J11
.R3
2-1 set
U.S. Congress

Appendix

Accomplishments of U.S. Space Exploration Under the Republican Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the very distinguished Senator from California and the Republican whip, Mr. KUCHEL, on the accomplishments of U.S. space exploration under the Republican administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF U.S. SPACE EXPLORATION UNDER THE REPUBLICAN ADMINISTRATION

(By U. S. Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, of California, Senate Republican whip)

The accomplishments of the U.S. space exploration program under the Republican administration can be divided into the following sections for a clear-cut picture of what the United States has done and is doing:

1. Organization and resources.
2. A scorecard detailing competition with the U.S.S.R.
3. A brief survey of the U.S. space program as evidenced in the successful shots in that program.
4. A delineation of important milestones in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's 10-year plan.

ORGANIZATION AND RESOURCES

When NASA declared itself to be ready for business on October 1, 1958, it began work on:

(a) Completing the several programs which were initiated by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Department of Defense.

(b) Developing a sound but bold and imaginative long-range plan with specific projects for the next 2 years calling for concentrated attention to the need for more powerful launch vehicles and a program of satellite and deep space flights that will approximate 26 major flights in each year.

(c) Integrating the efforts of the 8,000 people inherited from the great NACA organization with the 2,400 fine people of the jet propulsion laboratory and the 5,500 people who made up the famous Von Braun group at the NASA Marshall Space Flight Center, and developing 2,000-man operation at the new Goddard Space Flight Center at Greenbelt, Md., and drawing together a headquarters staff of more than 550 people in Washington.

(d) Creating this new organization when the eyes of all the world placed the United States in the spotlight of the space race.

As of July 1, 1960, the NASA will be operating at $911 million annual rate as compared with a $33⅓ million annual expenditure rate 21 months earlier. (The grand total of all U.S. missiles programs from an obligational standpoint for fiscal year 1961 is estimated at $6,962 million, subject to revision.) With a total of more than 18,000 people—one-third or more of them professional people—NASA represents the Government's greatest research organization and, in many ways, its most unique. Its product is new knowledge and the development of the techniques necessary to acquire that knowledge and apply it for the benefit of mankind.

COMPETITION WITH THE U.S.S.R.

The U.S.S.R. appears to excel the United States in the thrust of its rocket-powered launch vehicle system. Their substantially higher thrust level has permitted them to undertake spectacular missions requiring the carrying of relatively advanced guidance equipment in addition to the payload instrumentation—a combined weight substantially beyond that which we have been able to fly.

In spite of this advantage, it seems clear that the United States has clearly bested the Soviet Union in the breadth and depth of its program development and particularly in the quality, quantity, and importance of the scientific results of its flights.

It is reasonable to believe, however, that the steady growth of the U.S. program, the obvious willingness of the United States to share its information and competence with other nations, and the beneficial and, at times, striking information being derived from the U.S. experiments is beginning to make itself felt as a positive counterforce to any Soviet propaganda.

Highlights of the Nation's space exploration program (with some remarks about results of the U.S.S.R. program). The direct exploration of space by means of unmanned vehicles traveling in space began on October 4, 1957, with the launching of Sputnik I by the U.S.S.R. In the intervening 30 months there have been launched successfully 22 additional earth satellites which have yielded much scientific information about the space environment by radio telemetry of data to the ground. Three satellites were launched by the U.S.S.R. on November 3, 1957, May 15, 1958, and May 15, 1960.

The United States has launched 19 satellites, the first on January 31, 1958, and the most recent on May 24, 1960.

Five were called Explorers, launched by Jupiter C's in three cases, Thor-Able II in one, and Juno II in one.

Three were Vanguards.

Seven were Discoverers, launched by Thor-Agena A's.

One used an Atlas for the communications experiment, Project Score.

One, the meterological satellite of Project Tiros, was launched by a Thor-Able IV.

One, the navigation satellite Transit, was launched by a Thor-Able Star.

One, the missile early warning satellite Midas, was launched by an Atlas-Agena.

Seven space probes have been launched since October 4, 1957, three by the U.S.S.R., four by the United States.

All of the U.S.S.R. space probes were directed toward the Moon; one launched on January 2, 1959, was claimed by the Russians as having passed within a few diameters of the Moon, and went into an orbit around the Sun.

The second, launched on September 12, 1959, hit the Moon, or so the Russians said.

The third, launched on October 4, 1959, passed close enough to take pictures of the far side of the Moon and was deflected by the gravitational field of the Moon to return toward the Earth.

The first U.S. space probe, launched on October 11, 1958, traveled to a distance of 70,700 miles.

The second, launched on December 6, 1958, traveled to a distance of 63,580 miles.

The third, launched on March 3, 1959, went into orbit around the Sun, communication with it being maintained to a distance of 407,000 miles.

The fourth was launched on March 11, 1960, inward toward the orbit of Venus, and on May 8 was at a distance of a little more than 8 million miles from the Earth with data still being received by telemetry.

Each of the satellites and space probes has produced much information on various aspects of the space environment itself and of environmental conditions within space vehicles. Many of the missions have been directed toward scientific objectives relating to the Earth and its atmosphere and ionosphere. To illustrate the types of information returned, you may consider the return from Sputnik II, Lunik III, Pioneer V, and Tiros I.

Sputnik II was launched into an elliptical orbit with initial perigee of 140 miles and initial apogee of 1,038 miles inclined at 65 degrees to the equator. It carried the dog Laika for measurement of physiological reaction of an animal to space flight. Its instruments measured cosmic rays, solar ultraviolet, and X-radiation. Temperature and pressures within the satellite were measured.

Significant solar influence on density in the upper atmosphere was noted from measurements of fluctuations in satellite drag which were directly correlated with solar activity. Cosmic ray counting rate increased with height, not understood at the time, but later found to be associated with the Van Allen radiation belt discovered with the instruments in Explorer I.

Lunik III apparently produced the first pictures of the far side of the moon. Lunik III demonstrated maneuverability in a large spacecraft, the successful storage of pictures on film and their later transmission back to Earth, according to the Russians. Apparently no further scientific data were obtained because of early failure of the power supply or transmission system.

The Pioneer V space probe, weighing 94.8 pounds, was accelerated to a velocity of 24,869 miles per hour in an orbit about the Sun inclined inward toward the orbit of Venus. Its period is about 311 days. Its perihelion is about 74,700,000 miles, which is about 18 million miles closer to the Sun than the orbit of the Earth.

Long-range projection of the trajectory forecasts that Pioneer V will be farthest from the Earth—183 million miles—in September 1962 and that the Earth and probe will approach within 16 million miles in November 1965.

Because of the eccentricity of the probe orbit, the probe again will come within 15.6 million miles in April 1966. A closer approach than this will not occur until 1989, when the two will come within 2 million miles of each other, according to present estimates.

The probe carries instruments to measure charged particles in space—i.e., an ionization

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

chamber and Geiger-Mueller tube to measure total radiation—and a triple coincidence cosmic ray proportional counter. The probe also carries a micrometeorite counter, a magnetometer, and instruments for measurement of temperatures and attitude. Power is furnished by solar cells mounted on paddles. There are two transmitters, designed to permit communication at distances up to 50 million miles, although there are now indications that degradation of the batteries may halt transmission between 10 million and 20 million miles.

Tiros I is a 270-pound satellite which carries two television cameras to observe cloud formations and transmit the pictures to stations on the ground.

It was launched in a nearby circular orbit with perigee of 435 miles and apogee of 468 miles, with a period of 99.15 minutes. It is stabilized by spinning, thus maintaining a fixed direction in space. Pictures are obtained when the satellite is in that part of its orbit where the camera sees the sunlit portion of the Earth.

The satellite is provided with tape recorders which can record as many as 32 pictures for later transmission to the ground stations.

Thousands of pictures have been obtained of cloud formations.

Tiros promises a major forward step in observations of major storms and frontal systems.

On the basis of this and future meteorological satellites, it is hoped to develop within a few years an operational system for routine use in weather forecasting.

SPACE TRAVEL BY MAN

For present purposes, the NASA is interested in the bearing of the information obtained on the prospects for space travel by man. The data obtained on the pressure, density, and temperature are required for rational design of any spacecraft, whether carrying man or instruments. Similarly, data on the ionosphere are of interest because of the electrical charging of the vehicle and its effects on radio communication from the vehicle and on its drag.

One of the major results of the first satellite launchings was the discovery by James A. Van Allen and his colleagues of a belt of charged particles trapped in the magnetic field of the earth which produced radiation on striking a space vehicle.

Further studies have shown that the structure of this region is quite complex and the outer zone varies in extent with solar activity.

We have learned considerably about outer space, but much basic information is yet to be obtained before man ventures very far away from the earth. Specifically, there are formidable technical developments needed to assure the success of manned journeys to the moon and to the planets of the solar system.

THE U.S. LONG-RANGE PLAN FOR SPACE EXPLORATION

Listed below are the highlights of the 10-year plan developed by NASA and presented to the Congress early in 1960. It is to be noted that forecasting research and development activities for many years in the future is a questionable procedure.

What can be undertaken 2 years from now depends on what is learned in experiments to be undertaken in the intervening 2 years. Nevertheless, in a rapidly moving technology involving long leadtimes, it is possible to identify objectives which should be possible of accomplishment given normally accelerated advancement of the technologies involved and assuming an adequately paced funding program.

Under these ground rules, the following listing represents certain long-range objectives of the U.S. space exploration program.

NASA MISSION TARGET DATES

Calendar year 1960

First launching of meteorological satellite.
First launching of a passive reflector communications satellite.
First launching of a Scout vehicle.
First launching of a Thor-Delta vehicle.
First launching of an Atlas-Agena-B vehicle (by the Department of Defense).
First suborbital flight of an astronaut.

Calendar year 1961

First launching of a lunar impact vehicle.
First launching of an Atlas-Centaur vehicle.
Attainment of manned space flight, Project Mercury.

Calendar year 1962

First launching to the vicinity of Venus and/or Mars.

Calendar year 1963

First launching of two stage Saturn vehicle.

Calendar year 1963–64

First launching of unmanned vehicle for controlled landing on the moon.
First launching Orbiting Astronomical and Radio Astronomy Observatory.

Calendar year 1964

First launching of unmanned lunar circumnavigation and return to earth vehicle.
First reconnaissance of Mars and/or Venus by an unmanned vehicle.

Calendar year 1965–67

First launching in a program leading to manned circumlunar flight and to permament near-earth space station.

Beyond 1970

Manned flight to the moon.

A New Mask for Big Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, during the weeks ahead the citizens of this country will hear a lot of oratory as we approach a great national election which will decide which of the two major political parties will be in charge of our Government during the next Congress.

In the opinion of the editors of Fortune magazine the 1960 campaign largely boils down to one word and that word is "growth." In an article under the the heading of "A New Mask for Big Government" by Max Ways, the April 1960 issue of Fortune presents the author's views as to the different interpretation placed on the word by the two parties. The article clearly points out that one of the issues of the campaign ahead of us will be whether voters wish to transfer to the Federal Government more and more powers reserved "to the people."

The comparison of the two positions with respect to the catch phrase "growth" is well worth reading and Fortune's presentation is submitted for the consideration of readers of the RECORD.

A NEW MASK FOR BIG GOVERNMENT

(By Max Ways)

In this presidential election year, as in any other, there's a lot of gabble; but is there a debate? Sometimes it's hard to tell whether a Democrat or a Republican is talking, or how one dismembered argument fits with another. If the confusion continues, the public may forget about issues and let the 1960 campaign degenerate into a personality contest, second only to the one that chooses Miss Universe.

That would be a pity, for beneath the drifting verbal sandstorm the parties are widely divided on the most important kind of question that can enter politics. The half-hidden issue of 1960 is nothing less than the nature of government itself in a free society. Will the U.S. Government remain a creature of great but limited powers, laying down general rules and laws within which men can live their own lives, make their own decisions, and pursue their own ends? Or will government become responsible for seeking everything that men hold good and wielding whatever power can serve that unlimited responsibility? Will it write the rules of free economic life? Or, instead, give the specific commands to advance the Nation toward specific economic goals and plans? Will it be judge—or architect? Umpire—or manager? On the answers to these great questions the future of our society turns.

Piecemeal examination of most of the specific economic issues now kicking around would disclose in the end this profound constitutional conflict. Republicans take pride in the fact that, by painstaking exertions, they have reduced Federal expenditures to something less than 20 percent of the gross national product. But Democrats denounce these efforts and propose more spending on so many fronts that they seem to have abandoned entirely the idea of limited government. The administration has taken grave risks in an election year to carry out sovereignty's unique obligation to provide a stable currency. But the Democrats ridicule this concern about sound money and insist that anti-inflation measures conflict with more important functions of the state. In their attitude toward the farm issue and other matters, party lines have tended to blur. Yet research would show that in fact the parties are using different definitions of the fundamental nature of government.

A MAGIC WORD BOBS UP

Up until a few months ago, it looked as if any serious effort to get down to the skeleton of the 1960 campaign would have to go through such an analysis, issue by issue. Then a word began to be heard more and more often from the lips of such Democratic spokesmen as Hubert Humphrey, John Kennedy, Paul Douglas, Leon Keyserling. It works magic—in ways intended and unintended. It pulls together all the specific issues into a hub of coherence. But it also discloses—plainly and without drudgery—how all the issues add up to the great constitutional question about the nature of government.

The magic word is "growth." In the past it has appeared many times on that side of the constitutional argument which holds that the responsibility of goverment should be limited to those necessary functions that only government can perform. The original American assumption was that if government established a firm structure of essential order, then the economy would grow through the free decisions of its citizens. Famously, it grew. But now some Democratic spokesmen have given the word "growth" a very special meaning. For them, "growth" signifies a conscious assumption by the Federal Government of responsibility for seeing to it that the total U.S. economy, measured by the amount of goods and services produced in a year, shall grow at a predetermined target rate.

Now this definition of growth, cast as it is in terms of material production, bypasses a concept of development that relates primarily to men, not things. True economic growth is more than the piling up of goods and services: it is the widening of man's options over those goods and services. The goal of expanding the range of choice is consonant with the goal of political freedom; but if the Government sets specific goals of performance for the economy and acts to see that those goals are reached, then the citizen's range of choice about his work, his property, and his purchases must be greatly constricted. It is legitimate for the Government to foster development through wise fiscal and credit policy, and it is essential that government preempts through taxation a part of the national product for defense and other functions that only government can perform. But if the Government is made responsible for setting and realizing a predetermined rate of growth for the entire economy it must do more than create a climate. It must plan. It must set priorities. It must substitute for the decisions of the free market the decisions of the growth "expert."

The current insistence on growth curiously twists discussion of every public issue away from the merits of the case. Is defense adequate? Never mind the hard questions of how well military power is tailored to political goals. Instead, quantify the thousands of complex defense problems into aggregate military expenditures: assume that U.S. defense would be better if the sum spent were greater; then note triumphantly how much more could be spent if the economy grew faster. Does communism threaten to take, without war, world political and economic leadership? Ignore the great issues of political philosophy and the diplomatic skill involved in this challenge, and reduce it all to the standing of the teams in the international growth-rate league. Is it difficult to determine how much foreign aid to direct where? Aim it at growth on the assumption, utterly unproved, that the faster a nation's gross national product gains, the more resistant it is to communism. At home, does inflation threaten individual savings and distort economic decisions? Ignore inflation's causes, including heavy Government spending, and instead warn that growth may slow down unless Government activity whips the economy along at an unflagging pace. Is American education under belated scrutiny? Forget all question of its quality; bypass local community responsibility and demand $1 billion in Federal aid on the ground that this will serve economic development. Are cities blighted? Let's grow—with Federal funds for urban renewal.

Many of the specific proposals now put forward under the rubric of growth are proper and necessary functions of government. The Eisenhower administration, although deeply committed to limited government, is forced to an $80 billion budget by the necessities of the cold war, by irreversible prior commitments, and by public demand. If these pressures can generate an $80 billion budget with Republicans sitting on the spending lid, what would be the limit under an administration that saw every issue in terms of an alleged government responsibility for directing the whole economy toward target growth rates?

President Eisenhower and the other top Republican leaders have not been panicked into going along with the vogue of the growth drive. They have stated clearly that the rate of growth should depend upon the aggregate of decisions in a free economy, the Government's responsibility being to maintain an orderly framework. They have marshaled impressive evidence that the old formula of limited government still works, that the economy continues to grow. But the Republicans have not succeeded in getting over to the public the significance of the constitutional question raised by growth. They behave as if the growth issue was an embarrassment, instead of embracing an opportunity to make directly and dramatically a case that they would otherwise have to make piecemeal and tediously.

THE STONE REJECTED BY THE BUILDERS

As matters now stand the responsibility is on the Republicans to lift the 1960 campaign out of the ruck of stale issues, and to rise to the great issue. In doing so they would have a wealth of material to draw upon. For the fact is that the Democrats' espousal of the new growth theme has been mothered not by high principle but by necessity. They used to consider growth a Republican idea, belonging to the national adolescence and no fit preoccupation for citizens in an age of maturity. Understanding of the relation between the growth slogan, as now used, and the idea of expanding government will be increased if we trace the outlines of an ironic story of how a stone rejected by the New Deal's builders became the cornerstone of the 1960 Democratic edifice.

The rejection occurred on September 23, 1932, when Franklin Roosevelt, at the Commonwealth Club in San Francisco, made one of his choicest speeches. "Our industrial plant is built," he said. "The problem just now is whether under existing conditions it is not overbuilt. Our last frontier has long since been reached, and there is practically no more free land." During the years when America was growing, initiative and the pioneering spirit had served it well. But "our task now is not discovery or exploitation of natural resources, or necessarily produring more goods. It is the soberer, less dramatic business of administering resources and plants already in hand • • • of meeting the problem of underconsumption, of adjusting production to consumption, of distributing wealth and products more equitably, of adapting existing economic organization to the service of the people." Since growth had ended, government's new role would be to "bring the scheme of things into balance, even though it may in some measure qualify the freedom of action of individual units within • • • business."

The Commonwealth Club speech, based on the matured economy thesis of Rexford Guy Tugwell and others, makes strange reading today amidst all the hubbub about growth-at-any-price. Nevertheless, the thesis served Roosevelt well by providing a historical interpretation for tasks, such as the redistribution of wealth, that government had not previously performed. New times, new methods was the mood that needed to be created; and having created the mood, Roosevelt proceeded to construct the New Deal upon three patterns. The first, as old as the Republic, was a set of specific promises, each designed to appeal to an economic interest group—farmers, union labor, etc. The second pattern, which had once disgusted such Democrats as Al Smith, was the class struggle. The third pattern, presented merely as instrumental to the first two, was big government.

TRUMAN NO LONGER COMES CLEAR

Politically, this combination was brilliantly successful. But inexorably time and changing circumstances undermined at least two of the New Deal's props. In recent years economists and sociologists have been calling attention to profound alterations occurring within American society, but political analysts have been a little slow to recognize how drastically these changes would affect politics. We are familiar with the idea that Americans are becoming more alike—not regimented but homogenized. This trend has undermined New Deal pattern No. 1, because regional, ethnic, and economic groups have become weaker, either through loss of numbers as with the farmers or through loss of esprit as with the union workers. Both parties still make promises to such groups, as parties always have and always will; but the game of the interest groups is losing its political zing.

Meanwhile, New Deal pattern No. 2 is in similar trouble. U.S. society, like all others, used to be in the shape of a pyramid, with the majority living under or at or barely above the subsistence level. Fluidity saved the United States from class struggle, until the depression offered a great but transitory opportunity to pit the poor against the rich. Since then, however, the shape of U.S. society has changed to that of a diamond, 43 percent of the people having entered the $5,000-to-$10,000-a-year income bracket. History's first diamond-shaped society is no place for the politics of class struggle, and when the Democrats today dutifully cheer Harry Truman's old-style forays against the gluttons and in favor of the common man, they know he isn't coming in clear on the channels to well-fed, well-clad, and newly housed suburbia.

The erosion of groups and classes helped lose the Democrats two presidential elections. Eisenhower's 7-year emphasis on being "President of all the people" makes these older appeals even more awkward to use. What remained of the New Deal combination was big government, a pattern with certain peculiarities. No doubt big government itself has a powerful attraction for many anxious and bewildered 20th-century voters, but, as with alcohol, the taste has to be masked. Any vintage speech from the caves of the Hyde Park connoisseur always had a bouquet of group or class justice or historical necessity to perfume the full-bodied big government base. Now that patterns 1 and 2 had been weakened, what could become the necessary companion to pattern 3?

TWO SOLUTIONS; ONE RESULT

One answer to this question has been provided by John Kenneth Galbraith, member of the ADA, and economist for the Democratic Advisory Council. In his "The Affluent Society," Galbraith argues that our present concern for expanding production is a hangover from our necessitous past. In this he is close to the fundamentalist "matured economy" thesis of the Commonwealth Club speech. But Galbraith is vitally interested in the Government's assuming a larger role in improving the quality of American life, and his ideas have been echoed by Adlai Stevenson. It is not always clear just how Stevenson wants Government to go about improving the quality of life, but it is quite clear that his conception requires a lot of scope for Government. Galbraith is more explicit. In a recent Saturday Evening Post article he calls for large "investment" in human beings through increased Federal aid to education, and in general he wants the Government to take an even larger bite of the national resources than it does today, using taxation to change and channel national tastes. In the end, this consumer approach might well entail a greater proliferation of Government activities and controls than old proposals that Government control the means of production.

However, the quality-of-life goal for big government is not well attuned to another great change—this one external—that has come over the United States since early New Deal days. Galbraith brushes off the cold war by assuming its most urgent issues could be negotiated out. Most Americans do not believe this, and the Democratic leaders generally do not buy it. They assume that the United States must continue its leadership of the non-Communist world in a desperate struggle. And they have drawn on this prospect to construct a way very different from Galbraith's of answering the question of what big government is for. After all, the two world wars had done more

than anything else to bring unlimited government to the forefront of men's minds. The influence on American political values of the long contest with totalitarian nations has been ambivalent: on the one hand, Americans detest unlimited government more than they ever did; on the other hand, they are attracted by the strength that seems to accrue when a nation puts all its resources and vital decisions under central political control. This ambivalence could be resolved by presenting the idea of an enlarged government at home as the best or the only way of combating unlimited government abroad. If done crassly, the contradiction in values would be too obvious. Some term had to be found to substitute for "enlarged-government-at-home." Obviously, the old growth-has-ended premise was not suitable for this purpose. But the contrary premise, growth-must-be-faster, would serve beautifully. All that had to be explained away was an inconsistency, and in politics that is not an unusual task.

Observe how the New Deal's sympathetic historian, Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., went about it a few years ago when the New Dealers were quietly transiting from growth-has-ended to growth-must-be-faster. In "The Crisis of the Old Order" he noted that the passage quoted above from Roosevelt's Commonwealth Club speech had been written by Adolf Berle and might reflect Berle's thought, not Roosevelt's. Then Schlesinger pointed to another passage in the same speech where Roosevelt had said: "America is new. * * * It has the great potentialities of youth." Schlesinger opined that this latter passage "seemed to express Roosevelt's élan more truly than the calm assertion that growth was over." Finally, Schlesinger finished his bridge between the two contradictory promises by stressing that the conclusion, rather than the premises, was what counted. "Still, the Commonwealth Club address," Schlesinger, "provided impressive reasons for enlarging the role of government. For Roosevelt, who was more interested in results than in systems, this was probably more important than the basic framework of interpretation."

In addition to being a historian, Schlesinger is a maker of current Democratic party doctrine. His bridge has put him in position to use the growth-must-be-faster slogan and to combine the motive of fighting Communism and the quality-of-life motive into one brilliant blend. Writing in the January, 1960, Esquire, Schlesinger found the fifties a decade of "torpor," "inertia," "sterility," of "private opulence and public squalor." The average annual increase in the gross national product between 1953 and 1958, he said, was only 1.6 percent, while the Soviet economy continues to roar along at an annual growth rate of 9.5 percent. Having studied Roosevelt's life not in vain, he also denied that he favored big government for its own sake. "The object of strengthening government is to give force to the idea of the public interest and to make possible to allocation of resources to necessary public purposes. There is no other way to meet the competition of communism. There is no other way to bring about a higher quality of life and opportunity for ordinary men and women."

Nor will Adolf Berle be left behind, a scapegoat in the growthless wilderness beyong the last frontier. In January he contributed to the New York Times magazine an article called "Why Our Economy Must Grow Faster." The social objectives and political methods therein set forth do not seem to differ greatly from those advocated by Berle in the 1930's, when he thought that these measures ought to be undertaken because he believed the period of rapid expansion was permanently over.

THE 5 PERCENTERS

The operation of reversing the attitude toward growth and then using it as a mask for unlimited government has been so successfully performed that Democratic spokesmen now employ growth with increasing frequency and enthusiasm. The Democratic advisory council's policy statement in December said that the Republican administration had reduced our long-term national economic growth to a very low rate. It said the Soviet growth was two or three times that of the United States. The Democrats blamed lack of bold and creative political leadership for this condition and urged that we, as a nation, roll up our sleeves. The AFL–CIO in February of this year called for a sustained growth rate of 5 percent a year. Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who blames Republican complacency and flaccid ease for the erosion of our national power and prestige, also comes out for a 5 percent rate. Meanwhile, Senator JOHN KENNEDY says we are in a period of stagnation and retreat. He demands expanded economic growth—rate not specified.

The extent to which growth dominates Democratic Party thinking can be seen in the report of the Joint Economic Committee on Employment, Growth, and Price Levels. The Democratic majority, led by Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, comes to seven fundamental conclusions about the U.S. economy, of which six are concerned with growth. Government policies are to be so shaped as to produce a 4.5 percent a year growth rate. Most of the Democrats, including Senators SPARKMAN, O'MAHONEY, and KENNEDY, signed this report. All of the Republicans, a wide band ranging from Maryland's JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER to New York's JACOB K. JAVITS, rejected the majority's insistence on government responsibility for growth rates set at a particular level.

The Democrat who most explicitly spells out what "growth" really means for our political system is Leon Keyserling, a lawyer who became chairman of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers. (If the Democrats won in 1960, Keyserling would deserve, as the most consistent and persuasive of the growthers, an even higher post in their next administration.)

Keyserling skillfully weaves together the two main strands of Democratic thought on the growth issue. He cannot, of course, agree with Galbraith that the United States is placing too much emphasis on the growth of production. But Keyserling does agree that "our sense of values, in using what we now produce, needs to be greatly improved." He asserts that a high growth rate (his figure is 5 percent) will make for better values. If, as he promises, the GNP can be raised to $600 billion by 1964, then "this huge increase would be available for wise utilization, in accord with our priorities of need." Unlike Galbraith, Keyserling does not insist that a greater proportion of GNP be spent by Government. He thinks the Federal budget for 1964 need be only $96 billion, or 16 percent of his target GNP. But both wings of the Democrats should be happy with this sum: Galbraith's followers would have available money for all sorts of public purposes; Keyserling's adherents would get growth; and both would get what they really want—expanded government.

TOWARD A NEW NRA?

Much more Government control is, indeed, Keyserling's recipe. He proposes that the President in his Economic Report each year "set forth a national prosperity budget, furnishing short-range and long-range overall targets for production and employment." The "National Prosperity Budget" would, Keyserling emphasizes, "have no mandatory force upon the powerful private groups in our economy. But it would necessarily contain overall advisory targets for private investment and consumption." Would the "National Prosperity Budget," then, be just a pep talk to industry? By no means, because Keyserling wants representatives of industry, labor, and agriculture to be intimately involved in setting the targets, and he wants these groups to cooperate with each other under Government auspices to meet the targets.

Such cooperation, involving repeal or disregard of the Sherman Antitrust Act, would imitate one of the New Deal's most disastrous experiments, the NRA. Keyserling's system would run into a dilemma as soon as some business or union made a decision contrary to the official plan of cooperation. If government did not coerce the maverick into compliance, then cooperation would break down. If government did enforce cooperation, then we would have a corporate state.

Yet despite this, Keyserling's ideas have extraordinary appeal even to businessmen. In January of this year, speaking in Philadelphia, he made his case for growth as the central theme of government policy and concluded: "Nobody need worry about what his taxes or what his job or what his profits are going to be 5 years from now; the only thing we need to worry about is where we, the American people, are going to be 5 years from now." Warm applause followed this extraordinary proposal to abandon individual responsibility in favor of collective responsibility. Perhaps it is a measure of the growth argument's emotional appeal that Keyserling's audience on this occasion was the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Philadelphia.

IN MOURNFUL NUMBERS

Like a drumbeat through Keyserling's speech, and through the jeremiads of other growthers, runs an evocative echo of war. In wartime, we are reminded, our Nation was muscular and intent. Then the Government was a font of economic decision and a focus of productive strength. Now, soft and aimless, we loll among the fleshpots. But, again, an enemy is at the gates.

What usually comes next is a mournful count of United States versus Soviet growth rates. Keyserling, for instance, says that "since the Korean war" the U.S. economy has been growing at only a little better than 2 percent a year while that of the U.S.S.R. has been growing at more than 10 percent.

Because such comparisons form a large part of the growth argument, it is important to examine these figures with some care. Four sets of growth figures are involved: (1) the Soviet rate, (2) the "Truman rate," (3) the "Eisenhower rate," and (4) the projected U.S. rate beyond 1960. The first three, as used in the Democratic case, are distorted by a common error of trying to extrapolate long-term trends from a short—and specially selected—span of years.

The widely accepted notion that the Soviet economy is growing faster than the U.S. economy has been exploded by Colin Clark, the distinguished British authority on productivity (see Business Globe, Fortune, March 1960). The high Russian figures are mainly derived from the period 1948–53, when the U.S.S.R. was recovering from the devastation of war. Germany, Japan, and Italy show similarly high annual growth rates under similar circumstances. Clark uses a striking analogy to explain the exaggerated U.S. projections of Soviet growth: "A child recovering from a serious illness shows, for 2 succeeding weeks, a rapid gain in weight. The doctor plots these figures on a logarithmic diagram, and deduces the conclusion, which he tells to the parents,

that in a little more than a year the child is going to weigh more than its father. If any doctor acted in this manner he would be regarded as not qualified to practice."

Growth in total production must reflect either growth in population or growth in man-hour productivity. The Soviet population is almost certainly growing at a slower rate than the U.S. population. That leaves man-hour productivity, where the Russians made enormous, but not startling, gains in the postwar recovery years. As reconstruction came to an end, Clark says, the Russian productivity increase expectably slowed down and now approaches the long-range Russian rate. For the period 1913–56 that rate was 1.2 percent a year as against a long-term U.S. productivity rate per man-hour of 2.3 percent. Allowing for population increases, the long-range growth of the Russian national product has probably been at a rate of only about 2.5 percent, while the comparable U.S. figure has been 3.5 percent.

Clark's emphasis on long-term trends has an obvious bearing on recent U.S. experience. The so-called "Truman growth rate" of 4.5 percent is for the years 1947–53, and was accepted by the majority of the Douglas committee. The Republican minority replied that the base year 1947 was deliberately selected to give a high annual average for the Truman administration. By contrast, the period 1945–53, which begins in a year of booming war production, shows an average annual growth rate of less than 2 percent.

Similarly, the "Eisenhower rate" of 2.3 percent used by the Democrats is low because it begins with 1953, the peak of Korean-war production. In a word, these short-range growth calculations can prove whatever the calculator wants to prove, depending on his choice of base years.

The final set of figures, relating to the future growth of the United States, are not so much subject to statistical correction as to caution in how they are used. The 4.5 percent rate selected by the Douglas-committee Democrats is not wildly out of line as a projection. The U.S. population is now growing at 1.8 percent a year; this increase, joined to the long-term average productivity increase of 2.3 percent, would produce a better than 4 percent growth in annual product.

What it all boils down to is this: the only growth-rate figures useful for measuring political performance are long-range figures, and the long-range figures indicate that the United States probably will continue to widen its advantage over the U.S.S.R. The danger in the Douglas committee's conclusion is not so much its arithmetic as the fixing of a preconceived government target.

THE DEEPER CHANGE

For even if the figures ran the other way and it could be shown that the Russian economy was overtaking ours, the United States would only handicap itself by making a fundamental change in its relationship between the Government and the economy. There is no danger that the United States will go Communist. There is danger that it will be frightened into a half-planned system that would have some of the disadvantages and none of the advantages of communism.

The chief Republican spokesmen, resting their case on the superiority of the American system of limited government, although they are obviously for economic expansion, have so far refused to accept Government responsibility for reaching target rates of economic growth. Both President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON have made clear how they think growth does and does not relate to politics. In his 1960 Economic Report, Eisenhower said: "Excessive reliance on government machinery may not only frustrate the quest for steady growth and reasonably stable prices, but may also have undesirable consequences for our economic system and for our freedom." Then Eisenhower had a key sentence: "In a free society, Government makes its major contribution to economic growth by fostering conditions that encourage and reinforce the efforts of individuals and private groups to improve their circumstances." This is in direct contrast to Keyserling's statement that "nobody need worry about what his taxes or what his job or what his profits are going to be five years from now." Eisenhower is against transferring private economic worries and hopes to the shoulders of Government.

The President's Cabinet Committee on Price Stability for Economic Growth, of which NIXON is chairman, spelled out why. "Ours is a nation in which idealism, not materialism, is fundamental, a nation in which the Government is the servant, not the master, of the people. * * * Economic growth is not an end in itself but a means of advancing to more fundamental ends." It follows that "our economy * * * must provide expanding opportunities for every individual to realize his own potentialities to the utmost. * * * It must encourage initiative, independence and integrity. It must preserve and enlarge the dignity and moral worth of the individual."

When it employed the words "advance, expand, encourage, and enlarge," the NIXON committee was using a traditional American standard for measuring the worth of a society primarily by what its pattern of organization does for the strength of men, rather than by what men can be made to do for the strength of the state.

THE PRACTICAL DIFFERENCE

But what about the strength of the State? It is a conspicuous part of the growth crusade to charge that the Eisenhower administration so limits the role of the Government that it cannot fulfill its military and other responsibilities to the society. Walter Lippman writes that the President adheres "to a principle that puts private comfort ahead of national need." Keyserling rams this thought home by charging that, although "every military expert" believes present defense levels to be inadequate, the administration holds down defense expenditures because it is unwilling to stimulate the economy to higher levels of production.

What the Lippman and Keyserling arguments do is confuse a legitimate debate on defense levels with an entirely different debate on whether the Government should control the private economy. After all, the present level of defense spending is approaching $50 billion, the highest ever in peacetime. Defense costs the average American family about $1,000 a year, which scarcely suggests that Washington today is being run by pacifists or hedonists. Comfort-loving Americans have again and again shown their willingness to pay for whatever level of defense their situation requires. The Eisenhower administration, knowing this, has set a level based on its conception of U.S. military need. Naturally, this is lower than the aggregate of all the estimates of all the experts in each ramification of defense spending. Perhaps on the merits, defense spending ought to be higher, but the point here is that the administration is not using defense as a backdrop for the glorification of the State and the shackling of the free economy; many of its critics are using the defense issue in just that way.

A similar cleavage can be seen on other policies. Eisenhower believes that the chief nonmilitary responsibility of government is to establish the general framework and climate in which the free economy operates. The vigorous record of the Eisenhower administration on antitrust prosecution reflects its concern for setting the framework. So does its position as regards sound money and the maintenance of economic stability. The Eisenhower record in combating inflation is one of substantial success. Moreover, the Eisenhower administration has promoted economic stability by devices that interfere less directly than do specific controls with the day-to-day decisions of individuals. It has relied on both monetary policy as practiced by the Federal Reserve Board and, to a lesser degree, on fiscal policy to level off the business cycle. But it is just this general approach that is under attack from the Democrats. The attack takes several forms. Contending that tight money inhibits growth, the Democrats would emasculate credit policy. Such experts as PAUL DOUGLAS would rely mainly on the budget as a stabilizer. Fiscal policy, however, is far more cumbersome to operate than credit policy, is always late in action, and tends to become a one-way street for more spending. Secretary of the Treasury Anderson has observed dryly that "experience in the postwar period indicates that it is much easier to achieve a deficit in a recession than a surplus in a boom."

This dispute about government's relation to the economy is sharpened still further by Galbraith. He would go all the way to direct price-wage controls—and he would use these controls not only to affect the price level but also to shift the allocation of national resources toward a higher quality of American life. In a less candid form, other Democratic leaders share Galbraith's deep distrust of the whole market economy. To them the market stands for waste and drift, just as government stands for growth and aim. They refuse to face squarely the fact that in one way or another resources have to be allocated if society is to function. The market makes the allocation by relating production to the desires of individuals. The alternative to the market is full-scale government planning over the whole economy.

THE MORAL ISSUE UNDERNEATH

In terms of U.S. political theory and in terms of practical policy, the Republicans' case appears to be solidly based. But their job in the 1960 campaign is much more difficult than it looks, because growth has an emotional appeal deeper than material practicalities. Although the Nixon committee truly said that idealism, not materialism is the foundation of this Nation's character, it is not clear that the Republicans understand that in growth the Democrats have got hold of a moral issue to which the statistics are only incidental. Democratic speeches on this ostensibly dry subject are somehow filled with idealistic passion, and there is reason to believe that they are finding an emotional response in the breasts of many citizens.

This Nation knows that it is both prosperous and in mortal danger—a combination that conjures up visions of the decline of the Roman Empire and other great civilizations whose social health and military power were really weakened by a concentration of luxury at the top. The bulk of the new U.S. prosperity, however, has gone to raise a huge group of Americans from the level of subsistence to a level that is still far short of luxury. Continuing mass prosperity is no doubt an important factor in defending the Nation against an external danger from an aggressive Communist system built on the claim that a free economy cannot bring mass prosperity. But an ingrained—and basically wholesome—American characteristic generates a deep distrust of mere prosperity. Hence Americans do listen guiltily to those who interpret the increased volume of consumer goods as waste, and softness, and luxury.

Thus the Democrats have a popular cause when they demonstrate unnecessary consumer spending, and argue that our mili-

tary power would automatically multiply if we got rid of signs of luxury. Today, tail fins are the devil's gauds, as TV sets were at the beginning of the Korean war, as jukeboxes were in 1941, as silk shirts on steelworkers were in 1918. "Abundance," meaning a decent life for most of the people and a widening choice of goods, is hard to get used to—although nobody really proposes that we do without it. Many comfortable Americans will applaud denunciations of luxury, so long as they think that it means no paint off their tail fins. "Growth" as a national ideal is not merely or mainly a program for more goods; it is a much more subtle promise that we can keep the goods and at the same time not feel guilty about those consumer spending figures. A recent U.S. Chamber of Commerce booklet observed, "The growth bandwagon is crowded with planners, but it also hast its complement of Puritans."

If the Republicans are to make their case for limited government really stick, they must take account of this Puritan characteristic, which ought to be on their side of the argument. They will have to offer a better slogan than "peace and prosperity." They will have to get over to an idealistic nation the moral content of their case against big government. At bottom, the idea of limited government turns on a belief in ethical values held to be higher than political power. The State's role is to provide certain protections to individuals as they go in freedom about the pursuit, through their own decisions, of their own values. Freedom has made the U.S. prosperous, but freedom's highest value is that it leaves on the citizen's shoulders the burden of responsibility for working about his taxes, his job, his profits, and many another element in his daily life. The 1960 campaign will begin to have some shape and clarity if the Republicans will try to show that, for Americans, the ultimate softness, the ultimate smugness, the ultimate waste would be transferring to the Government, in the name of "growth," powers reserved to the people.

Annual Meeting of Valley Electric Membership Cooperative, Natchitoches, La., June 25, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD B. McSWEEN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. McSWEEN. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on Saturday, June 25, 1960, to address the members of the Valley Electric Membership Cooperative at Natchitoches, La. I appreciate the privilege of inserting this speech in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Ladies and gentlemen, I am grateful for the invitation to be on your program today at the annual meeting of Valley Electric Membership Cooperative. I am particularly glad to be able to have a role in celebrating the silver anniversary of the REA loan program, 1935 to 1960.

Notwithstanding the popularity of this great program which has done so much for rural America in the last 25 years I find that many persons would like to know more about it.

The Rural Electrification Administration is a lending agency of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It makes loans to finance electric systems and telephone service in rural areas. Congress annually determines the amount of funds that REA may lend. In this regard I am happy to report that there will be a carryover from the current fiscal year to next fiscal year which begins next month of $110 million which has not been needed for REA loan applications during the past fiscal year. We in Congress have appropriated an additional $190 million plus a contingency fund of an additional $120 million, if needed, to meet loan applications during next fiscal year, 1961.

REA ESTABLISHED IN 1935

Established in 1935 by Executive order of the President, Congress gave REA permanent status in 1936 as an independent agency. The program was extended indefinitely in 1944. REA has been an agency of the Department of Agriculture since 1939, when Congress made this change.

WHAT REA DOES

For rural electrification REA may make loans to qualified borrowers. Loans cover the full cost of constructing powerlines and other facilities to serve persons in rural areas. These loans bear 2-percent interest and are repaid over a maximum period of 35 years.

The REA telephone loan program is operated much in the same way.

REA itself operates no electric facilities. Its main functions are to lend money and assure repayment through appropriate loan-supporting activities. Loans are repaid from operating revenues of the locally owned, locally managed systems it finances. Part of each consumer's monthly payments for electricity goes to pay off the Government loans. In short, your Federal Government, through the REA agency, operates as a bank to assist rural electric power facilities.

GROWTH OF FARM ELECTRIFICATION

The first central electric generating system in America went into service in 1882. When REA was created in 1935 only 11 percent of all farms had electric service. Now 96 percent of all farms are electrified; 98 percent in Louisiana. More than half of these farms get power from REA-financed systems.

About 93 percent of REA's electrification loans have been to cooperatives. These cooperatives, such as the Valley Electric Membership Cooperative, are local, independent, private enterprises. It should be made clear to all that this is not public power; this is not socialism, although some misinformed persons confuse cooperatives with public power. In fact, some of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association's officials often confuse the public by using the cooperatives' money to support public power and fight private power. In my humble judgment this is a mistake which hurts the cause of the co-ops and of rural consumers. I know full well that co-op members and rural electric consumers in Louisiana are believers in private enterprise and that they are opposed to socialism.

As of January 1 of this year, REA had approved over $4 billion in loans to 1,085 borrowers. They included 984 cooperatives, 50 public districts, 27 other public bodies, and 24 electric companies. These borrowers are serving over 4.7 million consumers in 46 States, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico.

The monthly average power consumption per farm is now 350 kilowatt-hours, more than double that of 1950. Electricity is a production tool for farmers. There are now more than 400 farm uses for electricity.

RECORD OF REPAYMENTS

As of January 1 of this year electric borrowers had paid to the government a total of more than $1.2 billion on their loans. This includes $669 million repaid on principal, $397 million paid in interest, and $154 million paid ahead of schedule. One borrower was overdue in payments amounting to $97,600.

You can thus see that the record of REA and of REA's borrowers, such as VEMCO, is an impressive one. It is a record to build on, and I am sure that the next 25 years of the REA program will be even more outstanding.

AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

I am proud to be a member of the Committee on Agriculture of the U.S. House of Representatives, which has legislative jurisdiction over farm credit programs, such as the Farm Home Administration, Federal Land Bank, and REA. The members of the Agriculture Committee have the best interests of farmers at heart. I was interested to learn that I am the first Louisianian to be a member of the Agriculture Committee since the late Congressman James B. Aswell.

HUMPHREY-PRICE BILL

During the last session of Congress there was before us a legislative proposal dealing with REA, known as the Humphrey-Price bill. It was introduced in the House by Congressman MELVIN PRICE of Illinois and in the Senate by Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY of Minnesota. It was a reorganization bill. It proposed to leave REA in the Department of Agriculture but clip the wings of the Secretary of Agriculture by not permitting him to have the authority to review the loan applications. This proposal would have created a hybrid situation, leaving REA half in the Department of Agriculture and half out. It would be best either to leave REA like it is and has been since 1939 or take it completely out of the Department of Agriculture and make it an independent agency as it was before 1939.

I voted against this Humphrey-Price bill. The fact that only four of us in the Democratic Party voted against it suggests that it was a party-line issue. It was a political slap at the Secretary of Agriculture which I personally did not feel justified in supporting. My party had not been able to beat the Secretary of Agriculture on farm commodity questions. Because of the popularity of the REA program it was felt that an REA bill could gather the number of votes sufficient to embarass him. I felt that it was a shame to carry the farm fight to the REA battleground and a shame to get REA into politics.

When the President vetoed this bill I voted to sustain his veto for the same reason. (Later last session I voted to override the President's veto of the public works appropriations bill, which had in it money for all of our flood control and drainage projects.)

Because of my vote on this bogus issue, I received both praise and criticism. I was disappointed to receive criticism from the hands of the LECA newspaper (which you help support), which said that my vote was a vote against REA. But I was proud to receive commendation for this vote from many rural electric consumers, who appreciate the fact that I was willing to use my judgment and not follow the mob. If my vote was a vote against REA, how can it be explained that the REA program has had its greatest success and growth under its present organizational structure—in the Department of Agriculture and under the Secretary of Agriculture—which was recommended by President Roosevelt and passed by Congress in 1939?

STATES RIGHTS

Individuals are often right, while associations and pressure groups are often wrong. I am sure that all of you are for States rights and believe that it should be the law of the land. I certainly believe in States rights and shall fight for it as long as I have the honor and privilege of representing you in Congress. Let me tell you about another bill we had before us last session. It was a States rights bill, called H.R. 3. It was for the purpose of curbing the power of the U.S. Supreme Court by overruling a

decision which gives Federal laws the preemption over State laws. Under this Supreme Court decision it was impossible for States to try seditionists under State laws. I was a strong and active supporter of H.R. 3. It passed the House, but did you know that Mr. Clyde Ellis, the manager of your parent cooperative organization, NRECA, opposed this States rights bill? This illustrates the fact that associations and pressure groups can be wrong.

Before I close I should like to mention briefly several other important legislative matters and serious problems facing our Nation.

It seems as if the entire world is in a state of turmoil. The riots in Japan, Turkey, Korea, and in Africa have been most serious. And there are revolutionary causes and plots brewing in many other nations at this very minute.

BLASTS CASTRO

The most serious question facing the United States at the present time, however, is just off the coast of Florida on the island of Cuba, where a young dictator has ridden to power dishonestly on the cause of freedom and liberty. Fidel Castro is nothing but another Latin American demogogue. I take that back. He is more than a demogogue. He is also a Communist, who has tossed aside over 60 years of friendship and good relations between the peoples of Cuba and the United States. He is now making alliances with Soviet Premier Khrushchev that are detrimental to the best interests of the United States and of the American hemisphere. In fact the prospect of the possibility of Russian missile bases located in Cuba is the most serious threat to the security of this Nation in all our history. It is high time that we take off our gloves and deal with this despicable Communist dictator in any way that may be necessary.

OPPOSES FOREIGN AID

Speaking of trouble in the world, we do not seem to be accomplishing much with our extravagant foreign aid program. As you know, I have opposed foreign aid at every turn; the authorization bills as well as the appropriation bills. In opposing foreign aid I have advocated that our foreign policy be recast in the light of disappointing results of this costly program for over 10 years. Western Europe and Japan have recovered, and they are beating us over the head with their cheap imports. Nevertheless, Congress has just appropriated almost $4 billion again for foreign aid, but not without a fight from many of us who do not believe in it. We shall continue to fight this outdated program, and our ranks are increasing every year.

TOLEDO DAM

Let me say a word to you about the Toledo Bend Dam project on the Sabine River. As one of the Louisiana and Texas Congressmen bordering on the Sabine River who who was contacted in Washington last year by the Sabine River Authority and members of the Louisiana Legislature I have cooperated in having the Federal Government step up its study of the Sabine River in the event the assistance of the Federal Government is desired in the development of this project. Moneys have been provided as requested.

Several weeks ago I mailed a newsletter to the residents of Vernon and Sabine Parishes giving complete facts on this project in an effort to answer the many inquiries about the scope of this project that I have recently received. In this newsletter I pointed out the great value that this project could have for western Louisiana.

Sponsors of this project have been reluctant to have the Federal Government build it for several reasons, such as the ownership of the shoreline, use of the water rights, control of the electric power project by the Federal Government, and the loss of water to Texas if the project should be built by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Because of the excellent progress being made during this session of the Louisiana legislature it appears that the Toledo Dam project is now nearer to reality than ever before. The members of the Sabine and Vernon Parish delegations to the legislature are to be commended for their excellent work as is Governor Davis and the State administration for supporting it.

I note that certain political candidates are now embracing this popular project, although they have never before now ever lifted a finger themselves to do anything about it.

I thank you again for this privilege of being with you today. I extend to all of you my very best wishes for another successful year.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Occupation of Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 12, 1960, it was my pleasure to address a large rally held at Ciurlionis Hall in Cleveland, commemorating the 20th anniversary of the Russian Communist takeover of the Baltic States. The chairman of this rally was Mr. Julius R. Smetona, who is the son of the last legal President of Lithuania. Much has happened during the 20 years of Russian occupation of the Baltic States. I felt the major events of this period should be examined in terms of whether or not they advanced the emancipation of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from the ycke of Russian imperial communism. By so doing, I believe we can best evaluate national policy, past and present, and find the guideposts for our policy of the future.

Under leave obtained, I insert in the RECORD my address on the 20th anniversary of the occupation of Baltic States:

My Lithuanian-American friends, I deem it a privilege to be here with you today to play a part in this sad commemoration of the 20th anniversary of the Russian occupation of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian nations. This is the anniversary of one of the blackest chapters in the history of civilized mankind. It marks the days when the true colors of the Russian Communists were exposed for all to see, the days when the Russian imperialists were the happy allies of the tyrant Hitler. It also marks the days when the peace-loving people of the Baltic States were forced to accept, by treaty, peaceful coexistence with the Russians which turned out in reality to be military occupation. These long 20 years which have elapsed since have provided undisputed evidence of what the Russians mean by peaceful coexistence. Let us look, briefly, at the record of these past 20 years.

We see that all the Baltic States are still occupied by the Russian Communists. They are in these countries in violation of solemn treaties of peace and mutual understanding entered into between these countries and the U.S.S.R. They are not welcome. They remain there by military force alone.

We recall the brutal mass deportations carried out by the Russian Communists—deportations which violate the genocide code and shock the conscience of all mankind. Today loyal sons and daughters of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are scattered throughout the Russian Empire against their will. Thousands and thousands have died at the hands of the Russian slave masters.

We remind the people of the world that these mass deportations were directed by none other than one General Serov, an NKVD specialist in crimes against humanity. This same General Serov is Czar Khrushchev's favorite executioner. He accompanied Khrushchev on his tour of London a few years ago, serving as chief of security for the Russian dictator and his entourage. Khrushchev selected him to succeed Beria as head of the dreaded MVD. These two are real buddies in crime, inseparable partners. This, by the way, is the same Khrushchev who was invited by President Eisenhower to be his guest in the United States.

We can never forget that the people of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have been fighting these past 20 years to preserve their national identity, their rich Christian cultures, their historic values. These are the things the Russians have been attempting to destroy in their plan to make the people of these countries into Soviet peoples. We all know what they mean by Soviet people—they mean Russian Communists, people without love for their fellow man, people who live on hate, people who worship tyranny and despotism and reject all thoughts of God and the divine plan for mankind.

We are constantly reminded that the people of the Baltic States remain dedicated to human liberty, to freedom, and to the political ideals of the West. They are prepared to fight for the restoration of their national independence if the United States and its allies will take the political initiative against the Russian imperialists who are their oppressors. This spirit, this desire for liberty and national independence by these captive people constitutes a powerful deterrent to war. The Russians know that if they start a war the captive people will seize this opportunity to fall upon them, to destroy the chains which bind them to the empire, to dismember once and for all this empire of fear. This is a fact, an inescapable fact, of contemporary international political affairs. It is time the American people were awakened to this fact and the present administration in Washington did something to help keep this flame of freedom burning ever brighter.

This is the record of the past. Now what is the record we are going to make in the future? We have several choices as to the course of action we shall take. Let us look at them.

1. We can accept a status quo which the Russians have been attempting to force down the throats of free people. The Russians say that if we will recognize their empire of captive nations as final and unchangeable, they will not drive us out of free Berlin. They ask us to close our eyes to the genocide of nations going on behind the Iron Curtain. They ask us to join with them in killing the aspirations for freedom in the hearts of several hundred millions of non-Russian people. They ask us to turn our backs on our proven allies, the captive people, in return for which they promise not to throw us out of Berlin until they are ready for an all-out war against the free world. This, then, is the certain course to war and it must be publicly rejected by both political parties in the United States.

2. We can continue to engage in the Russian instigated plan of coexistence, as the present administration has been doing these

past years. We are now censored to speak no evil aganist the Russian tyrants, which throttles the truth. We are admonished by Vice President NIXON to receive the arch criminal Khrushchev with courtesy and consideration. The Voice of America has been reduced to a faint whisper, daring not to even echo the call to freedom. We are speaking over the Voice of America to the people of many captive nations in the Russian language, the mother tongue of communism and the language of their oppressors. On all sides the caution is urged "Do not provoke the Russians"—which has come to mean moral and political paralysis for our Nation. The time has long passed when we should have stepped out of this Russian bear trap. We can be sure the people are going to demand a new administration this November, which will remove these chains from our national honor.

3. We can continue to allow our Nation to be dragged into and out of so-called summit conferences. This device is nothing but the stage for the "mirage of peace" which the present administration has attempted to foist upon the American people. Our people were thoroughly brainwashed into believing some good could come out of such propaganda exhibits. But the complete collapse of this ill-conceived balloon at Paris a few weeks ago has awakened the American people to the Disneyland in which our leaders have been living and into which these same leaders sought to entice them. Summit conferences and personal diplomacy with the Russians have been exposed as the road to appeasement and the road to appeasement is the course to war. The only way anyone can do business with the Russians is to concede to them all they demand—and this is peaceful surrender.

4. We can look honestly at the nature of the Russian Communist empire. If we do we will find the road to peace with justice and freedom. We will find that the empire is tottering, that the 70 million Russians cannot possibly hold it together much longer, that the several hundred million non-Russians in the empire—the people of all the captive nations—are anxious to work with us in bringing about the dismemberment of this unholy empire. If we take the time to look close enough we will find abundant evidence that a great political explosion is in the making, an internal explosion, an explosion caused by the powerful desire of enslaved people to be emancipated. Look what is happening again in Tibet, recall what happened in Turkestan a month ago, see what is now happening in Poland, remember what happened in Hungary and East Germany but a short time ago. This is the march of freedom, the march which our Nation must lead with courage and boldness.

This brings us to the Captive Nations Week observation under Public Law 86-90, which will take place this year from July 17 to 23. I am proud of the part I played in introducing this law in the House and in helping to bring about its enactment. This law forms the foundation for the foreign policy our country must pursue if we are going to win the struggle for a just and lasting peace.

Allow me to point out that 1 month from now the Democratic Party will hold its convention in Los Angeles. Immediately following the Republicans will gather in Chicago. Now I ask you—what are your plans for informing both parties of what you believe our foreign policy toward the Russian Communists should be? Both parties are moved by what the electorate demands. This is the strength of our democratic system—it is the duty of informed citizens to make their demands known.

How should our country observe Captive Nations Week this year? This is my second question leading to citizen action. I have recommended to Mayor Celebrezze that he appoint a civic committee here in Cleveland to make certain we make the most of this opportunity. I am sure that all present here will want to play a part in the work of that committee.

If we do these things, not just once a year, but in spirit and dedication every day of the year, the record for the future will look much brighter and more hopeful than the record of the past. We must not wait another 20 years for Lithuania and her sister republics on the Baltic Sea to be free and independent. We must act now. This is my wish for the gallant people of Lithuania and all other nations behind the Russian Iron Curtain.

Defense Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am in basic agreement with the statements and explanation by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] as he presents to us the conference report on the defense appropriations bill. I especially concur with his premise that the Communist threat is certainly not greater or more dangerous than it was 6 months ago. Certainly we do have the responsibility, fortified with the realization that the cold war will be with us for many years, to maintain our world military position and present armed superiority must be maintained and, of course, increased. This $40 billion defense budget provides basically for the necessary improvements we continue to make in our military program, and gives our Armed Forces the ability to deter war because of our overwhelming strength as compared with the boastful, but much exaggerated, Soviet military machine.

However, Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly that we have an obligation to the American taxpayer to study all details of the defense budget, since spending, as it does, half the Federal annual expenditure, the possibility of waste and extravagance is obvious.

I do not wish the statement that I will now make to reflect upon the competence, loyalty, or devotion to duty of our military leaders, but the plain facts are that there is as much, if not more, careless administration and waste in the Defense Department than in any other governmental agency. Frankly, one of the hangovers of World War II and the Korean war has been the pampered state of our top military officials, who hold themselves above civilian criticism of their spending.

Mr. Speaker, we must, as I pointed out, in our duty to the taxpayers we represent, insist that our military leaders provide us with not only the strongest force in the world, as they have done, but, equally important, do so with the utmost efficiency and conservation of a greatest resource: the American dollar. In my humble opinion, we could, today, save 10 percent of the dollars to be spent and provide completely for our Nation's defense if the military leaders would practice true economy in all phases of our Military Establishment. Mr. Speaker, may I repeat, my statement is one that I am sure a great majority of my colleagues concur in, since we have received in communications from our constituents, a clear mandate that whenever possible we must reduce the back-breaking tax burden that rests upon the American public. It would be a tragic thing to yield to the false theory advocated by the pseudo-liberal leftwing element here who believe that their duty is to recklessly spend as much of the American public's money as they can lay their hands on. We are determined, as we pass this defense appropriation to battle communism abroad. We cannot surrender to socialism here. This defense appropriation worked out so carefully by Members of both bodies provides each of our armed services with the weapons they need to continue their stalwart defense, not only of our Nation but of free people throughout the world. It is true that the interservice rivalry continues, and that the differences of opinion within this appropriation remains, but overall this is a sound, practical defense appropriation maintaining and increasing our military superiority over the Soviet Union.

Japan and American Purpose—Our Ultimate Goals Should Range Behind Decision To Defeat Communism First

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present the text of an editorial appearing in Life magazine recently:

JAPAN AND AMERICAN PURPOSE—OUR ULTIMATE GOALS SHOULD RANGE BEHIND DECISION TO DEFEAT COMMUNISM FIRST

The mob explosion in Japan was the gravest setback for the Eisenhower foreign policy in 7 years. It was far more serious than the collapse of the Paris summit. In Paris, naked at stage center, Khrushchev insulted the President from obvious weakness,

frustrating our policy but not hurting our position. In Japan, though personally invisible, Khrushchev humiliated Eisenhower with a show of strength. It took us by surprise and advanced the cause of communism throughout Asia.

It was strength, moreover, of a kind we have scarcely bothered to contest: organized revolutionary strength among the youth of a prosperous, democratic, major allied nation, the strongest free nation in Asia. It was the strength of a loaded and pointed political gun that checked us last week but may eventually force us to retreat across the Pacific. It was the strength of a clear purpose long pursued—the Communist purpose of communizing the world. Have we a purpose to match it?

Life has just published a series of articles on the American National Purpose. We did so to stimulate the kind of debate that might help fill a vacuum in that area, palpable to many for quite a while. This debate has barely started and can last for years. It should certainly not be settled in a panicky frame of mind. Nevertheless, the defeat in Japan is a proper context for reviewing what our eight distinguished contributors have proposed so far about the American purpose, and for rehearing their proposals through what one of them (David Sarnoff) called "the loudspeakers of events."

First let us note three points of agreement among all eight contributors. None argued that survival was an adequate national purpose. Albert Wohlstetter was most explicit on why mere survival is a formula for surrender, and why a larger purpose, such as extending democracy, is not just a nice thought; it is vital. Judging by the mail response, some of Life's readers (mainly the women) would settle for survival. We urge such readers to follow their narrow instinct by at least taking Governor Rockefeller's advice and building themselves some fallout shelters.

Another point of agreement is implicit even among those contributors who most criticized the mood of the American people—that selfish mood of vulgar materialism that Archibald MacLeish called our sluggish, sunoiled sleep, and Adlai Stevenson our pervasive mystique of privacy. The agreement is that the American people, whatever their mood, have not failed to respond to any demand or sacrifice seriously urged by their Government. They certainly responded when Ike got serious about his balanced budget last year. It can be assumed—as Lippmann insisted—that they would also follow the lead of a more vigorous and purposive foreign policy.

A third point of agreement is that an American purpose must have worldwide application. No contributor proposed to divide the world with Russia or advocated those defensive loops setting a strategic periphery for U.S. interests that were being suggested and refuted a decade ago. There is no natural periphery on the map for American purposes; the great globe itself is their arena. Those who still find our chief purpose in the Declaration of Independence, notably MacLeish, still underwrite Jefferson's claim to its universality. And Clinton Rossiter, who proposed that the cause of peace should be our great second American mission, envisioned it as a step-by-step approach to a worldwide government.

The main contrast in emphasis among our contributors was between those who, like Billy Graham and John Gardner, were concerned with the American as an individual, and those who looked chiefly at the rest of the world. Gardner's admonition that all of us should pursue excellence and Billy Graham's reminder that only good men can make a good society, and his summons to individual courage and spiritual health, deserve a hearing by all men at all times. In selecting national goals, however, there is the problem of costs and priorities emphasized by Wohlstetter. The Japanese disaster is merely the latest reminder that one of these priorities may involve our national life or death as a free people.

David Sarnoff's article was the most explicit summons to battle and call for victory in the cold war. It was therefore, on our view, the most relevant to America's world situation today. The paramount challenge of this epoch is indeed the struggle between communism and freedom; and as he says, the cause of freedom conspicuously lacks both a strategy as massive and a will to win as clear and purposeful as the Communist cause. Theirs is the vocabulary of confidence, ours the semantic timidity; theirs is the choice of weapons and battlefields, ours the defense of static and passive arrangements which can't last. Our fear of nuclear war leads us always to choose the more agreeable interpretation of Communist strategy, and even to rely on an evolutionary theory of where communism is going which is pure blind wish. Thus all our great purposes in the world, says Sarnoff, will remain mere dreams unless and until we range them behind a single great decision: that the cold war is in fact an all-out struggle for the survival of freedom. Unless this great decision is consciously made, boldly announced, and acted upon over a wide front under American leadership, freedom could lose.

The decision urged by Sarnoff would not, as some fear, mean a surrender of ideals in mere conflict, nor a suspension of our ultimate (i.e., postcommunism) purposes and goals. Those ultimate goals were most persuasively set forth by Professor Rossiter; but Sarnoff also sees the "rise of a world order under law" as both logical and desirable. The prior question at issue is whether tyranny or freedom will be the organizing principle of that ordered world. Since communism is determined to make tyranny the principle, communism cannot safely be outwaited; it must be combatted, confounded and overthrown.

The decision to do this, says Sarnoff, will itself breed the means of its implementation. Many such means are already at hand, lying around unused or half-used for lack of adequate motive. A bolder foreign aid and trade program, a stronger and bolder NATO, an earlier B–70, are obvious examples. Another is the Freedom Academy mentioned by Sarnoff (and advocated by Life, February 16, 1959) which still awaits action by committees of Congress. Had a few graduates of such an academy belonged to the Japanese Teachers Union at the time the Communists invaded it some years ago, last week's disaster might have been prevented at its source.

We urge all readers of Life's series to think further on this "great debate" (we'll gladly send reprints for rereading) and there will be more discussion in Life. Each contributor has opened up some exciting perspectives for a great American future. But to realize any of these great purposes, can it be taken for granted that communism will simply move aside? In our view, the challenge of communism must be met first.

Big Newspaper Chains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Newhouse Octopus Clamps Its Tentacles on Four More Papers," published in the Hudson Dispatch, of Union City, N.J., for June 21, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWHOUSE OCTOPUS CLAMPS ITS TENTACLES ON FOUR MORE PAPERS

Despite the repeated warnings which this newspaper has sounded against the insidious moves of big press chains to absorb and crush independent operations throughout the country, the dangerous trend toward eliminating opposition papers goes on at an increasing pace.

We have long wondered when the American people will awaken to what will eventually transpire if the newspaper trusts in the Nation aren't curbed. We think that it is long past time that some congressional committee looked into this monopolistic threat to the once-vaunted freedom of the press. We seem to recall that there is a Federal statute known as the Sherman antitrust law.

Formidably, the Newhouse chain of newspapers has been buying up independent publications throughout the country until today it has emerged as the second combine in importance in the United States of America, topping the dwindling Hearst publications, with 14 as against 13, for the once powerful trust which had 26 dailies. Newhouse operations now are only led by the Scripps-Howard syndicate, which operates 18 newspapers.

Within 8 days the Newhouse combine has moved in on four of the country's most important publications. First it was the Denver Post. Then it was the Springfield (Mass.) Republican Co., which publishes the afternoon Daily News, the Morning Union, and the Sunday Republican. In both instances, as has been his practice in many of his acquisitions, Mr. Newhouse purchased only minority holdings, with the eventual intention of taking over full control.

In getting a toehold on the Denver Post, the Newhouse chain reportedly paid $3,600,000 for its 15-percent holdings, purchased from the daughter of the late cofounder and copublisher. Other Post stockholders banded together to announce that this invasion was as far as Mr. Newhouse would be allowed to go.

The Springfield transaction netted the chain 40 percent of the Republican Co. stock. It was announced that the Newhouse interests had also acquired rights to buy an additional 45 percent of the stock at a future date. No purchase price was mentioned.

Indicative of the growing resentment toward the Newhouse acquisitions was a front-page editorial published in the Springfield Sunday Republican expressing displeasure over the sale. The editorial said it "came as a shock," and added: "Inroads by outsiders into New England business are attaining galloping proportions.

"The purchaser, Samuel I. Newhouse, of New York, is a stranger to this area. He typifies absentee chain ownership. His motives are allegedly profits. This represents his first invasion of New England. It is not good for the community."

The editorial said the three newspapers assured their readers, advertisers and employees that "irrespective of Mr. Newhouse the present employee-management will continue to control these newspapers at least for the next 7 years." The Newhouse organization declined comment.

This newspaper octopus now has spread its tentacles from coast to coast and from North to South until it either owns outright or has acquired a percentage of 17 dailies or Sunday publications.

Besides the Denver Post and the Springfield papers, the Newhouse chain includes the Staten Island Advance, Long Island Press, Jersey Journal, Newark Star-Ledger, Long Island City Star-Journal, Syracuse Herald Journal, Syracuse Post Standard, Syracuse Sunday Herald-American, Harrisburg Patriot and News, Portland Oregonian, Birmingham News, St. Louis Globe-Democrat and Huntsville (Ala.) Times.

More and more are the newspaper trusts buying up independent publications and subjecting large populations to the "brainwashing" that comes with having no opposition press. If something isn't done to halt this trend, the American people someday may find themselves in the grip of a few great news chains—and freedom of the press will really be "chained."

Wiretapping: Take a Second Look

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, the bill of rights which protects the individual from Government interference distinguishes us from people living under totalitarian regimes. Wiretapping and eavesdropping violate a citizen's right to privacy. This right has been valued greatly by civilized men and should not be encroached upon except in emergency or for the protection of our Government against espionage and treason. Congress has been called upon to pass upon legislation which would give States the right to wiretap and to invade the person's right to privacy. The Washington Post in an editorial has critically reviewed pending legislation in its editorial of June 29, 1960. Mr. Lawrence Speiser, director of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union, has set forth the thinking of those opposed to wiretapping and the reasons why pending legislation should not be approved.

I believe that the Washington Post editorial and the letter from Mr. Speiser to the Washington Post will clarify the confusion and the thinking of the uncertain. I believe that these articles are well written and will prove of assistance to the reader.

LOCAL EAVESDROPPING

Although it has had bills to permit wiretapping introduced in almost every session for the past 20 years, Congress has never authorized this kind of invasion of privacy by any law enforcement authorities, Federal, State, or local. Section 605 of the Federal Communications Act adopted in 1934 still stands as a flat prohibition of any unauthorized interception and divulgence of telephone communications. Now, however, in the closing days of the 86th Congress, the Senate has approved a new-fangled way of circumventing section 605—a bill by Senator KEATING which would grant Federal statutory permission for wiretapping by State and local officers in compliance with State law.

Six States have statutes authorizing their police to tap telephones in defiance of the congressional statute forbidding the practice. New York, where most wiretapping takes place, permits the practice on order of a State judge. Embarrassment over the conflict with Federal law has led several New York judges to announce recently, however, that they will no longer grant police wiretapping requests. This, in turn, has produced pressure from New York police and prosecutors for congressional passage of the Keating bill.

The Keating bill would allow State law enforcement authorities to do what is forbidden to Federal law enforcement authorities. It would, in consequence, create a completely confused as well as completely anomalous situation. Telephone lines are no respecters of State boundaries. Eavesdropping would become indiscriminate not only for all local users of a tapped telephone but for all persons at the other end of the line in another State which did not authorize the eavesdropping. The right to privacy—the right which Justice Brandeis called "the most comprehensive of rights and the right most valued by civilized men"—would be diminished all over the country.

This newspaper has favored limited use of wiretapping by Federal authorities in espionage, treason, and kidnaping cases, under strict judicial safeguards. Certainly no more lenient policy should be applied to the States. The Keating bill to permit local wiretapping was drafted in haste and has been reported by the Judiciary Committee without hearings and, we think, without adequate consideration. It would change the atmosphere of American life far too drastically to be jammed through in its closing days by a Congress impatient to get out of Washington.

WIRETAPPING: TAKE A SECOND LOOK

One of the recurrent criticisms of Congress is that in its headlong rush to adjourn by a fixed date, often much legislation is adopted without adequate consideration and study.

A prime example is the Keating wiretap bill, S. 3340, which would authorize the admission in State courts of evidence obtained by wiretapping pursuant to a State court order. This would change the Federal law which we have had on our books since 1934 which prohibits the interception and divulgence of telephonic communications.

Last Friday the Senate Judiciary Committee reported out the Keating wiretap bill, even though no hearings had been held on it. The suggestion of wiretapping pursuant to a court order is at first blush an attractive one. New York and four other States have laws of this kind. Yet the experience of New York under its law has not been a happy one.

In 1955, Justice Hofstadter of the Supreme Court of New York County, in announcing his intention to grant no further applications by law enforcement officials to wiretap, said:

"A tapped wire is the greatest invasion of privacy possible * * *. A telephone interception is a far more devastating measure than any search warrant. A search warrant is confined to a definite place and to specific items, or, at least to items of a stated class or description. Those in possession of the searched premises know the search is going on, and when the officer has completed his search, whether successfully or not, he departs.

"Not so in the case of telephone interception. The interception order is obtained ex parte, and the person whose line is to be tapped is, of course, in ignorance of the fact. The tap is maintained continuously, day and night. Everything said over the line is heard, however foreign to the stated objective of the law enforcement officers. The most intimate conversations, personal, social, professional, business, or even confidential, of an unlimited number of persons may be laid bare.

"In effect, the line of everyone who is called from or makes a call to the tapped line at any time is being tapped during the maintenance of the tap. When a line in a public telephone booth is tapped, as has on occasion been done, the conversations of people having no relation of any kind to the operator of the place in which the booth is situated or the person whose line is tapped are overheard."

The American Civil Liberties Union also objects to wiretapping on the ground that the results are so inadequate that when balanced against the enormous invasion of the right to privacy, the former appears minute in comparison. Here again it is pertinent to quote Justice Hofstadter:

"The application now made follows the general pattern of like applications heretofore made to me, which also, in the main, had as their objective the detection of gambling in some form * * *. Some years ago I instituted the requirement that * * * written reports of the results obtained from any interception ordered be thereafter submitted to me * * *. These showed some arrests and fewer convictions and then rarely, if ever, for a heinous offense.

"It is melancholy to behold (our city) rife with violence an admittedly lawless community, its inhabitants no longer safe by night or day, in their persons or their homes. To be redeemed as part of the great American community, its police department needs external aid, that is, a larger force, with more pay for the men, and a renewed spirit from within * * * but not more wiretaps."

We have too long witnessed the flagrant violation of a Federal statute, not only by State officers, but by Federal officers as well. Nonetheless, during the entire history of section 605, there is no reported case of any law enforcement official having been prosecuted for violating that section notwithstanding the common knowledge that wiretapping is an everyday practice of police departments throughout the country.

In considering this bill, Congress will be confronted with the clear choice of deciding whether to sanction invasion of the right to privacy of citizens who rely on their telephones to communicate with their friends and asociates with the same confidence with which they would communicate with these people in the privacy of their own homes.

The mere fact that the district attorneys of New York have demanded the passage of the Keating bill does not mean that these demands alone can ever replace the necessity for careful and considerate study by Congress.

We recognize that such a procedure may mean the death of the bill in this session because of lack of time. However, it hardly seems likely that such pressing demands have arisen in the past few months since the bill was introduced, which warrant making a major change in our law which has stood for 24 years, and that such demands could not possibly wait until the next session of Congress to consider and determine.

LAWRENCE SPEISER.

(NOTE.—This letter was written before Senate approval of S. 3340. The bill now goes to the House.)

What Rural Electrification Means to My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, 19 Indiana REMC organizations and the Indiana Rural News recently sponsored an

essay contest on "What Rural Electrification Means to My Community." Twenty-eight Indiana high school juniors were selected by the 19 REMC's as winners. One of the 28 was selected by judges as the State winner. She is Johanna Wright of North Webster High School. Her sponsoring organization was the Kosciusko County REMC.

Miss Wright and the other 27 winners received an expense-paid trip to Washington as the guests of the sponsoring organizations. I had the pleasure of lunching with the group and found all of them to be outstanding young men and women.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD Miss Wright's winning essay on "What Rural Electrification Means to My Community."

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINNING ESSAY—WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO MY COMMUNITY

(By Johanna Wright)

To tell you what rural electrification means to my community, I must first identify it with myself and my life and that of my parents.

Years ago when I was a very small girl I used to ask my parents questions about what they did in the "olden" days. Now this, I found out, brought some laughs but it also brought denials about being that old, you see. Yet when I talked to them about our electricity and how long we have had it, and what they did before the REMCs were operating, my father said a strange thing to me. He said, "Johanna, we were living in the olden days, for farming and living in rural areas changed little until we could turn a switch and have light, waterpower, and heat."

At the dawn of this century, the farmer was earning his living in a way that had changed very little since the middle ages. The tools he used were simple and ancient and for most tasks he could use only the strength of his own body or that of mules and horses. His children studied by the dim light of the kerosene lamp, and his wife was a slave to the wood range and washboard.

Later on, the Delco plant came into being for a few farmers. Compared to how things had been before, this was a great improvement. My father said they could run a 32-volt radio on it and such things as a toaster and a washing machine. Still this was not very practical because they would have to recharge it every day and buy batteries, which were expensive.

Then finally to the farmer's aid came the REMC. Although many did not realize its importance at that time, they surely realize it now. What a difference it has made in our lives and ways of living.

As a rule, farm wives put electricity into use before their husbands did. And usually the first appliance they bought was an electric iron, which was far different from the 6-pound wedge of cast iron that had to be heated on a wood range and handled with a pot holder, that their mothers used to use. Another one also very popular was the radio.

When the cooperatives were first formed many directors wondered how the farmers were going to use all the electricity the lines were built to carry. Their wonderings were shortlived, however, after a survey disclosed the following purchases of appliances by their members: Electric irons and radios, 84.3 percent; washing machines, 63.2 percent; vacuum cleaners, 48.2 percent; and many others.

As for the schoolchildren, teachers, and principals from all over reported that pupils' grades improved remarkably after lines were energized. Also, they were cleaner as a result of running water all the time and there were fewer respiratory diseases during the winter months.

Ministers, too, were pleased at the increase in church attendance as a result of electric lights.

For years the farmer's idea of a good hired hand was a steady worker. But he had to choose carefully in order to get one that wouldn't play off on him and one that would be responsible to his job.

With the electric motor, the farmer had a steady hired hand at last, and also a versatile, hand, too. They were able to use it for pumping water and sawing wood, to elevate hay from a wagon to a hay loft, to blow ensilage into the silo, to grind and mix feed and convey it in mechanical feeders, and for many kinds of farm equipment.

Today, electricity performs more than 400 different chores in the farm home and barnyard. It has taken over much of the drudgery that used to make farmers and their wives old before their time, while at the same time aiding farmers in increasing production.

By and large, local businessmen were enthusiastic about the new co-ops, too. Main Street had felt the impact of rural electrification, and new appliance stores and equipment dealers appeared in town. The co-op's payroll made a difference to merchants, too, for the cooperative was often the biggest business in town.

Some might wonder just what a co-op is? It is a private nonprofit enterprise, locally owned and managed, and incorporated under State law. It is owned by the members it serves and each member has one vote in the affairs of the cooperative, regardless of the amount of electricity he uses.

I have explained how conditions without the REMC have been in the past and how conditions are now, with the REMC, in the present. As for the future, there will be more farm uses for electricity as well as the infinite variety of rural industries and businesses that are starting each year. Also, the summer and winter resort boom shows no signs of abating.

It is a fact that rural electric systems today are an established segment of our Nation's electric service industry. Whether they remain so depends on their ability to adapt themselves to the changing times, to establish themselves financially, and to serve their customers with a maximum of efficiency, helpfulness, and business courtesy. The attainment of these objectives should be their goal for the future.

Reassignment of Colonel Stoddard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, in these days of keen competition with the Communist world for military supremacy, we must not forget to offer praise to able officers of our Armed Forces who distinguish themselves in the discharge of their important duties in the defense of our country.

I am pleased to commend to the attention of this House the following resolution adopted by the chamber of commerce of Rome, N.Y., on the occasion of the reassignment of Col. Edward F. (Skip) Stoddard, commander, Griffiss Air Force Base, N.Y., after 4 years' outstanding service to the Air Force at that installation.

From my personal knowledge, I am aware of the great contribution made by Colonel Stoddard. He has been an outstanding military commander, while at the same time, promoting excellent community relations. His devotion to teamwork has done much to enable Griffiss Air Force Base to fulfill its vital missions. In leaving for his new assignment, he carries with him the sincere appreciation and good wishes of all citizens who have been privileged to observe the performance of his duties.

The resolution follows:

Whereas Col. Edward F. Stoddard, commander, Griffiss AFB, since July 1956, has been assigned to duty at Ankara, Turkey; and

Whereas the community of Rome is losing a close friend, a good neighbor, and a leading citizen in the departure of Colonel Stoddard; and

Whereas Colonel Stoddard has been a motivating force in the excellent relations existing between the Rome area and Griffiss AFB these past 4 years; and

Whereas Colonel Stoddard has served his nation in a manner reflecting great credit upon the Air Force and himself, and will take with him the affection and esteem of many friends in this community: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the directors of the Rome Chamber of Commerce, acting for the community of Rome:

1. Express to Colonel Stoddard its deep appreciation for his many contributions to the welfare of the community and its airbase.

2. With him and his family continued success and happiness in their new assignment.

3. Convey to his military superiors the conviction of the community of Rome that Col. Edward F. Stoddard is the personification of all that an Air Force officer should be—friendly, courteous, efficient, loyal, capable, dedicated and devoted—and that Rome is a better community because Colonel Stoddard helped make it so.

Unanimously adopted by the directors of the Rome Chamber of Commerce, Rome, N.Y., June 23, 1960.

Class Day Oration by Julius Byron Levine at Harvard College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on June 15, 1960, Harvard University held its Class Day exercises. The Class Day oration was given by Julius Byron Levine, of Waterville, Maine. Mr. Levine was subsequently graduated from Harvard summa cum laude. In addition he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa as one of eight members of his class in his junior year. He has also been selected as a Rhodes

scholar to attend Oxford University in England next fall. His Class Day oration has been termed one of the finest presented at Harvard University. He has brought great credit, not only to himself, but to the State of Maine, and therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Levine's Class Day oration printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLASS DAY ORATION DELIVERED BY JULIUS BYRON LEVINE OF WATERVILLE, MAINE, MEMBER OF THE GRADUATING CLASS AT HARVARD COLLEGE, ON JUNE 15, 1960

Mr. First Marshal, ladies and gentlemen, when Emerson Hall here in Harvard Yard was dedicated in 1906, it became the first building in America to be devoted to philosophy. Quite naturally, the Harvard philosophers offered an eager hand in drawing its plans. William James, in a letter to President Eliot, proposed that a motto be inscribed over the doorway, and he suggested that it be the Hellenic proposition, "Man Is the Measure of All Things." When Emerson Hall was dedicated, and its motto, unveiled, William James was surprised to see that President Eliot had chosen for its motto the query of the psalmist, "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?"

Professor James and President Eliot were profound men who intended the motto inscribed on Emerson Hall to provide us a sound maxim by which to conduct our lives. If men about to be graduated from college have ever needed sound maxims, we need them now; for in our scientific world, and presumably still more in the more scientific world of the not distant future bad men can do more evil, and good men, more good, than had seemed possible to our ancestors even in their wildest dreams. Our need for sound maxims requires that we answer the riddle that James and Eliot have placed before us: can we at once so conduct our lives that "Man is the measure of all things" and that we act in the spirit of "What is man, that Thou art mindful of him?"

There is ample room, I think, in our multifaceted lives for the full play of both maxims. On the one hand, in our private and inward lives, it behooves us to act in the spirit of "What is man, that Thou are mindful of him?" For example, when in our democratic society opportunities for bearing political and social responsibilities present themselves to us, we should be unmindful of selfish jealousy of our privacy, our efforts, our time, and our money. And in the inwardness of our private thoughts, we should be unmnidful of subjectivity; we should commit ourselves instead to objectivity; we should never allow our thoughts on issues and values to slip into ad hominem channels; nor should we let our measure of truth and good become others' conceptions of them; in a word, let us not cringe before an idealogical tyranny of the majority, but let us make the demands of conscience and reason the measure of all our convictions.

On the other hand, in our public and outward lives, in our decisions and actions that directly affect others, it behooves us to treat man as the measure of all things. As Kant put it, to perpetuate and deepen the "dignity of man as a rational creature * * *," we should "so act as to treat humanity * * * in every case as an end withal, never as a means only." This is to say that the political and social actions which spring from our inward thoughts should be motivated hominis gratia, for the sake of man, for man "as an end withal * * *," for man as the measure of all things. This is to say to this generation of graduating students, as Emerson said it to his, "I think I see place and duties for a nobleman in every society; but it is not to drink wine and ride in a fine coach, but to guide life by the remembrance of the humble old friend. * * *" This is to say also that as we graduates enter our scientific world, we need not fear the possibilities for natural and human engineering that advances in our knowledge of nature and man engender, provided that we are ever mindful of man "as an end withal * * *," as the measure of all things; if this is the case, we may rejoice instead of shuddering at the prospect of almost limitless power, almost limitless food, clothing, and housing, of humans circling the moon, manning space platforms, and, yes, being taught by Professor Skinner's machines. Finally, to say that man is the measure of all things is to say that in the world of affairs, which many of us will soon enter, we should not, in order to swell our profits, acquiesce in dishonesty in television quiz programs or give the Federal Trade Commission reason to report that advertising abuses are at an all-time high; for when we thus treat humanity as "a means only" and not "as an end withal," as when we shirk our political and social responsibilities lest our earnings decline, we bring upon ourselves Oliver Goldsmith's admonition, "Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey, where wealth accumulates, and men decay."

Lest we decay, let us at once heed Professor James' and President Eliot's chosen maxims; let us try to conduct our overlapping private and public, inward and outward, lives so that the maxims, "Man is the measure of all things," and "What is man, that thou art mindful of him?" are at one. To this end, let us join Socrates in prayer: "Beloved Pan, and all ye other gods who haunt this place, give me beauty in the inward soul; and may the outward and inward man be at one."

Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc.: Its Legislative Goal and Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED WAMPLER
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. WAMPLER. Mr. Speaker, on July 15 and 16, 1960, it will be my extreme pleasure to attend the annual convention of the officers and membership of the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., Department of Indiana, where I will be honored to participate as a principal speaker before this exceptionally praiseworthy organization, an organization dedicated to the welfare of the Nation's veterans of the First World War.

At that time it is my full intention to convey to the Department of Indiana membership of the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, the legislative progress made thus far with regard to the major legislative goal of the organization, namely: proposals which would provide World War I Veterans with what I consider to be a very justifiable monthly pension of $100.

I shall also endeavor to predict, within the framework of reasonably anticipated legislative procedures, prospects for final enactment of the legislation.

As I stated on January 19, 1960, the date of the introduction of my bill in the U.S. House of Representatives, H.R. 9746, I am sharply aware of the glorious deeds and humbly grateful for the heroic sacrifices of our World War I Veterans, to whom all America points with reverence and pride.

My measure, H.R. 9746, provides for the payment of pensions of $100 per month to each veteran of World War I who served for 90 days or more, or who was discharged or released from service for a service-connected disability, or who served for a period of 90 consecutive days or more and that service ended during World War I.

My bill calls for $100 monthly pension payments without regard to the veteran's annual income, whether derived from social security or railroad retirement benefits, or other annuities or pensions.

I have introduced this legislation realizing fully that in order to maintain individual social and economic status and dignity, this Nation's World War I veteran warriors must have, and, indeed, richly deserve and merit supplemental monthly funds.

When it became apparent that my bill, and similar measures, would receive scant, if any, congressional attention during the 2d session of the 86th Congress, a parliamentary procedure, known as a discharge petition, was initiated in the U.S. House of Representatives. Ultimately, this parliamentary procedure would discharge the House Committee on Veterans Affairs from the further consideration of the legislation, after a majority of 219 Members of the House of Representatives have affixed their names to the petition.

On the very day, June 2, 1960, that the discharge petition—No. 7—was filed in the House, it was my privilege to be one of the very first to sign. Since that time, because of my publicly stated and well-known keen interest in the welfare of our country's World War I veterans, I have worked diligently to generate among other Members of Congress an interest sufficient to activate their support for the $100 per month pension legislation to the extent that they, also, would find it justifiable and reasonable to add their names to the discharge petition.

I most assuredly shall continue to strive in the U.S. Congress to promote the economic and social betterment of the veterans of World War I of the United States of America, a cause which I consider to be fully just and meritorious.

A Circle Trip Around Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDMUND S. MUSKIE
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on April 2 and 3, Mrs. May Craig published two columns which were printed in our Maine newspapers.

In the first, she describes the Algerian crisis.

In the second, her summation for the future upon her return to Washington from her extended tour of Africa.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFRICA ON THE MOVE—ROADSIDE MACHINEGUNS BRING DEATH IN THE AFTERNOON

(By May Craig)

ALGIERS.—There is no prospect of peace in this war-torn country where terrorists, Algerian rebels, fighting to be wholly free of France, assassinate not only French, but Moslems who want to stay in association with France. There are bombings, murder of French and pro-French Arabs in outlying sections of the cities; on the highways motorists are ambushed indiscriminately, usually killed in late afternoon by roadside machineguns. Highway travel is banned after dark around cities; there is curfew in Algiers, this handsome, poor-and-rich ancient city on whose coast the pirates got rich in the early days of the United States. In movies and theaters, nobody can leave during a presentation lest one leave a bomb behind him. Fifty percent of the Moslems are under 20 years old; 35 percent non-Moslems.

We did not see the Algerian rebel government-in-exile in Tunis where they have refuge. We thought we would, but no engagement could seem to be set. We were to see some of them, somewhere, at 6; then at 11:30 at night; then at 1 a.m. I gave up when the 11:30 failed. Whether the Tunis Government interfered, or the rebels were afraid, I don't know. Here we saw only French Government officials and our own American officials and they spoke off the record. Vice consul and economic officer at our consulate is Lewis P. Pickett, Jr. of Portland, who filled me in off the record, and completed—with me asking him about Algeria and him asking me about Maine politics. Perdita Champey (nee Huston) of Portland is English secretary to the Tunisian Government for information—she married a French doctor who has been drafted by France for 2½ years in the Army at $9 a month and she has to earn a living, does not know where he will be sent except that she cannot go with him—she will try to get back to France.

This is polyglot place too; first inhabitants were Berbers, of whom many are still here, and at odds with the Arabs who came with Islam in the 7th century. The Phoenicians were the first known invaders, in 1200 B.C.; after the Romans destroyed Carthage and held most of north Africa, they moved in on Algeria, inter-married with the Berbers; St. Augustine had Berber blood in him. After the Romans came the Vandals and the Byzantines. Coming to these ancient countries, with their history of successive conquests and occupations, it seems naive for us to talk about self-determination except in terms of present rebels and occupants. The Turks held Algeria for 300 years before the French drove them out in 1830. In this Hotel St. George, on room 18 door, is a brass plaque I went to see. It says that Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower had his office there during the north African campaign in World War II before he went to England to prepare for the invasion of German-occupied France across the bloody channel. Sic transit.

The French are now saying they will stay here with pacification by military action. There are 2 million French settlers here who are determined to stay with Algeria a part of metropolitan France. General de Gaulle, having offered Algeria self-determination in free elections, has now said that free elections cannot be held under terrorist conditions, that the rebels have refused his offers, and that Algeria must be pacified before there can be elections. The French Government officials, and our own, say there are many Arabs here who want to stay with France in some role—either in the French community, but independent, or in association with France, somewhat like Puerto Rico with United States. Whether France, fighting uselessly for 5 years, can stand the drain of an indefinite pacification, with bloodshed on both sides, remains to be seen. It is a dilemma for the United States. Worse, all the Arab nations and the Moslem nations want Algeria to have independence rights now.

Morocco, Tunisia, Libya, Algeria, do not want to join Egyptian Nasser's United Arab Republic, which they regard as a Middle East Egyptian attempt at domination. These countries may federate themselves. The blacks in Africa will not accept any kind of Arab domination. We were told: "Egypt is Egyptian first, then Arab and then Moslem." Other nations know this.

INSIDE IN WASHINGTON—A LONG LOOK TO THE FUTURE

(By May Craig)

WASHINGTON.—The heart turns homeward from the foreign land before the body leaves it for the beloved homeland. So it was with me in Algeria, the last stop at the end of the circle trip around Africa, which began with Morocco, next neighbor to Algeria on the west.

There is a gladness that is almost keen as anguish, when one glimpses the homeland. Patriotism is not bad, one might remember in the fashionable internationalism of today. The modern promotion of internationalism at the expense of family and own land may not be in the best interest of individual liberty and development. The Red Chinese are trying to destroy family and religion in working their will to subordinate everything to the state control, even the age-old devotion of ownership of a piece of land. The farmer, owning his own land, has always been a foundation stone of the United States and the development of the corporation instead of small business, the factory farm instead of the individual farm, the centralization of power in the Federal Government at the expense of States and communities and private enterprise may be the end of individual choices and development. The end is in a conformity that does not foster free thought, free religion, and free education. The individual is not free to think, to choose his government, his education, his God, to follow his individual conscience.

Internationalism would further this dilution of individual development nationally. Africa, determined to get freedom from outside colonialism, talks of Pan-Africanism, of federating the whole continent. No whole continent has ever been federated. Even in North America there are three countries, Canada, United States, Mexico, all individual, all independent, all friendly, with not even a border fort. This is a pattern that might well be followed by all homogeneous groups of people, countries, if they choose freely and carefully.

All over Africa I found different political and social and religious setups. South Africa is determined to live alone; the middle and western groupings who do not want to join the blacks or the Middle East-Egyptian Arabs-Moslems. The blacks are determined not to be dominated by north African Arabs. Yet the newly free, or almost free colonial blacks talked of pan-Africanism—though most will privately admit, and some publicly (as Ethiopia) that they want to be independent of all, but friendly to all.

There is danger of replacing the European colonialism by black colonialism, Red Chinese colonialism, Communist imperialism from Russia. There is already civil and tribal war in the free or nearly free black countries. Most of them are unprepared for freedom and would do well in their new freedoms to keep their former white masters on as hired help to show them how to run their countries. Tripoli did that; Burma did not and now regrets it. Those who do not step carefully may fall into chaos and find themselves under dictatorship, red or black.

One thing is for sure. The whites are doomed as such all over the world. Not today or tomorrow, but eventually. We are the minority. The rising tide of color—yellow, brown, black—will submerge us, dilute the whiteness. In the United States, the blacks will be swallowed up in the whites, in thin dilution, their African personality will be lost. When the founders of this Republic said all men are born equal, and the Supreme Court of the United States said that racial segregation is inherently unconstitutional, they doomed the African Americans to be absorbed into the white population.

Segregation in the South is doomed. But the white race everywhere will be absorbed into the colored. There will be a battle between the yellows and blacks and they and the browns will all become browns with perhaps slant eyes and less curly hair than present blacks. The present browns are too lazy or too diluted to win in this battle. Nobody knows the fate of reliigons as we know them now. The Union of South Africa, fighting for pure white is doomed, their apatheid cannot win; despite the killing.

In the far north there are a few Eskimos left, they are dying a natural death, unable to adjust to civilization. There are cases of pure whites in Scandinavia, where blacks cannot live because they need more sun. The browns who may be the ultimate unified color can live there with modern discoveries of artificial sunlight, vitamins, air conditioning. The Russians, afraid of the Red Chinese, may, in the not-too-distant future, join the West in the battle against the yellows, though themselves diluted already by the Mongol and Manchurian. It is useless, though it may delay the day of complete amalgamation of all races into one in conformity.

One day, creatures from other worlds may come here and stand on the ruins of Carthage as I did. They may look upon the desolate remains of an earth whose people ate of the tree of knowledge, who knew good and evil, who split the atom but were not worthy to know the secrets of nature. There is no asusurance that a unified race will be any better than a mixture of races. The unified race could destroy itself in the fury and fire of nuclear fusion. Perhaps beings from other planets will be better than we; perhaps not. The universe is dotted with dead planets and suns and stars and moons and the dust of what once was. This may be earth's destiny.

Keep the Bookmobiles Rolling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. MORRIS

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor has considered and favorably reported H.R. 12125 to amend the Library Services Act in order to extend for 5 years the authorization for appropriations under the act. The bill was reported unanimously by the committee without amendment.

There are but a few remaining days for this 86th Congress, yet the question of the extension of the Library Services Act has not been resolved by this body. In view of the time in which we must act, and the very positive need for the enactment of H.R. 12125, I believe that this bill should be considered under suspension of the rules.

As I have said, H.R. 12125 would extend for 5 additional years the provisions of Public Law 597, the Library Services Act, passed in 1956. The primary purpose of the Library Services Act, you will recall, was to stimulate the States in providing better public library services for rural areas. The act was designed to assist in eliminating a serious deficiency in the educational program of the Nation, the lack of adequate public library services in towns, villages, farming communities, and other nonurban areas. Federal funds under the act could be used for books, library materials and equipment, salaries and other operating expenses, but not for construction.

This program of Federal assistance proved to be just the spark needed to stimulate State efforts, and there is today an abundance of evidence supporting its success. We know, for example, that the Subcommittee on Special Education held extensive hearings on more than 50 bills which provide for the extension of the Rural Library Services Act. According to a report submitted by the Committee on Education and Labor, testimony from persons representing every section of the country, was, without exception, in favor of the expansion of the Library Services Act. Favorable testimony indicating progress under the library services program was presented by the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Moreover, the U.S. Office of Education presented clear evidence of the value of continuing the program The Office of Education summed up this need for extension of the act in its report which stated in part:

We recommend that the act be extended for an additional 5 years, to June 30, 1966. An excellent investment has been made in building State programs for rural public library development to maximum effectiveness. An extension of the act will enable many more rural areas still without library service or with inadequate services to experience new or improved service and to benefit directly by a cooperative State-local-Federal library development project.

We can hardly read the pages of the high-caliber newspapers of this country; or pick up one of our well-known, widely circulated magazines; or listen to an address by learned authorities in the field of education; or listen to the statements of our colleagues in this Chamber, without hearing again and again—a plea on behalf of intellectual pursuits and the development of a more highly informed and more learned society. Moreover, we know that through books freemen may expose their minds to the progress of the past, to the teachings of great men, to the prophecy of modern philosophers, and to pertinent explanations of the phenomenal technology of this fascinating and complex era. To insure that all citizens enjoy the same opportunity for the intellectual challenge of good books, we must continue to assist those rural areas in need of assistance in the expansion of their library programs.

Mrs. F. L. Bull, legislative chairman, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers spoke to this general point when she testified before the House Education and Labor Committee in support of an extension of the Library Services Act. Mrs. Bull said, in part:

At the end of each school year we receive reports from all the 52 State congresses. The most recent of these indicates, almost without exception, that the Federal aid received from the Library Services Act has been a tremendous stimulant and incentive for expanding and improving good library service in rural areas. The reports indicate the changing attitude of the general public toward library development is most encouraging and wholesome, as they have learned what good library service is and what it means to the economic as well as the cultural welfare of the community.

Studies of the effect of the Library Services Act upon children are emphasizing what book-loving parents have always urged—that the surest way, the most effective way, to build up in children the sound values which are a defense against trash and obscenity is to steep the children in good reading.

Our PTA's recognize libraries of an essential factor in education. We no longer think of education and learning in terms of years in school, but as something that continues and must be made available to everyone, and particularly to those in the more remote areas.

Under the Library Services Act more than 5 million books have been purchased; large-scale buying and cataloging systems have been made possible which have cut costs of operation and opened new plans for operations; and the movement toward larger administrative units for efficiency and economy of State library operation has been greatly stimulated.

Of particular significance to me, is the fact that 200 new bookmobiles have been added to those already serving people. These bookmobiles are in actuality—taking the written word to the people—a task of importance in library service to rural communities where families are sparsely settled.

There are almost 25 million people in the United States without access to local public libraries. More than 250 counties do not have a single public library. In 1961, it is estimated that there will be 22 million rural Americans without access to public library services, 18 million more with inadequate service, and 150 counties without any service. Moreover, the costs of books, periodicals and bookmobiles have increased significantly. For example, one study reports:

That from 1947 to 1958 the price increase [of books in 13 different subject fields] ranged from 47 to 58 percent.

In the area of U.S. periodical prices, the average cost of periodicals in the field of agriculture in 1947–49 was $1.77, and in 1958 the average cost was $2.48.

Before 1946 few bookmobiles were being manufactured. Converted buses and trailers were in use in some areas. In 1947 a bookmobile carrying 1,000 to 1,400 books costs about $2,900. In 1959 a bookmobile carrying 1,600 books cost about $7,500 [and this is for the smallest standard model available today]. Other models and sizes show ever greater increases in costs.

According to information obtained from a leading library supply house, there has been a 38-percent overall increase in all items since 1950.

Unquestionably, States have a continuing need for the assistance which an extension of the Library Services Act will afford. And this need is not because State efforts in this area are lacking. On the contrary, such efforts have been commendable. Again turning to the House report, we learn that "* * * over the 4-year period the act has been in operation less than two-thirds of the amount authorized by the act has been appropriated. Over the same 4-year period State and local matching funds have increased over 300 percent—from $4,373,826 in 1957 to $13,176,916 in 1960. State appropriations for rural library service have increased 54 percent between fiscal 1956 and fiscal 1960 and local library funds have increased 45 percent during this time." I agree with the committee that this is an outstanding example of the response of State and local efforts to the stimulation of Federal aid.

It was further pointed out that—

Although State and local support has increased remarkably since the beginning of the act, the financial assistance they are able to provide is still inadequate.

I share the belief that since State and local communities have seen what adequate library service means to their cultural and informational life, they will provide even more support. We must not let these people down at this time when such encouraging efforts are everywhere evident.

In conclusion, we might well take our guide to favorable action on the bill to extend the Rural Library Services Act from these famous words by Milton—

A good book is the precious lifeblood of a master spirit, imbalmed and treasured up on purpose to life beyond life.

Processing Perks Up Idaho Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the current issue of Business Week magazine contains a fine article on Idaho potatoes, with special emphasis on significant new developments in the field of potato processing, which will be of interest to many Members of the Senate. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCESSING PERKS UP IDAHO POTATO

Only 5 years ago, Idaho's potato growers were worried about surpluses when they produced a 30 million hundredweight crop. Last year, they raised 40 million hundredweight and did not worry a bit; instead, they looked for more acres to plant and for means to boost per-acre yields. What made the

difference was a sudden, massive rush by the Nation's consumers for dehydrated and frozen potatoes—and Idaho's early-bird leap into processing.

Until the processed product sprang into popularity, per capita consumption of potatoes had been shrinking for decades, under pressure of changed eating habits—the switch from starches to proteins as incomes rose.

In 1910, the average American stowed away 200 pounds of potatoes a year. By the mid-1950's, he was down to 100 pounds. The only thing that saved potato demand from being halved was the growth of population.

Tide turns: Then came the turn to dehydrated and frozen potatoes. The shrinkage in per capita consumption halted; indeed, the National Potato Council figures it is turning up a bit this year.

The turn came suddenly and rather unexpectedly. During World War II, the processed potato had acquired a bad name as many an Army cook ignored the instructions and miscooked it into a soggy, starchy mess. As years passed, the bad name lost its sting, processed potatoes became tastier and came in more varied forms. Apparently the variety and convenience made people defy economics, since processed potatoes contain as much starch as natural tubers.

The biggest charm of all was the no-paring ease with which the processed potato could be cooked. Housewives and restaurants clamored for them in chorus. Today, supermarket shelves are laden with instant mashed potatoes, frozen food cabinets are crammed with an ever-widening variety of French fries, hash browns, patties, and even "golden potatoes" wrapped in gold foil to simulate baked-in-the-skin.

Swift start: Of all the potato growing States, Idaho moved fastest into processing. In the packing season just ended, the State had 11 packing plants in operation; several more will be ready for the fall season. For the last season, Idaho processed 13.2-million hundred weight, 6 times as much as Maine, its arch rival as a potato grower. And in growing more potatoes to supply its plants, Idaho finally in 1958 passed Maine as the No. 1 producer in the Nation. Last year, it clung to the lead.

Both the bigger crop and the new processing industry brought a nice factor of stability into Idaho's economy. Actually, cattle and wheat are the State's most valuable agricultural items, but potatoes are a strong third. Farmers figure now that the demand from the processors assures them a steady, even a growing market in what had been a feast-and-famine cycle. Most of them produce on contract for the packers. That means they aren't subject to the vagaries of the market; and it assures them of cash in hand, which in turn makes the merchants happy.

More jobs: As for the processing plants themselves, they have added substantially to the State's rather skimpy job openings. Last year, total manufacturing jobs in the State rose by 1,500; the Employment Security Agency says most of the increase was in potato processing.

On top of that, the packing plants run almost all year round, and so provide a cushion for the State in winter when men are laid off in lumber and logging. Idaho's biggest nonagricultural industry. The only time the potato packing plants are idle is for a few weeks in summer, when other industries are at or close to their peaks.

A single valley: Idaho's potato industry, and its boom, lie in a rather small part of that wild and far-spreading State. The part is the upper Snake River Valley, where 80 percent of the State's 660,000 people live. Potato growing started back at the beginning of this century, when the Snake's waters were first tamed for irrigation of the plain along side the river that lies within sight of the Sawtooth Mountains to the north and the Tetons to the east.

Once the irrigation ditches were filled, the area was perfect for potato growing. The soil was light, well aerated, and enriched by ancient volcanic deposits. The growing season was long, the sunshine ample. It didn't take long for the Idaho potato to become a household word. Growing it became a lively business, if a risky up-and-down one. Finally, came processing and the relative stability it brought with it.

Wartime start: Processing, both in techniques and plants, evolved from war-time activities. Indeed, the two biggest companies now in the field—J. R. Simplot Co. and Ore-Ida Potato Products—both had wartime roots. Between them, they now turn out more than half of the Nation's frozen potatoes. Simplot alone produces one-third.

Simplot, whose headquarters is at Caldwell, just west of Boise, was the biggest shipper of fresh Idaho potatoes and onions in the 1930s. During the war, Simplot turned to dehydrating potatoes (BW–Jan. 22, 1955, p. 146). When peace came, the company figured the Army had killed any consumer market for them, so it decided to experiment with frozen French fries.

"We learned a lot about the internal chemistry of the potato," says Leon C. Jones, vice president of Simplot. "We knew we could offer restaurants vastly improved quality over what they were able to prepare themselves from raw potatoes or from precut strips. We knew, too, that our product could save much time in the fryers, which are kitchen bottlenecks at mealtime." Today, Simplot is largely in the business of supplying restaurants and institutions.

Retailers: Ore-Ida, on the other hand, concentrates on supplying retail stores. It got its start in frozen potatoes after President F. Nephi Grigg took over a bankrupt wartime frozen food plant in 1946 at Ontario, Oreg., just across the Idaho line.

Simplot and Ore-Ida support their huge volume with a high degree of integration. Both sell, as well as buy, seed and potatoes. Simplot has a commercial fertilizer division. Ore-Ida keeps 16 trucks on the road to carry less than carload lots to its retail-store customers from Chicago to Los Angeles. It also keeps stocks in 180 warehouses, to provide a faster service for an added fee.

As other processors moved into the business, they started plants in the upper valley—in the heart of the potato-growing area—and Simplot and Ore-Ida have begun to set up their new plants in the same belt, away from their starting bases down the Snake. The new wave of expansion centers particularly around Burley, where both Simplot and Ore-Ida are building new production lines and where one of Grigg's other companies is erecting a plant for lease to the Gerat Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co.

Newcomers: Other companies adding to their facilities are Idaho Potato Processors, Idaho Potato Growers, Inc., and Rogers Bros. Seed Co. Still others are already talking of moving in, some have even bought land. Notable among these is Lamb-Weston, Inc., the Northwest's largest independent packer of frozen peas.

Lamb-Weston has put off announcing the start of building work—and this may have a special meaning. The trade suspects it may be deterred by a growing suspicion that the plants now being built will mean excess capacity, at least for a while. One large packer already expects to operate at less than capacity next year; in 1959, he was pressed to meet demand.

For the long term, no one is seriously worried. Says Ore-Ida's Grigg: "If we continue in this type of economy, there is no reason why the housewife would know what the raw product looks like any more than she knows what a cow looks like—she buys cream and butter and milk," Simplot's Jones adds: "We will see the day when 80 to 90 percent of all potatoes marketed through commercial channels will be processed."

At Simplot's Caldwell plant, there's a "Restricted area, no visitors" sign on the room where the research staff is cooking up new techniques to improve old products or handle new ones. It's symptomatic of the Idaho industry's knack of looking ahead. One example of a new product: the crinkle-cut French fries that in a short time have matched the volume of the original French fries—and without cutting into sales of the older type.

Dehydration: The dehydrated potatoes, which suffered most from wartime unpopularity, have gotten a leg up from new processes. The Agriculture Department collaborated with the industry to make possible potato flakes as well as the granules that are simply potatoes cooked and reduced to powder.

In the new flake process, cooked mashed potaoes are rolled on a huge stainless steel drum and then peeled off in thin sheets that break up into flakes. Both granules and flakes can be dropped directly into boiling water. That's where Army cooks went wrong: They worked with dried potatoes, but often ignored the instruction to put them in lukewarm water first and then bring them to a boil. This broke up potato cells which the new processes preserved.

Improved product isn't the industry only gambit. It is also counting on more professional selling, as such experienced giants as Pillsbury, General Mills, General Foods, Kraft, and A. & P. help do the peddling.

Soviet Spy Figure Set for Cuban Envoy Post

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of Wednesday, June 29, 1960, carried a news story of great significance. In viewing this appointment, it must be recognized that the Communist conspiracy plans its moves and trains its personnel as much as 20 years in advance. The rapidly unfolding events in the Caribbean and the appointment of the well-trained Sergei M. Kudryavtsev as Ambassador to Cuba conforms to this pattern and bodes ill for the future of the lands bordering on that great body of water, now rapidly becoming the "Soviet Sea" of the Americas. The indicated news story follows:

SOVIET SPY FIGURE SET FOR CUBAN ENVOY POST

Russia has selected Sergei M. Kudryavtsev, who headed a Soviet espionage ring in Canada in the early 1940's, to be its Ambassador to Cuba, informed sources said last night.

Kudryavtsev is now Minister Counsellor of the Soviet Embassy in Paris.

He was first secretary of the Soviet Legation (later Embassy) in Canada in 1942–45 and reputedly one of the early bosses of the espionage ring in Canada. The operation was exposed when Igor Gouzenko, a Soviet code clerk in Ottawa, defected to the West on September 5, 1945.

In 1947, Kudryavtsev came to the United States as an adviser to the Soviet delegation to the United Nations. But his presence in this country in the wake of the disclosures by Gouzenko caused such an adverse reaction that he was recalled 4 months later.

Independence of the Belgian Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, today, June 30, the Congo gains its independence from Belgium. This is an event of enormous importance in the lightning changes which are sweeping across the face of Africa.

But a short 15 years ago—at the end of the Second World War—only four nations, Liberia, Egypt, Eethiopia, and the Union of South Africa, on the entire continent of Africa were independent. Independence for other countries of Africa was considered a problem for the far, far distant future. But 3 years ago the first of the sub-Sahara countries, Ghana, gained its independence from Great Britain. In the last 3 years Africa has been literally transformed until today it is the remaining dependent countries which are in the minority, with independent or near-independent nations dominant on the continent.

This emergence of an independent Africa will be a factor of ever-increasing importance in our foreign relations. We have felt but the first tremors of the new eruptions in Africa. For long our friendly relations with the "mother" countries in Europe have largely sufficed for the conduct of our relations with Africa, but they will not suffice for long in the future. We are going to feel a pressing need to build a new structure of friendly relations with the new nations of Africa, whose interests and inclinations in some degree and part are quite different from those of the European "mother" countries. Not the least important, the membership of the United Nations will be transformed as numbers of independent African nations join together with us in that organization.

The future for independent Africa holds both exceptional promise and exceptionally difficult problems. Hardly anywhere in Africa is this combination of promise and problem so sharply present as in the Congo.

The Congo is blessed with both the resources and the beginnings of industry. Its economic future is bright and it should not be plagued by the continuing and almost insoluble economic difficulties which beset many a Nation emerging to independence under less favorable conditions. The Congo will need new capital and new skills from the world but it needs these to fully develop and use its potentialities, not in desperation to meet acute economic problems. It now provides an attractive setting for private investment and there is no reason why this will not become even more attractive in the future.

One of the Congo's most serious problems is its acute shortage of skills and exeperience. Few Congolese are ready to take over the business of running an independent economy. And even fewer Congolese have any experience in the highly complicated affair of running a government. The Congo has not had the benefit of a long period of transition during which rule was gradually shifted from the representatives of the "mother" country to those who will soon govern the new nation. Instead, in the Congo, independence has burst suddenly upon the scene.

The Belgians, in my mind, are to be congratulated upon moving rapidly to Congo independence once the signs became clear. But for the independent Congo, finding both skilled men to do the day-to-day work of government and the exceptionally wise and experienced leadership which transforms a multitude of tribes into a great nation will remain among the foremost concerns.

In differing degree, these promises and problems confront the whole continent of Africa. There are many bright spots for the future of the economies of these nations. Brightest of all is the future when Africans will be the masters of their own destinies, able to stand in complete equality and dignity among the peoples of the world. At the same time Africans must find solutions to some exceptionally difficult problems, which range from building true nations out of disparate elements tied together only by the common experience of a colonial past, to selecting a course for their nation's role in the wider world, ever more complex and beset by pressing problems. These are African problems and promises. The United States can do little to solve them. But it can help Africans in their solutions by extending wise and sympathetic understanding.

Sparks, Nev., Girl Winner of My True Security Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, in the RECORD, it is a privilege for me to introduce an essay written by a young Sparks, Nev., high school student, Miss Muriel Ann Ellis, winner of the My True Security contest sponsored by the national U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. The essay follows:

INITIATIVE AND SELF-RELIANCE: FOUNDATIONS FOR MY TRUE SECURITY, THE AMERICAN WAY

(By Muriel Ellis)

I am an American, my whole being thrives upon the freedom of choosing my own course in life which is allowed by our democratic government. This freedom which is enjoyed by all Americans, but not always employed to its fullest extent, is necessary if a person is ever to realize and test his own potentialities.

We have each been endowed with certain abilities and only the individual can determine to what degree these abilities will develop. Our parents, teachers, and friends all influence our growth, but when once embarked upon the voyage of life, the success or failure of that voyage depends entirely upon the individual.

We are all seeking security in one form or another and all looking for it in different directions. We all want this certain something that enables us to feel reasonably free from the danger of uncertainty. Though we try to attain security through such means as a good job, money in the bank, or other equally materialistic things, the foundation for true security lies within oneself in the resources of initiative and self-reliance.

True security is not simply a bulwark of material goods built up to keep the threat of poverty away. It is more than that. Security is the belief in your own personal worth which is born of confidence. Security is the feeling of surety that enables a person to feel he can surmount or at least overcome the difficulties that will appear on the horizon to mar his course of life.

Two of the foundations for this sought-after security are initiative and self-reliance. We must first discover ourself, decipher what we want from life and then have enough initiative to work steadily toward these goals. No one can help us discover ourself or furnish us with initiative. We must do these things on our own. We must learn to make decisions for ourself and if we feel we are right we should remain steadfast to that decision and pay no attention to what others think. Then if the decision proves to be either right or wrong we must be able to take the consequences.

Self-reliance is the quality which enables us to overcome failure and have enough confidence to continue reaching for new things. It is the realization that success is within our reach and if we have tried our best and not succeeded the effort we have put forth is still enough to envelope us in the feeling of security, for we will know that the best that we could do or attain has been accomplished.

Although initiative and self-reliance are foundations for security, security itself can become a trap which will eventually destroy these two qualities. We must be careful that in our quest for security we do not entrench ourself so deeply as to take the excitement and chance out of new adventures. We must not depend too heavily upon other people for our security, but enjoy the special satisfaction of achieving by oneself.

We should strive to attain a balance between the security we all seek and the uncertainty needed to make our life interesting.

Yes, my true security is based upon the foundations of initiative and self-reliance for my life will be what I make it and the way of life providing an opportunity for this true security is—the American way.

Senior Citizens of Connecticut Favor Medical Care Plan Under Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. In Connecticut many private citizens are working indefatigably for legislation to establish a Federal program of hospital and surgical care for our older citizens under the social security system.

Of these, one of the hardest workers is Mrs. Evelyn Gregan, of Manchester, Conn. Under unanimous consent, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a letter written by Mrs. Gregan to the editor of the Hartford Courant, and published in the Courant on Tuesday, June 28.

In her letter Mrs. Gregan cites some telling reasons why older folks in my home State favor the Forand-type approach to the problems of health care for the elderly.

Following is the text of Mrs. Gregan's letter:

THE FORAND BILL

To the EDITOR OF THE COURANT:

It was my privilege and pleasure to attend the rally for the Forand bill sponsored for the senior citizens of Connecticut by the AFL–CIO at the Bushnell Memorial in Hartford recently.

For more than an hour I stood on the steps of the Bushnell Memorial and watched bus loads of men and women, most of them well past 60, arriving, some on crutches, some on canes, some being guided along but each with a big smile on his face.

As I looked over this tremendous group of people, I remembered what it was like previous to the social security program when there was a poorfarm in every town and everyone had a fear that some day he might be forced to go there.

Statisticians say that the longevity of our citizens is due to the discovery of wonder drugs but as I looked at the eager faces of these people, I wondered: here were some 5,000 people between 60 and 90 gathered together in good, holiday spirit, all members of some club where they go each week to meet and talk with people like themselves, having the same problems, giving them something to live for. Gone is the fear of the poorhouse, each knowing that every month his check is coming, come hell or high water. This, I believe, is responsible for longevity. Keep a person happy and he will live longer.

These are the people that we shall be some day and it is for this reason that we must get behind some guaranteed insurance plan. As Congresman KOWALSKI said at the Bushnell, the Forand bill is not the absolute answer to the problem but it certainly is a big step in the right direction. Handled under social security, the burden would be little for each person whereas if it is handled under the private insurance or Government-State plan, the tax rate is bound to go up to finance it.

Whether you are 20 or 70 it is food for thought. Think what it would mean if you or a dear one should have to be hospitalized for 2 months, plus 2 months of nursing home care, plus surgical expense against the amount of one-quarter of a percent of our social security payments.

If you do not already have a copy of the Forand bill send to your Congressman for one.

EVELYN W. GREGAN.

MANCHESTER.

Roosevelt to Eisenhower; a Period of Rapid Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, as a majority of the Texas delegation already know, chief of the Dallas Morning News Washington Bureau, Walter C. Hornaday, is retiring from his post here after 15 years of service. During the time I have served here in the House I have known Walter both in his official capacity as a representative of his paper and socially. By far, the large percentage of the Fourth Estate are men of honesty and integrity and do a fine job of reporting the news. No one who has ever given Walter Hornaday a news story has doubted that it would be reported verbatim, without slant or bias. He is one of the finest political writers that I have known on the Washington scene and I know his many friends here will miss him greatly. No one will question the fact that he has earned his retirement and I know his many friends here join me in wishing him and his wife, Ann, all of the enjoyment and happiness they so richly deserve. I am including in my remarks an article written by Walter that appeared in the Dallas Morning News, Sunday, June 26, 1960, that contains some of the highlights of his career here in Washington:

A TEXAN IN WASHINGTON—ROOSEVELT TO EISENHOWER: A PERIOD OF RAPID CHANGE

(Walter C. Hornaday, a member of the News' organization since 1917, will retire July 1. He was chief political writer before moving to Washington in 1945 as head of the Washington Bureau. Here he reminisces on his years in the Capital.)

(By Walter C. Hornaday)

WASHINGTON.—My more than 15 years in Washington cover a brief span in history, but many momentous events have occurred during that period.

Nuclear weapons have been developed so fearful that they may have ended future wars. Russia, an ally in World War II, has become a powerful enemy, while Japan and West Germany are now on our side.

Outer space is being probed with hopes its mysteries may some day be disclosed.

These and other world-shaking developments have had their impact on the Nation, State, and local communities. The pattern of the country's political life, however, has generally remained unchanged.

Democrats and Republicans are still fighting. Blocs within the two parties continue to join forces when it serves their purposes. Conservatives, their ranks thinned, are battling the efforts of liberals to make a big central government bigger by their pushing for higher and higher spending by eroding the rights of the States with the bait of Federal aid.

Franklin D. Roosevelt's death in 1945 gave brief hopes to the conservatives that his successor Harry Truman would follow a moderate course. Truman, after an interlude, adopted the Fair Deal for the New Deal and many anti-New Dealers began to wish for the good old days of Roosevelt.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower's election was hailed as the definite end of the liberal era until modern Republicanism showed up and the Eisenhower regime adopted with some modifications most of the domestic policies of Roosevelt and Truman. Only fairly recently has the President shown a real desire to turn the liberal tide, particularly on spending.

Arriving in Washington some 6 months before Roosevelt's death, I was able to see him closehand at his news conferences. Although few realized it, the President was a sick man then. His health, however, didn't deter him from using cruel wit to make reporters squirm helplessly when they asked questions he didn't like.

President Truman's press conferences were fun. He used an acid tongue at times, but he liked reporters and they liked him personally regardless of their views on his political philosophy.

Truman's habit of shooting off the hip pained his staff but delighted newsmen who seldom left the White House sessions without a fine story.

Truman had no use for the Dallas News. He once told this correspondent at a cocktail party given by Speaker SAM RAYBURN that the Chicago Tribune and the Dallas News were "the two worst newspapers in the United States." And he wasn't joking.

Eisenhower doesn't like reporters. He handles his news conferences with restrained dignity, punctuated with flares of anger when questions he considers impudent are asked. Familiarity is out. Newsmen are referred to by the President as "mister," never by their first name. Eisenhower plainly considers press conference a nuisance, although necessary for himself and the public. He leaves the distinct impression that he would just as soon get along without them.

Washington correspondents are not awed by Eisenhower, although they recognize the hold he has on the American people. Even scandals in his administration have not affected the public's admiration. Attacks on his handling of international affairs will bear the Democrats no political fruit, in my opinion.

No article of this kind would be complete without some mention of the Texas Members of the House and Senate.

Tom Connally was still the powerful and witty chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee when I arrived. LYNDON B. JOHNSON was in Congress.

JOHNSON'S spectacular rise as Democratic leader has made him a national figure. Political experts snickered when the ambitious, restless Texan began to make moves toward the presidential nomination. Today these same experts list him as the man that Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY will have to beat for the prize.

The Texas congressional delegation has been my special assignment during my years in Washington. They are all my friends, at least none are my enemies.

Without my meaning to disparage any of the other Members, I believe Speaker RAYBURN tops them all for personal and political integrity and political wisdom. The high quality of the Texans in Congress is due in part to the discretion of the voters and perhaps in larger degree to the guidance and inspiration they receive from RAYBURN.

Wives of the Texas Members of the House and Senate shouldn't be overlooked in praising their husbands. I personally am grateful to them, for they quickly accepted my wife Ann into their circle and helped a lot to make my family feel at home in Washington from the start.

Outstanding Folklorist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Wilkes-Barre Record of Thursday, June 23, 1960, carried a most interesting editorial on the fine career of Mr. George Korson who, earlier in life, was a reporter for that newspaper and who attended the same high school as I did—James M. Coughlin High School in Wilkes-Barre. Today, George Korson is considered to be one of this country's best writers of

folklore which is an impressive distinction indeed. It gives me a great deal of personal pleasure to include the above-mentioned editorial as part of my remarks and to wish George Korson many more eventful years in his chosen field:

OUTSTANDING FOLKLORIST

George Korson of Washington, D.C., former Wilkes-Barre Record reporter, has long had stature as an author. He has written seven books with Pennsylvania folklore as his specialty. His fellow workers will share in the community's pride in his designation as a nationally known folklore authority, one of the three living outstanding folklorists in America, and one of the alltime "Big Ten."

We learn of the designation through James J. Corrigan, himself of note as a writer of history with emphasis on Wyoming Valley and a former member of the Record news staff.

Korson has given an imperishable touch to our region by recording with skill and accuracy, songs, ballads, and tales of the Anthracite. The merit of his work has been widely recognized at home and abroad. We are told that a survey of librarians showed that nearly 200 books of all kinds, published in the United States and outside, have reprinted folklore material collected by Korson or have discussed him and his work.

Turbulence of the Airways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article which appeared in the New York Times on June 26, 1960:

TURBULENCE ON THE AIRWAYS—WHILE STRANDED BY WILDCAT PILOT'S STRIKE, PASSENGERS LEARN OF DOMESTIC FARE INCREASES TO START FRIDAY

(By Paul J. C. Friedlander)

These have been bad days for the air traveler, and there are few signs that things are going to get much better very fast. First, the traveling public was caught in a fued involving the pilot inspection issue, a fight that the airline pilots and their union have been waging against the Federal Government in the shape of Gen. E. R. Quesada, head of the Federal Aviation Agency. Then, while stranded planes and passengers were still scattered all over the eastern seaboard waiting for the wildcat and unofficial strikes to be called off, the Civil Aeronautics Board announced its decision to raise domestic air fares by about 5 percent. The rise becomes effective Friday.

Simultaneously, the traveling public had been led to believe by some Washington spokesmen and reporters that Congress would abolish the 10 percent Federal travel tax as of 12:01 a.m. this Friday. The tax had been scheduled, by congressional vote a year ago, to be cut to 5 percent on July 1 of this year; then came promises of eliminating it altogether, which is a long-delayed, albeit a fine idea. But in the politics of a presidential year, when every Senator wants to appear a stateman full of "fiscal responsibility," the unorganized travelers lost out to the 10-percent tax.

NO TRAVELER'S LOBBY

It is interesting to note that the final roll-call vote to retain the travel, telephone, and other excise taxes was 84 to 0, but that an amendment to withhold income taxes on stock dividends was defeated 62 to 24.. And the annual attempt to reduce the 27½-percent depletion allowance graciously granted owners of oil and gas wells was defeated 56 to 30. Travelers may recognize from these voting trends the fact that they, almost alone in Washington, have no powerful, nationwide lobby working in their behalf.

As if to fill this void, the Airways Club recently sprang full blown into being, offering to represent anyone who flies as a passenger and also sell him or her flight insurance. The club, a private corporation, hopes to become for the air traveler what the American Automobile Association and its local and State automobile clubs have become for the motorist—his spokesman and his lobby in Washington and in the State capitals. The club's annual membership fee of $10 now provides $15,000 of insurance with the Guardian Life Insurance Co. The club's initial act as a representative of more than 1,000 members enrolled in its first couple of weeks was to line itself up with General Quesada and against the wildcatting airline pilots on the safety inspection issue.

The domestic air fare increases are the result of a CAB investigation of air fares begun in April 1956. The idea then was to inquire whether a rate reduction was not indicated. In April of this year, the CAB concluded that the domestic airlines needed financial help and that they should get a return of 10.5 percent on their investment. To do that, the Board has just concluded, the airlines may raise fares by 2½ percent, plus a flat $1 additional charge on every one-way ticket. This is expected to give the airlines an additional $84 million in revenue annually. The jet surcharges also will continue unabated, at least until June 30, 1961.

The airlines will get that money out of the passengers this way:

Fares from New York [1]

To—	1st class		Coach	
	Now	After July 1	Now	After July 1
Washington	$16.00	$17.40	$13.55	$14.90
Chicago	47.95	50.15	36.35	38.30
Boston	13.65	15.00	11.80	13.10
Miami	80.80	83.83	54.55	56.95
Denver	107.30	111.00	78.00	80.95
Detroit	33.35	35.20	27.00	28.70
Lake Placid	20.70	22.25	None	None
Los Angeles [2]	176.25	181.45	115.50	119.15

[1] Fares do not include Federal tax.
[2] Includes $10 jet surcharge in both classes.

No one will argue that the airlines should not make a profit on their operations. But one may look searchingly into some reasons why they may not be turning profitable dollars. And one may wonder whether it is a joint responsibility of, and failure to act by, the carriers and the CAB that keeps the airlines crying poverty while the population, the traveling public and travel statistics keep growing.

EXPENSIVE "COMPETITION"

Only recently have the carriers begun to admit, first privately and now sometimes in public, that some of their vaunted competition is not true competition, and that it may not be worth what it costs the passenger. The airlines all fly the same equipment, cover the same distances between cities in the same flying time, serve the same kind of food (often indistinguishable in looks and taste), put different but similar uniforms on strikingly similar cabin attendants, make the same kind of mistakes day in and day out in reservations and advance bookings, make the customer suffer through the same confusion when he tries to book a seat and put him through the same kind of exhausting nervous tension at the airports while waiting for his flight and later, for his luggage.

Seven airlines are certificated to fly between New York and Detroit, four between New York and Pittsburgh, six between New York and Boston and three between New York and Miami. It is a rare and highly perceptive passenger who can tell offhand whether he is riding in a 707, a DC–8 or an 880. They look alike, their performance characteristics are similar, their flying times run within minutes of each other and the fares are the same. What kind of competition is this?

CAN'T TELL THEM APART

The airlines reply that their competition comes in the personal service they give at the air terminals and at their reservation offices and in the food and beverages and the cabin service aloft. Here also, it takes a highly perceptive passenger to tell whether he has been waiting impatiently on a telephone ringing in one airline reservation office or another, whether he has been bumped off a flight because of overbooking by one airline or its competitor, whether the domestic champagne the stewardess offers him is bubblier on one plane than on another and whether his weight allowance (40 pounds on domestic coach and first-class flights) is more inadequate on one airline than on another.

He certainly finds no airline fighting competitively for his trade by offering him free stopover privileges, such as are available on foreign routes. European airlines advertise that, for the price of a ticket between New York and, say, Amsterdam, Copenhagen, or Rome, the traveler may visit a half-dozen major cities in between.

In this country it costs the passenger money to make a stopover; not much money, perhaps, but the principle seems to be violated at the expense of the traveler. A New York-Los Angeles ticket today on a nonjet airplane costs $166.25 in first class. To include a stopover in Chicago today the passenger pays $47.95 New York-Chicago, and $120.35 for a Chicago-Los Angeles ticket. The difference between $168.30 and $166.25 is $2.05. In a coach it costs an extra $12.15 for the stopover. These annoying charges are hard to explain, since they involve none of the additional miles of flying a stopover in Paris entails on a New York-Amsterdam ticket.

On Friday when the new fare increase becomes effective with its $1 additional charge tacked onto every ticket, the stopover fee will get worse. The new New York-Los Angeles ticket will include the additional $1 rise. But the passenger who wants to stop en route in Chicago will have to pay the additional $1 fare increase on the New York-Chicago leg, plus another $1 increase on the Chicago-Los Angeles leg. The airlines and the CAB appear to be learning well from the Nation's railroads the lessons of ticket pricing and other customer services that helped denude the railroads of their passenger business.

It is a fair question, one worthy of prompt study, whether both the industry and airline passengers might not be served better if there were fewer airlines operating opposing services over the same route. There could be no less true competition than there is now. There might even be more if the CAB then kept a close eye on the kinds of service being offered and compelled the airlines to live up to the responsibility inherent in their Government-awarded franchises.

CARRYING THE UNPROFITABLE

If the CAB has to adopt fare schedules that will permit the weaker airlines to make a profit, perhaps mergers that leave only a few, strong carriers would permit an eventual rate reduction. Over the North Atlantic air fares, instead of going down, have gone up. Also, jet surcharges have been retained

in the basic fare structure, and all this on the argument that the weaker carriers had to be protected and a fare level adopted that would cover the needs of the neediest carrier. There also has been talk of some kind of cooperation or merging of services over the North Atlantic.

Speaking of both domestic and international flying, no one has yet come up with a good reason why there should be seven airlines flying between New York and Detroit, each with its own station manager, downtown ticket office, reservation system, terminal staff and duplicating multiplicity of expenses. And with all their electronically propelled booking clerks, the passenger still stands in line 15 minutes just to check in a previously checked-in ticket.

It was the passengers, as usual, who stood around and waited while the airline pilots fought their battle with the Federal Aviation Agency. The public arguments and statements about the wave of illness and the wildcat strikes that grounded most of Eastern Air Lines' planes and sharply curtailed Pan American World Airways appeared to disregard the people who fill the seats and make commercial aviation possible.

The pilots were angry with General Quesada, as they have been since he took over direction of the FAA a year and a half ago and started modernizing and enforcing governmental flight safety regulations. The Air Line Pilots Association objected when the FAA ruled that pilots must retire at the age of 60; it tried to beat this ruling in court, but was ruled out of order. Then, when FAA inspectors began tightening up on flight activities, the pilots began striking back.

They objected to the FAA rule requiring the pilots to remain in the cockpit while in flight rather than socializing with the passengers. This was a public relations bit that the airlines liked in the earlier days of aviation, for the captain's graying hair and dignified mien lent courage to timid passengers. But with high-speed jets, the FAA wants the pilots up front working their passage, a conclusion concurred in by many passengers.

Then came the inspection of in-flight jet operations, with the FAA inspector riding the jump seat behind the pilot and copilot. This trouble has an interesting history:

ONLY TWO PILOTS REQUIRED

Twelve domestic airlines fly jets, all of them American-built airplanes. General Quesada notes that every American-built jetplane was designed, constructed, and certificated by the FAA to be flown with a crew of three—a pilot, copilot, and engineer. In negotiating labor contracts with the airlines, the pilots' union persuaded five airlines to use three pilot ; the remaining seven airlines have only two pilots. The trouble developed on planes of those airlines that conceded the third pilot to the union negotiators.

The word featherbedding is heard more often around railroads than airlines, but management officials describe the third jet pilot as so much featherbedding. The union insists he is a necessary part of the crew. This debate fails to note that seven airlines seem to fly jets safely with only two pilots.

The intensity of the pilots' union objections, and of the unofficial walkout of many pilots, fails to jibe with FAA statements. The FAA says it has only 29 jetplane inspectors, 20 turboprop inspectors, and 138 piston-engine inspectors, and that the commercial airline pilot may expect to be checked only once in every 500 flights. This lends more credence to the theory that the pilots' objections might be pointed more at protecting the third pilot's job than in avoiding serious interference with flying safety.

It is unfortunate that in an industry still in the bloom of its youth so many errors of omission can and have been committed in relation to its customers. The local newspapers were filled the other day with the story of a widow who was trapped in New York City with several children while trying to fly to Puerto Rico. She was terribly inconvenienced by the pilots, who refused to fly the plane because they were angry with the Federal Government.

PITY FOR THE PASSENGER

Not quite so dramatic, and not so often or thoroughly reported, are the mistreatments of ordinary passengers whose reservations are lost, whose seats are sold—deliberately or innocently—a second time to someone else, whose luggage takes forever to be unloaded from a plane or, worse luck, lands at another city, who finds it impossible to put through his telephone call to an airline ticket office or, if he is lucky enough not to get a busy signal, to find a clerk who can answer his questions. The laying on of electronic devices apparently has confounded the confusion. It has not eliminated the fog of misinformation and mistakes that rises between the passenger and the airline.

It is hard to believe that this week's fare increase is going to clear up all this confusion and result in sparkling service and on-time departures and arrivals. It may be that some good may come from the arrival on the scene of a company eager and willing to speak up for the air traveler. It is cheering, even though the Airways Club is still a weak, young voice, to find its executive vice president, William R. Beattie, writing to the FAA that the club believes the FAA position is sound and reasonable and that action of certain pilots "caused great inconveniences to the traveling public and threatens to lower the standards of air safety."

Tribute to the Honorable Aime J. Forand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK IKARD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. IKARD. Mr. Speaker, one of our most beloved and able colleagues, AIME J. FORAND, of Rhode Island, has announced his retirement at the end of this session of the 86th Congress. After serving with great honor and distinction for more than 22 years, a total of 11 Congresses, as Representative of the First District of the State of Rhode Island, AIME has decided for personal reasons that he will not be a candidate for reelection.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply regret that my good friend AIME has reached this decision. I wish him the very best, of course, and a happy and a well-deserved rest. However, AIME will be greatly missed on the Committee on Ways and Means and in this House.

AIME FORAND and I have served together on the Committee on Ways and Means for 6 years. He, of course, was a senior member of the committee when I was first elected to the committee. He was generous with his advice and counsel to new Members who sought it from him and I may say that he through the years has assisted me in this regard on many occasions. His service on the committee has been marked by great accomplishments in the area of the jurisdiction of the committee, resulting from bills which he introduced and his great contribution to the other legislative matters before the committee. I know of no member of the committee, past or present, who has had a more intense interest in the area of social security than AIME FORAND, and I know of no one who has devoted more time, effort, and full capacity to accomplishments in this field than has AIME. We have not always agreed on particular legislative matters, but our area of disagreement has been much smaller than our area of agreement. Much of the legislation in the area of social security is due to his diligent and conscientious efforts on the committee and on the floor of this body.

Another facet of our jurisdiction to which AIME has made great contribution is that of Federal excise taxes. As Members of this House will recall, the Committee on Ways and Means in 1956 established, for the first time in several years, three subcommittees to pursue special areas of jurisdiction—namely, excise taxes, income taxes and tariffs and trade matters. AIME FORAND as a senior member of the committee was made the chairman of the Subcommittee on Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Problems. He applied himself with great energy and diligence to the task before the subcommittee and as a result of his efforts during the 84th Congress, and in subsequent Congresses as chairman of a subcommittee on the same subject, the first revision of the excise tax structure in 30 years took place. The Excise Tax Technical and Administrative Act of 1958 will serve for many years as a monument to the able, efficient and energetic efforts of AIME FORAND. Members of this House appreciate, and may I say particularly members of the Committee on Ways and Means appreciate, the difficult and complex problems which always attend any effort to revise any substantial part of our tax structure. To have accomplished the first technical revision in over 30 years in the excise tax area is indeed a distinct honor.

AIME FORAND, of course, brought to the Committee on Ways and Means and to this House a vast amount of experience. When he first became a Member of the House, he had served for many years in the Rhode Island Legislature and in administrative and other public capacities in his own State. His prior services included not only the foregoing but also service here as a secretary of the man whom he succeeded as Representative of the First District of the State of Rhode Island.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned briefly some of the accomplishments of AIME FORAND since he has been a Member of this body, but I could not close these remarks without expressing my deep feeling about the personal qualities of our admired and beloved colleague. AIME is one of those individuals who stand out from the crowd because of the many personal traits which we all admire and indeed envy. He is a kindly man, a man of the highest integrity, a man devoted to his country, family, church and friends. He is one who has always sought to be helpful to others. I have noticed that he was a man who is always thoughtful of his colleagues on

the committee and of members of the staff of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I regret that AIME FORAND has decided for reasons of his own that he will not be a candidate for reelection and therefore will not be a Member of this body next year. We will sorely miss him as a fellow Member, but we all hope that he will see fit to visit with us often during his well-deserved years of retirement. I wish him the very best.

Hon. Ray J. Madden To Head Indiana Delegates to National Convention at Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINFIELD K. DENTON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana, First District, has been twice honored by Indiana Democrats during the month.

On June 21, he served as permanent chairman of the Indiana State Democratic Convention and on June 26, he was elected to head the Indiana delegates to the National Convention at Los Angeles.

Mr. Speaker, I hereby submit an article from the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune reporting the caucus of the Indiana delegates last Sunday.

I also include a paragraph from Congressman MADDEN's speech as permanent chairman at the Democratic State Convention. This excerpt from his speech should be followed in every State during the coming election. The State organizations too often overlook the importance of building their campaign strategy around the congressional and State legislative candidates in the various congressional districts.

MADDEN TO LEAD DEMO DELEGATION—PICKED TO HEAD 68-MEMBER STATE GROUP AT NATIONAL PARLEY

INDIANAPOLIS.—Representative RAY J. MADDEN, of Gary, veteran First District Congressman, will serve as chairman of Indiana's 68-member delegation to the Democratic national convention starting in Los Angeles July 11.

MADDEN was elected by a 37–26 margin over Third District Chairman Marshall F. Kizer, Plymouth, at the delegation's organizing session Sunday. The vote was then made unanimous on Kizer's motion.

Kizer is cochairman of KENNEDY's Indiana campaign. But MADDEN, who was in Washington, comes from a district where the organization also is considered pro-Kennedy.

MADDEN was nominated by his district chairman, Mayor Walter M. Jeorse of East Chicago. Kizer was nominated by Fourth District Chairman James L. Koons, Avilla.

Here is the list of officers and representatives on national convention committees chosen at the organizational meeting in the Claypool Hotel:

Chairman: Representative RAY J. MADDEN, Gary.

Vice Chairman: Margaret Affils Johnston, Indianapolis.

Secretary: Richard Inskeep, Fort Wayne.

Platform and resolutions committee: MADDEN and Mrs. Kenneth J. Luckett, English.

Credentials committee: D. Emmett Ferguson, Lafayette and Mrs. Johnston.

Committee on permanent organization: Mayor Frank McDonald, Evansville, and Mrs. Lawrence Arnsman, Lebanon, State vice chairman.

Committee on rules and order of business: Eugene B. Crowe, Bedford, State committee treasurer, and Fannie Mae Hummer, Kokomo.

Committee on notification of presidential nominee: Mayor Edward F. Voorde, South Bend.

Committee on notification of vice presidential nominee: Sheriff Gresham Grimm, Evansville.

Honorary vice president of convention: State Auditor Albert A. Steinwedel, Seymour.

LAUDS MADDEN

Mayor George Chacharis, of Gary, said today that Lake County Democrats are happy because Representative RAY MADDEN, of Gary, has been chosen as chief of the Indiana delegation to the National Democratic Convention.

"We feel—like the rest of the State delegates—that MADDEN can do more to unify and solidify the Indiana delegation at the national convention," said Chacharis. "He is well liked by delegates throughout the State and this was indicated by his selection yesterday."

NINETEEN HUNDRED SIXTY CAMPAIGN IN CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICTS

The Indiana Democrats won a great victory 2 years ago in the election of six new Democratic Congressmen and Senator VANCE HARTKE by a majority of almost a quarter of a million votes. We Democratic candidates have barren campaign funds but we are rich in issues and accomplishments for the people. Our record of public service must serve instead of dollars. This great victory was accomplished because of the concentrated work in the various congressional districts throughout the State. The voters realized the necessity of enacting legislation that will improve our economy, increase employment, and bring more security for the American home. We did not have the prestige of a National Presidential or Governor's contest to aid us in the 1958 campaign. Victory in 1958 was accomplished by emphasizing national legislative issues and also the necessity of electing Democratic Congressmen, State representatives and State senators in order to implement laws that would be beneficial for the prosperity and security of farm, labor, and small business.

It is time that the Democratic Party in Indiana realizes that the Republicans have concentrated in the past by educating the voters in the various congressional districts on the necessity of electing Representatives and Senators both National and State, because these officials play such an important part in the economic welfare of the millions of average Americans. It is time for Democratic State, district, county, and city chairmen, including all Democratic precinct committeemen, to know that the average voter can only be enthused and become an active worker in the campaign if he knows a candidate or a party has a platform or a program that will aid the Nation's economy and help his business, job or future security for his family. Historically, the Democratic Party has been the only instrument through which the millions of working men and women, farmers and small business could make an appeal for aid and cooperation. Their requests for just recognition in the operation of our Government can only come through the halls of Congress and the State legislatures of our Nation. After the various programs are acted upon legislatively in our National Capitol or in the State houses, it is highly important that we must have a Democratic President and Democratic Governor and State officials to carry out the legislative programs which a Democratic Congress and State legislature enacts.

Report to Joint Meeting of Civic Committee and American Municipalities Association, Washington, D.C., March 22, 1960, by International Friendship Council of Fresno

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. F. SISK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD, a report from the People-to-People Council in Fresno, Calif., which was delivered to the civic committee of the people-to-people program this year in Washington, D.C.

The People-to-People Council, originally the International Friendship Council of Fresno, was founded 10 years ago at the suggestion of the U.S. Information Service, for the purpose of promoting international friendship. Rather than acting through official agencies and governments, the People-to-People Council arranges for individuals in Fresno to contact and assist individuals or small groups in other countries. As the report points out, all the council's projects are small, and have a personal quality which makes them the most effective sort of international diplomacy—a southeast Asian town that has been adopted as a "brother city" by a California town will feel more good will toward the United States than ever could be generated through official channels.

Many towns and cities in the United States have organized similar groups, and I am pleased to say that the first such group was founded in my district, in Fresno. I hope that the following concise and interesting report of the People-to-People Council of Fresno will encourage other comunities to form international councils with the same effective results:

International Friendship Council of Fresno was organized 10 years ago under the guidance of U.S. Information Service. We are now changing our name to People-To-People Council in order to identify ourselves with the broader aspects of the national program.

We operate with a minimum of formality under articles of association which provide for unlimited membership and a board of directors of up to 50. A steering committee of six and the President direct the program. Membership dues of $2 per year have been adequate.

Our first project was the citywide collection of good American books for the University of Delhi, India. Service clubs and other groups participated. The mayor proclaimed International Friendship Week. The consul general of India came from San Francisco to speak to a meeting of Rotary Clubs. The ladies' clubs of Fresno gave a

tea for the consul's wife, at which she spoke and local Indian students danced. Local radio, TV, and newspapers gave excellent coverage of the week's events.

Since then International Friendship Week has been an annual event in Fresno, with newsworthy programs and citywide recognition.

Most of our projects are small. We try to have a member on our board from each of the active service clubs and civic groups in Fresno.

Our steering committee decides on a project and gets one of our members to accept the responsibility for it. The member draws on his club members for help if he needs it. Our steering committee advises, makes contacts abroad, and helps when necessary.

An example is a project which furnished 500 pairs of eyeglasses to a hospital in India. Girl Scout troops collected used glasses. The county optometric society sorted and classified them and furnished blank lenses. Our council arranged transportation.

Under this system, groups and individuals have sent books to a village library in India's Punjab, to Japan, and to the Philippines. In each case the council checked book titles and made sure of delivery to destination. About 10,000 books have been shipped in this way.

One of our members maintains contact with individuals and organizations in 20 foreign cities and coordinates a magazine program for them. He furnishes Fresno groups and individuals with addressed manila-clasp envelopes for mailing magazines, selected to please each recipient. At the top of the priority list are Reader's Digest and National Geographic. Several thousand mailings each year go out through this arrangement.

The council arranges pen pals for young people and adults. Some of these correspondents have become good friends.

A committee, headed by a council member contacts foreign students at Fresno State College to make sure they get a chance to visit in Fresno homes. Some Fresno families have practically adopted students from Asia and the Middle East with very gratifying experiences for both families and students.

Because Fresno is the center of the richest agricultural area in the world, we have many prominent foreign visitors. A council committee is always available to entertain these visitors in their homes, to show them through Yosemite Valley and our mountain resorts and to take them on personally conducted tours of things of interest in agriculture and its related industries. These visitors frequently stay several days.

We write to these people after they return home and send them literature about things which interested them—from how to domesticate honey bees to subsidence in deep aquifers.

One of our members recently shipped two dozen California fruit trees and vines via air-freight to the Governor of Khorat Province, Thailand. These have been planted in the Governor's gardens and will furnish budding and cutting stock to upgrade Thai varieties.

Our latest project is the promotion and organization of a city-to-city relationship between Fresno and a southeast Asian city. We hope to consummate this project during 1960.

Our objective is to furnish individuals and groups in Fresno with do-it-yourself kits for making friends abroad. Hundreds of Fresnans have made friendly contacts with thousands of people overseas and people on both sides of our borders are having fun and broadening their horizons of understanding and good will with our do-it-yourself plan.

Correctional Problems the Courts Can Help Solve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the very interesting and informative speech of Mr. James V. Bennett, Director, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, given before the eighth annual meeting of the Advisory Council of Judges of the National Probation and Parole Association, at Boulder, Colo., on June 26, 1960.

Mr. Bennett who has served honorably and well for many years in the Government service, with a wealth of knowledge gained by his years of experience in the Bureau of Prisons is most conversant with this subject matter and knows whereof he speaks. He is one of the most sincere, intelligent, and conscientious officials in the Department of Justice and is respected and admired by all who have occasion to confer with him on matters affecting his Department. I believe that his speech warrants the attention, serious consideration and thought of every Member of the Congress.

CORRECTIONAL PROBLEMS THE COURTS CAN HELP SOLVE

(By James V. Bennett, Director, U.S. Bureau of Prisons)

Time and time again I have had various friends remark to me—"I'm glad I don't have your job" or "I sure don't envy your job" or something of the kind. These sentiments apparently stem from the idea many people have that I must deal with a lot of difficult, dangerous, and cantankerous people. Perhaps they also stem from the fact that the results of my work are often disappointing and discouraging—sometimes spectacularly so.

I have an answer for remarks of this kind but that is a theme for another talk some day. But these people are right to the extent that it is not an easy job to run a prison, especially a large one. The administrative details and problems are burdensome, almost overwhelming at times. Funds are chronically limited. Personnel are hard to find, hard to induce into coming into prison work where the financial rewards are so much less than they could expect in almost any other type of work. The institution is overcrowded, and seemingly the bigger the institution the more overcrowded it must be. There is not enough work to go around, and the milling, idle prisoners create other vexing problems for the prison management.

But most of all a prison warden's job is made perplexingly difficult because the objectives of the prison are unclear. He is asked to carry out tasks that are frequently inconsistent or even impossible. This is the oft-asserted paradox of the prisons. He may be asked on the one hand to punish the miscreant, the only conclusion the warden can reach from the excessively severe nature of the sentence. And yet on the other hand, because this prisoner will eventually be released, the warden is expected to rehabilitate him, to modify his attitudes sufficiently that he can live peacefully and lawfully with his neighbors when he gets out. The warden struggles against the embittering influence of the sentence on the prisoner, and sometimes he wins and sometimes he loses. But at best it is a trying and challenging experience.

Conversely, the warden is asked to perform a different kind of miracle. He may be expected, for example, to take a check forger whose depredations have stretched over a period of 20 years and wean him from his larcenous habits within the few short months the court has given him. The court may expect the miracle, but the warden doesn't. But he tries his best.

He is also asked at times to drydock an offender who really did not need to go to prison in the first place and is expected somehow to keep alive in this prisoner hope, drive, and ambition.

However you view it, prison is tough medicine and appropriate only for those who require tough medicine. There is little need for major surgery to clear up a pimple. In dealing with the offender the same principle applies; major surgery where a shot of penicillin will do may be disastrous for the patient.

The courts can do much to help ease these paradoxical tasks with which our wardens are faced. The courts can bring about a more meaningful rapport between themselves and the institutions, closer teamwork, a more productive understanding of each other's problems. The crowded court calendars keep the judges busy of course, but at the same time it seems to me that they have no more challenging and paramount responsibility than prescribing the medicine for the offender and then following up to see how it takes. One of the reasons the doctor watches the effect of the prescription he has written for his patient is so that he can learn what kind of medicine and what kind of dose he might most successfully prescribe the next time. The courts are in much the same position. In order to accomplish their sentencing responsibilities intelligently they should know how the sentences they have already imposed worked out.

For one thing, I am sure they would learn from observation that they should not send anyone to prison unless they are dead certain that this disposition will meet the problems of the individual offender and also provide real protection for the community. We already have a higher proportion of our population locked up in penal institutions than any other nation in the world. We have 120 persons serving sentences in various institutions for adults for every 100,000 of the general civilian population. If we add to this the number of persons held in local and county jails, we get a figure of 178 persons behind bars for every 100,000 of the civilian population. In contrast, England and Wales have only 65 persons under lock and key for every 100,000 citizens. Japan has 89. About the only nation I know of that comes close to our rate is tiny Guatamala, which I visited in October 1958. I found that it had 176 prisoners per 100,000 population, but when I looked deeper into this situation I found that about 60 percent of these prisoners were unsentenced and being detained only temporarily. Our rate of prisoners to population cannot be matched anywhere in the world and it is one record of which we cannot be proud and which we must do all we can to minimize.

Probation over its relatively short history of use in this country has proved itself to be an invaluable substitute for imprisonment. It has saved a good many hopeful offenders from what might have been a corroding experience and it has saved untold

millions of dollars in prison costs. However, because of the use of this type of disposition rests almost entirely with the courts, there are almost startling contrasts in the extent to which the courts depend on it. Some courts use it for a majority of dispositions, while others use it sparingly. It is the chief tool of the courts in New England, for example, while in some midwestern States it is a feeble and undernourished device.

All of us are grateful to the National Probation and Parole Association for its expanding influence and unflagging effort in fostering an intelligent use of probation. It has come a long way during my time. I well remember how Charlie Chute and I were the only ones who appeared in behalf of the Federal probation system. Frankly, the Department of Justice was then skeptical about it and all but a handful of judges were indifferent to the whole idea. From this cradle has grown the great system of today in which we all take pride. The efforts of this organization have speeded the trend toward greater participation by the individual States in the selection, training, and support of personnel involved in probation services. A singular achievement has been the acceptance of the interstate parole and probation compact by all the States. Now probationers may go from one State to another and remain under supervision.

The continuing efforts of this organization to push a more consistent use of probation throughout the country is of paramount importance for many reasons. The statistics on prisoners tell us that in many jurisdictions highly suitable prospects for probation are still being sent to prison. In the courts of New York State only 25 percent of the convicted defendants are being placed on probation, and in Pennsylvania only 30 percent. Yet in Wisconsin 60 percent of the convicted defendants are placed on probation and in California about 50 percent. It appears that the courts in such jurisdictions as New York and Pennsylvania need to be sold on the value of probation. If this can be done, it will be a long step forward in the solution of correctional problems now being passed on to the prisons.

Sometimes the court may be reluctant to extend probation to a defendant because he has no home or job or other personal resources upon which to lean. Rather than send him to prison the court, it seems to me, should make every effort to find some alternative. I have noted that check forgers are frequently mentally or physically ill. They might, for instance, be hospitalized. Sometimes the youngsters—and we are now receiving a thousand juveniles a year in Federal institutions—can better be placed in foster homes or in special community schools, if resources of this kind are developed by the Probation Service. Some of these defendants—like an elderly victim of brain damage that one of our penitentiaries recently received on a minor charge—need domiciliary care, and that is obviously a community responsibility. They should not clutter up the prisons.

The courts can also help to minimize our prison problems even by the very manner in which they impose sentence. It is of course the court's duty to define for the defendant the community's attitude toward his act, and that is partly the function of the sentence. But this can be done in an objective, constructive way, and it may actually put the defendant in a frame of mind where he might be more inclined to cooperate with the corrective efforts of those to whom the court has delegated this duty. On the other hand the manner in which the court passes sentence can have the opposite effect. If the court creates unnecessary antagonisms in the defendant by heaping invective upon him, ridiculing and humiliating him, it may impose very formidable handicaps to the probation officer or the prison personnel who must thereafter try to instill within the defendant an attitude that he really has within himself the capacity to become a worthy citizen. I have seen some prisoners who have gone through such an excoriating experience in court that they remained hostile and intransigent problems for many months, sometimes indefinitely.

If the needs of the defendant and the requirement for community protection dictate that he must be sent to prison, then the type of sentencing procedure that is used becomes most important. And it may also become an extremely frustrating problem for the judge. The penal statutes of this country are a mish-mash of conflict and variation. Most of the States use indeterminate sentences in some form, and at the same time most of them retain some elements of the definite sentencing system. Twenty-seven of the States and the District of Columbia have predominately indeterminate sentences, and 21 States retain predominantly definite-sentence systems. In some jurisdictions mandatory statutes dictate the sentence and leave the court with little discretion. In other jurisdictions, as in California, much of the sentencing responsibility may be removed from the courts for most offenses. The courts of California, as you know, have no say whatsoever as to the time that shall be served by the defendant in prison. These differences in sentencing procedures are complicated further by variation in statutory penalties for the same offense categories and by varying parole policies and practices.

It is devoutly to be hoped that this conglomeration of sentencing procedures will some day be resolved in the direction of more flexibility, more alternatives, and more discretion. The courts need a range of dispositions as broad as the range of sentencing problems with which they are confronted. The Federal system is moving in that direction, as you know. As a result of leigslation enacted in 1958, the Federal courts can, after setting any maximum within the statutory maximum, specify that the matter of parole eligibility will be left entirely up to the Board of Parole, fix a parole elligibility date at any point up to one-third of the imposed term, or let parole eligibility stand at one-third of the sentence.

The new legislation contains an additional feature that has proved invaluable to courts faced with serious sentencing problems. The courts can commit a defendant to one of our Federal institutions for a tentative period of 3 to 6 months, during which time he is studied, observed, and diagnosed. At the end of the period fixed by the court I must take into consideration all of the factors that have been disclosed by this study, and formulate a sentencing recommendation to the court. This procedure, needless to say, has required me to reduce my ideas on sentencing to specific and concrete terms.

But whether or not the courts are equipped with a number of sentencing alternatives, they can still avoid creating problems for the institutions by remembering, as I must remember when specifying for the court exactly the type of sentence that I think should be imposed on an individual defendant, that the institutions have certain very definite limitations. There are certain services they can perform, and certain services they cannot. In this respect it has been my experience that the courts are often overgenerous in their estimates of what correctional institutions can accomplish.

The availability of psychiatric services, for example, has been overadvertised. To a very large extent these services are simply not available. In the Federal Prison Service only a half dozen institutions aside from the Springfield medical center have psychiatrists on their staffs. The other 28 have none. The States are in an even less favorable position. In a recent survey we found there were only 32 full-time psychiatrists employed in State institutions for adult offenders, and even this number was concentrated in 12 States, with 15 of the psychiatrists accounted for the State of California. However, even if a prison is fortunate enough to have a psychiatrist, the number of prisoners he can treat is severely limited. He is lucky if he has time enough to perform the diagnostic services that are required of him.

Further complicating this situation is the fact that there are certain types of problems that most psychiatrists agree they can do little to remedy, especially in a prison setting with all its limitations. Homosexuals and other persons with any extensive history of several aberrations are pretty poor prospects for any presently known psychiatric technique. The psychiatrists cannot do much to help the mentally defective, and the addict or the sociopath do not seem to offer much hope at our present stage of knowledge. The mentally defective belong in a mental institution where specialized facilites for this training are available. The addict is a product of his environment and must be treated within the context of that environment after a period of withdrawal under medically controlled conditions. Perhaps of the three, only the sociopath should be committed to prison, but even with this type of offender the psychiatrists admit their prognoses must be guarded.

Under present conditions unfortunately the courts must send to prison the alcoholic, the vagrant, and the social misfit. For all practicable purposes they get along well in prison, but as soon as they are released they resume their previous patterns and the prison is indicted for their failures. But the reason for their failures is all too obvious. The prison can treat only the individual, and those problems that are peculiarly within him. It cannot treat the social environment which produced him in the first place. The readjustment of the alcholic, the vagrant, and the social misfit, if it is to be accomplished, must be done within the community.

The community has been hesitant to accept its rightful responsibilities with regard to this group, and as a result the prison has become a catch-all for its many rejects. The judge, as a partner of the institutions in the administration of justice, must use an intelligent discrimination in insisting that the community accept its problems. He does not, I believe, need to be an automaton merely processing such cases to prison. He can assume a more positive role, as many of them do.

In Denver, for example, through the efforts of Judge William H. Burnett and his associates in the municipal court the "drunk" population of the city jail has been cut by 60 percent in recent years. This has been accomplished largely by marshalling community resources, by recommending some of these individuals to a medical commission for commitment to a State hospital, and by encouraging those individuals with any constructive motivation left to join some organization such as Alcoholics Anonymous. Through similar efforts by Judge Ray Harrison, of Des Moines, the rate of arrests for drunkeness in his city has been cut more than 30 percent. In this respect I agree with Judge Burnett's observation that "there is a definite relationship between the community which is making progress on this problem and the leadership of some particular judge in that community."

In addition to developing overall policies of this kind the judges can more closely scrutinize the individual defendants to determine the appropriateness of imprisonment or some other disposition. I recall, for example, that one eastern court sensed from the characteristics of the defendant before

him that there was some element present that he could not put his finger on, and he committed the defendant to us for study and observation. We found that the defendant had been in and out of mental institutions, that he was in escape status from one State mental institution, and that he was currently schizophrenic. Between the court and ourselves arrangements were made to return him to the State hospital from which he had escaped and the court cut his sentence to time served. We have had several other similar cases in which this procedure has proved useful.

Finally, the importance of a consistent sentencing philosophy at all times and between all judges cannot be overemphasized. Admittedly, this is difficult to achieve. The range of median time served varies markedly across the country. For all offenses, the median time served is the lowest in Vermont, with 10 months, and highest in Illinois, with 3 years and 2 months. Even for murder, the time served by those who are released varies from 5 years 4 months in Virginia to 15 years 2 months in Ohio. Persons convicted of manslaughter serve from a median of 1 year 5 months in Tennessee to 4 years 6 months in New York. Robbers serve 1 year and 3 months on the average in Colorado, but they serve an average of 6 years in Indiana. For the common offense of auto theft convicted offenders serve as little as 8 months in Maryland and as much as 31 months on the average in Iowa. Similarly with forgers, who serve 8 months in South Carolina, but 3 years in West Virginia.

Many judges have worked out a system for minimizing such disparities. Some of them keep on hand the statistics showing the average time served for given offenses in an effort to be consistent with their fellow judges. Some of them keep memoranda concerning their own sentence dispositions, in an effort to keep their own sentences consistent with each other. Some find it helpful to write short opinions or statements of their reasons for imposing a particular sentehce. We have found the latter helpful, incidentally, when the court sees to it that these transcripts accompany the prisoner to the institution.

Perhaps more promising than any of these methods is the sentencing institute. This was also a feature of the sentencing act passed by the Congress in 1958. The first nationwide conference of this kind, as most of you know, was held right here in Boulder in the summer of 1959, under the dynamic leadership of Judge Alfred P. Murlah. Several of the circuits have also made sentencing an important part of their conference agendas, and within the next year a regular program of sentencing institutes on a circuit basis will be organized. The authorizing legislation sponsored by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER was quite broad and in effect specified that the judges at these institutes could discuss any and all matters that would bring about the "formulation of sentencing principles and criteria which will assist in promoting the equitable administration of the criminal laws of the United States."

To achieve the teamwork which is necessary if the criminal laws are to be applied more equitably the judge ought to visit the institutions to follow up on the persons they have committed there. They ought to observe the programs and find out what the actual resources of a prison are. And if a prisoner again returns to their courts they should try to determine what reasons accounted for his failure. Sometimes it may be the institution that is at fault, and sometimes it may be the community. Sometimes it may be the nature of the original sentence. No one could expect, of course, that the judge will be able to follow up on every case that appears in his court. But he can make a sampling survey of this kind from time to time.

Our ideas concerning prisoners and punishment have changed gradually over the years, but it is likely that this type of inquiry will accelerate that process. And it is likely that similar inquiry on the part of the courts will do a great deal to change our sentencing procedures over the next generation. There seems to be left only one direction for this change to take place—in the direction of more consistency and more flexibility.

That inquiry is both overdue and essential. About 200 years have elapsed from the time of the classical principle of punishment, which equated each crime with an appropriate penalty established in advance by statute, to the more contemporary proposal of a sentencing tribunal, which divorces the judges from practically all responsibility or discretion with respect to the imposition of sentence. Despite 2 centuries of discussion and experience, no general consensus has yet been reached and the question of the limitations of the individualization of punishment continues to be the most intractable problem in the entire field of criminal jurisprudence.

The significance of historical trends in the individualization of treatment lies in the fact that each development has been incorporated into the criminal law. Furthermore, the acceptance of these developments by the public, the judiciary, and the legal profession has been facilitated by advancements in the social and behavioral sciences. As this knowledge increases and becomes more precise, the correction of the offender will hopefully become as important a function of the sentence as are the values of deterrence and public protection.

These values of deterrence, incapacitation, and correction attributed to the criminal law are not inevitably and necessarily contradictory or mutually exclusive. The overriding function of a sentence is not to be an end in itself, which is sheer retribution, but rather a means for the achievement of those values. The problem of judicial discretion is the determination of a sentence, therefore, is that of balancing the requirements of the legal norms with the characteristics of the individual offender. Experience has taught us the paradoxical but sad lesson that reliance on the humanitarian motivation or the sense of justice of a judge is not enough to insure the most appropriate disposition of the offender either in the interests of the community or in the offender's eventual correction.

Justice for United States in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, now that expropriation of American property in Cuba has become a reality, this Nation, in my opinion, cannot afford further delay, in its own interest and in the interest of freedom and justice in the Western Hemisphere, in taking prompt action. I have felt and said that we should have taken action long ago.

Nothing is ever gained by compromising with Marxists or waiting for them to change their tactics. The fact that we have temporized with Marxism over a period of time is responsible for much of the trouble that exists in the world today. However, that is a different story, and a long story, and I will not go into it now. It constitutes a sad, pathetic chapter as history will attest.

The Congress has been beside itself passing measures to expedite and accelerate foreign investment. What good will this do, I inquire, if American investments overseas and American property in foreign countries face ruthless, illegal, confiscation and expropriation?

The sanctity of human rights, property rights and contractual rights lie at the very basis of Western civilization and, indeed, should be a necessary part of any civilization. No worthwhile government can operate successfully, domestically or externally, that does not recognize contractual rights and is not willing to protect valid, legitimate property rights. No self-respecting, decent government will repudiate its solemn treaties and legal commitments.

By its harsh, arbitrary action, the Cuban Government has indicated that it intends to pursue expropriation of American property, and perhaps other property as a national policy. That being so, this Nation has no choice but to protect itself against this kind of brigandage and theft, and if we do not do so, we will become the laughing stock of the world.

I again respectfully suggest to the President and Secretary of State that the Organization of American States be immediately convened to discuss not only expropriation of property by Cuba, but also the existence of a dangerous, aggressive Communist conspiracy in the Western Hemisphere that constitutes a present danger and dire threat to the peace, security, and liberty of our Western World.

This action should be taken immediately, and without further delay. It should have been taken long ago.

Furthermore, the Congress and the Government should move immediately to apply such economic sanctions as we have available to us—and they are very persuasive—designed to mitigate, if that be possible which I doubt, the severity of the vicious anti-American campaign in Cuba and the ruthless expropriation of American property in that land.

And, Mr. Speaker, if these measures should fail, we should boldly map out and adopt other more extreme measures that will definitely insure the protection of American interests and rights in Cuba and keep our great country and this hemisphere from being infected with the malignant virus of communism.

Bayard Auchincloss' Sound Dollar Drive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, like the weather, almost everybody talks about the need for a sound dollar, but few in-

deed are undertaking to do anything about it. One such man though, who is doing what he can, with what he has, where he is, and whose efforts I have observed and applauded from afar is Bayard Auchincloss, a young science teacher from Oklahoma City. That his efforts have attracted the attention of the press as well is encouraging, and is attested to by three recent articles, which I commend to the attention of colleagues who share my concern over our responsibility to shore up the American dollar:

[From the Napa (Calif.) Register, Apr. 7, 1960]

SIGNATURES ARE FINE—BUT DON'T SEND ANY DOLLARS

(By Ed Koterba)

WASHINGTON.—Please don't send any more dollars. They've kept two of us busy stuffing them back in envelopes and returning 'em to the senders.

It all started when I told about an Oklahoma City science teacher, Bayard Auchincloss, and his one-man campaign for a sound U.S. dollar.

Auchincloss' plan is dramatically simple. He wants to collect 2 million signatures from people who are for a sound dollar. These he will display before Members of Congress to prove just how deeply incensed our taxpayers are about inflation.

MAIL ERUPTS

I related this, and the mail erupted. Within a few days the sound dollar man received 500 letters asking for petition-pledge forms (which he sent out pronto).

Letters bombarded me, too—at the Capitol, the White House, at the newspapers and at home. They came from the poor, the well-established, the young, the elderly, Democrats and Republicans. So enthusiastic were some writers that they enclosed dollar bills to be forwarded to Auchincloss.

The irony is that this personable patriot hadn't asked for contributions. He's absorbing the expenses himself, as long as his own personal budget can take it.

Already, the science teacher has amassed more than 100,000 "me too" signatures from all points of the country. He expects to hit his first million in a couple weeks.

Since he can't leave his classrooms for the whole day, he's had to hire two helpers at his sound dollar headquarters, 106 West Main Street, Oklahoma City. They've been working overtime sending out the petition-pledge forms and "I'm For A Sound Dollar" auto stickers.

SEND CLIPPINGS

There's another major item in the master plan of the sound-dollar man. That is to kick off an avalanche of letters from constituents to Congressmen enclosing clips of any newspaper story that tells of Government waste or proposed Federal inflationary spending.

Auchincloss, a handsome former P-47 fighter pilot, and an ace of World War II, has another idea of dramatizing his campaign. He hopes to hold an enormous sound-dollar rally in Oklahoma City for 6,000 taxpayers.

Already he has acceptances tentatively from two speakers, Capitol Hill's biggest anti-inflation advocates, Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, Republican, of Arizona.

Just in the short time since the Oklahoman came up with his plan, new records leading toward fiscal destruction were being established.

Our national debt nudged up another notch and now stands at just a shade under $300 billion—the highest debt of any nation of any generation in all the world. At the same time, the people who keep tabs on installment buying disclosed that families have fallen deeper than ever into personal debt—$50 billion.

And as this is written, I learn that our 46-cent dollar has shrunk another fraction—to its lowest point in all time.

Maybe those 2 million signatures will wake somebody up in Washington.

A TEXAN IN WASHINGTON—CRUSADER PUSHES FOR SOUND DOLLAR

(By Robert E. Baskin)

WASHINGTON.—A carrot-topped young descendant of Peter Stuyvesant turned up in the Capital one day last week to see what he could do around here about promoting his one-man crusade.

Bayard Auchincloss is 38, a World War II fighter ace over Germany, a science teacher at a private school in Oklahoma City and—most of all right now—an exponent of the sound dollar.

Washington is full of pleaders for special causes, most of whom operate with an expertness born of long practice. But Auchincloss is strictly new to the business.

"I don't have any organization," he told reporters here. "And I don't know what needs to be done to achieve a sound dollar.

"What I want to do is arouse the American public to the need for a sound dollar. Then it's up to the people in Government to work out the details."

Considering the fact that his campaign has been underway only since February, he appears to be doing fairly well.

Auchincloss is concentrating on youth and he has obtained about 10,000 signatures on a youth petition to Congress asking that it stop increasing the national debt. Kiwanis Key Clubs in Oklahoma and Texas, including those in Dallas, have approved the project.

Auchincloss, a member of a wealthy New York family, is financing the campaign himself.

"I haven't asked anyone for contributions," he says.

He is using many types of promotion to make the public aware of his campaign.

On April 15, deadline for filing Federal income tax reports, Auchincloss had a skywriter make a big dollar mark over Oklahoma City. Newspapers, radio and television advised folks that this was a "sound dollar" promotion.

In addition he printed up automobile stickers, campaign buttons and stationery stickers with the sound dollar theme.

So far he has received about 1,000 letters from persons in 31 States offering to help the campaign along. One well-to-do Oklahoma farmer spends most of his spare time distributing buttons and literature, Auchincloss reports.

"As the program progresses," he says, "it is becoming more and more apparent that people already have strong feelings about the financial profligacy of our Government, and that all they need is some way to express themselves on the subject."

Recently, Auchincloss distributed postcards which urge Senators to support a constitutional amendment to bar any increase in the national debt and to reduce it annually by $500 million.

This summer Auchincloss plans to attend both national conventions to distribute literature and advertise in other ways the sound dollar theme.

Asked about his reasons for launching the campaign, he has a simple answer.

"I've got four children," he says.

[From the Daily Oklahoman, Mar. 24, 1960]

INFLATION FIGHTER RALLYING SUPPORTERS—AUCHINCLOSS' SOUND DOLLAR LTD. ATTRACTS LETTERS FROM 22 STATES

(By Bill Harmon)

Bayard Auchincloss' favorite letter among those received at his Sound Dollar Ltd. headquarters came from a Canonsburg, Pa., housewife.

She and her husband, she said, are weary of "fighting the losing battle of trying to live within our very modest means." She wrote she had left dishes in the sink to take time to offer help to the anti-inflation crusade.

Auchincloss thumbed through a growing stack of letters from over the country Wednesday. The response to his sound dollar movement, he said, has been marvelous.

From a new headquarters location at 106 West Main answers to the letters along with petitions, auto stickers, and red, white, and blue folders explaining the plan are going out daily.

Auchincloss, 38-year-old Casady School teacher, counted almost 250 letters received since Monday. Many of them, like the one from the Canonsburg mother, were penned or penciled on tablet paper. Others came on expensive letterhead stationery. All offered aid in the fight against inflation.

"We've come a long way, I think, in 2 months. We've become national in scope now," said the soft-spoken Auchincloss. "It shows the extent of the feeling of the people about what's happening to the dollar.

"It's there, wanting to come out. The more they think about it, the stronger their feeling about it. That's the way I feel."

The objective of Sound Dollar Ltd., has changed a little since it was formally launched February 4, he said. It began—Auchincloss' own idea and financed by him—as a means of letting the people know about economic issues.

"We're now providing a way for people to communicate with their Congressmen easily and effectively," he explained. "We're getting people to write and we're helping them realize that their opinions about inflation are worth something."

Auchincloss, son of a wealthy New York family, seeks no personal gain from the movement and he has no readymade plan to stop inflation. The goal he's set for the sound dollar petitions is 2 million signatures to present to Congress.

Many of the letters he's received evidently came from elderly persons.

"Here's wishing you success," said a Baldwin, N.J., man. He said it was time "someone with backbone did something about nasty inflation."

Inflationary Government spending has given him an upset stomach, said an Amarillo, Tex., man, and he was "unable to find any Republican or Democratic medicine that gives me any relief."

A few of the letters contained dollar bills.

"Sorry it's only worth 46 cents," wrote a Huntington, W. Va., man who enclosed a dollar.

One letter was written in verse.

"Looking for a dollar as sound as '39, let us stop our kidding, it's going to a dime.

"Our Uncle Sam, the Grand Old Man, even if he's broke could find a way to subsidize every single bloke," wrote the versifier from Media, Pa.

"Let's do something about it besides talk," urged a Clarksburg, W. Va., man. Another, from Garden City, N.Y., asked, "Why stop at 2 million signatures?"

The letters began coming in more heavily since Auchincloss appeared last week at a Washington news conference. Reports of his crusade for economy in Government were circulated in the East, and Auchincloss now has received requests for petitions from 22 States.

The petitions call for an end to wasteful spending and eventually an end to foreign aid.

A letter from a New York woman offered her services in carrying a sound dollar placard in Washington.

"I could always stretch the dollars but they have lost their elasticity," said another from a Belle Vernon, Pa., woman. A retired teacher deplored the gimme, gimme atti-

tude of people today wanting Government support from the cradle to the grave.

Auchincloss said he believes the sound dollar movement is just beginning to roll. He plans to continue to finance as much of it as he can alone. Use of the new headquarters space was donated by a supporter.

One of Casady's original staff of four, Auchincloss teaches history, geography, general science and music.

As a P-47 fighter pilot he was an ace in World War II with the 8th Air Force, making 71 combat missions and shooting down five German planes. He won the Distinguished Flying Cross.

His teaching duties limit the time he can give to Sound Dollar, Ltd., but now that national interest is becoming aroused, Auchincloss believes the 2-million-signature goal is in sight.

"We hope to show the mounting feeling on the part of average Americans that they don't want the Government to keep on spending so much money, more money year after year," he said.

Effect of Importation of Machinery on the Domestic Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, a serious problem exists because of the unfair competition to the machinery industry on foreign-made machinery and I wish to mention at this time some of the effects such imports have on the U.S. economy and on the economy of the 23d Congressional District of Illinois which I represent.

Traditionally, the United States is a heavy exporter of machinery. However, in recent years imports have been growing. In the single year between 1958 and 1959 they rose from $472 million to $656 million or by 39 percent. In the same period exports remained almost stable. Much of the increase is the result of more modern, lower cost foreign industries rebuilt since World War II, many of them with the financial and technical aid of the United States. Not only do their products come in as imports and compete with domestic industries but they also compete with our exporters in foreign markets.

According to a study by the Department of Commerce, Illinois share of U.S. exports of nonelectrical machinery is one-seventh of the national total. About 11 percent of the Nation's electrical machinery output is located in Illinois. Her machinery industry thus is affected by increased imports, such as 1959 witnessed in industrial, office and printing machinery and in electrical apparatus imports. Furthermore, our machinery industry is experiencing more and more difficulty in competing in world markets.

One pertinent example is the recent award of a contract to Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha, Ltd., of Japan, for a number of towing locomotives to be used in the Panama Canal Zone. It is true that the Japanese bid was well under the lowest American bid, that of the Plymouth, Ohio, Locomotive Works. Perhaps this is good business, but I quarrel with the idea that the Japanese were awarded the contract through fair and free competition. Our laws impose burdensome production costs upon business which, together with our high wages, makes the term "free and fair competition" a mockery.

If our machinery industry is to survive, action must be taken to insure fair competition.

Imports are causing serious concern in our country. While exports increased only slightly less than the gross national product between 1950 and 1959, imports increased by 8 percentage points more than the increase in gross national product.

Dun's Review has recently completed a survey of the effects of imports on our economy. Both the members of their president's panel—representing 175 of the Nation's leading companies—and a random selection of 300 small manufacturers expect more serious competition from foreign imports in the next 5 years. Most of the panel members and the smaller companies polled believe that lower labor costs, less overhead, foreign government export subsidies, and low ocean freight rates account for the difference in costs. Many trace it primarily to lower wage costs, although there is diversity of opinion here. I am sorry to say that close to 40 percent of the presidents of large corporations on the panel reported that they plan to launch more foreign operations—licensing arrangements, new plants and expanded facilities abroad, joint operations with oversea manufacturers, and purchase of foreign concerns. I do not know how many of these are located in Illinois or if any are in my district, but I do know that this means the export of jobs from our borders and import competition. The smaller businesses must rely on increased efficiency, new products, automation, and greater production. The increase in imports of finished manufactures, which in 1950 constituted about 18 percent of total consumption imports, accounted for about 34 percent of import transactions in 1959. Together with semimanufactures, they accounted for over half of U.S. imports by value. This is a grave portent for my congressional district and for the State of Illinois.

For all these reasons, I feel that concrete action should be taken immediately to alleviate such conditions.

Federal Bureau of Investigation—IV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the fourth of a series appearing in the Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch relative to the wonderful record of the world's greatest law enforcement agency:

WASHINGTON.—A couple of years ago, just before the Christmas season, an FBI apprehension was effected in Columbus, Ohio.

Walter Carl Splitt and Barbara Ann Jones were arrested. Their story began when they escaped Ohio institutions and FBI assistance was requested. The FBI found indications they were responsible for a bank robbery in Kentucky.

Shortly before Christmas, the FBI received word that Splitt and Jones might well be in Columbus.

Columbus police were particularly desirous of taking these individuals into custody. Investigation led to the Northern Lights Shopping Center. Splitt had a reputation of being an extremely dangerous individual. Barbara Ann Jones, although of relatively tender age, was nevertheless a gun moll and normally carried a loaded automatic strapped to her thigh, concealed by her dress.

A special agent of the FBI walked into a drugstore in the shopping center. He saw Splitt and Jones seated at a table. Reinforcements and police were summoned.

As he came out of the drugstore, he gave an appropriate signal to the assisting officers. The signal assured them that Splitt and Jones were in the drugstore. The fugitives finished their coffee, emerged and edged through the crowd to their car. They were hemmed in by Columbus police and FBI. Both were taken into custody before they could use firearms.

In such a case, immediate positive identification of a fugitive is of paramount importance. Fingerprints provide the answer.

The FBI Identification Division established by Director J. Edgar Hoover in July 1924, is an indispensable part of the FBI team.

The world's largest storehouse of identification data, currently houses more than 155 million sets of fingerprints and receives about 20,000 fingerprint cards each working day.

The bulk of these prints are noncriminal and are housed in the civil files. But there are approximately 13½ million fingerprint cards of individuals arrested for criminal offenses. These are segregated from the civil fingerprint cards. A "monicker" or nickname file is also available.

In one instance, the name of "Kentucky Red" was all that was known by a law enforcement agency. When this alias was checked through the "monicker" files of the Identification Division, full facts concerning this criminal were made available. As a result, a case was solved, a fugitive located, and justice meted out.

At the time of its establishment, the Identification Division totaled 810,188 fingerprint cards.

These were the result of consolidation of the fingerprint cards on hand at the Federal penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans., and those in the possession of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Today thousands of law enforcement agencies throughout the States use and contribute to this national clearinghouse of identification data.

During the early days of World War II, a fisherman pulled a shark from the water near Miami, Fla. A human hand was found in its stomach. It was the right hand and identification would be painstaking without the prints of the left hand. The FBI files (except with regard to certain notorious criminals such as bank robbers, extortionists, and impersonators) classify fingerprints according to data derived from a study of all 10 fingers.

The FBI's efforts to identify the right hand necessitated an approximation of the classification of the missing left hand.

Trial and error took place. After considerable study, research, and unsuccessful attempts to identify the person, a sufficiently close guess of the left hand was made to permit the location of a fingerprint card. A positive identification was made based upon the fingers of the right hand.

The FBI is constantly serving the public through its identification facilities.

In one instance, an individual from Thiess, Germany, consulted the FBI as to the whereabouts of a missing relative who had been known to reside in Oklahoma years earlier.

A check of the Identification Division files of the FBI revealed that this missing relative was in Portland, Oreg. The correspondent in Germany and the missing person in Oregon were notified. As a result, father and son were restored in family unity after an absence of approximately 25 years.

In another instance, a person walked into a sheriff's office, and said he had no idea who he was. Clearly he was an amnesia victim.

There were no papers of identification or other means of identifying this person—but fingerprints, which remain the same throughout life, provided the answer. A check of the civil files of the FBI revealed he had been fingerprinted in the State of Washington in 1905, one of the first enlistees of the U.S. Army subjected to fingerprinting.

In Columbus, Ohio, recently, a man was charged with the death of three schoolchildren. The individual, driving a stolen car and fleeing from police, lost control of the vehicle and plowed into a group of children awaiting a schoolbus in South High Street. Three died.

There have been similar occasions in the past when the offender was not under police scrutiny as in the preceding case. For example, there was the situation involving a 7-year-old schoolchild. As she stepped from the curb after school she was struck and killed by a hit-and-run motorist.

Alert local officers investigating at the scene of the crime encountered bits of evidence which led to the solution of this case.

Tiny pinpoints of paint embedded in the clothing of the child were sent to the FBI laboratory for spectrographic analysis. In the hands of scientists staffing the FBI laboratory, these paint specimens were analyzed. They found that the vehicle was an old model car which had been painted 11 different times.

Comparison with the FBI national automobile paint file showed that the car was a 1948 Pontiac and was green at the time it left the factory, but 10 subsequent layers of paint had been applied.

The FBI advised local officers of the exact order and color of each layer of paint and the order in which these applications were put on the car. Shortly, police located a suspect vehicle.

A penknife and a quick flick of the wrist made it possible for an investigating policeman to secure a sample of paint from the suspect vehicle. It was sent to the FBI laboratory and there compared with the initial specimen. Each layer of paint matched up conclusively.

When faced with the possible testimony of an FBI expert in local trial, the suspect confessed and admitted the situation which led to the death of the child.

Prior to November 1932, this would not have been possible. At that time the FBI laboratory was founded. Director J. Edgar Hoover, in building the basic structure of the FBI, realized the importance of science in crime detection. Small at the beginning, the FBI laboratory has grown to more than 100 experts, each highly proficient in his particular specialty. Municipal, county, and State law-enforcement agencies throughout the Nation submit evidence in criminal cases to the FBI laboratory for cost-free examination. During the 1959 fiscal year, nearly 185,000 examinations were conducted by experts of the FBI laboratory.

Examinations cover a multitude of matters. The FBI laboratory has on hand samples of the typewriting of all known U.S. makes and most typewriters of foreign manufacture. There are thousands of samples of safety paper. Handwriting as retained from known extortionists, impersonators, espionage agents, anonymous letter writers, and persons likely to participate in the overthrow of the U.S. Government.

Even lipstick is susceptible to analysis and comparison with FBI standards.

As its name implies, the FBI laboratory is not devoted solely to criminal undertakings.

A few years ago, an elderly lady died. Litigation arose over the estate and the case wound up in Federal court.

One thing which puzzled the persons looking after the estate was the large number of notebooks, papers, notes, and various documents around the huge house. Some mentioned explorations.

A question developed as to the authenticity of papers relating to the Lewis and Clark expedition into the Northwest Territory. The papers soon wound up in the FBI laboratory. It took the laboratory a relatively short period of time to render its report:

"The papers are notes of the Lewis and Clark expedition, authentic notes, the only known authentic notes, in the handwriting of Lewis, and of Clark, except for document No. 12 which was a map and contained a paragraph written in the margin; that paragraph was written personally by Thomas Jefferson."

The FBI laboratory concluded that these documents would be interesting to scholars and historians when ultimately published.

Like all FBI undertakings, the laboratory is devoted to search for the truth. The officials and experts of the FBI laboratory are not rated according to the number of convictions which they obtain. Appreciation of scientific fact—understanding of science as a means of assisting in the administration of justice is of top-level importance.

Thus the FBI laboratory is a valuable adjunct of law enforcement officers throughout the land. Both are devoted to serving the ends of justice. Neither is concerned with convictions per se; each is concerned with putting facts on the record.

Fulbright Report Falls Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, in the report of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, we witness the appalling spectacle of Americans trying to undermine American prestige. I call to the attention of my colleagues the article by David Lawrence which appeared in this morning's New York Herald Tribune:

FULBRIGHT REPORT ON U–2 SEEN REACHING NEW LOW

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, June 29.—Has the "prestige" of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee "reached a new low"? The Senate has just been given a report on the U–2 affair which in part is concurred in by some of its Members, while others dissent. It lacks coordination and consistency. Ten Senators—all of them Democrats, including Senator KENNEDY—officially put themselves on record as implying that the President should have lied to the world. Six Republicans and one Democrat insist that it was absolutely necessary for the President to tell the truth.

The same committee's chairman, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat of Arkansas, after presenting the report to the Senate, alleges that the administration is lying now about certain aspects of the incident. In a speech to the Senate, he says:

"We are told that this particular flight was in a special category; that it was seeking information of extraordinary importance which might not be available later. However, we are not told, even under conditions of the utmost secrecy, what that information was. In view of the sensitivity of some of the other things we were told, this reticence on the part of the executive branch raises the question of whether the information sought on May 1 was in fact as important as it has ben represented. There is ground here for the conclusion that the alleged extraordinary importance of this information is the administration's cover story for its own costly mistake."

SEES INCONSISTENCY

To accuse one's own Government of lying to a Senate committee doesn't seem to bother the Senator, who, in the same speech, also declares that President Eisenhower should have refused to take responsibility for the U–2 business and, instead, should somehow have evaded the truth. For, while Mr. Eisenhower did not really know in advance of the particular flight on May 1, he did give general authorization in advance and said so to the American people and the world. Yet Chairman FULBRIGHT says to the Senate:

"The gravest mistake was made when the President assumed responsibility for the flight."

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, of Ohio, Democrat, in a separate report concurred in by five Republican Senators, rebutted this same point as follows:

"Conditions following the May 1 flight having developed as they did, it was unavoidable for the President to make a statement with regard to it. If he had to make a statement, he had to state the truth. Moreover, if he had not told the truth by avoiding personal responsibility, the four demands Khrushchev made upon him in Paris would not have been altered."

NOTES CONTRADICTIONS

But what is puzzling are the contradictions in the main report, which frankly says that "the sort of information provided by the U–2 if or enormous value in assessing Soviet capability to mount a surprise attack," and then argues later on as follows:

"In looking back, if one accepts the conclusion that the failure of the mission furnished an excuse for Khrushchev's wrecking of the summit conference, then, in the absence of compelling reasons to the contrary, there is good reason to conclude that the flight should not have gone."

But the Secretary of Defense says the reasons were compelling, and the Senate majority report itself concedes the great value of information obtained by the U–2 flights, which were needed to help protect the American people against surprise attack by the missiles of the Soviet Union.

THE FULBRIGHT SPEECH

Possibly the prize example of inconsistency and lack of coordination among the Democratic Members is to be found in Senator FULBRIGHT's own speech, when he says:

"In any event, my argument is not that the President should not have told the truth; my argument is that he should not, as the head of our Nation, have become personally involved in the incident, one way or the other."

WOULDN'T SATISFY RED CHIEF

This appears to be one of those "distinctions without a difference." For the query will be immediately posed as to how a President of the United States can keep himself from becoming "personally involved" in any official action taken by his own administration. One can hear already the outcries from the Democrats demanding an investigation of why the President, assuming that he did blame someone else, didn't know in advance what was being done and why he has subordinates who do such things, and so on. Indeed, Mr. Khrushchev would not have been satisfied with such a patent evasion of official responsibility and would have continued to demand the removal and punishment of those same subordinates.

There was a time when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had considerable prestige. Today its report stands as a glaring example of how to furnish arguments to the Soviets for use on the airwaves to try to discredit the United States and to help bring it to a "new low in prestige"—which phrase an American Senator, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, uses in an indictment of his own Government.

Some Notes on Foreign Trade—Tariff Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JIM WRIGHT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, so much has been said and written about the effects for good or ill upon our total economy exerted by our trade and tariff policies that it sometimes is difficult to obtain a clear, broad, and objective picture of the situation.

Recently, at the request of Mr. C. Wilson Harder, president of the National Federation of Independent Business, Mr. George Burger, Jr., prepared a thoughtful and careful analysis of the problem which I believe merits reading and study.

Mr. Burger is assistant to the president of this organization. The organization itself, certainly known to most Members of Congress, is an excellent example of democracy in action. Representing the largest numerical strength of any such businessmen's organization, this federation espouses causes only after they have been individually voted upon and endorsed by the majority of its many thousands of small and independent business members throughout the entire Nation.

The article follows:

SOME NOTES ON FOREIGN TRADE—TARIFF PROBLEMS

Right from the beginning, it's important to get a balanced view on these matters. Some points are in order:

1. The problem of import damage to U.S. domestic industries is not new; it is something that's been with our country right from the beginning and despite the presence of which we have developed an increasing number of small businesses.

2. We're not alone in this problem. To a greater or lesser degree, some businessmen and labor bodies in other countries have been, and are, complaining to their own governments about the effect of imports on their own industries.

3. Since we are not a self-contained unit (since we need some things produced in other lands), we've got to trade. This leads to problems. For instance, we buy tin. To pay for this, we try to sell oil. This runs us headon into industries in other countries, and generates competition. For the gross of knitting needles we sell to Japan, the payback may come in a roundabout way, as an effort to sell, say on the part of England, a British automobile to some consumer in our country.

4. In all this international buying and selling, just the same as in our own buying and selling, somebody is going to get hurt. My friend who opened a variety store in South Redwood City went into competition with a chap across the street, and failed. He got hurt because of competition. Now he's doing something else. Our problem, in all work on international trade, is to prevent serious injury through unfair competition. This is where the rub comes in. Who is to say what is serious injury and unfair competition? A case in point: When my wife suffered a thyroid condition, the family doctor was much alarmed and gave her a long, costly series of treatment. Finally he sent her to a specialist. This chap, used to seeing extreme cases, examined her, dismissed her trouble as inconsequential.

5. As in all other situations, the outfits most likely to be hurt first and worst are the newer and smaller firms in an industry. At both levels they are likely to be tender financially. However, we've got to make a distinction: the direct, immediate effect of imports is likely to be felt by manufacturers in affected lines. Retailers (particularly the large retailers) generally are most interested in being able to sell good goods at long profits, regardless of source of supply. In the field of imports, this may not be entirely true for the smaller retailers who, for one reason or another, may be wedded to distribution of American-made products. But, generally, retailers will complain bitterly only when imports dry up sufficient domestic manufactures that they begin to lose customers due to unemployment. Since manufacturing in the U.S. employs only a fraction of the number of workers who are employed in the retailing trades, this reaction could be a long time coming, barring a well-developed public relations program by affected manufacturers. Further, we've got to make another distinction: the effect of, and reaction to, imports can vary from area to area. For instance, our port cities would have an interest in foreign trade, imports and exports, and might think such trade very beneficial. But a nonport city—that is, the site of an affected manufacturing plant or plants—might be forced to stay awake nights worrying about the inflow of foreign goods.

6. There's no question but that there is a definite problem in some areas of our domestic industry due, directly and indirectly, to imports from foreign countries. For instance, Business Week reports: "Chinamakers have had a body blow from the growth of imported merchandise. Eight out of 21 firms of long standing in the restaurantware field folded in the last couple of years." Some of the remaining factors in the industry have made manufacturing connections abroad.

Among the products and industries affected seriously by import competition, are the following:

Watches, office machinery, sewing machinery, tableware, cameras, clothing (women's and men's), bicycles, wilton and velvet carpets, radios, semiconductors, handmade glassware, chemicals, oil, automobiles, coal, calf and kid leather, mink skins, hardwood plywood, textiles, stainless steel flatware, steel.

7. However, before considering the injury and remedies needed, we have to look into the problem. For instance, automobile imports have been giving Detroit a headache, but there is a strong possibility this is not due to price alone, but rather in some measure is due to the possibility that the foreign manufacturers had been giving the American consumer a choice in style and size and economy he hadn't been having. Now, with the new American small cars on the market, some of these foreign manufacturers will take a beating. Goliath is already cutting its operations back. More than this, we have to be careful of statistics. For instance, Singer Sewing Machine is the only large manufacturer of these devices remaining in the United States. It has set up plants abroad to produce, with lower labor costs, machines to compete with those being sold here from Japan. Its employment at its New Jersey plant has been reduced from 9,000 to 4,000, but not because of the swelling tide of imports so much as because of the introduction of labor saving machinery.

8. We must not fall into the trap of thinking that protection for U.S. industries is the solution to prosperity problems. Statistics show that the volume of imports and exports grows and dimishes with our prosperity, and with its cycle. High tariffs have never reversed an economic downswing. The Smoot-Hawley protective tariff of the early 1930's, one of the biggest barriers ever erected against import competition, failed miserably either to restore prosperity to our country, or to bring stagnant industries back to life, or to restore small business activity.

9. One thing we must recognize, whether we like it or not, is that since World War II we have been building ourselves a king-sized import headache. In the long run, for any country, exports tend to balance imports, and imports to balance exports. Since the war we have been exporting tremendous amounts of capital to restore the war-shattered and disrupted economies of other lands (to a degree, in self-interest we've had to do this in order to remain competitive with the only other major power in the world—the U.S.S.R.). Whether or not we want a "payback," we've got to get one, and we must expect it to come in goods and services. There's no other way out. This would seem to be the pattern that came about after World War I, when the sum of our postwar capital investment, in other countries was much smaller than recently. In this connection, in textiles (one of the hard-hit industries), according to Business Week, it's unlikely you will find many stores doing as much as 5 percent in imports, 1, 2, or 3 percent would be more like it—as compared with the 10-percent figure after World War I.

10. The facts in No. 9, above, would seem to indicate that, if we are in trouble over imports, we are now only in the early stages. This is borne out by statements that the thing which is worrying manufacturers today is not so much the total volume of imports being received and sold, as it is the rate of increase in these imports. For instance, in women's clothing there were an estimated $115 million worth of imports last year, against half of that in 1955. Further, imported new car registrations for the first 8 months of this year amounted to 400,000, against only 57,000 for all of 1955.

11. Much is heard about lower wage costs in other lands being the basis for successful cut-price competition in American markets. The truth is that in other countries wages are perhaps 25 percent of what they are in the United States. But this is not (as indicated in the example of automobiles and bicycles in No. 7 foregoing) the only reason

for successful sales of foreign products on our markets. It is, however, one reason in certain industries affected, and in these industries an important one.

12. Much is being heard about the establishment of plants abroad by U.S. firms. U.S. firms are establishing such plants. But it must be kept carefully in mind that not all these plants are being established to sell back into the U.S. markets. Some of them are being established to meet local and regional requirements which could not be met out of plants located in the United States. In any case, as reported in U.S. News & World Report, John L. Lewis recently observed "1,000 American companies have producing plants abroad. They employ 1 million foreign workers." A list of some of these companies and brief descriptions of their operations (based mainly on an article from U.S. News & World Report are appended.

13. Some effort has been made to make a case for freer foreign trade, or to attack protectionist moves, on the basis of relative employment. For instance, statement has been made that the process of foreign trade (imports and exports) is responsible for 4.5 million jobs (steamship operations claimed that in 1956 the jobs of 1 million New England workers depended on foreign trade). But just how many of these jobs are due to imports, and how many to exports, is not broken down (think of this in the context of having to have imports to have exports, and vice versa). Against this, it was said, up to 1 year ago, that the jobs of 500,000 Americans had been affected by foreign trade. In any case, judging by the number of industries affected by import competition, and by the fact that in only one of these industries—pottery—there are 100,000 jobs, this 500,000 figure could be low.

14. In any case, the argument over damages in this field seems to center around two or three things:

(a) Whether our Government is using the escape-clause device in agreements to provide needed protection of our domestic industries.

(b) Whether there is vigilance in using peril-point provisions and powers to assure no damage to U.S. manufacturers.

(c) Whether we are, in fact, allowing the United States to become a dumping ground for foreign manufacturers.

In connection with the latter, we've got to remember that other countries have accused us of dumping in our below-.US. cost sales of agricultural commodities on world markets. But in this connection, American Viscose Corp. complained in 1956 that of 92 complaints of dumping submitted by U.S. manufacturers and industries to Government from 1947 on, in only two cases were there findings that dumping had actually occurred. The Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy reported in 1958 that succeeding Presidents had given but lipservice to escape-clause provisions in our tariff laws.

APPENDIX—AMERICAN FIRMS WITH PLANTS ABROAD

(Based mainly on article in U.S. News & World Report)

Royal McBee: Three plants in Holland, building a fourth, producing typewriters, with total employment of 1,600. Another plant, in Italy, makes accounting equipment. Plans to import a portable from the Dutch plants, costing about $75, as compared with the selling price of $145 for its American made counterpart.

Smith-Corona: Recently bought British Typewriters, Ltd., in order to compete with foreign portables sold in this country. Its British plant labor costs are estimated about 70 cents an hour.

Remington-Rand: Expanding its oversea operations, already had 23,000 workers in 29 plants. Latest move, agreement with Japanese company to make business machines for the Far East. Remington portables made in Holland are coming in to the United States at a few hundred a month. Some standard typewriters produced in Holland are coming in, too.

Underwood: Reports its British plant is bursting at the seams. Is selling in the European market. Earlier this year it opened a new plant in Italy for adding machines and may produce a standard typewriter for the U.S. market.

(All the four foregoing firms are banking on their oversea operations to keep them competitive in foreign markets and at home.)

National Cash: Plants in Britain, Germany, France, Switzerland, Sweden, Brazil, and Japan which employ 7,300.

Frieden: Plant in Holland makes calculators and billing machines, is about to add a full line. Some office equipment parts made in Holland are to be exported to the United States for use in assembling domestic products. Labor costs abroad reported one-third of U.S. costs.

Burroughs: One plant in France, employing 600, making adding machines, for sale in European Common Market, by present plans.

IBM: Twenty-five thousand eight hundred and fifty employees in 22 plants in 18 countries. Plants in Germany, France, and Italy are being expanded. New factory underway in Holland, and others being built in Japan and Argentina. At present time none of its products are coming back into the United States.

Minnesota-Mining: Shortly will begin making recording tapes and other supplies in new South African plant. Company officials also looking for suitable property in Italy, for a new $750,000 factory.

Hamilton Watch: Agreement with Japanese firm to exchange its production know-how for the exclusive right to sell that firm's watches in U.S. markets. The Japanese firm plans to send 8,000 watches a month into the United States. In Japan the average wage for workers in precision industries, making watches, radios, cameras, and optical instruments, is $46 a month. Average wage in the United States is about $360 a month.

Elgin National: Has leased small factory in Switzerland, for manufacture and assembly of watch components, for use in U.S. assembly. Average wage in Switzerland is about 60 cents an hour.

U.S. Time Corp.: Has taken over 2 German plants that make 1.2 million timepieces a year. Time plants in Germany, England, and France employ 3,700. All the firm's movements for low-priced watches are made in the United States, however.

Singer Sewing: Americans bought $3 million in British sewing machines in 1958, most made by a Singer subsidiary. Singer is the only large sewing machine maker left in the United States. It is producing a low-priced machine in Scotland to sell at $69.50 in the United States, to compete with foreign machines, mostly Japanese, which sell for as low as $49.50. The British wage rate is about $1 an hour. Singer has had plants in Britain, Germany, Italy, and France for many years. It is building in Turkey, Australia, and Mexico. It has part interest in a Japanese firm, but none of this firm's products are being sold in the United States. It has definitely cut back on manufacturing in the United States, mostly on the cheaper models. No plants are closed, but employment is down (for instance, its New Jersey plant has dropped from 9,000 to less than 5,000), but attributes this to automation.

(American auto makers, hit by falling exports, are increasing production abroad to keep sales and profits up.)

Ford: Plant in Australia planned to employ 2,750 workers and produce 200 cars a day. Will make trucks in Argentina, in $15 million plant, employing 1,200.

GM: Completing new plant in Brazil. Employed 97,000 overseas in 1957, and 107,000 in 1953. Net investment outside United States and Canada, end of last year: $330.5 million.

Chrysler: 1958 bought 25-percent interest in Simca, plans to increase holdings. Recently announced plans to build in Mexico for parts. Later plans to produce 12,000 Chrysler and Simca cars there.

GM: Plans to import 64,000 Vauxhalls and Opels this year, compared with 33,000 in 1958.

Ford: Plans to import 44,000 English Fords and German Taunus cars, 2,000 more than 1958.

Chrysler: Plans to ship 50,000 Simcas to the United States this year, against 12,800 sales from September through December last year.

(Auto industry pay in Britain, an average hourly $1.26; in Germany, 69 cents an hour; in France, slightly higher than in Germany, all against an average $2.66 an hour, plus fringe benefits, in the United States.)

(Rubber companies are using foreign plants to produce small tires for small cars abroad, and also for shipment into the United States for sale here.)

General: Plants in 18 countries, including Canada. Principal products tires and tubes, some plastics, and tiles.

Goodrich: New plants building or planned in Brazil, Australia, and Iran. Synthetic rubber factory planned for Holland.

Firestone: $18 million being poured into building and expansion overseas. Major expansion areas: Argentina, Brazil, Venezuela, India, Portugal, and Germany. Has 15,000 factory workers in 17 foreign countries.

U. S. Rubber: Recently acquired majority interest in one of the largest German rubber companies. Also has plants in Belgium and France.

Goodyear: Making tires and tubes in 29 foreign countries. Sinking $7 million into new plant in France.

(In drugs, the benefit has been, to an extent, with American companies, because other countries have been forced to get basic materials from us.)

Parke-Davis: Rapidly expanding abroad because of high cost of exports from the United States to other countries. Wages in Germany are 25 percent of those in the United States. Has plants in Belgium, Italy, Spain, South Africa, Australia, Puerto Rico, Brazil, Colombia, Argentina, and Chile. Its British plant, in operation since before 1900 now employs more than 1,500 people. Has close to 5,000 employees, exclusive of Canada.

Johnson & Johnson: Six thousand five hundred employees in 20 countries, making baby products and health and hospitalization specialities. No plans to manufacture abroad especially for the United States, although this is being done to a minor degree on specialized products.

Merck, Sharp & Dohme: Owns largest chemical and pharmaceutical manufacturing plant in India. Other units in Holland, Britain, and Australia being expanded. Company reports no drop in employment in the United States, just expanded consumption abroad.

Bristol-Myers: Just bought new German plant, and plans another to employ 250 in making toothpaste, hair tonics, shaving cream, and other products. Other plants in Britain, Latin America, South America, Australia, and New Zealand.

Vicks Chemical: In the Philippines, at one of the three oversea plants owned and operated by Vicks, the wage scale, based on official rate of exchange, is around $3.62 a day.

International Harvester: Producing bargain-price tractors in Britain for sale into the United States. Plans to import at least 300 this year, to sell for about $2,800, as compared with an American-made machine that goes for $3,350.

Ford Motor: Importing two models of diesel tractors made in its British plants. In last few years, $28 million worth of one of these models was sold in the United States.

J. I. Case: Has bought controlling interest in a French firm that makes tractors and other farm equipment. Has not announced plans to import French production, but there's possibly it may import a small diesel tractor.

Deere & Co.: Owns 85-percent interest in German plant that turns out tractors and other farm equipment. Has another plant in Mexico, and building another in Argentina.

Allis-Chalmers: Has plant in Britain and recently bought others in Mexico and Australia.

(Interesting observation on comparative wage rates: IH pays about 80 cents an hour in Britain, 70 cents an hour in Germany and France. The average wage for its hourly employees in the United States is $2.59.)

Ex Cello Corp.: (Machine tools) says it's being priced out of world markets, and the only way to stay in business is to make products abroad. Formerly 25 percent of American-made machine tools went for export. Now the flow is the other way. It has bought plants in Britain and Germany. German labor costs are 25 percent of Detroit. In England, skilled labor is available at $1 an hour. Its domestic employment is down from 10,000 a couple of years ago to 6,750 now. The firm isn't bringing foreign-made products back into the United States, but says it will have no qualms about doing so if the need arises.

Gross Printing Press: Employs 800 people in new plant in Britain, building a smaller plant in Germany. Has not yet tried to sell British-built presses in the United States. Says its British subsidiary could undersell its domestic plant by 25 percent any day in the U.S. market. Comparative labor costs are 80 cents an hour in Britain against $2.72 an hour in Chicago.

Hyster Co.: Has opened new plants in Britain, Holland, and Brazil.

Minneapolis-Honeywell: Has 50–50 ownership deal with a Japanese firm that employs close to 13,000 workers.

Marine Outboard International: Bought newly built plant in Belgium to assemble Evinrude and Johnson outboard motors of small sizes. Has $2.6 million investment presently, will expand on this by another million.

Otis Elevator: Has number of oversea plants, and policy of importing some of the more complicated components of elevators because, even after paying duty, they are cheaper than those produced in the United States. Figures its manufacturing costs are two-thirds raw material, one-third labor in Europe, and just the reverse in the United States.

Yale & Towne: Has metal products plants in Britain and Germany and two licensees in France. Plans to open another plant in Brazil.

Eversharp: Recently announced plans to import razor blades from newly purchased plant in Sweden.

Johns Manville: Has working agreements with 13 companies in 10 European countries. Opening two plants in Italy. Investing several million in existing plants in Latin America, and has acquired majority interest in a Mexican factory.

Du Pont: Building three new plants, to employ 1,000, in Holland, Belgium, northern Ireland to produce fibers, paint, and synthetic rubber for the European market.

Worthington Corp.: Makes pumps, compressors, and other industrial equipment in 11 countries, about to open new plant in Italy, and is thinking of expansion in South America. Although Worthington's sales abroad represent about one-fourth of its total business, 60 percent of these sales are based on oversea production, and only 40 percent represents exports from this country.

Litton Industries: Expanding operations abroad, primarily to make items to sell back into the U.S. market. Just bought majority interest in Swedish firm that produces cash registers. Forty percent of this Swedish firm's output is now sold in the United States, and Litton aims to raise this to 75 percent. Litton has plant in Netherlands which ships to the United States. Additionally, the firm imports German-built machines.

One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Gardner, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged and honored to bring to the attention of the House that the city of Gardner, Mass., in my district is celebrating this week its 175th anniversary with an impressive program of activities to commemorate this outstanding event. In recognition of this anniversary, I am introducing an appropriate resolution for the consideration of the House which extends greetings and congratulations to the community on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of the incorporation as a town of Gardner, Mass.

It was on June 27, 1785, that the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, approved the petition of some 30 citizens to incorporate the township of Gardner, named after the great hero of Bunker Hill, Col. Thomas Gardner, from portions of the surrounding towns of Winchendon, Ashburnham, Westminster, and Templeton. At the time of incorporation, Gardner had a population of about 375, made up of some 60 families, mostly engaged in farming.

Located in an area of Massachusetts which was settled by pioneer colonists in the early days of American history, Gardner has grown from this small beginning into a thriving and active community of some 20,000 people. Today, Gardner is a busy manufacturing center known as the Chair City of the World, symbolic of its fame as a furnituremaking center. The manufacture of fine furniture in Gardner goes back to 1805 and the community takes pride in the fact that its artisans and craftsmen have made the name of Gardner synonymous with that of quality furniture.

Furnituremaking is Gardner's chief industry with some 100 factories, big and small, making home furnishings of all kinds. Among the largest furniture makers is the well-known Heywood-Wakefield plant, one of the oldest furniture manufacturers in America. It remains under the active management of direct descendants of the five Heywood brothers, who founded the company in 1826. There are other outstanding concerns too numerous to recite here.

In these brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, it is not possible for me to recount in full the story of this historic Massachusetts community, but I would like to pay richly deserved tribute to the early settlers of Gardner who helped to build this great country of ours with their magnificent sacrifices, struggles, and accomplishments. The record of their superb work and contributions lives to this day, and Gardner can take justifiable pride in the remarkable legacy it now possesses.

Efforts to form the separate township of Gardner first began in 1781. With the help of neighboring towns, this became a reality on June 27, 1785, when Gardner was incorporated as a town from parts of four neighboring towns. Gardner took about 6,000 acres from Westminster, 2,800 acres from Ashburnham, 4,500 acres from Winchendon, and 700 acres from Templeton.

For some 50 years, farming was the main occupation and those few first industries were those which met the needs of farmers. Chairmaking had its start in 1805 when James M. Comee began the manufacture of chairs in his home. This work was done by hand except for the legs which were turned by a lathe. His product was well received in such cities as Worcester, Springfield, and Boston and it soon became necessary for him to hire workmen to meet the demand.

From this small enterprise grew the great Gardner furniture industry of today and diversified manufacturing enterprises from baby and doll carriages to industrial time recorders.

I am prompted on this occasion to say a word about the leadership and the people of Gardner with special emphasis on this generation.

Like most New England communities, Gardner originated in travail, painstaking work and bitter sacrifice. The early founders meant business. They were not confounded by the grandiose, economic schemes and social ventures that confront us. They were a devout and patriotic people. They placed their faith in their God and their reliance in the developing strength of their free institutions and their courageous fellow countrymen.

First of all, they established places of worship, meeting houses, schools and libraries. The rows of stone walls which cover so much of the New England countryside are silent, but impressive testimony to their industry and laborious work. They zealously pursued the arts of agriculture and husbandry and wrung out of the stubborn, rock-strewn soil and rugged hills of colonial lands a meager, hard-earned living for themselves and their families that nurtured a wholesome, loyal family life.

They encouraged learning, the arts and sciences, and diligently embraced education as a means of securing better leadership and developing their resources, and lifting the levels of knowledge, intelligence and know-how.

Their patriotism was not only a watchword; it was an all-embracing, constantly felt resolution to defend and develop their sacred birthright.

Present-day Gardner has many outstanding leaders imbued with this devotion to basic values and fundamental institutions. I know of no other Ameri-

can community that can boast of better leadership in its industrial, civic, and political activities. Labor and management, banking and manufacturing, artisan and professional man, banker and religious leader, worker and teacher, every class and group of Gardner's society, work hand in hand to promote the common interest of the city.

Thus, an enviable esprit de corps has been built, animated by strong, capable, public-spirited leaders, drawing sustenance from the enthusiastic support of the people, who are quick to recognize not only what is in the interests of the city, but what squares with the rules of humanity and justice.

I am exceedingly proud of this great city with its superb leaders and loyal people. It is without question one of the cleanest and most beautiful of all American cities, and it could never be excelled in its civic spirit and patriotic fervor.

Gardner is indeed a queen and a gem among the cities of the Nation, and on its 175th anniversary, I am highly privileged to hail, salute, and heartily congratulate the leaders and the people of this hard-working, warm-hearted, dignified, and charming city.

Gardner marches into the future with the vibrant confidence born of its illustrious heritage and past successes, inspired by a most able and vigorous leadership, and sustained by a loyal and devoted people.

Gardner, working harmoniously for the advancement of the community, will move ahead in growth and progress in these years, and in the years to come, ever growing stronger in a material sense and ever preserving and enhancing that quality of spiritual dedication for which it is noted and which will continue to engender in its citizenry those close ties of loyalty, respect, and affection which are so essential to American community life and so valuable in safeguarding the fountainhead of American enterprise and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, in observance of its 175th anniversary, Gardner has arranged a varied program of events extending from June 27 to July 4 which should long be remembered by northern Worcester County. Among the highlights will be a general reunion of all Gardner High School classes, which promises to be the largest class reunion ever held at the school, a huge civic parade, reportedly the biggest since Gardner celebrated its 150th anniversary 25 years ago, an outstanding NEAAU swimming meet, and finally on July 4 as the grand finale, an old-fashioned mammoth fireworks display with every indication it will be the most spectacular in central New England on that date.

In addition, a Founder's Day program will be held on July 2 under the direction of the Honorable M. Alan Moore, district court judge, which will review Gardner's history and growth. Representatives of neighboring towns from which Gardner was formed will participate in the program.

Also on July 2, there will be held a general class reunion at Gardner High School, the largest gathering ever of alumni of this outstanding school, which will furnish dramatic and convincing proof of this school's contributions to the growth and welfare of the community. Several thousand will attend the special program planned at Stone Field.

Gardner's 175th anniversary celebration program opened on Monday of this week with a special proclamation by Mayor Cyrille P. Landry. This proclamation so fittingly sets the general character of the Gardner observance that under unanimous consent I insert the text at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Gardner (Mass.) News, June 27, 1960]

PROCLAMATION

Gardner's 175th anniversary celebration gets underway today with a proclamation by Mayor Cyrille P. Landry officially setting aside the week of June 27–July 4 for the citywide observance. The proclamation follows:

CITY OF GARDNER BY HIS HONOR, CYRILLE P. LANDRY, MAYOR, A PROCLAMATION, 1960

In the "History of the Town of Gardner" written by the Reverend William D. Herrick and others (November 1877–July 1878) the following statement appears: "According to the most accurate information, which we are able to obtain, regarding the initiatory steps, taken for the incorporation of this town, Mr. John Glazier, then a citizen of Westminster, in May 1785, presented a petition to the Massachusetts Legislature, bearing about 30 signatures, praying that body to erect certain portions of Winchendon, Ashburnham, Westminster, and Templeton, into a township, called Gardner."

Acting on the above petition the general court of Massachusetts on June 27, 1785, created the town of Gardner, securing the necessary land from the westerly part of Westminster, the southwesterly part of Ashburnham, the southeasterly part of Winchendon, and the easterly part of Templeton, in the county of Worcester.

The history referred to above tells us that, as far as is known, Gardner had, at its incorporation as a town, "a population of only about 375, embraced in about 60 families." The principal occupation of the inhabitants, during the first 20 years following the incorporation, was farming. At the present time Gardner—having become a city January 1, 1923—has a population of approximately 20,000 and has become a manufacturing center whose products are known throughout the world.

It is only fitting that we celebrate the 175th birthday of our fair city and pay tribute to those who helped to make it a reality. Now, therefore, I, Cyrille P. Landry, mayor of the city of Gardner, do hereby proclaim the period from Monday, June 27, 1960, through Monday, July 4, 1960, for the 175th anniversary celebration and request that these days be observed by appropriate events, exercises, and ceremonies throughout our city in commemoration of Gardner's incorporation as a town and her rich heritage since that time.

Given at the office of the mayor, this 15th day of June, in the year of Our Lord 1960.

CYRILLE P. LANDRY.

By His Honor the Mayor.

GENIA J. PACOCHA,
City Clerk.

Through the effective help and kind cooperation of Rear Adm. Edwin J. Roland, commander of the First U.S. Coast Guard District with headquarters at Boston, Gardner has been fortunate in obtaining the renowned U.S. Coast Guard Academy Band, which will be featured at three celebration events: the 175th anniversary ball at the National Guard Armory, a band concert on July 3 at Greenwood Pool during the NEAAU swim meet, and participation in the July 4 parade.

The anniversary program of events follows:

June 27: Proclamation by the mayor opening anniversary week.

June 28: Coast Guard tour for leading citizens, 10:30 a.m., aboard Coast Guard cutter in Boston Harbor.

June 29: Gardner Junior Olympic Day, track and field competition for city youth, 1 p.m.

June 30: Rotary luncheon, address by Coast Guard official, 12:15 p.m., Colonial Hotel; Gardner High School Band concert, 8 p.m. Bickford Playground.

July 1: Softball game between Coast Guard Academy and Napoleon Club, 5:30 p.m., Ovila Case Playground.

July 2: NEAAU swimming meet, 10 a.m., Greenwood Memorial Pool: Founders' Day program, 2 p.m., Pearson Auditorium; Gardner High School general class reunion, 4:45 p.m., Stone Field; comedy safety boating exhibition, 5:30 p.m., swimming meet finals, 6 p.m., Greenwood Memorial Pool; 175th Anniversary Ball, music by U.S. Coast Guard Academy Recruiting Band, 8:30 p.m., National Guard Armory.

July 3: Anniversary church services, morning, city churches; NEAAU swimming meet, 12:15 p.m., Greenwood Pool; car exhibition, sports, classic, antique, and vintage divisions, 2 p.m., Industrial Foundation Building; U.S. Coast Guard Academy band concert, 5 p.m., Greenwood Pool; swimming meet finals, 6:15 p.m., Greenwood Pool.

July 4: Little League exhibition game, 10 a.m., Little League Field; anniversary parade, 3 p.m., streets of Gardner; band concert, 8 p.m., fireworks display, 9:45 p.m., Gardner Airport.

This well rounded program of anniversary activities is being met with the enthused and wholehearted cooperation of the entire Gardner community. In addition, Gardner will be host to thousands of visitors over the holiday weekend since the celebration is one of the main attractions in central New England during the July Fourth holiday period.

Especially noteworthy is the Founders' Day program planned for this Saturday at Pearson Auditorium which will signal an unusually busy weekend of anniversary activities. Chairman of this event is the Honorable M. Alan Moore, learned and distinguished Massachusetts jurist who presides over the Gardner district court. Judge Moore directed the Founders' Day program during Gardner's 150th anniversary in 1935. The 100th anniversary of Gardner in 1885 was presided over by his grandfather, the Honorable John M. Moore.

Under Judge Moore's direction, a simple but eloquent ceremony will set the theme of the Gardner anniversary celebration—the development of the community from a small settlement of some 60 farming families to the busy industrial and trade center the city is today for northern Worcester County. The exercises will be opened by greetings extended by Gardner's mayor, the Honorable Cyrille P. Landry. In turn, greetings and best wishes to Gardner will be extended by visiting selectmen and other town officials from the four

neighboring towns from which Gardner was formed.

The Honorable George C. Sweeney, a native of Gardner and former mayor, now chief judge of the U.S. District Court at Boston, will address the group.

The exercises will also feature three historical sketches by Dr. Marie Gearan, Mary I. Burch and Esther Gilman Moore.

Mr. Speaker, I am very much pleased to introduce today in the House a special resolution bringing attention to the 175th anniversary of Gardner, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, and extending the congratulations of the House to the people of this community. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the text of my resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

Whereas the year 1960 marks the 175th anniversary of the incorporation as a town of the city of Gardner, Mass., as a town on June 27, 1785; and

Whereas from the time of its settlement in 1740 the people of Gardner have figured conspicuously in the founding, growth, and defense of this Nation; and

Whereas the observance of the 175th anniversary of Gardner is being celebrated June 27 through July 4, 1960, with impressive community ceremonies, large public gatherings and widespread participation of Massachusetts citizens and visitors from other States and places; and

Whereas Gardner is a beautiful community rich in historic interest, well known for its patriotic contributions, noted for its many famous sons and daughters who distinguished themselves in many fields of endeavor and many facets of American civilization: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felicitations to the people of Gardner, Mass., on the occasion of the 175th anniversary of this community and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Gardner during the past 175 years.

For Services Rendered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KYL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, when we talk about postal privileges of small country newspapers, it might be well to note that all the red ink is on one side of the page. An Iowa editor writes as follows:

Last week the ASC manager returned our statement for subscription renewal with the comment that the ASC has no funds for newspaper subscriptions. The very next day we received three sheets of material from his office for free publication and we have received two other releases since then. We also received two releases from the Soil Conservation Service, a four page release from the Post Office Department, two from the Department of Defense, one from each branch of the military service, and several from other Federal Agencies asking for free space. Similar appeals have been received from the Red Cross, polio, heart, and cancer foundations. And to top it all off, we recall items in Congressman POWELL's franked envelope, and items from STU SYMINGTON and LYNDON JOHNSON, none of which related to Iowa business.

Mr. Speaker, newspaper publishers in our small towns ask for no free ride. The Government should continue to consider services rendered when it presents its bill to the country newspaper.

Rearview Brinkmanship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the critics of the late, great John Foster Dulles constantly belabored him for his "brinkmanship" without ever coming up with an alternate plan that would keep the Communists on the defensive, as his unyielding stand unquestionably did. Today we are seeing a display of another type of "brinkmanship" by some of Mr. Dulles' former censors who are walking to the very edge of criticizing the President for the U–2 incident, the collapse of the summit meeting, and the Japanese fiasco, but refrain from an all-out attack upon Ike for the simple reason that they sense that the American people are in no mood to tolerate open assault on their beloved President. Indeed, there is much evidence that the people resent domestic, partisan attacks on Mr. Eisenhower even more than they do the rantings of Mr. K. or the Japanese commies, since they feel that the latter are outside the family and are following an expected pattern.

It is recognized, of course, that there are certain highly placed partisans who conveniently forget that it has been only a few short months since they were urging Ike to do the very things in which they now find so much to criticize. They are now saying—looking into their rearview mirrors—that we should have suspended the U–2 flights prior to the Paris conferences. But they wholly ignore the fact that as soon as Mr. K. would have become aware of our having called off our aerial surveillance for the duration of the talks he would have strung out the conference interminably, all the while preparing his nuclear weapons for attack. And they forget, too, that diplomatic negotiation was the very device that Japan used to cover up her plans for the assault on Pearl Harbor. In other words, it is illogical that we should have let down our guard for a single moment and I can only hope that steps are being taken to come up with an adequate substitute for our suspended flights.

As for the charge that Mr. Eisenhower should have ignored or denied our aerial reconnaisance after it became evident that the Russians had one of our planes is simply to say that Ike should have maintained a lie. And recognizing that innuendo and untruth are the traditional tools of diplomacy is still no reason that Americans—and especially their President—should depart from our time-honored trait of "telling the truth and shaming the devil." Yes, we have come to a pretty pass when Members of the Congress of the United States are given to criticizing the President simply because he refused to be branded a liar.

The President in his report to the people on his Far Eastern tour has, I think, put things in their proper perspective. He emphasized that his trip was a good will journey and not a diplomatic mission. He also underscored the fact that he was invited to visit several countries and was royally received in all but one. That the invitation in the case of Japan was withdrawn was definitely a slap at the United States but certainly not at the prospective guest. And there is ample evidence that the overwhelming majority of the Japanese people are now mortified to an extent greater than that which they experienced when they lost the war.

There is ever-increasing evidence that the one thing the Communists fear more than anything else is the winning personality of our great American President and the way of life he represents and personifies. Indeed, their violent demonstrations are ample testimony to that fact.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we have never been stronger than in this hour when we have proved that, in balance, we are superior in deterrant power to the strongest potential aggressor and that, also in balance, due to the peaceful missions of our President we have more admiring friends around the world than ever before in our history.

Good for Gates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. HESS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article, "Good for Gates," by the widely read columnist, Alice Widener, whose column appears in the Cincinnati Enquirer and other leading newspapers throughout the Nation.

This article is of particular interest in that it points up the manner in which U.S. prestige was enhanced at the time of the ill-fated summit conference in Paris, by the strong but prudent action of Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., in ordering a worldwide test of U.S. communications and command readiness.

Although this sound action of Secretary Gates received spasmodic and gratuitous criticism from some individuals who were not close to the issues, the result of Secretary Gates' action has been highly beneficial from the international standpoint. It is the kind of action, as the article points out, which demonstrates to the world that the military forces of the United States are not asleep in these critical days. It demonstrates, also, that our leadership, as exemplified

by the Secretary of Defense is alert, strong, ready, and at the same time statesmanlike. It is the kind of governmental action which demonstrates the much-admired qualities of resoluteness and prudence.

Secretary Gates has stated that he was mystified why anyone should criticize his action of directing the precautionary tests of U.S. military communications at the time when tension was quickly increasing prior to the torpedoing of the summit by Chairman Khrushchev. After reading this fine article by Alice Widener, I think that the readers will be mystified also why anyone should have criticized that action by Secretary Gates.

I think it is highly appropriate to observe that the action referred to in this article is another of the numerous decisions and policies enunciated by Secretary Gates which have materially enhanced the prestige of the United States, and the effectiveness of our national security. For these many things which Secretary Gates has accomplished in the relatively few months he has been Secretary of Defense, I believe that the title of this article is particularly appropriate.

As you will note, it is entitled "Good for Gates."

I commend this article to the attention of all Members of this House.

GOOD FOR GATES

(By Alice Widener)

PARIS.—Most Europeans breathed a sigh of relief on learning that Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates had ordered a worldwide test of U.S. Armed Forces' readiness at summit time. The people here know that Secretary Gates has to cope with two facts:

1. The Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party intends to wipe out Western civilization;

2. The Pentagon is the main physical defender of our civilization.

Even Hitler spared Paris and Rome in World War II. But Khrushchev would willingly destroy in one blow and without a qualm all the symbolic and actual beauties of the Capitol, Notre Dame, Westminster Abbey, St. Peter's and the Vatican, the Coliseum and the Parthenon.

Yesterday, at the French Ministry of Information, Mlle. Simone Menut said, "On his state visit to De Gaulle, we showed Khrushchev some of our most beautiful historic sites. Not only was he bored, he was hostile. At Rheims Cathedral, he made a point of turning away and saying rudely, 'Show me a factory worker so I can talk with him.'"

Last night, the well-known French press photographer Zizi told me, "Last week when Khrushchev went to the countryside to talk about peace, he patted two healthy, happy French schoolboys on the head and said in Russian to Malinowsky, 'They'll make good soldiers!'"

If the West were to abandon its traditions and accept a proletarian culture, then the Kremlin would gladly accede to "peaceful coexistence" during the change-over. But if the West wants to preserve its civilization and great traditions, then it must be ever ready to fight for them.

As things stand now, most Europeans frankly admit that they rely for safety on our military might. They don't fear or dislike American militarism; they pray for its strength. Contrary to what some biased reporters say, most people in Great Britain and France deplore the "ban the bomb" activities of a loud minority of "walkers for peace." They also deplore the activities of those whom they describe as "good-for-nothing professional pacifist intellectuals." Again and again, I heard Englishmen say in May, "The pacifists were wrong in 1936; the French wanted to move against Hitler, but our pacifists wouldn't let them." Again and again this week, Frenchmen have told me, "If only you Americans don't permit yourselves to be hamstrung as we were in 1936."

The pacifist "marchers for peace" in London and Paris are a loud minority with a hard core of Communists at the center. These militant Reds urge fronters to advance further toward appeasement and goad laggers into putting out a left foot first.

As soon as Khrushchev's infamous press conference was ended, European journalists turned to one another with the comforting remark, "At least the U–2 affair shows the Americans are on the qui vive." Except for pro-Communists, no responsible reporter believes it is possible to talk things over rationally with Khrushchev or his ilk.

It is an excellent thing that Secretary Gates had said the U.S. Armed Forces will undergo more readiness tests on a no-warning, no-notice basis. He says he is "mystified why anyone would question the wisdom of it." Secretary Gates is not the only one who is so mystified. It is most puzzling to note reactions to our Armed Forces test in some American quarters and to see how encouraging these reactions are to Communists here.

On May 20, l' Humanite, the French Communist newspaper, reprinted Walter Lippmann's critical column of May 19 in its entirety with the quoted heading, "The errors of the American Government not only torpedoed the summit but also gravely hurt the prestige of the United States." Mr. Lippmann said that Secretary Gates' act in calling for a worldwide alert was an even greater mistake than the U–2 affair. Next day, l' Humanite highlighted on the center front page the quotes, "Mr. Adlai Stevenson—We can't wipe out our mistakes with a sponge" and "Mr. Chester Bowles—We must revise our foreign policy."

These statements, coupled with Senator KENNEDY'S, are worrying Europeans greatly. The French people know it was General de Gaulle who stood firm against Khrushchev. Now they wonder whether Stevenson, Kennedy and Bowles, if in power, would undercut De Gaulle and Adenauer. The French say there are three Western leaders with firmness enough to oppose Khrushchev—"De Gaulle, Adenauer and Nixon," and they ask, "Will the Americans punish the Pentagon for protecting us all?"

Jean Prost, a Frenchman who does liaison work for De Gaulle and the Quai d'Orsay with foreign diplomatic representatives, said today, "It is sheer demagoguery to talk of censuring Secretary Gates, restraining the Pentagon and changing American foreign policy. In Paris, the Western alliance was tested and stood firm. Do demagogic critics want to break it up?"

Here in Paris, after the arrival and departure of Khrushchev and Malinowsky, popular opinian is "Good for Gates."

H.R. 870, To Abolish Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege on May 25, 1960, to appear before a special subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee in support of my bill, H.R. 870, to abolish capital punishment.

My testimony was as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ABRAHAM J. MULTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank you for that very kind introduction. It is always a pleasure for me to be able to appear before you and your distinguished colleagues and present my views. Even though sometimes we are in disagreement it is always an agreeable disagreement and looking toward getting the best legislation on the subject presented.

I am happy to have the privilege of appearing before you in presenting my bill, H.R. 870, which would abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States enacted by the Congress except the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

My bill does not touch the Atomic Energy Act. I thought it did not touch any of the espionage acts. It certainly was not intended to do so. If it does, I have no objection to the committee's amending it in that respect or in any other respect, for that matter, to meet with the will and intent of the Congress.

If H.R. 870 is enacted, then the extreme punishment under our Federal laws would be life imprisonment instead of death.

It should be emphasized that this bill does not seek to invade States rights and it will not in any degree affect or change either the statutory or common law of any one of the 50 States. Every one of these 50 States will continue to have the sovereign right to determine the basic question for itself.

It is generally agreed, I believe, that there are three basic purposes of punishment in our society today. These three basic purposes are to prevent crime, to mete out justice, and to rehabilitate the criminal. We automatically preclude rehabilitation of the criminal when we impose the irrevocable punishment of death.

That leaves for our consideration the other two basic purposes for capital punishment. It is around those two alone, then, that the strongest arguments for the retention or abolition of capital punishment revolve.

Mr. Chairman, the most important question here, it seems to me, is whether we can justify the death penalty on the ground that it prevents or deters crime. For if this unique deterrent of death, as it is sometimes called, does not clearly serve this purpose of prevention, then we are left with only the purpose of meting out justice or retribution. Some say that is merely demanding an eye for an eye, a life for a life. But in some cases we demand a life for an injury, for of the 31 executions carried out under Federal laws since 1930, only 15 were for murder. Two were for rape, one was for armed robbery, five were for kidnaping and eight for espionage.

Let us look at the deterrent purpose of the death penalty. Is the death penalty necessary for the purpose of preventing crime.

There have been studies made to determine whether the death penalty clearly deters crime. One of the most authoritative of such studies was conductd by Great Britain's Royal Commission on Capital Punishment. This commission made an exhaustive study of capital punishment in many countries, including the United States. Their report, issued in 1953, concluded "that there is no clear evidence in any of the figures which we have examined that the abolition of capital punishment has led to an increase in the homicide rate, or that its reintroduction has led to a fall."

Sir Ernest Gowers, chairman of the Royal Commission on Capital Punishment, later wrote a book entitled "A Life for a Life," and began his book by writing, "Before serving on the Royal Commission, I, like most other

people, had given no great thought to this problem. If I had been asked for my opinion, I should probably have said that I was in favor of the death penalty, and disposed to regard abolitionists as people whose hearts were bigger than their heads. Four years of close study of the subject gradually dispelled that feeling. In the end I became convinced that the abolitionists were right in their conclusions."

In the light of the conclusions of this Royal Commission, one very interesting point was made by a participant in the debate in Great Britain when he questioned where the burden of proof should lie—with those who would retain the death penalty or with those who would abolish the death penalty. In answer to the argument that it should be clearly established that an alternative to the death penalty offered a deterrent to crime and satisfied the public conscience before we abolish the death penalty, this witness answered, "Is not that really putting the onus in the wrong place? If we start from the assumption that there is a practice that is inherently barbaric, and which everybody, deeply and profoundly, feels ought to be dispensed with if it possibly can be, is not the only justification for its retention convincing and irrefutable proof that without it society would be seriously harmed?"

Mr. Chairman, one of the most comprehensive studies of capital punishment and the value of the death penalty in the United States was published in the "1952 Annals the American Academy of Political and Social Science." The conclusion of this study of the death penalty as a deterrent to homicide in the United States was summarized as follows: "Statistical findings and case studies converge to disprove the claim that the death penalty has any special deterrent value. The belief in the death penalty as a deterrent is repudiated by statistical studies, since they consistently demonstrate that differences in homicide rates are in no way correlated with differences in the use of the death penalty. Case studies consistently reveal that the murderer seldom considers the possible consequences of his action, and if he does, he evidently is not deterred by the death penalty. The fact that men continue to argue in favor of the death penalty on deterrence grounds may only demonstrate man's ability to confuse tradition with proof, and his related ability to justify his established way of behaving."

I think also that we need only to look at the murder and nonnegligent manslaughter rate here in the District of Columbia which imposes a mandatory death sentence for first degree murder to see the weakness of the argument that the penalty of death deters crime. The most recent report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation shows that in 1958, Washington, D.C., had a rate of murder and nonnegligent manslaughter per 100,000 that was as high or higher than most other standard metropolitan areas of comparable size. Washington, D.C., with a rate of 6.1 murders and nonnegligent manslaughters per 100,000 population had an even higher rate than Chicago, Ill., with a rate of 5.9, or the New York-Northeastern New Jersey area with a rate of 3.3.

It seems to me, then, that we are not justified in speaking of the necessity of the death penalty. There is no valid case for the death penalty as the most effective deterrent of crime. On the contrary, the invalidity of this argument is upheld by each murder committed.

We must then defend the other purpose of punishment as it applies to the death penalty; i.e., to mete out justice.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that it has often been pointed out that it is not so much the threat of the death penalty itself which has served as a deterrent, but rather the certainty of its being carried out. The U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia recently testified before a House District Subcommittee that the mandatory death sentence here in the District of Columbia actually hinders the administration of justice. He pointed out that there have been only 12 first degree convictions in 104 indictments over the past 7 years and only 1 of these convictions has resulted in execution. Abolishing the death penalty in the District would improve rather than hinder the administration of justice.

That hearing was held this very month. This is the most current testimony that is available on the subject. At that time the District of Columbia Committee was considering a bill which would make the death penalty instead of mandatory, discretionary with the jury.

I believe, also, Mr. Chairman, that there is a moral question involved in the justice of capital punishment. This is especially pertinent to this punishment because the death penalty is absolute and final. It permits no correction of error. We know that innocent men have been executed. How can we impose a penalty as absolute as death when our knowledge cannot be absolute in imposing it? Juries do make mistakes.

If we hold that life is sacred, then what moral right does society have to demand a life for a life? One of the best answers to this question was given by a man who had intimate knowledge of the judicial process, Evelle J. Younger, judge of the Municipal Court of Los Angeles, when he wrote that "no human instrumentality is fit to pronounce and execute an irrevocable judgment. Only God with His infinite wisdom and charity should wield that awful power."

These are some of the reasons why I hope this committee will see fit to report favorably on my bill, for, as Albert Camus, the Nobel Prize winner wrote, "The death penalty is to the body politic what cancer is to the individual body, with perhaps the single difference that no one has ever spoken of the necessity of cancer." I hope that we will remove the cancer of capital punishment from the laws of the United States.

I am sure you will hear much more from other witnesses in support of this measure. May I conclude my comments by directing your attention to the wealth of data which I have accumulated from time to time in support of my position and which I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. They are not so much in the order of importance but rather in the order in which they appear in the RECORD. They are as follows: With your permission I would like to have these items made part of your record.

(The information referred to follows:)

"June 2, 1959, page A4663, article from the New Jersey State Bar Journal by Daniel M. Berman entitled 'The Case Against Capital Punishment.'

"June 3, 1959, page A4733, statement of New York Board of Rabbis entitled 'Capital Punishment.'

"March 4, 1960, page A1882, article from New York Herald Tribune by Victor Wilson entitled 'Capital Punishment in the United States.'

"March 7, 1960, page A1973, testimony of Dean Donal E. J. MacNamara before the Legislature of the State of Virginia.

"March 7, 1960, page A1925, article from Vassar Alumnae magazine by Prof. C. Gordon Post entitled 'On Capital Punishment.'

"March 8, 1960, page A2028, article from New Republic magazine by Gerald W. Johnson entitled 'Chessman's Challenge.'

"April 12, 1960, page A3221, article by J. A. H. Hopkins entitled 'Capital Punishment.'

"April 13, 1960, page A3265, article from United Synagogue Review entitled 'A Shameful Blot on Society.'

"May 2, 1960, page A3739, editorial from the Washington Post entitled 'When the State Takes a Life.'

"May 2, 1960, page A3712, article by Dr. William F. Graves entitled 'A Doctor's Ordeal Along Death Row.'

"May 3, 1960, page A3790, editorial from the Washington Post entitled 'The Sanctity of Life.'

"May 10, 1960, page A4022, news story from the New York Herald Tribune by Robert J. Donovan entitled 'Governors Against Death Penalty—Oppose It 17–8 in Poll; Others Are Noncommittal.'

"May 12, 1960, page A4097, article from Reader's Digest by Ernest Havemann entitled 'Capital Punishment Is Not the Answer.'

"May 18, 1960, page A4254, editorial from Bulletin of the East Midwood Jewish Center entitled 'From Where I Stand.'

"May 24, 1960, page A4419, article from the Progressive magazine by Daniel M. Berman entitled 'Capital Punishment Is on the Way Out.'"

Mr. MULTER. I will also leave with the Committee a pamphlet entitled "Issues of Conscience—Man's Right to Life" written by Ruth Leigh for the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism and published by the Union of American Hebrew Congregations, a national organization representing reform jews. I understand you will hear Miss Leigh later.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. LANE. Would you be kind enough to take that list which I presented you?

Mr. MULTER. I have it here, sir.

Mr. LANE. Would you take up separately each of the items on that list and tell us whether or not it is the intention of your bill to remove the death penalty in those various statutes outlined there by counsel of the committee?

Mr. MULTER. I wonder if it would serve your purpose if, instead of taking this section by section, and your staff has done a careful job on it, there are what appear to be some 18 to 20 different items of reference, if I said to you without trying to take the time to refer to them item by item, that it is not my intent to include—my bill was prepared for me by a congressional draftsman—if the draftsman included any reference to an Espionage Act, Atomic Energy Act, or to the U.S. Code of Military Justice, it should be deleted.

I did not intend by my bill to cover any of those items or to eliminate the death penalty in any of those cases.

You might ask why. I am opposed in principle to imposition of capital punishment in any case. I have been here long enough to be a practical legislator, however. I do not believe that in the atmosphere that prevails today that the country would approve repealing the death penalty in courts martial proceedings or in espionage cases. Therefore I would like to amend the law as to each of the other crimes. There I think the country is ready for the abolition of capital punishment.

If it is agreeable to you I will review each of these items as against the sections and submit to you a supplementary statement to indicate which of these sections should be deleted from the bill.

Mr. LANE. That will be most helpful to the committee if you do that.

What would you say about treason?

Mr. MULTER. I did not say treason specifically. I believe it comes within the same category as espionage and should be treated the same way and excluded from my bill.

Mr. LANE. If you prefer to go into it further and report to the committee that will be agreeable.

What would you say in a case such as this, where a man has committed murder and is serving a life sentence in Alcatraz, and while he is there serving in Alcatraz he plans and plots the murder of one of the guards for some particular reason and does murder the guard while he is there as a prisoner? How will you take care of such

a case? You cannot give him any more imprisonment. He already has life imprisonment.

What do you think in such a case?

Mr. MULTER. In that case we must direct ourselves to the fact that the criminal has been enabled to commit a murder or a second murder for which he can get no greater punishment than that already imposed. We should address ourselves to the administration of that prison. If this man is in prison for life there is something radically faulty with the management and operation of that prison if that person can be put in a position where he can commit murder on an inmate or a guard. The principle still remains the same in my mind. The fact that such a man might be faced with the death penalty will not deter him from committing that crime. It never has.

Mr. LANE. It would make no difference in the world if you had the best warden in the world in those institutions. Some of the prisoners always are scheming or plotting to do damage to somebody else or to get out. It is one of those things they cannot easily detect. We may have the best administrators in those institutions.

Mr. MULTER. The violent prisoner should be confined so he cannot be violent. Certainly every prisoner before he enters the prison is stripped of everything, everything he might use to commit a crime, even taking away his shoe laces.

If despite all that kind of care a prisoner still will commit murder upon an inmate or upon a guard, capital punishment will not deter that man from doing it. We need better administration to prevent that possibility.

Mr. LANE .That has been said and done.

Mr. MULTER. I have not had too much experience with the administration of prisons. It seems to me the man who is violent should not be in jail but in the psychiatric ward and should be getting treatment there.

What do we do in the psychiatric wards where we have violent patients who are confined because it is believed that these people have murderous tendencies? We hold to a very minimum commitment of murder on the part of a potentially violent patient.

If that can be done in a hospital why can it not be done in a prison?

Mr. HENDERSON. The argument you make concerning abolition of mandatory death penalty in the District of Columbia appears to be an excellent one. However, it does not quite follow that that is an argument for the abolition of the death penalty universally, it seems to me.

Mr. MULTER. Is life worth any more or any less in the District of Columbia than it is anywhere else in the world?

Mr. HENDERSON. I refer to the mandatory death penalty. That is what you are faced with in the District of Columbia. According to your argument and according to the argument of many it has in itself interfered with the administration of justice in the District of Columbia.

However, that argument does not necessarily follow, that the discretionary use of the death penalty would hamper the administration of justice.

Mr. MULTER. I cannot argue with you. I must concede that in those cases where the death penalty is discretionary with the jury or with the court there is more likelihood of the jury to convict where the sentence might be the death penalty, while in those States, and New York is one of them, where in certain crimes if the jury brings in a verdict of guilty in the first degree the death penalty is mandatory. There is no choice with the court. The only relief then is to seek a commutation or pardon from the Governor.

In those cases New York, as the District of Columbia, where the jury is confronted with no choice, either murder in the first degree and the automatic imposition of the death penalty, or acquittal, they have too many times acquitted. Many times a man has gone free where certainly the least that should have been done with him was to imprison him for a number of years.

In that respect, you might write into this bill a provision as to what you mean by life imprisonment, so as to provide that nobody convicted of one of these heinous offenses, who is sentenced to life imprisonment, can be released until he has served a minimum of 20 years.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is all I have.

Mr. LANE. I have before me a report from the government of the District of Columbia signed by the President of the Board of Commissioners, Mr. Robert McLaughlin.

In that report he makes this statement:

"While the Commissioners express no opinion on the provisions of H.R. 870, not directly related to the District of Columbia, it is the belief of the Commissioners that sections 13 and 14 of the bill abolishing the death penalty in the District of Columbia are not desirable at the present time and, accordingly, the Commissioners do not favor their enactment.

"Instead the Commissioners prefer the Congress to enact S. 2083 of the 86th Congress or H.R. 11263 of the 86th Congress, each of which would abolish the mandatory death penalty for murder in the first degree in the District of Columbia and vest discretion in the trial court and jury to impose either death penalty or life imprisonment."

Mr. MULTER. I commend the Commissioners for the attitude they take in going as far as they do, but I must disagree with them and urge they do not go far enough.

They are addressing themselves there to the administration of justice in the District in the hope there will be more convictions of criminals indicted for these heinous offenses; criminals now go free because the only choice with the jury is death or acquittal.

They imply, in taking their position that a jury should have discretion in imposing the death penalty, that the death penalty is a proper punishment. That is the basic difference between us.

Mr. LANE. Further questions?

Mr. KASTENMEIER. I would like to ask this: I understand, then, you regard this primarily as a practical political problem rather than a moral problem?

Mr. MULTER. Oh, no. I say this is basically a moral problem. I take the position that governments are mere aggregations of men, and the morality we require of men must be required of nations if the nation is to be moral, and this is definitely a moral problem.

If I as an individual have no right to take the life of another, the Government which I, together with my fellow man have set up, has no right to do as a nation or as a State that which I have no right to do.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Then it is a rather divisible morality. For example, you preclude capital punishment in courts-martial cases. In other words, if a soldier falls asleep while on guard duty or deserts you would permit execution in those cases. Apparently you do not oppose capital punishment in those cases.

Mr. MULTER. I do oppose it in principle. It is not included within the terms of this bill because I am afraid we could not get a bill enacted which also affected courts-martial proceedings and treason cases. I oppose it even in those cases, but, as I said before, I am a practical enough legislator to believe that a bill that would try to abolish it in all those spheres would not today have public acceptance in our country.

Mr. LANE. You say there have been only 31 of these cases in the last 30 years?

Mr. MULTER. Yes. That is the information given to me by the Library of Congress after some very exhaustive research of the matter. Eight were for espionage.

Mr. LINDSAY. I should like to commend our distinguished colleague for the excellence of his testimony and presentation on a very important subject.

I was interested in the Congressman's answer to Mr. KASTENMEIER's question. I take it you do not make any distinction in principle to the death penalty with respect to espionage and other crimes.

Mr. MULTER. I do not, sir.

Mr. LINDSAY. If your principle is good for one it is good for all. Is that true?

Mr. MULTER. That is my feeling.

Mr. LINDSAY. I press this because I have debated this question at great length with my friend, Mr. James Bennett, Director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. I know he will not mind my putting this in the record because it is generally known that he makes exception to his general disapproval of the death penalty in the case of espionage and the killing of Federal officers in the course of duty. He is thinking, of course, of personnel in the Federal Bureau of Prisons.

I consider Mr. Bennett one of the world's experts on this subject. I have never quite been able to rationalize in my own mind the reason for the difference. If the argument is good in one it is good in the other.

If you accept the fact there is no real deterrent value any longer, if there ever was, in the death penalty, then it should extend across the board.

Mr. MULTER. I agree.

Mr. LINDSAY. I think you are absolutely correct in not trying to include in your bill the armed services. In the first place I am afraid that subject matter would have to come before the Armed Services Committee.

Second, it is complex. There is no distinction, however. The Army continues to carry out death penalties whereas the Navy and Air Force have not executed a man in something like 30 or 40 years. There is no reason for the Army to continue.

Mr. MULTER. I agree.

Mr. LINDSAY. You have done a good job.

Mr. MULTER. I am aware of Mr. Bennett's opinions and I respect them and him. Without trying to evaluate who is the man who is more to be respected or the greater expert in the field, I am sure you are familiar with the opinions of our own former Warden Lawes of the Sing Sing Prison in New York who takes the opposite position to Mr. Bennett.

He says capital punishment accomplishes no purpose and should be abolished.

Certainly he is and was rated as a foremost penologist.

Mr. LINDSAY. There is no doubt but what the mandatory death penalty at times makes bad law. We had a terrible battle in the Congress over the subject of the so-called Mallory bill. There are those who argue that if the death penalty in the District were not mandatory the conviction never would have been reversed.

In other words, the courts find ways to avoid convictions where there is a mandatory death penalty. As Congressman HENDERSON pointed out there are clear grounds for removing the mandatory aspect, at least. If Congress takes action on nothing else, it should do this much.

How many Federal laws are there where the death penalty is in nature mandatory?

Mr. MULTER. Murder in the first degree is one, of course. Murder in the course of——

Mr. LINDSAY. Is there a Federal crime of murder in the first degree?

Mr. MULTER. They may not call it murder in the first degree, but premeditated murder carries the death penalty under Federal statutes.

Rape carries with it the death penalty under the Federal statutes.

Kidnapping carries the death penalty under Federal statutes.

Unintentional killing during the course of the commission of a felony, such as armed robbery, carries the death penalty.

Mr. LINDSAY. All of these crimes are crimes which occur on Federal property, I suppose?

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. LINDSAY. In each of those cases is the penalty of death mandatory or are there discretionary powers within the jury, within the judge, or both?

Mr. MULTER. On the Federal level.

Mr. LINDSAY. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. I believe it is the same as it is in New York State. It is mandatory. The jury determines merely the guilt or innocence. It cannot find the defendant guilty of a lesser crime. If it finds the defendant guilt of that crime, the court must impose the death penalty.

Mr. LINDSAY. It is required to do so?

Mr. MULTER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LINDSAY. In those statutes does the jury have the power to recommend a penalty less than death?

Mr. MULTER. On the Federal level, I think not. I am not certain.

Mr. LINDSAY. Counsel has pointed out in title 18, section 108(2), the crime of murder, the statute reads: "Whoever is guilty of murder in the first degree shall suffer death unless the jury qualifies its verdict by adding thereto 'without capital punishment,' in which event he shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life."

I suppose there would be an improvement on that language, in your mind, if the judge also had the power to make an adjustment in the event the jury did not recommend life imprisonment.

Mr. MULTER. I very strongly believe that the imposition of the punishment should always rest with the court, and in every case the court should have discretion as to the punishment to be imposed. It should not be left to the jury. Every member of the committee is a lawyer and has practiced law before coming here, and some of us are still practicing law. We know how a jury can become emotional about some of these problems. When it comes to imposing the death sentence, or any other sentence, for that matter, I think if there is a lapse of time between the bringing in of the verdict by the jury and the court has the probation report before it and has time to consider the matter and then imposes the sentence, there may be less emotion involved and more adherence to justice and right.

Mr. LINDSAY. Did you submit figures as to the number of Federal executions which have taken place in the past decade or so? Do we have that in the record?

Mr. LANE. Thirty-one.

Mr. MULTER. Thirty-one by Federal courts.

Mr. LINDSAY. Can you bring that down to date a little more? Do you have the figures for the last 10 years of the number of Federal executions for nonmilitary crimes?

Mr. MULTER. I shall try to get that information for you. I think I can get it very readily, although I do not have it at the moment. These 31 cases were since 1930, a 30-year period. Of course it would be considerably less if we take the last 10-year period.

Mr. LINDSAY. I would suspect, without knowing, that it is a declining scale; that the graph goes down; that within the past 10 years there have been very few. Has counsel that information?

Mr. MULTER. I will get that information for you, sir. I think you are quite right in what you say. I am looking at the statement with reference to the District of Columbia alone, where of course the rate has been going down, too. In the last 7 years there have been only 12 first-degree convictions in the District of Columbia out of 104 indictments. In other words, here we have approximately 92 defendants who went free. I do not say all of them were guilty or that all of them should have been convicted, but I venture to guess that of the 92 who went free—Mallory is a typical incident which comes to mind—many should have been convicted of some crime. They should have ben imprisoned. Again without trying to pass judgment on Mallory, I think from what we know about the Mallory case, that is a typical instance of where there should have been a conviction for some crime.

Mr. LANE. Any further questions, gentlemen?

Mr. HENDERSON. One further question.

In your opinion, Mr. MULTER, does society have the provision for capital punishment as a deterrent to crime, as a method of punishment for the guilty offender, as a part of the provision of the principle of an eye for an eye, or a carryover of the barbaric principle of revenge?

Mr. MULTER. I think, sir, it is defended on the basis of all three. I say not one of the three reasons for it are logical or reasonable or should be followed any longer. The best illustration of the eye for an eye idea and the emotionalism involved is the action of a lynch mob. A mob carrying out a lynching is doing what they think is enjoined by the Old Testament, an eye for an eye, but their emotions are running away with them. It is an emotional reaction which causes them to take the law into their own hands and to speed the imposition of the punishment, which should be done only by a court. They justify it on the ground that a court would do it anyway. The court should not do it anyway. The court should not do it at all.

May I refer to the Old Testament reference to an eye for an eye. In those days it was usually a rabbinic court. A rabbinic court which once in 70 years condemned a defendant to death was referred to as a murderous court. We are inclined to overlook the fact that even in those days the eye for an eye injunction was circumscribed by so many if's, and's and but's that it was rarely, if ever, imposed. It came to be known not literally as an eye for an eye, but a theory of compensation for the injury done.

Mr. CAHILL. May I ask one more question.

Under your thoughts, Congressman MULTER, would a person who is convicted of a major crime and is sentenced to life imprisonment ever have the possibility of being released from prison?

Mr. MULTER. My bill does not touch the subject.

Mr. CAHILL. What is your thought on that?

Mr. MULTER. I think if the bill is enacted, it should have a provision in it defining what we mean by life imprisonment, with a minimum number of years that the defendant must serve before his sentence can be commuted or he may be released.

Mr. CAHILL. Do you feel that there should be the possibility of commutation and release where a person is sentenced to life imprisonment?

Mr. MULTER. After a minimum of, say, 20 years of service. If you recall, I think here, too, we have the famous Loeb-Leopold case.

Mr. CAHILL. That is what I am thinking of.

Mr. MULTER. The court said these boys must remain in prison for the rest of their natural lives and should never again be released to society. One of them died as a result of a murder in jail, and the other was more recently released. Those who have followed that case I think will all agree that this man has been rehabilitated and he deserves another chance. He is making good. The chances of this man ever committing another crime of any kind are nil.

Mr. CAHILL. That is my question, along with the chairman's question. Let us assume a person is sentenced to life imprisonment and, on the basis of prison conduct, is released, and then immediately upon release commits a major crime. What would be the punishment?

Mr. MULTER. The punishment upon conviction again would be life imprisonment. If you write into it a minimum of 20 years, it would be a minimum of 20 years. No case comes to mind. I do not say they have not happened, because I am sure they have, but I can recall no case of a man having been convicted and sentenced to life imprisonment who, upon release, committed another crime for which he could have been convicted and sent to jail for life again or upon whom the capital punishment could have been imposed. There may be such cases, but I have not come across them.

Mr. LANE. I think, Mr. MULTER, I could cite you a case where a man had life in an institution and murdered one of the guards in the institution while he was there.

Mr. MULTER. There have been such cases, yes, sir.

Mr. LANE. I know of one particular State where a life sentence for murder means only that at the end of 13 years he may apply for his parole and may be released.

Mr. MULTER. I think this committee, if it looks upon this bill with favor, should write into the bill the minimum of what it believes a life sentence should be—15, 20, 25 years. It should be written into the bill.

Mr. LANE. Any further questions, gentlemen?

Mr. LINDSAY. There is one point which is interesting, raised by Mr. CAHILL. When you get to the question of whether or not a Federal court can impose a life sentence not subject to commutation, you run into tricky questions as to the power of the Executive. It is the same question whether or not the Executive can commute a death sentence to life imprisonment on the condition that there be no later commutation or lessening of the sentence. There you have the question whether the Executive has power to bind his successor.

Mr. MULTER. It is a nice question whether or not you can take from the Executive, his right to pardon.

Mr. LINDSAY. Right.

Mr. LANE. If there are no further questions, Congressman MULTER, we again thank you for your appearance here this morning. You are always so helpful to our committee.

The National Convention of the Polish Falcons of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the fact that the Polish Falcons of America have chosen to hold this year's national convention in the congressional district which I am proud to represent.

This is a great tribute to the vitality and achievement of Nest 104, our local chapter of Falcons, and an honor for all of the people of Newark and, indeed, of the State of New Jersey.

I understand that this is the first time in 88 years that the National Convention has taken place in Newark, N.J. Some 4,000 delegates have gathered here for a weeklong schedule of tournaments and other events which will culminate in a banquet at the Polish Falcon Hall on Sunday.

I should like to take this opportunity to bid them a warm welcome, and to express the hope that they have had such

a successful week that they will come back to us again in the very near future.

The activities of the Polish Falcons are well-known and highly regarded throughout the country. The very name "Falcon" suggests vigor, strength, vitality of mind, and soundness of body. It is these goals which the Polish Falcons have pursued for almost a century.

A large part of the Falcon program is focused on youth activities and on physical development. This emphasis on youth, and on diverting youthful energies to sound and wholesome purposes is of the utmost importance. We appreciate its significance today, as we become more and more concerned with the frightening statistics on juvenile delinquency and with the general aimlessness of many of our youngsters who do not seem to be able to find their way.

These are problems which do not worry mothers of young Falcons, or Falconettes. They know that their youngsters are engaged in worthwhile pursuits and are building their characters and bodies for a bright and happy future.

The importance of physical fitness is too often forgotten in this country. President Eisenhower himself expressed distress at this fact in a recent press conference. The problem began to receive increased attention with the onset of the draft, as we realized what a large proportion of our young men have been unable to meet the physical requirements of the armed services.

And yet, physical fitness is vital to our strength as a Nation. We cannot permit ourselves to grow soft in any regard, if we are to remain the vigorous and energetic people we have always been in the past. By its activities the Polish Falcons are doing a service not only to Falcon members, but to the entire country. There is no greater patriotism than helping to build up the strength and human resources of this Nation.

The Falcon program, it is important to note, is based in the context of Polish tradition and culture. Their young people grow up learning of their national origins and taking pride in their heritage. They thus become fine, outstanding American citizens, enriching the American scene by their unique contribution and adding to that great diversity of culture of which America is justly proud.

There is a similar Falcon organization which exists in Poland today. I do not know how much contact there is, or is permitted to be, between the Polish Sokolstwo and the Polish Falcons of America. But I do know that the very existence of this flourishing organization in this country cannot but give heart and courage to the members in Poland who have suffered, and continue to suffer, under the yoke of Communist oppression. We all know that the hope of the Polish people for eventual liberation has never been extinguished. I am confident that that hope is nurtured and inspired by the example of the American Falcons who live in liberty and freedom.

The Falcons have always concerned themselves with the trials and the sufferings of the Polish people. They have focused attention on the cause of Poland, and, by so doing, have furthered the cause of freedom everywhere.

I should like to pay special tribute to Nest 104, the Falcon chapter in Newark, and to John Byk as well as to the other officers and leaders, many of whom I have come to know personally. The fact that Nest 104 has been selected as the hosts of the Falcon convention is eloquent testimony of the effectiveness of Nest 104's thriving and successful program.

A San Franciscan's Reaction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert W. Tallman who is one of the outstanding members of the California Bar interested himself in the circumstances surrounding the rioting in San Francisco last month in connection with the hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. An editorial in the Washington Post of May 17, 1960, dealing with these hearings so shocked Mr. Tallman that he wrote to the Washington Post about the editorial and what his investigation disclosed with reference to the demonstrations against the Committee on Un-American Activities.

It is my feeling that the Members of the Congress should have the benefit of the thinking of one of San Francisco's leading citizens concerning these unfortunate demonstrations. I am therefore asking that Mr. Tallman's letter of June 28, 1960, be included in these remarks:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *June 28, 1960.*

EDITOR,
Washington Post and Times Herald,
Washington Post Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is the first letter I have ever written to a newspaper editor. However, I feel compelled to bring certain facts to your attention which you obviously did not have before you when you wrote your May 17, 1960, editorial, "Coming to Life," concerning the so-called spontaneous student riot in San Francisco or what we San Franciscans now sadly refer to as "Black Friday."

As a member of the San Francisco bar and an alumnus of Stanford University and of the University of California Law School, I must take strong exception to your unwarranted conclusion that on that day our San Francisco "police, it seems clear, acted with unnecessary severity" in taking action against students whom you describe as merely noisy. I take even stronger exception to your sunny exultation that, "It is heartening, despite the excesses, to see American students behaving once more like American students."

Before answering your statements I think it necessary to explain why I am so late in commenting on your May 17, 1960, editorial. The answer is simply this. On Sunday, June 26, a film entitled "Operation Abolition" compiled from the news coverage of the riots by our television stations KRON-TV and KPIX-TV had its first showing before a group of some 600 college students and alumni at the Greenbrier Hotel. This film was shown for the first time to Members of Congress on Monday, June 27. There were many University of California alumni viewing these films and we were so shocked and appalled by what we saw and heard that Mrs. Edward Collins, former vice president of the University of California alumni, myself, and other alumni present called yesterday upon Representative GORDON SCHERER who was in the hearing room at the time the riot occurred to learn all we could about the background and the buildup of this so-called spontaneous student behavior. As you may know, many of our noisy University of California students were taken to jail and booked for inciting a riot, disturbing the peace, and resisting the police and one of the noisier ones was additionally charged with assault with a deadly weapon for grabbing Officer Ralph Schaumleffel's club from him and hitting him over the head with it. (San Francisco Chronicle, May 14, 1960.) Officer Schaumleffel and seven other "unnecessarily severe" police officers were treated at our Central Emergency Hospital for injuries received during the riot. Four of the demonstrators were also injured.

After talking with Representative SCHERER and reading his speech on the House floor of June 2, 1960, "How far will they go?—The San Francisco Riots," I contacted your paper to determine whether you had taken an editorial position on this riot. After a reading of your May 17, 1960, editorial and the various UPI and AP releases upon which it was apparently based, I strongly recommend that you review all the facts concerning "the excesses" of our students' irresponsible and lawless behavior.

As I see the issue, it is not a question of whether one is for or against the House Un-American Activities Committee, but rather whether it is not in fact frightening and appalling rather than "heartening" to see American students openly and flagrantly violate the law and treat Congressmen, judges, and law enforcement officials with utter contempt. Certainly, the San Francisco Chronicle, which was on the scene, clearly recognized this issue in its May 16, 1960, editorial.

"Friday's disgraceful riot at city hall left a black mark on San Francisco which is quite undeserved by this tolerant city.

"The students who were responsible for it have a lesson to learn. It is that strong personal opinions of hostility toward an Un-American Activities Committee cannot be turned into hostile action without intolerable risk of harm to public order.

"Friday afternoon's mob of 200—mostly students, but not all of them innocents in the art of mass demonstration—threatened to force its way into the Un-American Activities Committee meeting room against the orders and warnings of the police. What, we wonder, does the concept of "law and order" mean to these students? What do the sight of a policeman's uniform and the sound of his command mean? Apparently, to this mob, nothing but a challenge to get more stubborn and defiant.

"The performance by college and university students in so ill-mannered, boorish, and obviously dangerous a way gets no sympathy from us as an exercise of youth groping to understand and improve the democratic process. Chanting defiance in the face of a police order to fall back is not a first amendment freedom. These young people have managed to set back the cause of responsible concern for the Bill of Rights."

The background or the buildup of this tragic day bears examination. In February 1960 the following question appeared on the University of California English entrance examination:

"What are the dangers to a democracy of a national police organization, like the FBI, which operates secretly and is unresponsive to public criticism?"

When this question was brought to the attention of the board of regents it was with-

drawn and an apology was made by the regents to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover. However, this action provoked a storm of protests from certain university faculty members and students and the Daily Californian in its editorial of March 4, 1960, condemning the regents action referred derogatorily to Mr. Hoover as a "sacred cow."

There were a number of student picket lines formed in the ensuing months for the savior of the late Caryl Chessman and against the Berkeley branches of the Woolworth and Kress stores. The other merchants of Berkeley bitterly complained that their business was adversely affected by such picketing.

On May 2, 1960, Caryl Chessman was executed. A delegation from the university arrived at 11 p.m. the preceding evening to maintain a vigil at the gates of San Quentin. On the morning of the execution the demonstrators learned that our State supreme court had denied Chessman a stay and:

"Upon hearing this the demonstrators sat down in the middle of the road. Police had to use force to get them out of the way and a riot almost occurred. Arrested for opposing arrest and unlawful assembly were Frank Harper, an English instructor at San Diego State College and Peter Thygeson, a union organized from Berkeley." (Daily Californian, Tuesday, May 3, 1960, p. 1.)

On this same date Students for Civil Liberties, a student action group recently mobilized on this campus issued the following statement:

"We, the Students for Civil Liberties, have formed to protest the announced hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee in San Francisco * * *.

"We feel that the hearings should be canceled and that the committee be abolished." (Daily Californian, May 3, 1960, p. 1.)

On this same evening student Dan Greenson submitted a resolution to the executive committee of the Associated Students of the University asking them to condemn the actions of the University of Illinois in firing Prof. Leo Koch for his views on premarital sexual relations. The executive committee passed this resolution even though it had been ruled a direct violation of President Kerr's directive against the associated students taking an official stand on an off-campus issue. But the Daily Californian editorialized:

"Many people have argued that one cannot correct a law by breaking it. In this particular case we disagree with them."

Chancellor Seaborg demanded that the resolution be rescinded but the executive committee openly defied him and refused to do so. Thus on May 2, at San Quentin the law was broken and "a riot almost occurred." On May 3 the policy of the president of the university was specifically violated.

As the week of Black Friday opened "nearly 300 members of the U.C. faculty" blasted the committee and branded its work as "insidious and harmful." The Student Committee for Civil Liberties held a mass meeting at Dwinelle Hall, "which was addressed by two law professors, Jerome Cohen and Michael Heyman.

"We must try to cancel the committee itself—have it abolished," said Cohen. (San Francisco Chronicle, May 11, 1960, p. 9.)

The student committee then scheduled and held a protest rally at Union Square in San Francisco on Thursday, May 12, 1960. According to the May 12, issue of the Daily Californian:

"The SCCL plans to picket the hearings today. It has issued a call for students to attend the rally and hearings and suggests that people 'laugh out loud in the hearings when things get ridiculous.'"

This issue was freely circulated among the mob at the hearings. According to the Daily Californian the SCCL was picketing and holding protest rallies to "back subpenaed student Douglas Wachten." According to the May 12, Daily Californian:

"Wachter doesn't know why the committee subpenaed him. 'I think the committee wanted to subpena someone on campus in order to tag Cal's political movement as un-American,' he said.

"Wachter is a member of Stiles Hall and Slate and has participated in the CORE picketing of Kress and Woolworth's stores. He was the only university student to walk 18 miles from San Francisco to San Quentin to protest Caryl Chessman's scheduled execution."

What the Daily Californian probably did not know was that Douglas Wachter and his father, Saul Wachter, "an identified Communist agent, attended the 17th national convention of the Communist Party last December as delegated from the northern sector of the California Communist Party." (Representative SCHERER'S June 2, 1960 speech.)

Thus the university students were urged "to laugh out loud in the hearings" by their own newspaper and to treat Members of Congress with utter contempt. And laugh, sing, chant, scream, boo, hiss they did.

The following Friday afternoon is tragic history. Rather than describe it I strongly urge you to view the newsreel films of what took place and to listen closely to the terrifying sound track. The organized shouting and chanting of the mob caused our judges to request that the city hall chambers be cleared of the demonstrators for three of our judges found it impossible to continue their proceedings because of the noise. Before the police summoned to disperse the crowd could reach city hall, admitted Communist agitators such as Archie Brown were leading the shouting and clapping of the mob and at one point these agitators sang "The Star-Spangled Banner." The frenzy of the mob rose to new heights.

You must see "Operation Abolition" to believe what happened next.

When the arrested students subsequently appeared before our judges they booed and hissed them. Judge Axelrod who is to be commended on the way he handled the problem urged the students to waive a jury trial and submit their cases to him on the basis of the police reports. Sixty-two of the defendants accepted his advice and Judge Axelrod subsequently determined that there was sufficient evidence in the police reports to justify conviction of each defendant. However, he dismissed the charges against them stating that "I believe the defendants have been punished sufficiently, I am hopeful they will profit by their lesson." He was thanked by the defendants shouting that he had completely vindicated them and that the police therefore were guilty of unwarranted police brutality.

San Francisco is a proud city, and the Post's editorial does us a grave injustice. I honestly feel that you will find little heartening in viewing students behaving like wild animals—totally unresponsive to the commands of those charged with enforcing our laws. And in viewing their excesses, as recorded by the KRON–TV and KPIX–TV cameras, please keep in mind that every Congressman, regardless of the purpose of his visit to our city, has the right, as does any other citizen, to enjoy our hospitality in complete freedom from harassment by a few irresponsible and lawless individuals.

Sincerely,

ROBERT W. TALLMAN.

Water "Laboratory" in Southwest Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include in the RECORD a timely article by Mr. Roscoe Fleming, of Denver, which appeared recently in the Christian Science Monitor. With increasing interest being focused on the problems of the Nation's water resources, the suggestions presented in Mr. Fleming's article deserve thoughtful consideration. Those of us from the arid and semi-arid regions of the Southwest and the mountain West have lived and worked with water resources problems for generations. We stand ready to contribute to the rest of the Nation whatever we may have gained in the way of practical knowledge of the problems of water resources use and conservation. There is no better region in the Nation for a program such as that outlined in Mr. Fleming's article.

The article follows:

WATER LABORATORY IN SOUTHWEST URGED

(By Roscoe Fleming)

DENVER.—A group of water experts skilled in looking at the future suggests that the entire Southwestern United States might well become a great, overall water-and-climate laboratory or pilot project, to show the best ways for development and use of water that the whole Nation will need before A.D. 2000.

They say that the Southwest, the Nation's driest corner, will need water first and worst, and that its booming growth in certain areas is already pressing hard on the available water supply.

Yet the needs of the whole Nation are not far behind. By the year 2000, or in only 40 years, the United States must find a consistent water supply throughout to support twice as many people as now, plus a material complex more than twice as great and intricate.

INDISPENSABLE RESOURCE

Water is the one most indispensable material resource for a civilization, and where is ours to come from?

Lessons learned in such a regional development as is proposed for the Southwest could be invaluable, in saving time and in averting waste in an overall national planning and development program such as "must become standard practice sometime in this century."

The report is one of those commissioned by the Senate's Select Committee on National Water Resources headed by Senator ROBERT S. KERR, Democrat, of Oklahoma, preliminary to the committee's own overall summation. The whole, with its supporting documents, will form the most comprehensive and valuable body of national water information ever gathered.

This particular document is the work of a group headed by Edward A. Ackerman, who with Dr. George O. G. Löf wrote the massive and thorough "Technology in American Water Development" last year, for Resources for the Future. Dr. Donald Patton aided Dr. Ackerman in this one.

TECHNIQUES STUDIED

Its specific topic is the impact of new techniques, and their meaning and possible value in the gigantic forthcoming task. The writers suggest that this task is at least as vital to the Nation as the $40 billion integrated highway program already underway, but that the water program in its entirety will dwarf the road program both as to size and complexity. In fact, it will be the most complex task of internal development the Nation has ever tackled.

It will require an immense body of advance planning and programing in itself, and we ought to get started now, they say, in a specific segment to accumulate experience for the great national task.

The first big job will be to determine what the Nation wants water to do, and what are the national and regional priorities. Another early task will be to determine what ground area shall be needed for waterworks such as future dams, plus a program to set it aside so it won't be covered with hundreds of millions of dollars worth of improvements and therefore unavailable and out of reach later for what may be, after all, a more valuable use nationally.

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE

All this comes under the head of planning, which has many more facets. Next will come development. New techniques will apply to management as well as to physical construction.

The writers do not visualize the Federal Government, in itself, as the doer and controller of all. Instead, they say it should do its part in planning, development, and construction; but as to the latter in particular should leave it largely to State or regional organizations, local entities public or private, and so on.

They suggest that a system of loans and grants to induce local cooperation would be more effective than overall Federal operation. Such a method now is being relied on to enable local pollution control, and thus slowly to improve the waters of whole basins.

Finally, when it comes to operation they envisage computer-aided control systems that will see that every drop of water is in the right place doing the right thing at the right time for the utmost benefit to the needs of the human population, direct and indirect.

COMPLEXITY GREAT

This would be something like the water-control systems already in use in the TVA, and some basinwide western developments—but so much more complex that any present system is little more than an early embryo of what those of A.D. 2000 must be.

If the southwest with its pressing water needs were to be chosen as the first arena for such complete water control, the first step would be to ask the States to set up models of their expected consumption right up to A.D. 2000. The States included are California, Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Wyoming, New Mexico, Texas, Oklahoma, Kansas, and Colorado.

Secondly, both by States and overall, "prognostic hydrology" would be put to work to ascertain the total possible water supply that will be available, counting all that which could be developed or saved by advanced techniques.

Thirdly, these two patterns would be matched, and from the matching would naturally flow such further developments as the systematic design of new facilities, basin and interbasin flow, the making of future construction big enough to make sure of all available "scale economies" due to size (as in power production) and so on. Insofar as possible, legislative bodies would be asked to provide continuing appropriations so that work might be planned years ahead.

A large, general research and innovation program always on the alert for better ways of doing things would accompany all this.

As to the actual management of water, the writers say we must come to the three-dimensional concept in which water in the atmosphere, on the surface, and underground all will be developed as one integrated supply. We are far from this today. Only in a few scattered spots has there been any integration at all of surface and ground waters, for example, which are treated as entirely separate entities.

SUGGESTIONS LISTED

When it comes to making the best use on a permanent basis of the Southwest's waters specifically, the writers suggest:

Prognostication of weather and of consequent water supply for future years through better forecasting aided by such powerful new observational aids as satellite observations, and lessons learned through atmospheric research, and so forth, all rapidly integrated by computer techniques.

Location and development of ground waters which, in all, total much more within reachable depths in the earth's crust than all the surface waters.

WASTE SUPPRESSION

Enhancement of supply by consistent cloud seeding—which the writers estimate could add 40 million acre-feet yearly to western precipitation and 15 million acre-feet to runoff by manipulating forest patterns to keep more snow on the ground, by ground water development, by desalting brackish and sea water, and by averting pollution or cleansing polluted waters.

Suppressing waste, as by keeping reservoirs covered with chemical films to hold back some of the 10 million acre-feet that yearly evaporate from water surfaces; by eliminating water-wasting vegetation; by lining canals against seepage; by better irrigation practices, both technical and legal—the writers say that western water precedents are designed for justice, not efficient use; and by studying the highest use of water. This might lead to a slowdown in irrigation development.

Other water uses, such as those connected with establishing homes or industries or even recreation, are beginning to be more economically valuable.

Immigration of Orientals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JUNE 14, 1960.

Hon. HIRAM FONG,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR FONG: You were kind enough enough to favor me with a copy of your article which appeared in the Honolulu Advertiser, and which you inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 1, 1960. Your article discusses, in the main, what you refer to as discriminatory features of our immigration laws affecting orientals.

Assuming that your purpose in inviting my attention to your article was to elicit my comments thereon, I am willing to oblige in the spirit of frankness and fairness.

Your article contains several errors as to facts. This is said not for the purpose of embarassing you personally. I believe that you have been misled by those who supplied you with information dealing with matters of considerable complexity and a wide legal and historical background.

The following is submitted for the purpose of correction and clarification:

1. Soon after the cessation of hostilities—in 1946, to be exact—a few of us in the House of Representatives originated an effort to repeal the exclusion clauses based on race then effective under the 1917, 1924, and 1940 immigration and nationality laws. Our efforts were partially successful when, in 1948, we succeeded in removing from our "suspension of deportation" statute the racial restrictions applicable to orientals.

Further attempts to delete from our immigration and nationality laws the main oriental exclusion clauses resulted, in 1949, in the passage by the House of a bill which, unfortunately, encountered delays in the Senate.

2. Having enlisted the support of the late Senator McCarran of Nevada, I succeeded in providing for the final and definitive repeal of the oriental exclusion clauses by the Walter-McCarran Act, enacted in 1952.

For the first time in the history of the United States an immigration and nationality law contained a sentence which was unanimously praised as the "Magna Carta" for oriental immigrants and their descendants. The sentence reads as follows: "The right of a person to become a naturalized citizen of the United States shall not be denied or abridged because of race or sex * * *" etc. (sec. 311 of the Immigration and Nationality Act). By virtue of the same law, ineligibility to naturalization because of race was abrogated as a bar to immigration. All countries of Asia and the Far East have been assigned immigration quotas pursuant to the Walter-McCarran Act.

3. The late Senator McCarran and myself have been rather lavishly praised and awarded honors which I do not intend to list, by several countries of the Far East and by organizations of American citizens of oriental descent. My personal files and records are replete with the most touching expressions of gratitude and appreciation for what the Walter-McCarran Act has done with respect to immigration and naturalization of orientals.

4. The results of the repeal of the oriental exclusion clauses are clearly indicated in the statistical reports published annually by the Department of Justice. While in the last prewar decade, 1931–40, the total immigration from Asia amounted to 15,344 persons, there were 42,385 Asians admitted into the United States as immigrants in the first 5 years following the enactment of the Walter-McCarran Act. (This figure is, of course, unordinately large due to the fact that during those years there occurred a sizable influx of "war brides" and "GI fiances.")

However, the long-range effects of the Walter-McCarran Act on immigration from the Orient remains readily ascertainable in the statistical figures published annually by the Attorney General of the United States.

Here are some abstracts from the Department of Justice reports for the years 1956–59, pertinent to the erroneous assertions of your article.

Immigrants admitted:

Natives of—	1956	1957	1958	1959
China	4,450	5,425	3,213	5,723
Japan	5,586	6,354	6,543	5,851
Korea	703	648	1,604	1,720
Philippines	1,873	1,996	2,236	2,633

Since the enactment of the Walter-McCarran Act, total admissions of immigrants from Asia were as follows:

1953	8,029
1954	11,751
1955	12,131
1956	17,538
1957	23,102
1958	19,867
1959	24,312

5. You have devoted a considerable portion of your article to deploring the fact that the United States does not admit a sufficient number of immigrants from such countries as Burma, Cambodia, Malaya, Laos, Nepal, Vietnam, and Thailand.

I wish to invite your attention to a report of the Department of State dated April 1, 1960, in which it is stated that the immigration quotas for all the above-listed countries are open and immigrant visas thereunder are immediately available for qualified applicants.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS E. WALTER,
Chairman.

Future of Lafayette Square

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. McCARTHY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter to the editor of the Washington Evening Star of June 30, written by Mr. Frederick Haupt III, entitled "Future of Lafayette Square."

I was one of those who joined with several other members of the Public Works Committee in objecting to the approval that the committee gave to the planned courthouse construction in Lafayette Square. The least we can do is to wait until after the next election, because of the possibility that the next President might wish to spend more time at the White House and he may be concerned about Lafayette Square when he looks out his front door.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I would like to voice my approval.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUTURE OF LAFAYETTE SQUARE

I wish to acknowledge a debt of gratitude owed to our paper by everyone who is interested in preserving Lafayette Square and the buildings adjacent to it. The editorial support which you have given bespeaks a breadth of vision and a genuine concern with the historical—and esthetic—appearance of the Nation's Capital, both of which provide the logical answers to the parochialism which would convert this "forecourt of the White House" (as Frederick Gutheim has called it) into another Federal Triangle—or rectangle, in this case. In addition to your editorials, your news coverage of the hearings by the Senate Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds, the pieces by Day Thorpe, and the piece by Gilbert Gimble (on June 26) have not only maintained public interest in this matter (which had already begun to take on the aspects of a strictly private affair between various agencies of the Federal Government) but have also provided the backing that is so necessary to the efforts undertaken to preserve the square in Congress and by private citizens in Washington.

The article by Mr. Gimble ably presents both sides of the case as it has developed to this point, and quite properly points out that congressional action "may shape the character of the historic square for coming generations."

General Services Administrator Franklin Floete is especially to be thanked for his sensible alternative proposal to erect a triple court building in Southwest Washington. It is particularly encouraging to see the legislation introduced in Congress by Senators DOUGLAS, GRUENING, HENNINGS, HUMPHREY, KENNEDY, MANSFIELD, MORSE, and MURRAY and by Representatives THOMPSON and McDOWELL. The General Federation of Women's Clubs and the National Federation of Music Clubs have shown a determined interest in preserving Lafayette Square; and their support is invaluable and of special significance because it does not represent purely local interests. And finally, our thanks should go to Carl Levin for his initiative and energy in forming the Citizens Committee To Save Lafayette Square.

FREDERICK HAUPT III.

Freedom Academy Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement, prepared by me, relating to Senate bill 1689, to create a Freedom Commission and Freedom Academy charged with undertaking a development and training program aimed at developing an integrated cold war operational science and training Government personnel, private citizens and foreign students in this science.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

Senate Judiciary Committee approval of the Freedom Academy bill may well be historically marked as the turning point upon which this Nation's fight for freedom in the cold war struggle against communism began to yield the returns of victory through the erosion and eventual demise of the Red conspiracy's drive for world domination.

While those who have carried on the campaign for the Academy would have preferred to have such a program of counteraction in operation long before now, nevertheless, the committee action comes at a most propitious time, for the echoes of Communist success in fomenting the riotous acts of a minority of Japanese still ring in our ears.

The riots in Japan, unfortunately, are an excellent demonstration of Communist techniques—developed in the hard schools of political warfare over a period of 40 years—which have led to the conquest and subjugation of nearly a billion people.

There is no question in my mind that with final enactment of this legislation establishing the Freedom Academy as a permanent weapon in our cold war arsenal, our Nation, as leader of the Free World, can sustain a systematic, coordinated economic, political and psychological campaign which can perhaps be one of the most important factors for attaining permanent world peace. The Freedom Academy can be of substantial force in bringing to an end despotic, tyrannical oppression by the architects and practitioners of an ideology that is a disease of the mind in building false hopes of materialistic success when at the same time it destroys the fruits of such success by wiping out the fundamental, moral foundation of dignity and freedom of the individual.

The two broad objectives of this bill, I believe, provide this Nation with the organizational means to meet our cold war development training needs in such manner as to bring the full strength of our tremendous moral, spiritual, intellectual, and physical capacity to bear in this struggle for survival.

These objectives as outlined in the Committee report are:

1. To develop an integrated operational science for our side which will meet the entire Soviet political-economic attack and work toward our national objectives in a systematic manner, utilizing all potential means in the public and private sectors which are in accord with the ethics of free men faced with a Soviet-type challenge.

2. To train Government personnel, private citizens, and foreign students in this science.

The cold war in which we are engaged has been clearly defined in an editorial by Life magazine (February 18, 1959) when it said, in presenting arguments for establishment of a Freedom Academy:

"The gap (in the range of weapons with which we are fighting the cold war) lies between our military preparedness at one end and our conventional diplomacy at the other. On this wide and surging central front we presently deploy a few smidgens of propaganda, economic aid and covert intelligence activties. To the Communists, on the other hand, this is the most important front of all. Throughout it, and in depth, they deploy all those techniques of political warfare, both overt and covert, which are the day-and-night work of the world's Communist Parties and which were known to Lenin, their inventor, as the organizational weapon.

"The weapon with and without the help of military threats, is chiefly responsible for all the gains the Communists have made since World War II. It becomes more potent with their rising capacity for economic and technical and cultural exports. Neither the Red Army nor straight Marxist propaganda, with all their power, could alone have created student riots * * * frustrated the parliamentary system of Italy, won an election in the most literate State of India * * * retained key footholds in the British and American labor movements * * * dazzled the opening mind of Africa, or poisoned strategic corners of press and university opinion from Paris to Tokyo. These are organizational successes, the fruit of long and rigorous training of dedicated individuals in a conspiratorial technique."

Life's editors said: "Given the will, the Communist political war can be countered by open and ethical methods which will uphold the values as well as the institutions of freedom." I think these methods can be found in a program such as is contemplated in the Freedom Academy legislation.

America has learned the lessons of hot war. Today we have a Defense Establishment in a state of such combat readiness that it prompts Russian Premier Khrushchev to say that his Moscow comrades would put him in a straitjacket if he thought of waging war.

But it took generations of experience—some of it bitter—to reach the position of military readiness which now exists and to complete a system of hot war training schools such as our military academies, or the National War College, for example.

The cold war which confronts us is as deadly, if not more so, than a hot war. While we are prepared to meet and defeat

any enemy on any front in a hot war, we have yet to develop a coordinated program to attain similar success in the cold war. This, of course, is not difficult to understand, for until the cold war was thrust upon us after World War II, never had we been faced with the type of conflict in which we are now engaged.

The crash of the summit, the riots in Japan, and the monstrous propaganda attacks coming from behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains leave little room for misunderstanding the determination of communism to capture the world. With any lingering doubts removed as to the intentions of the Communists, it seems to me the opportunity is at hand, as the committee points out, to implement this program to develop an integrated, operational science for our side which will meet the entire Communist attack and work toward our long-range national objectives in a coordinated manner, utilizing every area of potential strength.

To those who question the wisdom of looking to new methods and new approaches in the struggle against communism, I call attention to the report of the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. While the portion I cite is brief, I think the report developed in part from Central Intelligence Agency testimony reveals the extent and depth to which the enemies of the free world have gone to undermine and destroy the institutions of freedom.

In substance, the report outlines the fact that the Soviets are operating an extensive system of political warfare training schools and development centers at Moscow, Leningrad, Tashkent, Prague, and elsewhere on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Some of these schools, like the Lenin Institute of Political Warfare, began operating in the mid-twenties. The center at Prague specializes in training Latin Americans and Africans, while the school at Tashkent trains Communists from the Islamic countries. The top schools in Russia, China, and Czechoslovakia are not narrow trade schools, but comprehensive training centers giving detailed instruction in the vast field of political warfare and supporting subjects, with courses often running 2 or 3 years in length.

Significantly, the training of Latin Americans was stepped up in 1956 and in that year Red China began operating a parallel system of schools for Latin American Communists. And with the harangues of the Cuban Red Dictator Fidel Castro slapping us in the face nearly every morning as we pick up our newspaper, the committee comment that "one lone Freedom Academy, costing a fraction of the Cuban sugar subsidy, can lay the foundation for a major breakthrough" is even more revealing as we consider what can be a positive, direct, forceful step toward launching an offensive that can strengthen the free world alliance, raise anew the hopes of mankind everywhere, and dash forever the ambitions of power-mad rulers who threaten to bury us.

I am hopeful that despite the few remaining days in this session of Congress, the leadership of the Senate will bring this important, vital legislation to a vote.

Lassie Leaguers in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement, by me, relating to Lassie Leaguers in New York.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In these times of intense work, it is both refreshing and rewarding to take note of an organization devoted simply to recreation—the Lassie Leagues. Lassieball is similar to baseball, indeed it is a part of baseball. It gives girls aged 10–15 a chance to play a game organized on the national level. Nearly 10,000 girls are now playing the game across the country. In Albany, N.Y., alone, 500 girls are playing. One hundred and fifty girls play in the two leagues at Rochester, and new leagues undoubtedly will be formed. New York is proud to see such great interest in Lassie Leagues within the State. Opportunity for physical training is important to a young person's education, and the Lassie League provides just this opportunity. Fitness has always been a desirable goal for the men of this country, but it is equally vital for women as well. In playing Lassieball, girls can work toward fitness while gaining a sense of the excitement of winning and the acceptance of being a good loser. I think we need to recognize more the value of athletics in recreation and to salute the Lassie Leagues for helping our youth to do so.

American Veterans Committee Platform on International Affairs, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the international affairs platform of the American Veterans Committee, as adopted at its 1960 convention:

AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE PLATFORM ON INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS, 1960

I

1. The American Veterans Committee has as its central concern a more stable world. But a stable world is not an unchanging world. The first requirement for American diplomacy is that it identify itself sympathetically with those changes that can lead to greater freedom from want and from fear.

2. We believe that our Nation's security requires continuous collaboration between the United States and other countries for the preservation of peace, the improvement of living standards, and the enjoyment of personal liberties. At the same time, just as the welfare of the American veteran depends upon the health of the whole American community, so does the welfare of the American community depend upon the strength and solidarity of all nations that are or aspire to be free.

Moreover, the standing of the United States abroad will in great measure be determined by what we do within our country. Specifically, the military capacity to resist aggression, whether nuclear or conventional, wherever and in whatever form aggression may occur, is an indispensable foundation of a successful foreign policy.

Such a foreign policy also demands that we produce and develop those goods, services, and new ideas which will satisfy essential domestic needs and the greater needs of less-privileged peoples. The present rate of U.S. economic growth is inadequate to meet the needs.

And, finally, no foreign policy will be persuasive for the other peoples of the world until the American Government takes positive action for the discontinuance of racial and religious discrimination in political, economic, and social activities in its own country.

3. The people of the United States and its Government are firmly committed against war as an instrument of national policy. This commitment is an inalterable fact of American life. Further than that, the people of the United States and its Government recognize their responsibility in the maintenance of peace and the raising of living standards throughout the world. Since World War II any significant remnants of isolationism have disappeared. As a nation, we have recognized our responsibilities as one of the greatest world powers. Consistently with our basic policy of peaceful resolution of international controversies we led in formation of the U.N.

From the adoption of the United Nations Charter to the end of the Korean conflict the United States has led the world in combating the economic conditions that lead to war. Of all this, we in AVC are proud.

For some years past, however, the foreign policy of the United States has been limited to "holding the line" against aggression and has largely been one of reaction to Communist initiatives rather than positive action based on an affirmative and consistent policy of our own.

As the Soviet Union has created periods of "cold war" or of "peaceful coexistence" the United States has moved from brinksmanship to summitry. As a result the traditional methods of diplomacy have suffered and the importance of the U.N. declined. But the traditional methods of diplomacy and the U.N. are calculated to develop responsible relations and peaceful solutions of controversies between states. In an increasingly complicated world these institutions become even more important.

Replacing these methods by personal diplomacy can only lead to confusion and discord and can only serve the purposes of those who seek to frustrate responsible agreements among nations.

The fiasco of the recent summit meeting at Paris is a glaring proof of the need to return to the traditional methods of diplomacy and a greater utilization of the United Nation's machinery. Periodic meetings of the heads of governments of the great powers are certainly necessary, but it is our belief that these can best be held within the United Nations Security Council under the procedures established by article 28 of the charter.

Further than that, rapid emergence of new nations toward independence requires the strengthening of the existing international machinery in order that they may develop in a responsible and constructive way. In this connection we believe that, to an increasing extent, international aid should be channeled and harmonized through the United Nations, on the basis of long-term planning, and long-term commitments.

With this being so, ways must be found to include within the United Nations all nations, including the Peoples Republic of China.

4. Too often our foreign policy has not been sufficiently attuned to world realities and our Government has been unwilling or unable to anticipate things to come. Too often Americans have been preoccupied with the menace of communism to the exclusion of all else, and our leaders have shown neither the imagination nor the daring to risk new approaches to peaceful settlements. The assumption of our foreign policy has been that if the status quo vis-a-vis the

Communist world can only be preserved long enough, the Communist world will collapse under the weight of its own injustices and inconsistencies. The history of recent years demonstrates the futility and danger of that assumption.

II

5. Yet, however, interdependent the world has become through technology, it remains sharply divided in a variety of other ways. On one level, it is split among the Communists, the anti-Communists, and those who are neither. We are obliged to recognize the differing demands that each of these worlds makes upon U.S. foreign policy and to recognize at the same time the divergent interests within each world.

6. There is first of all the Communist challenge. It requires that the military defenses of the non-Communist world be made progressively stronger and more flexible. We hope, however, that the leaders of all nations are aware that in this nuclear missile age the avoidance of war between major powers has become an essential. The controlled reduction of all armaments and the abolition of atomic weapons must continue to be a central objective of U.S. policy—a disarmament which is reliably policed and enforced. Meanwhile, we cannot in safety discount the influence of Sino-Soviet military power and the threat of blackmail implicit in that power.

7. At the same time, greater emphasis should be given by the United States to diplomatic initiatives, which demonstrates our Nation's unflagging interest in achieving a more peaceful, free, and prosperous world. Our governments should, for example, press forward with a program through which all peoples may benefit from the peaceful uses of atomic energy. We believe, further, that the Sino-Soviet challenge at this point is a challenge to the Western World's capacity to associate itself constructively with the struggle of nations, in Africa, Asia, Latin America, and the Middle East, to raise their living standards and to achieve a democratic society.

8. We welcome the interchange of persons between the United States and Communist countries and hope that the present exchange program will be considerably strengthened and broadened. We believe that such a program should emphasize exchanges in matters of health, rehabilitation of the disabled, science, and other technical fields. We support President Eisenhower's proposal for exchanges of thousands of students between American and Russian universities and only regret that no steps were taken to implement this proposal.

III

9. It is essential that our Government form its foreign policies in concert with all our friends so that at all times there shall be the widest possible consensus on how best to deal with threats to peace and freedom.

This brings us to America's relations with its allies. We believe our Government should think and act on the realistic basis of cooperation between consenting partners. This requires a sharing of decisionmaking between the United States and friendly governments on problems which directly affect their interests. And this applies not only to Western Europe but to Latin America and elsewhere. If division and discord among non-Communist nations is a prime Sino-Soviet objective, and we believe it is, the closing of ranks and the building of confidence among non-Communist nations should be a prime objective of U.S. policy. The American Veterans Committee supports measures which promote the unity of the non-Communist world through political consultation, the lowering of trade barriers and in certain instances the pooling of ideas and resources for mutual benefits and the active fostering of the European Common Market, the free trade area, and the budding Latin American Common Market.

We should reassure the Latin American countries that we respect thier sovereignty and act accordingly. Our actions should consistently show that we regard them as equal partners in the Organization of American States rather than as second class states. Instead of carrying on a day-to-day program of expediency, we should, as part of a long-range policy, intensify our programs to help the Latin American nations achieve economic advancement and political stability.

10. We believe that the United States has much to learn from as well as give to the peoples of Asia, the Middle East, Latin America, and Africa, and that underdeveloped areas can be helped to progress along their own lines of development. A diplomacy which succeeds with these many races and histories must be sensitive to local traditions, aspirations, and materials needs. Foreign economic assistance, technical cooperation and long-term loans repayable at low interest rates all on a scale far beyond that presently in effect—are required from the United States in order to remove dangerous inequalities of opportunity, as well as to counter enterprising Sino-Soviet trade operations in these areas.

11. Nor should we expect in exchange for such assistance that less developed nations will approve of U.S. foreign policies or that they will spurn whatever assistance may be offered them by the Communist world. Our Government cannot command cooperation; it can only encourage it by respectful, generous, and continuing interest in the rapid development of those countries. That development should have high priority in our national thinking. For we know that if present trends continue, despite assistance presently being given, the gap between the industrialized nations of the West and the underdeveloped regions will become wider, not narrower. And the Communist world, pointing to the rapid technological advances of the Soviet Union and Communist China as examples, will do all it can to convince the underdeveloped nations that progress demands the kind of collective organization championed by communism. The alternative path to progress, one consistent with free association and humane values, must be made to work.

12. The American Veterans Committee supports the peaceful settlement of international disputes and a strengthened United Nations. The peace for which we work, like the disarmament we seek, will not come from capitulation to aggressive threats; it will come from courageous, intensive effort to harmonize the positive purposes of the United States with the needs of the world at large.

13. Finally, the prime task of nations in this second half of the 20th century is to find a method of banning war. Both the United States and the U.S.S.R., regardless of which may have the preponderance of power, are now capable of destroying each other as well as scarring all humanity on this planet for all time to come. All nations must find the means somehow of surmounting the barriers of ideology, mistrust, and past errors on both sides so that the prophecy will be realized: "Neither shall man know war any more."

Address of Hon. Michael A. Feighan of Ohio, Before the Donauschwaben Society of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 12, 1960, the Donauschwaben Society of the United States held its annual meeting in Cleveland, Ohio. The Donauschwaben people were among the many who were dispossessed and pauperized by the Russian Communists during and immediately following World War II. Many of these victims of Red tyranny have come to our shores and here they have built a new life in freedom for themselves and for their families. A deeply religious and hard-working people, they look to the United States to give vigorous leadership to the cause of justice as the key to a lasting peace.

Under leave obtained, I include in the RECORD my address "The Donauschwaben People Look for Justice":

I am happy to have this opportunity to attend this national meeting of the Donauschwaben (Dough-na-schwa-ben) and to say a few words of greeting. At the outset, I want to commend Reverend Sulzer for the wonderful work he has done and I am confident will continue to do, for the Donauschwaben people here in Cleveland. He deserves the grateful thanks of all present here for his untiring efforts and sacrifices in the cause. You have a fine man as president of the Cleveland chapter, Mr. Anton Rumpf, who is equally concerned with the future welfare of your people; good leadership is the requisite to happy results and I am sure you have enjoyed both.

It was some years ago that I became acquainted with the Donauschwaben people. The circumstances were not happy ones because it had to do with the expulsion of all people of German Ethnic origin from the nations and territories occupied by the Red army. As a member of the Judiciary Committee I made a number of official visits to Europe immediately following the war to study the plight of the homeless and dispossessed. I was concerned with all who were so stricken regardless of their ethnic origin or country of nationality. The magnitude of this problem in the years 1945 to 1948 was such as to cause some people to throw up their hands in despair. I was not among them. This, I felt, was the greatest of our immediate postwar problems because it involved millions of innocent people. A solution to this problem had to be found, a solution which met the requirements of justice.

Sufficient time has passed to permit an objective examination of the reasons which led the Russian Communists and their collaborators to expel the people of German Ethnic origin from homelands they had enjoyed for centuries. I see these as the major reasons:

1. Most of these people were dedicated Christians, people who clung to their faith in the face of all odds. As such they would find all the works and demands of communism as repulsive, as something to be fought.

This attitude would lead to resistance against the new order the Russians planned to impose upon the people. Thus, the Russians decided forced expulsion was in the interest of communism. This would mean fewer people to control and fewer problems for their police state methods.

2. Communist functionaries were demanding loot and reward for their collaboration with the Russians. By expropriating all the property held by the people of German ethnic origin and expelling them, the Russians would acquire a rich treasure of loot which they could share with their hired hands in the countries occupied by the Red army. The record of performance tells us this is exactly what they did. But the record also tells us that many of those who collaborated with the Russians to share in this loot were later liquidated by the Russians—a just reward for their treasonable services.

3. The Russians were convinced that by throwing some 10 million homeless and pauperized people upon the war-torn economies of Germany and Austria they would create chaos and insoluble human problems—the grounds upon which the Communist vulture feeds. They believed the people of the western world would lack the courage and spirit of sacrifice required to resolve this great human problem. But here they were wrong. We have reduced the size of the problem to manageable proportions, we have found new homelands for several millions of the dispossessed, we have provided economic programs for the assimilation of more millions of people in the Federal Republic of Germany, we have utterly defeated the hopes of the Russians for chaos and civil disorder on a scale which would make Communist takeover of Germany possible. What we have done has not fully compensated the individuals who were deprived of their rights, property, and heritage by these Russian expulsions but we have acted in the spirit of justice. Time and the scales of international justice, we know, will take care of the rest.

The United States became a haven for over 400 thousand of the dispossessed and homeless of all creeds, all nationalities and all ethnic origins. There were those who sought to exclude persons of German ethnic origin from the right to participate in our resettlement programs. They sought to blame the expellees for the crimes of the Nazis, being blind to the fact that the expellees were equal victims of tyranny and inhumanities, that they were human beings with the same problems, the same hopes and the same rights before God as all the rest of the displaced. Any effort to discriminate against people on the basis of their ethnic origin is completely un-American. That is why Congress provided opportunities for your people to come to America and here to build a new life in freedom. I have always been proud of the part I played in making this possible. My efforts have been amply rewarded by the fine record of achievement and good citizenship your people have made in this land of their adoption.

Let us look for a moment to the Russian problem in its broader context, in the context of their struggle for the world. All thinking people are concerned with the tensions which grip our international life. The Russians have created these tensions during the past 40 years of Communist conspiracy. Today they occupy and enslave more than a score of non-Russian nations with a total population of over 200 million people. They are attempting to put the entire world behind their Iron Curtain, to turn back the pages of history to the dark days of the Mongol khans. Seeing this in its reality has caused freemen to unite, to prepare to meet the challenge, to turn back the Muscovite hordes.

The great question of our times is not summit conferences, it is not personal diplomacy. It is not peaceful coexistence. All these questions have been disposed of by the present administration in Washington. They have disposed of them by proving the utter futility of attempting to resolve the Russian problem by these methods. For this we give them credit, they have performed a useful service, they have proven that no administration can carry on negotiations with the Russians unless it is prepared to agree to concessions which will lead only to war or peaceful surrender.

The time has arrived to take the political offensive against the Russians. We must look forward to the peaceful dismemberment of the present-day Russian Empire—the source of all the world tensions. This can be done by the people of the captive, non-Russian nations if we will give them full moral and political support. There are only 70 million Russians in the U.S.S.R. To this we can add no more than a few thousand non-Russians who are fully collaborating with them in the preservation and extension of the empire. We have several hundred million non-Russian captives behind the Iron Curtain who want the United States and other free nations to collaborate with them in their fight against Russian imperial communism. It is foolhardy on our part to reject their pleas for assistance in destroying the menace which is attempting to destroy our free way of life. This is the only sure course to prevent war, the only road to peace with justice.

I do not believe it is too much for us to believe that the restoration of freedom and national independence to these captive nations will open the door for a just settlement of the injustices done the Donauschwaben people by the Russians and their communistic collaborators in those countries. We Americans believe in justice for all nations and people. This includes the just claims of your people for the properties expropriated by the Russians who occupy these captive nations.

You have found the good life here in the United States of America. You have worked hard for the success you have attained. You have found a new happiness in all the opportunities our free way of life offers to all other people. You are proud of your heritage. You have preserved your culture and the historic aspirations of your people. This is a story of success. It is the American story. This is the story all of us seek to preserve and share with all the nations of the world.

Oversea Refugee Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the following letter which was sent to President Eisenhower by the Nutley Chapter of the American Association for the United Nations:

JUNE 22, 1960.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Nutley Chapter of the AAUN, noting that only one-half of the $10 million made available to the White House contingency fund under section 703 of the Mutual Security Act 1959 has been committed to refugee needs, expresses the hope that you will see fit to allocate the remaining $5 million to oversea refugee programs.

We realize there are many legitimate claims upon the mutual security contingency fund, but we are deeply convinced that refugee needs should be given high priority in order to present to the world a faithful reflection of U.S. leadership and cosponsorship of World Refugee Year.

We know, too, that like all our compatriots, you have a sympathetic concern for these victims of powerful historic forces, of Communist oppression, and of the most cruel social injustices.

During the coming United Nations Week in October, the Nutley Chapter of the AAUN plans to focus special attention on the refugee problem and to collect funds for transmission to the United Nations High Commissioner through the U.S. Committee for Refugees. We feel that our efforts would be very greatly aided if the full $10 million authorized by Congress were utilized to this great humanitarian end.

Respectfully,

C. A. REOPELL,
President, Nutley Chapter, AAUN.

World Refugee Year—Success or Failure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it is just a matter of hours until World Refugee Year becomes history. This year—dedicated to alleviating the plight of the earth's uprooted peoples—is due to end on midnight, June 30.

Some 70 nations of the free world joined in proclaiming World Refugee Year under the auspices of a United Nation's General Assembly resolution adopted in December 1958.

According to the United Nation's resolution the World Refugee Year was to have the following aims: "To focus interest on the refugee problem; to encourage additional financial contributions from governments, voluntary agencies and the general public; to encourage additional opportunities for permanent refugee solutions through voluntary repatriation, resettlement or integration on a purely humanitarian basis."

It is too early to assay the general impact of World Refugee Year upon the total problem toward which it was directed. Indeed, it is hoped that this impact will not cease to be felt with the passing of World Refugee Year, but that the increased efforts and the solutions that were found during the year will continue to be applied as long as world refugee problems remain to be overcome.

There is no single world refugee problem. There are many of them. Someone has said that the refugees are not a stagnant pool but a running stream of humanity. New peoples are constantly joining their ranks, others gradually leaving them.

It is not an easy task to ascertain the nature and extent of the refugee problems throughout the world. A complex

of economic, social, political and humanitarian considerations are involved. These considerations vary with each group of refugees and with each individual within a group. They do not all need, nor do they want, the same type of assistance. They do not all wish, for example, to be moved once more and resettled in a strange and foreign land. Some do. Most, at one time or another, are in need of food, shelter, clothing, and medical care. Others need rehabilitation and training to make them self-sufficient in the environment of their asylum. An unfortunate few will never be totally self-sufficient again.

I believe that a great deal has been accomplished during World Refugee Year that is worthwhile. At the same, the high expectations for this event were to a large extent unfulfilled. No one, of course, expected that all of the problems would be cleared away within the year. But there were many things that might have been done that were not.

There has certainly been a quickening of the public awareness in the United States of the nature and extent of the refugee problems. This was brought about by the publications of the United Nations and through the use of mass media by private organizations such as the U.S. Committee for Refugees.

There have been increased contributions for refugees by private individuals, both in money and the basic necessities, such as food and clothing. Here again the private voluntary refugee agencies are to be credited with having provided the stimulus that sparked these drives. Substantial contributions were made in this field by other private organizations such as the fraternal and benevolent societies, church groups, and the like, that are not normally engaged in refugee activities.

The U.S. Government increased its contribution to the various activities benefiting refugees. Over $70 million was spent on these programs by the United States. This included approximately $40 million for the regular refugee programs, $25 million in surplus foods distributed under Public Law 480, and over $5 million of the $10 million fund specially earmarked for World Refugee Year activities.

The one area, in my opinion, in which we in this country failed to live up to our capabilities is refugee legislation. The Congress alone is responsible for this. What better occasion could we have had to enact a substantial refugee bill, or even to revise our basic immigration law so that more of the world's refugees could be accommodated within its framework?

I, for one, am sadly disappointed with what we shall have to settle for as our legislative contribution to World Refugee Year. This, as it turns out, is House Joint Resolution 397, which at best can be expected to allow about 5,000 refugee-escapees to enter the United States in each of the next 2 years. This joint resolution passed the House in April and was amended and reported out of committee in the Senate last week. I hope it will clear both Houses before adjournment.

The Senate committee's amendments to the joint resolution, I believe, improved it in several particulars but did not broaden it very much in scope. These amendments added a provision committing us to accept up to 500 "difficult to resettle" refugee-escapees. In doing this we will join Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and a number of other countries that have already taken in hardcore refugees, whose needs are the most urgent of all. The Senate committee also amended House Joint Resolution 397 by tacking onto it the provisions of H.R. 10419 which had already passed this House. These provisions extend the alien orphan adoption program under section 4 of the act of September 11, 1957, for 1 year until June 30, 1961, and the Azores and Dutch Indonesian refugee programs for 2 years until June 30, 1962.

One of the shortcomings in the general provisions of House Joint Resolution 397 is that they apply only to refugees under the mandate of the United Nations High Commissioner for refugees. That is, only European refugees can come in under them. Refugees in the Near and Far East are completely excluded from these provisions.

Another shortcoming is that the legislation provides that the United States shall accept only 25 percent of the number of refugees resettled outside the United States. The United States, the free world's wealthiest and most powerful nation, is thus put in the position of being a follower rather than a leader in resettling refugees.

There would, of course, be less need for this country to enact special refugee legislation if its basic immigration laws were not tied to the national origins quota system. The best way to provide permanent refugee relief would be to replace this antiquated and discriminatory system with one that would determine immigration on the basis of need.

Congress has had before it a bill for such a system since 1955. This is the Celler bill first introduced in 1955 and reintroduced in each Congress since that time. Along with a dozen or so of my colleagues I introduced in the present Congress a companion bill to that of the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee.

This bill is a comprehensive omnibus proposal which would completely rewrite the Immigration and Nationality Act. In addition to abolishing the national origins quota system it would enact other needed reforms in our immigration and nationality laws. These include granting increased due process protections in deportation and exclusion procedures; eliminating second-class citizenship provisions for naturalized citizens; and providing greater efficiency in administering the law by an independent commission in place of the dual administration by the Justice Department and the State Department that the present law requires.

I shall not attempt to explain all the details of the substitute provided for in the bill in place of the national origins quota system. The substitute system would be a unified quota system with certain percentages going to five different classes of immigrants from any country in the world.

These classes are:

First. Family reunification, which would include close family relatives of residents of the United States.

Second. Aliens whose skills are urgently needed in the United States.

Third. Those whose admission would help solve economic problems of friendly nations. The Dutch Indonesian refugees are a good example.

Fourth. Those fleeing religious or political persecution.

Fifth. A fifth class would include those who do not fit into any of the four preference groups.

No one nation would receive a preponderant share of immigrant visas, as a percentage limitation would apply apply within each of the five classes of immigrants.

The United States can be justly proud of its efforts to assist the millions of displaced persons and refugees resulting from World War II and ensuing events. During the past 15 years our Government has spent well over a billion dollars for these purposes. The big intergovernmental agencies—the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and the United Nations Relief and Works Agency—would hardly be able able to operate without this country's financial support. More than 700,000 displaced persons and refugees were settled in this country since World War II.

This proud record only adds to my disappointment over our lack of greater accomplishments during World Refugee Year.

Howard "Slim" Suttle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I announce the passing of a long-time member of the Capitol Press Corps, a noted newsman, and my close friend—Howard "Slim" Suttle.

Widely known for his deep and abiding love for Mississippi and her people, Slim Suttle was a competent reporter, having covered the Washington scene for 20 years. He was active in promoting the good qualities of our great State.

He will be missed by those who knew him. My office particularly will not soon forget his friendly greeting. Hardly a day passed but that Slim dropped by, quite often with a Mississippi visitor he was showing around Capitol Hill.

To his wonderful wife, Amelia, and their devoted daughter, Kay, I extend my sincere sympathy.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the news story of his passing from the June 22 issue of the Jackson (Miss.) Daily News, and two editorials

on the life of our departed friend. They follow:

[From the Jackson Daily News, June 22, 1960]

CAPITOL CORRESPONDENT HOWARD SUTTLE, DEAD

Howard "Slim" Suttle, Washington correspondent for the Jackson Daily News and a veteran of more than 30 years in the news writing field, died at Baptist Hospital here early this morning.

Suttle, 52, became ill about 3 o'clock last night at the Heidleberg Hotel and was removed to the hospital about 1:30 a.m. He died at 3:25 a.m.

Cause of death has not been determined.

Wright and Ferguson is in charge of local arrangements, which are incomplete. Burial is expected to be in McComb where Suttle formerly lived.

Suttle was the son of the late Reverend G. H. Suttle, founder of Northside Baptist Church in Jackson.

A native of Louisiana, he moved to McComb in 1930 as city editor of the McComb Daily Journal, now the McComb Enterprise-Journal.

Suttle moved to Washington in 1940 and opened a news bureau there. He served as Washington correspondent for both the Jackson Daily News and the Shreveport, La., Journal. He was also a former staff member of United Press International wire service.

Suttle maintained a voting residence in Pike County, and had been named as a alternate delegate to the National Democratic Convention next month in Los Angeles from the Fourth Congressional District.

He was a member of the National Press Club in Washington and also a member of the Washington professional chapter of Sigma Delta Chi journalism fraternity.

In addition he held membership in both the Mississippi and Louisiana State Societies of Washington.

He was well known among congressional delegations and Government officials in Washington from Mississippi and Louisiana.

Suttle had been in Jackson and McComb for the past several days and was registered at the Heidleberg Hotel here.

After he became ill about 8 p.m. he called State Representative Walter Hester of Adams County, who was in the hotel, about 1 a.m., complaining of abdomen pains.

Suttle was in shock when a physician arrived and was moved to Baptist Hospital about 1:30. He died 2 hours later. The physician said cause of death could not be determined.

Mrs. Suttle, the former Amelia McCarthy of McComb, was in Washington.

She and a daughter, Mrs. Leonard Hearton of Forest Heights, Md., are scheduled to arrive here this afternoon.

In addition to his wife and daughter, Suttle is survived by his mother, Mrs. G. H. Suttle of Monroe, La.; a sister, Mrs. J. Norman Coon of Monroe; and a brother, Spurgeon S. Suttle of Little Rock.

Three grandchildren also survive.

[From the Jackson Daily News, June 23, 1960]

HOWARD SUTTLE, SOUTH'S CHAMP

The sudden and untimely death of Howard "Slim" Suttle, Washington correspondent for the Jackson Daily News and several other southern newspapers, was a deep shock to his family and a host of friends.

Mr. Suttle died at the age of 52 a short time after he was stricken at a downtown hotel where he had been completing arrangements for a series of television and radio broadcasts on the National Democratic Convention in Los Angeles next month.

Mr. Suttle was in the editorial office of this newspaper on Tuesday afternoon after returning from Shreveport where he conferred with the editor of the Shreveport Journal, one of the newspapers he represented in Washington. The veteran newsman was in a cordial and cheerful mood, having enjoyed several days visit in Mississippi from the hectic Washington pace.

A native of Louisiana and a former resident of Jackson and McComb, Mr. Suttle had close personal contacts with some of the highest officials in the Nation's Capital.

He was truly a man who walked with kings but never lost the common touch. He was in love with politics.

Ever friendly, never complaining, Howard Suttle had a tender spot in his heart for the underdog. Nonetheless, he pursued news without fear from any quarter.

Howard Suttle will be missed by a host of friends in all walks of life in Mississippi, in Washington, and in the Southern States which he dearly loved and championed the cause therefor.

Heartfelt sympathy goes out to his widow and relatives.

[From the Jackson Clarion Ledger]

HOWARD SUTTLE WAS AN ABLE JOURNALIST

Journalism has sustained a loss in the untimely passing of Howard "Slim" Suttle, widely known newspaperman of Mississippi and Washington, D.C., who died at the age of 52 after a career of 30 years.

"Slim" Suttle was popular, conscientious, and devoutly loyal to the South. Energetic and resourceful, he established his own news bureau in the National Capital, covering the Washington beat for various southern newspapers.

He had his own inimitable style and the knack of interpreting political events with wisdom, accuracy, and clarity. He was faithful to his profession and distinguished himself as an outstanding journalist.

Many Mississippi leaders at local, State, and National levels have paid impressive tributes to "Slim" Suttle's ability, loyalty, and integrity. Each of these tributes has been well earned and richly deserved.

We join his many friends and contemporaries in extending heartfelt condolences to his loved ones in their time of sorrow. "Slim" Suttle was a credit to the fourth estate and will be greatly missed.

Trouble in San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, on June 22, 1960, a constituent of mine, Mrs. George C. Dreyer of Mountainside, N.J., addressed a communication to the mayor of San Francisco in regard to the recent hearings held by the House Un-American Activities Committee in that city.

Since she has requested me to insert her statement in the RECORD, I am doing so under leave to extend my remarks.

The communication follows:

RE BREAKDOWN IN LAW AND ORDER, THEREFORE SOCIETY

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 2, 1960, page 10921, gives an eyewitness account by seven ministers of the savage treatment permitted members of a duly constituted congressional committee—the House Committee on Un-American Activities—when holding May 12 and 13 hearings in San Francisco.

It was a frightening and unsavory account, to say the least, sir. To me it was a demonstration of a successful attack upon law and order; therefore society, an attack upon everything my family and friends believe in and belong to—decent American society.

I simply had to write you of my feelings of shock and worry at such a riotous happening. It was communism at work in an American city, and I earnestly and most respectfully beseech you, Mr. Mayor, to mark well those responsible for the outrage, and thus gain the thanks and respect of American patriots throughout the whole country.

My Congresswoman, the Honorable FLORENCE P. DWYER, the members of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, and each member of the California congressional delegation and New Jersey congressional delegation have been forwarded a copy of this communication.

Sincerely,

Mrs. GEORGE DREYER.

Helen Keller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the name of Helen Keller, already an inspiration to millions of persons throughout the world was the subject of much discussion this week, which brought her 80th birthday. In this body, Senator LISTER HILL has, in his sponsorship of a bill to offer new honors to Helen Keller, focused attention on her achievements in very dramatic and pertinent fashion.

An editorial in the June 25 edition of the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., also expresses the affection felt for Miss Keller. It also gives a deeply meaningful statement once uttered by her.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HELEN KELLER AT 80, HER LESSON LIVES

Monday will be the 80th birthday of one of the great ladies of our time, Helen Keller.

Stricken totally blind and deaf and virtually speechless at the age of 19 months, Miss Keller's adventurous spirit and dogged determination, aided by the faithful assistance of two other great ladies who have now gone to their reward, led her to triumph over apparently insurmountable obstacles.

Twenty years ago Miss Keller wrote, "The spirit, like the sea, is greater than any island or continent of sense-experience within its waters. * * * My deep-rooted feeling that I am not deaf or blind is like the feeling that I am in the body but not of it. * * * I use my limitations as tools, not as my real self."

Probably no other person of our times has done so much personally to cheer the handicapped, to spur the handicapped along to triumph over their misfortunes. With her teacher, Anne Mansfield Sullivan and her companion, Polly Thompson, Miss Keller traveled the world taking encouragement and help to the blind in institutions on all the continents. Her life was a busy one, full of writing and lecturing.

Then her faithful associates passed on. Now in the sunset years of her life, Miss Keller in retirement still exerts a tremendous influence on the world around her, in her own words still trying to "make the light in others' eyes my sun, the music in others' ears my symphony, the smile on others' lips my happiness."

The March of the Mail Through History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, the importance of our mail system cannot be overemphasized. Its significance in history has been recognized.

Under unanimous consent I am including a column entitled "Topics," from the New York Times for Sunday, June 12, 1960, in which some interesting facts about the history of the mail service are set forth:

TOPICS

TRADITION OF MAIL DELIVERY

Eighty-eight years ago, in the second week of June 1872, the Post Office Department became a separate department of the U.S. Government. The same act of Congress provided that "mail robbery should no longer be punished by death," and in other respects brought postal regulations into harmony with the conditions of the day. Thus was formalized an institution that links our own country with a tradition of mail delivery going back to distant antiquity. The earliest letter carriers were couriers who brought epistles scratched on clay, wax, or bronze directly from sender to receiver. King Sargon of Babylonia founded a royal post in 3000 B.C., and during the first millennium of its existence postal service remained a royal prerogative.

GREEKS AND ROMANS

The Greeks and Romans, who fashioned so much of what we know and appreciate today, perfected the art of delivery by human courier. Speedsters who were messengers, when they were not competing in Olympic Games, were known to cross vast areas in a short time, and one renowned runner, Philonides, once covered 60 miles in 9 hours. To the Greeks, too, we owe the famous inscription gracing the entrance to our town's general post office; the historian Herodotus, writing of the Persian postal system of the sixth century, B.C., said: "Neither snow nor rain nor heat nor gloom of night stays these couriers from the swift completion of their appointed rounds." Credit for the first modern postal system goes, though, to Caesar Augustus, first Roman Emperor. The postal system disintegrated with the collapse of the empire, and Europe lacked organized postal communication until the early 1300's. But other civilizations had picked up the threat. Marco Polo reported 10,000 postal stations in the China of Kublai Khan, believed to have lived from 1215 to 1294, and more than 700 years ago Inca couriers were carrying messages along a 5,000-mile stone road from Colombia to Chile.

BUSINESS BY MAIL

Our own postal system was based largely on the British, whose tradition of having the finest in the world started when Henry VIII appointed Sir Brian Tuke first "Master of the Posts." Benjamin Franklin, co-deputy Postmaster General of the Colonies from 1753 to 1774 and appointed first Postmaster General by the Second Continental Congress in 1775, was largely responsible for developing our own postal service into an efficient and reliable means of communication. The movement westward in the 1800's not only increased the demand for speedy and efficient postal service but set the stage for the conduct of business by mail. Mail order publications were recognized as aids to the dissemination of knowledge as far back as 1789, and lower postal rates governed them. Pioneers in isolated locations eagerly welcomed items ranging from a squirrel rifle to a complete set of living room furniture—a forerunner of today's direct mail business, which includes everything from a postcard to a 1,500-page catalog.

RISING TO THE CHALLENGE

Today just about everyone with something to sell, teach or preach uses the mails. This includes big and small business, service industries, philanthopies, educational institutions, clubs, labor unions and political candidates. Modern technology and organization have risen to the challenge to our Post Office Department posed by this deluge of mail, estimated at 55 billion pieces a year, more mail than is handled by all the rest of the post offices of the world put together. In 1943 a postal zoning system was started to expedite mail handling and delivery. In 1947 helicopter mail service was started in Los Angeles, and "talking mail boxes" were introduced here in New York in 1956. Last year a Regulus I guided missile, launched from a submarine 100 miles off the Florida coast, carried 3,000 letters to a safe landing 22 minutes later at the Mayport Naval Auxiliary Air Station near Jacksonville. This marked the first official use of missiles by any post office of any nation. Such an event gives rise to the thought that rockets may carry mail from the earth to the moon in less time than it once took a pony express rider to gallop from Dodge City to Tucson.

Increase in Informal Entry Ceiling Would Cut Costs of Small Businessmen

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 9240, to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 so as to authorize informal entries of merchandise where the aggregate value of the shipment does not exceed $400.

This is not a tariff cutting bill, Mr. Speaker. It could be accurately described as a redtape cutting measure for the relief of small businessmen.

If enacted, this bill would not change the amount of duty collected on imported merchandise. It would, however, eliminate a considerable amount of paperwork for jewelers and other small businessmen on small shipments of goods for retail sale. Tourists and travelers also would benefit from a higher informal entry limit.

The Department of Commerce, in its favorable report on my bill, explained that informal entries are distinguished from regular entries in that a short written form and less complicated customs procedures apply to shipments qualifying for informal entry.

The original ceiling of informal entries was $100. This was increased to $250 by the Customs Simplification Act of 1953. Although my bill would increase this limit to $400, it is certainly true that there has been considerable price inflation since 1953. It is probable that a $400 limit would permit a small businessman to use the informal entry method for about the same quantity of merchandise as was possible under the $250 limit 7 years ago.

The informal entry method is particularly useful for shipments by mail. Such shipments are examined by customs officers and the amount of duty is ascertained. Then they are delivered by the postal service to the addressee who pays the duty and whatever tax may be applicable. In contrast, shipments over $250 are mailed to the customs office nearest the addressee. The addressee is notified by mail that his shipment has arrived. He or his authorized agent must appear personally at the customs office to file an entry with supporting invoice, entry bond and any other necessary documents. After payment of duties and taxes, the shipment then may be released.

Besides being less burdensome to the small businessman, the informal entry method, is much less expensive. Since many of the retailers affected operate on a small profit margin, the difference in importing costs is often the difference between profit or loss.

It is for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, that I urge the House to follow the unanimous recommendation of the Ways and Means Committee and pass this bill.

U.S. Labor Against Fidel Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include an illuminating article, "U.S. Labor Against Fidel Castro," by Dr. Emilio Nunez Portuondo, former president of the Security Council of the United Nations. This piece shows that only one political party is allowed to function in Cuba today, the organization set up and controlled by Soviet China and the Kremlin. In short, Nikita Khrushchev and the Soviet "Gauleiter of China," Mao Tse-tung, are collaborating in the domination of the Castro brothers, Fidel and Raul. Working people are the first victims and principal slaves of the regime. Fortunately, the AFL–CIO executive council, on May 4, 1960, expressed itself on this subject. The ar-

ticle is included at this point in the RECORD:

[From Latin American Events, May 16, 1960]

U.S. LABOR AGAINST FIDEL CASTRO

With great satisfaction, we turn over the editorial space of this issue to the AFL–CIO executive council, which on May 4 released a very significant statement sustaining the anti-Castro prodemocratic position of this newsletter.

U.S. workers, patriotically, and with much more perspicacity than the "experts," recognize the fact that Cuba is in the hands of international communism, that the Cuban situation constitutes a problem threatening the security of the entire hemisphere, especially the United States.

Is U.S. labor to be classified as alarmist, or will the required measures be taken with the necessary urgency to prevent the entire hemisphere from being turned into a concentration camp run by Soviet Russia and Red China?

Wrote this great organization of workers, "Since the fall of the Batista dictatorship in Cuba, the AFL–CIO has expressed on several occasions its complete support of the Cuban people's efforts to rebuild the political and economic structure of their country on the basis of social justice, freedom, civic morality, and human rights.

"We have also offered our cooperation to the Cuban labor movement in whatever action might be required to maintain it truly independent and democratic, free of Communist influence and solely responsible to the will of its members.

"In the early months of the Fidel Castro regime, we shared with other true friends of Cuban democracy, the misgivings caused by the initial excesses of the revolution; but we also shared the hope that democratic processes would soon be restored, so that the many long overdue economic reforms would get underway. The Cuban people could then utilize the resources of their country for improving their social and economic conditions and strengthening their democratic institutions.

"Events in Cuba have taken, however, quite a different turn. The latest manifestations of the Castro regime have revealed unmistakable signs of a definite trend toward a totalitarian state. This is based upon the technique of regimentation and militarization of the masses to a degree comparable to the practices prevailing under Fascist or Communist regimes.

"The Cuban Confederation of Labor has become a mere appendage of the Government under complete control of pro-Communist elements imposed from above without consideration of the will of the rank and file.

"Loyalty to democratic principles and opposition to communism has been branded by Castro's government as synonymous with counterrevolutionary activity, punishable with discharge from the job, immediate arrest, and loss of property.

"The right of collective bargaining has been abolished. As in countries behind the Iron Curtain, Cuban workers are no longer free to change jobs without Government approval.

"Hiring and firing have become the prerogative of the Government. The quest for economic improvement, a legitimate trade union activity, has been banned.

"Cuban Government spokesmen have asserted that the people will not be given in the foreseeable future the right to choose their leaders through the process of democratic elections. The courts have been submitted to the arbitrary will of the executive. The right of habeas corpus has been indefinitely suspended.

"The Communist Party is the only political party which is free to operate today in Cuba. Opposition newspapers have been forced to close. Democratic journalists, who distinguished themselves in opposition to the Batista regime, have been forced into exile for insisting upon their right to criticize the pro-Communist policy of the present government.

"These actions on the part of the Castro regime in Cuba have shocked the democratic public opinion of the Western Hemisphere, particularly those sectors which rejoiced over the victory of the revolutionary forces in January 1959, and have consistently supported the economic reforms and other social objectives once proclaimed by the revolution.

"The Cubans, our traditional friends, are being subjected to an intensive violent campaign of hatred and scorn against the United States. This has been aggravated by the repudiation, on the part of the Castro regime, of the treaties which are the foundation of our inter-American system. These treaties bind the countries of the Western Hemisphere to respect each others' sovereignty and pledge them to unite against external aggression and internal Communist subversion.

"The disruptive activities of the Cuban Government can no longer be lightly dismissed as outbursts of inexperienced, youthful leaders swept by the upsurge of economic nationalism.

"They have all the earmarks of a well-planned strategy designed to make Cuba an advanced outpost of the Soviet Union's drive to infiltrate the new world.

"The AFL–CIO has consistently advocated that dictatorships have no place in the world and particularly in our inter-American system. We have consequently urged, time and time again, the Organization of American States (OAS) to isolate the dictatorship of the Dominican Republic and similar regimes which do not emanate from the freely expressed will of the people.

"We have also urged the OAS to take firm steps to prevent these dictatorships from endangering the peace of the Americas with their constant subversive plots against neighboring democratic regimes.

"We now believe with its repudiation of the existing inter-American treaties and its purposeful, violent, and slanderous anti-U.S. campaign, tailored on the Communist pattern, the Castro government is endangering the peace of the Western Hemisphere.

"We call upon the American family of nations, through the instrumentality of the OAS, to be alert to the danger that the Castro regime and other dictatorships represent to democratic stability and the peace and progress of the Americas. The OAS has in its charter sufficient provisions to enable it to take collective measures to protect the peaceful democracies from the aggressive designs of the dictators and from the subversive actions of international communism.

"The AFL–CIO sends the Cuban people renewed expressions of support for their aspirations of economic reforms capable of bringing higher standards of living, social justice, national economic independence, and democratic freedoms.

"We also send fraternal assurance of solidarity to the free trade unionists of Cuba, now fighting to rescue their labor movement from the presently imposed, pro-Communist, totalitarian control. We are with them with the same spirit and determination that has inspired the AFL–CIO to oppose dictatorship and totalitarian rule of every color and kind, in every part of the world."

Thus ends U.S. labor's indictment of Fidel Castro. We would like to add only one point to this great declaration of the AFL–CIO. (Incidentally, all of the facts and conclusions mentioned therein can be found in past editions of Latin American Events.) We hope and pray, for the well being of the Americas, especially the United States, that the opinions of organized labor will be taken into account by those officials responsible for policymaking decisions on the tragic Cuban situation.

Where Big Crops Are No Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a visitor from Pakistan has, within recent weeks, worked at my office while pursuing his studies of agricultural policymaking in the United States. He is Aslam Zafar, District Director of Agriculture in the Karachi Federal District.

In a recent interview with George Kentera, Washington staff reporter for the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, Mr. Zafar gave his opinions on problems that perplex us in this Nation and problems of concern in his home nation.

His comments, as reported by Mr. Kentera, offer an interesting commentary on matters of interest to everyone concerned with the international food shortages and surpluses which exist incongruously today. The interview also gives us Mr. Zafar's reactions to the American system of government.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHERE BIG CROPS ARE NO PROBLEM—PAKISTAN EXPERT SAYS FOOD-SHORT LANDS WELCOME "TROUBLE" LIKE OURS

(By George Kentera)

WASHINGTON.—One of this Nation's most vexying problems, its growing crop surpluses, doesn't seem horrendous at all to someone from a food-deficient land.

"I'd be willing to turn in my problems for yours," say Aslam Zafar of Pakistan.

The 36-year-old Zafar does have problems. They center around his efforts to produce enough food on 200,000 acres for the 2 million persons in the district of Karachi's 800 square miles of territory.

District director of agriculture, Zafar holds a master's degree in agriculture from Cornell University (1953) and a similar degree from the University of Pakistan. He has been in this country since November, studying U.S. agriculture under sponsorship of the Asia Foundation and the American Political Science Association, and he is presently working in the office of Senator WILLIAMS, Democrat, of New Jersey.

SEEK UNDERSTANDING

"Our main purpose," he says of himself and similar visitors, "is to understand the democratic system as it relates to agriculture policymaking and legislation; also, to observe your general democratic system of government."

Like many Americans, Zafar disagrees with the policies of Agriculture Secretary Benson.

"Benson says there should be no agriculture controls, free production, and less parity," he says. "But you are spending $1½ million a day to store your surpluses. This calls for more controls, high parity, and a distribution program of surplus food in the United States and abroad.

"There is no need to discourage your farmers from producing more, because this is the only field in which the United States has a clear lead.

"Americans should be proud of their capability to feed the world, in 10 years, it may not be the same."

SO NEEDED

In Pakistan, which is deficient in food but an exporter of such crops as jute and cotton, incentives are being offered farmers to produce more. This year, the Central Food and Agriculture Ministry established a floor price for wheat and may extend it to rice.

"Food is so needed abroad that maybe Americans can't visualize the conditions," he says. Zafar is a supporter of the food-for-peace plan offered by Senator HUMPHREY, Democrat of Minnesota, under which surplus foods would be offered to the United Nations for distribution to needy lands.

He has pertinent statistics at his fingertips. He cites figures to show that shipping the food abroad to non-Communist nations would cost only half as much as storing it in this country.

COMPENSATION

Zafar also feels a plan could be worked out that would not depress the international market for other food-exporting nations. If, for instance, Pakistan buys 100,000 bushels of wheat a year from Canada, he says, an agreement could be made binding his country to continue such purchases despite commodities it might receive under the food plan.

In his work at home, Zafar is immersed in programs of land reform and farmer education. Pakistan farmers did not use fertilizer until 1950, and many still believe it to be a poison.

The holdings of large landowners are being broken up in a program which may take 25 years. No one may own more than 1,000 acres of nonirrigated land, of 500 acres of irrigated land. Attempts are being made to raise small farms to at least 12½ acres.

The large landholders will be paid for their land over a 20-year period; the small farmers who gain land will have to pay for it over a 25-year period.

While Zafar sometimes expresses bewilderment at the American system of government, he nevertheless believes that the American system of area representation—in both the Senate and House—is worthwhile.

"Of course, there is a human factor," Zafar says. "People like to please those who help them during the elections."

But he finds this closeness between legislators and the electorate to be, in general, a good thing. Last year, he says, an Agriculture Advisory Committee was formed in Pakistan to represent the farmers; it drew its inspiration from the American system of congressional representation, and the local farmers contributed ideas which are being incorporated in the district's program.

Zafar, who is in this country with his wife Shirien, was born and reared on a farm in a village in the district of Jullundur. Before he returns home this summer, he will visit a group of California farmers, near Sacramento, who immigrated here from that village.

The National Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to commend to the attention of my colleagues an article written by Walter Lippmann in the June 20 issue of Life magazine.

The article is another in the fine series on defining America's national purpose, and its title is suggestive of its theme, "The Country Is Waiting for Another Innovator."

Mr. President, this is an article of nourishing wisdom, and I want to quote a few passages from it:

To use increments of our growing wealth wisely and prudently for public and immaterial ends: that is the goal, so I believe, toward which our national purpose will now be directed. We have to pay for defense, and there can be no serious dispute that we must pay for it. But we have also to be able and willing to pay for the things which cannot be consumed privately, such as the education of children, the development of beautiful cities and the advancement of knowledge. We have to be willing and able to pay for what is, to put it briefly, civilization itself.

At bottom, we have to do these things because they need to be done, because they have to be done, and because they are supremely worth doing. Even if we were not challenged, we would need to do them for their own sake. We would need to do them even if Russia were still where it was 50 years ago.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Walter Lippmann's article from the June 20 issue of Life be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COUNTRY IS WAITING FOR ANOTHER INNOVATOR

(By Walter Lippmann)

In a rather special sense Americans have always been a purposeful Nation. For the country is settled by the descendants of people who pulled up their roots in the old societies and crossed the wide ocean for a purpose. Always they came with a sense that they would make for themselves a better life in a new world. They believed that they had new work to do and that all who saw their example would be enlightened and inspired by it.

The bond of American union has not been piety and reverence for the past but a conviction of purpose and of the destiny it would bring for posterity. America has always been not only a country but a dream. There has always been a general and unquestioned belief that here on this soil there would be demonstrated to mankind the blessings of freedom: as the shackles and servitudes of the past were put away, there would arise a great and glorious society.

And so, until very recently at least, we have looked upon it as in the nature of things that for America nothing is finished, that this is a young Nation. Americans have been a Nation of exuberant optimists, sniffing the air with a buoyant feeling that it is the early morning and that it is good to be alive. Evil and perversities of fate were not more than obstacles to be gotten at and overcome.

There were no insoluble human problems. At the worst, there were problems that it might take a generation or two to master. It never occurred to Americans to ask whether they were going to survive. They had just begun to live. Nor did they worry about the consequences of becoming rich, fat, self-centered, and beset with the illusion that the present can be made to last forever. For they were not yet rich and they had to work hard for a living.

If, as so many of us think today, we are now without such a general and inspired sense of national purpose, where shall we look for the cause and the remedy?

The cause of the vacancy is, I believe, this: We have reached a point in our internal development and in our relations with the rest of the world where we have fulfilled and outlived most of what we used to regard as the program of our national purposes.

We are rather like a man whose purpose it is to cross the continent and, having started from New York, he has gotten to Chicago. Which way shall he go then? There is more than one way to cross the continent, and until he has chosen which way and then has worked out the intermediate stops, he will remain in Chicago, feeling worried and without a sense of direction and of clear purpose.

The American people today are like the man who got to Chicago, who needs a new roadmap to show him the way from there on.

In this century, the sense of national purpose has been a composite wrought under three innovating Presidents, under Theodore Roosevelt, Woodrow Wilson, and Franklin Roosevelt. They led the country on the road which it has taken for some 50 years—since America emerged as a great power in the world, and since at home it has become an evermore industrialized and urbanized society.

Time has passed and history has not stood still. The Roosevelt-Wilson-Roosevelt formulas and policies and programs no longer fit the character of the world Americans are now concerned with, the world as it has developed since the Second World War. We are now waiting to be shown the way into the future. We are waiting for another innovator in the line of the two Roosevelts and Wilson.

The innovator for whom the country is waiting will not come with a new revelation of the ultimate ends and commitments of our society. The ultimate ends are fixed. The Nation is dedicated to freedom. It is dedicated to the rights of man and to government with the consent of the governed. The innovation, which is now beginning, will be in the means, in the policies and programs, by which the ultimate ends of our free society can be realized today.

IT IS NOT THE NATION WHICH IS OLD BUT ONLY ITS LEADERS

My thesis is that to affirm the ultimate ends—as every public man does in almost every speech—is not a substitute for declaring our purpose and leading the Nation. These affirmations are like standing up when "The Star-Spangled Banner" is played, and then doing nothing further. They beg the question, which is not whither the Nation should go but how it should get there.

The remedy, then, will not be found in the restatement of our ideals, however resounding the rhetoric. It will be found in the innovation of the political formulas, the concrete measures, the practical programs by which our ideals can be realized in the greatly changed world we now live in. I feel sure that innovators will appear with the new generation that is rising to power. For it is not the Nation which is old, but only its leaders.

Broadly speaking, there have been two great epochs in our history, each with its own dominant national purpose. The first epoch extended from the middle of the 18th century down through the 19th. Beginning with the colonial wars of the 18th century and then with the founding of the Republic, the central purpose of the American people was to open up the continental territory, to consolidate that territory firmly within the American Nation and to make the territory invulnerably secure against all other powers.

In the pursuit of this purpose the American colonists fought the French and the Indians. The new American Nation fought the British and the Spanish and the Mexicans and the Indians. It fought a great and terrible Civil War to preserve the Union of its territory. Officially it may be said

that this epoch, during which the national purpose was to consolidate the national territory, ended in 1890 when the last of our 37 wars with the Indians was concluded.

After the turn of the century, the original national American purpose having been fulfilled, an new epoch began. It began, we may say, with Theodore Roosevelt's recognition that the United States was no longer a sheltered and semidependent nation but that, having settled the continental territory, it had become one of the great powers. Roosevelt, who was a far-seeing innovator, saw too that the United States was no longer a rural nation of independent farmers. Increasingly, it was becoming an industrial society inhabited by great corporations which exercised powers that often challenged the authority of the established Government itself.

The innovation begun by Roosevelt was carried further by Woodow Wilson. Wilson accepted reluctantly the burden of our being a great power. When he was forced into the First World War he attempted to define a national purpose which would reduce that burden. He began by declaring that the world must be made safe for democracy and ended by demanding that it become democratic.

This has proved to be an aspiration rather than a purpose, policy or program. For had it become a national purpose, the Nation would have found itself committed to a perpetual crusade and, therefore, to perpetual war. Nevertheless the aspiration, though it is quite unrealizable in a very great part of the world, has become an element of the Amercan conscience. Even when we feel compelled to subsidize some of our more primitive clients the Wilsonian ideology makes us uneasy and embarrassed.

When Franklin Roosevelt became President he found himself, rather unexpectedly, confronted with the breakdown of the established economic order. Contrary also to his hope and to his expectations, he was confronted with the rise of a new thing in modern history—the monster of the totalitarian state. Necessity became the mother of invention. It demanded the improvization of a new national purpose in domestic and in foreign affairs. The innovations of Franklin Roosevelt were an grand improvization.

From the New Deal, particularly from the second phase of it when Roosevelt turned from a planned economy to a compensated economy, the present generation of Americans have inherited the formulas of their political actions. They have inherited the compensated economy and the welfare state, and no serious person in either party would now propose to repeal and undo them.

In foreign affairs, the country learned in the Second World War that it was no longer one among many great powers but that in fact it was the leading power upon which the whole Western World depended for its security and for leadership. This is a burden and a responsibility and a danger and a demand upon our resources and a test of our wisdom which the first Roosevelt and Wilson never anticipated, but which the second Roosevelt began to be aware of from about the middle of the war to the time of his death.

In the 15 years which have passed since the end of the Second World War the condition of mankind has changed more rapidly and more deeply than in any other period within the experience of the American people. There has been a swift and radical change in the balance of power in the world. Among the masses of the people in the underdeveloped countries in all the continents there is a mounting revolution. There is a radical change in the technology of war and of industry. There is in the United States and other countries a threatening agglomeration of peoples in cities. There is a menacing increase in world population. There is a development of the mass media of communication which, because it marks a revolution in popular education and in the presentation of information, and in the very nature of debate and deliberation, is affecting profoundly the assumptions of the older democratic system.

IN PART WE HAVE OUTLIVED OUR OLD PURPOSES, IN PART THEY ARE IRRELEVANT

Nobody, it is fair to say, not the most sensitive and knowing among us, is as yet able to realize fully what all these changes mean and to point out specifically how this country should deal with them. But what we do know is that the formulations of national purpose which were made in the first half of this century are now inadequate. In part we have fulfilled them. In part we have outlived them. In part they have become irrelevant because of the unexpected changes in the condition of things. In part they are out of focus. All in all, they do not now mobilize our energies.

Necessity will again be the mother of invention, and in the time to come we shall close the gap which now exists between the new realities and the old formulations of our national purpose. I do not presume to anticipate the innovators for whom we are waiting. But there is already visible, it seems to me, the shape of the land across which the innovators must lead the Nation.

Thus for the first time in American experience we are confronted with a rival power which denies the theory and the practice of our society, and which has forced upon us a competition for the leadership of the world. This challenge coincides with the radically new fact that the oceans have ceased to be our ramparts and that our land is no longer invulnerable.

As there is no chance that our immensely formidable rival will disarm or disappear, we shall have to live in the same world with him. We shall have to solve problems which did not exist for Wilson or for the two Roosevelts. We shall have to devise ways of protecting our vital interests, which are worldwide, and we shall have to do this without precipitating an insoluble crisis that would generate an inevitable war. This will demand a deep reformulation of our foreign policy, which has hitherto been, and in a great part still is, addressed to a very different world situation. It will demand a reeducation of American opinion, not only when it yearns for the lost innocence of our old isolation but also when it plunges into a new globalism which supposes that we are omnipotent, and averts its eyes from the hard reality of the power of the Communist bloc.

TO USE OUR GROWING WEALTH WISELY FOR PUBLIC ENDS: THAT IS THE GOAL

We know, of course, that the challenge is a broad one. The competition is in the whole field of national power. It is a competition not only in military power but in all forms of power, the power to produce wealth and the power to use wealth for education, for the advancement of science, and for public as well as private ends.

On our success in achieving military security by arms and by diplomacy depends our existence. Our ability to meet the challenge depends upon our success in learning to use our growing wealth for something more than just private satisfaction. It depends upon our being willing to use it for imponderable and immaterial ends, like science, education, and the public amenities.

To use increments of our growing wealth wisely and prudently for public and immaterial ends: That is the goal, so I believe, toward which our national purpose will now be directed. We have to pay for defense, and there can be no serious dispute that we must pay for it. But we have also to be able and willing to pay for the things which cannot be consumed privately, such as the education of children, the development of beautiful cities and the advancement of knowledge. We have to be able and willing to pay for what is, to put it briefly, civilization itself.

At bottom, we have to do these things because they need to be done, because they have to be done, and because they are supremely worth doing. Even if we were not challenged, we would need to do them for their own sake. We would need to do them even if Russia were still where it was 50 years ago.

But now we are in fact challenged, and because of that we must do these civilized things, not only to make a better life for ourselves but to mobilize the power to avoid a much worse life. Were there no great rival and challenger, we might dawdle along, we might indulge in a growing private affluence while we suffered a declining national greatness. But for us there is no choice but to respond to the challenge, even though this demands that we change many of our cherished dogmas and harden ourselves to a sterner way of life. For our freedom and our system of democratic government are not likely to survive just because we believe in them and enjoy them. We shall have to prove that with them and through them we can satisfy the needs of our people and be equal to the challenge of the time we live in.

Western freedom will not survive just because it is a noble ideal. In our age it will survive if, and I think only if, we can take freedom down with us into the hurly-burly of the conflict and prove that a free society can make itself the good society.

I should like to add a postscript to express a personal feeling about the challenge we face and the response we must make. It is that with all the danger and trouble and worry it causes us, the Soviet challenge may yet prove to have been a blessing in disguise. For without it, what would become of us if we felt that we were invulnerable, if our influence in the world were undisputed, if we had no need to prove that we can rise above a tranquil self-satisfaction?

We would, I feel sure, slowly deteriorate and fall apart, having lost our great energies because we did not exercise them, having lost our daring because everything was so warm and so comfortable and so cozy. We would then have entered into the decline which has marked the closing period in the history of so many societies—when they have gotten everything they wanted, when they have come to think that there is no great work to be done, and that the purpose of life is to hold on and stay put. For then the night has come and they doze off and they begin to die.

An Open Letter to City Friends on Problems Faced by Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERWIN COAD
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. COAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including an article from the Fort Dodge (Iowa) Messenger, of June 24, 1960, entitled, "An Open Letter to City Friends on Problems Faced by Farmers":

AN OPEN LETTER TO CITY FRIENDS ON PROBLEMS FACED BY FARMERS

(By Fran O'Brien)

(A recent article in the Messenger brought this note from a New York man, "Your story of April 9 in the Messenger—'A Man May

Laugh, That Is a Hat' is great. The readers of your paper are fortunate to have such good advice. Best wishes, Bill Riemers." Riemers is with the Millinery Institute of America and enclosed two articles on hats, so I suspect he is with the public relations department. In return, I hope Bill won't mind if I do some public relations for the farming industry, for I feel this is a field sadly neglected by those actively engaged in it. Thus, I am writing this open letter to Bill Riemers and city friends.)

DEAR BILL: It was a thrill to hear from you and to know that a bit of my writing is enjoyed way out New York way. I likewise enjoyed your articles on hats. Personally, I love hats, Bill, and I'm all for the movement to "Get hats back on heads." But, I'll have to confess, I haven't had a new Easter bonnet in 3 years. I couldn't afford one.

You see, Bill, we are farmers, and despite all you may have heard about those "rich farmers," money just isn't plentiful down on the farm these days. If you haven't read Mary Conger's story on the farm situation in a recent Saturday Evening Post, I suggest that you do. It pictures the plight of the "big, efficient farmer" on 720 acres. Ours is a family-size farm of 160, so we are "little farmers." But the Congers are losing money—so are we.

My husband and I have been married 18 years and have five children. We love the farm and think it is an ideal place to raise a family. Ours is a beautiful farm, with rich, all-tillable soil, a fine, modern house and good buildings. It especially means a lot to my husband because he was born on it and lived here all his life. It dates back to the days of his grandfather. For 80 years it has supported several generations of large families with a good living, but it isn't doing that today.

This isn't due to our laziness or inefficiency. My husband is, and always has been, a good, hard-working, thrifty man. When his dad died in the depression, he was in his twenties. For many years he worked and made many sacrifices to help his mother pay off heavy debts. They succeeded. Now, he is trying to do the same for us. We were doing very well until the last few years when we, like the Congers and other farmers, got caught in the merciless cost-price squeeze.

I have tried to do my part, too. Before marriage and for 2 years afterward, I was a teacher, and used by savings to completely furnish the house. This was a big help to my husband because he could use his earnings to buy the $18,000 worth of machinery and livestock to farm. Now, I make a few dollars writing. By the way, Bill, if you know a friendly New York editor, who would be interested in any "literary corn" fresh from the country, please let me know.

We are average farmers—better off than some, worse off than others. But farmers all over are having a hard time making a living. Again and again, I talk to worried farmers, who are losing money and heart. Many are taking part-time jobs if available, some are competing for extra land, and others are leaving the farm entirely.

City folks are fed all sorts of myths about the farmer. For example, that their trouble is due to their inefficiency. Actually, farmers have been the most efficient workers of all. During the last 10 years they have increased their output per man-hours by 69 percent but are working for less than they got in 1950. Compare this with factory and office workers, who have increased their efficiency only 21 percent but their wages have increased up to 58 percent in the same time.

Perhaps you, too, believe that higher food prices mean the farmer is making more money. Just the opposite is true. The average net income per farm in Iowa last year dropped 29 percent compared to a national decline of 16 percent. Higher food prices are benefiting only the processors, packagers, and distributors.

But we wouldn't complain if our expenses hadn't increased tremendously during the same 10 years. Everything we sell is on a "What will you pay me?" basis while the things we buy are on a "You pay what is asked" basis. I shall cite a few examples.

What are you paying for pork chops and hocks in New York these days? We sold our hogs for 10 cents a pound. It would take about 2½ hogs to buy new shoes for the seven members of our family. And how are eggs selling in the city, Bill? We sell ours for 20 to 26 cents a dozen.

But last summer eggs were lower than that. I remember, because our 2-year-old son accidentally sat on a broken popbottle. It took three stitches by the doctor to sew up the cut and his bill was $18. We had just sold 90 dozen eggs for a total of $15. It took a week's work of feeding and caring for hens, gathering, cooling, cleaning, packaging, and delivering the eggs. But the 90 dozen was $3 short of paying the doctor bill.

The other day I saw the most adorable hat in the shop. I looked longingly at it, tried it on, then looked at the price tag. It would have taken 60 dozen eggs to pay for it. I couldn't even consider buying it—the kids needed shoes too badly.

Does your wife complain of the price of beef brisket and steak, Bill? We sold some fine beef cattle for 24 cents a pound. It would take 15 head of these to buy a $3,600 tractor that sold for $2,000 back in 1951 when we were getting 36 cents a pound for beef cattle.

I have heard farmers say that if they don't get at least $1.25 a bushel for corn they aren't even making expenses. Top price for corn here today is 96 cents, but most farmers are getting much less. The adverse weather of last year caused a high moisture content and farmers get docked for the extra moisture. Some farmers got as low as 60 cents. We sold ours for 85 cents. At this price it would take about 3,000 bushels to buy an economy-type car. A few years ago when we got $2 for corn, a similar car sold for less.

Maybe this will be hard to believe because we live in an area that has some of the best land in America, but there isn't a single "Cadillac farmer" in our neighborhood. "Our Cadillac" is a 1954 Ford bought second-hand. I suspect that a lot of those "Cadillac farmers" you hear about had a previous big bank account, inherited a lot of money or are just one jump ahead of the banker.

We do all sorts of crazy things down on the farm, Bill, such as selling stewing hens for 6 cents or 9 cents a pound, then seeing them on display in the supermarket for 43 cents per pound. Then, there was our neighbor who raised some fine potatoes—prepared the soil, bought, cut and planted seed, weeded, sprayed, cultivated, dug, sorted, and delivered the potatoes. He got 2 cents a pound. The grocer put them in 10-pound bags and sold them for 39 cents—getting almost double what the farmer got.

Why do we do such idiotic things? Because our products are perishable or costly to hold, we need the money, and we are at the mercy of the buyer and seller. Like yours, our grocery bill has skyrocketed, too, Bill. It used to be that the farm wife's "egg money" paid for all the groceries plus such frivolities as new hats, but in many cases that isn't true any more.

No doubt you've heard about the "pampered farmers" getting rich off Government subsidies. Yet, many like us are getting no subsidies at all. But the subsidies that are paid to the actual farmers are low compared to those given to railroads, airlines, steamships, power, and other companies, the postal deficit or compensation checks.

From the early days, our Government has passed laws for the protection of manufacturing and processing industries in the form of tariffs and national subsidies, both direct, and indirect. Minimum wage laws protect industrial workers. Americans have paid out billions for these in the form of taxes and higher prices for goods and services. We acquiesced or approved on the principle that what was good for industry and labor was good for all. But there are many who believe that the farmer should be denied the same protection.

Some say surpluses are an evil, but they are a safeguard against crop failure, a reserve in disaster, and a means of winning friendship abroad. Yet, with our grain bins overflowing and our feedlots overcrowded, there are millions throughout the world who go to bed hungry every night. Does it not seem paradoxical that we have men with the intelligence to solve the secret of the atom and send satellites into space, yet we cannot find a way to distribute our vast surpluses to the starving millions?

We are told, "Farmers have to get big or get out." But what is the sense of spending more and more to get bigger and bigger to raise more and more to get less and less? It takes money to get big, and where will we go if we get out? To the cities, already crowded with workers competing for jobs? Besides, industry isn't interested in a middle-aged man like my husband, who has no training or experience in anything but farming.

So, like the Congers, we, too, will try to ride out the storm. We are cutting down and doing without. My husband used to hire outside help but he can't afford it now. Although he is older and the work is harder for him than it used to be, he is working 12 to 15 hours a day, 6 days a week. So am I. We receive no time and a half for overtime, no unemployment compensation, and no vacation with (or without) pay.

But I have little desire to be wealthy, Bill, for riches have their hazards. There are more important things I would like our children to have, for instance, a deep appreciation for the good, the true, and the beautiful. What better place can one hope to find this than in God's great, beautiful outdoors where every season proclaims the wonders of creation?

However, I do want enough return from our work to pay our debts and to keep our family reasonably well nourished and clothed. I hope, too, that we can give our children a good education, because I believe it is one of the best investments there is. It opens doorways to many wonderful things, and it is something no one can take away from you.

I wish we could work a little less hard and occasionally be able to enjoy a few frivolous things, like a baseball game or a new hat. My husband loves baseball—almost as much as I love hats, but he has never gone to a big league game in his life. I hope some day he can, and that I can go with him—wearing the newest, craziest hat I can find. After all these hard years, he deserves a good laugh.

Best wishes to you, too, Bill, and thanks for listening.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

5732

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses overrode President's veto of Federal pay raise bill and cleared for President appropriation bills for military construction, independent offices, and legislative branch.

Senate passed numerous bills, clearing many for President.

House passed Roosevelt Memorial bill, and killed bill on foreign surplus imports.

See Résumé of Legislative Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 14213–14256

Bills Introduced: 13 bills and 3 resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3795–3807; S.J. Res. 217; and S. Res. 348–349. **Pages 14215, 14443**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 12483, to abolish mandatory capital punishment for first-degree murder in the D.C. (S. Rept. 1824);

H.R. 11516, to create a judicial officer for the Post Office Department (S. Rept. 1825);

H.R. 5436, to provide for a register in the Department of Commerce in which shall be listed the names of persons who have had their motor vehicle operators' licenses revoked (S. Rept. 1826);

S. 675, to regulate the practice of physical therapy in the D.C., with amendments (S. Rept. 1827);

S. 2979, authorizing conveyance of U.S. moneys and land to the Convalescent Hospital of Washington, D.C., Inc., with amendments (S. Rept. 1828);

S. 3727, to provide for the bonding of persons engaged in the repair or modernization of residential property in the D.C., with amendments (S. Rept. 1829);

H.R. 10952, authorizing the National Society Daughters of the American Colonists to use certain D.C. property as its national headquarters (S. Rept. 1830);

H.R. 10921, to revise provisions of the D.C. Life Insurance Act dealing with investment of funds of life insurance companies, with amendments (S. Rept. 1831);

H.R. 12740, making supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1961, with amendments (S. Rept. 1832);

S.J. Res. 217, authorizing the President to make certain adjustments in the sugar quotas for foreign countries (S. Rept. 1833). **Pages 14214–14215**

Bills Referred: Numerous House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. **Pages 14258, 14293, 14301**

Sugar: It was made in order to consider H.R. 12311, to extend the Sugar Act of 1948, when it is received from House. **Page 14213**

Hawaii: Senate adopted H. Con. Res. 706, authorizing the making of certain corrections in the enrolling of H.R. 11602, amending certain U.S. laws in light of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union. **Page 14268**

Calendar Call: Order was entered for call of calendar on Saturday, July 2, beginning with Order No. 1817 (S. 3758, minimum wage bill). **Page 14281**

Federal Pay Raise: Senate debated and, by 74 yeas to 24 nays, overrode veto by President of H.R. 9883, to provide salary increases for postal and other Federal employees. Both Houses having voted by a constitutional two-thirds majority in favor of passing the bill over the objections of the President to the contrary notwithstanding, the bill becomes law. **Pages 14264, 14265–14266, 14275–14292**

Bills Cleared for President: The following bills were cleared for President's signature in the manner indicated:

Alaska University: S. 3545, to permit the lease or sale of Alaska University lands by sealed competitive bids (concurrence in House amendments);

Temporary appropriations: H.J. Res. 778, making temporary appropriations for fiscal year 1961 (passage without amendment);

Military construction appropriations: H.R. 12231, fiscal 1961 appropriations for military construction (conference report adopted);

Appendix

Greetings to Townsend Clubs of America 20th National Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the 20th National Convention of the Townsend Clubs of America will begin on Monday in Indianapolis, Ind. I have been at several of these national meetings and I regret I cannot join these fine people for this meeting.

I would like to share with my colleagues a message which I sent to the Townsend Clubs convention outlining my plan for a broad program to achieve social justice for America's 16 million senior citizens. This is a practical plan which we in this body ought to adopt now not because of political considerations but because we have a moral obligation as a nation to see that justice is done for all our citizens.

I ask unanimous consent that my message to the 20th National Convention of the Townsend Clubs of America be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY—MESSAGE TO TOWNSEND CLUBS OF AMERICA, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., JULY 4, 1960

Dr. Townsend, delegates, and visitors to the 20th national convention of the Townsend Clubs of America, I deeply regret that I cannot be with you at this convention as I have been at several of your national meetings. I have many good friends among you and know your organization well. It is a fine patriotic organization of good, God-loving people. I like it. I have considered it a privilege to work side by side with you in the effort to win a place of respect for the elderly men and women of America.

I want to pay tribute to Dr. Townsend and his son, Robert, for their farsighted leadership and to your Washington legislative representative, Mrs. Ford, for her hard working day-in and day-out devotion to the needs of elderly Americans. It is an honor to pay tribute to them and to every member of the Townsend Clubs of America for your unswerving defense of the rights and best interests of our senior citizens and the cause of social justice for all Americans.

You and I believe that when any American is a second-class citizen—when any American cannot walk in dignity and self-respect—we all are hurt and our country is hurt. As a full measure of dignity and self-respect for our senior citizens is achieved, our whole Nation is better.

In the record of achievement for older men and women in America, the Townsend Clubs have a special place. You have earned an immense share of the credit for keeping the goal of social justice for all in the public eye and awakening sympathy for this goal in the hearts of millions of Americans. Your determined spirit made possible many of the past achievements under our social security program.

There may be no Federal law that bears the name, Townsend plan, but your goals, because you convinced so many, became national goals; and many were written into law. Do you know why they became national goals? Because you worked constantly in all the communities of America to show your fellow citizens that your objectives were actually theirs. You did not speak only through a large corps of Washington lobbyists. You relied on the good sense of the American people and took your plea directly to them. This is why social security and all kinds of legislation which maintains the dignity of older Americans is one of the best known and best understood issues today.

Even the present administration, which sometimes has a difficult time hearing because its closest friends are shouting too loud for special interests, has heard the demands of the American people of all ages for justice for more than 16 million senior citizens. But the administration has its own idea of what justice is—what dignity is—for these 16 million. Justice, as close as I can figure it out, from the plan for medical care presented by this administration is not total destruction of the specter of unexpected and costly illness. Justice instead is just that amount of medical care and other social security benefits wrapped up in a soothing explanation and a clever label that the administration hopes the voters will not check up on before November.

But you and I know—because we have talked to the American people about their hopes and fears for their later years that if they are told honestly that the administration package is really a limited, ineffective pauper's oath plan of medical and hospital care, they will demand real, honest justice, not administration self-justification.

That goal of real justice, real security, real dignity is what I am going to be thinking of every minute that Congress may meet this year—just as I have thought about it every day of my 12 years in the Senate.

And I am not going to stop at thinking—but I am going to continue to do everything I can to put my action program for senior citizens into law.

My program has six major points:

First, America's older men and women want, need, and ought to have health insurance benefits that give adequate protection against the heavy costs of illness and provide necessary medical, hospital, and nursing home care through the social-security system.

Second, our senior citizens need and ought to have an increase in retirement and pension benefits to meet the rising cost of living now and in the future. I have recommended that the minimum social security benefit payment be increased by 30 percent.

Third, we need a realistic limit on the amount older workers may earn for themselves before they lose social security benefits. Older men and women have valuable skills which can help our Nation, but they cannot be asked to give up benefits that they have earned over the years because of a maximum-earnings formula designed for another era.

We need more opportunities for employment of older workers. I have proposed a tax credit for employers who hire older workers as a means of encouraging employers to use this wonderful fund of skill, knowledge, and experience, if the elderly want to work.

My fifth proposal would put an end to the inequities and injustices of old-age assistance programs. It would make individual people, not statistics, the overriding concern of assistance programs. It would set minimum Federal standards for State assistance programs and abolish public shame lists.

Finally, my six-point program calls for effective Federal assistance in a broad program of housing for the elderly. This proposal was adopted recently by the Senate.

But action on social security law improvements and on medical and hospital care is up to the Senate. The House sent the Senate a long, long bill which would revise some aspects of present legislation. The House sent us a great many words, some technical improvements, and not very much else.

One Townsendite proposal—payment of disability benefits regardless of age is in the bill. Beyond that there is little to indicate that social security is a program adapted to meet the 1960's.

Our social security program, splendid in intent and as a framework for meeting some of the needs of retired and disabled men and women must be constantly and courageously reevaluated. We cannot rest with provisions designed for the thirties, forties or even the fifties—however excellent they were. We must meet the challenge of the 1960's and future decades—the challenge of assuring all Americans a retirement income for their retirement needs. We cannot tie the dignity of human beings to an out-dated, rigid formula.

I shall continue to press for six amendments to the 1960 social security bill. Four are part of my six-point program—a medical and hospital care plan through social security; an increase in the maximum earnings limit to at least $1,800 a year; removal of inequities in public assistance and a tax credit to employers hiring older workers.

I shall continue to press for two other amendments. First, I want to transfer the responsibility for distribution of our food abundance from the Secretary of Agriculture—who refuses to believe that there are Americans who are going hungry—to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Many of our elderly citizens are without adequate diets—which is outrageous in our generally prospering economy. I want to see that the elderly and the needy get the food that is available and will be wasted if not used.

Finally, full disability payments for the blind are a must. I do not see how we can justify discrimination against the blind when it comes to these benefits.

That is my program for 16 million senior citizens. It is a practical program which can and ought to be adopted now. I assure you that I will keep on doing everything I can to see that it is adopted. I look to you Townsendites for the same wonderful cooperation in achieving this program which would be a major step toward a realistic, just retirement program for all Americans—a universal retirement and pension program. I know you have always given wonderful cooperation to all programs which will really benefit America's senior citizens.

I myself pledge to you that I will continue to work side by side with you for justice for senior citizens and all Americans.

Germanium Diodes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a letter I have received from the general manager of Clevite Transistor in Waltham, Mass., on the subject of germanium diodes:

CLEVITE TRANSLATOR,
Waltham, Mass., June 30, 1960.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: The U.S. Tariff Commission proposes to reduce or eliminate the tariff on germanium diodes at the next General Agreement on Trade and Tariff Conference in 1961. I am calling this to your attention as at least 75 percent of the germanium diodes manufactured in the United States are manufactured in Massachusetts. Manufacturers include CBS Electronics, Lowell; Kemtron, Newburyport; Raytheon, Brighton; Sylvania, Woburn; Transitron, Wakefield; and Clevite Transistor, Waltham.

Outside of Massachusetts there are seven other manufacturers in the germanium diode business. This list includes Hughes Aircraft, Newport Beach, Calif.; General Instrument, Newark, N.J.; and General Transistor Co., Pawtucket, R.I.

While the dollar volume of sales of the semiconductor industry has increased four and one-half times between 1956 and 1959, the dollar volume of sales for germanium diodes decreased from $33 million to $27 million. The number of germanium diodes made has increased by 50 percent since 1956, but prices have dropped faster than unit volume has increased. As you can see, a number of companies are selling in a highly competitive market.

Germanium diodes are the one part of the semiconductor business which has been selected by the Tariff Commission for tariff reduction. It is the smallest segment of the industry and the only one which has not been increasing in dollar volume of sales. Yet the Tariff Commission proposes to decrease the tariff and invite further foreign competition. This proposal is made at a time when the industry had already petitioned the Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to investigate the threat posed by foreign importation of semiconductor devices and take some corrective action.

In the past 3 years the Japanese production of germanium diodes has increased by 1,000 percent while the U.S. unit volume has increased only 50 percent. At this rate the Japanese will soon surpass the United States in diode production as they have done in transistors. The Japanese can undersell U.S. manufacturers because their labor rate is a small fraction of ours. While no data are available, we know that the European production of germanium diodes is also increasing rapidly. The logical market for this increased capacity is the United States, as both the Japanese and European markets for germanium diodes are not increasing as fast as their capacities to make them.

About 75 percent of the germanium diodes manufactured in the United States are used directly or indirectly for national defense. A healthy germanium diode industry is necessary for the national security and welfare.

Approximately 3,000 people are directly employed in making this product and many others who work for suppliers are indirectly involved. Clevite Transistor employs about 1,700 people from Waltham and adjacent areas. A majority of these people are supported by germanium diode sales. The expense of our research and development is largely supported by this same product. A major loss of germanium diode sales would be a crippling blow to us.

We presently operate in the old Waltham watch factory. This building is one of the few remaining relics of a now defunct industry which was ruined by imports made from low labor rate countries.

We are now building a new $4-million plant in Waltham. I do not believe it is in the best interest of Massachusetts, or the country, to turn this into another mausoleum.

In summary, I do not believe it is in the best interest of Massachusetts or the country to reduce the tariff on germanium diodes. The employees of Clevite Transistor will be very grateful for any assistance you can give them in preventing this from happening, and would be very pleased to hear of any positive action which can be taken.

I have enclosed a copy of the statement in behalf of the Electronics Industry Association to the Committee for Reciprocity Information Relative to the Trade Agreements Act of 1934. This statement will provide you with additional information.

Very truly yours,

JAMES F. BATTEY,
General Manager.

STATEMENT IN BEHALF OF THE ELECTRONIC INDUSTRIES ASSOCIATION TO THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION RELATIVE TO NEGOTIATIONS UNDER THE TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT OF 1934 AS AMENDED AND EXTENDED

This statement is submitted in behalf of the Electronic Industries Association and its membership, representing approximately 350 manufacturers of electronic products, pursuant to notice of investigation and hearings of the U.S. Tariff Commission, issued May 27, 1960. It is the purpose of this statement to express the opposition of this association to the inclusion of germanium diodes (Tariff par. 214) as a product for consideration in proposed trade agreement negotiations under the Trade Agreement Act of 1934, as amended.

More than two score manufacturers of semiconductors, including germanium diodes, are members of this association.

EIA's opposition to the inclusion of germanium diodes in the list of products to be considered for possible U.S. tariff concessions is twofold:

(1) Reductions in the present tariff would endanger national security; and

(2) The American semiconductor industry, including germanium diode production, is a relatively new business which has been greatly expanded, but which is highly competitive. Specifically, both sales and prices of germanium diodes have decreased recently in this country. The GATT description relating to the product in question follows:

Paragraph 214:

Earthy or mineral substances wholly or partly manufactured and articles, wares, and materials (crude or advanced in condition), composed wholly or in chief value of earthy or mineral substances, not specially provided for, whether susceptible of decoration or not:

Ammonia synthesis catalyst: dead burned basic refractory material consisting chiefly of magnesia and lime: feldspar, ground; germanium diodes; marble chip or granito; stone (except Cornwall stone), crushed otherwise than merely to facilitate shipment to the United States, or ground; synthetic materials of gem stone quality, such as corundum and spinel, and articles and wares composed wholly or in chief value of such materials; and substances and articles, decorated.

BACKGROUND STATEMENT

The U.S. semiconductor industry was born only 10 years ago as a result of scientific breakthrough in solid-state physics. However, production of these devices did not reach significant levels until 6 years ago. Since then, a phenomenal expansion has taken place, in capacity, facilities, and new companies. Many of these concerns represent small business as defined by the U.S. Government. This industry is extremely important to the national defense as these devices are used in most military electronic equipments.

Despite the expansion of U.S. facilities and the highly competitive nature of this business, foreign competition already has made a huge inroad in this area, based primarily on low labor costs.

In fact, last September this association filed a petition in behalf of its member companies, requesting that the Director of the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization exercise the authority conferred in him under section 8 of the Trade Agreement Extension Act to (1) initiate an immediate investigation of the import of semiconductors, including those contained in finished products; (2) determine pursuant to such investigation whether such imports represent a present or foreseeable threat to our national security, and (3) take whatever action is deemed appropriate as the result of such investigation to alleviate any possible threat to the impairment of our national security. EIA's application was filed on September 17, 1959, pursuant to OCDM regulation 4.

GOVERNMENT ACTION

On October 2, 1959, the Director of the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization announced that "he has ordered an investigation of imports of transistors and related products under the provisions of section 8 of the 1958 Trade Agreements Act." His announcement stated further: "The investigation will cover all semiconductor products including diodes, rectifiers and transistors imported as separate units, as combination of units or contained in finished products."

EIA POSITION RE SECURITY

In brief, the EIA application to the OCDM stated that the increasing foreign penetration of the American semiconductor market will have an adverse effect upon the growth of the electronics industry producing these products: that the continued trend of imports of such products will impair the efforts of American producers to provide the capacity to meet existing and potential national security requirements; that it will create instability in employment, thereby resulting in loss of essential skills; and finally, that it will result in an eventual reduction in research and development needed to further advance the art—all to the detriment of our national security program and efforts to meet the challenge of Soviet Russia for superiority in military technology in electronics.

U.S. INDUSTRY STATUS

The Electronic Industries Association has some difficulty in submitting statistics on germanium diode production and/or sales as it is difficult to delineate between germanium diodes and rectifiers. However, available statistics indicate that the market for germanium diodes has decreased from $37.8 million in 1956 to $26.7 million in 1959. It is interesting to note that significant production of semiconductor devices probably began in 1956 and that there has been a decrease in sales of germanium diodes since that time.

JAPANESE PRODUCTION

In contrast, information obtained by the U.S. Embassy in Tokyo from the Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry and published by the Electronics Division of the Business and Defense Services Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, shows the following production data:

Semiconductor devices, diodes

Quantity (units):	
1957	3,862,800
1958	10,106,700
1959	33,094,900
Value (1,000 yen):	
1957	592.4
1958	956.7
1959	2,506.5

The above statistics released by the Japanese indicate their production facilities and capacities and other statements point to the fact that export of such devices are aimed at the U.S. market. Therefore, EIA concludes that U.S. manufacturers will suffer greatly by foreign competition from those areas where labor rates are much lower than ours.

Incidentally, there are at least 12 U.S. manufacturers competing for the reduced $26.7 million market for germanium diodes and indications are that many of these will be forced out of the business if tariffs are reduced and the extensive foreign imports continue.

An interesting fact in support of the EIA statement is the fact that Japanese production of germanium diodes has increased by 1,000 percent in the last 3 years. It is evident that at this rate the Japanese will soon surpass the United States in diode production as they already have done in other semiconductor areas.

While we have no specific data on the European production of germanium diodes, indications are that such facilities have been increased extensively.

The logical market for this increased capacity in both Japan and Europe is the United States as foreign domestic markets of diodes have not increased as fast as the abilities to produce semiconductor devices.

Based on the foregoing statement, the Electronic Industries Association believes that the Committee for Reciprocity Information relative to negotiations under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as amended and extended should eliminate germanium diodes from the list of products to be considered for possible U.S. tariff concessions.

Realities of Soviet Strategy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on April 26, 1958, the Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Congressman from the 20th District of Ohio, made a very penetrating and prophetic examination of the realities of Soviet strategy. This address was given at the first annual roundtable conference of the Institute of Ethnic Studies at Georgetown University. The conference was attended by scholars and authorities on world affairs from various parts of the United States and other countries of the free world.

The address of Congressman FEIGHAN won the 1959 Vigilant Patriots award given annually by the All-American Conference To Combat Communism.

A short time ago I read the national award winning address given by Congressman FEIGHAN and was impressed with the fact that while it covers an examination of the global conflict, the analysis cuts through complicated problems and issues to arrive at the stark realities which all Americans must understand.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REALITIES OF SOVIET STRATEGY—WHAT IS BEHIND SOVIET POLICY?

(Address by Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN)

Mr. Chairman, faculty of Georgetown University, the director and staff of the Institute of Ethnic Studies, and distinguished guests, I should like by way of introduction to congratulate the president and the board of governors of Georgetown University for the foresight and leadership they have exercised in the establishment of the institute. I recall the happy circumstances during 1954 under which Georgetown University and its able faculty cooperated with the Select Committee To Investigate Communist Aggression, 83d Congress, in the tremendous task of putting together 17 special reports predicated upon, as I recall it, several tons of historic documents and eyewitness statements given under oath attesting to the nature and the objectives of Communist imperialism. As a member of that select committee, I am privileged to say that without the assistance of Georgetown University much of the information so badly needed to understand the tactics and objectives of world communism would not now be available to the leaders of our Government or to the American people. It is a truism that without the full truth which can come only through a careful and objective examination of all the material available, it is impossible to understand the nature and objectives of communism and accordingly it is impossible to prepare a defense against its further encroachment upon the individual liberties and freedoms of all mankind.

It is fitting that the institute should select as its theme for the first annual roundtable conference the subject—"Nationalism in Our Divided World." By so doing the institute has provided an opportunity for a scholarly examination of the most powerful political movement at work in the world today. In another sense, your deliberations during these 2 days can serve a very useful purpose because nationalism as a worldwide political movement is so little understood here in the United States and elsewhere in the free world. By the wide publication of these deliberations, which I earnestly hope may be done, the basis will be provided for a much needed program of public education.

Unfortunately the grave misunderstandings about the origin and nature of nationalism which has developed in the last 20 years or thereabouts has caused us to confuse positive nationalism with such self-destroying movements as national socialism as epitomized by the dictator Hitler, and so-called national communism, a tactic more recently developed by the Communists as a device for smothering the legitimate national aspirations of subjugated nations.

The topic assigned to me is not an easy one because it calls for an examination of worldwide Russian Communist strategy and an estimate of what lies behind the policy of the Kremlin. I shall approach this assignment by dividing the world arena into four readily understandable parts and then examine Russian-Communist tactics in each of these areas.

The first area to be examined is what I shall call the Russian power orbit which includes the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic come 11 well-defined non-Russian nations forcibly incorporated into the Soviet Union, the 5 so-called satellites of Central Europe, Communist China and the Communist occupied areas of Korea, Vietnam, and Germany.

As I see it, the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic is the heartland of a modern-day Russian empire. The non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union are the first line of colonies of this empire. The Central European satellites and Communist China represent the second line of colonies of the empire. The Communist occupied parts of Korea, Vietnam, and Germany are tactical operation centers from which the Russians expect to add at least three more strategic colonies to their empire in the forseeable future. It is arguable that the Central European satellites and Communist China are more in the nature of dependencies than colonies. However, I believe that an objective examination of the Russian methods of controlling and exploiting these nations reveals them to be more in the nature of colonies than dependencies.

As to the existence of a modern-day Russian empire, there is much less dispute on this vital question than prevailed but a few years ago. The strange alliance of World War II brought the United States and other free nations into a "working relationship" with the Communist dictatorship. The free nations had nothing more in common with the Communists than the common objective of defeating the dictators Hitler and Mussolini, and at the 11th hour of conflict, Tojo, the leader of Japanese imperialism. This strange alliance muted our understanding of world political realities which existed then as now and beclouded the true nature of our partner of necessity, to-wit: the Russian Communists. The events of the conflict caused the leaders of the Soviet Union to be pictured as allies of democracy and defenders of human freedom. At war's end the people of the free world naturally expected that a period of unparalleled tranquillity among nations would quickly develop and that all the war objectives set forth in the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration of Liberated Territories would be accorded to all the people of the world without exception.

The uneasiness of the strange wartime alliance was soon brought to public attention by the provocative and uncooperative attitude of the Russian Communists in the immediate months following the cessation of armed hostilities. The failure of the Russians to honor their firm commitments with respect to the liberated territories by their rigging of rump elections in Poland, Czechosolovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria brought dismay and anxiety to the leaders of the free world. Communist aggression in Greece and Communist threats against the national integrity of Turkey sounded another alarm. This was followed by the Russian inspired and directed Communist conquest of China. The Berlin blockade and Communist aggression in Korea increased already existing political tensions in the world and served to cause the free nations to develop alliances calculated to prevent further Communist aggression. The Russian-instigated war in Vietnam provided additional evidence that the land conscious Russians had not given up their dream of world empire. These unhappy events caused thinking men to shake off most of the political illusions created during World War II. The cold war has forced us to take a cool look at the cold facts of life as it exists in the world of today.

During the past 5 years there has been an increasing amount of evidence of the colossal failure of communism as a system behind the Russian-imposed Iron and Bamboo Curtains. The Communist camp, since the death of Dictator Stalin, has been faced with the choice of giving up communism as a political and economic method or engaging once again in all its most brutal and inhuman methods in an effort to force an unworkable system upon the many different people of a vastly expanded empire. The present Russian leaders in an effort to avoid making the choice have been compelled to expose the failures of communism as a sort of safety valve for the pent up feelings of the exploited masses. In these circumstances the beclouded picture of life under communism caused by the events of World War II is day by day becoming clearer. On March 5, 1953, just before the Kremlin announcement of the death of the dictator, Stalin, an illuminating editorial appeared in the Moscow Pravda calling for unity within the ruling class of the Soviet Union. This editorial is marked by a sense of fear and urgency and is highlighted by the following statement:

"The ardent, selfless support which the Soviet Government enjoyed in the difficult years of the war from all peoples of the U.S.S.R.—and above all, the confidence in the Soviet Government displayed by the Great [ethnic] Russian people, the leader among the peoples of our country—was the decisive power which insured for our country the historic victory."

There now should remain little doubt in the minds of students of the problem that the basic driving force behind world communism is Russian imperialism. Communist ideology remains as a psychological weapon which is used by the Russian imperialists in their tactical and propagandistic maneuvers directed at the non-Communist world. I believe that with the passage of time these realities will become more apparent and the small amount of confusion which still remains on this basic question will disappear.

The first task, therefore, which confronts the Russians is that of consolidating their colonies to their empire by a wide variety of control mechanisms and tactics, most of which are administrative, propagandistic, military, economic, and perhaps outstanding, by the use of their secret police. From the geographical point alone one can see the tremendous burdens which are involved. The great distance involved, from the Baltic Sea to the Pacific Ocean, imposes grave problems of administration, communications, and the deployment of military forces in such a manner as to be quickly available to put down any political revolutions such as the Hungarian freedom revolution. Added to this are the political and economic problems which compound the overall problem of internal control and consolidation which now confronts the Russian leaders. Coupled to these problems is the fact that there are, at maximum, only 90 million Russians in the empire—a small minority when one considers the unenviable regard with which they have been held historically by the non-Russians in the empire. This, in my view, explains in large part why the Russians must carry out a constant and unrelenting propaganda effort within their own empire.

Communism has a limited appeal with the present-day Russian empire. Only the new aristocracy spawned by the Russian Communists are fixed to the party. The new aristocracy composes but a small fraction of the total population of the empire. Many of them are the opportunists like one finds in any society who put physical comfort as their primary requirement—the role they play to attain this is immaterial to them. Among these are non-Russians who, like their counterparts in any colonial or dependent area, are willing to carry out the orders and plans of the imperialists, providing their material lot is somewhat better than the exploited masses. Still others are infused with historic Russian chauvinism which is reflected by their desire to play a superior role in the attainment of the dream of world empire, which dates back at least 300 years.

On the other hand, the appeal of nationalism is almost unlimited. The people in the non-Russian nations of the present day Russian empire, certainly no less than the people of Asia and Africa, are attuned to the call of this worldwide political movement. Most of them have known the blessings of free and independent governments in the past. All of them have highly advanced and distinctive cultures, languages, arts, music, folklore, and traditions which are supported by a geographical contiguity which reaches far back in history. The suppression of these national traits by the Russians has fanned the flame of nationalism in all their colonies.

While there are minorities in the proper sense of the term within the Russian Federated Soviet Socialist Republic, it is a grave mistake to refer to the people of the non-Russians nations of the Soviet Union as minorities or nationalities. Even the Russians have stopped referring to them as nationalities and minorities, as was the custom in the Czarist Russian Expire. It will be recalled that on the occasion of the commemoration of the 300th anniversary of the Treaty of Peryaslav in 1954, the Kremlin made many proclamations attesting to the fact that Ukraine and other non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union have the status of independent nations. However, the Russians define this independent status as "national in form and Socialist in substance." Clearly this is no independence at all, but rather a clever device of the imperialists to meet the on-rushing wave of nationalism in the non-Russian nations and a propaganda term calculated to mislead the people in the non-Communist world, particularly those who have recently attained national independence or are today striving for that goal.

While the leaders of the Kremlin talk much about the managerial class, the new intelligentsia and economic goals, in fact, their major attention is address to making constant accommodations to the drive of nationalism. This is attested to in part by the fact that today there are more non-Russians holding membership in the presidium and in the secretariat of the central committee of the Communist Party than at any time during the past 40 years. Last November Khrushchev, in an address marking the 40th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution, made this revealing statement:

"A powerful, modern industry has been created in all union republics, national group leaders of the working class and intelligentsia have been created and cultures, national in form and Socialist in content, have been widely developed."

These changes did not come from any goodness of the heart on the part of the Russian leaders but rather as a matter of absolute political necessity. Where this trend will eventually lead is a matter which should be given the most careful thought and study by those who believe in the independence of nations and human freedom for all people.

I will not take your time in discussing the powerful trend of the national independence movements in central and north Europe because the case has been made in the public mind by the self-liberating actions of the Poles and the Hungarian Freedom Revolution.

It is my judgment therefore, that the complex internal tactics employed by the Russian leaders are directed at meeting and containing the most powerful force at work within their empire—nationalism.

The second area to be examined is the colonial and dependent areas of the free world. I believe there is general agreement that the African Continent stands as the last remaining colonial area in the free world. The tactics of the Russians directed to the African Continent can be quickly defined as follows:

1. To incite general discontent and disorder among the population at large.

2. To incite the people of the colonial area against the West which is pictured by Communist propaganda as imperialist, colonizers, and exploiters. The United States is singled out in this conection and our desire to lend a helping hand is described by the Russians as "economic imperialism."

3. To stimulate a rapid step-up in the demands for self-government.

4. To train and position cadres of Communist agitators and political commissars whose task it is to seize control of newly independent nations as they emerge from colonial status.

5. To disrupt and retard legitimate efforts of Western nations to train indigenous leaders for responsible and democratic self-government. Without such leadership the rapid emergence from colonial status to independence makes the Nation a vulnerable target for the well-trained cadres of Communist agitators and commissars. So that there shall be no misunderstanding about my meaning in this regard, I point out that there is no justification for any foot dragging on the part of any of the Western nations in hastening the day of independence for all the nations of Africa now in a colonial status.

6. To deny the vast mineral resources of the African Continent to the free enterprise system of economic development. The Russians are well aware that the indigenous leaders have no chance, on their own, of developing these vast resources so as to benefit the African people. Also the Russians do not have the wherewithall, though they are full of rosy promises, to provide what is necessary to bring about a rapid economic advance for the people of Africa. If the Russians are unable to maintain a standard of living for the people in the colonies they have established upon the once free and independent nations since World War II, commensurate with what the people therein have been accustomed to, it is reasonable to ask how they might be expected to help in the economic development of other colonial people? The improbability on this question is multiplied when one understands that the people in the non-Russian colonies of the Russian Empire are day-by-day increasing their demands for the decencies of life.

It is of interest to note that not so long ago the Russian Communists were attacking positive nationalism in Africa by characterizing it as "bourgeois nationalism" and attempting to brand it as a political instrument of the West. Particularly singled out for this treatment was President Tubmann of Liberia. Times have changed, however, and the Russian leaders have been forced to adopt new techniques to meet the increasing threats of nationalism to their dreams of world empire. Today their basic technique is to associate themselves with the rising tide of nationalism in Africa while undertaking measures calculated to capture those political movements and to pervert them into instruments of Russian imperialism. The experience which the Russians have had within their empire and in south and southeast Asia with nationalism taught them that it was a movement which took its strength from the masses of people and therefore could not be defeated by mere propaganda or a head-on political collision.

The third area to be examined is the non-Communist area of Asia and the Near East, particularly the newly independent nations. The political complexion of this entire area

has changed since the end of World War II. The colonial empires of the past are no more. In their stead are many independent nations, which today are faced with a variety of internal economic and political problems.

The Russians took unusual steps to associate themselves with the tide of nationalism which swept through Asia during and immediately following the war. The extremes to which they went is best demonstrated by the skillful role played by Ho-Chi-Minh, an old Comintern agent who, during World War II, took on the disguise of "worker for the national liberation of Vietnam." Through intrigue and propaganda, Ho Chi Minh, an agent of Rusisan imperialism, took over a large part of a legitimate national independence movement in Vietnam and plunged that country into a bloody war which resulted in the present unnatural division of that unhappy land. Similar efforts were made by Russian trained Communists to be in the vanguard of the national liberation movements in Indonesia, the Malay Federation, Cambodia, Laos, and Burma. Even in the Philippines, where the United States had pledged national independence for that country which would come into effect immediately after the war, the Communists attempted to organize armed forces to oppose the establishment of a democratic form of government.

Where the Communists failed to seize control of the national liberation movements they have developed other tactics now directed at the newly independent nations of Asia.

They are:

1. To prevent their orderly and full development as sovereign independent states.

2. To neutralize them in a manner as to isolate them from the stream of progress of civilization. The neutral character which the Russians have been attempting to foist upon these nations is a first step in dragging them into the Russian power bloc.

3. To spread suspicion and disfavor upon the free countries of the West—particularly the United States. The West is pictured by Communist propaganda as "imperialist," "exploiters" and "colonizers"—phrases which have deep meaning to the people of Asia. Little is known by the people in these newly independent countries about either the historic or present-day imperialism and colonial methods of the Russians. This situation is further aggravated by the fact that there is uncertainty in these countries as to just where the United States stands with respect to the rights of nations to national self-determination.

4. To use agitprops to cause internal confusion and dissension—a tactic calculated to prevent bona fide indigenous leaders from stabilizing their countries, developing workable economic progress programs, and cementing national independence of a genuine character. Thus the internal strength necessary to withstand the buffeting and tensions in international affairs caused by Russian actions elsewhere in the world is not developing as rapidly as proven friends of these countries had hoped for.

5. To develop cadres of local Communist commissars for infiltration of the newly independent governments and given time, which the Russians seek by their tactics of confusion and delay, they hope to have a sufficient number of local, trained agents to gain control over the affairs of the newly independent nations.

6. To make gilded promises of economic assistance as a wedge to gain entrance for cadres of so-called technicians and advisers. These so-called technicians and advisers have proven in reality to be skilled Communist agitators. The orderly economic development of these newly independent countries does not fit in with the plans of the Russian Communists. On the other hand economic disorder and stagnation leading to economic dependence on the U.S.S.R. does serve those plans.

In the Near East the Russians have concentrated on the tactic of diverting nationalism into negative and self-destroying channels. There they pose as friends and supporters of the Moslem people despite the fact that one of the largest colonial holdings of the Russians is the former independent Turkestanian Democratic Republic which since 1922 has been subdivided, for purpose of control, into five so-called Soviet Republics. Those are Uzbek, Turkmen, Kirghiz, Tadzhik, and Kazakh. In addition the once free and independent nations of Azerbaijan, North Caucasia and Idel-Ural are now reduced to Russian colonial status. In all, there are well over 30 million Moslem people held within the Russian power bloc.

The Kremlin is now attempting to turn this vulnerability into an asset with an estimated 350 million Moslem people in the Middle East, Africa, south and southeast Asia. Radio Tashkent, located in the heart of old Turkestan, with a powerful radio signal utilizing the major languages and dialects of Asia and Africa, works around the clock spreading the biggest of Communist lies. Neither the United States nor any other free country has a radio signal or program capabilities to even remotely counteract this Russian propaganda campaign. Even Radio Peiping, the organ of the Chinese Communists, is being forced into a secondary position in Asia by the powerful radio signal which emanates from Tashkent. If this situation is allowed to prevail, vast areas of Asia and Africa will, by default, be gravitated into the Russian power bloc.

The fourth area is the free Western World. This is roughly defined by the still free nations of north, west, and south Europe, Great Britain, the Commonwealth countries of Australia and New Zealand, together with the nations of the Western Hemisphere. The tactics directed to this area by the Russian Communists take the following form:

1. To cause confusion among and between the leaders of the free nations. On the foundation of confusion the Communists can and do quickly build dissension and distrust. This tactic is reflected by the recent efforts of the Russians to entice the United States into bilateral discussions as a prelude to another summit meeting. Only a few days ago Gromyko, the Russian Foreign Minister, refused to see the Ambassadors of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France together, and insisted on carrying on separate preparatory discussion with them. To divide and sow distrust between allies is the objective.

2. To disintegrate and fragmentize the free world alliances which to date have stood as a bulwark against the outbreak of world war III. The distinguished American labor leader, George Meany in a recent public address spotlighted this tactic by the following statement:

"In recent years Soviet expansion has been blocked through the collective defense system of the West and through American superiority in the thermonuclear field. The primary purpose of Soviet foreign policy is to destroy these safeguards of world peace."

3. To strike fear into the hearts of the people of these free and independent nations by the Russian technique of rattling the atomic and hydrogen bombs in such a manner as to suggest that those countries which prepare adequately to defend their national independence and integrity will be marked out by the Russians for early and special treatment. Today's paper April 26, 1958, reported that Mikoyan heading a trade delegation to Bonn, Germany, made a proposition that if Germany refused to accept missiles and other defense equipment from NATO, the Russians would guarantee that the West Germans would not be treated to atomic and hydrogen bombs in event of conflict. This is only the latest evidence of this tactic.

4. To stimulate negative nationalism or better defined—isolationism—in each country to an extent that the people therein will be deluded into believing that neutralism is a safe haven for them or that their best interests are served in world affairs by going it alone. If the Russians attain this objective in the free Western world they will then proceed to pick off each of these countries, one by one.

5. To create the impression that the people of the world have no other alternative but to make a choice between all-out atomic warfare or peaceful coexistence on terms laid down by the Kremlin. The primary requirement of the leaders of the Kremlin for peaceful coexistence on their terms is now well defined. Those terms have been publicly stated by Khrushchev on many occasions. They call for the recognition of a status quo as it now exists in the world. The loud clamor of the Russians for another summit meeting has for its immediate objective that of forcing the leaders of the West into a formal recognition of the present-day Russian empire. By this maneuver the Russians are calling upon the United States and other free countries to assist them in their ignoble task of enslaving many nations and hundreds of millions of people. This demand now being made by the Russian Communists underscores the urgency of their needs for time to consolidate their empire, time to work out new accommodations within their empire to meet the rising tide of nationalism, and time during which the leaders and people of the non-Communist world will be forced to haul down their defenses and thus become weakened in their determination to exist as free and independent nations.

6. To propagandize all the people of the non-Communist world into believing that all is well behind the Russian Iron Curtain, that the future belongs to communism, and that the Russian drive for world empire cannot be stopped by any nation or coalition of nations. In this respect the present-day occupants of the Kremlin are making skillful use of the propaganda technique which Genghis Khan first demonstrated with devastating effect as his highly organized mounted army moved from east-central Asia westward in a movement that reached the very gates of old Europe. The advance agents of Genghis Khan went into towns and villages several days march in advance of the golden hordes. There they engaged in a whispering campaign advancing a doctrine of military invincibility of the "Great Khan" together with the considerate treatment he extended to all those who took no active part in resisting his military movements westward. This caused whole villages and provinces to submit meekly to the advance of the golden hordes. Promptly thereafter all the men and male children were murdered, the women ravaged, and the entire area plundered of everything holding material value. We can learn a lesson from the psychological strategy of Genghis Khan by understanding that his successors, who now occupy the Kremlin, have borrowed his techniques of psychological warfare and applied them to modern-day conditions in their drive for world empire.

But with all their propaganda the Russian leaders from time to time unwittingly make statements which expose their internal political and economic weaknesses. Only last November in a report to the Supreme Soviet Khrushchev pointed up the lot of the common people of the empire in these words, "We still have unresolved problems and that defects exist and serious difficulties must be overcome * * *." He was referring to an acute housing shortage, the lack of consumer goods and the poor quality and high cost of the limited amount of such goods available

to the people. Apparently Khrushchev has found a solution to this problem for himself because he had some very stylish suits and coats made to order in Italy a short while ago.

Since last October the Russians have been taking a great international sleigh ride on their spectacular launching of an earth satellite. There is no doubt this is a considerable accomplishment for a system which is unable to provide a decent way of life for the people it controls. However, I believe it would be a grave error to take this highly sensational accomplishment as evidence that the Russians have achieved a high level of industrial capacity comparable to the United States or that their general level of scientific capability equals that of the free world. Account must be taken of the important part played in the sputnik success by German scientists who were captured or kidnaped by the Russians or otherwise enticed to go to the Soviet Union. Then too, one must take into account the possibility that the Russians needed a spectacular success to draw world attention away from their unattractive record in putting down the Hungarian freedom revolution, which may have caused them to put all their eggs in one attention-catching basket. In any case their spectacular sputnik performance served to wake up the people of the United States to the extent that we quickly thereafter successfully launched three earth satellites of more advanced types which are still circling the world. The last satellite has a life expectancy, as estimated by an eminent scientist, of some 200 years.

Now, turning to the question of what is behind Russian policy, I believe the following conclusions follow logically from the examination of their worldwide tactics:

1. That their goal of world empire remains unchanged.

2. That their serious internal political problems are compelling the Russians to seek another summit conference in order to force the free world to recognize a status quo in the world and to accept an era of peaceful coexistence.

3. The Russians need recognition of a status quo in order to convince the people of the many nations held within their empire that the non-Communist world has deserted them and that there remains no other course open for them but total and final submission to their present colonial status.

4. That the Russian plan for peaceful coexistence is a timesaving device which will permit them a breathing spell during which they will seek to make new accommodations to the rising tide of nationalism within their empire, in Asia, in the Middle East and in Africa. These accommodations will of course seek to smother this natural political movement or pervert it into an instrument of Russian-Communist imperialism.

5. That the Russians are engaged in an all-out effort to fragmentize and finally destroy the free world alliances which have stood firm in a common determination to prevent world war III. The recent declaration of the Russians about ending nuclear bomb tests, immediately after they completed their biggest series of tests, is nothing more than a supporting action to this objective. So long as these alliances of free and independent nations remain prepared to meet and defeat any new power thrust of the Russians the possibilities of a hot war are very slim indeed.

In the face of these realities I cannot resist the temptation of making a few observations on what the non-Communist world could do in these circumstances to advance its own self-interest.

The first is that we should not refuse to enter into a summit meeting with the Russians. We should begin immediately to prepare a new and fresh climate of world opinion for such a meeting. To that end there are a number of meaningful actions which the United States could undertake immediately. Among them I would include:

1. A firm declaration by the President that the United States continues its historic support for the political principle of national self-determination for all people. Such a statement, if properly and fully exploited, would clear away the serious doubts and uncertainties about where we stand on this issue in the critical areas of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East, as well as behind the Russian-imposed Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

2. The United States should take the initiative in convening a conference of the leaders of the free world who, working in concert, should establish a definite date for the independence of each nation on the African continent, and then push ahead rapidly with a program calculated to develop indigenous leaders who will provide responsible and democratic government for the people of each of these nations. Such a step would do much to enhance the cause of free people because it would assure democratic forms of government and at the same time turn the spotlight of world opinion upon the Russian imperialists. Moreover, action of this type would provide incontrovertible evidence of our determination to create a world atmosphere in which the natural right of all nations to national self-determination could be exercised.

3. The President could challenge the Russians to honor the war aims set forth in the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration for the Leberated Territories. Action of this type would quickly expose the basic fallacy of the current Russian demand for a recognition of a status quo as it now exists in the world.

4. The President and Congress could take cooperative action to cause the Voice of America to be in a position where it could effectively counteract the Russian tactic of the big lie which is now being beamed from Radio Tashkent, Radio Moscow, Radio Prague, Radio Peiping, and from other centers within the Russian Empire. There is no valid reason why the Voice of America should not reach the people of all the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R. in their native language with programs calculated to cause them to associate their destiny with that of the United States and other free and independent nations. This would be a very inexpensive undertaking compared to the billions of dollars Congress must now provide to keep our Defense Establishment in a state of certain preparedness.

5. Finally, we should take immediate steps to firmly associate the United States with the coming victory of the national independence movements within the present-day Russian Empire. Our failure to take such steps at this critical stage of the worldwide ideological contest will cost us dearly in terms of the historic friendships which our Founding Fathers have earned for us through their Declaration of Independence and our Nation's lifelong opposition to imperialism and colonialism.

Israel Port Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of the New York Times it was reported that heartening progress has been achieved in Israel on the creation of an Israel Port Authority. The authority, which will be modeled on the Port of New York authority, will operate Israel's shipping facilities on the Mediterranean Sea and the Gulf of Aqaba.

I am proud to relate that the chief credit for this beneficial development belongs to Mr. Austin J. Tobin, executive director of the Port of New York Authority, who recommended such an agency on a recent trip to Israel at the request of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The Bank has hinted that if a port authority were recommended and approved it would be more favorably inclined toward Israel's request for a loan to help it finance a port expansion and modernization program.

Mr. Tobin, who is enthusiastic over the progress the Israelis have made, particularly in reclaiming desert land for citrus crops, reported that more port facilities are urgently needed. The tonnage that is expected to flow through Israeli ports by 1965 will be more than 30 percent greater than at present. Raw material imports would be matched by industrial, chemical, and agricultural exports.

Under the proposed program, facilities would be constructed at Ashdod on the Mediterranean and at Elath on the Gulf of Aqaba, the revenues from which would amortize the World Bank loan.

The additional economic strength that these projects will give to this dynamic democracy in the Middle East is welcomed by its friends all over the world. New York is particularly proud that one of its outstanding citizens, Mr. Austin Tobin, who is among the Nation's most highly regarded authorities in the field, has been largely responsible for the inception and development of this meritorious project.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include an article from the New York Times of June 11, 1960, describing the port authority and Mr. Tobin's efforts in its behalf, in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The article follows:

ISRAEL PORT AUTHORITY ASSURED; AGENCY HERE TO SERVE AS MODEL

(By Bernard Stengren)

Establishment of an Israel Port Authority, modeled on the Port of New York Authority has been virtually assured. It will operate Israel's shipping facilities on the Mediterranean Sea and the Gulf of Aqaba.

If the Knesset (Parliament) approves, one of the first major tasks of the semi-autonomous agency will be supervision of the construction of Ashdod, a new port facility south of Tel Aviv and Jaffa.

Austin J. Tobin, executive director of the Port of New York Authority, acknowledged yesterday that he had recommended such an agency. Mr. Tobin returned this week after an inspection tour of Israel made at the request of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

While Mr. Tobin was in Israel, Eugene R. Black, President of the Bank, hinted that if a port authority were recommended and approved, the bank would be more favorably inclined toward Israel's request for a loan to help it finance a $64 million port expansion and modernization program.

The Bank, which recently lent the United Arab Republic $56,500,000 for widening and

deepening the Suez Canal, was asked to advance from $25 million to $30 million to Israel, with the remainder to be raised by local interests.

A major share of this money—about $46 million—would be used to build a modern, deepwater port at Ashdod. At present, the waterfront there is sandy beach—"just like Asbury Park," Mr. Tobin said—and a huge stone jetty would be built in the shape of a rounded L out into the Mediterranean. Another stone jetty would be built perpendicular to the shore, forming an almost closed pincers through which ships could pass into protected waters and to the piers.

In its first stage, Ashdod would have two piers, each containing two sheds and separated by a 100-foot slip in which two ships could be loaded or unloaded simultaneously.

Mr. Tobin, who was enthusiastic over the progress the Israelis have made, particularly in reclaiming desertland for citrus crops, said that more port facilities were "urgently needed."

"The trees are planted and are growing," he said, "and by 1965 Haifa just will not be able to handle the additional exports and imports."

LARGE CARGOES HANDLED

He said Haifa had done "miracles" in handling a record total of 2,820,000 tons of cargo. By 1965, he said, a "conservative estimate" indicated that 3,630,000 tons of cargo would be coming in and going out of the country.

The remainder of the port development funds would be spent at Elath, on the Gulf of Aqaba—which last year handled 130,000 tons of cargo on what Mr. Tobin described as a "fisherman's wharf," and at Haifa.

With the further development of the three ports, Mr. Tobin said, Haifa could concentrate on imports of iron ore, semifinished iron and steel items and other raw materials and on exports of industrial products; Ashdod, near the citrus-growing region, could specialize in exports of those fruits, and Elath would be the logical place for shipping potash and phosphates obtained in the Dead Sea area.

Mr. Tobin said that in discussions with high Israeli officials he gained the impression that a board of unsalaried commissioners would be chosen to supervise the authority, with a full-time executive director and staff to operate it.

At first there would be no attempt to operate airports also as the Port of New York Authority does. The agency would be self-sustaining, using port fees to repay the World Bank loan and to foot its operating expenses. It would sell bonds for future capital projects.

The Miracle of Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Dean Alfange, New York attorney, and former candidate for Governor of New York, made the following statement about Israel upon his recent return from that country.

A special study mission from the Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I was a member, visited Israel last fall, and its report on Israel is confirmed by Dean Alfange's findings.

The report of the study mission, House Report No. 1386, stated on page 23:

Although still primarily concerned with the attitude and acts of the Arab world around her, Israel's economic efforts and improvement are nothing short of amazing. The Government has demonstrated its capability of assisting newly independent nations in the development of their economies by providing technical assistance. The study mission was impressed with the progress Israel is making.

In Israel's governmental circles there is no misunderstanding or confusion regarding Russia's aims in the Middle East. However, there seems to be primary preoccupation for acquiring a self-determined defense posture of greater strength.

Dean Alfange's statement follows:

REPORT ON ISRAEL

(By Dean Alfange, of New York)

Israel is the miracle of our times. She is developing a pattern of life that has no analog anywhere in the world. She has absorbed immigrants from backward and even uncivilized countries and has molded them into a free, productive and classless society with full employment.

Israel's example should point the way to the underdeveloped nations of Asia and Africa. By adopting the Israeli pattern they could make the most of their meager economies and at the same time retain their freedom.

We, in the United States, are making a fatal error when we assume that these underdeveloped nations must choose between the Western way of life and the Soviet system. These nations lack the training and the heritage to adapt themselves to Western ways. If the Soviet system is the only other alternative, it has a far better chance to succeed because it promises quicker results in terms of material benefits.

But now comes Israel with a third alternative—a pattern of life which offers decent living standards plus freedom. Israel holds the key to the solution of the problem of the underdeveloped states.

The free world can win the battle with the Soviet Union for the loyalty of these nations by studying the Israeli pattern of life and promoting it as a third alternative to the countless millions of Africa and Asia who are yearning for freedom and a just share of the good things of life.

In my opinion, Israel has made the greatest single contribution toward winning the cold war in this area. The statesmen of the free world should recognize this fact and act upon it.

Business Plans for New Plants and Equipment, 1960–63

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a Nation, we recognize that if we are to provide rapid progress domestically as well as meet the challenges internationally, it is absolutely essential that we maintain a sound, progressing economy.

Among other things, this means providing goods and services essential for a better life for our people. In addition, we have the task of supporting an ever-stronger defense to provide for our security.

What does this depend upon? A high level of business activity, maximum employment, strong purchasing power for consumers, fair wage levels for the workers of our country, and further strengthening of other aspects of our economy.

If we are to make maximum progress, then we not only need long-range planning in these fields, but also a close evaluation on whether or not the proposed rates of progress will meet the needs of the Nation.

We recognize, of course, that the interests of workers, business, industry, consumers—all our people—are closely related; consequently we must strive for greater cooperation, not strife, as we attempt to work together to build a stronger economy.

Recently, the McGraw-Hill Department of Economics published its 13th annual survey entitled "Business' Plans for New Plants and Equipment, 1960–63."

The highlights of this survey include:

First. American business plans to spend a record $37.9 billion for new plants and equipment in 1960 and to maintain a high level of capital expenditures during the next 3 years.

Second. Manufacturers plan to concentrate on greater efficiency. Close to $10 billion or about two-thirds of this year's expenditures planned by manufacturing firms is for modernization.

Third. Manufacturing companies were operating at an average rate of 85 percent of capacity at the end of 1959. This is 9 points below the rate they indicated they would prefer to operate.

Fourth. Manufacturing firms are planning a modest 5 percent increase in capacity this year—and they plan to increase capacity at a rate of about 4 percent per year in the next 3 years.

Fifth. Manufacturing companies expect sales to increase 8 percent this year and an additional 17 percent during the 3-year period 1960–63. If these sales expectations are met, these increases would bring operating rates close to preferred levels and create a demand for additional capacity.

Sixth. Depreciation allowances will rise to nearly $25 billion by 1963 and will provide a strong prop for a high level of capital investment. More than 80 percent of the reporting manufacturing firms indicate it is their policy to spend all or nearly all of their depreciation allowances for new plants and equipment.

Seventh. Business plans to increase its research efforts and to step up its introduction of new products. Research and development expenditures are expected to reach $9.5 billion this year and $10.7 billion by 1963. About one-third of the reporting manufacturers indicate that they will be devoting a significant amount of their 1960 expenditures on plants and equipment for facilities to make new products. By 1963 they expect that 12 percent of their sales will be in new products, products not made in 1959.

I ask unanimous consent to have the overall survey printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the survey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American business plans to spend a record amount for new plants and equipment in 1960 and to maintain a high level of capital expenditures during the next 3 years. Manufacturers plan to concentrate on greater efficiency. Almost two-thirds of this year's expenditures of $15.2 billion will be for modernization. Business also plans to increase its research efforts, and to step up its introduction of new products and processes. These are the most important findings of the 13th annual survey of Business' Plans for New Plants and Equipment, conducted by the McGraw-Hill Department of Economics during the last half of March and early April.

For 1960, this survey shows that business now plans to spend 16 percent more than last year—compared with an increase of 10 percent indicated in our preliminary checkup last fall. (The Department of Commerce and Securities and Exchange Commission survey published in mid-March indicated a 14 percent increase in business spending for this year.) This increase in business' plans for expenditures on new plants and equipment suggests strength in the capital investment segment of the economy. Thus, American business now has plans to spend $37.9 billion this year and already has plans to spend more in each of the next 3 years than was spent in 1959.

This figure and all other figures in this survey relating to capital investment are now directly comparable with those provided by the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission. In the past capital expenditures were not comparable with the official Government figures because of differences in industry classifications and because of the inclusion of a petroleum figure which covered some current account expenditures as well as capital investment. Data tabulated by the previous methods are available to those specifically interested, but in this report only figures comparable with the Government data are used.

The average level of spending already planned for 1961–63 is higher than the amounts spent in 1959. These are preliminary plans—and incomplete in many cases. Expenditures may actually exceed current estimates for these years, if plans are revised as they have been in the past. Experience indicates that businessmen generally underestimate their capital expenditures for periods longer than 1 year ahead.

The McGraw-Hill survey is not a forecast; it is a report of what companies plan to spend on new plants and equipment at the time the survey was taken. And these figures represent the plans of large firms, in most cases. Past experience indicates that small companies do not always follow the trend of the larger firms.

PLANS IN MANUFACTURING

Manufacturing firms now plan to spend $15.2 billion in 1960—26 percent more than last year. Among the metalworking industries the auto industry shows the biggest increase with spending plans up 66 percent in 1960. But the other industries in metalworking—machinery, electrical machinery, transportation equipment—also show substantial gains this year. The planned expenditures of the metalworking industries are also up since last fall. Although plans decline slightly in 1961 and 1962, metalworking firms already have plans to increase spending in 1963.

The chemical process industries, as a group, indicate considerably more long-range stability in their plans than the metalworking or primary metals groups. The chemical industry, which has spent over a billion dollars every year in the postwar period, already has plans to spend an average of $1.7 billion in each of the next 4 years. The petroleum industry, which is spending $2.8 billion this year, already has plans to spend the same amount in 1961 and to spend even more in 1962–1963. The paper, rubber, and stone, clay, and glass industries plan to increase spending this year, but show expenditures declining after 1960.

The steel industry is planning to spend $1.6 billion this year—and more than $1.5 billion in 1961—very near the record amount spent in 1957. Beyond this year and next, however, steel companies indicate a considerable decline in expenditures. Nonferrous manufacturers indicate spending plans of $369 million this year—and approximately the same level over the next 3 years.

The food and beverage industry (up 6 percent this year) and the textile industry (up 17 percent this year) plan a steady level of investment in 1961–63.

NONMANUFACTURING INDUSTRIES

Every industry in the nonmanufacturing area has increased its expenditure plans for 1960 since last fall. Electric and gas utilities now plan to spend a record $6.2 billion this year—only a few million dollars less than their 1957 peak. To meet growing power needs, electric utilities' planned expenditures remain high throughout 1961–63.

A sharp rise in expected deliveries of jet airliners boosts the spending plans of "other transportation" this year. However, since most of the aircraft will be delivered this year, there is a substantial decline in each of the succeeding years.

The mining companies, which account for a relatively small part of the nonmanufacturing total, show an up-and-down pattern in plans beyond this year. Railroads indicate a 16-percent increase in expenditures this year. Although there will be some fluctuation in expenditures beyond this year, this survey indicates plans of close to a billion dollars in spending in all the years reported.

Commercial companies (which in this survey are mostly large chain stores, department stores, banks, and insurance companies) plan a total expenditure of $9.2 billion in 1960. This figure represents the largest amount ever spent in this area.

EXPANSION VERSUS MODERNIZATION

Manufacturing companies are concentrating on replacement and modernization in an effort to increase productivity and reduce costs. This year, industry plans to devote 65 percent of its total spending for replacement and modernization and only 35 percent for expansion. These are almost the same proportions devoted to this purpose as in 1959. However, total spending by manufacturers in 1959 was only $12 billion compared with $15.2 billion this year. Thus, over $2 billion more will be spent for modernization this year. Only the chemical industry expects to spend a larger proportion of its investment on expansion than on modernization of its facilities.

NEW CAPACITY AND RATES OF OPERATION

With the emphasis on modernization, manufacturers are planning to increase capacity[1] by only 5 percent this year. With the exception of 1958 this is the smallest planned increase in the past 10 years. Manufacturing companies plan to add to capacity at a rate of about 4 percent per year over the next 3 years. These smaller additions to capacity are a reflection of operating rates which are below the preferred rates.

[1] Our capacity index for total manufacturing has been reweighted, by industries, in the same manner as the Federal Reserve Board's revised index of industrial production, resulting in a revision of our index of manufacturing capacity in prior years.

At the end of 1959, manufacturers, on the average, were operating at 85 percent of capacity. This is 9 points below the rate they indicated they preferred to operate.

Manufacturing companies now indicate that they would prefer to operate at 94 percent of capacity, compared with 90 percent as indicated in the McGraw-Hill survey of April 1957, the last time this question was asked. With the exception of the paper industry, every industry now indicates a higher preferred rate.

Conceivably, the operating rate at the end of 1959 might have been slightly higher if companies had been able to get special types of steel, which were still in short supply because of the 116-day strike. Only steel companies were operating at close to their preferred rate.

SALES EXPECTATIONS

Manufacturers expect, on the average, an 8-percent increase in sales this year and an additional 17 percent by 1963. If these long-run sales expectations are met, operating rates would be close to preferred rates and create a need for additional capacity by 1963.

Since our preliminary survey last fall, some industries have revised their sales expectations for this year. The auto industry which had expected a 15 percent increase in sales, now expects only a 7 percent increase. The steel industry which expected a 25 percent increase in sales for this year now expects a 22 percent increase. The transportation equipment industry (aircraft, ships, railroad equipment), on the other hand, now expects higher sales this year.

BUILDINGS, MACHINERY, AND OTHER EQUIPMENT

This year, 30 percent of business total capital expenditures will be for buildings and 70 percent for machinery and other equipment, again emphasizing industry's concentration on modernization. In manufacturing, the proportion going for buildings is only 20 percent. These percentages are nearly the same as indicated in last year's McGraw-Hill survey. The commercial sector (chainstores, hotels, and office buildings) is the only area devoting more than half of its investment to buildings.

DEPRECIATION

Depreciation allowances are now equivalent to about two-thirds of total capital spending planned for this year and are the largest single source of funds for new plants and equipment. By 1963 American corporations will have $24.8 billion available through annual depreciation deductions—an increase of 18 percent over 1959. Manufacturing companies indicate their depreciation allowances will rise 17 percent.

The estimates in this survey are based on depreciation deductions for tax purposes. Some companies record depreciation differently on their own books of account.

Companies were also asked whether or not it was their policy to spend all or nearly all of their depreciation allowances for new plants and equipment. More than 80 percent of all manufacturing firms answering indicated they do spend all of their depreciation for this purpose. Depreciation allowances plus retained earnings and depletion allowances will provide a strong prop for plant and equipment expenditures in the next few years.

REGIONAL EXPENDITURES

Manufacturing companies plan to invest the largest proportion of their expenditures in the North Central States—30 percent in 1960 and 27 percent in 1961. However, this is a smaller proportion than manufacturers indicated they were spending in this area in 1958 and 1959.

Manufacturers are continuing to devote an increasing proportion of their capital expenditures to the West. Last year they planned to spend 13 percent of their invest-

ment in the West. This year they plan to increase the proportion to 15 percent in 1960 and 17 percent in 1961. Manufacturers are also planning to increase the percentage of investment in the South, but New England and the South Atlantic States will receive a smaller share of total investment in 1960 and 1961. About the same proportion will be spent in the Middle Atlantic States in the next 2 years as a year ago.

RESEARCH AND NEW PRODUCTS

Industry is increasing its research programs in an effort to increase productivity, cut costs, and develop new products and processes. Expenditures for research and development by American industry reached a record $9 billion in 1959—exactly the amount companies reported they planned to spend a year ago. Industry now plans to increase its research expenditures by 6 percent this year and another 12 percent by 1963. Every industry with the exception of the aircraft industry which obtains a large proportion of its funds for research from the Federal Government expects to spend more for research and development this year.

A significant share of manufacturers' research and development programs is for new products. Manufacturing companies estimate that 12 percent of their 1963 sales will be in new products. (New products are defined as "products not made in 1959 or products sufficiently changed to be reasonably considered as new products.") And close to one-third of the reporting companies indicated that a significant share of their 1960 expenditures for new plants and equipment will be for facilities to make new products.

The largest increase in new products is expected by the transportation equipment industry, largely aircraft. With the exception of the auto industry, the metalworking industries expect new products will acount for at least 15 percent of 1963 sales. The chemical industry expects 14 percent of its 1963 sales to be in new products and other figures range from 4 percent in the petroleum industry to 25 percent in the machinery industry. This will mean the introduction not only of many new products, but of completely new processes during the next 4 years.

RESEARCH FACILITIES

Manufacturers are planning to increase their capital investment in research facilities to carry out their research programs. Manufacturing firms now plan to spend $682 million for research facilities compared with $523 million planned for 1959. The chemical industry plans to spend the largest amount for this purpose—$119 million, followed by the transportation equipment industry ($94 million), and the electrical machinery industry ($92 million). Thus if these expenditures were added to the total research effort this year, R. & D. would be well over $10 billion.

Companies were also asked how they determined their research budgets. Nearly half (48 percent) of the reporting manufacturers indicated that plans for new products were the most important factor in determining their research and development budgets. Sales are the next most important factor. Only 2 percent of the reporting manufacturing companies indicated that they relate their R. & D. budgets to capital investment, while 13 percent of the firms answering indicated that profits were the most important factor in determining their R. & D. programs.

Some industries differ considerably from the average. For example, 44 percent of the companies in the stone, clay, and glass industry indicate R. & D. budgets are related primarily to sales. Steel firms also indicated that sales were more important than plans for new products in determining R. & D. expenditures.

HOW THE SURVEY WAS MADE

This survey, made by the McGraw-Hill Department of Economics, is based on industry's replies to a questionnaire received during the last half of March and early April and thus represents industry's thinking at that time of year.

Companies that participate in the McGraw-Hill survey are usually the larger companies in their industries. This fact may affect the results of the survey. However, in each successive survey a concerted effort is made to include more medium-sized and smaller firms. More such companies cooperated in this survey than in any previous year.

Companies reporting in the survey employ more than 50 percent of all workers in the group of industries where capital investment is highest. This group includes petroleum, utilities, railroads, chemicals, autos, and steel. In industries where coverage is not so complete, companies are carefully selected to provide a representative cross section of their industry. Companies included in the industrial sample employ a total of nearly 8 million workers, about 40 percent of total employment in all industry.

Commercial business—trade, finance, and services—is the one major field of capital investment with a lower level of coverage. The sample in this field is made up primarily of large chainstores, mail order and department stores, insurance companies and banks.

Figures on manufacturing capacity compiled by McGraw-Hill are the only available direct measure of expansion in manufacturing. Physical capacity is measured by the reporting companies, according to their own definitions. However, companies in the same industry generally follow the same practice. Weights for the index are based on value added by manufacture. Our capacity index for total manufacturing has been reweighted, by industries, using the new weights developed by the Federal Reserve Board in its revised index of industrial production. This has resulted in a revision in the index for manufacturing capacity for prior years. This makes it possible to compare our index of manufacturing capacity with manufacturing production.

STATISTICAL NOTES

All figures on capital investment plans are now directly comparable with those provided by the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Securities and Exchange Commission. Considerable confusion arose because of the lack of comparability between the two sets of data. In the past the McGraw-Hill data differed in industry classifications and included a petroleum figure which included some current account expenditures. These differences have now been eliminated.

Correspondents of Business Week personally interviewed many company executives, as did members of the McGraw-Hill Department of Economics. Other McGraw-Hill magazines helped conduct the survey in their own fields.

Panamanian Protest Plans for July 4 Celebration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, an informative news story in the Christian Science Monitor of June 27, 1960, by Mr. Ralph K. Skinner, distinguished correspondent of that paper on the Isthmus, will be of interest to all who follow United States-Panama relations.

The news story follows:

PANAMANIANS PROTEST PLANS TO MARK JULY 4

(By Ralph K. Skinner)

PANAMA CITY, PANAMA.—A campaign pushed by Panama University students and professors to revoke official celebration of the Fourth of July as an official holiday here is seen to be merely another slap in the face to Uncle Sam.

The students may believe they are being fiercely nationalistic whereas there is evidence they are being used by Cuban agitators and other anti-U.S. groups active in Panama.

Traditionally the Fourth of July has been celebrated in Panama because of its close links with the United States. Panama's Independence Day, November 3, is a legal holiday in the Canal Zone. There has been reciprocal entertainment on the respective national holidays.

PANAMANIANS WELCOMED

In addition to the big reception given on the Fourth at the U.S. Embassy in this capital city for Panamian officials and other citizens, Canal Zone officials have welcomed Panamanians of all classes to celebrations in the Canal Zone.

The American Society, composed of American businessmen in Panama, customarily has entertained the President of Panama at a big Fourth of July party with fireworks and the like.

This correspondent has attended such parties when the President of Panama had such an entertaining time he stayed for hours. Top Panama officials and United States officials mingled in an aura of great friendliness and cordiality.

U.S. OFFICIALS INCLUDED

Similary, the U.S. officials were included in Panama official affairs coincident with the celebrations of November 3.

To cancel any Panama observance of the Fourth of July and to revoke its status as an official holiday here would be a step backward in the already unsatisfactory relations between the two countries, it is held by observers here.

A friendly Fourth of July this year might tend to restore the previously amicable relationships between Panama and the United States. Perhaps the student action is a signal that Panama does not want such relations restored.

Last year on November 3, Panamanians seeking to plant Panama flags in the Canal Zone touched off extremely serious riots in which many were injured, cars overturned and burned, property damage done, and the U.S. flag at the American Embassy torn down and desecrated. Another anti-United States riot followed on November 28.

RELATIONS STRAINED

Since that time, relations have been strained between the two communities.

This correspondent has been told by Panamanian leaders that massive demonstrations against the Canal Zone are planned again for November 3 this year. They forecast great public support.

Although the Panama Government and its public order forces would not favor such demonstrations, it is unlikely they would seriously oppose any action obviously backed by public sentiment.

Avowedly, the purpose would be to plant Panamana flags in the Canal Zone to reassert Panama's claimed sovereignty there.

Actually the purpose might be to exert more pressure to gain further U.S. conces-

sions to Panama's seemingly insatiable demands.

And for certain groups, there would be the collateral advantage of lowering U.S. prestige throughout Latin America with twisted reporting of the demonstrations.

Herman Blum Speaks on Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of the Senate a significant address made recently by Mr. Herman Blum before the New Century Club of Philadelphia. Mr. Blum, chairman of the board of Craftex Mills, Inc., is the Pennsylvania member, advisory council, Civil War Centennial Commission; senior vice president, Lincoln-Civil War Society; and honorary member, National Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission. Since his words on Lincoln are worth even greater attention than they have been getting throughout Pennsylvania, I ask unanimous consent that the text to his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LINCOLN PARADOX: SELF-CONTRADICTORY, YET EXPLAINABLE

(Address by Herman Blum, before the New Century Club of Philadelphia)

Beginning on January 8, 1961, and continuing during the following 5 years, the American people will observe the 100th anniversary of the Civil War. The commemorative programs planned by the Civil War Centennial Commission, will be conducted on a nationwide basis at grassroots level—in schools, colleges, churches, and civic organizations.

You ask: "What do we expect to commemorate about this tragic period of our national life?"

Certainly, not the bloodshed, not the strife or the hatred and discord occasioned during the war period.

What we are seeking to remember should be of vital interest to our young people, who will have a historic opportunity to bring into proper focus, the record of the years between 1860 and 1865. And part of that record should be our ardent desire to pay tribute to the men on both sides, who fought to settle the greatest issue America ever faced.

I

We cannot commemorate the Civil War, however, without recognizing the overwhelming impact of one man upon that conflict. That man was Abraham Lincoln. For Abraham Lincoln was the Civil War. More than anyone or anything else, it was his personality, purposes, politics, policies, and overall strategy that dominated and directed that struggle.

A Confederate general once summarized his conclusions about the Civil War like this:

"We were never outfought, the truth is that we were simply outthought."

In this connection note what Lincoln said in his Gettysburg Address:

"The brave men who fought here * * *." He didn't say, "The brave Union men who fought here."

It was Lincoln's magnanimous thinking which recognized the heroism of all the men who fought in the war—Rebel as well as Union—that was the decisive factor in bringing the Civil War to a conclusion. It was his thinking that robbed the South of the will to continue the fight and laid the foundation for basic reconciliation.

II

Now, what can I tell you about Abraham Lincoln that 5,000 or 6,000 books written about him have not already told? What is there about this man that makes people understand him and take him into their hearts? What is there about him that commands the reverence of all classes of people, of all creeds and races in all the nations of the earth?

I will not attempt a categorical answer to these questions. Perhaps there is no logical explanation of the Lincoln phenomena.

Be that as it may, it is an inglorious personal experience of mine that answers some of these questions. The incident I am recalling, will also make the humble background of our 16th President a little more understandable and less astonishing.

At the turn of the century, I was an eager-beaver cub reporter on the Chicago Tribune. I recall how excited I was about a John T. McCutcheon cartoon that appeared in the Tribune on Lincoln's birthday of that year. The Tribune's indulgent city editor tolerated my bizarre reportorial feats, but not my habitual impertinence or the squandering of my $2-a-week expense allowance. Just before he fired me from the paper, I managed to muster up enough nerve to ask the famous cartoonist to autograph a copy of his Lincoln drawing for me. And this McCutcheon did graciously.

You will appreciate how I have cherished that engaging cartoon, when I tell you that I managed to save it all these years. After more than a half century, it still has a place of honor in the Lincoln memorial room of our Blumhaven Library.

The McCutcheon cartoon depicts a log cabin set against a background of desolate wilderness. In the foreground, deep in a muddy rut of a forest trail, is a rickety buckboard being dragged by an amiable mule. A mongrel dog is trotting up ahead. On the wagon seat, smoking a corncob pipe, is a ragged backwoods man. Sitting beside him, rigged out in calico and a slouchy sunbonnet, is his wife. Our Kentucky bushwacker points to the shack and out of the corner of his mouth, remarks to his wife: "I heerd Nancy Lincoln's got another baby—a boy this time. Goodness knows whut she'll do with it. They kaint skessly take keer o' little Sairey as it is."

Obviously, we can't say for sure what that Kentucky backwoodsman had in mind when he made that remark about the birth of the Lincoln baby, but it could well have been the hillbilly version of the acute worry we call the "population explosion" today.

Ever since that cartoon was published in the Chicago Tribune, historians have been working on the theme that the underprivileged baby, who was born in that dirt floor log cabin, had shiftless, improvident, illiterate parents. Over the years, the discussion as to how Lincoln achieved greatness, has gone on without letup. Was Lincoln great because of his heritage? Was he great in spite of it? Which is fact, which is fiction? The stories about Lincoln's parentage may be summarized as follows: His parents were poor indeed; the father,[1] however, was hardly an ignorant man, although he lacked formal schooling. His mother was an intensely spiritual woman; his stepmother, a loving parent and an inspiration to young Abe.

In short, the thing that answers all the questions about Lincoln's paternity, are Lincoln's own words. And these in substance are: "I owe it all to my angel mother."

This simple tribute to his mother, has somehow escaped most Lincoln biographers. Lincoln's declaration of his indebtedness to his mother, however, leaves no fundamental questions about him unanswered.

III

Today, while we are feverishly comparing the qualifications of our "undeclared" and/or "declared" candidates for the Presidency, all of whom are Governors, U.S. Senators, or Vice Presidents—wouldn't it be illuminating if we could account for the paradox of Abraham Lincoln becoming our only President who had never been a Governor, a U.S. Senator, a Cabinet Minister, a Vice President, a war hero, or a great general?

What was there about this obscure[2] lawyer, who had been a postmaster of a tiny village, a humble State legislator and a one-term Congressman, that indicated he was to be the preserver of a united America? Here was a man, born in a log cabin, on a site known as "Sinking Spring Farm," deep in the wilderness of Kentucky. He had less than a year's schooling, and no formal education at all. This tall, bony man arrived in Illinois in 1831, friendless, penniless, powerless, ragged and alone, struggling for the bare necessities of life.

And when it came time for Lincoln to make his bid for the Presidency, he had no multimillionaire to back his candidacy; there was nary a Wall Street tycoon among his sponsors. Nor did he have a combination of big city political bosses who met in a smoke-filled room to handpick him. And no politaker buzzed around to make a survey for Candidate Lincoln or to advise him how to alter his personality image to influence the voters.

Was he that well known that he didn't need organized political support to win the nomination for the Presidency? Actually, when he was nominated, he was so little known that some newspapers kept misspelling his first name as "Abram." Some of the papers printed phonetic pronunciations of his last name so people would know how to say it. He was deeply etched in the mind of the voters as a tall, awkward railsplitter, a homespun lawyer who told stories and jokes, but could be silent and melancholy as well.

What about Lincoln's personality? His contemporaries said he was the homeliest man in Illinois. Cartoonists spurred on by Lincoln's political enemies, pictured him as approximately diabolical. If Mr. Lincoln were to make an appearance on television today, his roughhewn features, framed by his shaggy beard, would scare the bejabbers out of his viewers.

Lincoln was 6 feet 4 inches tall, ungainly in his movements. He had a high-pitched, thin voice, utterly different from the deep voice of those who recite his words today.

---

[1] Webster's Biographical Dictionary, 1957 issue, lists him as "an illiterate wandering laborer."

[2] But by no means ineffective. Lincoln is reputed to have likened his opponent for the legislature in 1833, to a river steamboat with a whistle so big and an engine so small, that when the whistle was blowing the boat merely trembled, but couldn't run. And when the engine did manage to propel the boat, the whistle "wooden" whistle. "Now as to my worthy rival," he said, "when he speaks, he is incapable of thinking, and when he is thinking, he is speechless."

He was no spread-eagle, whistlestop, give-'em-hell orator. His stump speeches were mostly extemporaneous. While plain spoken and timely, his talks were seldom movingly expressive. By no stretch of the imagination, could we rate him a radio spellbinder or image-salesman on TV today.

And was the nomination of Mr. Lincoln handed to him on a platter, because nobody else wanted it? No indeed. There were powerful contenders for the nomination. Among them was William H. Seward, then U.S. Senator, and former Governor of New York and Salmon P. Chase, U.S. Senator from Ohio. And on the first ballot Lincoln was far behind his rivals.

IV

Well then, what power did pick this undistinguished lawyer for the Presidency? How was it that this relatively untried statesman, inexperienced in foreign affairs[a] or diplomacy, untrained in military science and war economy, was able to face the perils of his day and to carry out his staggering assignments? What force was it that impelled this undeveloped man to make wise decisions in frightfully crucial situations? What caused him to suddenly generate leadership which he had not shown before entering the White House? Was it the gigantic pressures of circumstances that raised this uneducated man to the highest intellectual level or was it something else?

Do you suppose there is such a thing as fate? Do you believe in destiny? Do you believe that Divine Providence, every now and then, intervenes in the affairs of our Nation, to pick a man to meet a particular crisis? Are there not a number of these mystic occurrences recorded in history—outstanding events for which there is no other explanation than that Almighty God, in His wisdom, had chosen a man as His instrument to avert the disaster that threatened his people?

V

The key to Lincoln's eternal position in history was the depth of his spiritual feeling. It is true he was not a member of a regular church. In Illinois he once rented a church pew, but it was Mrs. Lincoln who usually sat in it. He was never baptized or made a formal profession of faith. This has caused some to conclude that, since he was not a member of a church, Lincoln could not be considered religious. Some of his political enemies raised the religious issue and insisted on calling him an infidel. This did not dismay Lincoln, for he was not an unbeliever. He was not opposed to creeds, but he did say this:

"I cannot without mental reservations assent to long and complicated creeds and catechisms. If the church would ask simply for acceptance of the commands 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy soul and thy neighbor as thyself'—that church I would gladly join with."

Another passage in the Bible makes clear the nature of true religion. It is: "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

Basically, Lincoln symbolizes this text and must be recognized as genuinely religious. He memorized long passages from the Bible. Perhaps no President who occupied the White House ever read the Bible as much as Lincoln. His two great speeches—the Gettysburg Address and second inaugural, are filled with the rich word "poetry" of the King James version of the Bible.

Lincoln had deep religious convictions and constantly sought divine guidance. There is no doubt in my mind as to the source of Lincoln's power. If he was not inspired of God, then there is no man who ever lived on earth who was so inspired.

From Caesar to Napoleon, from Socrates to Albert Schweitzer, men have risen step by step, according to well-known principles. That is not what we call being a man of destiny. They are men of time, men of talent. The inspired men are fewer. Whence they came, from whence they get their power, by what rule they get that power, we know not. They arise from the shadow and vanish in the midst. We see them but we know them not. Where did Shakespeare get his genius, Mozart, his music, Burns, his poetry—where but from God? And from the same source came Lincoln's power to carry out his stupendous mission. It was from this same divine source that Lincoln derived his courage, endurance, judgment, and mercy. And no story told a thousand years from now will be received with greater interest than that which tells of the life and work of Abraham Lincoln.

VI

So, how does our terrified world today react to this Lincoln story? In our grim struggle to capture men's minds and to win international friendships, what more persuasive argument do we have than the compassionate understanding, deep sense of justice, and the humanity of the Great Emancipator? Today, prejudice toward minority groups, racial discrimination, segregation, and religious bigotry seriously threaten the gains we have made for brotherhood since the Civil War.

In disclaiming membership in the "Know Nothing Party," Lincoln wrote to Joshua F. Speed in 1855, "How can anyone who abhors the oppression of Negroes be for a party that favors the degrading of minority groups of other races, including some whites? Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a Nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We now practically read it, 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.' When the Know-Nothings get control, it will read: 'All men are created equal, except Negroes and foreigners and Catholics.'"

If we could somehow invoke the spirit of this Lincoln's letter, perhaps the cold war wouldn't approach its blasting stage so relentlessly. And who knows, that by easing world tensions, we may by this humble means achieve the miracle of peace and final disarmament.

VII

To the people behind the Iron Curtain, there is one American symbol of friendship they believe in, and that is in the name of Lincoln.

It is in faraway lands that many active Lincoln study groups are being organized today. In India alone, there are some 150 Lincoln societies and these groups flourish and eagerly study the principles and philosophy of their hero, Abraham Lincoln, and memorize his Gettysburg Address. Our State Department continually gets requests for copies of Lincoln's Gettysburg address from them. The words in this Lincoln masterpiece are easily translated. They are universally meaningful to people who yearn for freedom wherever there is oppression and tryanny. Lincoln spells out the American philosophy that in a free society a man can pull himself up by his bootstraps. He is our secret weapon and the best asset in our diplomatic pouches.

During the late lamented Hungarian uprising, crushed so ruthlesly by the Soviet, a rebellious radio station repeatedly broadcast the Gettysburg Address to hearten the freedom fighters.

Lincoln's words were part of the ferment that resulted in the bloody overthrow of Dictator Rhee in Korea; it was Lincoln's philosophy that sparked the protest marches of students in Ankara, just before the coup against dictatorial Premier Menderes.

In other lands, praise of Lincoln goes hand in hand with the denunciation of despotism. An Associated Press dispatch from El Salvador carried the news on February 10, 1960, that the Minister of Education had issued orders to the schools throughout the country to pay suitable "homage to Abraham Lincoln and to commemorate the 151st anniversary of his birth."

While the Soviet Union's official news-gathering agency, the Tass, severely restricts its acclaim of Lincoln, and Nikita Khrushchev arrogantly chants "Nyet, Nyet," the Russian people fondly remember that their renowned writer, Leo Tolstoy, characterized Lincoln as follows:

"Of all the great national heroes and statesmen of history, Lincoln is the only real giant. He overshadows all other national heroes. Lincoln was not a great general like Napoleon or Washington; he was not such a skillful statesman as Gladstone or the adroit Disraeli; but his supremacy expresses itself altogether in his peculiar moral power and in the greatness of his character. He had come through many hardships and much experience to the realization that the greatest human achievement is love. He was what Beethoven was in music; Dante in poetry; Raphael in painting; and Christ in the philosophy of life."

When President Eisenhower visited India last year he was given a spectacular ovation. What was the meaning of this outburst on the part of those millions in India? The answer was given to me by a Calcutta newspaper editor, who is a member of the Indian delegation to the United Nations. Those multitudes, he said, were not actually paying a tribute to President Eisenhower. They hailed him as the representative of the Nation that gave the world Lincoln. And logically enough, he said, they regarded their sainted Mohatma Ghandi as the spiritual heir or perhaps the reincarnation of our Abraham Lincoln.

On the occasion of the 96th anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, Premier Jawaharlar Nehru, of India, made this remarkable statement to the Associated Press:

"As we look at a world torn asunder by suspicion, distrust and fear, and living in the shadow of terrible destructive weapons, we need more than ever to remind ourselves of Lincoln's message and learn to imbibe its spirit."

Isn't it obvious that the heritage of kindness, idealism, and political wisdom left by Abraham Lincoln for our own Nation, is being shared by people the world over?

If "government of the people, by the people, for the people" is not to "perish from the earth," then neighborly relations of peo-people to people must be promoted to spread on this earth. When this is achieved, Gettysburg will be less a memorial of the past and more a preview of man's destiny in a world of peace and brotherhood.

---

[a] Great Britain openly favored the Confederacy. Lack of forthright relations with her could have wrecked the Union cause. Lincoln supplied the discreet, vitally important diplomacy to cope with the threat of English intervention.

William H. Eaton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the REC-

ORD, I include the following address by Hon. John Cashmore, borough president of Brooklyn, at the installation of William H. Eaton as president of the Society of Old Brooklynites. The installation ceremony was held in the surrogate courtroom of the Supreme Court Building in Brooklyn, on June 1, 1960. Mr. Eaton, a prominent Brooklynite—known to his friends as "Billy"—and the borough president lived in the same neighborhood in Brooklyn and their friendship and their close association has endured through many years. It is a pleasure for me to include in the RECORD Mr. Cashmore's fine tribute to his old friend and a distinguished and beloved member of our community. I know that the borough president's remarks were founded on his long and intimate knowledge of the character of "Billy" and of his deep and sincere admiration for his many fine works:

REMARKS OF BOROUGH PRESIDENT JOHN CASHMORE AT THE INSTALLATION OF WILLIAM A. EATON AS PRESIDENT OF SOCIETY OF OLD BROOKLYNITES, SURROGATE COURTROOM, SUPREME COURT BUILDING, BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN, N. Y., JUNE 1, 1960

Mr. President, Dr. Crane, and my friends of Old Brooklynites, to my mind, the Society of Old Brooklynites personifies Brooklyn at its best. I say that because you are dedicated to the preservation of the historical heritage that is ours—to the preservation of the culture that is ours—and to the promotion of a civic pride that should be the badge of every Brooklynite.

At a time that all too many are tempted to take America and the American way of life for granted, it is well that we have here in Brooklyn a society such as yours to keep alive the memories of the sacrifices that Brooklyn and the people of Brooklyn made to make America free.

All too few of our citizens are aware that in the very neighborhood where we meet tonight, the ground reverberated to the tread of Washington's troops.

All too few are aware that the battleground of Brooklyn was literally soaked in blood when our people joined in battle to throw off the yoke of tyranny. That men died by the thousands in prison ships in Wallabout Bay, was a fact fading from remembrance when your society helped to focus the spotlight of history upon it.

Today, we are face to face once again with the hard fact that the American way of life is something that must be fought for and defended. We are fortunate indeed to have a society such as yours to recall and to dramatize the contribution that Brooklyn has made to American independence.

Tonight you install a new president to succeed Dr. Crane who has worked so diligently in the interest of your society and in the interest of Brooklyn. In choosing your new president, the Society of Old Brooklynites honors one of the greatest old Brooklynites I have ever known, my friend of a lifetime, William H. Eaton. "Billy" Eaton has served Brooklyn with every ounce of his energy. For more than half a century, he has spent himself for Brooklyn. It was never a question of what Brooklyn could give him, but what he could give Brooklyn.

To one who loves Brooklyn as "Billy" Eaton loves Brooklyn, this honor you confer upon him tonight, is the greatest he would ever ask. As the elected President of this great community, I come tonight to bring the congratulations of its people to one of its finest citizens.

"Billy," this is a high honor indeed that has been bestowed upon you and in all humility, let me say, I feel privileged to play a part in it.

The Influence of the Federal Government on the National Economy—Address by Senator Butler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I had the pleasure yesterday morning of addressing some 400 public and parochial schoolteachers of Baltimore at their annual workshop on economics. Yesterday was Government Day, and I was afforded the opportunity of discussing "The Influence of the Federal Government on the National Economy." As I pointed out, "In order for us to maintain our position as leaders of the free world, the time has come for prudence in spending the hard-earned income of American producers by every level of government."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD my speech before the Baltimore teachers' workshop, as well as certain charts and explanatory comments which serve to complement my speech.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in RECORD, as follows:

THE INFLUENCE OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

I believe that the future of this country lies in your hands. I believe that because you teachers gathered here today are the prime molders of the minds of our youth who will lead this Nation tomorrow. And so what you think and what you teach will determine the course of the United States for generations to come. You are bound, therefore, with a serious and challenging responsibility. I know that you do not consider this duty lightly nor indifferent. These are indeed serious times, challenging times, when all of us must give fully and completely of ourselves.

It is not a time to bewail our troubles and mistakes to pick and probe feverishly at where we went wrong or how we could have done better. It is not a time to be discouraged or despondent. It is a time to realize that the Soviets want to bury us completely and thoroughly and that we must be prepared to bury them—if necessary.

These are challenging times, but it is not only the challenge of the Soviets, whose unremitting efforts to win the world to their cause has had some temporary success, of which I am speaking, but the challenge of those people here at home who would turn the present crisis, unwittingly perhaps, into what I consider a most imminent and fearful possibility—bankruptcy and economic ruin of the Federal Government.

I, for one, refuse to discard as archaic and inefficient the free enterprise and balanced budget methods which have produced this marvelous Nation, which is still the strongest and the freest in the world.

And so I am going to talk this morning about the influence of the Federal Government on the national economy and some of the dangerous emergency proposals which come too often before the Senate.

Ladies and gentlemen, there are many proposals currently before the Congress to establish new programs involving large expenditures by the Federal Government which were not included in the President's budget. Some of these measures may be worthy if there were not so many other existing commitments and they would certainly prove beneficial to a great number of our citizens.

Yet, as a member of the Senate Finance Committee and the Joint Economic Committee. I have become increasingly concerned with the impact of these many proposed programs on the Federal budget and the national economy and with the question of how we are to finance them.

The decade of the sixties will be a time of serious challenge to our Nation, and indeed to our way of life. The economic offensive launched by the Communist nations will require a rededication to the principles of our free enterprise economy. At the same time we must keep up our military strength, and we must marshal all our resources to maintain and strengthen our position of world leadership. To accomplish these ends will require a healthy, strong, and growing economy.

The budget which was proposed by President Eisenhower for the fiscal year 1961 calls for revenues of $84 billion and expenditures of $79.8 billion, leaving a surplus of $4.2 billion to be applied toward reducing our public debt of $284.5 billion. The public debt, which has now reached a per capita level of approximately $1,580 for each of our 180 million citizens is fantastically high.

Yet, if we add the liabilities of an estimated $350 billion of future obligations for retirement benefits for civilian Government employees and military personnel and future pensions and compensations to veterans and an estimated $98 billion of commitments for future spending for highways, public works programs, public housing, unexpended balances in the defense program, and a variety of other obligations. We arrive at the astronomical total of a $732 billion mortgage on America's future.

In the closing days of the Congress, every Senator and every Congressman will be examining many proposals requiring additional Feleral spending. An even cursory study of the budget reveals that once such programs become embedded in our statutes, they are never eliminated. Indeed, history shows that these measures grow and expand from year to year.

An excellent example of the practice we have followed for many years is provided by an examination of expenditures for public assistance programs. At the time that the Congress liberalized the old-age and survivors' insurance program in 1950, we contemplated that expenditures for public assistance would ultimately decline.

The intent of the Congress is clearly revealed in Report No. 1669 of the Senate Finance Committee dated May 16, 1950, which discussed the amendments embodied in H.R. 6000, 81st Congress. It stated that:

"The committee-approved bill is designed to have the insurance program become the basic method. The strengthening of old-age and survivors insurance will reduce the need for public-assistance expenditures. The broad extension of coverage, the increase in benefits, and the liberalized eligibility requirements of the insurance program will decrease the number of people who will have to depend on the assistance programs * * *."

This statement was made in 1950 when budget expenditures for public assistance totaled $1,039 million. The 1961 budget estimate for this program submitted by President Eisenhower on January 18, 1960, proposes expenditures of $2,087 million. In other words, although coverage had been extended, a program which was destined to decrease in importance doubled in size during a decade. This illustrates the need for extreme caution in embarking upon new programs which may require modest financial obligations at the time they are suggested.

The economic facts of life are such that we have only two alternatives we can use

to finance these expenditures. We must either go into debt, or we must increase our tax revenues.

The dangers and serious consequences of a continuous budget deficit need not be recounted. The experience of many European countries in the postwar period have demonstrated beyond a doubt that inflation and depreciated currency are not mere phantoms. Events here in the United States have proved that a firm stand must be taken to preserve the integrity of the dollar. Our current balance-of-payments problem should serve as a constant reminder that unless we maintain competitive prices in world markets and bring about a balance in terms of our international payments, we are headed for serious trouble. In 1949 U.S. gold stocks reached a postwar high of $24.6 billion. At the end of April of this year, they stand at $19.4 billion, a decline of $5.2 billion. It is self-evident that this trend must be halted if our economic system is to survive. In fact, the claims on our gold at Fort Knox, if they were all exercised, would completely absorb our reserves.

Ladies and gentlemen, an examination of the budget outlined by President Eisenhower last January shows that interest payments represent 12 percent of expenditures; general Government, 2.4 percent; major national security programs, 57.1 percent; international affairs and finance, 2.8 percent; veterans' services and benefits, 6.9 percent; agriculture and agricultural resources, 7 percent; labor and welfare, 5.7 percent; commerce and housing, 3.4 percent; natural resources, 2.4 percent; and allowances for contingenies, 0.3 percent. On the revenue side, corporation income taxes are expected to contribute 28 percent of revenues, individual income taxes, 52 percent, and excise and other taxes 20 percent.

The original budget prepared last January will bear little resemblance to the appropriations and authorizations provided by the present Congress. For example, the President requested an increase in postal rates which apparently will not be granted. Furthermore, within the past few days the Senate has adopted bills that would add more than $2 billion to the budget, which was presented by President Eisenhower last January, and the end is not yet in sight since there will certainly be additional spending bills, including programs not provided for in the budget before we finally adjourn.

For example, the tax rate on corporation profits presently stands at 52 percent. The Federal Government is the senior partner in every corporation with a taxable income in excess of $25,000. It derives more revenue from the enterprise than the investors who risk their capital to provide jobs for our people and the goods and services that we need.

Accordingly, if more Federal revenues are needed, they will have to be raised by increased personal income taxes in the lower and middle brackets. Yet we are all aware that today the average employee is most concerned with his take-home pay. If further tax withholding reduces take-home pay, organized labor will of necessity demand higher wages. These added labor costs will in turn have to be factored into higher prices. Further price increases will only aggravate the problem of foreign competition with which we are now faced and will ultimately result in more problems of unemployment, depressed areas, and a lower standard of living.

There have been many bills which were passed by both Houses of the Congress to establish new programs but which were vetoed by the President. In and of themselves some of them may have been worthy, but the problem now is one of priorities. It is important that every voter understand that if additional demands for Federal funds are pressed upon the Congress, they can only be met through increased taxes that will raise his cost of living and lower his take-home pay.

This is not a time when any of us should be solely concerned with the merits or demerits of specific programs but rather with the simple fact of how we can pay for them and how they will ultimately add to the growth of our tax base.

I would like to quote from a recent speech given by Mr. Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget at the annual dinner of the Tax Foundation in New York. Mr. Stans said:

"Except for its dimensions, the Federal budget is parallel to a family's budget, as a plan for living, with its goals, its fixed costs, its choices among variables, its contingencies, and above all its relevance to what we can afford within our means. The simple idea that whatever is spent must somehow be covered by what is earned would help to dissipate the widespread delusion that in some strange way when money comes from Washington it doesn't cost anybody anything."

Ladies and gentlemen, plans for participation by the Federal Government in our economy must be designed to meet only those requirements which cannot be covered through the exercise of local resources and initiative.

President Eisenhower in his budget message of January 18, 1960, said:

"I believe that the American people have made their wishes clear: The Federal Government should conduct its financial affairs with a high sense of responsibility vigorously meeting the Nation's needs and opportunities within its proper sphere while at the same time exercising a prudent discipline in matters of borrowing and spending, and in incurring liabilities for the future."

The high sense of responsibility and prudent discipline to which President Eisenhower referred should be ever before legislators as they consider any legislative proposals until this country has demonstrated over a reasonable period of time that our budget is balanced and our national finances are in proper order.

It is most important to allow local authorities the right to tax. We are in effect making an indirect contribution to State and local governments to assume added responsibilities by allowing them to issue securities, the income from which is exempt from Federal taxation. In 1951 the spending program of the States totaled $15.3 billion. It has more than doubled in the short span of 9 years to $32 billion in 1959.

In the years ahead there will be added demands because of population increases and the movement from concentrated urban areas to the suburbs. There has been increased pressure on the States in terms of their own financial problems which must be met by the same individuals who support the Federal Government. An unhealthy fiscal situation has developed because population growth and concentration have occurred in urban and suburban areas, with the total population increasing about 30 million between 1946 and 1957. Over half of this growth was in the nonproductive group of citizens who are in school, in the age group from 5 to 17, or those who have retired and are 65 years of age and over.

In spite of additional Federal programs, State and local governments have been burdened with added costs for public assistance and other social welfare programs. More schoolteachers are needed to meet the educational requirements of our expanded youth population. The number of motor vehicles has grown from 34 million in 1946 to 68 million in 1959. All these factors add to the cost of Government—National, State, and local. I am a fervent believer in having as many of these activities conducted by the States and their subdivisions as possible since I am convinced that any Government activity carried on under the close observation of those who are paying for it will probably result in greater efficiency. However, regardless of how these programs are financed, they are imposing an ever-larger burden of taxes on those who constitute the civilian labor force of less than 70 million out of a population of almost 180 million.

In order for us to maintain our position as leaders of the free world, the time has come for prudence in spending the hard-earned income of American producers by every level of government.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it was my great privilege to address a group of leading business and professional men of the tristate area of which Pittsburgh is the center, known as the Amen Corner group, in the spring of 1959. At this time I pointed out a danger which has since become a reality. I append hereto certain statements which I made before this group, including a table, which were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 23, 1959, to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

Our tax system deters thrift. In these days, when the Government requires the maximum possible revenue, progressive tax rates which exceed the point of diminishing returns represent fiscal irresponsibility at its worst. What is not generally recognized is the fact that our progressive income taxes apply particularly to investment income from the private sector of our economy. Anyone can readily secure a yield of 3 percent through the purchase of tax-exempt bonds which finance State and local enterprises of many kinds.

An investment in a corporate enterprise must produce at least 7.8 percent before taxes to provide an equivalent yield to a person with a taxable income of only $2,000. If the income of an individual is $10,000 the yield from a private corporate venture must exceed 10 percent before taxes to equal the 3-percent yield he can obtain from a tax-exempt security. If he happens to be in the top Federal bracket tax bracket the equivalent yield from a private corporate investment must be more than 69 percent. This is an absurdity.

"I do not have to belabor the point with this audience that there are few individuals in the upper-income brackets who are interested in financing new risk enterprises under such conditions. I hope, as a member of the Senate Finance Committee, to make a contribution toward the restoration of some sense to this utterly unrealistic progressive tax structure which was designed to punish success rather than to raise revenue. Mr. Khrushchev would not have made this mistake.

"American citizens are not permitted to convert paper dollars into gold; however, foreigners have this opportunity. In recent years we have been providing them with dollar resources to enable them to draw on our gold balances. Unless we maintain competitive prices in world markets and bring about a balance in terms of our international payments our economy is headed for serious trouble.

"In 1949 U.S. gold stocks reached a post-was high of $24.6 billion. At the end of last year they stood at $20.6 billion, a decline of $4 billion. The reduction in 1958 alone totaled $2.3 billion. In fact, the monthly figures show a falling gold stock for every month since January 1958. While a $20 billion gold stock provides an adequate base for our currency, it must be self-evident that a decline of about 10 percent a year can no longer continue without completely destroying our own economic system. This, perhaps, is the best way for us to fully appreciate the impact of unsound economic

policies, since an excess of demands for dollar payments abroad over purchases from us will sooner or later be reflected in our monetary reserves.

"Our country has faced and met great problems in the past. I have every confidence that our leaders in industry, labor, and Government are capable of meeting the difficulties which confront us today. They can, and will be met by a rededication by each of us to those ideals which guided our Founding Fathers in writing the Constitution and our Bill of Rights.

"We must reinstill these virtues in our youth, because it is quite apparent that our opponents behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains are developing the willingness to sacrifice immediate pleasures in order to achieve their objectives. We must meet this challenge while retaining freedom. It is more difficult for us to impose self-discipline upon ourselves than to permit dictation by the state, but if we are true to our heritage, this is what we shall do.

Federal taxes paid by the 44 largest industrial corporations, ranked by sales, are required to finance 1959 expenditures for international affairs and finance

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Company	U.S. income taxes paid in 1957	Sales	Assets	Invested capital	Employees
General Motors	$703,221	$10,989,813	$7,498,008	$4,905,108	508,160
Standard Oil (New Jersey)*	53,000	7,830,270	8,712,387	5,755,611	160,000
Ford Motor	84,048	5,771,275	3,347,645	2,149,474	191,759
United States Steel	406,000	4,413,906	4,372,770	2,997,819	271,037
General Electric	248,718	4,335,664	2,361,319	1,231,273	282,029
Chrysler	128,700	3,564,983	1,496,605	732,308	136,187
Socony Mobil Oil 1*	80,100	2,976,104	3,105,252	2,378,925	77,000
Gulf Oil	133,459	2,730,085	3,240,571	2,190,299	61,100
Bethlehem Steel	175,000	2,603,713	2,260,340	1,586,792	166,859
Swift	3,338	2,542,238	544,690	377,514	71,900
Texas Co	39,000	2,344,177	2,729,095	2,053,369	53,340
Standard Oil (Indiana)*	26,348	2,010,115	2,535,023	2,012,260	50,845
Westinghouse Electric	66,800	2,009,044	1,400,683	821,350	128,572
Du Pont de Nemours, E. I.	272,120	1,964,324	2,755,547	2,342,599	90,088
Shell Oil	35,284	1,764,602	1,407,444	977,566	40,000
Standard Oil (California)*	40,100	1,650,823	2,246,296	1,858,900	39,206
Boeing Airplane	39,030	1,596,500	491,029	178,901	94,998
General Dynamics	47,550	1,502,539	570,605	225,278	91,700
National Dairy Products	37,750	1,432,319	553,604	341,576	46,332
Goodyear Tire & Rubber	50,285	1,421,850	928,951	455,962	101,386
Union Carbide	120,175	1,395,033	1,456,353	839,664	64,247
Sinclair Oil*	21,000	1,251,069	1,480,616	962,351	25,240
North American Aviation	35,102	1,243,767	349,623	170,448	54,660
United Aircraft	55,223	1,232,919	451,459	252,784	61,688
Republic Steel	$89,600	$1,227,258	$980,379	$697,207	65,110
International Harvester	31,280	1,171,389	1,021,117	773,440	68,861
Radio Corp. of America	38,500	1,170,905	751,644	288,382	78,000
Firestone Tire & Rubber	40,635	1,158,884	780,420	459,349	88,323
Procter & Gamble	58,880	1,156,390	737,774	462,097	29,367
Phillips Petroleum	36,400	1,131,794	1,519,631	980,348	26,838
Douglas Aircraft	35,450	1,091,366	407,213	168,836	78,400
Cities Service	16,988	1,046,360	1,292,561	615,930	19,300
Continental Can	33,350	1,046,267	664,125	393,703	53,886
American Can	42,468	1,066,305	790,974	487,723	50,838
International Business Machines	97,000	1,000,432	1,153,969	622,518	60,231
General Foods	45,100	971,335	404,467	256,676	21,300
International Paper	55,507	940,428	850,056	718,811	48,306
Borden	21,539	931,221	353,437	221,095	35,058
U.S. Rubber	20,961	873,583	592,935	289,109	60,136
Sperry Rand	26,215	871,047	708,536	336,848	93,130
Aluminum Co. of America 1	69,000	869,378	1,315,569	670,531	54,640
Lockheed Aircraft	17,120	868,315	419,024	115,932	54,781
Jones & Laughlin Steel	39,271	837,568	799,289	512,623	43,948
Eastman Kodak	94,509	798,283	775,034	587,188	50,300
Total	3,811,184	90,805,529	72,614,069	47,456,477	4,029,139

1 Includes U.S. and foreign income taxes.
*Asterisks indicate data was taken from corporation's annual report.

NOTE.—All data from July 1958 Fortune "Directory of the 500 Largest U.S. Industrial Corporations" except U.S. income taxes, which was taken from Moody's 1958 "Industrial Manual." Western Electric, which ranked No. 11, was omitted, as its data are consolidated with American Telephone & Telegraph, a public utility. Armour, which ranked No. 16, was omitted since it paid no Federal income taxes.

Fortune magazine in its July 1958 issue ranked America's leading industrial corporations in terms of their sales. On the basis of this list, I find that the taxes paid in 1957 by 44 of our largest industrial corporations do not equal $4 billion. In fact, they paid taxes to the Federal Government in the amount of $3,811 million. These taxes in turn were predicated on sales of $91 billion worth of products. The production of these goods required the use of assets costing $73 billion. The production to furnish these taxes required the employment of more than 4 million employees.

I have prepared a table which shows the actual budget expenditures and receipts in 1957, which is the latest year that figures are avaliable, showing the breakdown of individual personal income tax receipts by the various brackets, which is as follows:

TABLE I.—*1957 Federal spending and receipts*

EXPENDITURES

	Dollars (billions)	Percent of total
Interest	7.3	10.5
General government	1.8	2.6
Major national security	43.3	62.4
International affairs and finance	2.0	2.9
Veterans' services and benefits	4.8	6.9
Agriculture	4.5	6.5
Labor and welfare	3.0	4.3
Commerce and housing	1.4	2.0
Natural resources	1.3	1.9
Total	69.4	100.0

RECEIPTS

Corporation income tax	21.2	30.4
Excise and miscellaneous taxes	14.2	20.4
Individual income tax:		
$100,000 to $1,000,000 and over	1.9	2.7
$50,000 to $100,000	2.2	3.2
$25,000 to $50,000	3.1	4.4
$15,000 to $25,000	2.7	3.9
$10,000 to $15,000	3.9	5.6
$9,000 to $10,000	1.7	2.4
$8,000 to $9,000	2.2	3.2
$7,000 to $8,000	2.8	4.0
$6,000 to $7,000	3.3	4.7
$5,000 to $6,000	3.4	4.9
$4,000 to $5,000	3.2	4.6
$3,000 to $4,000	2.2	3.2
Under $3,000	1.7	2.4
Total	69.7	100.0

NOTE.—Of the $35,000,000,000 derived from the personal income tax, $28,000,000,000 (or 80 percent of the total) was in the personal income tax brackets under $25,000.

On the expenditure side I have listed the items in terms of priority. Interest payments must be met if the Government is to remain solvent. General Government expenditures are shown next; major national security is our next order of priority; international affairs and finance come next; followed by veterans' services and benefits. Then I have considered other domestic programs in their order of interest to the Congress, such as agriculture and agricultural resources, labor and welfare, commerce and housing, and natural resources.

On the receipt side I have listed the income by source in the following order: First, there is income from corporation income taxes; then excise taxes; followed by estate, gift, customs, and miscellaneous taxes; and then the receipts from the personal income taxes, which I have shown in terms of income tax brackets. This table, Mr. President, reveals some startling facts. If we take the first four expenditure items—namely, interest payments, general Government expenses, major national security programs, and international affairs and finance expenditures in the year 1957—we find that they preempted all of the receipts from the corporate income tax, all the excise, estate, and gift taxes, customs and miscellaneous receipts, as well as the receipts from personal individual income taxes down to the $7,000 to $8,000 brackets. By adding the next two priorities of budget expenditures—veterans' services and benefits and agriculture and agricultural resources—we then find the Congress has authorized the use of the receipts from all corporate income taxes, excise, estate, and gift taxes, customs, and miscellaneous receipts, as well as the payments to the Federal Government through personal income taxes down to the $5,000 bracket. Expenditures for labor and welfare, commerce and housing, and natural resources were paid for by taxes received from those citizens with taxable incomes of less than $5,000.

I have prepared two additional tables, as follows:

TABLE II.—*Summary of present rates of Federal taxes*

Corporation income tax:
Normal tax: 30 percent of taxable income.
Surtax: 22 percent of taxable income in excess of $25,000.

Typical excise taxes:	Rate
Telephone ----------percent--	10
Furs, jewelry, and other luxury items ----------percent--	10
Transportation of persons-------do--	10
Gasoline----------cents per gallon--	4
Automobiles ----------percent--	10

Typical estate taxes (flat exemption of $60,000).

On estates in excess of this amount Federal taxes are levied with certain credits for State taxes, as follows:

(A) Taxable estate equal to or more than—	(B) Taxable estate less than—	(C) Tax on amount in col. (A)	(D) Rate of tax on excess over amount in col. (A)
			Percent
$10,000	$20,000	$500	11
$20,000	30,000	1,600	14
$30,000	60,000	7,000	25
$100,000	250,000	20,700	30
$500,000	750,000	145,700	35
$1,000,000	1,250,000	325,700	39

TABLE III.—*Summary of personal income tax rates (after allowable deductions and personal exemption of $600 per individual)*

MARRIED TAXPAYERS FILING RETURNS

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Not over $4,000----	20 percent of the amount on line 5.
Over $4,000 but not over $8,000.	$800, plus 22 percent of excess over $4,000.
Over $8,000 but not over $12,000.	$1,680, plus 26 percent of excess over $8,000.
Over $12,000 but not over $16,000.	$2,720, plus 30 percent of excess over $12,000.
Over $16,000 but not over $20,000.	$3,920, plus 34 percent of excess over $16,000.
Over $20,000 but not over $24,000.	$5,280, plus 38 percent of excess over $20,000.
Over $24,000 but not over $28,000.	$6,800, plus 43 percent of excess over $24,000.
Over $28,000 but not over $32,000.	$8,520, plus 47 percent of excess over $28,000.
Over $32,000 but not over $36,000.	$10,400, plus 50 percent of excess over $32,000.
Over $36,000 but not over $40,000.	$12,400, plus 53 percent of excess over $36,000.
Over $40,000 but not over $44,000.	$14,520, plus 56 percent of excess over $40,000.
Over $44,000 but not over $52,000.	$16,760, plus 59 percent of excess over $44,000.
Over $52,000 but not over $64,000.	$21,480, plus 62 percent of excess over $52,000.
Over $64,000 but not over $76,000.	$28,920, plus 65 percent of excess over $64,000.
Over $76,000 but not over $88,000.	$36,720, plus 69 percent of excess over $76,000.

TABLE III.—*Summary of personal income tax rates (after allowable deductions and personal exemption of $600 per individual)*—Continued

If the taxable income is:	The tax is:
Over $88,000 but not over $100,000.	$45,000, plus 72 percent of excess over $88,000.
Over $100,000 but not over $120,000.	$53,640, plus 75 percent of excess over $100,000.
Over $120,000 but not over $140,000.	$68,640, plus 78 percent of excess over $120,000.
Over $140,000 but not over $160,000.	$84,240, plus 81 percent of excess over $140,000.
Over $160,000 but not over $180,000.	$100,440, plus 84 percent of excess over $160,000.
Over $180,000 but not over $200,000.	$117,240, plus 87 percent of excess over $180,000.
Over $200,000 but not over $300,000.	$134,640, plus 89 percent of excess over $200,000.
Over $300,000 but not over $400,000.	$223,640, plus 90 percent of excess over $300,000.
Over $400,000------	$313,640, plus 91 percent of excess over $400,000.

Table II summarizes the present rate of taxes other than personal income taxes. Table III, which shows the tax rates on personal income, is conservative as it is based on a married taxpayer filing a joint return. Under this schedule the 50 percent tax rate is reached with a taxable income of $32,000 whereas a single person is in the 50 percent bracket with a taxable income of only $16,000.

Table III shows that personal income taxes have already reached a level of 91 percent in the top bracket and that even the first $4,000 of taxable income for a married couple carries a rate of 20 percent. In this connection, may I remind my colleagues that social security taxes must also be paid on the first $4,000 at the rate of 3 percent. This payment is not a deduction in the computation of personal income taxes.

"My True Security—The American Way"—State of Florida Winning Essay by Dennis Cumberton, Miami Central High School, Miami, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged recently to attend a banquet sponsored by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce here in Washington, D.C. The occasion was the second annual My True Security National Awards program.

"My True Security—The American Way" is a Jaycee program designed to increase the American students' understanding of the importance of individual initiative and self-reliance in our free enterprise system.

Throughout the 50 States and the District of Columbia, more than 50,000 high school seniors in 1,700 schools took their time and energy to think, write, and speak on this vital subject.

The Jaycees are young men at work and in 3,800 communities their name is synonymous with action. As a former member and president of the Miami chapter, I am proud of my association with this organization which does so much to instill civic consciousness and responsibility and to promote leadership.

"My True Security—The American Way" is another of the affirmative programs emphasizing the fundamental beliefs of the junior chamber of commerce in our American system.

A distinguished national judging panel chose the national winners who were provided with scholarships.

We in Florida are very proud of our State winner in this contest, Dennis Jay Cumberton, who attended Miami Central High School, Miami, Fla. He is an outstanding young man and I enjoyed meeting and talking with him. I am pleased to present his thoughtful presentation on "My True Security—The American Way":

I like to think of my security as a living chain, complex in construction and operation, but composed of many simple parts or links. In this living chain, each part is important—for a chain is only as strong as its weakest link. As I examine my living chain, I find the links to be composed of the by-products of democracy and our American way of life, all of which constitute my true security.

The first and most important link is my family. A family, in essence, is a small nation in which each member symbolizes a citizen. When citizenship fails to unite for common protection, the whole nation fails—as was the case in ancient Rome. Conversely, if the family is secure and successful, the individual will be secure and successful. I owe any progress that I have made to my family's guidance and confidence, and know that I can always turn to them when in trouble or doubt.

My second link is my religion. Since the beginning of time man has had to find something that transcends his own mundane experience in which to believe and on which to base his morals. I am sure that a steadfast belief in God which has extended to belief in the essential goodness of my fellow man has served to instill in me a deep sense of belonging in the world and thus has fostered in me a feeling of security. A feeling of belonging is also derived from participating in service oranizations within the school such as Key Club and Student Council. Later such experience of service will be extended to those of a community nature, such as Kiwanis Club, Lions Club, or working for the United Fund.

My third link is my education. In this link I include the freedom to be educated, as well as the freedom to choose my profession. One major byproduct of education is a progressive growth in self-reliance and self-confidence. Self-reliance and self-confidence are good synonyms for security because they are composed of and derived from the same living links. It is these qualities, the byproducts of education, that give me a sense of security for I am ever aware that I can always make a useful place for myself in the world both in earning a living and by repaying society with constructive service.

My fourth link is the one of largest scope. It includes all the rights and freedoms guar-

anteed me by our American Constitution and also the sense of personal protection that stems from the knowledge of national security. I know that I am secure from undue search or seizure of my house because this fact is so stated unequivocally in the Bill of Rights of our Constitution. From our Constitution, I am also assured of my security as a citizen in regard to legal protection and rights. I know that I am innocent until proved guilty and that I cannot be held without cause, as is guaranteed by the writ of habeas corpus. Should I ever stand trial, I am assured of a trial by a jury of my peers.

By being permitted the privilege of voting in the future and by freedom of the press and by freedom of speech, I am assured that I will always have a say in and full knowledge of the proceedings and status of my Government. This knowledge will serve to give me a feeling of national security by keeping me informed as to our national defensive position with regard to the rest of the world.

Looking at my living chain as I have created it, I find that its elements; my family, my religion, my education, and my knowledge of my rights as guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, form a chain of my true security—the American way. These links, this chain—comprise my true security because only through them do I find the necessary elements which give me the self-confidence and self-reliance that I need to succeed materially, morally, and constructively.

Will the Future Redeem the Past?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, Hon. Charles Malik, former President of the United Nations, speaking at a prelude to independence ceremony in Williamsburg, Va., on June 11, delivered a brilliant and thought provoking speech entitled "Will the Future Redeem the Past?" I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of that speech printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I propose today to meditate briefly on the past decade or two and to look ahead to the coming decade or two. I have been led to this undertaking partly through the inspiration of the whole concept of Colonial Williamsburg and its majestic execution, whose purpose is so perfectly expressed in its motto, "That the future may learn from the past"; partly because of the critical nature of the present moment of history.

Communism started from zero 43 years ago and today it rigidly controls one-third of mankind and has penetrated and softened up in varying degrees the remaining two-thirds: Was this phenomenal development inevitable? The victory of communism in the late forties in China means that the largest compactly homogeneous mass of humanity, numbering some 600 million people, are now sworn enemies of everything free and Western: Was this development inevitable? The Korean war, despite all its heroic exertions, ended in a draw: Was this outcome inevitable? In Southeast Asia there has occurred during the last 10 years an advance of communism and a retreat of freedom: Was this advance inevitable? * * * The Communist Party, receiving orders directly from Moscow, is certainly more active and influential today in Asia and Africa than 10 years ago * * *: Was this penetration inevitable?

Backing international communism as its embodiment and vehicle is the most superbly organized international political party in history, the Communist Party, with the most advanced techniques of intellectual, social, economic, and political penetration and subversion ever devised: Was the impotence of the West in developing any comparable counterforce inevitable? Backing international communism materially is the second most industrially advanced state in the world, the Soviet Union, which might at the present rate of development surpass the United States in 2 decades—Was this discrepancy in the rates of growth, and in the rates of change of the rates of growth, between East and West inevitable? This supporting industrial base appears to command atomic and nuclear weapons in abundance, whereas 10 or 15 years ago the United States had a monopoly of these weapons—Was this decline in Western relative strength inevitable? We are today more than 2 years and 8 months since Sputnik I, and while the West has made enormous advances in rocketry, it is not clear that in this revolutionary technological field it has caught up with the Soviet Union so far as thrust power is concerned: Is this persistent lag inevitable? * * *

The visible struggle appears to occur all on this side of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains—in Europe, in the Middle East, in southeast Asia, in the Far East, in Latin America; and when people expect a crisis to break out tomorrow, they do not expect it in Albania or Rumania or Russia or China, but in the home of freedom; freedom then is on the defensive and not communism: Is it fated that the West should be always on the defensive, always reacting? * * * In the nascent nationalism of Asia and Africa, which is otherwise a natural and good thing, there is an admixture in varying degrees of anti-Westernism, if not procommunism that leads to anti-Westernism: Was this spread of anti-Westernism as concomitant of the growth of nationalism inevitable? In the very nations that have attained the dignity of political freedom and independence other dimensions of freedom have been severely curtailed, namely, personal freedom, intellectual freedom, social freedom, spiritual freedom: Was this contraction of the domain of freedom inevitable? * * * Communism has been more persistent and effective in presenting to the Asian and African mind a well-thought-out interpretation of existence, the Marxist-Leninist ideology, than any outlook that has been forthcoming from the West: Was this timidity in the articulation of the ideology of freedom inevitable? * * *

The simple fact that the free world has not succeeded in 40 years in pushing back the tide of communism by 1 inch from where it really got political control leaves the strong impression that we are here dealing with an irresistible and irreversible thrust which will inevitably inherit and transform in its own image all the kingdoms and cultures of the earth: Is this creeping tide of communism completely irreversible? Perhaps the most distressing fact is the self-satisfaction and self-congratulation that prevails in the West; the softness, the laxity, the lack of determination and decisiveness, the general decadence, the uncritical readiness to settle for "peaceful coexistence"—are we then face to face with some ineluctable judgment of fate or God?

In terms of the ultimate world struggle, how are we to assess the net performance of the immediate past from the comparison of the two sides of the balance sheet which I have just drawn up? I can draw the provisional conclusion that while things could have been much worse, in my opinion they could have decidedly been much better. International communism is today on an over-all basis relatively stronger than 10 or 15 years ago, and the free world is relatively weaker; there is a marked overall advance by the one and a corresponding overall retreat by the other. In history it is impossible at any moment to work out a neat, final balance sheet, for at no moment "in history" does history come to an end. It all depends then on the future. The future could redeem the past or it could confirm it. But it will redeem nothing unless the question of the inevitability or otherwise of the developments of the immediate past is first squarely and honestly faced. For either you believe that these things were inevitable or you believe that they could have been helped. If you believe that they were inevitable; namely, that the outcome of the struggle in China, in Korea, in Indochina; that the Communist penetration of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America; that the absence of any effective counteracting force to the Communist Party; that the relative decline in Western influence and Western economic and military strength, etc., if you believe that all these developments of the fifties of the twentieth century could not have helped, then you are already a Marxist. For Marx, Lenin, and Khrushchev hold firmly (and Khrushchev repeats it everyday) that the iron laws of history are precisely such that whatever happens, Communism will come out on top. I warn you therefore against declining to assume full moral-historical responsibility for what happened during the last 2 decades; for if you do so you are already a Marxist and Marxian communism will have already won in your soul.

The only hope therefore is to believe on a basis of truth and not of darkness or sentiment or dogmatism that nothing of what transpired was inevitable, and that everything could have been prevented or reversed. Only on the basis of radical moral responsibility can you overcome the fatalism of the cosmologists and the determinism of the dialectical materialists. The future will never redeem the past and we will only pass from one fiasco to another, from one pathetic drift to another, unless in contemplating the past we can put our finger with certainty on such and such an act and such and such a decision and such and such a person, and honestly say that this act or decision or person could have been different and therewith the course of events would have taken a radically different turn. If only people rose to the occasion, if only they were not overwhelmed by their softness and apathy, if only they overcame their greed, if only they were morally strong, if only they were not selfish and narrow, if only they were not petty and spiteful and stupid, if only they were big, if only they knew what was at stake, if only they were not hypocritical, if only they trampled under foot the wide and easy way.

I shall not go into any detailed moral-historical-political evaluation of the past. Taking upon ourselves the whole moral guilt of the past, believing that the present would have been entirely different if only people measured up to the historic requirements of the moment, and therefore determining that the future which will be the responsibility of this generation shall redeem the past, let us now quietly inquire into what must be done in the immediate future to reverse the trend of the immediate past.

Four conditions are absolutely sine qua non: Unity among the Western allies, deeper understanding and statesmanlike assistance toward the peoples of Asia and Africa, winning the technological competition especially in the matter of armaments, and winning the economic competition in productivity. If the Atlantic world breaks up,

whether from internal friction or external pressure, there will be complete disarray in the free world and little will be left to oppose effectively the onward march of communism anywhere. If the Asians and Africans are not understood on the deepest possible plane and if the Communists prove that they are more friendly and helpful to them, then Asia and Africa will gradually fall to their wiles. If the Communists do better in the technological revolution, especially with respect to weapons, then all will be lost. If the West does not outproduce them, both quantitatively and qualitatively, then the rest of the world will be sucked into their system.

On the subject of Western unity the question is whether the Western nations can morally rise above their narrow nationalisms into a realization that it their whole civilization that is once more today at stake. I believe they can. Nothing is half as important today as that the spiritual unity of Europe, America, and the Mediterranean world be understood and affirmed.

Putting aside the question of vision, will, softness of living, and unity of effort among the diverse factors involved, there is no doubt whatsoever that, by any standard of measurement, the material and human resources of North and South America, of Western Europe, of Japan, of Australasia, and of as much of Africa (and there is no reason why all of Africa should not be included) and Asia as may be persuaded to cooperate, can be so marshaled and coordinated as to outdo the Communist domain, in any field of human endeavor, by a ratio of at least 5 to 1. * * *

The West should stand firm at all costs against any further expansion of communism, including above all the test case of Berlin. In a possible showdown, the obvious strategic handicaps notwithstanding, there should be no question in anybody's mind that the West would not accept a weakening of its position in Berlin. Some Western commentators have darkly hinted that the West would not fight over Berlin. It is fair then to ask, over what would the West fight?

But merely holding the line is patently not enough. This was the error of the doctrine of containment. It is a passive, defensive, unchallenging policy; and such a policy, except as a necessary first step, is doomed to failure; firstly because this is a dynamic universe; secondly because you are dealing with the most aggressive enemy who will always swirl around and underneath and above all your containing devices; thirdly because a merely defensive or containing attitude means that you are so fat and satisfied yourself that all you wish to achieve is to get away with your own skin, and thus you have no vision, no concern for the rest of the world, and he who has no concern for others will sooner or later find that others, including his erstwhile friends, have no concern for him; and fourthly because you cannot be true to your own freedom if you do not wish and work for freedom for others. * * * Freedom creates justice, but not conversely; for justice could be something mechanical without the ultimate freedom of the spirit which demands and creates and recognizes and enforces justice. The West can only be true to itself if it says, "I am prepared to settle for peace with freedom and justice," and if it wants to use only one of the two, "I am prepared to settle for peace with freedom."

But only a believing, active, sustained, and bold looking forward to a free Eastern Europe, a free Russia, and a free China is worthy of the magnitude of the gigantic world struggle. A radical distinction must be made between the great peoples of these countries and their Communist governments. Policies should be devised and pursued in conformity with this distinction. The flame of freedom must be kept burning in the soul of the oppressed. The hope of liberation must never be allowed to fade away from their hearts. As free peoples they have an honorable and equal place in the company of the free. Their energies will be given the freest scope. Their spiritual and cultural contributions to the whole world are awaited and welcomed. With vision and leadership the West should be able to promise them greater material benefits than they have been able to achieve under communism; benefits which they themselves would acquire by their own free exertions. But they should be promised much more: they should be assured of the freedom to criticize, the freedom to think, the freedom to create, the freedom to live, the freedom to work, the freedom to choose and turn out their own governments, the freedom to lead on the basis of merit in a world freed of the poison of mistrust, subversion, and intrigue. * * *

The Communists never tire of assuring the rest of the world that "peaceful coexistence" only means that they will realize their unalaterable aim of communizing the world without war, and that where they do not succeed in this, they will keep in mind the possibility of nonpeaceful means. They are therefore absolutely determined to dominate the world with or without war. This was explicitly stated by the international Communist congress to which I referred. They therefore speak of the "doomed classes" and of "burying" you and me. We should not be misled by the terms they use, such as "capitalism," "imperialism," "American imperialism," "Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-American imperialism," "bourgeois society," etc. These are only revolutionary slogans employed by them to excite and enlist people in their international proletarian revolution. What they are saying behind all this jargon is that the international Communist movement wants to overthrow every existing government, regime, system, outlook, religion, and philosophy, and bring the whole world, all human thought, aspiration, action, and organization, under its absolute control. This is their declared, unchanged, and unchanging objective.

I am yet to hear one Western leader who, assured to his face that he is doomed and will be "buried," can muster enough courage and conviction, if not to use the vulgar phrase "bury" with respect to communism itself, at least to use some such civilized expression as that the days of communism are numbered and that communism will one day be completely forgotten. When Mr. Khrushchev assures Western leaders that their children or at most their grandchildren will all be Communists, I am yet to hear one Western leader who assures Mr. Khrushchev with the same gusto that his children or at least his grandchildren will live to regret and be thoroughly ashamed of the fact that their fathers or grandfathers were ever Communists. And whereas international communism believes and acts on the belief that the days of everything non-Communist are numbered, my deepest fear is that Western leadership believes no such thing with respect to communism. My fear is that the softening up process has reached such an advanced state that all now believe that communism is here to stay and that therefore the utmost they can do is to manage somehow to coexist with it. The deepest crisis of the West is the crisis of faith in its own values: whereas communism believes that non-Communist values must be eliminated from the face of the earth, and acts on this belief, the West no longer believes that Communist values themselves are doomed to utter destruction and oblivion, and therefore no longer acts on this belief. I am yet to meet or know of one important Western leader who entertains a dynamic vision for the Communist realm which includes the certainty that the children of present-day Communists will have completely repudiated communism and will have adopted the fundamental values of freedom. Let the West face up to this advanced state of decay in its own soul.

But what is preeminently at stake in Mediterranean-Western civilization today is its human and universal elements. It is man who is denied; it is the affirmation that there is nothing that binds and cements all men into one family that is the prime danger; it is the fragmentation of humanity into endless exclusivisms, whether national or cultural or racial or economic, that poses the deepest challenge. Western civilization is doomed until, jolted out of its complacency, self-satisfaction, and sense of apartness, it rediscovers and reaffirms what is genuinely human and universal in its own soul. This means not only economic and technical sharing with Asia and Africa, but intellectual, moral, and spiritual sharing. What is supremely good must be good for all. Those who keep on repeating, as though they discovered a transcendental wisdom, that their ideas, their way of life, their civilization, is "not for export," but only their industrial products, do not know that they are thereby digging the grave of their civilization and the grave of their way of life. Those who come to Asia and Africa and tell them, "You stay where and what you are and we stay where and what we are; we have nothing to give save our goods and gadgets," little know that the day will come, and perhaps is already here, when Asia and Africa will turn upon them and spit in their face. Man can live without goods and gadgets but he cannot live without something human and universal that joins him to his fellow men. A civilization in which the human and universal has atrophied can relate itself to others only through force, and force is not an enduring mode of relation, and it can always be broken by force. I am not speaking of diplomacy and propaganda; I am thinking of a whole philosophy of history. I am saying that a civilization is doomed if it is not creatively conscious of something universal and human it can and must give; and I am saying that Western civilization need not be doomed because no civilization conceived and developed the human and universal more than it did.

The Communists bring in a message. It affects the whole of human life. It provides a total interpretation. They are not afraid to be revolutionary; to say, this is good and that is bad. They are not afraid to shock and challenge the received customs and habits and ideas. They believe in something. The West does not want to be revolutionary, it is afraid of being revolutionary, it does not want to shock and challenge, it is civilized, it is afraid lest it offend. Its trouble therefore may lie precisely in the fact that the content of its belief is very thin. For that which you really believe to be true and human and universal you will want to share with others, you cannot keep under a bushel. The question is whether there is a profound

part of your being that you honestly feel you must share with others. The question is whether you honestly feel that you are not complete or happy so long as others are humanly incomplete, that you are not self-sufficient, so long as others are miserable or subhuman, a prey to every superstition and every dark fear. The self-sufficiency of the Anglo-Saxon world, its age-old protectedness by seas and oceans, is its greatest present spiritual trial. It has not needed the rest of humanity. But the world has suddenly become physically one, and minds and ideas are much more critically and instantaneously and perpetually interacting with one another. Only he therefore who feels with humanity, who is at one with all conditions of men, who is insufficient and incomplete without them, who is not protected and separated from them, can help them and lead them and love them and be loved by them. The incompleteness of the Communist until he completes himself in others is what gives him the dynamism, the vision, the appeal in the eyes of Asia or Africa.

If there were no universal and human elements in Western civilization the thing would be hopeless. But it happens that the deposit of humanity and universality in this civilization is the richest in the world. The civilization at whose heart pulsate Aristotle and Augustine and Aquinas and Dante and Newton and Shakespeare and Pascal and Kant and Lincoln, the civilization which has been blessed and transformed by Christ, needs only a mighty hand to shake it out of its slumber. And once shaken, once really awakened to the world responsibilities which it and it alone can shoulder, there is nothing it cannot dare and do.

The Americans forsook the Old World and their one desire was to forget all about it; the Russians stayed in the Old World and never ceased to interact with its east and west and north and south. In this simple difference in fundamental existential orientation the whole secret of the present and the future may be hid. Can the Americans quickly recover the intimacy of relationship with the Old World which the Russians never lost?

Negotiations and contacts must never be broken. The United Nations must never be abandoned or weakened. Cultural exchanges must be deepened and enlarged. The Russian people must be brought into intimate spiritual community with the West. Nationalism is not enough, and the new nations must be afforded the opportunity of belonging to larger worlds with wider horizons. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights which is one of the greatest documents of this age and which owes so much to the Virginia Declaration of Rights must be vigorously held up as a standard of achievement for all nations and all peoples. The West must know its ultimate values and believe in them. The field of struggle must be transposed to the intellectual and spiritual plane. The prevalent softness and complacency must be overcome. The area of decision must not be left to the initiative of the Communists. The West must itself choose it. And so long as the head of international communism in Moscow remains unchanged, there is no hope.

Can the future redeem the past? I believe it can. Will the future redeem the past? That depends on four things: on depth, on wisdom, on daring, and on leadership. I believe without high leadership daring to act in wisdom and depth the future will not learn from the past. These are things for which we should yearn and work. But in our own effort we may not achieve them. It is only as God's wills that depth, wisdom, daring, and leadership be granted the free world at this crucial hour in history, that the future will redeem the past.

James A. Farley Honored by St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently an honorary degree of doctor of laws was conferred upon my good friend, the Honorable James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coco-Cola Export Corp., by St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, Pa. I shall quote verbatim the language of the president of St. Joseph's College in awarding this unusual degree:

THE PRESIDENT AND FACULTY OF SAINT JOSEPH'S COLLEGE TO ALL WHO VIEW THESE PRESENT LETTERS GIVE GREETINGS IN THE LORD

It is not given to many men that they should see themselves become legends in their own lifetime. Few of us ever live to experience that feeling which comes from passing under the scrutiny of historians as a public figure who helped to reflect and to mould the spirit of an age.

Today we honor a man who has already trodden such a judgment path. One cannot read a book on American history or American politics dealing with that era, just before the members of this graduating class trailed their clouds of glory into the world, without encountering the exploits of Grassy Point's most famous son, indeed the son who made Grassy Point, N.Y., famous: James Aloysius Farley.

There is no need to recount here Mr. Farley's phenomenal rise from the office of town clerk of Stony Point to the office of Postmaster General of the United States. Furthermore, it would be quite impossible even to list all of our honored guest's accomplishments as a business executive in the realm of national and international commercial enterprises, much less his worthy achievements in promoting clean athletics and wholesome recreation, or in aiding numerous religious and philanthropic causes.

We prefer to single him out for the activity for which he became uniquely noted and for which he will be best remembered: his activity as a statesman and politician par excellence. Perhaps no better way can be found to cite him than to use the same terms which have been applied to him in the works of contemporary scholars, who have called him a man of "acute political genius" and "native sagacity," a man "whose personal honesty, intelligence, and capacity to command friendship and loyalty were to win for him a deserved reputation as the ablest political manager since Mark Hanna."

For nearly three decades, Americans of every shade of political opinion have admired James Aloysius Farley unstintingly for the integrity, the informality, and the personal warmth which he brought to the task of managing the farflung affairs of one of our two great political parties. In an age of fast-growing communication and sophisticated but impersonal techniques, his singular contribution to the operation of our democratic institution is especially cherished.

Wherefore in virtue of the powers conferred upon his Corporation by the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, we have created and do hereby proclaim Hon. James Aloysius Farley a doctor of laws (honoris causa), and that all the rights and privileges attached to this degree be safeguarded unto him, we have issued these letters patent, signed by our hand and sealed with the great seal of the college on this 5th day of June, in the year of our Lord, 1960.

The tribute was entirely fitting and was richly deserved by Grassy Point's famous son, Jim Farley.

Czechoslovakia Bars U.S. "Masaryk" Stamp

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the Post Office Department annually issues special stamps depicting in minature famous men and women, great events in history, organizations, industries and natural wonders.

In addition, the Department issues a special series "champions of liberty" stamps. The purpose of this series is to honor foreign leaders and fighters of freedom.

Recently, a special stamp was issued to honor Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder-president of the Republic of Czechoslovakia in October 1918.

As we know, Czechoslovakia is now under Communist domination.

Traditionally, the Communists have changed or distored history to put communism in a better light insofar as possible.

Following the issuance of the special stamp honoring Thomas G. Masaryk as a champion of liberty for Czechoslovakia, the Czechoslovakian Government took action to bar mail bearing this stamp from that country.

The action reflects an unwillingness to allow even a postage stamp depicting freedom fighters of the past to circulate among the people. In addition, it calls to mind the old adage which, in essence, says, "Uneasy rests the head of a dictator who has denied freedom to his people." At this time, I request unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two items: First, an editorial from the Green Bay Press Gazette entitled "Champion of Liberty," reviewing the action and its significance by the Czech Communist government and; second, a release by Postmaster Arthur E. Summerfield deploring the action barring the mailing of champion of liberty stamps to people in Czechoslovakia.

There being no objection, the editorial and release were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press Gazette]

CHAMPION OF LIBERTY

When postage of one country is not acceptable to another, the latter is supposed to so notify the nation of origin under the Universal Postal Agreement. But authorities

in Czechoslovakia so far have been shy about doing so. They simply send back undelivered letters from the United States which bear the stamp honoring Thomas G. Masaryk.

Masaryk, the president of the Czechoslovakian Republic from its start in 1918 until 1935 when it only had a few years to go to be dissolved, is honored in the "Champions of Liberty" commemorative series. When the stamp was issued, Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield said: "These stamps * * * will mark not only the strong friendship between the peoples but their common aspirations for freedom."

But since the end of World War II, the adoption of a new constitution and the taking over of the entire nation by the Communists, the Czechs have shown little aspiration for freedom. Of all the Russian satellites, Czechoslovakia is supposed to be the most communized. If there are underground movements, there is little rumble of them in the rest of the world. From the outside it appears that the freedom-loving Czechs, so determined in opposing the oppressive Nazi rule and the slicing up of their country at Munich, have been worn down by the years of war and oppression.

But the very fact that the Czech government has made no loud noise about Masaryk indicates that there must be a lot of people in the nation who do him honor and the cause for which he lived and died. A people who have lived with liberty do not forget so easily.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT RELEASE No. 193

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield today deplored the action taken by the Czechoslovakia Government in barring mail bearing U.S. "champion of liberty" stamps honoring Thomas G. Masaryk, the father of the first Republic of Czechoslovakia.

"On March 7, 1960, the U.S. Government issued two new postage stamps of the 4-cent and 8-cent denominations honoring Thomas G. Masaryk, the founder-President of the Republic of Czechoslovakia in October 1918," Mr. Summerfield said. "These stamps are part of a series paying tribute to the great contributions to freedom made by great foreign-born leaders.

"An impressive ceremony was held here in Washington on that date with large numbers of American citizens of Czechoslovakian birth or ancestry in attendance. Many of these freedom-loving Americans used these new Masaryk stamps for mail addressed to their friends and relatives in Czechoslovakia.

"To our amazement we were informed that mail bearing the Masaryk stamp was being delivered in Czechoslovakia with the Masaryk stamps removed and envelopes marked 'received without stamps.' We protested this practice but received no reply from the Czechoslovakia postal authorities. Later they began returning such mail marked 'not admitted.'

"The procedure being followed by Czechoslovakia is used when international mail is received which is objectionable to the country of destination. The Universal Postal Convention, to which the United States and Czechoslovakia are signatories, prescribes that each member country of the union has the right to determine what articles shall be prohibited in its service, and there is no effective way in which another country can take exception to such determination.

"When a nation establishes a prohibition, it normally notifies the other country or countries from which the objectionable matter is being sent. The Czech postal authorities failed to follow this universally accepted obligation.

"Our efforts to correct this situation date back to May 10, when we wrote the Czech postal authorities protesting the removal of the Masaryk stamp from letters.

"Then, on June 8, we cabled them again to protest the removal of the stamps. And, in the same cable, we also asked them for an official explanation of the many complaints which we had received meanwhile protesting their return of letters with the Masaryk stamp marked 'not admitted.'

"It is clear that we have made substantial efforts to get satisfaction from the Czech postal authorities. While they are technically within their legal rights in determining what mail may enter their territory, it is deplorable that they should bar communications from this country to loved ones in Czechoslovakia because of stamps honoring a brilliant scholar, author, and patriot who fought with the powerful weapons of ideas, logic and eloquence, and who won the admiration and active support of freedom-loving peoples everywhere."

Michigan's Ford Rises in GOP Race for V-P

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, all of us recognize the many talents of Congressman JERRY FORD, of Michigan. Despite his youth, he has provided responsible, imaginative leadership, splendid cooperation, a great amount of statesmanship and an outstanding grasp of the world issues we face now and in the future.

Therefore, it was with a great deal of pleasure and pride for my own home State of Michigan that I noted an article in last Sunday's Omaha World-Herald proclaiming him as one of the leading contenders for the nomination for Vice President on the Republican ticket next November.

JERRY FORD has been outstanding here in Congress, on the football field and in the Navy. He has shown his sagacity and his intellect on many occasions as ranking Republican member of the important military appropriations subcommittee.

JERRY FORD is indeed a man of the present and of the future. May I urge my colleagues to note carefully the article from the Omaha Sunday World-Herald, which follows:

MICHIGAN'S FORD RISES IN GOP RACE FOR V-P

The word from political insiders in Washington is that Representative GERALD R. FORD, Jr., of Michigan, should not be sold short in the Republican vice presidential sweepstakes.

The 46-year-old Michigander—he will be 47 by national convention time—is generally regarded as a darkhorse possibly, but he's a lot less dark than he was a few months ago.

United Nations Representative Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts and Senator THRUSTON MORTON, of Kentucky, are the front runners right now. Some others, such as Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton of Nebraska, get considerable mention.

NOT TAKEN LIGHTLY

But the prospect that Mr. FORD might wind up with the nomination is not taken lightly among seasoned politicos.

Some of it may be wishful thinking on the part of Mr. FORD's friends, but they say: He's "right" geographically. He's young, a persuasive speaker, a good campaigner. He's sound in his viewpoint.

Mr. NIXON, who is known to regard Mr. FORD highly, has told friends many times, that, if President, he would regard his Vice President as the administration's chief troubleshooter."

HAS RIGHT VIEWS

This man's views, says Mr. NIXON, should in general parallel his own. Mr. FORD's friends say his do.

A six-time House Member, Mr. FORD does not have the national acquaintance of Mr. Lodge or Mr. MORTON or Secretary Seaton. But again, Mr. NIXON has been heard to say that in these days of mass communications it does not take long for the country to get to know a man.

Mr. FORD was born in Omaha, but lived in Nebraska only a short time.

FOOTBALL STAR

Like Mr. NIXON, he is a Navy veteran. Also like Mr. NIXON, he played college football—but where the Vice President was a scrub at Whittier, Mr. FORD was one of the University of Michigan's great stars—captained the 1934 team, played in the East-West game and with the college all-stars at Soldier Field against the professionals.

In Congress he is regarded as a conservative, and he is the ranking Republican on the Subcommittee on Military Appropriations. When 50 Washington correspondents were polled recently by Newsweek magazine for their choice of five outstanding House Members, Mr. FORD got 25 votes on the Republican side, only two fewer than the leader, Representative CHARLES HALLECK of Indiana.

Executive Bypass of the Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, earlier this year an attempt was made to destroy the Connally amendment. Fortunately for the people of the United States the attempt failed, and it failed due to the action of the subcommittee to which the Humphrey resolution was referred.

It is my understanding that the State Department is still trying to perform this surgery. In fact, I have been told authoritatively that a resolution was prepared, which was turned down by the Foreign Relations Committee, and I commend the committee for that action.

We must be constantly alert lest the State Department destroy this very important protection to American sovereignty, and I urge Senators who recognize the danger in the destruction of the Connally amendment to be constantly attentive in these closing hours of the first part of the second session of this Congress lest something be sneaked in that would accomplish what the consensus of the Senate has refused to accomplish by vote.

Mr. Raymond Moley has written an excellent editorial, entitled "Executive Bypass of the Connally Amendment Perils U.S. Interests," which appeared

in the Los Angeles Times on Friday, June 24.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE BYPASS OF THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT PERILS U.S. INTERESTS

(By Raymond Moley)

Having failed to get the Humphrey repeal of the Connally amendment off the ground this year, the State Department is now attempting to bypass it through executive agreements.

Such an executive agreement, which would supercede the Constitution and the laws, would place a large part of our rights on the seas under the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.

As was pointed out when the attempt was made to repeal the Connally amendment, we have only one judge on that Court while the Communists have two, and the Soviet has never subscribed to the World Court at all.

In the executive agreement in question there are four "conventions" and a protocol. The conventions cover a wide range of subjects in which controversy may arise between the United States and practically any seagoing nation.

Some of the subjects distinctly belonging within our sovereignty. Very important are the control of resources in territorial waters, fishing rights, and labor conditions.

Fishing rights have traditionally been determined by specific treaties between us and specific nations and the control of labor conditions on the seas would practically place under bodies in the United Nations and the World Court issues which might, if decided against us, greatly cripple our merchant marine and those nations such as Panama and Liberia which register so many American-owned ships.

There has been trouble enough in that field already with certain maritime nations in Europe cooperating with American maritime unions to get such ships, flying the so-called "flags of necessity," to register under the flags of Britain or the Scandinavian countries. That would deny us the use of them in case of war.

One of the most serious aspects of such an agreement concerns "territorial waters." Consider the closeness of the United States to Cuba, which seems at the moment destined to be a Soviet satellite. We have a great naval base there. There are also considerable properties still owned by Americans.

On the slightest pretext, Cuba, which has already joined in this protocol, could, under the influence of the Soviet, drag us into the World Court. Under such an agreement we would be powerless to sustain our legitimate rights to the south.

There has been something very covert and tricky about the way this executive agreement has been managed in the Senate, where, in order to be valid, there must be a two-thirds majority for it.

All of the conventions and the protocol were suddenly brought together for a vote. The package deal was accepted. But there were demands for a reconsideration of the protocol and the vote was 49 in favor, 30 against, and 21 not voting. Since such a matter requires two-thirds of the Members present and voting, it was lost.

Other Senators were alerted to the fact that the right of the United States to determine what matters were of purely domestic concern in international disputes should remain where it is, under the Connally amendment, in the United States alone.

The present danger is that in the rush to adjourn, this vital question may be slipped through with insufficient warning and consideration. As the end of the session approaches, haste, confusion, and politics will muddy the waters. And those who would surrender our sovereign rights love to operate in such waters.

Duties and Responsibilities of a U.S. Representative

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been noticing the development of a trend which, I believe, bodes well for our country. If my constituents are representative of the Nation as a whole, and I believe they are, more and more of our citizens are evidencing an increasing awareness of and interest in our Government and how it operates. In ever greater numbers, they are coming to the Nation's Capital to visit our historic shrines and to see the Congress of the United States in action. I personally have had, this year, a record number of visits by my constituents who decided to spend their vacations in Washington and learn more about the Federal Government. The questions they have been asking reflect their keen interest in national affairs. So long as our citizens maintain this interest in the operation of our Government, our Nation will be secure from the forces that threaten to destroy it.

One of the chief questions that my visitors have been asking is just what does a Representative do and what qualifies a man for this important position. To answer, I should like to set forth, in brief, some of my thoughts on the subject.

It is difficult, I am sure, for someone who has not served in the House of Representatives to understand how diverse and complex is the work of a Member of Congress, and how much more than just voting on bills is involved.

The duties and responsibilities of a Representative fall, I believe, into two general categories, one, a legislative function, and the other a service function.

Since most legislation considered by the full House of Representatives is written in its final form by the various committees of the House, a major portion of a Representative's time and efforts are devoted to the subject matter with which his committee deals.

In my own case, for example, I am a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, so many of my bills and much of my work are devoted to matters dealing with the Federal Government and its employees. Because of my seniority on the committee I have additional responsibilities as chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics which has broad responsibilities involving all the work the Federal Government does in collecting information from the public, processing it, and using it, and the impact of such work on the public. Such subcommittee work adds a great deal to the demands on a Representative's time.

The fact that a Member is assigned to a specific committee does not, of course, keep him from taking an active interest in the writing and enactment of other types of legislation. It should be noted, however, that major legislation usually carries the name of the chairman or a high-ranking member of the committee from which it is reported. A Member who is interested in legislation which is being considered by another committee may appear formally to give his views or he may discuss the matter informally with members of the committee.

When a bill is reported from a committee and scheduled for debate and vote by the full House of Representatives, a Member will read the committee's report to acquaint himself with the background of the legislation and then, taking into account his constituents' feelings about the subject, will decide upon whether to vote for or against the measure.

The average day for a Representative starts at an early hour. He will first go to his office to review the mail and dictate replies before he goes to his committee meeting which is usually scheduled at 10 o'clock. He may remain in the meeting until noon when the House convenes. Depending on what is scheduled for debate, he may remain in the House Chamber all afternoon, or he may return to his office to do the other part of his work, that of performing a multitude of services for his individual constituents or the communities in his district. He may consult with officials of the Federal agencies on housing problems, on veteran or immigration cases, on tax matters, on a public works project vital to the economic welfare of his district. It is almost an impossibility to make a complete listing of the special problems which he is called upon to help solve. He must, in addition, compose speeches and statements on subjects in which he is interested, and do research on legislative matters.

The Honorable Champ Clark, a great Speaker of the House of Representatives, gave a memorable speech on a Congressman's necessary qualifications for success and the importance and power of seniority in Congress. He said:

No man is a born Congressman. He must learn to be a Representative just as he must learn to be a blacksmith, a carpenter, a farmer, an engineer, a lawyer, or a doctor. He must be a man of at least fair capacity, honest, industrious, energetic, courageous, and sober. His usefulness and influence are made by experience and practice. * * * If he has those qualifications and diligently exercises them, his honor, influence, and usefulness to his country and his constituents increases in gometrical rather than in arithmetical proportion with each of his additional terms in Congress. A man should be elected to the House for the good of the country, and never just to gratify his ambition.

He urged all congressional districts to select a man of those qualifications and then keep him in Congress as long as he discharges his duties faithfully and well. Such a man will gradually rise to high position and influence in the House. His wide acquaintance with Members helps amazingly in doing things.

I hope that this brief statement of mine will help our citizens understand a little more clearly the duties and responsibilities of a U.S. Representative.

J. Edgar Hoover Congratulates Dover Sponsors of Local School Essay Contest

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, two prize-winning essays written by high school students in the city of Dover, N.H., appeared on June 29 in Foster's Daily Democrat, Dover, N.H. They were so excellently written that the authors received a letter of commendation from J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The essay contest was sponsored by Joseph T. Jalbert and William J. Kickham of Dover, former FBI agents.

Not only are these essays worthy of commendation by Mr. Hoover, but I feel they are thought provoking enough to call to the attention of the Senate. The two winners, Philip Grimes of Dover High School, and Patricia Ayer of St. Mary's High School have written their essays on the subject of communism, its evils and its dangerous implications. These two fine American high school students are a credit to their teachers, their school and their city. They present with clarity and perspective, the evils of communism throughout the world and the dangers of it in the United States. Their forthright thinking would do credit to persons older and with supposedly more judgment in matters of this importance.

I commend these two excellent essays to the Senate, particularly at this time when high school students in various parts of the Nation are taking part in unseemly demonstrations at graduation exercises which have a tendency to dishonor and discredit the American way of life. Both Philip Grimes and Patricia Ayer's essays emphasize the excellence of the American way of life and the godlessness and the degrading aspects of communism.

I ask unanimous consent that these essays be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

J. EDGAR HOOVER CONGRATULATES DOVER SPONSORS OF LOCAL SCHOOL ESSAY CONTEST

DOVER.—One of the features of the graduation exrcises at Dover High School and St. Mary's High School here was the award of prizes for essays in a contest in which the entries dealt with communism and methods of combating it in the United States.

Sponsored by Joseph T. Jalbert and William J. Kickham of this city, former FBI agents, winners were Patricia Ayer of St. Mary's High School and Philip Grimes of Dover High School.

Mr. Jalbert has recently received the following letter from J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI:

"I have received your letter of June 14 furnishing the identification of the winners of the essay contest sponsored by Mr. Kickham and you."

"In response to your request, I have written letters of congratulations to Miss Patricia Ayer and Mr. Philip Grimes at their respective high schools. Your sponsorship of the contest with Mr. Kickham is an excellent example of responsible citizenship and I am sure those students who participated benefited from the study and effort it required."

ESSAY BY PHILIP GRIMES, DOVER HIGH SCHOOL

Since ancient times there have been men—thinkers, dreamers, philosophers—who have hoped for a perfect world. In their utopian state, no one would be very rich or very poor. All men would live like brothers, working for the good of all and sharing equally, so that there would be no poverty or injustice and little need for law and government.

Most of these dreams of a so-called "perfect state" never proceeded past the stage of a mere idea. Yet toward the middle of the 19th century a somewhat similar ideology was developed by two Germans, Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. They based their reasoning upon the theory that throughout history there has been an unceasing struggle between the rich and the poor. To them this conflict was waged by the wealthy property owners against the unfortunate workers, whom they classified as the proletariat. On these grounds, Marx and Engels urged workingmen in all countries to rise up against the domineering capitalists and end the existing system by revolution. After the revolution had destroyed the government, a dictatorship of the proletariat would be established. Finally, with all procapitalist supporters crushed, a classless society would emerge, and the dictatorship would gradually disappear. Thus communism would reign supreme.

"Despite their vigorous appeals, notably in their "Communist Manifesto," Marx and Engels failed to arouse the workingmen into revolution. Though they died in the anguish of defeat, Marx and Engels by means of their ideology had implanted a tremendous character upon the minds of a few power-hungry men.

Such a man arose in Russia in the early part of the 1900's. Vladimir Lenin, self-appointed successor of Marx and Engels, contorted the ideology of these two philosophers. Although firmly believing in a classless society, he advocated a permanent dictatorship. Thus, after the Russian revolution of 1917, he became the first head of the Communist Party in Russia. With his followers he organized the Political Bureau, which directed the nation's political life, controlled all business and agriculture, and made many decisions that men and women in democracies are allowed to make for themselves.

And so, from Lenin to Khrushchev, the twisted ideology of Marx and Engels has spread to all continents of the world. Each day communism makes new gains, enlists new recruits. Today no nation is free from subversive Communist elements. Democracy is being shaken from its lofty pedestal by the momentum of the Communist quake.

There is no finer example of democracy than in the United States of America. At present, communism has concentrated its hostility on this Nation as the most powerful among countries not yet under its sway. The United States thus finds itself under attack by an enemy whose motivation for hostility is not any visible or practical grievance or limited aspiration, but rather the basic will to destroy the order of life in the United States in order to make room for a Communist rule.

The enemy has moved on many fronts. In the field of international power relations, Soviet Russia has pursued an aggressive policy seeking to isolate the United States in order to destroy her power. With or without war, by means of diplomacy, trade, propaganda and subversion, she has pressed on her attack. In social and political categories, her objective has been to influence, paralyze, or disintegrate the processes of our common life. Finally, in the realm of ideology, the enemy has attempted to employ many kinds of intellectual and cultural activities, such as education, science, literature and art, in order to destroy all loyalties other than those to Communist leadership.

This unprecedented attack differs so greatly from the natural pattern of relations between nations or political groups within nations that many people fail to grasp the full potency and extent of the threat. It is this ignorance of communism in all its aspects which could provide the one fatal blow to democracy.

It is, therefore, the primary obligation of every freedom-loving individual to make an earnest effort to assist national agencies in the occult war against communism. But what is the most effective means of assistance?

Vladimir Lenin ironically provided this means when he stated, "Give us the child for 8 years and it will be a Bolshevik forever." If Lenin believed that true Bolsheviks were created through education from childhood, why should not true adherents to democracy be created through an identical manner? In this educational process the child from kindergarten through college would be instructed in the evils of communism. A mere study of the daily life of a Chinese youth in a commune or the activities of a freedom-starved Hungarian would arouse youth. America's tomorrow, to realize the corruption and horror of such a system. By knocking the facts and the futility of Communist goals, the student could more fully appreciate his America and strive to protect it and its principles of democracy.

It is known that communism preys upon ignorance. But this ignorance would not be present in America, if her youth were instructed in communism. And so simply by educational means, America could successfully combat the growing tides of communism and maintain her status as the world's showcase of democracy. President Eisenhower effectively sums up his philosophy in a statement he issued in 1956:

"Competition for men's minds begins when they are students. This is when they must be taught to discriminate between truth, the American form of government, and falsehood, the Soviet form. When they have all the facts, I am confident they will make the correct choice, as they have done for the last 181 years."

ESSAY BY PATRICIA AYER, ST. MARY'S HIGH SCHOOL

The dictionary defines "communism" as "any system or social organization in which goods are held in common." The word "communism" comes from the Latin word "communis" from which we get our English word "common." Modern communism, which you read about in the newspaper, is a very different thing. It is based upon the writings of Karl Marx, a German philosopher. He advocated a state of society in which the

government, land, and machinery should be controlled by the workers who should get the entire product of agriculture and industry. Communism came out of our Western civilization; it was produced from the atheism and materialism of the 19th century. Under communism liberty is abolished. The rights of the individual are done away with; communism interferes with and regulates every sphere of the life of its citizens. It does not tolerate groups or individuals who oppose the government. It maintains itself by force and terror, by elimination of all criticism, by the silencing and wiping out of all opposition. Communism undoubtedly is the greatest epidemic with which the world was ever affected. It is anti-God and certainly anti-Christian, and it is pushing itself across the world by force and propaganda. Courting you with promises communism will bring all the dreams anyone ever dreamed of. You will work less, have more, you will have everything you need and everything will be fine.

If you fall for it, and communism actively seizes power, then you are transformed into slaves and packed off to the slave camps. The Communists claim they represent the workingman. Never in history have the workingmen been so thoroughly transformed into slavery as they have been in communism. Regimented, enslaved, chained to their jobs, arrested at will with nothing to say about their working conditions, they have no redress against their grievances. If America is scandalized at communism, it is merely because the Soviets are wholesaling what Western civilization once retailed. Communism makes inroads because of the vacuum created in the Western world through loss of faith in God. One need only notice the type of soul to which communism appeals in our own civilization and one finds a suggestion of the types of civilization to which it will appeal.

Communism is a crude and cruel materialism. It is certain that most Americans should have a more realistic view of the enemy. America's young people will have to combat it even more effectively than do the adults, and they can't fight an enemy about what they do not know. The most effective weapon against the evils of communism would be to tell our young people exactly what it is. People should alert themselves and learn the true nature of communism. Ignorance of communism has resulted in a certain widespread apathy and indifference toward this "ism." Indifference toward communism can be fatal when national survival is at stake. Communism should be shown for the intrinsic evil that it is, by being taught in every high school and college.

Where there is justice for all, communism has no foothold. Respect for human dignity is important. If there is no respect for human rights, how can we destroy the evils of communism? Exercise your rights to vote. Inquire and read up on candidates running for office. Find out their opinion and stand on communism. Make sure that your candidate will fight communism, in no way compromising with evil principles and aims. If a Communist gets into office, it was the voters that put him there. Never vote for a person because he is good looking and has a good personality. Vote only if you think he is the best qualified to fill the position.

The greatest shame of our world is that we have the truth, but little zeal. Communists have zeal, but they have no truth. Communism is like a fire that is spreading itself all over the world. Someday instead of turning downward, that fire will begin to burn upward, bringing life and peace and joy to men instead of hate, destruction, and death. Our Western World lacks that fire. There are seldom any deep loves or passionate devotions to great causes; expediency and self-interest are too general. Our fires of patriotism and zeal are being reduced to embers. Are we cold, dull, and apathetic? Our Western civilization should not just sit back and watch communism take over. Civil rights would become a more cherished heritage after they have been totally suppressed by communism. While exposing the evils of communism to our young people, we need also to embrace them with a deeper sense of the responsibilities and privileges of living in a democracy under God, and so give pupils a sounder knowledge of the basic differences between a democratic form of life and that of communistic ways of life. If we can do all this with the same enthusiasm the Communists muster in propagating their philosophy, and apply it to the perpetuation and extension of moral principles and love of God and love of man, we can look forward with confidence to a free world of freemen everywhere.

The Sugar Act

SPEECH
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12311) to extend for 1 year the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I shall vote for this legislation to extend the Sugar Act for 1 year and to give the President the authority to fix Cuban sugar quotas.

As all of the Members know, the present Sugar Act legislation expires December 31, 1960. As we consider this legislation today, the only alternative to extension of the Sugar Act is for the Congress to take no action, which would result in utter chaos in this very important domestic industry, not to mention the disruptive effect such a course would have on the world market.

Given these alternatives, a Member has little choice but to support this legislation as reported, with amendments, by the Committee on Agriculture. I appreciate the fact that in considering this legislation the committee has had to face extremely complex problems affecting our relations with the volatile Government of Cuba, and I appreciate the work the committee has done in bringing this legislation to the floor.

It is regrettable, however, that it could not have been brought to the floor earlier, when more time would have been available to give to these problems the careful consideration that is necessary.

It is also regrettable, in my opinion, that the committee has seen fit to recommend only a 1-year extension of the act. I think this would have been a much better bill if the committee had recommended a 2-year extension of the act, rather than a 1-year extension.

I am sure that the members of the committee in charge of this legislation would be the first to agree that the problems involved are complex and controversial. It is time for a thorough review of the Sugar Act legislation and its related problems. In its report on the bill the committee itself, I am pleased to note, recognize this. The committee report says, in part:

> The fact that the act is by this bill extended for only 1 calendar year (through Dec. 31, 1961) is to be taken as an indication of congressional policy that this is not an appropriate time for another 4-year extension but that the whole act should be reviewed and reconsidered next year in the light of conditions in sugar-producing areas at that time.

It would have been much more logical, in my opinion, for the committee to recommend a 2-year extension, so that a thorough study could be made in the first session of the 87th Congress and legislative action based on that study could be taken in the second session of the 87th Congress.

I am afraid that with a 1-year extension we are going to come up to the closing days of the first session of the 87th Congress and be faced with much the same situation we have here today. Again, we will have to consider this legislation on a rush basis. Anyone would have a difficult time convincing me that in the first session of a new Congress it is going to be any other way. There simply will not be enough time next year to give this program, and its related problems, the thorough study that is needed and then come up with legislation based on such a study.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Agriculture itself in a committee report on legislation to extend an existing program, the farm labor program, argued most persuasively for a 2-year extension. I find it difficult to understand why the committee has chosen not to apply its own highly logical reasoning to the legislation we are considering today, so that the Congress would have a full term in which to give careful consideration to revision of the basic legislation rather than being forced, once more, to act hastily in the closing days of a session.

I should like to add that, in my opinion, a 1-year extension rather than 2 years is not in the best interests of the farmers who grow sugar beets or sugar cane. Farmers need to be able to plan their operations for the ensuing year with some degree of certainty as to what the situation may be, and a 1-year extension of the Sugar Act does not meet that need.

Daughters of Republic of Texas Saved the Alamo as a Shrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a great deal has been said and written, and of course rightfully so, about the heroes of the Alamo where Crockett and

Bowie and all the others choose to die for liberty instead of live under tyranny.

But recently a new and different story was written about saving the Alamo, and it turns out that while our heroes defended it, our women have been the ones who saved it from commercialism and made it the shrine of which Texans and all Americans are proud.

The article about how the Daughters of the Republic of Texas saved the Alamo was written by Mr. Jack Butterfield for La Prensa, San Antonio's English and Spanish newspaper. It is an interesting and well-written article. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article from the June 22, 1960, issue of La Prensa, entitled "We Owe Our Alamo to the Weaker Sex."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE OWE OUR ALAMO TO THE WEAKER SEX

(By Jack C. Butterfield)

The men of the Alamo created the greatest monument on earth to raw courage and self-sacrifice; but it was the women of Texas—specifically a devoted group known as the Daughters of the Republic of Texas—who rescued it from commercialism and made of it a shrine commensurate with the honor due those heroes—a shrine of which the State of Texas is justly proud.

The Daughters of the Republic of Texas was the outgrowth of the dream of two women, Miss Bettie Ballinger and Mrs. Hallie Bryan Perry. Having had no experience in organizational work, they enlisted the help of the Honorable Guy M. Bryan, president of the Texas Veterans Association, who issued a call for all interested women to meet at the home of Mrs. Andrew Briscoe. Fifteen ladies responded who completed organization of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas November 6, 1891. With rare tact and wisdom, they elected Mrs. Anson Jones, widow of the last President of the Republic of Texas, as president, a position which she held during the remainder of her life.

The oldest living expresident is Mrs. O. M. Farnsworth, who served in 1933–35, and devoted more than 50 years of faithful service to the cause. She is the granddaughter of Deaf Smith, one of the outstanding heroes of the war of Texas independence.

Membership in the organization is the privilege of a select few. Eligibles are the descendants of those who participated in the Texas revolution; of the 300 families who comprised Austin's first colony on the Brazos River; and of those who held public office, or otherwise rendered service to the Republic of Texas. As service to the Republic usually was paid for in land grants, the record of those grants prior to 1845 is a valuable guide to membership.

The objectives were, broadly, to perpetuate the memory and spirit of the men and women who achieved and maintained the independence of Texas, to encourage historical research into the early records of Texas, and the preservation of the many monuments to the glory of the Republic and those who made it possible. While there are many such monuments in their care, the chief concern of the Daughters is, naturally, the Alamo.

What is now known as the Alamo originally was the Mission of San Antonio de Valero. It was established near the presidio of San Antonio de Valero in 1718, but moved to its present location in 1722. Today it is the heart of San Antonio but when the move was made it was into a wilderness half a mile from the town and presidio of San Antonio de Bejar, while the mission retained the name of Valero.

The present buildings were started in 1744 and, being solely for religious purposes and not a fortress, they consisted of a church, with convent and courtyard adjoining, which were designed to house the padres. Adjoining this, to the west, was a large plaza enclosed by a stone wall 10 feet high, wherein dwelt the converted Indians.

The church originally had twin towers, but they were blown down during a storm in 1762, carrying the upper part of the front wall and the arched roof and dome over the sacristry with them. The church was never rebuilt but remained a roofless ruin, filled with the debris from the towers and roof. A small room in the convent was converted into a chapel where religious services were held.

All missions in Texas were secularized by royal decree in 1799, and were gradually abandoned for religious purposes. The padres were recalled to Mexico and some of the missions became temporary homes of military companies. The company which occupied the Mission of San Antonio de Valero was from the town of Parras, in Coahuila, Mexico, and was known as Los Alamos de Parras. Inevitably the soldiers became Los Alamos, and their domicile El Alamo.

Another version as to how it received the name was that the mission was built in a grove of cottonwoods, "alamo" being the Spanish name of that tree. At the beginning of the present century there was a cluster of cottonwoods growing along the ditch which ran back of the Alamo. When the ditch was closed the trees died.

The Alamo, however, soon became a melancholy ruin in the wilderness, frequented chiefly by freighters and campers. Thus it stood at the time of the Texas Revolution, the church roofless and filled with debris, the stout walls of the convent deteriorating, and the walls of the plaza and the buildings they enclosed sadly in need of repair.

At the time of the Fall of the Alamo, the mission was the property of the Catholic Church, but it had not been used for religious purposes for fully a quarter of a century. After the Fall, Santa Anna decreed its destruction and the plaza walls were razed and the convent walls torn down to two or three feet above ground. The church itself was such a ruin that no attempt was made to destroy it further.

It remained an abandoned ruin, half a mile from the town of San Antonio, neglected by church, State and the people, until the war with Mexico. In 1849 the U.S. Government rented it from the Catholic Church, restored the convent, rebuilt, cleaned and reroofed the church, and used them for the quartermaster's depot. To Maj. E. B. Babbitt, who was in charge of the work, goes credit for creating the simple dignified facade which today is known to people all over the world as The Alamo.

The U.S. Government occupied it now and then until Fort Sam Houston was established in 1876, when the Alamo again was abandoned. It had been surrendered to the Confederacy at the beginning of the War Between the States and a fire had occurred in the church in 1861 and again it was a roofless, debris-cluttered ruin.

The Catholic Church sold the convent portion of the Alamo to Honore Grenet in 1878. He built a hideous frame structure atop the walls, with a tower at either end and a wooden arcade on the south and west. He conducted a wholesale grocery business and used what had been the convent patio as a horse lot.

In 1883 the State of Texas bought the church of the Alamo from the Catholic Church for $20,000, but beyond appointing a custodian, they did nothing toward restoration of the property.

In 1886 the executor of the estate of Honore Grenet sold his property to the Hugo Schmeltzer Co., who occupied it as a wholesale grocery and liquor store. They continued to use the original patio as a horse lot and built a long shed against the east wall as a shelter for their animals.

The arcade on the south and west sides, built by Mr. Grenet, was condemned as unsafe by the city. The Hugo Schmeltzer Co. was going out of business and their property was offered for sale. In 1903 a syndicate was formed for the purpose of buying it, as well as the property lying east of it on East Houston Street, for the purpose of erecting a hotel. The Daughters of the Republic of Texas had been trying to induce the State to buy the property, but the legislature was not in session and the Governor had no power to authorize the necessary appropriation.

It appeared as if the Daughters had lost the struggle to save the Alamo but, when things looked darkest, Miss Clara Driscoll, a young Daughter whose grandfather was one of the heroes of San Jacinto, in order to forestall the syndicate, paid $500 for a 1 month option on the property. Finding that nothing could be done in so short a time, she paid an additional $10,000 for an option for 1 year.

At the end of the year, the State having taken no action, Miss Driscoll bought the Alamo property outright. At her insistence a clause was inserted in the deed to the effect that she was buying it on behalf of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas for the purpose of creating a park and otherwise beautifying the property.

Eventually the State bought the property from Miss Driscoll, and on October 4, 1905, Gov. S. W. T. Lanham gave control and custody of the Alamo property to the Daughters of the Republic of Texas, as a whole, not to any specific chapter.

The Daughters finally had attained their goal—the custodianship of the Alamo; but it was conveyed to them "to be maintained in good order and repair, without charge to the State." How the repair and maintenance were to be paid for was strictly up to the Daughters of the Republic of Texas.

The Alamo and its beautiful setting today attest the complete success of their efforts. The arched roof, the church, and the dome over the sacristy, which originally were of masonry, have been rebuilt of concrete; but the towers were not rebuilt, as it was felt that facade created by Major Babbitt had become so much a concept of the Alamo thfoughout the world that it should not be changed.

Grenet's wooden monstrosity has disappeared, revealing again the walls which were rebuilt in 1849 with the original material left on the spot by the Mexicans when it was destroyed by Santa Anna's order in 1836. The vine-clad walls present a more appealing and pathetic reminder of the sacrifice of their own lives by 187 men that Texas might become a reality, than had the convent been rebuilt; but the horse lot is not a part of the formal garden.

By 1935, through purchase by the State, a donation of a fire station site by the city of San Antonio, and help from Miss Driscoll—now Mrs. Clara Driscoll Sevier—the entire block surrounding the Alamo had come under control of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas. Through a WPA project the buildings were razed, the block was surrounded by a stone wall, with an artistic arcade leading from the church to East Crockett Street. A museum also was built, facing East Houston Street; and Mrs. Beretta donated the Alamo Library in memory of her husband, John King Beretta. It is a reference library only, where interested people can find the data they want on anything pertaining to Texas, particularly the Alamo. The rest of the property has been transformed into a formal garden.

Although their work and responsibility thus were more than trebled, the Daughters

took it in stride. They have the care of everything in and around the Alamo except Alamo Plaza itself.

The Alamo church and convent stand out in bold relief, but the other buildings are smothered by a mass of trees and shrubbery and surrounded by the formal garden, which is always a thing of beauty. There is scarcely a day of the year when some flower or shrub is not blooming.

Occasionally one hears a visitor at the Alamo remark: "It seems very few Texans fought at the Alamo." They are wrong. Although many were newcomers on the scene, Crockett and his Tennesseans had been in Texas scarcely a month when they entered the Alamo; every one of the 187 men of the Alamo was a Texan; and gave his life to prove it.

Since the Daughters took charge, March 6—the anniversary of the Fall of the Alamo—it is a day dedicated to the memory of those heroes who died in its defense. The Church of the Alamo once more becomes a church wherein solemn services are held to commemorate their sacrifice in behalf of Texas.

The Daughters take particular pride in the fact that all which has been accomplished is through their own efforts, without State or other governmental aid, and that entrance to the buildings and the grounds is absolutely free. No fee ever has been charged and no contributions are solicited—although voluntary contributions are received with thanks.

As it stands today, the Alamo is as much a tribute to the enthusiasm and perseverance of the Daughters of the Republic of Texas in rescuing it and transforming it into a worthy shrine, as it is a monument to the heroes whose sacrifice it commemorates.

U.S. Seapower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, with exceeding wisdom the Congress this week finally placed its blessing on the construction of an additional large aircraft carrier by the Navy. In an era when our oversea land bases are becoming more and more subject to the vagaries of foreign political winds, it is more than ever necessary to the Nation's defense that we have aircraft carriers in being. In effect these are large, mobile bases, subject only to the control of the United States and capable of going anywhere the interests of the United States indicate.

The current June issue of News Front magazine contains an excellent summary of the place of the Navy in the country's necessary military force, which reads as follows:

THE NAVY'S MISSION: DETER OR DESTROY

Seapower, transformed beyond the recognition of a Nelson or a Mahan, still remains, the U.S. Navy insists, the Nation's chief resource should nuclear war come, and a major deterrent to that dread eventuality.

But the mighty capital ships, slugging it out with their great guns against their enemy equivalents, have been replaced by what are, in effect, mobile missile platforms, on or beneath the surface of the sea.

The target no longer is hostile seapower—no possible enemy possesses an equivalent surface navy—but the heart of that enemy's war potential, its bases, communications centers and industrial complexes.

The new "ships of the line" are, in place of battleships, the great attack carriers, of which the Navy now has 14, and the nuclear-propelled fleet ballistic missile submarines, of which three already have been commissioned, two more are entering service this year and a total of 9 are being built.

Both can deliver nuclear attacks to virtually any point on earth, and both, because they can swiftly shift location, are almost immune to land-based missile retaliation.

The submarines will fire, from beneath the surface, the nuclear-armed 1,200-mile missile Polaris. The U.S.S. *George Washington*, first of the FBM submarines, will be equipped with the Polaris in the fall.

The immunity of the nuclear-powered submarine, which can remain far beneath the surface for days and weeks while in rapid motion, to distant missile attack seems obvious.

But the carrier also, according to testimony at the recent House Appropriations Committee budget hearings, possesses the same immunity to a surprisingly large extent. Capt. Roger Mehle, Chief of the Navy's Air Weapons System Analysis Staff, displayer a radarscope photo to the committee, and stated:

"This is an actual photograph of the radar return from the western portion of the Mediterranean on a typical day. It covers about 196,000 square miles. It is uncluttered by any defensive electronic countermeasures such as decoys or chaff bombs which would increase the apparent number of targets.

"Nevertheless, under these ideal conditions, it shows less than 25 percent of the total number of ships which were actually at sea in the area. In this picture are the ships of the 6th Fleet, including two attack carriers.

"But where are they? It is impossible to pick them out.

"It is from vague and confusing information of this type that an enemy airborne or spaceborne radar would attempt to relay to its territory the precise position of our carriers.

"But let's assume that a chance guess has singled out one of the carriers. At least an hour would elapse before the arrival of the enemy missile.

"During this period, the carrier will have moved in an unpredictable direction as much as 30 miles.

"The missile will have been expended against a target this is not there."

The Navy's 14 attack carriers are, at present, distributed six in the Atlantic and eight in the Pacific areas. Of the Atlantic's six, two are always attached to the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean (within bombing and missile range of the U.S.S.R.'s European core) and three to the 2d Fleet in the North Atlantic. Of the Pacific attack carriers, two to three severe with the 7th Fleet in the Far East (within striking distance of Red China) and three to four with the 1st Fleet in the Pacific proper. Again one is always in overhaul.

The existing attack carriers, all of which are rotated at frequent intervals, consist of four *Forrestal* class supercarriers (77,000 gross tons), two *Midway* class (60,000 gross tons) and eight *Essex* class (40,000 gross tons). But the small *Essex* carriers, with their comparatively limited flight deck space, are finding it more and more difficult to handle modern jets. They will be retired, as fast as replacements are available, to antisubmarine duty.

These, as now planned, include a modernized *Midway*, scheduled to join the fleet this year, two new *Forrestals*, scheduled for 1961, and the nuclear-powered Forrestal-type *Enterprise*, scheduled for 1962. (The Navy, at present, plans no more nuclear carriers, which cost three or four times as much to operate as conventional ships, without compensating superiorities. The case is far different with submarines, which, with nuclear power, can remain submerged indefinitely. Of the 37 nuclear vessels built or authorized, all but three—the *Enterprise*, a frigate, and a destroyer—are submarines.)

Increasing the long-range attack potential of the FBM submarines and the attack carriers are five other missile submarines, and three missile cruisers (others are being converted), all armed with the subsonic, 500-mile Regulus missiles. Among destroyers and frigates, two already are armed with guided missiles, and five more are being built.

In addition to deterrence and, in the event of war, allout attack, the Navy has still another mission of major importance. This is, should war occur, to keep the world's sealanes open to the shipping of the United States and its allies, and to protect bases and cities from submarine-launched missile attack. The U.S.S.R. is believed to possess at least 450 submarines, including 85 to 100 long-range vessels on combat status at any moment.

The problem posed by this potential enemy force is grave, and one which, admittedly, the Navy has yet to solve completely. Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, told the Appropriations Committee that there has been "marked improvement in our antisubmarine warfare capacity" and that "even more significant progress" can be expected. But, he added, "submarine advances have been ever more rapid, and we are not yet able to feel confident in our ability to meet the threat—especially that posed by the anticipated sub-launched missiles."

The Navy's nine remaining carriers are assigned to ASW duty, and a carrier forms the core of each of the two Task Groups set up in 1958 to perfect ASW tactics and teamwork. Each includes, besides the carrier's planes and helicopters, a squadron of destroyers, several antisub submarines (the most effective weapon so far), and long-range patrol aircraft, seaplanes or land-based.

Of the 20 new ships in the Navy's $11.7 billion fiscal 1961 budget ($12.1 billion, with carryover), 13, including a deep-diving submarine, are designed for ASW service and research, and 14 destroyers are undergoing ASW conversion. Increased range of radar, torpedoes and planes, improved missiles for repelling enemy air attack, automatically homing torpedoes, and sonobuoys (listening devices) which can report back automatically by radio after being dropped from the air—all are adding to ASW readiness and effectiveness.

Altogether, one-ninth of the budget, or $1.4 billion, is assigned to ASW construction, procurement and research (not including operation, maintenance, etc., of existing ships and aircraft).

But the difficulties remain great, principally because the oceans cover three-fourths of the earth's surface, and all are open to potential enemy submarines. How then find and destroy them in this vastness? Present radar cannot detect a submerged vessel, and sonar's range is only a few miles.

But the very oceanic immensities which complicate the Navy's task of defense against submarines make easier the carrying out of its other two missions—to deter the potential enemy or, if that fails, to destroy the enemy's capacity to make war. Huge as the Red-ruled land mass is, sea-launched missile attack can now penetrate it from any direction, as the three sub-ice trans-Polar voyages of U.S. nuclear submarines proved, even to Khrushchev.

The United States. Admiral Burke testified, must be able, in today's uneasy post-summit situation, both to attain "limited political and military objectives" and to inflict "heavy, unacceptable damage on the U.S.S.R." should the latter start "suicidal" nuclear war.

The Navy is ready to accomplish either—or both.

THE NAVY'S COMBAT STRENGTH

Combat aircraft carriers, 14.

Antisubmarine carriers, nine.

Nuclear-powered fleet ballistic missile submarines (three more to be commissioned in 1960), two.

Other submarines (including 5 nuclear-powered), 112.

Cruisers (including 6 guided missile), 14.

Destroyers, frigates, etc. (including 2 guided missile), 226.

Planes (75 percent combat, 45 percent jet), 6,852.

Combat personnel, 385,000.

Total uniformed personnel (not including 175,000 Marines), 619,000.

Constitutionality of the Civil Rights Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, if there has existed any doubt that the present Supreme Court employs double standards in the protection of individual rights, all doubts were removed with the decision on the constitutionality of the rules of the Civil Rights Commission. An able editorial published in the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., on June 23, entitled "Justice Warren and Senator McCarthy" summarizes the application of the two sets of standards. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUSTICE WARREN AND SENATOR MCCARTHY

The shade of Joe McCarthy, a man who for all his shortcomings had a sense of humor, must have gotten a lusty laugh from the latest pronouncement of the Warren court.

For all the sins with which he was charged—the star chamber proceedings, the denial of the right to confront one's accuser and to know the specific charges leveled against one—all of these things the liberal-leftists pilloried him for have now received the solemn stamp of approval by the Supreme Court.

They are, if the liberal-left is correct, now the "law of the land."

However, as we have no doubt the Court will hastily point out, they may be used only in certain circumstances. Specifically, under this decision, they can be used when Federal agents get the idea that Negroes are being denied the right to vote.

The case which brought on this decision arose in Louisiana. There, the Civil Rights Commission was studying alleged voting discrimination against Negroes. Acting under its own rules of procedure, the Commission hid the identity of those who made the charges against local officials and it denied the officials the right to cross-examine or confront their accusers.

Lower court decisions held that the Commission could not do these things on the rather puzzling ground that they had not been authorized by Congress. We may be glad that the seven-man majority brushed aside this and went straight to the question of whether such procedure is constitutional. We can only be abysmally dejected that the majority found in the affirmative.

How to explain this paradox—that a Court whose members, individually and collectively, have so frequently denounced such behavior suddenly find it both necessary and appealing? The answer is not difficult. The Court has shown many times before that it has certain standards for matters involving racial matters which are of a totally different nature than those standards applied to other questions.

It has denounced the use of the tactics called McCarthyism when congressional investigations are involved. These are not to be tolerated for a moment when it is a question of identifying Communists or gangsters. But the yardstick somehow subtly changes when color enters the picture.

Justice may be colorblind but not the Chief and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

Two men—Justice Douglas and Justice Black—had the courage and perception to see through this maze of contradiction. As Justice Douglas declared in a dissenting opinion, "important as these civil rights are, it will not do to sacrifice other civil rights to protect them."

It is strange indeed to find such staunch "liberals" as Justices Douglas and Black on the opposite side from Chief Justice Warren. They too have displayed the tendency to bend rules to suit their purposes. The concise and damning indictment by Justice Douglas quoted above seems to prove that there are some things even they cannot stomach.

Address of Roger A. McDuffie, at Dedication of New University of North Carolina Pharmacy Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. DURHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, on April 24, 1960, the new School of Pharmacy Building at the University of North Carolina was dedicated. As a member of the pharmacy profession and as an alumnus of the University of North Carolina, I am very proud of this fine new building and equipment. I should like to insert in the RECORD the remarks made on that occasion by Mr. Roger A. McDuffie, a practicing pharmacist in North Carolina and an alumnus of the university and a member of the Board of Examiners of Pharmacists of the State of North Carolina. Recently Mr. McDuffie was named Pharmacist of the Year for North Carolina. I believe his remarks will be of interest to every pharmacist throughout the United States:

DEDICATION OF THE NEW PHARMACY BUILDING, UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA, CHAPEL HILL, N.C., APRIL 24, 1960

(Address by Roger A. McDuffie)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I think that I was selected for this job simply because I represent the average pharmacist of North Carolina.

Geographically speaking, I come from the center of the State—Greensboro.

Educationally speaking, my background is average, having obtained my college training about halfway between the time when no college training was required and today, when 5 years of college training are required for a B.S. in pharmacy.

As for age, I like to think of myself as average. You know, pharmacists live to a ripe old age. There is an old saying in this State (which I like to believe) that a pharmacist never dies until one is needed in heaven, and I am told there is no shortage up there as there is in North Carolina.

Financially speaking, I guess I owe about as much as the average.

Today, April 24, 1960, is the greatest day in the history of North Carolina pharmacy.

The dedication of our new pharmacy building marks the realization of the hopes and ambitions of the pharmacists of North Carolina since the end of World War II. This was not accomplished by the mere asking. It was accomplished by hard work and a good selling job. Even though we had the friendly cooperation of the administration of the university, it was not until the citizens of North Carolina and the legislature, in particular, realized that in order to supply the needs of a great and growing State we must have a larger and more modern pharmacy department.

The pharmacists of another century realized the need for college and laboratory-trained men and women. Some of their leaders were Howell, Zoeller, Hancock, Bradham, L. Richardson, and Horne, and others. Some of these men were well-known to you. Largely through their efforts the school of pharmacy was established on this campus in 1897, with Dr. E. V. Howell as dean.

The school of pharmacy has occupied four different homes on the campus. First, it occupied the first floor of the New West until 1912. From 1912 until 1925, it occupied Person Hall—now the Art Building. From 1925 until the fall of 1959, it occupied the whole of Howell Hall, which was the old Chemistry Building; and its fourth home—the building upon which our attention is focused today.

Now, let me take you back about 50 or 60 years. Mr. C. T. Council is one of the few men I know who studied under Dr. Howell in the New West. I learned from Mr. Council that in 1905 the pharmacy faculty consisted of Dr. Howell who taught pharmacy, Mr. I. W. Rose was in charge of laboratory instruction, a medical student who was a graduate in pharmacy taught Materia Medica. The chemistry was taken in the chemistry department.

In reminiscing, Mr. Council remarked that an interesting thing today is to reflect to the days of 1905, when there were no electric lights. The students studied by lamplight and took their baths in the gymnasium; however, he did not state how often he visited the gymnasium. But he did state, most emphatically, that he had never regretted having studied pharmacy. I'd like to add in my own words that pharmacy will be eternally grateful that Mr. Council is one of us.

Like many of you, I am well acquainted with pharmacy in Person Hall. Dean Howell and Mr. Beard were the main teachers, and the students took chemistry, botany, math, and electives in the general college.

I can't help but reminisce—please pardon. Those of you who studied under Dr. Howell, I think, will agree with me that he was the most impressive teacher you ever had. His jokes, which were a tie-in with the lesson, will never be forgotten. I employed one of the first girls to graduate in pharmacy—and she was good. Some of my friends kidded me by saying that I employed her chiefly to learn Dr. Howell's latest jokes.

Following Dr. Howell's death in 1931, Grover Beard became dean. There never

was a harder working or more conscientious man. He worked and worried not only with the problems of his own department but also with the problems of every drug store in the State. He headed the department during the depression and the lean years. Everyone who knew Grover Beard will testify that he stood for the right and the best and that he marched in the front ranks of pharmacy, both locally and nationally, and kept perfect step. These were the days when the band was not playing. It was before the days of antibiotics and $10 prescriptions.

Dean Beard died in 1946 and was succeeded by Dean Jacobs who died in 1950. Good old Jake—he was as steady as the Rock of Gibraltar. He had the ability to get along with folks and kept perfect harmony. Jake didn't talk much but what he had to say carried weight. He will go down in history as a good dean.

For a short period following the death of Dean Jacobs, Mr. I. W. Rose served as acting dean. Although too old to be made dean, Mr. Rose was master of the situation and the emergency thrust upon him. He kept the boat steady in midstream.

Here's one of the finest compliments that can be paid any man. Many of Mr. Rose's former students in sending in their contributions to the Pharmacy Foundation added this little footnote: "Please place this in the I. W. Rose Memorial Fund."

Ed. Brecht was made dean in 1950. I was right much amused when he was being considered for the deanship. Some people shook their heads and said, "Too young." The answer was—"Stonewall" Jackson was only 39 when he died, and Alexander Hamilton took his seat in the Continental Congress at 25. Too young, maybe—but he was smart enough to grow with the job and he did.

Pharmacy today is far more complex than in the days of Person Hall. Drugs today are far more potent and require greater knowledge and skill in their handling.

Our new pharmacy department is equipped in every detail to graduate finished products who can handle all situations in modern pharmacy.

The guts of any department lie in the caliber of its faculty. We are, indeed, fortunate to have a well-rounded faculty—all young men—all dedicated—men who grew up with the aroma of valerian and asafetida in their nostrils—and men who have made pharmacy their lifework and have a vital and personal interest in their students.

Some of our faculty, like Frank Graham and Bob House, grew up on this campus, received their training in this university, and remained to serve. This is well. Some of our faculty came from other States. This is well, too, as it wards off any inclination to become ingrown.

In digging back into the history of pharmacy in North Carolina, I found this very interesting law, enacted in 1881 and sponsored by the pharmacists of that day. This law required that in order to become registered as a pharmacist the applicant must graduate from a college of pharmacy or as an alternate serve 4 years as an apprentice under a registered pharmacist.

It is interesting to note that in 1881 there were only four schools of pharmacy south of the Mason-Dixon line. Little wonder it is that at that time the vast majority of aspiring pharmacists chose the 4 years' apprentice training.

A few people now say that pharmacy is becoming too academic—acquiring too much literary digest. But such is not the case. We must keep up with the march of progress. And we have. And we must keep abreast with the other health professions.

Stated very briefly: From 1918 to 1922 the law in this State required 1 year of college work. From 1922 to 1926, 2 years of college work were required. In 1926 it became 3 years, and in 1935, 4 years. Today the requirement is 1 year of prepharmacy, graduation from a 4-year college of pharmacy, and 1 year apprenticeship. However, the apprenticeship may be obtained in the summer months when not in school.

Now as to the future—I will not make any predictions, but with the equipment and the faculty that we have, with the friendly cooperation of every department in the university, with the 100 percent backing of every pharmacist in the State, and under the leadership of Ed Brecht, who has been appraised as smart—and levelheaded—intelligent, farseeing, dedicated, and possessing that little item called the common touch, the ability to get along with people; and, above all, a capacity for work and getting things done that is amazing to me—I point specifically to the completion of the new pharmacy building and the success of the pharmacy foundation—with all of these items on our side, I have no fears about the future in North Carolina of one of the oldest and most honorable professions known to mankind.

Is Coexistence Feasible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, recently I received a letter from a longtime friend of mine, Justice O. Otto Moore, of the Colorado State Supreme Court. Justice Moore enclosed a copy of a speech given before the Alumni Association of the University of Denver on the subject "Is Coexistence Feasible?"

In Justice Moore's opinion, this talk by Prof. Josef Korbel of the university displays a keen insight into the issues of the cold war. The Justice feels, as do I, that this speech is well worth including in the RECORD.

I have known Otto Moore for many years. Indeed, he served as my deputy when I was District Attorney in Denver. He is widely known as the "Father of Colorado's Old Age Pension Amendment." A highly admired and respected private attorney, he was elected to the Supreme Court in 1948 and reelected in 1958 where he continues to serve with great distinction. I am sure that my colleagues in the Senate will be interested to read this speech which has been so highly recommended by Justice Moore.

Dr. Korbel, an expert on Russia's relations with the West, has much to say to us at this critical point in our country's history. With the collapse of the summit and the cancellation of the Tokyo visit, we must turn from the illusive perils of personal diplomacy to the reality of the cold war. Dr. Korbel examines our position with a cool perspective.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS COEXISTENCE FEASIBLE?
(Address by Josef Korbel)

I

For several years we have heard Nikita Khrushchev advocating a policy of peaceful coexistence between the Communist and the democratic world. He traveled far and wide; to Geneva, London, and Paris, to India, Burma, and Indonesia. Last September he spent almost 2 weeks in the United States and distributed words of kindness and warmth among industrial magnates as well as workers; he kissed babies and appealed to God. With some people he left the impression of being a jolly good fellow who would make a good Senator for any State of the American Union. Compared with the enigmatic and cruel Stalin, Khrushchev looked to them as a jovial statesman who sincerely sought cooperation with the United States in building a peaceful world. These people preferred to ignore numerous lessons of history and the final goals of the Communist powers; they took by mistake change of tactics for change of heart.

Last month lightning struck in Paris. It pierced the atmosphere of ease and rosy expectations and pulled us down from clouds of soft dreams to hard realities. The ebullient Khrushchev revealed his other, his true face. His language dropped to a new low of vulgarity of which even Vishinsky had not been capable in the old days. He vilified the President of the United States in a manner which Stalin had applied to Adolf Hitler during the war. The Western World passed through a gruesome experience of coexistence which is quite different in nature and form from the peaceful coexistence it was led to believe in and accept at face value. The cold war has reached again a deep-freezing point.

For 2 years, Khrushchev insisted on a summit conference, conveying the impression that conventional diplomatic negotiations cannot bring us closer to the solution of the problems which separate the Eastern and Western Worlds. And they are many, grave and complex at the same time: the cessation of atomic tests, control of outer space, regulation of armament, its inspection and supervision, protection against surprise attack, the question of Berlin and unification of Germany, cooperative assistance to the vast populations of the underdeveloped countries, and last but not least, the ever-present but seldom admitted host of problems connected with the existence of the aggressive Communist China.

We were told, and some of us became convinced, that only a new approach—by summit diplomacy—offers a hope for settlement of at least some of these disturbing questions as only the leader of the Soviet Union, Nikita Khrushchev, had the power to make decisions and grant concessions. It was at his insistence that the Paris conference convened last month but it was equally his truculent behavior which wrecked the summit meeting before it could even begin. Under the wreckage was buried the myth of diplomacy by summitry, by sweet smiles and kind words, which were to supplement and perhaps even replace the strenuous, patient, determined, unheralded labors of professional diplomats and other experts. Under the wreckage has been also pulverized the pretense of, and trust in, Khrushchev's good will and possibly, too, the belief in his supreme power in the Kremlin. In these respects the Paris experience has been an eye-opener; it has thrown a new light on the scene of Soviet politics, or better to say, it has illuminated the more familiar nature and methods of the Soviet foreign policy. It has signaled to us the true meaning of the Communist coined term: "peaceful coexistence."

II

The Paris crisis has rendered to the free world in spite of deep disappointment another service. Presumably it all was caused by the unfortunate airplane incident. Khrushchev admitted knowing about espionage flights in the past and he knew also, without admitting it, however, that they are part of a worldwide routine practice which, as dis-

tasteful as it is, has become a necessity in the international power relationship, infested with suspicion, secrecy, and lust for more power. The American Government which handled the case—I venture to submit—with remarkable maladroitness facilitated Moscow's decision to gain extra mileage on its journey to coexistence. Khrushchev branded the flight as a bellicose act and threatened with retaliation. And yet, we have noticed with no small relief that the incident has not developed into a shooting war. This is, indeed, an encouraging sign pointing to the feasibility of coexistence in the arena of military contest.

In the past, individual incidents provoked wars, or rather served as a pretext for aggression, planned in advance. The Franco-Prussian War in 1870 started with an artificially prepared incident. World War I opened with the assassination of Archduke Ferdinand, though it was only the last straw in the long series of critical situations. It was Kaiser Wilhelm's conviction of quick victory which he expected, as he put it, "before the autumn leaves will fall off the trees," which precipitated the world conflagration of 46 years ago. It was Hitler's miscalculation of the extent of involvement in the conflict which prompted his exploitation of the Danzig crisis.

The Soviet leaders are hopefully not prone to such or similar miscalculations, and their treatment of the U–2 incident and other incidents which occurred since 1945 permits a conclusion that they do not believe in a possibility of a victorious war as short as it might be this time. Though the United States appears to be, according to the opinion of several experts, behind in the development of long-range missiles, her combined military power provides enough of a deterrent to the Soviet lust for obliterating this country and its allies. Admittedly, this is an uneasy balance of power, as it rests on the intangible foundations of mutual terror and danger of mutual annihilation, but it is the only effective policy in absence of an effective regulation and control of armaments. It is a military coexistence—the only one which the Soviets understand and are of necessity ready to respect.

However, we must not be misled by their repeated statements on peaceful coexistence, nor can we see in them a novelty in Soviet foreign policy.

Lenin spoke frequently about coexistence which he frankly viewed as a temporary expedient for the period needed for the entrenchment of the Communist Party. But he also stated with equal frankness that "the existence of the Soviet Republic side by side with the imperialist states for a long time is unthinkable. In the end either one or other will conquer and until that end comes, a series of the most terrible collisions between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states is inevitable."

Stalin clarified Lenin's thinking on coexistence as if it were not clear enough. He stated: "We cannot forget the saying of Lenin to the effect that a great deal * * * depends on whether we succeed in delaying war with capitalist countries, which is inevitable but which may be delayed either until proletarian revolution ripens in Europe, or until the colonial revolutions come fully to a head, or, finally, until the capitalists fight among themselves over division of the colonies. Until then, the basis of our relations with capitalist countries consists in admitting the coexistence of two opposed systems."

Mao Tse-tun, who appears to exercise increasing influence in the Soviet policy, put it bluntly: "Every Communist must grasp the truth that political power grows out of the barrel of a gun, in fact, we can say that the whole world can be remodeled only with the gun."

Do, then, Khrushchev's speeches on coexistence bring something new—a new policy, a new goal? He believes in the possibility of total Communist victory without violence, even through parliamentary elections, as he recognizes a new relationship of power in the world in which one-third of mankind is subjected to Communist control. In such a situation the sheer weight of the Soviet power, combined with subversion and infiltration, can bring about, as we saw in the case of Czechoslovakia, a nonbloody revolution. But he tells us with the same breath of the inevitability of violence should capitalists resist and try to forestall their doom. Or, as he puts it, he will bury them, unless they would bury themselves voluntarily.

The record of the Communist leaders testifies significantly to the real meaning of the professed policy of peaceful coexistence. Lenin even in the short period of his rule waged an aggressive war against Poland in 1920 while he posed as a supporter of Polish national independence. Stalin signed treaties of nonaggression—which is nothing else than adherence to the principle of coexistence—with the Baltic States and Poland, only to invade and annex them later. He entered into an alliance with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and guaranteed their natoinal sovereignty. Today they all are captives of the Soviet Union. Mao Tse-tung and Pandit Nehru proclaimed the so-called Pancha Shila, five principles of coexistence, expressing respect for territorial integrity. Today, the Chinese Army is embanked in strategic spots deep in the Indian territory. And Khrushchev—Khrushchev notified the Hungarian nation in an eloquent manner how he understands coexistence when it tried to shake off in November 1956, the Soviet and Communist yoke. He let the whole world know that he recognized coexistence on his terms only. He topped the long and convincing record last month in Paris to prove again that coexistence is subjected to the needs of the moment and to Marxist exclusive interpretation.

Nevertheless, if we can be satisfied with the minimum expectations that coexistence means in fact absence of atomic war our hopes for peace may be reasonably nestled in the comforting feeling that the Soviets would not start a war in a situation which does not offer a good chance of bringing it to a successful conclusion. True, the Soviet leaders have differentiated in their theoretical writings between just and unjust wars and they have considered any action, even aggressive and preventive action, undertaken in the interest of the proletariat a just war, but they have been equally vehement in warning against any adventures which might jeopardize their achievements. Though their practical record points to the problematic value of their assurances on coexistence it does indicate their rejection of adventurism in politics, and their capability of seeking accommodation to the realities of strength. In fact, one may be allowed to state summarily that the Communist aggressive policy was facilitated, nay invited, by the weakness of the opponents. In that single fact lies the clue to the policy of the free world if it prefers to coexist on the surface of this land rather than underneath.

III

Accepting, then, absence of war as a necessity, the Communist world, however, has not abandoned its ultimate goal. It wishes to compete with the Western World and to win in the field of ideologists. Khrushchev stated recently, "Messrs. capitalists accuse us of simultaneuosly proclaiming the policy of peaceful coexistence and talking about the struggle between the Communist and the bourgeois idealogies. Yes, this struggle goes on, because it expresses the interests of different classes. * * * Our ideas will conquer mankind."

* * * * *

However, I hasten to add a clarification lest an incomplete survey of the ideological struggle lead to a serious misunderstanding. When Nikita Khrushchev challenges us to an ideological competition he does not contemplate it as an intellectual exercise nor does he conceive of it as fair play under a set of rules applicable to both sides. He really has in mind not an ideological but a political struggle and in this respect the competition assumes most ominous features. The Iron Curtain has been pulled as a barrier to prevent Western influence on its Eastern side while the Soviet policy has a free field on its Western side.

* * * * *

Our mass media, with their highly developed technique of communications, which are meant to serve as an instrument for better knowledge of individuals and nations, have been frequently exploited by Soviet statesmen to their advantage. Bound by their own ethics of reporting as fully as practicable any event of importance, the free world's mass media publish, broadcast or televise statements of Soviet leaders which are frequently calculated to confuse and weaken the resistance of persons who are not versed in the deceitful Communist semantics. Khrushchev's visit to the United States last September is a good case in point. It was due to a shrewd exploitation of mass media that he could have left with many people the impression that after all he was a good guy with whom one can conduct business in good faith.

How different is the situation on the other side of the Iron Curtain. There, the mass media are under a strict, centralized control, presenting important events in the free world only to the extent and in the light of the Soviet Government's interest. There, the voices of freedom have been silenced and if they come from the outside world, trying to reach people on the waves of broadcasting their efforts are largely frustrated by an elaborate system of jamming. And if we say that ideological competition is a two-way proposition and suggest that the nations behind the Iron Curtain be given an opportunity to express themselves freely about their political preference as the Western World permits Communists to challenge its own political system we are faced with a flat and indignant refusal. This is not a ideological struggle, this is a power aggression short of bullets and bombs. It is peaceful coexistence on Soviet terms.

IV

Another field in which Khrushchev invites competition is economy. He is convinced of the superiority of the Communist economy over the system of free enterprise. He expects that the impressive growth of the Soviet economic power will attract millions of people in Asia, Africa, and Latin America who live in abject poverty as an example to follow to bring them quickly through planned and socialist industrialization to the first step of prosperity.

Again, the competition is unfair, but this aspect of the problem bothers the Soviet leaders least of all. The two economics, that of the Communist East and democratic West, operate at two entirly different levels and for entirely different, in fact, mutually exclusive purposes. The Soviets ignore the price their citizens have paid for the Government's industrial output—personal freedom which is to us in the West the central consideration of economic development. They think of their economy primarily in terms of the power it brings to the Soviet state; we view the West's economic systems primarily in the light of material satisfaction they give to its populace. As we cannot,

however, escape looking at the challenge of economic competition in a different way than a power struggle the consequences of these fundamental differences call for grave concern on our part.

Over 50 percent of the Soviet total production is channeled back into capital investment and military equipment. The industrialized democracies meet this challenge with just about one-half of the Soviet figure. The inevitable result is that we are exposed to the dangers of a military gap which may grow even further while they are closing the production gap and may even surpass us, as Khrushchev has proudly stated on frequent occasions. The Western democracies' economy has grown at a pace of 4 percent a year; the Soviet rate has been 7 percent. Considering the purpose of this impressive economic development we can ill afford to sit back and enjoy complacently the satisfaction of growing fatter while they grow stronger. The day may well come when the Western governments would be unable to conduct a purposeful foreign policy and assure their people of national security, due to an inadequate military and economic position.

The alternative of freedom or subjection may be solved in the vast regions of uncommitted and poverty-stricken nations. Only a long-term policy of economic and technical assistance which will be pursued as a matter of national interest and not humanitarian philanthropy can divert these nations from looking across the borders to the so-called great Socialist experiment in Russia and China. Only an enlightened attitude of massive help can bring these people to the realization of their inherent right to live in dignity as human beings. Only when we do not need to worry about economic competition with the Soviet world.

The final question then arises whether coexistence of the two systems of governments, of the two ways of life, is feasible. The answer is yes—yes, coexistence is feasible if the Western World becomes truly aware of all dangers of the Communist policy and draws some imperative conclusions.

Democracies have always been slow in realizing threats to their existence. It needed an invasion of a neutral Belgium in 1914, a bombing of the city of Warsaw in 1939, a Pearl Harbor in 1941 to wake them out of lethargy. However, this time they cannot afford the luxury of dozing and waiting for an alarm clock sounding the final warning from a faraway scene. This time, we may be dead before we wake up.

Unprecedented dangers call for unprecedented measures. The Western World's struggle for coexistence with the Communist world cannot be limited to expedient and hastily conceived reactions to Communist moves. It must be primarily based on a long-term, widely spread and cooperative program of political integration, economic growth and military preparedness. It must be inspired and conducted by daring and imaginative leadership which would be unflinching in its demand of supreme material sacrifice to the preservation of the only real and surpeme value of life, freedom.

Such leadership of the Western World can be provided only by the United States. Such is the call of destiny, the command to greatness. The alternative is no other than sinking into shameful oblivion.

One hundred years ago the famed French historian, Jules Michelet, uttered some prophetic words. Warning against Russia of the future, which would pretend to be a revolutionary and progressive power he had the vision, "Yesterday, Russian propaganda told us: I am Christianity. Tomorrow it will tell us; I am socialism." He saw Russia emerging as "Socialist tyrant, messiahs of the serfs, a barbarous messiah, terrible to Europe," and he wrote, "I solemnly call upon young America: 'Let America justify our hope, let her be deaf to all petty interests, free of all petty rancours, devoted to the great general interest of human progress, closely associated with the civilized West, with the cause of liberty, which she has supported so recently and which she has made so gloriously victorious.'" The call of a century ago becomes a necessity today.

However, the challenge can be met successfully only if the Western World first of all puts its own house in order, if it removes the intolerable racial barriers, the remnants of fascism, if it finally moves in the direction of an integrated community of Atlantic union.

Negotiate with Communist powers we must. But we can hope for a satisfactory outcome of such negotiations only if they find it in their own interest to sit behind a conference table. And we can make such a proposition interesting to them only if we are united and powerful.

However, for free men power is something much more than guns and gadgets. Material power and comfort degrade and enslave the man who has neglected the foundation of all and any strength, an ideological and moral conviction. The free man pursues happiness in the awareness that it is only sorrow which can give to joy proper appreciation; he can escape the boredom of plenty only if he experiences the worry of misery; he can enjoy the bright sunshine of the day only in contrast to the darkness of the night. The free man does not hunt the phantom of material satisfaction which inevitably evades him unless he is alert to cultural values of life. The free man respects others as he respects himself; he is faithful to himself without being egocentric; he has a sense of solidarity without being conformist. He is a man of public responsibility without allowing the public to encroach on matters which are reserved solely to his personal discretion. The free man is dedicated to the cause of such freedom, and works for it with calm and determination. He has a noble and ennobling purpose to live for.

Is the Western society composed of free men? Its cultural and spiritual heritage has certainly provided solid foundations for such a society. If we have betrayed them, if we have betrayed ourselves, then, I am afraid, our society cannot hope for coexistence with Communist society; then the Western man will succumb to the modern Neanderthal man of the East.

My Trip to Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, when the eighth grade class of the Manalapan Township School of Englishtown, Monmouth County, N.J., visited Washington, I had the pleasure of meeting with them. There were about a hundred in the group and I offered prizes for the four best essays written by the members of the class about their trip to Washington with their teachers who accompanied them to be the judges. I have just been notified of the winners and I am very pleased to have these essays written by these young Americans printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The first prize was won by Gerald Kuschuk, Woodward Road, Englishtown, N.J., and his winning essay follows:

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON

(By Gerald Kuschuk)

I shall never forget my trip to Washington. It was the climax of years of anticipation on my part and my fellow classmates. It was very inspiring to be in the same city where great men of the past and present have shaped the destiny of our Nation and perhaps the destiny of the world.

The U.S. Capitol Building is a magnificent structure, housing the legislative branch of our Government. Beautiful paintings and tapestries decorate the walls of the rotunda. Statues of great American statesmen line the corridors. Most interesting of all are the actual rooms, in which the Senators and Representatives meet to make the laws in the democratic fashion which exemplifies our democracy.

Our class was taken on a short ride into Virginia to visit Mount Vernon, the home of George Washington, the first President of the United States. It was in this house, with its now antique furnishings, that an ordinary citizen surrendered his private life to go on to the fame and glory of being the Father of his Country. Under his rule, 13 individual Colonies were fused into 1 united Nation.

We visited Arlington National Cemetery with deep reverence in our hearts. Here lie the remains of the Unknown Soldiers of World Wars I and II and of the Korean war. A member of the honor guard constantly marches near their tombs. We were fortunate enough to witness the changing of the guard. This is a most impressive ceremony, and we all enjoyed watching the precision with which it was performed.

The Lincoln and Jefferson Monuments are two landmarks to which all tourists and visitors are attracted. Their simple beauty enhances the personalities of the two great Presidents to whom they are dedicated.

The Washington Monument is a huge concrete tribute to our first President. Each landing is dedicated either to a State of the Union or a famous American hero. The entire city is visible from its top. It is brilliantly lighted at night and is visible from a great distance.

I am sure many of us would enjoy working in the Bureau of Printing and Engraving. The guided tour was both interesting and informative. In the exhibition room, all types and denominations of money were displayed. Most of us had never seen or even dreamed that bills of such denominations existed. We saw a $100,000 bill and a $500 million Treasury note which was one of the highlights of the tour.

The most memorable part of our trip was the tour through the Federal Bureau of Investigation Building. Located here is the chief law enforcement agency of the United States, together with its crime laboratories, shooting ranges, and offices. This agency, under the able direction of J. Edgar Hoover, is constantly seeking out those who would harm the security of the people of the United States. It was very interesting to see the same criminal weapons that such infamous people as Dillinger, Capone, and Ma Barker used.

We left our Nation's Capital, weary, but happy to have seen the spiritual and moral forces which make our Nation the model for the free world.

The second prize was won by Carol Marinko, Taylors Mills Road, Englishtown, N.J., and her essay follows:

ENGLISHTOWN, N.J., *May 20, 1960.*

Hon. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE AUCHINCLOSS: First of all, may I thank you for taking time out of your busy schedule to have visited with us, the eighth-grade Manalapan Township School students.

My trip to Washington, D.C., 1960, will be a memorable one for me in many ways. It gives me great honor and pride just to say that I have been to the Capitol of the United States of America.

In spite of repairs on the Capitol Building, the buildings and grounds were impressive, with an air of quiet dignity and beauty. One thing that impressed me was the bronze Statue of Freedom upon the dome of the Capitol.

It was a pleasure to visit Mount Vernon. Everything about it was so historically interesting. It proves after all that great men and women, along with the humblest of citizens, did and still do appreciate God's gift to man—the beauty of a garden. Please God, help us to keep it so.

Our visit to the Congress and House of Representatives gave me a newer feeling of appreciation and responsibility for our Government, and its difficult tasks ahead. It brought home to me clearer than ever, my own personal responsibilities toward my Government. I thought to myself—here is one country where people from all the nations on earth live in one land by voting for the men they want to represent them and for the laws which each outlying district in these United States wishes. Many times we hear gripes about this or that but many times we forget to realize that some citizens do not take enough trouble to vote or write their Representatives and Congressmen or make themselves heard. The men who make our laws were voted in by people who cared enough about their country to vote for the men who would represent them and would work to have laws passed to benefit the separate problems of each district. Our district problems of a varied nature are brought before Congress and heard. We Americans like our system of government best. We have the power to make changes by democratic processes, through proper channels, when we do not like any conditions. As we see the discord, the riots and the bloodshed in many other countries and the comparatively orderly way our men in office are voted for and put in power, its importance to our country's people becomes intensified. All I can think is: "Please, dear God, help us to keep it so, and help me always to realize my importance as a citizen."

Last but not least, what impressed me was our visit to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, and Arlington National Cemetery.

It is so difficult to find the words to express my highest, and truest feelings about those crosses, row upon row, and words alone cannot do justice to those who gave their lives for the protection of our freedoms in this land of ours. It gave me a feeling of awe and humble gratitude to be alive in this land of ours. May we only be worthy of their great sacrifices. That is the very least we owe to those who gave their lives for the ideals of the United States of America—religion, life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. Help us to keep it so.

Very sincerely yours,

CAROL MARINKO.

The third prize was won by Robert Yacknowitz, Gordons Corner Road, Englishtown, N.J., and his essay follows:

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON

(By Robert Yacknowitz)

There are many "Washingtons" a person could write about. The Washington Monument, the State of Washington, or Washington, D.C. I do not believe that the students of an eighth grade class, or anyone else, can show his true feelings about Washington by the way he acts or expresses himself. Even limited are words to describe Washington, for the real Washington cannot be seen—the real Washington exists only in the hearts of the people who visit her. The composition I am writing tells about the real Washington.

Washington itself is beautiful, however, there is nothing so great as its atmosphere. Washington is toured best at night, for this is when the atmosphere is the greatest. A person must stop and realize that Washington is the nerve center of a nation full of democratic ideals. This is what gives Washington its great atmosphere. Standing on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial looking toward the Washington Monument, with a breeze rustling through his hair, should make a man stop and think of the wonderful freedom of the United States, for somewhere out there beyond Washington are lands without the democratic ideals of the United States. There are people out there who would give anything to trade places with him. Many people live in fear of a revolution or take part in one and get killed. This is not true in the United States. People in the United States do not worry about their Government. They may live in fear of war, but this fear is not great because the Government that we have is trying to prevent it.

On the bus to Washington there was gayity, excitement, and anxiety, for no one knew what lay ahead. All during the trip there was noise and excitement except when we were told to be quiet. The greatest amount of respect is not shown by silence but it is felt in the hearts of everyone who visits Washington. Even the noisiest people in the group, deep in their hearts feel great respect for Washington.

A person cannot have Washington described to him. To get the true feeling of Washington, he must stand on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial and look at the Washington Monument, wondering to himself what goes on beyond it. He must look at Lincoln himself and wonder if he will stand up. He must come to Washington and get that strange feeling himself. The feeling that comes from the heart.

The fourth prize was won by Roy Daum, Daum Road, Englishtown, N.J., and his essay follows:

MY TRIP TO WASHINGTON

(By Roy Daum)

My trip to Washington impressed me from the minute we reached the city until we left it. It was not only the national buildings that were so beautiful, but the city itself. Alongside of every street there were grass and trees to make Washington look more beautiful to us.

Two places in Washington seemed to stand out among the others. This first one seemed to have special significance. It was Arlington National Cemetery. Here, as we entered we saw rows and rows of graves of soldiers killed in action in the two world wars and in the Korean incident. When we walked up to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, something strange came over me. I cannot describe it, because it is beyond words. The tomb was white, with many sacred words carved in the granite. I realized that this soldier, whoever he was, stood for the thousands of men who had not survived the endless battles, and whose bodies had never been found. God alone is the only one who knows the identity of the unknown soldier. The changing of the guards fascinated me. The immense crowd became silent, so silent, that I could hear the distinctive click of the guard's boots hitting the marble floor. It remained silent until the changing of the guard was over. The tomb is guarded 24 hours a day. This was a very humble experience of my Washington trip.

We arrived at the Federal Bureau of Investigation Building on the afternoon of the second day. W were then divided up into groups. Our guide took us on a tour of the building. Here we were shown many of the departments. In this building many of the Nation's toughest crimes are solved. The Federal Bureau of Investigation handles many crimes, from the counterfeiting of money to kidnapping and murder. In this building, also, are the fingerprints of every known criminal in the United States. At one of our stops at the Federal Bureau of Investigation, one of the investigators demonstrated his skill in shooting a 38-caliber pistol and a Thompson submachinegun. I thought that this building was very educational, interesting, and thrilling.

I was very sorry to leave Washington so soon, but I felt that I had learned a great deal about our National Capital. Going through the Capitol Building and Washington Monument made me feel very proud of the country I live in.

U.S. Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two articles published in the Washington Evening Star of June 30, 1960; the first written by David Lawrence and entitled "Eisenhower Critics Inconsistent," and the second written by Gould Lincoln and entitled "A Far Cry from Stephen Decatur."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star, June 30, 1960]

EISENHOWER CRITICS INCONSISTENT—DEMOCRATIC SENATORS WHO DISAGREE WITH HANDLING OF U–2 ARE SCORED

(By David Lawrence)

Has the "prestige" of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee "reached a new low?" The Senate has just been given a report on the U–2 affair which in part is concurred in by some of its Members, while others dissent. It lacks coordination and consistency. Ten Senators—all of them Democrats, including Senator KENNEDY—officially put themselves on record as implying that the President should have lied to the world. Six Republicans and one Democrat insist that it was absolutely necessary for the President to tell the truth.

The same committee's chairman, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Democrat of Arkansas, after presenting the report to the Senate, alleges that the administration is lying now about certain aspects of the incident. In a speech to the Senate, he says:

"We are told that this particular flight was in a special category; that it was seeking information of extraordinary importance which might not be available later. However, we are not told, even under conditions of the utmost secrecy, what that information was. In view of the sensitivity of some of the other things we were told, this reticence on the part of the executive branch raises the question of whether the informa-

tion sought on May 1 was in fact as important as it has been represented. There is ground here for the conclusion that the alleged extraordinary importance of this information is the administration's cover story for its own costly mistake."

To accuse one's own Government of lying to a Senate committee doesn't seem to bother the Senator, who, in the same speech, also declares that President Eisenhower should have refused to take responsibility for the U-2 business and, instead, should somehow have evaded the truth. For, while Mr. Eisenhower did not really know in advance of the particular flight on May 1, he did give general authorization in advance and said so to the American people and the world. Yet Senator FULBRIGHT says to the Senate:

"The gravest mistake was when the President assumed responsibility for the flight."

Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, of Wisconsin, ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, and Senator FRANK LAUSCHE, Democrat of Ohio, in a separate report concurred in by five Republican Senators, rebutted this same point as follows:

"Conditions following the May 1 flight having developed as they did, it was unavoidable for the President to make a statement with regard to it. If he had to make a statement, he had to state the truth. Moreover, if he had not told the truth by avoiding personal responsibility, the four demands Khrushchev made upon him in Paris would not have been altered."

But what is puzzling are the contradictions in the main report, which frankly says that "the sort of information provided by the U-2 is of enormous value in assessing Soviet capability to mount a surprise attack," and then argues later on as follows:

"In looking back, if one accepts the conclusion that the failure of the mission furnished an excuse for Khrushchev's wrecking of the summit conference, then, in the absence of compelling reasons to the contrary, there is good reason to conclude that the flight should not have gone."

But the Secretary of Defense says the reasons were compelling and the Senate majority report itself concedes the great value of information obtained by the U-2 flights, which were needed to help protect the American people against surprise attack by the missiles of the Soviet Union.

Possibly the prize example of inconsistency and lack of coordination among the Democratic Members is to be found in Senator FULBRIGHT'S own speech, when he says:

"In any event, my argument is not that the President should not have told the truth; my argument is that he should not, as the head of our Nation, have become personally involved in the incident, one way or the other."

This appears to be one of those distinctions without a difference. For the query will be immediately posed as to how a President of the United States can keep himself from becoming personally involved in any official action taken by his own administration. One can hear already the outcries from the Democrats demanding an investigation of why the President, assuming that he did blame someone else, didn't know in advance what was being done and why he has subordinates who do such things, and so on. Indeed, Mr. Khrushchev would not have been satisfied with such a patent evasion of official responsibility and would have continued to demand the removal and punishment of those same subordinates.

There was a time when the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had considerable prestige. Today its report stands as a glaring example of how to furnish arguments to the Soviets for use on the air waves to try to discredit the United States and to help bring it to a new low in prestige—which phrase an American Senator, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, uses in an indictment of his own Government.

[From the Washington Star, June 30, 1960]

A FAR CRY FROM STEPHEN DECATUR

(By Gould Lincoln)

We have gone a "fur piece" down the road since the days of Stephen Decatur, a U.S. naval hero in the early 1800's. It was Decatur, responding to a toast, who said: "Our country: In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be right but our country, right or wrong." Today it has become popular in certain quarters to decry the President of the United States and the country's intercourse with foreign nations. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, no less—Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas—at a time when this country and President Eisenhower are under bitter attacks by the Communists of Soviet Russia and China, has seen fit to charge that the prestige of the United States is at a "new low" due to the U-2 incident and Japan's withdrawal of her invitation to the President to visit Tokyo.

PLAYS MR. K.'S GAME

Mr. FULBRIGHT'S address to the Senate followed a few hours after President Eisenhower, reporting to the Nation on his recent trip to the Far East, laid the blame squarely on the Communists both for the blowup of the summit conference in Paris and for the riots in Japan which led to the withdrawal of his invitation to visit that country. And he said: "We in the United States must not fall into the error of blaming ourselves for what the Communists do, after all, Communists will act like Communists." He added: "Above all we must bear in mind that successful implementation of any policy against Communist imperialism requires that we never be bluffed, cajoled, blinded or frightened. We cannot win out against the Communist purpose to dominate the world by being timid, passive or apologetic when we are acting in our own and the free world's interests."

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in his bitter criticism of what he called the "bumbling and fumbling" of the administration, said the country could not "begin to regain our position in the world until we can disabuse ourselves of the habit of self-delusion, of viewing defeats as victories and of advertising blunders as strokes of genius." He went on to say that Adlai Stevenson, another Democrat, had been right in his May 19 statement that this Government had given Russian Premier Khrushchev the "crowbar and sledge hammer" to wreck the Paris conference. And Mr. Fulbright added on his own: "We might even go further and say that we forced Khrushchev to wreck the conference by our own ineptness."

Apparently the Democrats have now elected to make political capital out of the U-2 incident and the withdrawal of the invitation to President Eisenhower to visit Japan. In their efforts to discredit Mr. Eisenhower and the Republican administration, they seem to overlook the fact they are helping to play Khrushchev's own game, which is not only to divide the American people, but to make us appear weak and inept in the minds of our allies. This is not a pretty picture. It may in the end prove mighty poor politics.

Part of the Democratic effort, too, is to belittle President Eisenhower because of his good-will trips to many nations of the world. All their criticism is based on the fact that the visit to Japan did not come off. They overlook the wonderful receptions accorded Mr. Eisenhower when he visited capitals of our European allies, and then later India and other nations of the East, and later still when he toured South America.

President Eisenhower, in his report to the Nation, strongly pointed out that the Communist leaders had come to regard these good-will visits of the President of the United States to the nations of the world as a blow to the Communist drive for world domination. So much had they become aware of this danger, the President said, that they had used false reasons for withdrawing the Khrushchev invitation to the President to visit Russia, and later had gone to great lengths to stir up riots in Tokyo that, in the end, compelled the Japanese Government to withdraw its invitation, too. The President couldn't be righter. Yet his critics in this country insist that these actions on the part of Red Russians and the Red Chinese are to be overlooked because of our own "bumbling and fumbling." How do these Eisenhower critics expect the American people to react to the critics' own blunders?

ATTACKS NOT NEW

Such attacks by Democrats on the Eisenhower administration and its handling of foreign relations of this country are not, in reality, new at all. When the late John Foster Dulles was Secretary of State, the Democratic shout was that we had lost all our friends abroad; that Mr. Dulles was constantly bringing us to the brink of war, and that he was either too adamant or too yielding. Indeed, Mr. Dulles was criticized for constantly traveling about the world on many missions. In those days the same charge was made, that the prestige of the United States had fallen to a low degree. Mr. Dulles died. The expressions of regret coming from our friends abroad were sincere—and they expressed their feeling of loss because of the death of a strong, valiant leader against world communism. We rediscovered, if we did not know it already, that we—and Mr. Dulles—had plenty of friends abroad.

The Democrats will have a tough time, if they try it, making the American people or our allies believe that President Eisenhower has sold them short in defense measures against the Communists, or that he has failed to lead a courageous crusade for world peace.

Upton, Mass., Celebrates 225th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the year 1960 will long be remembered by several communities in my district because it is the year when outstanding programs of events were held to mark noteworthy anniversary dates.

A short time ago the city of Marlboro, Mass., conducted impressive exercises to celebrate its 300th anniversary and I was privileged and pleased to be able to attend some of these events. Earlier this week, it was a distinct honor for me to direct the attention of the House to the 175th anniversary celebration of the city of Gardner, Mass. When the Congress reconvenes next month, I will address the House on the 300th anniversary of the settlement of the Quaboag Planation which will be celebrated during September 16, 17, 18 by the towns of East Brookfield, Brookfield, North Brookfield, West Brookfield, Warren, and New Braintree,

all in my district. These towns were formed from the original settlement known as the Quaboag Plantation.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am proud indeed to bring to the attention of the House the 225th anniversary of the town of Upton, Mass., which will be the subject of a community celebration during the approaching July 4 holiday weekend. While Upton was incorporated as a town in 1735, its history goes back to the very earliest days of American history since it is located in an area where King Philip's War began in 1675 with an Indian raid against a small settlement.

Some researchers say that Upton's history perhaps goes back to even earlier times. A stone cave or hut discovered some years ago in Upton is described as being similar to huts found in Ireland of sixth century Pictic origin. Iceland has similar huts and some investigators have stated that the hut possibly may have been constructed by Norsemen since the Indian tribes in the area were unskilled in masonry.

Many descendants of the original band of early settlers still reside in Upton which comprises some 21 square miles in area with a population of about 3,100. The town was formed from the nearby towns of Mendon, Uxbridge, Sutton, and Hopkinton.

Settlement of the Upton region began in 1717 when Capt. Ebenezer Wood and his family carved a home in the wilderness. Soon former Essex County neighbors and friends joined him and a small community sprung up. The settlement grew slowly because the times were troubled. The constant threat of Indian wars and actual fighting between ominous periods of peace did little to encourage the growth of frontier settlements, but despite all these hazards Upton continued to progress to the point where, by 1730 the settlers felt that a new town should be formed.

The residents were finally successful in their efforts to form a new town on June 25, 1735, and the first town meeting was held on July 28, 1735, in the Sadler homestead which still stands today.

Mr. Speaker, this coming weekend the community of Upton will conduct simple but impressive exercises to mark the town's 225th anniversary. Townspeople will note the progress of 225 years in recalling the accomplishments and deeds of the courageous early settlers. Under the direction of General Chairman Clarence A. Lamson, a devoted anniversary committee has contributed time and effort to work out a memorable community celebration in observance of Upton's 225th anniversary.

The 3-day anniversary celebration opens this Saturday with a bicycle and doll carriage parade, an event which should awaken nostalgic memories among the many who participated in similar enjoyable exercises in past years.

Later in the day the Upton Little League will play the town's bearded men who formed earlier this year the Niagara Bush Association in anticipation of the anniversary celebration. The association is made up of Upton citizens with beards of various sizes and shapes especially grown for the anniversary activities.

Rounding out the day's events will be old fashioned New England bean suppers conducted by individual churches where old and new friends will meet to relive the days and joys of yesterday.

The program of events for Sunday features a pageant of Upton's history in the afternoon, a Little League baseball game, and at night the familiar holiday band concert of yesteryear.

On Monday, the anniversary committee is featuring an old fashioned July 4 parade, complete with floats. A firemen's muster and an anniversary dance in Town Hall are other highlights of the day's events.

The Upton anniversary program, which has been planned for the entertainment of the townspeople and the many visitors from neighboring communities, is truly impressive. One particular aspect of the program, Mr. Speaker, should be signaled out for special mention: it is a simple and dignified program which might well be a duplicate of the programs held to celebrate Upton's 100th or 150th anniversaries—and those are memorable celebrations which can be relived in Upton this weekend.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of Upton's 225th anniversary celebration, I am introducing today a special resolution extending the greetings and feliciations of the House to Upton on the occasion of this anniversary. I know that my colleagues will be pleased to join with me in paying well deserved tribute to this progressive community in my district and its people who have contributed so much down through the years to the growth and advancement of our great country.

The text of my resolution reads as follows:

Whereas the year 1960 marks the 225th anniversary of the incorporation of the town of Upton, Massachusetts; and

Whereas from the time of settlement in 1728 the people of Upton have figured conspicuously in the founding and growth of this Nation; and

Whereas the observances of the 225th anniversary of Upton is being celebrated with impressive community ceremonies which will attract many visitors to central Massachusetts; and

Whereas Upton is a progressive community rich in historic interest, distinguished for its fervent civic spirit, and faithfully devoted to American institutions and ideals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives extends its greetings and felications to the people of Upton, Massachusetts, on the occasion of the 225th anniversary of this community and the House of Representatives further expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of Upton during the past 225 years.

Civic Leader Cites Accomplishments of American Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, recently one of the outstanding civic and community leaders in my State of Wisconsin spoke on the accomplishments of labor unions in our State and Nation. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President that the thoughtful and perceptive comments of Mr. James Megellas, president of the Common Council of the City of Fond du Lac, Wis., be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD. I bring Mr. Megellas' remarks on the American labor movement to the attention of my colleagues, because of his outstanding record of civic and community service.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

SPEECH OF JAMES MEGELLAS, PRESIDENT OF THE FOND DU LAC COMMON COUNCIL, AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE SHEBOYGAN COUNTY AFL–CIO COUNCIL AND INDEPENDENT UNIONS

During the year 1959 we repeatedly heard a great deal about what is wrong with labor and charges that unions are too powerful. It is rather strange in view of labor's constructive record that in this day and age there are still people who cling to the notion that America would be better off without trade unions. I say this is utterly ridiculous.

Tonight I would like to talk about "not what is wrong with labor" but "what is right with American labor."

Today there are more than 16 million Americans in organized labor. They are here in Sheboygan, in my hometown of Fond du Lac, in the State of Wisconsin and in America. They work in the shops, they work in the mines, they work in the factories. They work in our forests, they drive our trucks. They operate our railroads. They build our schools and churches. These same people are members of the PTA's churches, civic association, veterans' groups, fraternities, school boards, city councils, and legislatures. They contribute unselfishly in time and money to charitable organizations and drives. They are good citizens. They are the backbone of the country in peace as well as in war.

The labor movement in this country has done a great good for the Nation. The accomplishments of the American labor movement in achieving a better standard of living for workers are unchallenged. As a result of the efforts of American trade unions, workers in this Nation have a higher income, work fewer hours, enjoy more protection and benefits such as pensions and vacations and work under healthier and safer conditions than in any other nation in the world.

Sweatshops have been almost completely eliminated. Child labor has been almost completely abolished. The American worker has achieved a sense of human dignity never before achieved in America or in the world.

I need not remind this group that the labor movement was the first to speak up and fight for universal free public education for all children, regardless of race, color or creed. Labor was among the first to speak up for social legislation. Social security laws, which bring dignity to working men and women in their old age, would never have passed if it had not been for the efforts of labor. Workmen's compensation, the 8-hour day and unemployment compensation are the product of the labor movement. And it has played an important role in lifting the standard of living for millions of Americans who have never even belonged to a union or paid a dime in dues.

Let me quote a paragraph from the preamble to the AFL–CIO constitution, "We shall combat resolutely the forces which seek to undermine the democratic institutions of our Nation and to enslave the human soul. We shall strive always to win

full respect for the dignity of the human individual whom our unions serve."

I am not a member of organized labor myself but I would be proud to be one. I believe that what is good for America is good for labor. I cannot subscribe to the philosophy of what is good for General Motors or big business is necessarily good for America. The welfare, security and the protection of the public interest should and must have priority over the interest of any economic group.

I become quite disturbed when I hear about the so-called power of labor. The public is being led to believe that the trade union movement has become too powerful. We should ask ourselves "too powerful for whom?" "Too powerful for what?" Do labor unions exploit the many for the benefit and enrichment of the few? Certainly not. The direct opposite is the truth. I see no harm in power, if it is power dedicated to human values, if it is power for good—and that is what the trade movement seeks. Yes, labor has used its economic strength to improve working conditions and the standard of living for all Americans, not merely union members.

But this is not the only arena of endeavor in which labor has deployed its forces. Labor has continuously fought against racial and religious discrimination. Labor has been carrying on a drive to wipe out poverty and human misery not only here in America but anywhere it may exist in the world. Labor was quick to recognize the threat of communism in this Nation and has been waging an unrelenting war against communism and Communist infiltration in the labor movement. Under the Red flag there are no strikes, no slowdowns, no absenteeism, no labor problems at all. Neither are there any individual freedoms or liberty.

Yes, organized labor has a record of accomplishments and service of which it can be justly proud.

However, labor cannot rest on its oars. For to stand pat would create stagnation and in effect the labor movement would be moving backwards.

With the turn of a new decade organized labor will be facing new challenges. The challenges of automation and new scientific and technological advances. This decade may very well become known as the soaring sixties. I can envison in the very near future labor producing not only all the needs and requirements of our expanding economy and population but for the free world as well and doing it in a 30- or 35-hour workweek.

The problems of labor and the Nation will then be that of providing additional recreational facilities and educational opportunities for its brothers and sisters. However, no new gains or progress will be achieved without resistance and opposition, for organized labor is not without its enemies. There is no question but that there will be continued efforts to retard the progress of the labor movement in this coming session of Congress. The keynote was sounded in the 1959 session.

Therefore, it is imperative in this year of 1960 that we, members and friends of organized labor assembled here this evening, resolve ourselves to the rededication to the principles and the great tradition of organized labor for the betterment of all mankind.

Address by Gen. Rafael L. Trujillo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest men the Western Hemisphere has ever produced is Rafael L. Trujillo. He is a God-fearing patriot who is dedicated to the defeat of atheistic communism in the Western Hemisphere. False rumors have been circulated against him by Communists and their left-wing stooges. General Trujillo is standing like a stone wall against the onslaughts and intrigue of the enemies of our civilization. He needs the support and backing of every loyal American.

We must resist left-wing attempts in the United States to destroy him and turn his great republic over to the followers of Castro and Khrushchev.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Congress the following address by this great and dedicated man:

ADDRESS BY HIS EXELLENCY GENERALISSIMO RAFAEL L. TRUJILLO AT THE OPENING CEREMONIES OF THE ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST INDUSTRIAL, AGRICULTURAL AND LIVESTOCK FAIR, SAN JUAN DE LA MAGUANA, DOMINICAN REPUBLIC, APRIL 19, 1960

Gentlemen, on the 22d of December last, I traveled to San Juan to pay homage to the memory of the heroes who, with their swords, put an end to our wars of emancipation. Today, I have returned to open the St. John the Baptist Fair, held to commemorate another historical event that is the first landmark in the wonderful transformation which, in the space of 21 years, has been wrought throughout this vast part of our homeland.

On the 19th of April 1938, when I was on a visit to this city, I promised the people of the region to raise it to the status of a province. Eight months later, on the 1st of January 1939, there arose in the eastern part of the country, the star of Benefactor Province. This is the happy event we are celebrating here today under the cloak of the name of he who announced the coming of our Lord; proof of our love of progress and of our Catholic piety and devotion.

Recently, I also promised the people of San Juan that by this date, they would be incorporated into the general electrification plan of the country. Within less than 120 days, I have fullfilled that promise.

Since yesterday afternoon, this city now has the electric current it needed and, very soon, with the enlarging of the present industrial and agricultural enterprises and the establishment of others, it will be possible to enjoy the full benefits these will provide.

I am happy to announce that the plan for general electrification will not stop at this city. It will be extended to Elias Piña and to other parts within this city's jurisdiction and I am animated by the hope that this province will contribute to the development of the vital forces of those municipalities which, through their geographical location, most require to be strengthened.

"I believe that if the people have faith in me, it is because they have always seen my readiness to provide them with the greatest possible happiness without thought to whatever obstacles or sacrifices it may be necessary to overcome or to make in order to achieve this. Nevertheless, my task has not been an easy one since there have been many inherited and acquired habits that have done everything possible to obstruct me.

Even now, after a number of years, I find myself forced to face a lack of understanding and the machinations of those who, moved by reasons of spurious personal interests, endeavor to ignore the teachings of history and to restore violence and disorder as methods of government.

All my endeavors were placed at the service of peace, and later, to wage an incessant battle to preserve it and to make it permanent. In order to achieve this, it was necessary to reestablish the rule of law and respect for legally constituted authority, authority damaged by 80 years of separation from constitutional and legal norms.

In order to preserve the peace, it was necessary to eliminate the causes of political unrest by fostering a balance between the social elements that produce that moral phenomenon called peace. Everything that has been done throughout the country in the space of the last 30 years in the various fields of our national activities, everything that exists as material proof of the designs to promote the common well-being, is the miraculous product of that supreme possession called peace.

Anti-Dominican interests abroad have conspired against us and against our peace. But it will be defended with firmness and tenacity because, in my hands, none of the Christian and democratic institutions which form the basis of the Republic, will ever be allowed to perish.

In the midst of a world agitated by the ferment of extremist ideas that preach subversion of everything by means of force, I will continue without letup to fight for the securing of peace.

This St. John the Baptist Fair is precisely an exhibition of the fruits of peace. If the Republic's provinces have been able to assemble here in this magnificent feast of labor, giving proof of the stability of the nation's economy, it is because of the atmosphere of order in which men in the fields of agriculture, industry and commerce have been able to establish and expand their enterprises with assurance and confidence, under a mantle of liberty.

Other fairs similar to this one will be held throughout other provinces as proof of the progress achieved by them during the last three decades, and with the idea of stimulating the feelings of that brotherly harmony which encourages our people in this rebirth of our nation.

It has always been my wish that every Dominican participate in the task of government and that this should be carried out in a spirit of justice. I have called for the collaboration of those whom I believed to be capable of helping to improve the public services, or of invigorating the will for that general reconciliation which has always been outstanding in my political activities, and I have carried official action, without regionalist discrimination of any kind, to every corner of the country, it having been my constant desire that every single Dominican should benefit from the prosperity brought in its wake by the efficiency of the regime I founded on the ruins of the past.

I believe in private enterprise and in the efforts of the individual to produce wealth. In accordance with this conviction, I proposed that an adequate legislation be voted and every institution established that would assist those who dedicate themselves to furthering our economy. The inhabitants of this region, those who have given so much proof of their assiduity and love of peace, may rest assured that at no moment will they ever lack the Government's protection and assistance.

New distributions of land to the peasants; new irrigation canals and the improvement of the existing ones and regard for the storage of whatever water may be necessary, will be carried out for the purpose of opening up new land for cultivation. My land, water and road policy is in force. Land for sowing. Water for irrigation. Roads for the transport of crops.

I call upon everyone to dedicate himself, in the shodow of the prevailing peace, to the noble task of expanding his cultivable land, of improving the conditions of his cattle, of overhauling his methods of cultivation and production and to do everything the light of his intelligence and the strength of his arm may prompt him to do to wrest from the

ground of this fertile valley, everything that may be beneficial to its inhabitants and to the nation as a whole.

Nothing and no one can stop our forward march. My task has the backing of the people whom I have always defended and protected. The victories won in the fight to achieve stability and a respectable position for our homeland, signify the crystalization of the great efforts put forth to overcome innumerable difficulties.

In order to preserve and to enlarge the fruits of these victories, victories that have provided Dominicans with a new way of life, I know I can rely on your loyalty and patriotism. The south has never failed to respond to the call of honor and glory.

Gentlemen, on behalf of His Excellency the President of the Republic, I am now delighted to declare open this St. John the Baptist Fair, eloquent testimony of the fertile working spirit developed in the country and of the profound religious feelings of its people.

The Van Zandt Bill H.R. 12395, Requiring Users of Inland Waterways To Pay a User's Charge Will Serve To Eliminate Unfair Competition Existing in our Nationwide Transportation System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, since May 25, 1960, when I introduced H.R. 12395, it is gratifying to observe the widespread interest in the proposed legislation.

The bill would establish the Inland Navigation Commission and authorize the provision and collection of fair and reasonable charges for use of inland waterway navigational improvements, constructed, maintained, or operated with Federal funds, and for other purposes.

There is scant opposition to the user charge principle. Presidents Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, and Dwight D. Eisenhower have all publicly urged the imposition of such charges for the use of publicly provided transportation facilities.

The Van Zandt bill, H.R. 12395, would correct an inequitable situation in the field of transportation arising from the fact that those who operate on our inland waterways have never paid a user charge.

It should be emphasized that users of the federally subsidized inland waterways, built and maintained at taxpayer expense, have never paid the Government anything for either the construction of or operating on these costly facilities. Federal expenditures for navigation on the inland and intracoastal waterways have aggregated more than $2.6 billion and have been increasing rapidly in recent years. Such expenditures have risen steadily from $57.2 million in 1955 to $145 million in 1959.

Mr. Speaker, there is no denial of the fact that barge-line operations on our inland waterways form a mature and financially strong industry. As such, that industry should be required to take its place in transportation, on a self-sustaining basis, bearing its own costs under conditions of fair competition with other modes of transportation. Mr. G. C. Taylor, president of the Mississippi Barge Lines Co., stated before the Subcommittee on Surface Transportation of the U.S. Senate, 85th Congress, on behalf of the Inland Waterways Common Carriers Association, that the common carrier barge-line members handled 24 billion ton-miles of freight in 1957 and collected revenues of $96 million. Mr. Taylor also stated that their rates averaged about 4 mills per ton-mile as against 14 mills for the railroads. An analysis of these nine common carrier barge-line members on the Mississippi River System that reported to the Interstate Commerce Commission indicates that the average rate of return on investment for transportation purposes in 1957 amounted to 16.74 percent of unamortized investment before income taxes and 10.38 percent of unamortized investment after income taxes.

These figures clearly reveal that the barge lines can well afford to pay their own way rather than to continue to expect the overburdened American taxpayers to "pick up the check" for them. Therefore there is nothing to justify annual appropriations year after year from funds paid into the Treasury by general taxpayers.

"Transportation Lines on the Mississippi River System and the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway for 1959," a Corps of Engineers publication, lists a total of 1,012 carriers on these waterways, which are classified as follows: 34 common carriers, 13 contract carriers, and 965 exempt carriers. The latter class is privileged to operate on the waterways without regulatory control, and it assumes no responsibility for public or common carrier service. It is estimated that an additional 230 inland waterway carriers operate on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts, making a total of approximately 1,240 for all inland waterways.

These carriers handled 109 billion ton-miles of cargo in 1958. Assuming revenue or value in lieu of revenue of 4.5 mills per ton-mile, the volume would equal $490 million. These data confirm that inland waterway barge line operations are a large and well-established industry. There is no longer any pretext of justification for these operators, in union with other proponents of navigation projects, to come to the Congress annually asking for, or, in fact, demanding, large appropriations from the Treasury to provide, improve, and maintain waterways which facilitate their commercial operations for private gain at taxpayer expense.

Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers of this country should have long-overdue relief from the burden of financing the ever-increasing demands of the waterway operators and their advocates. They clamor for appropriations from the Treasury not only to cover the operation and maintenance cost of existing navigation improvements, but in addition, the cost of extravagant enlargements and extensions of existing waterways. These users of our waterways also enjoy the benefits from the creation of new projects year by year—all of this with no provision whatever for reimbursement of the Treasury for the facilities and services furnished them by the public. These extortionate demands are always asserted, and justification attempted by a claim of cheap and economical transportation. I ask in all fairness: How can transportation be called economical or cheap when it falls upon the Federal Government to absorb a great share of the cost? How can this transportation be termed economical when the burden is carried by the general tax receipts of the Federal Government and, therefore, by all the taxpayers rather than the users of the waterway and the operators of carrier lines?

The present value of the depreciated federally built structures on our inland waterway system is estimated to be approximately $1.5 billion, with annual operating and maintenance expenses of approximately $44 billion. These expenditures by the Federal Government are pure subsidies. They constitute an outright gift of $1,200,000 with an additional maintenance donation of $35,000 year after year to each and every one of the 1,240 operating carriers. Obviously, these subsidies would not be evenly divided or accrue among the various operators; rather they accrue to a relatively few large corporations and industries that can well afford to pay the full cost of the transportation services and facilities they receive.

Approximately 93 percent of all barge traffic on the Mississippi River system, which includes the mainstem of the Mississippi River and its tributaries, is limited to eight classes of commodities. These commodities are listed below, with the percentage of total traffic represented by each class:

Coal	39.7
Petroleum	27.7
Sand, gravel, and crushed rock	12.1
Waterway improvement materials	3.8
Grains	3.0
Iron and steel manufacturing	3.0
Shells, unmanufactured	1.9
Industrial chemicals	1.3

All other class of commodities produce less than 7 percent of the total barge traffic. This further emphasizes the limited numbers of industries and corporations which gain directly from the ever-increasing Federal expenditures on inland navigation improvements and maintenance.

A user charge of approximately 1.5 mills per ton-mile on cargo vessels and a nominal user charge set up for other craft, would be established under the provisions of the Van Zandt bill, H.R. 12395. My bill would provide adequate revenues to insure that (1) the present useful inland waterway improvements could be equitably amortized; (2) that the operation and maintenance of the inland waterways could be financed; and

(3) that adequate funds would accumulate to provide for the repair and replacement of existing structures and the provision of new structures as required by the waterway users and approved by the Congress. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12395 will, in fact, free the long-abused taxpayers of this country from an unjust and ever-increasing burden of expenditures for transportation facilities for the advantage of a very limited group. It will place the responsibility for financing these facilities squarely upon the commercial interests who can best judge the economic value of their own demands. In conclusion H.R. 12395 will not impede, but will positively enhance, the efficiency and economy of our transportation system. Furthermore, it will lend dignity and responsibility to the demands of carriers that operate on our inland waterway system. And finally it will be instrumental in eliminating the waste that now exists in our inland waterway navigation programs.

Houston Chronicle Urges De Zavala Homesite Be Saved for State Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it was recently my privilege to call to the attention of the Senate a resolution passed by the commissioners court of Harris County, Tex., asking the General Services Administration to change its plans about selling land adjacent to the Lorenzo de Zavala cemetery and homestead.

De Zavala was the first Vice President of the Republic of Texas and one of the signers of the Texas Declaration of Independence. His family homesite is of great interest to Texans and other Americans and should be preserved as a shrine. But the identity of this historic site will be lost if the GSA sells surrounding adjacent land to commercial interests.

I have asked the GSA to reconsider its planned sale of this property at the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot on August 1, 1960, and am making legislative inquiry into feasibility of introducing a bill to deed a portion of this property to Texas for a State park.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial on this subject from the Houston Chronicle of June 19, 1960, which was headed "De Zavala Homesite Should Be Saved for State Park."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DE ZAVALA HOMESITE SHOULD BE SAVED FOR STATE PARK

An effort to save for posterity one of Texas' most historic spots has been inaugurated by patriotic organizations. It is an effort in which city, county and chamber of commerce should and no doubt will join.

The site in question, rich in history, lies right across the Houston Ship Channel from the San Jacinto Battleground—from the monument and the Battleship *Texas*. There is located the site of the home of Lorenzo de Zavala, vice president of the first government of Texas and a signer of the Texas Declaration of Independence. Not far from the site of the home—which served as a hospital for the wounded of the Battle of San Jacinto—is the De Zavala family cemetery in which that founder of the republic and David Thomas, attorney general of the interim government, are buried.

Speed is essential in the move to save this historic area from becoming industrial property and make it a State park for the benefit of future generations. For the land is a part of the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot, which the Federal Government plans to sell at auction on August 1.

Wednesday night, the San Jacinto chapter of the Sons of the Republic adopted a resolution calling upon Representatives ALBERT THOMAS and BOB CASEY to ask the Government, first, not to sell Tract 26 of the ordnance depot property on August 1, and second, to give a portion of it to the State of Texas for use as a State park.

Other patriotic organizations such as the Daughters of the Republic of Texas and the Sons of the American Revolution no doubt will join the S.R.T. in leading the movement for designation of the area as a State park. Commissioners court, city council, the chamber of commerce and every patriotic and civic group in Houston should join in this endeavor. Wires to Senators JOHNSON and YARBOROUGH as well as our congressmen would help, too.

The homesite and cemetery lie within the point of land between the ship channel and the San Jacinto River. The 10-acre cemetery already is part of the San Jacinto Battleground Park. If the Government would add perhaps 60 acres or so, the entire peninsula could be made a part of the park, or could be made a "De Zavala State Park" blending in harmoniously with the battleground.

On the other hand, if the property were sold and a chemical plant or oil refinery built on it, the beauty and utility of the battleground as a place to visit would be impaired seriously.

This is a project all Houston and Texas should get behind.

Enough Is Enough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following compelling editorial published in the Washington Evening Star of Friday, July 1, 1960:

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

The State Department's confession that our official policy of "restraint" in dealing with Fidel Castro has been a failure suggests an intention to crack down on the Cuban dictator. We hope this interpretation is correct, for enough is enough. And Mr. Castro's Communist-oriented regime has indulged once too often in the game of biting the hand that feeds it.

This latest nip came with the confiscation of the Texaco oil refinery, whose managers had refused to refine a batch of Russian petroleum shipped to Cuba in a barter deal. More confiscations will follow, and Mr. Castro is threatening to seize all American-owned property in Cuba if Congress finally passes the bill empowering the President, in his discretion, to reduce imports of Cuban sugar.

We trust that neither Congress nor the administration will be intimidated by this threat. It is much too late for any illusions respecting Mr. Castro. He has made a career out of slandering the United States and paving the way for Communist infiltration of Cuba. There is every reason to suppose that he will keep on doing this, and that he will find one excuse or another for confiscating or destroying property owned by Americans. Why should the United States continue to support the Cuban economy and thereby support Mr. Castro? Why should we continue to pay a premium price for Cuban sugar—a price higher than the rest of the world pays—and thereby give Mr. Castro an annual subsidy of $150 million? We hope the sugar bill will be passed, and that the President will not hesitate to use the authority it gives him to lower the boom on the 2-bit dictator who has destroyed Cuban-American relations and who is well on his way toward wrecking Cuba.

Rugged Individualism Versus Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Sumter (S.C.) Daily Item of June 27, 1960 entitled "Have We Abandoned Rugged Individualism for Security?" This outstanding editorial points up the need for our people to turn their attention more toward opportunity than mere security.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAVE WE ABANDONED RUGGED INDIVIDUALISM FOR SECURITY

"With some validity it could be said that security has become the 'opiate of the people' in America. You do not get boldness or dedication to public service or even responsible citizenship from those who choose as much idleness as possible as a way of life. They cease to be masters of the state, as the democratic thesis demands: they become its wards. When the citizen accepts the government as his guardian, democracy is in decay."

The above is an extract from an address delivered recently by Dr. Henry M. Wriston, former president of Lawrence College and now president of the American Assembly at Columbia University and chairman of the President's Commission on National Goals.

In his address Dr. Wriston discussed the need of "rugged individuals who like insecurity and will take chances."

"There was a time," said Dr. Wriston, "when the individual was at the core of

our political, religious and economic thought. Indeed, the key to our history is the concept of freedom.

"Somewhere in the 1930's, or thereabouts, rugged individualism became associated with industrial piracy, with defiance of moral checks, with exploitation of one's fellow men. If I may borrow an expression familiar in Britain, when we denounced rugged individualism, we 'threw the baby out with the bath water.' We went too far, for nothing is more obvious than that leadership is a word which describes a quality of individual not of a society."

Dr. Wriston pointed out some of the harm which has befallen this Nation because of the passion for security. College students, he says, are told to aim for certain jobs because there are plenty of vacancies and therefore not much danger of unemployment. They are advised to train for certain vocations because the pay is good, rather than because such employment of one's talent and energies bring intellectual, spiritual and emotional satisfactions. This kind of defensive counsel, the doctor said, will never help to produce leadership.

"A guidance counselor who has made a fetish of security, or who has unwittingly surrendered his thinking to economic determination may steer a youth away from his dream of becoming a poet, an artist, a musician, or any other of thousands of things because it offers no security, it does not pay well, there are no vacancies, it has no future," said Dr. Wriston.

Rugged individualism made this the great country it is and as Dr. Wriston has said if we have abandoned it we have thrown the baby out of the window with the water. Had it not been for this rugged individualism many of our great inventions of today would not have come about. Many of our great men of the past would have been mere men.

Here is another paragraph from Dr. Wriston's talk to which we would direct your attention:

"There is nothing in the Bill of Rights that promises that the freedom there guaranteed can be enjoyed in comfort or in a serene atmosphere. In the long history of freedom discomfort has always accompanied speaking on controversial matters. There never has been a time when there were not social sanctions against candor. But if freedom is to amount to anything, one must be ready to pay the price, when a man speaks out, he must be ready to receive, if not absorb, criticism.

"I am asserting that those who misrepresent the normal experiences of life, who decry being controversial, who shun risk, are enemies of the American way of life, whatever the piety of their vocal professions and the patriotic flavor of their platitudes."

There is so much truth in this statement. Many newspapers of today take no editorial stand on controversial matters because they are afraid of making enemies. It may be a lot more pleasant to write about the birds and the bees but Dr. Wriston says those "who decry being controversial, who shun risk, are enemies of the American way of life" and we are inclined to agree with him. While no one wants to make enemies, yet if one does in the discharge of a duty there should be no great worry over it.

One of the great troubles with America today is that there are too many people who will not speak out. A businessman is afraid to speak out because he fears he might lose a dollar or two in trade, a professional man who is afraid to speak out because he might lose a client, a politician is afraid to speak out because he fears he might lose a vote. And so you have it.

We need more rugged individualism in America.

Resolution of City Council of Philadelphia, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in the rush for recess and the national political convention, which take some of us in the opposite direction, I wish to call attention again to a very important ceremony which will take place in the city of Philadelphia on July 4.

Two great events will be celebrated. The 184th anniversary of the independence of our country, and the formal presentation of the 50-star flag to the State of Hawaii.

It will be my honor and pleasure to make this presentation to my friend and colleague, the junior Senator from Hawaii. We look forward to welcoming him and all others who wish to take part in this historic occasion.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution passed by the City Council of Philadelphia, inviting all Members of Congress to attend the ceremonies at Independence Hall on July 4.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 59

Urging members of the State Legislature of Pennsylvania and of the Congress of the United States to form a delegation of distinguished legislators to come to Philadelphia to attend the ceremonies on July 4 at Independence Hall

Whereas this Nation observes the 184th anniversary of its independence on July 4, 1960; and

Whereas the city of Philadelphia, where the Founding Fathers created the historic document of liberty, the Declaration of Independence declaring the Thirteen Colonies a free and independent nation, will observe this occasion with appropriate public ceremonies in Independence Hall at 11 a.m.; and

Whereas this celebration will salute the new State of Hawaii and will feature as its keynote speaker the Honorable HIRAM L. FONG, U.S. Senator from the State of Hawaii; and

Whereas a historic moment will be shared at this observance when the 50-star flag, which becomes official on this Fourth of July, is raised for the first time at the spot where American liberty came into being: Therefore

Resolved by the Council of the City of Philadelphia, That we hereby urge the members of the State Legislature of Pennsylvania and of the Congress of the United States to form a delegation of distinguished legislators to come to Philadelphia to attend the ceremonies on July 4 at Independence Hall, as an inspiration to their constituents all over America to join also in the national pilgrimage to this hallowed shrine.

Resolved, That the city representative forward invitations and certified copies of this resolution to Hon. David L. Lawrence, Governor of Pennsylvania; Hon. John Morgan Davis, Lieutenant Governor; Hon. Hiram G. Andrews, speaker of the house; and Hon. M. Harvey Taylor, president pro tempore of the State senate; and to Hon. Sam Rayburn, Speaker of the House of the Congress of the United States; Hon. Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the U.S. Senate; the Representatives in the Congress from Philadelphia and the U.S. Senators from Pennsylvania, with the request that they bring this ceremony to the attention of their illustrious colleagues.

Two Articles, "A Fighter for Freedom" and "A Life Devoted to Others," Concerning the Tragedy and Death of Milada Horakova and Democracy in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I took the floor of Congress to discuss the tragedy and the unhappiness that surrounded the death of Dr. Milada Horakova and to call attention to the 10th anniversary of her death. On June 27, the Brandon Sun, Brandon, Manitoba, Canada, carried two items, both discussing directly and indirectly the question of freedom and what has happened to freedom in Czechoslovakia.

To those who love freedom, to those who fear for the future of democracy in America and other countries now supposedly in the free world, I hope we can take a lesson from the tragedy and death of Milada Horakova and democracy in Czechoslovakia. I recommend the two items for the full consideration of my colleagues:

A FIGHTER FOR FREEDOM

Women's organizations in the United States, Canada, and many other countries of the free world are remembering today the 10th anniversary of the tragic death of Dr. Milada Horakova.

After 10 years the name may not be familiar to newspaper readers. Yet it is a name which should not be forgotten by people to whom freedom is not an empty word, for Milada Horakova gave her life for freedom. She was executed, together with three other Czech patriots, by the Communist regime in Prague on June 27, 1950. A few days later, speaking in the House of Commons in London, Winston Churchill said: "I fully share the grief and indignation which you feel at the cruel judicial murders in Czechoslovakia." And Mr. Ernest Davies added: "I can assure the House that the (British) Government utterly deplore these political trials, which are directed against people who have loyally served the cause of freedom."

Protests against the executions were voiced in the United Nations, in parliaments, by international women's organizations, by prominent men and women all over the world.

Who was Milada Horakova to arouse such response to her death?

No account of her career as lawyer, social worker, parliamentarian, and prominent figure in the political life of her country and in international women's organizations can

do justice to her stature as an exceptional woman, an exceptional human being. In her death she became the symbol of a fearless fighter for freedom not only in her country but around the world.

She first became a "criminal" when, in August 1940, the Nazis had arrested her and her husband for helping persons wanted by the Gestapo, for aiding families of Nazi victims—for helping her fellowmen. Democratic ideals and love of freedom were so deeply rooted in her that she never betrayed them through 5 years of torture, misery, and humiliation of the Nazi concentration camps. Freed by the American Army, she returned to her country and immediately resumed her fight for freedom against the new danger of Communist totalitarianism. She met the Communists at every turn, knew their perfidy and intrigue at firsthand—both in the Women's National Council and in Parliament. Even after the February 1948 coup, when the Reds imposed their dictatorship on Czechoslovakia with all the power of the U.S.S.R. behind them, Milada Horakova did not give up the struggle for freedom and never lost hope.

The Communists took their revenge. Together with a group of 13 patriots, Milada Horakova was given a theatrical trial which was to demonstrate the power of the Red regime and to crush the spirit of those who followed her example of never betraying the cause of democracy and freedom.

Shortly before the Communist court passed the death sentence, Dr. Horakova declared:

"Under the new concept of law we are called traitors, but we still know that if we had freedom of action again, we would act no differently than we have acted all our lives truly serving the noble ideals of liberty, democracy, social progress, and humanity. That loyalty is now considered treason. We stand here unshaken while expecting the severest penalty. In this most trying moment we take strength from the realization that we were not alone in our actions, that our cause will not die with our going. There are men abroad in the free world who will win our battle and prove that our cause was just. I shall gladly accept this punishment, this sacrifice, knowing that it will strengthen others in resisting communism."

It was this rare greatness of spirit which stirred the world 10 years ago and which those who understand its message are commemorating today.

MILADA HORAKOVA—A LIFE DEVOTED TO OTHERS

Born on December 25, 1901, in Prague, Milada from childhood showed a certain talent and determination, combined with a gift of warm human feeling. She could be deeply moved or inspired; enthusiasm was no mere flash for her, but entailed an obligation.

The First World War, liberation for the nation, and the founding of the Czechoslovak Republic came while she was a high school student. After that she studied at Charles University in Prague, and took her doctor of laws in 1926. Even before graduating she started to work with Senator Plaminkova, the leader of the equal rights movement and president of the Czechoslovak National Women's Council.

She married in 1927 and started work soon after in the social welfare office at Prague city hall. For years her chief was Dr. Peter Zenkl, founder of the grand social program and institutions of the capital city, later mayor and Vice Prime Minister. Her closest colleague was Ruzena Pelentova, director of the welfare department, for whom she headed the legal section.

Milada's daughter was born in 1933 and brought daily joy to her heart, for she was as fine a mother as she was a lawyer and public servant. Politics was not her interest until after the Second World War; she did not even join a political party at first, though she later joined the National Socialists, founded on the principles of President Masaryk and led by Eduard Beneš.

Dr. Horakova soon won recognition in both the women's movement and the city welfare department. She worked with Senator Plaminkova on a number of laws establishing complete civic equality for women in all fields. In social work, she specialized in legal protection for children, their health, and guidance. These efforts took her abroad to frequent conferences; she was active in a number of international organizations and was elected to responsible offices in several. She spoke French and German, and was a good public speaker.

Milada Horakova's strong personality led to outstanding service during the cruel Nazi occupation; the loss of national independence was a challenge for her to underground work. In the resistance group called PVVZ-UVOD she worked on drafts for the legal reconstitution of the Republic beside many dangerous and responsible assignments. The Gestapo finally arrested her and her husband in the summer of 1940 and imprisoned them until the end of the war.

Those were years of constant degradation, tyrannous inquisition with physical torture in Pankrac Prison in Prague and Terezin Fortress. None of this broke her, however. Instead, she became a ministering angel to fellow prisoners, and many are the lives she saved through clever intellectual duels with their tormentors, her utter courage in unbelievable physical exploits. In October 1944, she stood before the Nazi Superior Court in Dresden and heard the state prosecutor demand the death penalty, followed by the judges' sentencing her and a large group of Czechs to 8 years' imprisonment. That saved her from the worse fate of extermination camp, but nevertheless of the 41 convicted with her, only 11 lived through to the end of the war.

Horakova was in prison at Aichach in Bavaria in May 1945 when the American Army liberated the region and she returned to her family in Prague. She lost no time in starting to work again. First she was elected president of the Women's National Council to succeed Senator Plaminkova, who had been executed by the Nazis on June 27, 1942. Then she entered national politics, was elected to the Provisional National Assembly and then to the Constitutional Assembly. These and many other positions she accepted with a complete sense of responsibility and devotion. "My life has been returned to me as a gift," she said, "and I am obliged to devote it to others. I shall go straight along that road."

Knowing her ability and wide popularity, the Communists attempted to win her over to their side before "the inevitable victory of the revolution." She refused every approach, resigned all public offices, and went underground again in the struggle to regain national liberty.

The Red regime arrested her on September 27, 1949, left her in prison for 9 months without contact with counsel or the outside world. When brought with 12 others before a people's court of one judge and two party henchmen, but no jury, it was apparent from the cynical attacks by the prosecutor and shameful articles in the press that the purpose of the trial was to portray the accused as "enemies of the working class." That was ironical after Horakova's life as a social worker among the poorest of the poor, and after innumerable laws initiated by the Socialist Party through the years specifically to protect and raise the standard of living of the working class.

Throughout the trial Milada's character shone through that gloomy courtroom as a beacon of courage and indestructible patriotism.

The 1959–60 Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the Federal budget for fiscal year 1960, which ends at midnight tonight will show approximately a one-half-billion dollar surplus. This is almost double the $217 million surplus which was estimated at the beginning of the current fiscal year. It reflects a moderate decrease in Federal expenditures and a rise in tax revenues somewhat greater than that originally estimated by Treasury Department officials.

This sizable and important budgetary surplus is more than just a statistic. It represents the fulfillment of a pledge by this administration that every possible effort would be made to keep Federal expenditures in line, and to see to it that increased expenditures are compensated for by increases in the tax revenues.

The President's position is clear cut. He believes that responsible government depends upon and must be geared to sound fiscal and budgetary policies. Looking to the future, it is necessary that we not only balance the Federal budget—but that we go one step beyond this and achieve a surplus—especially in prosperous years. The need for a surplus is imperative in order that the day will come when we will cut down our Nation's herculean $285 billion Federal debt.

In my mind, the Federal budget is something of a barometer of fiscal and governmental soundness. Although by no means an exact or even highly sensitive indicator, it nevertheless guides us as to whether we, as a nation, are pursuing policies which in the long run will keep our Nation strong. Furthermore, it also tells us something about the impact of government in our society and in this way gives us a clearer and better picture of our overall national economy.

Admittedly we cannot and must not worship at the "holy grail" of a balanced budget. We must examine our needs and understand the potential of the Federal Government to deal with them in terms of dollar and common sense. The budget, as a measuring device, helps us to do this.

The 1960 fiscal year half billion dollar surplus, for all of the reasons which I have indicated, is an important and significant achievement. I am delighted today to call it to the attention of the Senate and ask that an excellent editorial from today's New York Times be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1960]

THE 1959–60 BUDGET

When the Nation's fiscal year 1959–60 came to an end yesterday the Treasury was able to report that, in round figures, its receipts for

that year had exceeded expenditures by $500 million. There were intimations that when the final tabulation has been completed, in a fortnight or so; the figure may reach $600 million.

A surplus of $600 million in a budget of $77 billion is impressive or unimpressive, depending upon what one takes as a basis of comparison. This surplus, for example, is the smallest of the three achieved during the Eisenhower administration, which began in fiscal 1953–54. The two others, which came in fiscal 1956 and fiscal 1957, were both of the same general magnitude, roughly $1.6 billion, or approximately three times the dimensions of the surplus just reported. As a matter of fact, there is a widespread feeling that under sound budgetary precepts the prevailing economic conditions during 1955 and 1956 should have produced considerably larger surpluses than the $1.6 billion of those earlier years when the budget was in black ink.

Regardless of whether the 1960 surplus turns out to be $500 million or $600 million, it will remain a major accomplishment for those who recall the skepticism that greeted President Eisenhower when he set a balanced budget as the basic objective of fiscal policy a year and a half ago. The country had slipped into a deficit to the extent of $1.5 billion in fiscal 1958, and when Mr. Eisenhowever, in January, 1959, announced his determination to return to a balanced budget by 1960 the country was in the midst of what was to prove the deepest plunge in red ink in its peacetime history. When the final results for fiscal 1959 were in they showed that budget receipts had fallen to $68 billion, the lowest figure since 1956, while expenditures had soared to $80.9 billion, a total that exceeded that of 1953, the peak year of the post-Korean rearmament boom, by $6.7 billion and contrasted with the low point for spending under the present administration, the $64.6 billion to which it had been reduced in fiscal 1955.

The decision of the President on this occasion came at a time when the predominantly Democratic Congress was in little mood for economy. But it came at a time when it struck a tremendous response with the public. In this week's budgetary figure we have the answer to the question: "Whose views prevailed on that vital issue?"

An Opportunity for the Good Neighbor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the President from a recent issue of the Washington Daily News and a letter of thanks from Mr. Persio C. Franco for the open letter to the President be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR THE GOOD NEIGHBOR

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Chile is suffering a great catastrophe. Thousands have died in earthquakes still rocking the southern part or the Republic. Thousands more will die, undoubtedly, from injuries, hunger, and exposure, because it is so difficult to get food, medicine, clothing, blankets, and emergency shelter to them fast enough, and in adequate quantities.

Conservatively, about 10,000 persons are homeless. Some estimate 50,000, and even more. Seasons are the reverse of ours in the Southern Hemisphere, and winter is setting in there. It is cold and rainy. Frosts and freezing weather are due.

The Red Cross is doing its utmost, but it has no plenary powers to cut redtape and order all facilities available to the United States to be put to use in this emergency.

Aware of this, you have already sent our military planes and helicopters to deliver emergency rations and medical supplies. Twenty-four cargo planes today began transporting two Army field hospitals with 420 doctors and nurses, from the United States to Chile.

But this is a truly great disaster, and much, much more is needed, and will be needed for many months.

After the hot coffee and the inoculations, after the emergency rations and field medical care, thousands of Chileans will face a bitter winter, roofless in an area sparse of extra living space, and with their means of livelihood smashed.

If a disaster of such magnitude struck a country even as big, rich, and well organized as ours, it would still require a major national effort to alleviate the suffering it would cause.

The Chilean Government is doing everything it can, but it cannot call up nonexistent resources.

Mr. President, you have already exercised your powers as Commander in Chief to help our friends in Chile. As Commander in Chief, you can, we believe, do even more.

Our military forces have in storage vast quantities of blankets, tents, and rations

The Agriculture Department has enormous quantities of surplus food.

The Navy has ships.

Supplies held by various Government bureaus could be loaded, for instance, on fast flattops, if you just pass the word, as Commander in Chief.

By off-loading the planes (as was done a few years back when the aircraft carrier *Franklin Delano Roosevelt* visited Chile), a big cargo of much needed material could be taken to Valparaiso, or perhaps even to Puerto Montt, which is closer to the disaster area.

This is the kind of help that will be most needed, not only for the next few weeks, but in the bitter winter months ahead, and it is the kind of help that only the United States is equipped to give promptly.

It goes without saying that Chile knows the United States is her good neighbor, just as we know that Chile is ours.

However, the United States has been the target of an incessant propaganda all over South America. Millions of persons there believe that our country is indifferent to their human needs. Many believe the anti-Yanqui propaganda they hear—that greed alone motivates our actions.

Recently you caused to be made public an exchange of letters with Chilean students, who asked you not only about the attitude of our Government toward the Government of Cuba, but also about our policies toward Latin America in general.

In the reply to these students, which you helped to prepare, you spoke also to all of Latin America.

In getting all possible aid to Chile as quickly as we can, your actions will speak as loudly as your words, and will refute the slanders carefully spread by those who would destroy the good will and the solidarity of the Americas.

MOVED BY MESSAGE TO IKE ON CHILE

Your open message to President Eisenhower "An Opportunity for the Good Neighbor" concerning the present terrible catastrophe in Chile has moved me to tears. It is a magnificent expression of human compassion.

It reminded me of Ella Wheeler Wilcox's immortal words: "The truest greatness lies in being kind." I will frame that page of your newspaper to hang in the sitting room of our humble home.

PERSIO C. FRANCO.

U.S. National Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the United States of America is a nation dedicated to the principles of national freedom and the recognition of the importance of individual rights and personal liberty.

Our Nation is founded upon these principles, and since the United States emerged from the American Revolution as a free nation, Americans in every generation have fought and died to preserve American independence and to maintain individual liberty for our citizens.

Today there are some who have expressed grave concern over what they term our lack of national purpose. Mr. Stanley U. Roberts, editor of the Wave Publications of Los Angeles, Calif., has met the challenge of those who doubt our national purpose in a stirring editorial which is especially appropriate on this eve of our celebration of Independence Day, 1960.

Mr. Roberts' editorial which follows is a timely and inspiring message to all Americans clearly defining our heritage of individual liberty from which emerges our national purpose:

Take aim: Whether it is known as a purpose, an aim, a goal, or by any other name, candidates, national magazines, metropolitan newspapers suddenly have become concerned over what they have branded as our lack of a national purpose.

When he spoke at baccalaureate services for this month's crop of graduates from the University of Southern California, the Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of California, pointed out that "it continues to look as though our only purpose is to save our own skins," and if this continues, we will have less than our competition.

The speaker predicted that a national purpose will become vividly evident again when more individuals "have a clear and sound personal purpose and actively manifest it in public affairs."

It may be merely a matter of degree, but all of these publications and individuals appear to have lost sight of the fact that this Nation, and the citizens who comprise it do have a national aim, one that probably is the most radical and idealistic in the history of nations.

That aim is cited in the Declaration of Independence and the preamble to the Constitution of the United States of America. Its safeguards are spelled out in the 10 amendments to the Constitution which are known as the Bill of Rights.

There is a tendency to believe that the intervening 184 years since the signing of

the Declaration may have made the thinking in the three documents obsolete. It is true that forms and technology have experienced broad and sweeping changes in that time, but history in the memory of the present generation shows that there has been no change in the fundamental forces that drive men. The powers which might have been vested in kings in 1776 today are in the hands of dictators.

The inspiration which induced the Founding Fathers to form a radical government dedicated to the preservation of individual rights and freedoms is as important today as it was then. Today's greatest witnesses to this are not those individuals behind the Iron Curtain who never have known any real freedom, but those citizens of formerly free countries which have succumbed to the modern dictatorship of Russian communism.

This could have been the "clear and sound purpose" to which the bishop referred at the baccalaureate service.

There certainly could be no finer goal than the preservation of the most radical form of government in history, once known as the "American dream" because it is dedicated to the individual and his rights.

The United States and its citizens do not lack a purpose. We do need a never-failing realization that we have had the finest through the entire history of our Nation and that is is worth keeping at any cost.

Economic Growth—I

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal, of Thursday, June 16, 1960, carried a feature article by W. Allen Wallis "Catch Phrase of the Day: Though Economic Growth Includes Real Issues, It Masks Dubious Political Aims—United States Leads Russia," which I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues. It follows:

CATCH PHRASE OF THE DAY: THOUGH ECONOMIC GROWTH INCLUDES REAL ISSUES, IT MASKS DUBIOUS POLITICAL AIMS—UNITED STATES LEADS RUSSIA

(By W. Allen Wallis)

(Mr. Wallis is special assistant to President Eisenhower and executive vice chairman of the cabinet committee on price stability for economic growth. This article is excerpted from a speech made to business and financial journalists.)

Unparalleled improvement in material levels of living, though dramatic, is far from the most important part of the story of American economic growth.

Two other features are even more significant: first, the nonmaterial benefits of economic growth, in the form of improvements in the quality of our life; and, second, the broad diffusion of both material and nonmaterial benefits to all the people.

Growth is not an end in itself. We do not live to grow; we grow to live better. And we do live better, not only by consuming better but also by working under better conditions.

Economic growth has provided us with leisure to enjoy the fruits of our efforts and to engage more fully in a richer variety of cultural and recreational pursuits. It has made possible higher levels of education and enlarged opportunities for creative activity. It has greatly widened the choices open to the average citizen, and it has given him vastly increased opportunities for developing and utilizing his individual capacities. It has given new dimensions to individual dignity and endeavor. In short, our economic growth has brought us more and better means of satisfying our wants, and it has also brought us better wants.

Throughout history it has been taken for granted, as it is taken for granted in many parts of the world today, that the inescapable lot of most of humanity is to live out their lives in toil, misery, ignorance, and disease. A unique feature of our economic growth has been the broad sharing of progress among all groups. We represent the nearest approach to a classless society.

What we tend to take for granted may well prove transitory unless we understand the sources of our past economic progress.

Economic growth is one of the catchphrases of the day. Behind the phrase there are, to be sure, real and important issues; but they are not simple issues. Economic growth is difficult to define and more difficult to measure.

Generally, people think of economic growth as an increasng supply of goods and services. This is all right as far as it goes, but it doesn't go very far. As population increases, a larger supply of goods and services is needed to maintain a constant level of output. An economy may get bigger—or "grow" in an absolute sense, perhaps even as a world power—without adding to individual welfare. Obviously, growth must involve rising levels of per capita output if it is to mean increased welfare.

But this is not all. Growth in any meaningful sense must mean not just more things, but more things that are useful and that people want. Evolution in the composition of output is as much a part of economic growth as is expansion of the volume of output. Similarly, if growth is to be meaningful the output must be well distributed.

FREE CHOICES

In our economy, changes in the composition of output reflect the free choices of the people, and the valuation of the output reflects the values placed on goods and services through voluntary purchases and sales. Private output conforms to choices made in the market, and public output to choices made through political processes by freely elected representatives. In a centralized economy, both private and public output reflect the choices and values of the authorities, and the values placed on goods and services also represent authoritarian decisions. There is no valid criterion of the extent to which the nominal growth achieved by a centralized economy is meaningful growth in terms of the aspirations and desires of the people.

Clearly, true growth must refer to economic welfare. This means we must consider not only goods and services but nonmaterial aspects of growth. As our productive capacities have risen, we have chosen to take part of our growth in the form of leisure and improved working conditions.

If the concept of growth is complex and elusive, as I have been trying to indicate that it is, the problem of measuring growth is fearsome. Not only do we lack adequate data, but the qualitative and nonmaterial aspects of growth are impossible to quantify.

Six of the most common gages of economic growth are the percentage rates of increase in real gross national product, that is, gross national product adjusted for price changes; real gross national product per capita; industrial production; output per manhour worked; output per unit of labor and capital combined; and real disposable personal income per capita.

Before considering what each of these gages appears to show, let us consider certain major shortcomings that seriously limit what any of them really show. These ubiquitous flaws, which create troubles for anyone trying to compare growth rates between countries or between times for a given country, are: deficiencies of data, vagaries of valuation, aberrations of averages, and treacheries of timing.

About the deficiencies of data I will say little, except that the basic figures on gross national product or industrial production even for this country—and ours are the best in the world—involve liberal use of estimation and guesstimation, of interpolation and extrapolation, of approximation and adjustment.

The valuation problem I have already alluded to. The list of things produced includes such heterogeneous products as apples, nuts, bolts, cloth, appendectomies, tractors, missiles, financial writing, and speeches. To measure the list by a single number it is necessary to put a value on each item. In a market economy, we can value most things by prices people voluntarily pay and accept.

Even in our economy, however, a large and increasing share of output is governmental, and can be valued in terms of things used up. But just using up something by no means guarantees that an equal value is created; sometimes it is more, too often it is less.

The magnitude of the valuation problem is shown by the comparatively simple problem of comparing Russian gross national product with ours. The two lists of products must be valued by the same prices, otherwise the comparison will reflect differences in prices, not just differences in gross national product. If Russian prices are applied to their output and to ours, our gross national product is nearly four times theirs. If American prices are applied to the outputs of both countries, we are only twice their size. Russian gross national product is commonly described as 40 percent of ours. This results from splitting the difference.

Averages can be tricky, and every one of the growth measures is an average of divergent rates of growth prevailing in different parts of the economy. It is possible, for example, for the overall average to go up even if every separate part is constant or even declining.

To see that this is possible, suppose that a country has half its economy in agriculture, and that growth is slower in agriculture than in the other half of the economy (both these things are true of Russia). The average rate of growth for the whole economy will be halfway between the rate for agriculture and the rate for nonagriculture. Now suppose that the economy changes, and the nonagricultural segment is larger than the agricultural. Even if the rate of growth stays the same in both agriculture and nonagriculture, the new average rate of growth for the whole economy will be nearer the nonagricultural than the agricultural rate, and therefore higher than before.

AGRICULTURE'S RATE

This kind of thing is in fact happening in Russia. In the United States, on the other hand, the opposite is happening. Agriculture here has an extraordinarily large rate of growth, so we are able to shift resources into things like services where growth is slower; and this pulls down the figures on our average rate of growth.

Another affliction of our measures of growth is the problem of a proper timespan, whatever criterion is used. Likewise every kind of growth, economic growth proceeds at an uneven pace. Measurements must be made at times far enough apart to average out seasonal, cyclical, and erratic fluctua-

tions. They must, for example, cover a full business cycle as an absolute minimum, and preferably several cycles. Measurements of growth must begin and end at comparable cyclical stages. A fictitiously high rate will result if we start at a cyclical trough and end at a peak, or a fictitiously low rate if we go from a peak to a trough. Peak to peak measurements are best, for peaks of successive cycles trace the course of economic growth in fairly smooth and regular fashion.

These limitations on proper time periods prevent making—honestly—a number of comparisons in the period since World War II that would be interesting. In that period there have been only three peaks, 1948, 1953, and 1957 and the middle one, 1953, was the peak of the Korean war boom. Thus, there is one and only one period that meets the requirements for a meaningful measurement of growth; namely, 1948–57.

While some politicians have presented comparisons of the growth rate from 1947 to 1953 with that from 1953 to 1959, this can only be described as unwary, unwise, or unscrupulous, for 1947 was a war reconversion trough, 1953 was both a war peak and a cyclical peak, and 1959 was a year of expansion but neither a trough nor a peak. Such unwise, unwary, or unscrupulous comparisons naturally invite other politicians to compare growth from 1945 to 1952 with growth from 1953 to 1960. On one basis, the rate of growth in real GNP is double in the earlier period; on the other basis, it is double in the later period. You pick your party, then you pick your periods; and so you prove that your party has done twice as well as the other party.

The treacheries of timing are especially hazardous in comparing growth rates of different countries. For the United States, 1948 to 1957 is a valid peak-to-peak period for measuring growth. For some other countries, however, it may be a peak-to-trough or trough-to-peak period.

JUDGMENT AND SKILL

All these difficulties mean, not that measurements of growth are futile and fruitless, but that to interpret them requires considerable care, skill, judgment, objectivity, and sophistication about both economics and statistics. Since this audience has those qualities, let's proceed to survey the principal measures of growth, paying particular attention to the recent record in relation to the long-term record.

Real gross national product from 1909 to 1957 grew at an annual compound rate of 2.9 percent per year. The longrun growth trend has been fairly stable in spite of large departures above and below it. Between 1948 and 1957, the annual rate of growth in total real production was 3.8 percent, somewhat higher than the longrun rate.

Real GNP per capita. From 1909 to 1957 the annual rate of increase in real GNP per capita was 1.5 percent. From 1948 to 1957 the rate was 2 percent per year, again somewhat higher.

Industrial production, as measured by the Federal Reserve Board Index, increased from 1919 (when the index begins) to 1957 at an average annual rate of 3.7 percent. Between 1948 and 1957 the annual rate of increase was 4.4 percent, a little higher, but within the range of statistical variation that characterizes this series.

Real private output per man-hour worked increased from 1889 to 1957 at an average annual rate of 2 percent. From 1948 to 1957 the rate was 3.1 percent, or about 50 percent higher.

Real output per unit of labor, and capital combined, useful as a measure of overall efficiency, increased from 1889 to 1957 at an average annual rate of 1.7 percent. From 1948 to 1957 the annual rate of increase was 2.4 percent, about 40 percent higher.

Real disposable personal income per capita measures the income available to individuals, after taxes, to use as they please. The annual rate of increase from 1929 (when the data began) to 1957 was 0.6 percent, a rate pulled down by depression and pushed up by war booms. From 1948 to 1957 the average annual rate of increase was 1.9 percent, despite high taxation and rapid population increase.

Even this brief look at the record shows the falsity of careless allegations that our economy is slowing down.

The issue of economic growth has entered the arena of contemporary politics through a course which has characterized many issues in the past quarter of a century. That is that after we have gotten over the hill by private endeavors, and are on our way at a brisk pace, urgent demands arise that the Government expedite and direct us.

Characteristically, individuals, private institutions, or general social forces break the paths and provide the initial momentum. Once the vision of an important goal gains currency, and once we are on our way toward attaining it, suddenly we become impatient for a magic carpet to put us there instantly. Our impatience is exploited by those promoting various political schemes.

Much of the current emphasis on economic growth is of this character. All sorts of plans are put forth under the banner of growth, with little or no analysis of the way they might promote growth—except growth in Federal spending. The same spending plans, on the other hand, are often described as reason for wanting growth.

The fact that too many of the considerations raised in discussions of growth cannot be taken seriously should not blind us to the fact that there are a number of important considerations that merit close examination.

The Soviet threat is one of these.

The Soviet threat is real and has many points of thrust. It would be perilous to underestimate the danger. But how is it related to our own economic growth? Some people fear that the Russians will "catch up" to us someday and so fulfill the Khrushchev boast about burying us. Others fear that rapid Soviet growth will increase Russian military potential so greatly as to jeopardize the free world's defenses. Still others fear possible adverse "demonstration effects" of rapid Soviet development—that underdeveloped and uncommitted nations will turn to communism as a way of achieving national strength, politically and economically.

First, it should be pointed out that we have a commanding lead over Russia in terms of both total and per capita output. Even if Russian growth rates continue higher than ours, the absolute gap between us will continue to increase for some time to come.

Second, we don't know how large the gap really is—except that it is large. As was mentioned earlier, international comparisons, even if we had good data, are a difficult and unrewarding business. We don't know whether Russian GNP is one-half of ours or one-quarter of ours.

MISLEADING COMPARISONS

Third, international comparisons of rates of growth can be even more misleading than comparisons of levels of output. The Russians, starting from a lower economic base and in a period of postwar reconstruction, should be expected to have a fairly high percentage rate of expansion. Moreover, they are able to take over the accumulated technology already developed and exploited elsewhere. Furthermore, they are transferring masses of people out of low-productivity employment in agriculture to industry with its more highly valued output per man-hour. They still have approximately 50 percent of their labor force in agriculture; we have only about 8 percent. Our employment is expanding in services, where improvements in output per man-hour are slow and limited. In other words, Russian growth is more rapid because they are still in the area where improvement is easy and the way has been shown, whereas we are more heavily involved in the difficult tasks of expanding productivity in medicine, journalism, education, engineering, and other services.

In short, there is no possibility that the Russian economy will overtake ours, at any time in the visible future—certainly not in this century.

Unmet social needs is a slogan we hear these days as a call for accelerated growth. According to this argument if we grow faster we will be better able to provide a greater variety of public services and to eliminate what we now regard as poverty.

One of the more pretentious versions of the needs argument is that we have shameful public squalor in the midst of vulgar private opulence. This argument has a strong authoritarian smell, an odor of desire to enforce the advocates' tastes on others through governmental machinery.

The argument about public squalor would be laughed out of court if confronted with the facts of the past decade on construction of schools, improvements in teachers' salaries, superhighways built, increases in the support of research, expansion in aid to the needy, diseases conquered, urban redevelopment, hospitals built, or indeed almost anything else. Growth in public services has been enormous in the past decade. The unmet social needers resort to pointing out plaintively that we don't yet have everything that they think we should want, and to lamenting that private opulence dulls interest in social revolution.

The public squalor argument is, in fact, simply this decade's battle cry of socialism, which—intellectually bankrupt after more than a century of seeing one after another of its arguments for socializing the means of production demolished—now seeks to socialize the results of production.

The real growth imperatives arise from the fact that a strong economy is a growing economy. An economy with a high per capita income such as ours generates a large volume of private saving which must flow into capital accumulation if the economy is to sustain itself. In other words, the continued vitality of the system requires growth.

But beyond such technical matters, we desire growth to promote our private ends and national purposes. It is that simple; we want growth because it enlarges the opportunities of our children, because it expands our capacities to pursue goals of our own choosing, because it increases the range of choices open to us, because it is a rewarding outlet for our creative energies and imagination, because achievement invigorates and stimulates. In short, through economic growth we lead richer and fuller lives.

Moreover, we desire growth for the preservation of our way of life. By continued growth we demonstrate to ourselves, and perhaps to the world, that our system of free enterprise and representative government is indeed strong and able to fulfill rising aspirations and to enhance the dignity of free men. We need to grow to demonstrate that our system is not headed for inevitable collapse, but will survive even in a world of oppression and hostility.

For a variety of reasons there is general agreement that economic growth is an important goal of economic policy. But growth is only one of several major goals of economic policy.

Economic freedom, stability of employment, stability of the general price level,

economic efficiency, and economic security all are important. Properly conceived and pursued, economic growth is compatible with all these other goals; but it becomes incompatible when pursued too ardently or by inappropriate means. Policies to promote growth or any other goal must reflect a compromise among competing goals.

Growth entails certain costs, and attempts to achieve greatly accelerated statistical growth rates may be costly in terms of human hardship. New machines may reduce prematurely not only the value of old machines but also the value of human skills acquired through long training and experience. New products may reduce the incomes of those producing old products. New industries in new locations may uproot homes and communities near old industries. Unless the costs of economic growth are equitably distributed, it is only reasonable to expect strong resistance to growth and its accompanying changes.

SOVIET COMPULSION

To get high rates of growth through more rapid capital accumulation means that people must save more, either voluntarily or by compulsion. In the Soviet Union people are forced to sacrifice current consumption and liberty to meet targets of capital formation imposed by the authorities. As much as Americans want economic growth, compulsions and depressed levels of consumption are costs which they would not willingly pay except in dire emergency.

The underlying forces that promote national economic growth are basically the same as those that account for the economic progress of individuals. An individual's desire for a higher and more secure standard of living for himself and for his family is the basic stimulus. To this end he studies, plans, works, saves and invests. He searches out new ways of doing things, and develops new techniques and processes.

Hence, one of the most effective means of stimulating economic growth—and at the same time one of our fundamental objectives in seeking economic growth—is to provide expanding opportunities for every individual to realize his own potentialities to the utmost and to open wider vistas for his children; to encourage initiative, independence and integrity; to preserve and enlarge the moral worth of the individual; and to approach more closely to our ideals of personal freedom, justice and fairplay, broad and equal opportunity, the rule of law, and mutual respect and charity.

Growth requires a flexible and adaptable economic system with freedom to experiment. New industries must spring up, and others must decline. New methods must be accepted and old ones discarded. Labor and capital must shift easily and cooperatively in response to economic rewards and penalties. The combination of an abundant flow of new ideas, a willingness to take risks, and the speedy adoption of successful new methods is a condition for a high rate of growth.

TRANSLATING NEW IDEAS

The translation of new ideas into practical processes is speeded by a high rate of saving, through which new equipment can be financed and put into use. Saving also contributes to growth even where new methods are not involved, since it makes possible a larger stock of plant and equipment, housing, and other physical capital, which add to our potential supply of goods and services. In this way, the prudence and responsible foresight of people in providing for future needs makes an essential contribution to our growth.

The future chapters of our story of economic growth are still to be written. We can be confident that these chapters will be happy ones if we have the wit and wisdom to preserve and strengthen the forces of progress that have produced in America an abundant economy, a great nation, and a free people.

The Legal Dispute in Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there are actions now pending in the Federal court in the State of Virginia to force the reopening of schools closed to avoid integration. Let us hope in this instance that the court does not engage in its all too frequent practice of amending the Constitution in order to decide this case. The stakes in this legal dispute are extremely high. On June 27, 1960, there appeared in the Greenville News, a newspaper published in Greenville, S.C., an editorial entitled "Stakes are High in Virginia," which clearly illustrates the far-reaching effect of the pending decision. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STAKES ARE HIGH IN VIRGINIA

Southerners determined to resist forced integration of the public schools will anxiously watch two interrelated events in Virginia.

Soon a Federal court will act on a move by Negro leaders to force the State to reopen closed schools. The court has been asked to require the State to operate the schools whether it wants to or not and to operate them on an integrated basis.

But the vast majority of Virginians seem determined both to resist this action and to support the operation of private schools where they are desired by local school patrons.

Fundraising campaigns are underway now in Prince Edward and Warren Counties and in the city of Charlottesville for the support of local private schools. The amount of money needed for the operation of these schools is not small. The Prince Edward School Foundation seeks $300,000, the Charlottesville Educational Foundation Building Fund is asking for $250,000, and the Front Royal Academy, in Warren County, seeks $350,000.

We hope these goals are reached and oversubscribed. The success or failure of these efforts to provide education on a private basis as an alternative to forced race mixing will be anxiously watched throughout the South and the Nation.

If the fundraising effort is successful, we may well see the birth of something like an educational revolution. The trend for too many years in education, as in other sociopolitical affairs, has been away from the local level and toward centralization. A certain amount of concentration of effort, the pooling of purchases and the like, as in Greenville County, is necessary and beneficial. But carried to extremes, as it has been in many areas, it quickly becomes detrimental.

It is even possible that some change will be made in the direction of the educational process itself. The new schools, if they come into being, will have to be operated modestly and without some of the frills that the National Education Association and organized education generally have laid so great stress on in recent years. Without these distractions, perhaps it will be possible for the teachers to restrict themselves to teaching.

Equally feverently we hope that the action to force Virginia to open and operate integrated schools will fail. This point has been a key in the South's struggle to avoid indiscriminate mixing of the races ever since the Supreme Court's antisegregation decision of 1954.

In that decision, the Court ruled that States may not operate schools and admit or reject applicants solely on the basis of race. It did not hold, and no lower judge has interpreted it as having held, that a State must operate schools or must operate them on an integrated basis.

The Court has said what a State or its agencies cannot do. It has not yet said what it must do. There is a vital distinction between the two and one that is important not only to education but to the philosophy of government itself.

As the Richmond News Leader put it the other day:

"It is vital that this principle be preserved. If Federal judges are permitted to twist the Constitution around, so that the Federal judiciary may affirmatively require States and their subdivisions to do particular things, the last vestige of a Federal Republic will have been scrapped.

The courts might with equal validity attempt to compel the States to operate efficient prisons, or efficient colleges, or efficient sanatoria, or efficient mental hospitals, or efficient maternity clinics."

The stakes are high in Virginia. What happens there will affect us in the South immediately and the entire Nation in the long run.

Need for a Branch Post Office at Hollis, N.Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I present for appropriate reference a petition from a number of residents of Queens Village and Hollis, N.Y., in respect to the construction of a branch post office at the intersection of Francis Lewis Boulevard and Hillside Avenue in Hollis. The proposal is designed to remedy a serious deficiency in postal facilities in the area, and I urge that the petition be favorably considered. Under unanimous consent I include the petition in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

Hon. SEYMOUR HALPERN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D.C.:

At the present time there are more than 10,000 people who cannot buy a postage stamp, register a letter, get a money order, or send any parcel post packages in our area with which you are familiar because the Hollis Post Office is from three-quarters of a mile distant and the Queens Village Post Office nearly 2 miles. In a first class post office district there should be a finance station or a branch post office installed for the reason that people, especially with children, cannot travel that distance without cars and since nearly all of the cars used during the day they cannot go to the post office at night

because the post office is closed. The revenue which should go to the Jamaica Post Office is being sent to Brooklyn, N.Y., Flushing, and Long Island City.

Please do what you can to see that a finance station at least is put into operation in the vicinity of Francis Lewis Boulevard, and Hillside Avenue to serve its patrons. The station could very well be called Hollis-wood, N.Y.

Shirley W. Traxler, Margaret Manning, Cecile Gold, Eleanor Pollock, Helen O'Brien, Ann Niklas, S. P. O'Halloran, Ruth Tompkins, Alice Bender, Patricia Mandel, Ruth M. Storch, Florence B. Rubin, Rhoda Gelman, Patricia Scudillari, Simone Trozzo, Margaret Morrow, Alice Pennuci, Jane Geist, Jeanne Janecki, W. Mayman, Morton Pickman, president, Hollis Crest Corp., Parkway Crest Apts., Inc.

Plight of U.S. Carpet Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. EVERETT JORDAN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made yesterday by Mr. Herbert L. Shuttleworth II, president of the American Carpet Institute, at a meeting of the institute here in Washington. I hope all Senators will taket he time to read this enlightening address on the alarming effects increasing imports are having on the U.S. carpet industry.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We have a gravely serious problem facing us. Despite our making full use of the peril point procedures, which Congress wisely put into the Reciprocal Trade Act, rates of duty have been successively lowered over the years. You can readily see that following each reduction the volume of imports has risen sharply. The increased imports have been the direct result of lower prices. The average per square yard invoice value of imported Wilton and velvet carpet this year is $3.42, to which approximately $1 is added to cover handling and duty for a total of $4.42 per square yard. This competes with our average wholesale per square yard value of $7, a difference of about $2.60 per yard. The reason for lower prices on imported carpets is primarily one of lower labor costs, which apply not only to the direct manufacture of carpet, but to indirect costs, such as buildings, supplies, raw materials, transportation within the exporting country, taxes, fringe benefits, and many other factors which are essential in arriving at the total cost of manufacturing.

Neither the Belgian nor Japanese industry has made any contribution to product development or product styling. Both industries have taken the best selling styles, colors, and textures established by the American industry. This is another reason why the effects of the import competition have been so pernicious. Imports have acted as a serious price depressant in most major markets.

Prior to World War II there was a 60 percent ad valorem in effect. At that time less than 200,000 square yards of carpet were imported into this country. Based on actual imports during the first quarter of this year, you will note that 10 million square yards will come into our market this year.

Belgium and Japan are the chief exporters to this country. Neither of these nations depended upon our American market prior to World War II. Belgium had a carpet industry prewar, but it has grown significantly during the past several years. Up until World War II there was no Wilton and velvet industry in Japan.

I point this out to you in order that you can fully appreciate the fact that Wilton and velvet carpet imports are a new commercial phenomenon and do not rest upon an historical industrial pattern in world commerce. It is significant to note in this respect the current emergence of the Japanese industry.

I quote briefly from a consular report, a copy of which is available for you if you would like it. It is dated September 22, 1958:

"The Wilton and velvet carpet industry of Japan obtained its start from orders placed by U.S. forces stationed in Japan after World War II. Exports to the United States were undertaken with the departure of the troops, beginning in 1955, and have grown from 270 square feet in that year to over 3,500,000 square feet in 1957."

"The same report also stated that the Japanese producers, under the 'Administrative Guidance' of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry * * * have voluntarily agreed not to increase their productive capacity for Wilton and velvet carpeting."

Testimony before the Tariff Commission in 1958 also indicated that the Japanese industry would not grow beyond its then capacity. Events since that time have proven such representations to be utterly without foundation. Japanese imports increased 230 percent in 1959 and continue to grow this year.

In 1958, when imports had actually reached 12 percent of domestic production and there seemed to be absolutely no limiting factors on the horizon to halt, or slow down, the rate of import growth, the industry instituted action under the escape clause provision of the Reciprocal Trade Act. After extensive investigations by the Tariff Commission and week-long public hearings, the industry was denied relief by a vote of three to two. Apparently the majority of the Commission felt that the industry was not being seriously injured at that time, nor was it threatened with serious injury. Both "actual" injury and "threatened" injury are mandatory for the Commission to consider under the law, as you gentlemen enacted it. It would seem, in this instance, that the majority was wrong in their opinion which was given in January 1959—particularly with respect to our industry being "threatened" with serious injury. Under such circumstances, we can only ask, "What constitutes a 'serious threat'?"

You will note that in the short space of 1 year imports have grown from 12 percent of domestic shipments to 23 percent of domestic shipments. During 1959 imports rose 52 percent; during the first quarter of 1960 they rose 60 percent over 1959.

It now has become unmistakably clear to our industry that we must have relief from import competition or we are, simply stated, doomed to extinction.

The industry currently is seeking relief under article 28 of the GATT Agreement. This article clearly provides the privilege for any GATT participant to modify or withdraw previously made concessions before the expiration of any 3-year period, beginning on January 1, 1958. The current period of so-called firm vitality expires December 31 this year. We believe this is an entirely proper means by which our Government can afford some relief to our industry. It is certainly the best means for immediate correction of an intolerable situation.

If article 28 of the GATT Agreement means what it says, it would seem our industry would present a classic case to be dealt with under the provisions of the article.

The concessions made by our Government were made when Belgium was the only major exporting country. Belgian labor costs average approximately 39 cents an hour, which compare with an average labor rate in our industry of $1.75 per hour. Japan is now a major factor in this situation, and their average wage rate is 19 cents an hour.

The volume of imports in yards and dollars and the volume of imports in relation to domestic production have both drastically changed since the last concessions were made.

The general level of the economy in Belgium and in Japan has materially improved since the last concessions were made.

We believe that our industry is entitled to the following:

Imports, at the current 21 percent ad valorem rate, should be limited to 5 percent of domestic shipments.

On imports above 5 percent a duty of 40 percent ad valorem should be imposed.

If it is felt desirable that the initial 5 percent should be allocated among exporting countries, our industry has no objection to this being done.

We feel this is an equitable solution to our problem which will enable the domestic industry to grow and prosper, will not deny a fair share of the market to importers, and will allow importers to participate in the growth of the domestic market.

We earnestly solicit your support and assistance in helping us convince the President that our Government should comply with our request to modify the concessions now in effect on Wilton and velvet carpets. We also would be most grateful for any suggestions you may have which would enable us to accomplish the fair and equitable program that we are endorsing.

What Has Happened to the American Pioneering Spirit?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks I am inserting in the RECORD an editorial column entitled "Across the Editor's Desk," written by Dick Hanson, that appeared in the magazine Successful Farming in the June issue.

He raises the question upon which all should deeply contemplate: "What has happened to the American pioneering spirit?"

Those are not his words; but it is clearly the question in his mind, which should be in the mind of all of us, when he calls attention to the fact in the last sentence of his editorial:

The pioneers hit the trail expecting hard work, while today too many taking the Washington trail expect to get out of it.

Indeed we need a revival of the American pioneering spirit. That is what

made this country great and strong. It is the way to keep her great and strong.

The editorial follows:

ACROSS THE EDITOR'S DESK

(By Dick Hanson)

Years ago, groups of Americans packed up their families and household goods and headed west. These people were the leaders of what a few years later was to become a great movement. Why did these people go into this vast, unmapped wilderness? There were many reasons, but the main attraction was opportunity. Opportunity was there if a man had the foresight and the strong hands to seize it. These people wanted to be independent, masters of their own destinies.

Today, there is another movement of Americans—but in the opposite direction. This movement is to the east and the end of the trail is in Washington, D.C., the seat of our sprawling Federal Government. One reason for the movement is the same as it was for the pioneers—opportunity. But there the resemblance ends. The opportunity is of a different nature and the strong hand that seized opportunity in the West years ago seems now to have been replaced by many descendants with hands turned palms up.

It is an amazing and almost frightening experience to visit Washington today. With little effort, you will discover that great numbers of people are there for only one reason—they have a problem and they want the Government to solve it for them. It is just that simple.

I have sat and listened to many groups discuss their particular problems. Too many times these discussions are ended by someone proposing that a representative delegation go to Washington and ask for help. So, the delegation travels east only to discover that the idea of having the Government solve their problem is not a unique one. They immediately run into countless other delegations who are also asking Government to solve their problems.

Somewhere along the line, many people have gotten the idea that Washington holds the answers and that all you have to do is turn over your problems to big Uncle and he'll solve them. Representatives from agriculture are not alone in this belief. All segments of our economy are involved, some far more than others.

Strange as it may seem to some people, our Government did not originate the phrase, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." How often have you heard, "If I don't get my share, someone else will?" This is certainly not an attitude that is conducive to solving problems, yet it is the attitude of many individuals and groups of individuals today. They want something for nothing—the prize without the price. There is an idea that the Federal Government does things with "free money"—that if Uncle Sam does a job it doesn't cost anything.

Is it old fashioned or naive to believe that maybe a little more work and a little less running to Washington might solve some of these problems? Admittedly, Government can and should help, but there is a difference between helping and doing the entire job. Government should do those things that we can't do for ourselves, or in cahoots with our neighbors. I have been in countries where the government does make all the important decisions for its people. It was not pleasant.

The trail to Washington gets wider and deeper each day, just as the pioneer trails did with the movement of people west—but again, there is a difference. The pioneers hit the trail expecting hard work, while today too many taking the Washington trail expect to get out of it.

Wisconsin Military Hero and Civic Leader Pays Tribute to War Dead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am proud and happy to have an opportunity to call to the attention of my colleagues a speech delivered at a Memorial Day observance in Sheboygan Wis., by Mr. James Megellas, president of the Common Council, Fond du Lac, Wis.

Mr. Megellas is particularly well-qualified to speak on the day set aside to honor our Nation's heroes, as he is one of Wisconsin's most decorated war heroes. During World War II he received the Distinguished Service Cross—America's second highest decoration for gallantry—and the Silver Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, Bronze Star with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster—twice wounded in action. In addition, he was the first American ever to receive the highest decoration of the Government of Holland, and was honored by the Belgian Government, receiving the Belgium Fouragere. Gen. James Gavin chose Jim Megellas as the outstanding officer of the 82d Airborne Division.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this speech by Mr. Megellas be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

SPEECH OF JAMES MEGELLAS, PRESIDENT FOND DU LAC COMMON COUNCIL, FOND DU LAC, WIS., ON MEMORIAL DAY, 1960, AT FOUNTAIN PARK, SHEBOYGAN

It is a great privilege for me to be with you in Sheboygan today to participate in your Memorial Day observance. I consider Memorial Day as the outstanding patriotic day of the year.

Today throughout the width and length of our great Nation, grateful Americans have gathered in every city, village, and hamlet just as we are gathered here in Sheboygan to pay tribute to the heroes who fought and sacrificed in the wars of fredom and self-preservation of our young and great Nation.

It is only fitting that on this day we should honor those gallant Americans who lost their lives in order that this Nation might live. It is only fitting that we should recall the hardships they endured and the sacrifices they made. For they died in the prime of life forsaking the opportunities and the joys of the years ahead of them.

They died on forcign soil never again to see the land they loved so dearly, never again to see their families and their loved ones. They died that the rest of us might live and develop our highest hopes and dreams.

In speeches all over the Nation today, speakers will be extolling the virtues and courage of our departed comrades. They will be reminding us how they gave their lives for their country. On this last point I must disagree with those speakers. For contrary to public belief they did not give their lives for their country. But instead it was taken from them. Any combat veteran will tell you this. They valued their lives just as highly and dearly as we value ours. The self-preservation instinct is probably the greatest instinct in man. We have all seen how an animal when cornered will fight for survival with its last ounce of energy. And so it was with our departed comrades, for they knew only too well that to be of the greatest service to their country they had to stay alive so they could fight on.

However, they knew full well the personal dangers involved and they accepted these dangers no matter what the odds. For they knew theirs was the righteous cause. The history of our Nation is replete with acts of heroism. Many times men volunteered for missions from which there was little or no chance to return. Yet when the going was the toughest the harder they fought for survival. They were fighting against not only enslavement for themselves, but for freedom for all mankind.

Let us ask ourselves today, what kind of men were these fallen heroes? They were the cream of our manhood. For, of necessity, fighting wars is a young man's task. It requires the utmost physical stamina and mental courage. They came from all walks of life; from the farms, factories, offices, and shops. But regardless of where they came from, they had one common trait—unselfish devotion to their country, their comrades and God. To these men we must dedicate ourselves to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion.

Today as we go out into the cemeteries to place flags on the graves of our departed heroes, their voices will be ringing out in the still air; "be vigilant, lest that which we endured and experienced should happen again to others." Were they able to speak to us this is probably what they would say: "Feel sorry not for us for we have found everlasting peace in the House of the Lord, while your struggle is a never ending one."

It was once said that the Lord would bestow freedom and liberty only upon those who were willing to fight and sacrifice for it.

The struggle for survival of this Nation has not been an easy one. From the first days of the American Revolution, through the entire history of our Nation, many Americans have sacrificed, fought, bled, and died to perpetuate the concept of the equality and dignity of man. It was during one of our darkest days in the desperate struggle for independence, when General Washington at Valley Forge, with a comparative handful of tattered, half frozen, hungry, and poorly armed patriots decided to cross the Delaware River and attack the British at Trenton, that Thomas Paine, a great American wrote:

"These are times that try men's souls, the summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will in this crisis shirk from the duty of their country, but he who stands it now deserves the love and thanks of man and woman."

The United States is not the product of a series of lucky coincidences. It was founded by people who chose to fight to gain their freedom. Until the establishment of the United States, no nation had ever been "conceived in liberty" or "dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." America was the crowning achievement of innumerable men and women, most of whose names never got into history books, who with painstaking labor and incomparable fortitude wrought from the hopes and dreams and experience of the ages the first edifice of government truly fitted to the dignity of the human spirit.

The concept that government is made for man and not man for government is an idea which not even yet has touched the lives of countless millions throughout the world. America was founded upon principles of freedom and justice stemming from a sin-

cere belief in the honor and worth of each individual. Back in the stirring days of our Declaration of Independence, of Valley Forge, and the writing of our Constitution they were very precious and personal principles, and they had first place in the lives of our people.

Freedom is not like a prize that can be won for all time and locked away as a perpetual treasure. It must be earned anew each passing day. It is a living thing that must be constantly nurtured by toil and sacrifice. Democracy is not like a granite statue which stands completed when the sculptor has smoothed away the last rough spot. On the contrary, it is like a ship that needs constant attention by every officer and member of the crew to keep it in repair and moving steadily forward, weathering the rough buffeting of every storm, wind, and wave.

America has a glorious past. We derive inspiration from countless examples of men and women who have made our Nation great. However, we do not belong to the past. This country of ours is a forward-looking Nation whose living history is being made from day to day. It has broader horizons today that its founders probably never dreamed of, new problems to be solved, new challenges to be met. Its strength is the strength of forward-looking patriotic citizens, standing together, each with an indispensable job to do, and the character and courage to do it.

Today our cherished America is once again in danger and once again preservation depends upon our meeting the challenge and our willingness to make sacrifices for our individual rights and liberties.

Let us understand what communism is by looking at the record—a tragic record of oppression, deceit, and corruption. Oppression of the human body, deceit of the human mind and corruption of the human heart.

How can we reconcile communism with our way of life when we recall these tragic events:

The anguish of Heartbreak Ridge, the tortures and brainwashing of the prison cells, and the death marches of North Korea and Red China.

The ruthless suppression and the butchery in Hungary and East Germany.

The rape of Tibet and the creation of turmoil in the Middle East to deprive those poverty stricken people of an opportunity for democracy.

The attempts to infiltrate and destroy the legitimate governments in South America and in the case of Cuba, using the Castro revolution as a steppingstone for their aims of seizing power and control in the Western Hemisphere.

Two of the greatest threats confronting the American people today are apathy and complacency. Complacency toward the threat of communism and the failure to understand what it is and what it does to people. Only by understanding communism can we rid ourselves of the disease of complacency that eats away at our determination to face up to this diabolical menace.

In these days of the cold war in which we are involved in the greatest ideological struggle of all time, too many of us are being lulled to sleep on the sweet notes of a false security.

I cannot help but recall on this occasion another opportunity I had to speak to a gathering of Sheboygan citizens at Kiwanis Park last Labor Day. Labor Day 1959, was on the eve of the Khrushchev visit to America. I would like to repeat my remarks of that day. I said that we were making a colossal blunder in inviting Khrushchev, the "butcher of Hungary" to this Nation to extend him the hand of friendship. While the leaders of many cities were extending a cordial welcome to this tryant, I emphatically declared that he would never be welcome in Fond du Lac unless he and the Kremlin would agree to the reunification of Germany and to grant an opportunity for self-determination to 900 million human beings enslaved under the Red sign of the hammer and sickle. While there had been an agreement on exchange of visits between our President and the Russian Premier it is now obvious in light of recent developments at the ill-fated summit conference that Khrushchev never intended to play host to our President in Russia.

I merely make this point to further emphasize that we are dealing with a cunning, ruthless, and intensely dedicated and devoted Communist that has violated every treaty and agreement to which the Communists have affixed their signature. We must realize that we are not dealing with gentlemen, but with atheistic materialists, who have been taught by their god, Lenin, that every kind of deception must be used to further Communist conquest of the world and to destroy our democratic way of life.

I would be remiss in my role as speaker on this Memorial Day observance if I did not remind you of the responsibility we have as Americans to perpetuate the great principles of human right and dignity for which so many gallant Americans died. If we do not now meet this responsibility we will be losing faith with the men we are honoring today.

As individuals we must awaken to the obligations and duties of citizenship at this time when other freemen look to us for leadership. We must recognize we are citizens first and that selfish or special interests of any group within the framework of our democracy must take second place. We must fully understand the nature of the threat to our security and freedom and that this threat is by no means limited to the military sphere. Selfishness, softness, and complacency can be just as deadly to our future as any lack of military power. The crises of these times demand patriotism of the highest order. If the American people understand this fact, I have no doubt that we will meet the challenge and threat of communism and demonstrate that the strength of freemen is far superior to that of any system based on human slavery.

Let us then, on this Memorial Day rededicate ourselves to the great democratic principles for which millions fought and died on foreign battlefields throughout the world to preserve.

And let us remind ourselves, too, of the other millions who today carry the scars of war upon their bodies and their minds. There can be no better time than on this Memorial Day of 1960 while we are paying homage to our war dead for us to resolve that the cause for which they endured and died shall not have been in vain.

Advertising: The World's Nonsecret Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., at the convention of the Advertising Association of the West, held at Mexico City, Mexico, on June 27, 1960:

ADVERTISING: THE WORLD'S NONSECRET WEAPON

(Address by Hon. James A. Farley, chairman of the board, the Coca-Cola Export Corp., convention of the Advertising Association of the West, Mexico City, Mexico, June 27, 1960)

When my good friend and colleague Felix Coste, abetted by Chick Collier and Hugh Smith, dangled before me the prospect of a visit with you I assure you I did not hesitate to accept.

The opportunity to meet personally with you people who are playing such an indispensable and vital role in our economy, and to have this take place in this beautiful city which I know so well and where I have so many friends—is something I have been looking forward to with keen pleasure.

Now I want to compliment you, individually and as a group, for the remarkable economic progress which has taken place in the area you serve—the Pacific coast area. Last year you led the Nation in sales by a good margin. Your consumers have 23 percent more motor vehicles per capita than the rest of the country. Supermarket sales alone averaged 23 percent greater than the rest of the country. Your energy, ingenuity, and imagination are responsible in a major way for this record. And, above all, you have rooted your great contribution in truth, community responsibility, and a professional pride which has recently brought you national admiration. Truth—the policy and practice of truth—comes before everything else. Certainly, you can't have community responsibility and professional pride without truth.

One of our great international advertising agencies, McCann-Erickson, Inc., has for many years identified itself in all languages with a slogan with which I am sure our Central and South American friends are familiar: "La Verdad Bien Dicha"—"The Truth Well Told." And this represents a way of business life to which at least 98 percent of the people in advertising thoroughly subscribe.

I think that the interests of the people for whom we work and the interests of the people we work with around the world will best be served in this coming decade if we remember one very simple precept that this is: To let the truth shine through in all things that we do.

Truth is the most powerful force that we have to build with in the years ahead, and, if need be, it is the ultimate weapon with which we will safeguard that which we will build.

Now, let's take a look at marketing communications and the business of advertising as a standard bearer of truth throughout the world. Let's take a look at it from the businessman's point of view as well as from the politician's point of view.

Politics and advertising have this in common, that they thrive best in a free society where both are subjected to the continual harsh light of publicity, claim and counterclaims, criticism, and opposition. About the only difference I see between the two is that a politician is a little bit like a banker. A banker draws up a statement at the end of his fiscal year—a politician subjects himself to the approval of the public every 2 or 4 years, as the case may be. But with a piece of merchandise and with advertising, every day is election day, and every product and every advertisement is continually and completely subject to the verdict of public opinion. In both cases it is truth and character that stand out.

If we look over the field of famous trade names, the ones that are permanent are the

ones that have been truthful and honest, that year in and year out have given full value for the dollar. If you stop to think of the amount of faith the average buyer puts in the merchandise he buys in the American market today it is the finest possible tribute to the veracity of the American printed advertising word. If you look at the politicians the world remembers, from Washington, Jefferson, Jackson, Lincoln, and Cleveland down to our own day, it is not the clever and expedient whom we remember but those who were known in their day for their stubborn addiction to the truth.

I do not know what your concept of a politician is. Perhaps it is erroneous as my own idea of an advertising man used to be. I used to think that advertising men were long-haired artists who dreamed up ideas. Perhaps you think a politician is an adroit character who spends his time glad handing in a smoke-filled room. But just as in advertising the harsh reality of sales results weeds out the opportunist in favor of the statesman who renders a public service.

Let me give you a definition of politics that I have carried with me for a quarter of a century, written by Andrew Oliver in Boston more than 150 years ago. It goes like this: "Politics is the most hazardous of all professions. There is no other in which a man can hope to do so much good to his fellow creatures—and neither is there any in which, by a mere loss of nerve, he may do as widespread harm. There is not another in which he may so easily lose his own soul, nor is there another in which a positive and strict veracity is so difficult. But danger is the inseparable companion of honor. With all its temptations and degradations that beset it, politics is still the noblest career any man can choose."

With the change of a few words that would be an equally good definition of advertising.

We hear a good deal of talk these days about the need for advertising censorship and regulation. I know of no field that needs regulation less or that has disciplined itself more. There is no governmental body whose wisdom could be as great or whose discipline could be as harsh as that of the open competitive market. If we stop to think about it, competition functions in much the same way as His Majestry's loyal opposition or as a minority party. State an untruth, be it ever so small, and your competitor is quick to point it out and to force you to correct it. Here and there a fly-by-night may publish an exaggeration and before competition and the public have time to catch up with him he will be gone. But the permanent manufacturer who represents 98 percent of the products we live by has long since learned that truth and honesty in advertising are the only policy that enable him permanently to live with his public.

To return to the economists who have been in government in past years, some of whom are still around, they are still writing books and articles. And they still cannot agree among themselves. I am thinking now of several examples. One of these has written a book which has had a lot of attention. In it he concludes that the American people are much too well off. They have not only all that they need but all that they want. And also that they have a lot of things that they not only don't need but that they should not really want at all. They are just too darned prosperous.

When I read points of view like this I ask myself what, then, has humanity been working for all these centuries, if it has not been to provide an increasing number of people with the comforts—yes, luxuries, if you will—which make our sojourn on this planet a pleasurable experience. I am not one of those who believe that prosperity is the inevitable companion of social deterioration. Nor do I believe that you have to be hungry to be religious or destitute to be honest.

I do get worried about the future of our way of life when I hear zealous propagandists attempting to seduce our people into an attitude of disdain for the sweat, the noise, and the nonartistic aspects of business.

You talented and energetic people in advertising are the master builders of this better life we are enjoying today. You must not only defend it at home but seek to promote it abroad.

That is why I think it is especially propitious that we meet here in this gracious city, one of the great world capitals today. Your Pacific coast area has strong historical and cultural associations with the lands and the peoples in Central and South America. Why should it not be your special task to cooperate with our Latin American friends in the development of higher standards of living through advertising?

It is apparent that our freedom-loving Latin American friends must deal with the same antiquated Marxist attacks on advertising as we must combat at home. Everywhere there is an urgent need to create a greater public understanding of the fact that advertising reduces rather than increases the cost of products through its stimulation of increased sales volume. And that increased sales volume and increased competition result in product improvement. The really dramatic benefits of this process descend to the people advertising serves—the mothers and fathers and children who find job opportunities expanding, while their lives are made longer, healthier, and happier.

Now I suppose you are aware that the Coca-Cola Co. has been doing a lot of advertising and merchandising and selling for some time—starting in 1886 in Atlanta with outdoor advertising and since then employing all major media at home and abroad. We are especially proud of the fact that with few exceptions Coca-Cola bottling plants abroad are owned and operated by citizens of the country where they are located. People directly and indirectly employed by the Coca-Cola Export Corp. outside the United States would total approximately 6,500. I know the story is the same in the foreign operations of countless American companies.

We at home need this interchange of business just as our neighbors need it. One of the many great developments which will take place in the sixties will be the consolidation of international economies. Foreign business will become an increasingly important factor in the successful operation of American companies, as well as of foreign companies. The world is indeed getting smaller; communication by message and travel is wearing down national boundaries.

Advertising will be crucial—I will say indispensable in the expansion of free world prosperity. If you men and women in advertising do your job honestly, truthfully and with a sense of world responsibility, you will be serving your country in a way comparable to our most effective diplomatic effort.

Equipped with these percepts, advertising is made to order for international communication. With its advantages of picture and symbol, it can transcend language and social barriers. With picture and symbol it can talk to the hearts and minds of men in ways that words, however useful, cannot equal. There is a saying in Spanish: "Ojos que no ven, corazon que no siente." It means, "When the eyes do not see, the heart does not feel." The wisdom of these words can be our inspiration. All over the free world modern merchandising methods, like self service supermarkets, are leapfrogging from centuries-old ways into the mid 20th century. Think what this means in terms of the responsibility of advertising to establish package identification, brand image, and corporate image.

One important admonition: If advertising is to bring its benefits to ourselves and our neighbors, we cannot work by remote control. We need to go into this job with nothing less than missionray zeal. We must study and absorb the culture and the history of the countries we are dealing with. We must develop proficiency in their languages. We must do what we know is the most effective kind of selling and public relations: we must make calls. We must integrate with those people we wish to sell and influence. We need also to devote serious attention to the development of more trained personnel among the nationals of the countries we are serving. There is a need for more well rounded advertising men and women in our neighboring countries. This will probably require an investment on our part, but it should be undertaken on a program basis of sufficient scope to insure a steady buildup of advertising and merchandising know-how throughout the free world.

This coming decade will produce pressures such as we have not yet felt or even envisioned in our conduct of world trade. Therefore, unless we do stick to certain fundamental principles and communicate these to other people adequately, we will lose the privilege of leadership that the world has grown to look to us for.

Marketing communications, the practice of which is in your hands, is an invaluable part of this privilege leadership. You, as its practitioners must use it wisely. It is for you to communicate the truths of sound business practice that we as a nation have learned and have pioneered, as well, over the years. It is for you to communicate that business must be allowed to make its own unfettered judgments. It is for you to communicate that the individual must have right to make his own free choice.

These are the freedoms that have made us what we are as a nation. We are by no means perfect. But this system of ours has produced more for all, more of what makes for happiness, and culture, and peace, and order, than any nation has in all history.

This liberty, the last best value given to man on earth. This is the truth that is ours—mine and yours. Value it, cherish it, protect it and let it shine through in everything you do.

The Real Bigotry in U.S. Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the June 29, 1960, issue of the News and Courier of Charleston, S.C., contains a column of editorial correspondence which I feel particularly merits the attention of the Congress. It is entitled "The Real Bigotry in U.S. Politics," and it was written by the able and distinguished newsman and author, Col. W. D. Workman, Jr., of Columbia, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that this excellent column be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (S.C. News and Courier, June 29, 1960]

THE REAL BIGOTRY IN U.S. POLITICS

(By W. D. Workman, Jr.)

Democrats and Republicans on the national level piously condemn bigotry in politics, but they continually practice it under the guise of seeking minority votes.

It is negative bigotry which they condemn—bigotry which reflects an obstinate intolerance of Catholics, of Negroes, of Jews, of labor unions, or of any other readily identifiable group. Such antipathies, the great men of politics declare, are un-American.

Yet do they not practice bigotry of an affirmative sort when they seek out and solicit the political support of precisely such special groups. Wherein lies the moral distinction between condemning one man for opposing the election of a Catholic President, and soliciting the vote of another man on the basis of his catholicism?

The positive practice of bigotry is much more polished than the negative, and it is cloaked in high-sounding phrases. It becomes, in the language of William Wordsworth, "something of an honorable bigotry," reflecting a special interest in a special group.

It is this sort of bigotry which prompts political parties to woo the votes of minority groups as minority groups, rather than as plain Americans. It accounts for the creation of special committees, the devising of special programs, and the inclusion of particular planks in party platforms—all designed to cater to the peculiar interests of the special group.

This appeal is tailored to attract Citizen X's support, not as an average American, but as a member of some class-conscious or caste-conscious group. If he be a Negro, he is reminded of the high offices to which Negroes have been named under a given administration, or will be named under a changed administration. If he be Catholic, he is shown the Catholic representation in the Cabinet. If he be Pole, or Lithuanian, or Jew, or other, he is persuaded that the particular party has done more, and will do more, for his particular group.

Foreign-language newspapers, broadcasts, and handbills are employed with great effectiveness in the metropolitan areas of the North and Midwest, where distinguishable ethnic groups abound. Vote seekers habitually play chameleon as they move from enclave to enclave, seeking always to identify themselves and their programs with persons and problems closest to the hearts of whatever group happens to comprise their audience of the moment.

In many cities, a pattern of ethnic distribution of public offices has evolved, giving substance to what Ed Flynn stated in his book, "You're the Boss":

"Our whole system of government is based on proportional representation."

While all this is understandable and perhaps necessary in many parts of the Nation, it seems strange to that one part of the Nation which has remained less affected by immigration—the South.

The Southern States underwent their "melting pot" roles early in American history, and since then they have been relatively unchanged in ethnic or cultural composition. The early day assimilation of diverse elements into the body politic of the South was so complete that virtually no undigested segments of the population remain as distinctive ethnic or religious groups. Except for the black-white line separating whites from Negroes, there are few groupings—of language, of nationality, or of religion—which compartmentalize southerners.

Consequently, southerners find it difficult to comprehend the stress placed on minority bloc voting elsewhere in the Nation. Likewise, they find it astounding to realize just how many Americans are relatively new to the United States. For example, the average southerner finds it difficult to grasp statements such as these, taken from the 1947 report of President Truman's Committee on Civil Rights:

"One out of every four Americans is still either a foreign-born white or the child of foreign-born white parents. One out of every five white Americans speak some language other than English in his home."

But just as there is need for the southerner's realizing how different is the complexion of the rest of the Nation, so is it highly desirable that the non-South appreciate the basic Americanism of the southerner.

The man of the South admits to a regional consciousness far surpassing that which characterizes other regions, and he is somewhat accustomed to being charged with bigotry and prejudice, even though he does not acknowledge the aptness of the application.

But amdist such charges, the southerner raises the countercharge that bigotry is no more prevalent in his region than elsewhere in the land. And in these days of liberalism run amuck, he is inclined to cite Horace Greeley's remark:

"There is no bigotry like that of 'free thought' run to seed."

Ceremony of Disposal of Unserviceable Flags

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the National Americanism Commission of the American Legion, I am inserting herewith in the RECORD official data covering "Ceremony for Disposal of Unserviceable Flags."

It is important that every American know the manner of properly disposing of unserviceable flags, and this article will clear the atmosphere because of certain misunderstandings. This is not only a ceremony adopted by the American Legion in convention assembly but in accordance with the law, as stated in this memorandum.

The American Legion has rendered another great service, and I am happy to include this in the RECORD so that all people will have an understanding of just what to do with our flag when it is no longer serviceable.

The article follows:

During the last few weeks there has been some criticism (by non-Legion groups and individuals) of American Legion sponsored public flag disposal (burning) ceremonies. We believe that most of this criticism springs from misunderstanding. The "Ceremony for Disposal of Unserviceable Flags" is published on pages 57–60 of the Manual of Ceremonies of the American Legion. This memorandum is intended to explain both the propriety and legality of this long-established ceremonial practice of the American Legion.

The "Ceremony for Disposal of Unserviceable Flags" was approved by the national convention of the American Legion meeting in New York, N.Y., September 20–23, 1937, and has been an integral part of American Legion ritual since that date. A copy of the resolution in question (exhibit A) is attached. The purpose of the American Legion in adopting this ceremony was to encourage proper respect for the flag of the United States and to provide for disposal of unserviceable flags in a dignified manner. Resolution No. 373, approved by the national convention of the American Legion meeting in Chicago, Ill., September 18–20, 1944 (exhibit B), reemphasized the purpose of proper public flag disposal ceremonies and encouraged greater use of this ceremony by the American Legion.

The ceremony in question is a eulogy to the flag of the United States and to its symbolism. By current standards of demeanor, it is admittedly a unique, overt expression of patriotism. The following brief excerpt from page 59 illustrates the general tenor:

"A flag may be a flimsy bit of printed gauze, or a beautiful banner of finest silk. Its intrinsic value may be trifling or great; but its real value is beyond price, for it is a precious symbol of all that we and our comrades have worked for and lived for, and died for—a free Nation of of free men, true to the faith of the past, devoted to the ideals and practive of justice, freedom, and democracy."

It is difficult to understand how such a ceremony could be regarded as inherently disrespectful. We therefore pass to the question of legality.

A set of rules of civilian flag courtesy popularly known as the flag code was first formulated by the National Flag Conference meeting in Washington, D.C., June 14–15, 1923. The flag code was an attempt by prominent patriotic organizations to collect together in one instrument: Statutes, Executive orders, and rules of established custom and usage relating to the flag of the United States. Rule 14 provided in part that unserviceable flags "should be destroyed as a whole privately, preferably by burning or by some other method in harmony with the reverence and respect we owe to the emblem representing our Country." The American Legion interpreted the underscored portion of Rule 14 as discretionary authority for the establishment of a dignified public flag disposal ceremony. As a precautionary measure, we sought the advice of two recognized experts and authors in the field of flag custom and usage: Col. James A. Moss and Col. Harrison S. Kerrick. Both of these gentlemen expressed the opinion that such a public flag disposal ceremony would reflect proper respect to the flag of the United States.

On December 22, 1942, Public Law 829 (77th Cong., 2d sess.) was approved, giving official sanction to most of the provisions of the flag code. Public Law 829 is contained on pages 2–6 of the Americanism Commission pamphlet "Let's Be Right on Flag Etiquette." Your attention is directed particularly to section 4(j), which provides as follows:

"The flag, when it is in such condition that it is no longer a fitting emblem for display, should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning."

Thus, the word "privately" is no longer relevant in determining either the legality or the propriety of a particular flag disposal practice. The controlling test now is that a flag "should be destroyed in a dignified way, preferably by burning." We are of the opinion that the American Legion "Ceremony for Disposal of Unserviceable Flags" is a dignified tribute to the flag of the United States and to its symbolism. We therefore conclude that this ceremony is both legal and proper, and that it is an effective instrument for promoting enchanced respect for the flag of the United States.

The Catholic News Speaks Out Against Recognition of Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Red China's continuing acts of aggression and repression have emphasized to all the world that its gangster government continues to live by its own rules. They show that the Peiping regime has not in any way reformed its policies.

All of this should serve to make clearer than ever before that Red China should not be recognized by our Government and should not be seated in the United Nations. A recent editorial in that fine publication, the Catholic News, drives home well these points. This newspaper, which has been in the forefront of the effort to expose the perfidy of the Communist Chinese and the need for continued firmness in the face of their unlawful acts, argues eloquently against any change in our presesnt relations with the Peiping government. Because of the importance of this message in the context of recent events, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Catholic News, June 25, 1960]

THE CHINESE REDS AND GENOCIDE

The International Commission of Jurists with headquarters at The Hague in a unanimous report of its nine members states that "the Chinese Reds have committed genocide against the Tibetans in that (1) they will not permit adherence to and practice of Buddhism in Tibet and (2) they have systematically set out to eradicate this religious belief in Tibet." The Commission also found that the Chinese Reds have violated most of the human rights proclaimed in the U.N. Declaration of Rights, including the right to life itself.

The Commission, headed by Purshottan Trikamdas, secretary of the Indian Bar Association and including three Indian jurists and one each from the Philippines, Ghana, Malaya, Thailand and Norway, has sent its 200 page report to all delegations at the United Nations.

The Commission charged that the Chinese Communists, in pursuit of their design in Tibet, have killed religious personages because of their beliefs and practices because such belief and practice were an encouragement to others. They have also, it said, forcibly transferred large numbers of Tibetan children to a Chinese materialistic environment in order to prevent them from having a religious upbringing. The Communists refused to permit the members of the Commission to enter Tibet, which therefore based its findings on "a wide range of statements and documents."

Yet, according to former Gov. Charles Edison of New Jersey "there exists a vociferous element in political life today which is consistently attempting to reverse our China policy and to bring about U.S. recognition and support of the Peiping regime."

Not only is there no evidence that the Peiping regime has in any way indicated any spirit of repentance of the violation of those rights guaranteed by the U.N. Charter, but it is continuing its policy of murder and genocide.

To counteract this, Governor Edison urges that "every American citizen in both major parties expressing his support of the current U.S. policy of nonrecognition of Peiping and of opposition to that regime's delegates being seated in the United Nations."

A Day at Centennial High School, Circle Pines, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, one of the most recent newspapers in Minnesota is the Circulating Pines, published in Circle Pines, Minn., in the midst of a growing new suburban area.

This lively and challenging newspaper recently received an honorable mention in the newspaper contest sponsored by the National Editorial Association in Atlanta.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article which won the award, "A Day at Centennial," prepared by Mrs. Grace Gibas and published November 5, 1959. This article is a uniquely interesting and lively "inside look" at a contemporary Minnesota high school.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Circle Pines (Minn.) Circulating Pines, Nov. 5, 1959]

A DAY AT CENTENNIAL

(By Grace Gibas)

You don't have to have an excuse to visit Centennial School—an excuse that you'll write about a day at Centennial for the Circulating Pines for instance. But it helps. Once youngsters get into eighth grade they aren't exactly delighted at the thought of mama visiting their rooms at school.

But if you have a desire to compare today's junior high with the good old days—we won't say how many years ago—maybe it's worth the risk of a little embarrassment to your children. Of course, you might disguise yourself.

Times have changed. There are more men teaching in junior high than there were in our day for one thing. And the pace is noticeably stepped up—less time between classes and a shorter lunch period. Students weren't reporting on pictures taken from a satellite of the side of the moon we can't see in ninth grade science in our day either.

Clothing styles haven't changed much though. Girls still favor sweaters and skirts, though their white tennis shoes and anklets are more informal than the heavy silk or cotton stockings our generation wore. Boys shirts are more colorful, and we couldn't help wondering if today's boys haven't bigger feet. At least we don't remember boys having such difficulty finding adequate space under their own desks for their feet. But maybe we've just forgotten.

We jogged up to Centennial School last Friday—and we do mean jogged. We thought the 1950 Ford would disintegrate completely on the stretch of washboard between North Road and Centennial. Fortunately however the doors didn't even come untied. We entered the school in the middle of the second period. The first period class had been Algebra, and after all we thought why expose ourselves to remembrance of things painful and unsuccessful.

ENGLISH

The 28 students in Miss Thompson's English class were studying an assignment when I walked in. Their studious concentration was quite impressive. We looked over the grammar text book and decided the authors had come about as close to making grammar irresistible as it is humanly possible to do.

The trip from English class down the hall to the science classroom was quite an experience. The dedication with which students rush determinedly from one classroom to another is one of the most inspiring things at Centennial. It didn't take us long to learn that there is really only one simple rule for survival. There is an invisible line down the center of each hall, and traffic moves as it does on the roads of our country down each side of this invisible line. The rule is simply this: "Don't try to cross against traffic."

In leaving a classroom if one must cross to the other side of the hall we found that most of the students had solved the difficulty by bolting through the door of the classroom like a bullet shot from a gun. This way they got across before there was any traffic. Real ingenuity comes into play in trying to figure out how to get into your next class if it lies across the stream of traffic. For the timid (that's us) the safest procedure is to flatten oneself against the wall until the torrent has slowed down to a mere trickle and then duck through. The awful risk one runs with this method however is being late to class.

SCIENCE

We learned some interesting facts in Mr. Dahlin's science class. Did you know the other side of the moon is more mountainous than the side we see? Do you know the principle behind the hydraulic press? Do you know that one acre of apple trees gives out 48 tons of water by evaporation in a month? Well, we know all this, thanks to reports the students gave and illustrated by drawing on the blackboard. (Only the board was green.)

Fortunately Mr. Dahlin repeated in a strong clear voice the gist of each report after it was given or we wouldn't have learned so much. Most students bowed their heads reverently over their papers and addressed them earnestly in soft and tender voices. Their devotion to their papers was quite touching, only it did make it pretty hard to hear what they were saying.

SPANISH CLASS

There were only 12 students in Beginning Spanish. They learned expressions such as "tenga usted cuidado" and "asi es la vida" to the tune of "When The Saints Come Marching In" played by the band in the room next door. Then they studied the difference between ese and aquel to the tune of "Rudolph the Red Nosed Reindeer." Miss Landers tried drowning out "Rudolph" by putting on a record of rhythmic Mexican music. But the students weren't letting either the Saints or Rudolph lure them from their concentration on Spanish. They covered a lot of ground during the hour.

Miss Landers relieved us of the only worry we had had in visiting Centennial when she invited us to eat lunch with the faculty. The prospect of being thrown on the hospitality of eighth and ninth graders frankly had us scared stiff.

LUNCH

The 20-minute lunch period went by so quickly that it is a little difficult to recall it in detail. We remember walking into the lunchroom, skimming by a line of students waiting for their cards to be punched. Miss Landers had her card punched twice before we had time to so much as open our purse, and then we were at the counters with trays in hand. As we passed down the counter at lightning speed, the cooks placed the food on our trays with deft movements and split second timing that must have taken months to perfect. We were given fish sticks with tartar sauce, fried potatoes, carrot sticks, bread and butter sandwiches, an apple and milk.

Then we sat down at a long table with faculty, and here is where we made our big mistake. We conversed as we ate. Before we knew it the time was up, and our food only half eaten. We reluctantly consigned the remains to a garbage can, dashed like mad for the lavatory and then on to social studies.

But we arrived too late. Sheepishly we crept into a seat and began to brood. Here these students had been standing in line as we skimmed past them, but they had arrived at social studies class on time, and we were late? If we hadn't talked could we have still swallowed all the food, gone to the lavatory and made it to class on time? Not us. The answer came back every time. We're the type that chews slowly and enjoys every mouthful. Clearly the times had moved ahead of us. We were nothing more than a relic of a leisurely way of life already buried in the sands of time.

And then hopefully we hit on an idea. What if we simply had omitted the trip to the lavatory; we'd undoubtedly lost a good 4 minutes there. But this line of thinking failed to bring us a solution, because we couldn't figure out when else that little trip could have been made. In the 3 minutes between classes? But how? Four from three still leaves a minute on the late side. This line of thinking simply raised a question which had to be answered. We asked it delicately of Miss Thompson after school. "Er, when do, er, for goodness sakes when do these children get time to go to the lavatory?"

Miss Thompson said students could sign up for lavatory privileges during class time but she thought most managed between classes. Again we had to conclude that the times have passed us by. Girls were very self-conscious in our day. They would have died rather than ask a man teacher for lavatory privileges.

SOCIAL STUDIES

Our brooding was brought temporarily to an end when the ninth graders in Mr. Rost's social studies class gave reports on the 1939 reorganization of Minnesota government. But a report on various methods of taxation set our minds to wandering again. These young people aren't really going to understand taxes until they start paying them, we thought. Still some of the students seemed quite interested in their Minnesota government even though their practical experience with it is fairly limited. Perhaps their parents talk about taxes and government at home.

It was the end of this period that we had our first experience with seventh graders. As the dignified ninth graders left the room, seventh graders swooped in bringing enough extra energy with them to run a hundred horsepower reactor. They were exhilerated, they were joyful, they were bursting with good spirits.

Did we imagine it or did an expression of pain pass over Mr. Rost's face? Perhaps not, but there was no mistaking the do or die spirit he seemed to acquire. Seldom have we felt more guilty than we did walking out of that room and leaving him single-handed to meet his fate.

GEOGRAPHY

The difference between eighth graders and ninth graders isn't as astonishing as that between seventh graders and ninth graders but it is still amazing. Ninth graders are young adults. They have acquired dignity. They simply ignore adults. But eighth graders still have some of the bubbling charm of children. They are exuberant. They are curious and friendly. And they are about half the size they will be in another year. (At least the boys appear that way.)

"What are you doing here?" we were asked simultaneously by all the children in the vicinity of the seat we took in Mr. Reinfeld's eighth grade geography class. "You aren't going to tell on us if we cheat, are you," said one. "Maybe you're here to see that we don't cheat," he added on second thought. They all looked suspicious when we explained we were merely visiting. They clearly showed that they knew we must have ulterior motives of some kind. And of course we did. What could be more ulterior than planning to write what we were seeing and hearing.

Mr. Reinfeld gave them a test on the geography of the western part of the United States. We took the test ourselves, just for the fun of it, and to our dying day no one will ever drag from us the humiliating score we made. We just laugh to ourselves when we remember our trusting neighbor who asked us to tell him the answers. How naive can children be. Do they honestly think a person can remember facts he learned 30 years ago?

Wait a minute. If we can't remember facts we learned then just what good did those years at school do us?

Actually they were very important years. We may not remember that Montana mines copper, but Montana has always been a magic name to us, a State of mountains and an invigorating atmosphere. We learned that learning was fun and we learned how to go about finding out what we didn't know.

And how much that can't be measured do children learn from the attitudes of their teachers—that every individual personality has importance, that children are best taught in an atmosphere of kindness and understanding, that there must be order instead of chaos, that self-discipline is important, that they must have consideration for others, that they must be neat and prompt and responsible.

Obviously today's children are being prepared to fit into a civilization in which ulcers are the mark of the successful person. Time is all important, and it is a real handicap to be slow. Food is something you eat on the run because there are things more important than eating. The schools reflect the times. One just hopes these young people can take the added pressure and strain.

HOMEWARD BOUND

The last period of the day was devoted to activities or to studying.

As we jogged home (and we do mean jogged) we were very glad we had spent a day at Centennial. We felt like doing just what the kids do when they get home—laying the refrigerator bare. Now we understand why after a flying stop at the bathroom they head for the kitchen and eat bananas, apples, peanut butter sandwiches, wheaties, and popcorn. And we understand why they munch at their leisure over a book. We also understand why they just can't gear themselves up to the effort of cleaning up the mess they've made. After all they've had quite a day.

Address by the Honorable Kenneth B. Keating, Senator From New York, to the Graduating Class of Albany Law School, Albany, N.Y., on June 7, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEAN P. TAYLOR

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. TAYLOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, Senator KEATING recently delivered a commencement address to the graduating class of the Albany Law School, my alma mater, Albany, N.Y. On this occasion he was the recipient of an honorary doctor of laws degree from the university.

In his excellent address he urged law schools to assume a more vigorous role in shaping the course of the law. He also, in stirring words, appealed to the young men of the graduating class to approach the practice of law with a full awareness that lawyers are a vital part of our democracy whose function is to serve the public good always.

Mr. Speaker, I know that Senator KEATING's erudite remarks will be of interest to many Members, and under leave previously granted I insert them in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Commencement is a most appropriate designation for the day of graduation. This is the beginning; the beginning of a new stage in your careers.

On such an occasion, it is useful to look back as well as ahead. In planning our goals and objectives, it is helpful to consider our present bearings before charting our next step in life.

Justice Holmes once remarked that a law school does not undertake to teach success. In his words: "That combination of tact and skill which gives a man immediate prominence among his fellows comes from nature, not from instruction."

Perhaps this was an overstatement. A great law school does more for a student than fill his mind with unending legal data. It teaches him to understand the law as a tool for preserving society. It teaches him to respect the law as a safeguard against oppression and arbitrariness. It teaches him to apply the law as an instrument for social and political progress.

It teaches him to relate the law to other professions and disciplines which serve the public good. It teaches him to revere the law as one of the principal guardians of liberty and morality.

This kind of education affects our natures just as an understanding of art affects our appreciation of great paintings. I know that after 3 years of legal training and after you have passed a bar exam—which I am sure will be a mere formality for most of you—you will feel very learned in the law and will be absolutely certain of a great number of legal doctrines.

It has been said that the young lawyer has three cardinal virtues: faith, hope, and charity—faith in his own infinite knowledge, hope for the obtuseness of judges and juries, and charity for the older lawyers who have all the business; and that the greatest of these virtues is faith.

I am sure that most of you realize that you are just at the threshold of the study

of law—but if you don't, the sooner you are enlightened the better.

Law is a process, not a thing. It is constantly growing in depth and scope in the manner of a living organism not an inanimate object.

It must be stable, but it cannot stand still if it is to serve its eternal purpose. For the law must adapt to its environment and adjust to the needs it fulfills, just as a person must, to survive and thrive.

That is why the study of law is a never-ending pursuit. It is a pursuit which will enrich your lives and ennoble your spirits. No one who understands the never-ending growth of the law ever expects to be its master. But anyone who dedicates himself to its study will achieve a more splendid character, a wiser outlook, and a better nature for his efforts.

The growth of the law and the dedicated lawyer go hand in hand.

Unfortunately this is not the picture all practicing lawyers present. Some members of the bar understand law only as a profitable business, and are oblivious to their obligations and opportunities as members of a great profession. These lawyers betray a great tradition. They renounce—often unwittingly—a valuable inheritance. No matter how many continuing legal education courses they sign up for, they will never be educated lawyers. The gap in their understanding of the mission and purpose of the law will remain permanently unfilled.

Sometimes these lawyers present a tempting example to the fledgling practitioner. Their lack of dedication does not seem to affect their ability to acquire rich and even important clients. They frequently achieve material opulence despite the absence of any spiritual substance in their makeup. It is a sad fact that some clients actually admire these lawyers just because they are cunning and calculating.

The important measure of a lawyer, however, is not made by his clients but by his brothers at the bar. There is no greater satisfaction to a lawyer than the respect of his colleagues. The recognition you receive from your brethren will be infinitely more rewarding to you when the time comes to look back upon your careers than any superficial praise you receive from a client who gets something through your efforts to which he is entitled or sometimes is not entitled.

In the words of Theodore Roosevelt, therefore, I urge you to eschew the life of "ignoble ease" in favor of the "strenuous life"—the life of toil and effort, of labor and strife.

I counsel you, as he did his countrymen, that "the highest form of success * * * comes not to a man who desires mere easy peace but to the man who does not shrink from danger, from hardship, or from bitter toil, and who out of these wins the splendid ultimate triumph."

If you are imbued with this spirit, I welcome you to the profession of the law. I predict a rewarding and a challenging life for you. I know that America needs your services. I am grateful for whatever circumstances have led you to the practice of law.

If you do not possess this nature, then I implore you to give up this ambition. We already have enough lawyers of shallow character. Find some other outlet for your interests—do not further corrupt our profession.

I hope there is none in this group who has failed to grasp the noble mission of the law. But if there are such opportunists here who seek to use the training they have received only for material gain, I want to do my best to discourage them from ever completing the transition from law student to lawyer.

They should know that law is one of the most crowded professions in this country. According to the 1958 lawyers' census conducted by Martindale-Hubbell, Inc., there were over a quarter of a million lawyers admitted to practice. Department of Commerce figures indicate that over 35,000 lawyers are right here in New York, which is more than twice the number in any other State. There are more lawyers in the United States than dentists, bookkeepers, or real estate agents. There are even more lawyers than clergymen, which certainly is something to ponder.

These figures should not discourage the worthy among you, which I am sure, having had considerable experience with Albany Law School graduates, includes every member of this graduating class. The profession may suffer from having too many lawyers, but never from having too many good lawyers.

My sincere conviction is that the legal profession still has a tremendous untapped potential for service. Too many people fail to consult lawyers until they are past the point of counsel and need only a stanch advocate to rescue them. I believe that a proper educational program would induce many more citizens to seek the advice of counsel before they have taken an irrevocable and unwise step. We have not developed preventive law at anywhere near the level of preventive medicine, for example.

There is also a great demand for lawyers in the Government service. There are more lawyers in Government service today than total graduates from this law school in its more than 100 years of existence. The increasing scope of Federal regulation and the constantly expanding activity of all levels of Government promise to keep the demand for lawyers for Government at a high level.

All that I have indicated about the attitude of lawyers in private practice applies to an even greater degree to lawyers entering Government service. Such lawyers assume in addition to the general obligations of all members of the bar to the public the special obligations of the public servant to the public. A lawyer in Government who does not live up to the highest ethics of his profession can do irreparable harm by destroying public confidence in the Government itself.

There also is a growing demand for law teachers. I hope that such a career will appeal to the best among you. The law schools of this country can be vital forces for shaping the course of the law. A law teacher enjoys an independence of spirit, a freedom from commitments and a forum for expression which can make him a powerful influence in directing legal developments.

Dean Roscoe Pound long ago recognized the unique opportunity the law schools enjoy of becoming effective instruments for legal reform.

In a speech almost 35 years ago, he said: "In these institutions we may find the permanence of tenure, the conditions of work—continuity, opportunity of dealing with problems as a whole, possibility of surveying a wide field, extending beyond the limitations of jurisdictions and localities and parties—the independence of politics, and the guarantees of training, ability, and scientific attitude, which are essential to effective research and which will command public confidence. * * * In no way may the lawyer be so sure of achieving his task of making straight the paths of American justice, as by doing his part to assure to our law schools the means of carrying on the scientific investigations on which the law reforms of the future must go forward."

I am uncertain whether the law schools have accepted or fulfilled this assignment. I know that individual law professors, including many of this faculty, have made a very significant contribution to the law. But these have been independent efforts, which while nurtured by the associated schools, have usually not been undertaken as part of the task of a law center.

The law schools have been plagued by fund shortages. But I would hope that high on the list of goals of every campaign drive for funds would be that of obtaining the necessary resources for this kind of undertaking. To a large extent, work of the nature I have in mind for the law schools is now being performed by private foundations—but under handicaps and with preconceptions which would not impede similar law school endeavors.

For the law schools ever to perform this function, they will have to have the full support of the alumni whose ranks you are about to join. Do not think of yourself as graduating from this institution in the sense of leaving it. It would be more constructive to think of this day in terms of changing the nature of your relationship to your alma mater. For three of the most important years of your lives you have been taking from it; give some thought now to what you can contribute to it in your new status.

There is no end to the valuable projects which could be undertaken by law schools functioning as law centers. Study of the operations of the Government would be my No. 1 suggestion. It is frequently pointed out that while Congress investigates the other agencies of Government almost without respite, none of the other agencies can investigate the Congress with the same thoroughness.

I have some sympathy with this complaint, and I believe that Congress has not been vigilant enough in keeping its own house in order and attuning its operations to present day demands. A respected and responsible law school, under the proper auspices, could do a superlative job in correcting this legislative oversight.

There is a need also for lawyers in the fields of legal administration. Problems of tremendous scope exist in translating our conceptions of justice into the processes of the law. The courts are desperately understaffed. The regulatory agencies are plagued by conflicting functions, objectives and policies.

Institutes of judicial administration still are relatively new. No agency at all exists for supervising and coordinating the work of the regulatory agencies.

I hope young lawyers will take a special interest in the problems of administering justice. No law is self-executing and even the best intentions can be frustrated by ineffective or inefficient procedures. These problems do not receive the thoughtful attention they deserve. The interrelation between procedural and substantive growth in the law is too often overlooked. In my opinion, this task of keeping the machinery of justice from breaking down is of supreme importance.

These are only some of the paths open to you as young lawyers. I could discuss numerous other branches of the practice with you because, in truth, the variety of endeavors in which a good lawyer can usefully engage is without end. The important thing is not which course you pursue but what purpose you serve.

Whether you are handling a closing in a real estate transaction, safeguarding the rights of a defendant in a criminal case, or organizing a corporation, keep in mind always that you are functioning as a vital part of our democracy, in the tradition of a great profession, with a responsibility to serve the public good always.

There are many stories of young lawyers, but I have always enjoyed the one

about the neophyte, who, being unused to the practices of the U.S. Supreme Court, addressed tthe dignified Justices as "gentlemen" instead of calling them "your honors." He immediately apologized.

Chief Justice Taft, in accordance with his customary attempt to make lawyers who were appearing before the august body feel at ease, replied, "Don't apologize for calling us gentlemen. That is what we try to be."

And gentlemen is what you must be. Be humble without being docile, for you have much to learn but must seek out knowledge. Be studious but not timid, for reflection will reveal the spirit of the law but action is its body. Give yourselves to community causes. Defend the liberty of your fellow men. Take pride in your country. Do not avoid conflict or seek easy success. This great school has prepared you to meet challenges less fortified men must shun.

You are no longer privileged to pursue easy, detached lives. You are part of the inner fabric of society and you must never reject the tasks your fellows will thrust upon you.

Justice Cardozo put it well when he said: "Law is not a cadaver, but a spirit, not a finality, but a process of becoming, not a clog upon the fullness of life, but an outlet and a means thereto, not a game, but a sacrament."

Keep these words always before you. And if you will always act with the understanding that you are part of a sacred mission—I promise you will achieve true success.

As you embark upon your chosen field of endeavor, please, I pray you, do not be haunted by the specter of security. Security is appropriate to old age. It is not the business of you young men who leave Albany Law School today. Cultivate rather the uncertainties of challenge—and make your only security that of knowing that struggle, not repose, is the best reason for living. Indeed, let us express sorrow for any young man who spends his life making the bed in which he will lie in his old age. He arrives at the destination, but he has missed all the scenery.

This day you leave the Albany Law School. But, in a sense, it is not a true departure. It can never be. For as long as you live a part of you will be here—must forever be here—in these halls and rooms you have known and loved. What remains for me to say but Godspeed—and may the lives of each one of you be the proud gifts you bring back one day to offer, as tokens of affection, to the school that your hearts will never leave.

The Cotton Export Subsidy Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Monday, June 27, the U.S. Tariff Commission handed down another decision against the best interest of our domestic economy and also against the proper administration of our trade program as envisioned by the Congress and the late Cordell Hull when the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was passed in 1934.

The Commission's rejection of the National Cotton Council's petition seeking relief from the adverse effects of the cotton export subsidy program's unfair advantage to foreign cotton textile manufacturers has not been received well at all in South Carolina or the southeastern area of the United States, where cotton and textiles play such a prominent role in our economic life. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two excellent editorials on this subject. They are "Tariff Commission in a Dream World" from the June 30, 1960 issue of the Greenville News, Greenville, S.C., and "Textile Industry Gets No Relief" from the June 29, 1960 issue of the Augusta Chronical, Augusta, Ga.:

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Greenville News, June 30, 1960]

TARIFF COMMISSION IN A DREAM WORLD

The Tariff Commission's rejection of a petition asking that quotas be placed on foreign textile imports demonstrates again that official Washington is still bemused by the old and honorable dreams of free trade.

These dreams were largely Southern in origin. For many decades the South favored free and untrammeled flow of goods between nations while the North and West were protectionist. And it was chiefly by the untiring efforts of Cordell Hull of Tennessee that protectionism, long the keystone of American policy, began to be abandoned.

Much has happened since Mr. Hull's day, however. The pattern of international trade has been drastically altered to conform with new political alinements and American foreign aid programs have reshaped the economy of many major powers.

The term "free trade" cannot be used with the same meaning today that it had 20 years ago. The "free trade" theory of economics held within itself certain distinctions and limitations that simply do not exist any longer.

Reduced to simplest terms, it was assumed that an economically undeveloped country would progress only very slowly because of the lack of capital and trained labor. As it gradually increased production of a given kind of goods, industries producing similar goods in more advanced countries would have ample time to adjust to the new conditions.

Among countries alined with the United States today, however, capital is about the easiest thing in the world to get. A dozen international lending agencies are available and even eager to make loans. The U.S. Treasury is constantly tapped for economic assistance to the so-called backward nations.

Money with which to build new plants, buy the latest equipment and train workers, is accessible to any Western-oriented country almost without limit as to amount or purpose.

This was not the stuff of which Mr. Hull's dream was made.

The bureaucrats in Washington have one foot in a bygone day. If they continue to operate the two programs of free imports and free industrial expansion, they may wreck the textile industry of the United States.

And who will be next?

[From the Augusta Chronicle, June 29, 1960]

TEXTILE INDUSTRY GETS NO RELIEF

A U.S. Tariff Commission majority has dealt a staggering blow to the Nation's textile industry in its rejection of a National Cotton Council petition for limiting foreign cotton textile imports.

The four-member majority not only turned down the industry plea for quotas, or a tariff-quota combination, but ruled that import duties are not needed to offset the Government's cotton export fees.

In doing so, it failed to stem a swelling tide of textile imports that threatens to wreck the domestic textile industry and upset the cotton price-support program in this Nation.

The gravity of the textile import problem is reflected in post-World War II export-import statistics. In 1947, U.S. textile exporters found a world market for $1.4 billion worth of textile manufactures, while imports amounted to only about one-fourth of this volume. This net textile export balance diminished until, by 1955, U.S. imports of textile products of $585 million had grown to 95 percent of our $615 million export trade. By 1958, a net textile import balance was firmly established, and in 1959, American imports total $337 million in contrast to exports of only $634 million.

Later statistics indicate that this trend is continuing, with imports of textile manufactures currently running some 140 percent of the U.S. export trade. And textile imports, if allowed to remain unrestricted, may be expected to cut even deeper into the American market in coming months. Not only do foreign manufacturers have the advantage of cheap labor and lower costs, but they buy cotton, including U.S. growths, at prices about 25 percent below those U.S. mills must pay.

The Japanese voluntary quota arrangement eased the problem to some degree in 1957, decreasing cotton cloth imports temporarily. But U.S. manufacturers cannot hope for any similar relief in the future, because imports are now pouring in, not only from the traditional Japanese and European competitors, but from an ever-widening circle of low-wage manufacturers based in Hong Kong, India, Korea, Pakistan, and Formosa.

Adding a deplorable note of irony is the fact that the United States, through the ICA, is financing the construction of many of these newer foreign mills that add to the woes of our own established textile manufacturers.

Viewed in the light of these facts, the Tariff Commission's action is indeed alarming. The United States must take some action to limit this low-cost foreign competition if the American textile industry—a basic element of the Nation's economy—is to continue to provide good jobs for millions of Americans and quality products for national and world consumption.

Having been denied by the Tariff Commission, the textile industry now must turn to Congress for action. As Senator STROM THURMOND said in commenting on the commission decision, this case "proves the imperative need of Congress to take action in the next session to regain control of its constitutional authority over our trade program."

Commemorating World Refugee Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 23, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on May 19, 1959, the President proclaimed the period from July 1, 1959, to June 30, 1960, as World Refugee Year. Some 70 nations in the free world joined in celebrating this event in answer to a United

Nations resolution adopted in December of 1958.

The purpose and the hope of World Refugee Year were to stimulate action—private, governmental, and international—in support of refugee assistance of all types throughout the world.

It is too early to say what concrete results have been relaized in the last 12 months. It is apparent, however, that the basic aim of encouraging support for refugee assistance has been fulfilled and that a campaign has been launched which with continued support will do much to resolve the many problems of the world's uprooted and homeless people.

The world refugee population was not significantly altered during World Refugee Year. Some progress was made in Europe, but there are still some 18,000 living in the barren, soul-depressing atmosphere of the refugee camps there. I would like to quote the following passage from the final report of the Zellerbach Commission which describes this atmosphere:

One has only to visit a European camp and to talk to some of the refugees who have been there for years to understand why prolonged existence under these conditions erodes the spirit of man. After years of inactivity, the refugees become accustomed to a way of life requiring neither effort nor initiative. They accept the compressed living quarters, the total lack of privacy, the lack of sanitary facilities as normal. Worse still, they even lose their capacity for indignation at a fate that is little better than a living death. They may marry and have children in the camps, because it is natural for human beings to do so. But they helplessly accept the malformation of their children's character which goes on before their eyes. There is nothing more appalling than the spectacle of refugees so attached to their dreary corner of a barrack building that they refuse to leave it—like the Yugoslav inmate at Camp Landshut who, after spending 5 years there with his wife and children, said to one of the Commission staff: "Don't bother to get us out. We are all right here. Just let us live and send up parcels."

The progress made in Europe during the past year was more than offset in numbers of refugees added in other of the trouble spots of the world. Tibetans continue today to crowd into neighboring countries of India, Nepal, and Bhutan. The cliffs of Hong Kong team with an ever-increasing number of Chinese fleeing from the mainland. The problem of what to do with a million displaced Palestinian Arabs is no nearer to any apparent solution now than it was a dozen years ago.

These are merely some of the problems in the world refugee picture. They could not all possibly be solved in a year's time, nor were they expected to be.

I would like to take this occasion to commend the U.S. Committee for Refugees for its untiring efforts in behalf of refugee assistance. In addition to fund raising and encouraging fund raising drives by other voluntary organizations in the United States, the Committee undertook an ambitious and successful campaign to arouse public interest in the plight of refugees. As stated by its executive director in his recent report "the U.S. Committee reached the American through his newspapers, magazines, radio, and television; through the service club, church, or other community organizations to which he belongs, and through the good example and stimulus of his fellow townsmen." I believe that there are now over 70 cooperating committees organized by USCR on State and local levels which will continue to work in an effort to render assistance to refugees.

Finally, I would like to call attention to the fact that there is presently before Congress a modest refugee relief proposal—House Joint Resolution 397—which should certainly be approved before we adjourn this year. This legislation has passed the House and is presently before the Senate. It is not as ambitious an undertaking as some would like to have seen adopted in view of the situation brought to light during World Refugee Year. It is the most that can be hoped for at this time, however, and should, therefore, receive unanimous approval.

World Refugee Year is now over. But the problems with which it was concerned remain to plague the conscience of mankind. Let us hope that the charity, interest, and enthusiasm engendered during World Refugee Year will be carried forth undiminished and that we will not leave the refugee to his hapless fate, feeling that we have done our part and need do no more.

Sugar Act of 1948

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK M. COFFIN
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12311) to extend for 1 year the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. COFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my agreement with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES]. I think it is important that we demonstrate here that we are sensitive to the importance of our relations with our good frends in Latin America, not only with the countries listed in the Committee report but with the other sugar-producing countries of Brazil, Colombia, Guatemala, Ecuador, and El Salvador. I recognize the inevitable complexities of legislation which in effect exercises economic sanctions as an instrument of foreign policy. As has been pointed out it is essential to consider the legitimate needs of Latin American countries and to weigh their interests most carefully. Brazil is as large as the United States and is the third largest sugar-producing country. She is prepared to supply substantial tonnage if given the opportunity. Guatemala, as we know, has dramatically thrown off the threat of Communist domination and is prepared to supply quantities of sugar. Even though her contribution may be relatively modest, this is of great economic importance to her and her participation should therefore be of importance to us. The other three countries I have named can make modest contributions, as well. It will take consideration and restraint to insure that a proper balance is maintained in this measure to place curbs on those whose actions are inimical to the United States and to see at the same time that our friends are not in any way damaged or endangered.

Federal Employees Pay Raise Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to comment on the President's recent veto message and the action taken by the House today in overriding the veto.

I am deeply gratified by the size of the vote and I am sure the American people will know by this showing that 344 Members of the House would not have taken such action if, as the President states, this bill "violates every concept of fairness, every rule of reason and logic."

Fully recognizing the President's right to take such action, I nevertheless cannot stand silent and read a statement that is as unfair to Federal employees as this one is. The President has been quoted as being shocked by lobbying tactics utilized in recent weeks to insure passage of a pay raise bill. I, for one, am shocked, and I think that I am joined in this feeling by virtually every Member of this body, by the President's use of such language. Yes, I have been urged to support H.R. 9883. Classified employees and postal workers have urged me to support this bill on the grounds that it is desperately needed in order for them to cope with today's ever-increasing cost of living. It appears strange to me that the President is singling out representatives of Federal employees' unions for strong criticism, while remaining silent for 7 years on the tactics utilized by the National Association of Manufacturers, the chamber of commerce, and hosts of paid lobbyist-attorneys from downtown Washington. In past Congresses we have even had Cabinet members present in the Speaker's lobby using every known pressure tactic to influence the will of this body.

The postal workers and classified Federal employees were not paid to visit me. In fact, many of these employees had to take time off, without pay in some instances, to ask their Representative to support legislation for their benefit. In recent days, an absurd complaint has been lodged against Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, concerning possible violation of the Hatch Act. Mr.

Doherty for many years has gained the widest possible admiration and respect for his untiring efforts on behalf of the Letter Carriers Association and is recognized by one and all as one of America's outstanding citizens. It is deplorable to me that this personal attack has been instigated against him. With well over 250,000 Federal employes in the Washington metropolitan area, I am proud to stand as their spokesman and to insist on fair and equitable treatment.

Whenever I read the President's veto message on Federal pay legislation, and this is the third time I have read such a message, I wonder who in the world advises the President of the United States to take such a position against his own employees. In the 6 years I have been privileged to represent the Fifth District of Maryland, from my own personal knowledge I have seen many Federal employees' families where the breadwinner is forced to take two and often three jobs and the wife is required to work just in order to make ends meet. The President tells us that the consumer's price index has advanced only 2.1 percent since the last pay increase was enacted. I have no doubt that the President's figures, as supplied by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, are correct. But this is completely beside the point. Congress has always lagged behind in granting Federal employees their wage increases. When this raise is granted, as a class they will still not be brought up to the average wage outside the Federal Government. Regardless of whether the cost of living has gone up 2 or 3 percent since the last raise, they started with an inequitable wage balance to begin with.

At this point, I would like to include in the RECORD a table of statistics prepared by the Bureau of Labor Statistics completely substantiating this point. It is inexcusable that the President did not study this chart before making his 2.1-percent statement, in an obvious attempt to mislead the American public.

Classified salary increases compared with advances of Consumer Price Index

Year and month	Salary increase		Increase of Consumer Price Index
	Percent	Cumulative percentage	
Aug. 15, 1939			
July 1, 1945	15.9		31.4
July 1, 1946	14.2	32.4	43.4
June 30, 1948 [1]	11.0	46.9	76.8
Oct. 29, 1949 [1]	4.0	52.8	[2]
July 1, 1951 [1]	10.0	68.1	88.0
Mar. 1, 1955 [1]	7.5	80.7	93.7
Jan. 1, 1958 [1]	10.0	88.8	[3] 109.7

[1] Increase effective 1st day of 1st pay period which began after this date.
[2] CPI dropped in 1949 but resumed steady advance in 1950.
[3] To June 1958 when increase was approved by Congress.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics and Civil Service Commission data.

Once again, this administration recommends that pay action be deferred pending still another survey. No one suggested a survey when the administration, with alarming speed, negotiated a steel settlement with the cost to the American public deferred until after the general election. The Vice President has remained strangely silent where the welfare of Federal employees is concerned.

The executive branch recognizes that there are inequities existing in the present Federal employees pay scale. I have no quarrel with this. I have long recognized this. An attempt was made by some of us in this Congress to focus attention on these inequities by the introduction of legislation designed to eliminate many of them. The administration failed to cooperate and to support a long-overdue adjustment in today's hodgepodge pay scale system. Are we to punish the Government's own employees because this administration for almost 8 years has failed to recommend to Congress a plan whereby this long-overdue adjustment could be realized?

The House today, by its vote, has obviously answered this question in the negative.

I supported such a study, as recommended, and introduced legislation 2 years ago to provide for such a study. We have had studies in recent times and what has been the result? The Cordiner Committee, appointed by the President, in 1957 allegedly studied the rates of pay of all individuals employed by the Federal Government. No implementing action has been requested. And what did the O'Connell Committee have to say? I quote: "Salaries fixed by statutes have not been adjusted in a timely and adequate manner in response to general changes in non-Federal salary levels."

The President has seen fit to criticize Congress for not awaiting the results of a national salary survey being made by the Department of Labor. I see absolutely no reason for awaiting a compilation of figures from every rural nook and cranny of the United States when the clear facts on the record demonstrate that Federal employees in the Washington metropolitan area, one of the highest cost-of-living areas in the United States, are not being treated fairly by their employer, the Federal Government.

I commend the House for its action today and let there be no mistake about it, I invite all of my constituents to continue to advise me of their feelings on pending legislation, even though their doing so appears to be distasteful to the President. It is a constitutional right of which neither this nor any other President can deprive them.

Relief to Small Businessmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the problem of maintaining an economic climate in which small business can survive is ever present. Because of the downward trend of small business during the past several years, it is indeed refreshing to know that one of our distinguished colleagues, the Honorable JAMES ROOSEVELT, of California, has taken up the cudgels on behalf of over 200,000 small businessmen who earn a precarious livelihood from their long hours of toil in gasoline service stations.

On June 28, 1960, Representative ROOSEVELT appeared before the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee and presented in his usual eloquent style a most logical and persuasive argument on behalf of H.R. 9894. Because of the importance of this subject and also to give that statement wider publicity, I request leave that it be inserted in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Congressman ROOSEVELT's statement is as follows:

STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMERCE AND FINANCE OF THE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, JUNE 28, 1960, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 9894 WHICH WOULD PROHIBIT GASOLINE PRODUCERS TO ACT AS AGENTS FOR, OR TO RECEIVE COMMISSIONS ON, THE SALE OF TBA ITEMS

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, it gives me great pleasure to appear before your subcommittee this morning. As you no doubt know, I have the honor of being chairman of the Subcommittee on Distribution Problems Affecting Small Business of the House Small Business Committee. That committee being a select committee has, consequently, no jurisdiction to pass on legislation, but concerns itself primarily with investigations and the making of recommendations to appropriate legislative committees, such as yours.

Early this year, I introduced in the House H.R. 9894, a bill which is designed to obviate the deleterious effects of certain practices in the distribution of motor vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, and supplies which tend to cause destructive and unfair methods of competition, thereby adversely affecting commerce. This measure was introduced by me as a result of 5 years of careful study and investigation by the subcommittee of the House Small Business Committee.

This measure simply provides that no producer who sells gasoline at wholesale for ultimate resale at retail, shall act as agent for or receive any commission because of the sale of any product of any manufacturer or distributor of motor vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, or supplies (TBA).

In the interest of clarification, I should like to point out that this bill—H.R. 9894—is not a divorcement bill to which, perhaps, certain segments of the industry might take exception. Nor would it prohibit any producer or affiliate not engaged in selling motor vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, or supplies at wholesale for ultimate resale at retail, from selling any of such merchandise directly to consumers at retail and profiting therefrom.

During the 84th Congress, the House Small Business Committee issued its report (H. Rept. 1423) in which its subcommittee found that the small gasoline service station operator "needs immediate and permanent relief to enable him to fulfill his role as an independent businessman. The present laws, procedures, and enforcement policies are inadequate to achieve effective and permanent relief."

That recommendation was reached as a result of voluminous testimony heard dur-

ing 1955 by the subcommittee. It reached the conclusion that the freedom of choice of the retail dealer, with respect to the manner in which he operates his station, is circumscribed by the economic power of his oil company supplier, whether or not such power is specifically exercised against him. The subcommittee further found that coercive and discriminatory practices against retail gasoline station operators by certain of their oil company suppliers was quite prevalent. This was especially so with respect to tires, batteries, and accessories (TBA).

Further hearings were held in 1956, which gave the subcommittee additional cumulative evidence of unfair practices which made the lot of the small businessman in the industry hard indeed.

Most petroleum companies own or control gasoline service stations which they lease to others on a short-term basis. Through the oil corporations' power to cancel, or refuse to renew such leases arbitrarily, such gasoline producers are able to prevail upon the persons leasing such gasoline service stations to accept the profit margins set by the producer, to conduct their businesses as directed by the producer, and to sell only the motor vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, and supplies, and other products chosen or sponsored by the petroleum company.

Two years later, during the 85th Congress, the subcommittee, as a result of a continuing stream of complaints received from small service station operators, conducted another investigation and held hearings in Washington, D.C.; Denver, Colo.; Los Angeles, Calif.; and Chicago, Ill. During the course of these hearings, it became crystal clear from the testimony that employees of some of the major petroleum suppliers continued to exercise unfair pressure toward their lessees and other dealers in regard to the sale of TBA items.

One of the findings of the subcommittee in 1957, in its House Report No. 1157, was to the effect that "the extent to which small business distributors and retailers of petroleum products are truly free and independent is severely limited by their awareness that their suppliers can wield great economic power."

The experience of the subcommittee in investigating the problems of the lessee-dealers of petroleum products at the retail level through service stations and the continuing flood of letters that it received in regard to alleged coercive and unfair trade practices on the part of certain of the petroleum suppliers, demonstrated the need for further investigation. Therefore, in 1959, additional public hearings were held which were devoted to the problems flowing from the distribution of TBA items and other related automotive products handled by retail gasoline service station dealers and by wholesalers. During those hearings many witnesses, who were representatives of the retail and wholesale segments of the industry and who came from every section of the United States, testified. These witnesses made charges against certain petroleum companies—charges that those companies, through pressure and through coercive means—forced and compelled its retail gasoline dealers to handle only those TBA items in their stations which were sponsored by the petroleum companies.

Actually 35 companies were named by the witnesses at those hearings last year and in the subcommittee's desire to be eminently fair, it gave the petroleum companies an opportunity to present their rebuttal to the charges made against them. Each of these companies were invited to appear at a subsequent public hearing which was held during April 1960, to answer the charges which were made against them, if they so desired.

We found that while 35 petroleum companies were named, 4 of these firms were merged with other named companies, so actually there were 31 invitations to appear; 22 companies replied to the letter of invitation—9 did not; 13 companies said, in effect, that they did not consider the charges made against their companies as something that required an appearance of witnesses on their behalf. Some of those 13 companies submitted affidavits challenging certain charges that were made in December, and other companies set forth in their letters of response unsworn statements denying certain other charges that had been made.

During the hearings, spokesmen for certain petroleum companies testified that it was the announced policy of their firms to permit their retail dealers a so-called freedom of choice respecting TBA items. However, upon further questioning by members of the subcommittee, it was ascertained that the companies' sales representatives were under certain quotas to sell such TBA items, which quotas were based on what the petroleum companies thought that their retail dealers ought to buy and what the maximum potentials of such dealers are. It is but natural to expect that these sales representatives would do their best to reach their expected quotas and utilize any means they deem appropriate to push their company's sponsored TBA items. This is true despite statements made by the companies that their retail dealers have a freedom of choice as to what TBA items they may handle. I submit that H.R. 9894 would remedy this and be a solution of the problem.

In this connection, it is worthy of note that the sales representative is the one who contacts the service station operators in connection with lease renewals as well as with the sale of his company's products. An examination of the various leases for such service stations discloses that the matter of the renewal of such leases is optional only with the oil companies. In that respect such agreements are unilateral. Thus, in having the sales representative who regularly calls on the service stations, being at the same time in a position to tell the service station operator that he, the oil company's salesman, could decide whether or not the lease for a service station would or would not be renewed, is indeed a deplorable situation.

From this it can be readily gathered that the operator of a service station is under a tremendous pressure to comply with the demand, whether expressed or implied, of such sales representative that he handle the petroleum company's sponsored TBA items exclusively. Nor should it be forgotten that such small and independent service station operator has what is to him a considerable investment in his business which the petroleum company could wipe out with either a cancellation of the lease or through a refusal to renew. It is, therefore, apparent that the dealer operating his station under a lease from the oil company supplier is not in fact independent and is subject to control by the oil company supplier. The freedom of choice of the dealer with respect to the manner in which he operates his station is very much circumscribed by the economic power and might of his oil company supplier whether or not such power is specifically exercised against him.

The tremedous inequality of economic bargaining power between the major oil companies and their small retail service station operators can be gaged from the fact that these corporations rank among the largest and most powerful in the world.

The Fortune Directory of August 1959, which lists the 500 largest industrial corporations in the United States, ranked according to sales, shows the following petroleum companies:

Company	Rank	Sales	Assets
		Thousands	*Thousands*
Standard Oil (N.J.)	2	$7,543,571	$9,478,603
Socony Mobil Oil	6	2,885,684	3,237,328
Gulf Oil	7	2,769,377	3,430,019
Texaco	9	2,327,939	3,111,527
Standard Oil (Ind.)	14	1,863,990	2,769,317
Shell Oil	18	1,665,989	1,648,271
Standard Oil (Calif.)	19	1,559,160	2,451,069
Sinclair Oil	27	1,190,377	1,499,901
Phillips Petroleum	32	1,066,554	1,515,498
Cities Service	35	1,015,317	1,288,378
Sun Oil	47	721,773	666,927
Continental Oil	60	596,503	619,662
Tidewater Oil	62	552,944	810,731
Atlantic Refining	65	538,110	770,797
Pure Oil	80	473,362	534,966
Union Oil of California	96	408,033	684,558

In this connection we should consider the practically infinitesimal position, economically speaking, of the average gasoline service station operator. The Internal Revenue Service of the U.S. Treasury Department, published in May of this year, statistics of income from the income tax returns filed. I was most forcefully struck by the comparative meagerness of the financial returns of the proprietors of service stations.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue reports that an examination of income tax returns of 206,582 gasoline service stations under sole proprietorships showed they earned a net profit of only $564,154,000. Through a process of simple arithmetic—by dividing one of these numbers into another—one arrives at the figure $2,731, which represents the average net profit derived by a proprietor of a gasoline service station. These figures are the figures supplied by the U.S. Internal Revenue Service. Mind you, only $2,731 net profit for a year's compensation for backbreaking toil through long hours. This figure I submit, gentlemen, in these days of the high cost of living, is pitifully small indeed.

It is small wonder then that the turnover—that is, percentage of transferred and discontinued business—in the service station business is the highest in any principal business classification in our entire economy.

Figures released by the U.S. Department of Commerce during 1959, showed average annual service station turnover of 37 percent for each of the years 1957 and 1958.

It is abundantly clear that the petroleum companies hold the means of economic life or death of countless members of this segment of our small business economy.

It is on behalf of these small people that I appeal for protection against the economic might and power of the major oil companies. While I do not infer necessarily that bigness in itself is a sin, I submit that bigness does often sin. One should not forget that these small and independent operators of gasoline service stations have all their worldly goods invested in their businesses. Is it not natural to assume that these small people would readily bend to the pressure and coercive practices by the big corporations?

It is interesting to note that one of the hearing examiners of the Federal Trade Commission in *The Matter of B. F. Goodrich Company and The Texas Company* (FTC docket No. 6485), recognized that dealers appearing to testify were under considerable pressure because they were naturally interested in not jeopardizing the renewal of their leases.

The acts and practices of the petroleum suppliers which involve coercion of its dealers are prejudicial to the public interest and have a tendency and capacity to restrict, restrain, or lessen competition in the sale of TBA products and constitute unfair methods

of competition and unfair acts and practices in the commerce within the intent and meaning of the antitrust laws.

It is, therefore, the purpose of H.R. 9894 to remove the impediments to the distribution of TBA items in interstate commerce, which impediments arise from the dominance and control of the retail market by producers. This bill is designed to restore true, unfettered, and unsubsidized competition in the distribution of motor vehicle parts, equipment, accessories, and supplies through prohibiting the practices which have led to such impediments.

The antitrust laws are perhaps the most important statutes in the United States Code, and have become a part of the warp and woof of our economic fabric. These laws originated in an era of trusts and combinations, when predatory and monopolistic interests openly sought to control the marketplace by the suppression of competition. In the last analysis, such laws are really conservative enactments to preserve democratic capitalism. It is altogether proper and fitting that committees of both Houses of Congress, from time to time, give their attention to the way and manner in which these important statutes function so that they may be improved and amended in order to better fulfill their objectives.

H.R. 9894 is a logical measure designed to protect free and competitive enterprise. It is intended as a further implementation of the board aims and purposes of the antitrust laws in general. It is a truism that no free society can survive on any foundation other than one which guarantees a maximum of individual enterprise and a minimum of power in the hands of a few. The American tradition emphasizes not only private enterprise, but also competitive enterprise. The antitrust acts constitute both a symbol of this tradition and a significant contribution toward making it effective. All through the history of business enterprise it has been accepted as self-evident that personal and political liberties thrive best in those areas where economic freedom is protected and preserved.

H.R. 9894 is but a means to insure that the free enterprise system in the retail business of gasoline service stations be maintained and that coercive measures on the part of their suppliers be not utilized against such dealers. Therefore, I most earnestly urge that this subcommittee report this bill favorably to the full committee. The need for this legislation is urgent and I sincerely trust the full committee will recommend that this bill be enacted into law.

Federal Bureau of Investigation—V

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, the following article is the last of a series appearing in the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch relative to the outstanding record of the world's greatest law enforcement agency.

As a former special agent in the Federal Bureau of Investigation I am happy to have the opportunity to insert these articles in the RECORD. My respect and admiration for the Bureau and Mr. Hoover increases with the passage of time. The article follows:

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION—V

WASHINGTON.—Fact gathering is the reason we have an FBI.

It is currently charged with collecting facts regarding alleged violations of 160 Federal investigative matters assigned to the FBI.

Alphabetically these range from antitrust investigations to violations of the White Slave Traffic Act.

They include kidnapings, bank robberies, civil rights matters, crimes on Indian and Government reservations, thefts from interstate shipments, fraud against the Government, and other Federal offenses which have not been specifically assigned to other Federal investigative agencies.

The FBI has played a prominent role in the solution of many of the most vicious and baffling crimes.

The FBI solved the November 1, 1955, airplane explosion over Longmont, Colo., which tok the lives of 44 persons, including the mother of the criminal involved, John Gilbert Graham. Graham ultimately was executed for his part in wholesale murder, perpetrated by him in an attempt to collect insurance which he had taken out in connection with his mother's travel. It was he who secreted explosives in her luggage. Dynamite wrecked the airplane and took the lives of the innocent and unsuspecting victims.

On January 12, 1956, almost 6 years from the date of the $2,775,000 Brink's robbery in Boston, the FBI arrested six Boston hoodlums on charges of being members of the robbery gang.

All six men were convicted in State court. It is one of the most celebrated cases in FBI history and a clear example of the intensity of FBI investigation.

For sheer intensity of investigation consider the kidnaping of Charles Fletcher Mattson, 10, in December 1936.

Young Charles Mattson was kidnaped from his Tacoma, Wash., home and within a few days his nude body was discovered in a snowbank approximately 12 miles away.

The FBI entered the investigation—and stayed in.

Throughout the years there has been no indication of interstate transportation of the victim—an essential element in any Federal kidnaping violation. Nevertheless, inasmuch as the FBI came into the case at the beginning, it has remained in the case throughout the years.

As of this writing, this investigation constitutes one of the two unsolved major kidnaping cases encountered by the FBI.

In August 1956, the kidnaping of 1-month-old Peter Weinberger was solved by the FBI. Special agents had identified the handwriting of Angelo LaMarca on the kidnap notes after examining nearly 2 million handwriting specimens on public documents in the New York area.

Young Peter Weinberger was taken surreptitiously from a carriage near his home. An alert was sounded and the fact the Weinberger baby had been kidnaped became public knowledge.

Just about all of the evidence available to the FBI consisted of the ransom note. The FBI felt the need to identify this handwriting as quickly as possible. As a result, utility records and other public documents were checked, thus leading to the ultimate uncovering of LaMarca.

Since 1919, the FBI has been responsible for conducting investigations where stolen automobiles are transported across State lines. These offenses are on the increase. The fiscal year ending June 30, 1959, was a peak year. FBI investigations resulted in 5,198 convictions in auto theft cases, and in the location of 1,070 fugitives. During that same year, the FBI located stolen cars in 16,957 instances.

Definitely auto theft is big business. In its daily operations, the FBI is countering the efforts of professional thieves who change motor and serial numbers and otherwise alter cars and then put these motor vehicles back into legitimate traffic.

Cars stolen in the United States have been found in Oslo, Norway, in Turkey, Cuba, Mexico, Canada, and in other countries.

In one instance, the FBI recovered 148 stolen cars taken primarily from Eastern States and channeled into the automobile auction business in Southern States after the motor numbers had been changed. Generally fictitious titles had been provided.

In a number of instances, the so-called salvage racket has been employed. Under this clever arrangement, a thief approaches a junkyard and buys the remains of a wrecked motor vericle. Duirng the course of sale, he receives a valid title. Thereafter, he arranges to steal an identical car, following which he changes serial numbers to agree with those on the title papers. It is then relatively easy for him to arrange for this car to be sold in so-called legitimate commercial pursuits.

Although the FBI's jurisdiction is specifically limited according to certain congressional enactments, Presidential directives and instructions issued by the Attorney General, it nevertheless provides cooperative services to agencies representing municipal, county, and State law enforcement establishments. It is thus possible for the FBI to assist them in the better fullfillment of their responsibilities.

Law enforcement agencies in the Columbus area have been making extensive use of the FBI's training facilities.

The FBI provides lecturers on a regular basis to the Columbus Police Department in connection with both recruit and inservice training for experienced officers.

Sheriff Stacy Hall, of Franklin County, Ohio, not only uses FBI instructors consistently, but is most active in all FBI National Academy graduate functions.

Lt. Jerry Seigel, of the Franklin County sheriff's office, Sheriff Hall, Chief George W. Scholer, Captain Knight of the Columbus Police Department, Lt. Joseph Seryak, of the Ohio State Highway Patrol, Chief George Rice, of Chillicothe, and numerous other prominent law enforcement officials of this immediate area are graduates of the FBI National Academy.

This is a 12-week course at FBI headquarters established by Director J. Edgar Hoover in July 1935. Primary purpose of the training is to provide for career members of the law enforcement profession, particularly those who will serve as instructors for their departments and those who are career executives, a course of training designed to better fit them to fulfill their individual responsibilities.

This select "West Point of law enforcement" has graduated more than 3,000 police officials. The aim of the FBI is to make the school exclusive. It caters to the needs of carefully selected individuals of most deserving attributes who will be of maximum assistance to their local agencies.

Ohio graduates meet semiannually, generally in Columbus, for a 1-day refresher seminar.

Col. Scott B. Radcliffe, superintendent of the Ohio State Highway Patrol, invites FBI instructors to participate in each patrol school. So does the Columbus Police Department. The Buckeye State Sheriffs' Association regularly uses the FBI teaching staff.

The FBI National Academy is supplementary to the local schools conducted by the various field offices of the FBI. Each year the FBI conducts more than 100 separate schools in Ohio localities for the benefit of local agencies.

Law enforcement in the United States is well mobilized and dedicated not only to the preservation of our American way of life, but to the guarding of the public against the assaults of the criminal element.

Approximately 13,000 authorized agencies contribute fingerprint cards and identification data to the FBI. Because of this unified effort approximately 1,500 fugitives are identified each month by the FBI for law enforcement agencies. Fingerprints do it. Although the FBI has no jurisdiction to conduct investigations for "missing persons," notices are nevertheless posted by the identification division as a cooperative service. Each year hundreds of missing persons are located; many are restored to their families.

Series of law-enforcement conferences conducted by the FBI help to stimulate closer cooperation within the profession. They provide a medium for the mutual exchange of ideas and discussion of problems confronting law enforcement on all levels.

During 1960 nearly 200 law-enforcement conferences were held concerning auto theft. Conferences in 1959 related to interstate transportation of stolen property and jewel thefts.

In November and December 1958, the FBI sponsored a series of 176 law-enforcement conferences devoted to the problems of bombings and threats of bombings involving religious and educational institutions. In all, 8,112 officers representing 3,667 law-enforcement agenices attended. With characteristic foresight, Director Hoover ordered these conferences to be held in view of the bombing of the temple at Atlanta, Ga., and the bombing of a school in Tennessee. He foresaw the possibility of additional bombings and threats to bomb which might be outside of FBI jurisdiction. He wanted local agencies to clearly understand their individual responsibilities and the fact that these responsibilities were not transferable to other agencies.

With regard to bombs aboard interstate carriers, particularly aircraft and trains, the FBI has full jurisdiction. The FBI is also called upon to assist State and local agencies in connection with bombings and attempted bombings of religious and educational institutions. The facilities of the FBI identification division and laboratory are available, and the FBI will also cover out-of-State leads—those outside of the jurisdiction of the agency investigating the bombing.

The reputation the FBI has gained over the years as a frontline guardian against crime and subversion is the result of hard labor, selfless dedication, and many sacrifices.

The demands of any public servants are great, and the demands of service in the Federal Bureau of Investigation are, of necessity, rigorous and exacting. The men of the FBI are men of integrity interested in securing the facts and the facts only. Their only loyalty is in doing a good job—no matter what the violation involved.

They strive always to do that job, never for a moment neglecting the motto of the organization they serve—"Fidelity, Bravery, Integrity."

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, June 14, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, due to the insistence on the part of the Democratic Party leaders to ignore the taxpayers and suspend congressional work for purpose of their preconvention activity, I would call the attention of the Members to a very important commemorative occasion which deserves our complete attention and support.

I hope that we can all put aside partisan feelings and cooperate in the observance of Captive Nations Week, July 17–23, to display to the world the concern of individual U.S. Congressmen for lack of freedom that exists in these unfortunate countries now engulfed behind the Iron Curtain.

I need not remind you of the tragic consequences of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements that drove these people into political slavery. Groups of dedicated American citizens who are concerned with the plight of people in Roumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Yugoslavia, East Germany, Ukraine, and other segments of the Russian Empire will be using that week to remind all Americans of the desire to maintain interest in these Iron Curtain countries and work effectively toward their eventual freedom.

Since freedom is such a precious thing, we who often take its blessings for granted could learn much observing and understanding the suffering of those who have lost their freedom to the ruthless atheistic Communist regimes.

Captive Nations Week must be remembered by all of us. I appeal to you to give it your attention in the period between the national conventions.

Address of Congresman Harold R. Collier at National Serbian-American Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, because I believe it has timely significance, the text of an address given by my colleague, Representative HAROLD R. COLLIER, of the 10th District of Illinois, at the annual Serbian-American rally held at the Sherman Hotel in Chicago on Sunday, June 29, is inserted for reading by the Members of the House of Representatives:

On this occasion, it is fitting and proper to take you back to the historically eventful morning of March 25, 1941, when, shortly after 10 a.m., news broadcasts and wire services around the world carried word that Yugoslavia had signed a pact with the Axis nations.

At that time the Nazi war machine had rolled through Europe and the Balkan States were to be the inevitable victims of Hitler.

With this word the flame of freedom sputtered as if to die and the nation that had offered some ray of hope in resisting aggression seemed destined to fall.

Yet within this land there were 8 million Serbs who, as the author, Ruth Mitchell, stated in the title of her book published in 1943, "chose war" in preference to the servitude of tyranny.

This comparatively small, freedom-loving populace suffered the perils and the atrocities of this brutal epic in history, with a stubborn courage that is now legendary in World War II, as legendary as the name Mihajlovic.

Certainly it is not necessary for me to dwell upon the conditions under which the Serbs carried on their own war as a guerrilla fighting force, matched against one of the greatest organized armies in history.

I am sure that they will live on as long as the uncompromising desire for liberty and freedom remains in the hearts of Serbian people wherever they may be.

The story of the heroic fight of these people was not new to the Serbian nation, for the history of these people, which dated back so many centuries, was punctuated with a fight for survival.

Yes; we can go back to the year of 850, when the Serbs rose against Byzantium and formed an independent state under King Vlastimar.

Several times the Serbian state fought for its freedom, was conquered, but arose again.

Throughout history, up until the beginning of the 19th century, the Serbian national movement repeatedly gained new impetus.

In 1804 the Serbs first rose against their invaders and joined their Balkan neighbors to gain temporary liberation from the Turks after 400 years of domination.

Serbia was ruled intermittently by two rival dynasties, Obrenovich and Karageorgevich, until 1918. Under their reign, other parts of Old Rashka were liberated.

And so you can readily see, from this, that from 850 to the present time the Serbs have had, in all periods of their history, at least one independent Serbian state governed by the rulers who invariably spring from the people.

And, while Serbia no longer exists as an independent nation today, it certainly provides an object lesson, and perhaps even some encouragement to other freedom-loving human beings of all nationalities who may be today under the heel of totalitarian rule.

Throughout the centuries, the burning desire for freedom and independence has been characteristic of the Serbian people. In fact, their willingness to make any sacrifice to fulfill this desire under any conditions has shaped the course of history in the Balkans. And well it may shape the destiny of freemen in their struggle against oppression in the future.

In today commemorating the historic Battle of Kossovo in 1389 and recalling the epic of King Lazar we must pause and gather the full meaning of the motto of the Serbs at that time—"Golden Liberty and Holy Cross"—for no slogan of freedom-loving men was ever more indelibly written and none has been more lasting. The Serbs of that time knew that no birthright was more golden than liberty—the right of a man to be the master of his own destiny—to breathe as a freeman with the right to worship his God as he pleased. And that slogan must never die as long as there remains those of us who are dedicated to liberty, justice, and devotion of our Creator.

Reviewing, as we are, the story of a great struggle of a nation of people of this dedication, we can only hope and pray that we have learned a deep and lasting lesson from Yalta and Teheran—though certainly we may never be able to alleviate the sad plight of several nations which resulted from the policy of appeasement of tyrants in these historic meetings of the Big Four. May this lesson prevail in any and all future dealings of our heads of state with Communist leaders.

The plight of every captive nation today should be a warning to free nations of the threat which faces them in this great struggle for the minds of man—a struggle that

demands vigilance against the threat of godless communism.

For communism, no matter how decentralized it may be, offers no compromise of freedom and certainly not the heritage which has long been our birthright as Americans.

In Yugoslavia today, despite the variation or diversion from the Kremlin hierarchy, there can be no dispute that the Communist Party, built upon the philosophy of Marxism, maintains control over the economy of the country.

And let there be no mistake that the Communist Party is still the only party permitted Marshal Tito in that country.

We know, too, that the party utilizes the national trade union, Sindikat, to control the workers' councils and this group absolutely dominates the worker-management system.

That progress is being made under a Communist system which is allegedly, or at least temporarily, divorced from that of the U.S.S.R. is not to believe that it has anything in common with democracy.

In the past several years, we have seen communism as a way of life make disappointing inroads in many parts of the world.

Only the strength and determination of those who believe in American ideals has maintained the balance which exists today. It is this kind of strength and determination which has sparked this meeting today—and which must never die in the future.

Whether within the framework of decentralized Marxism as it exists in Yugoslavia today there is any ray of hope that the system will ultimately collapse under its own weight and yield to a system devised by freemen is yet problematical.

More important, however, in a broad understanding of communism today, is the Soviet pattern and the tentacles of this economic octupus which are stretching, too often in camouflage, into unsuspecting corners of the world.

Free nations and free people will remain so only as long as they are vigilant of the threat of the Kremlin.

To ignore the fact of Czechoslovakia, and the story of Budapest written in the blood of freedom fighters is sheer folly.

To fail to understand the spy system of the Soviet Union or to minimize it in the face of recent international incidents which embraced the U–2 episode, the summit collapse and the demonstrations in Japan, would be catastrophic thinking on the part of the American, singular or collective, vividly brought home in Cuba and China.

One week and 1 day from tomorrow, the people of this Nation will celebrate the 183d anniversary of America's independence.

We have engaged in two great wars since the turn of the century to preserve this independence and to make the world safe for democracy.

Yet today we are still engaged in a struggle, one in which the Soviet leaders are employing the threat of might and the cunning of deceit and propaganda to undermine our determination to remain free.

While, perhaps, we are too inclined to accept this blessing of freedom that we have maintained for 184 years, certainly the average Russian must be as bitterly disgusted and weary of world conditions as we are.

For as human beings, created by the will of God, they must resent, though they dare not protest, the menacing shouts that issue from the Kremlin.

And their nerves must be ragged by now because this continuous threat is added to a standard of living far below our own.

Today and every day, and particularly on this coming Independence Day, it would seem that we must rededicate ourselves to keeping intact the freedoms which our forefathers won and so many boys have died to keep.

And remember, too, on this memorable day, how bitterly our ancestors fought to leave a legacy of freedom in a world plagued with a determined move to communize it, we dare not be complacent.

While the world is at the crossroads, I believe that time is running out for the masters of the Kremlin and that time, in other words, is on our side.

If we are patient and determined, and if we are willing to make sacrifices to keep ourselves strong and free here at home, and if we do not allow ourselves to be bluffed into appeasement, we and the millions like us around the world can preserve our own independence and offer the light of hope to those behind the Iron Curtain.

I believe that God has so willed it.

Further Reduction in Tariff Rates Could Sound the Death Knell for Many American Industries

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, American industry is vitally concerned with the hearings to be conducted by the U.S. Tariff Commission beginning July 11, 1960. Many industrial and manufacturing firms fear that further reductions will be made in tariff rates and thus add to the economic woe of basic industries throughout the entire Nation. There is also grave concern over the action that may be taken by the Committee for Reciprocity Information in a further reduction of tariff rates at the conference in Geneva next September. Already many American manufacturers have submitted briefs to both the US Tariff Commission and to the Committee for Reciprocity Information which is an interdepartmental committee of the Tariff Commission.

For the past several years I have repeatedly called the attention of the House of Representatives to the plight of American industries caused by flooding the American marketplace with cheaply manufactured foreign goods that rob American wage earners of their jobs and hence their means of earning a livelihood.

Among my many efforts to curb the uncontrolled importation of foreign goods manufactured at slave labor wages was the introduction on January 21, 1960, of H.R. 9841, a bill designed to adjust conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States. The proposed legislation was drafted in cooperation with Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, Representative of New York, who introduced the bill in the U.S. Senate as S. 2882. It is regretted that it has not been possible during the past six months to obtain action by the House Ways and Means Committee on the Keating-Van Zandt version of legislation needed to curb the evil effects of flooding the United States with foreign-made goods manufactured at slave labor wages.

In addition to writing to the Committee for Reciprocity Information regarding the need to delete from the public list many products of our domestic manufacturers that if subjected to a further reduction of tariff rates will result in real chaos, I have also written to the U.S. Tariff Commission concerning the plight of the Rockwell Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa., which manufactures several products among which are taxi meters and water and gas meters all of which have been adversely affected by the sharp reduction in tariff rates.

Since hearings are scheduled to begin before the U.S. Tariff Commission on July 11 and are expected to continue for 6 weeks, I have written the Commission in support of the views of Ralph K. Ulrich, vice president, Rockwell Register Corp., and sales manager, Register Division, Rockwell Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa. Mr. Ulrich submitted a statement on June 27, 1960, to the U.S. Tariff Commission in which he clearly explains the inequitable situation that has resulted from the tariff reduction in 1951 which slashed tariff rates 50 percent on taxi meters or parts thereof, finished or unfinished. Mr. Ulrich points out that from the standpoint of the dollar volume, imports increased from $5,848 in 1951 to $38,436 in 1952 and since that time the average annual imports have climbed to over $92,000. Additional statements regarding other products will be filed by the Rockwell Manufacturing Co., in time for the July hearings.

It is significant to state that the production of taxi meters is only one of the many products manufactured by the Rockwell Co., which is one of the most highly respected industrial concerns in the Nation. This particular company which operates a modern plant in my congressional district at Du Bois, Pa., made an enviable record during World War II and the Korean conflict through its contribution to the war effort. The firm which employs highly skilled mechanics proved its ability to retool with surprising speed and engage in Government contracts requiring a high degree of precision work.

Mr. Speaker, it is unthinkable that the Federal Government, through ill-conceived reductions in tariff rates, would endanger the future operation of firms like the Rockwell Manufacturing Co., whose reservoir of highly skilled mechanics may well be needed should further national emergencies arise that threaten the security of this Nation. At this point in my remarks I wish to include my letter of July 1, 1960, to Mr. Donn N. Bent, secretary of the U.S. Tariff Commission, together with the statement filed June 27, 1960, by Mr. Ralph K. Ulrich, vice president, Rockwell Register Corp. and sales manager, register division, Rockwell Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

It is my fervent hope that both the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information will

weigh well the factual information being submitted by various American manufacturers against further tariff reductions, because unless the precarious situation confronting American industry is fully recognized and a tendency to reduce tariff rates is curbed the future is bleak for many firms throughout the Nation who find themselves helpless to compete against the inroads being made by cheaply manufactured foreign goods now flooding the American marketplace. The letter and statement referred to in the preceding paragraph follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., July 1, 1960.

Re Rockwell Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mr. DONN N. BENT,
Secretary, U.S. Tariff Commission,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SIR: Since DuBois, Pa., is in my congressional district and the Clearfield-DuBois area is among the two areas in Blair and Clearfield Counties that have been certified for the past several years as labor surplus areas by the U.S. Department of Labor, a great amount of time and effort has been devoted by me in trying to rehabilitate the economy of that section of Pennsylvania.

My reason in stressing the chronic unemployment problem which continues to plague my congressional district is due to the fact that it is among the labor surplus areas in the Nation frequently referred to by President Eisenhower as "pockets of unemployment" in contrast to a measure of prosperity enjoyed in other areas of the Nation.

It is against the above-described background of unemployment that I write you in support of the plea of the Rockwell Manufacturing Co. with respect to the menacing situation that prevails because of the marked increase since 1951 in the importation of foreign-made taximeters. In this connection, under date of June 17 the Rockwell Manufacturing Co. wrote you and furnished 20 copies of a written statement relative to the Tariff Commission hearings scheduled to begin July 11, 1960. The request was made for permission to appear at the public hearings at which time Mr. Ralph K. Ulrich, vice president, Rockwell Register Corp. and sales manager of the Rockwell Manufacturing Co., would appear as a witness.

The Rockwell Manufacturing Co. has a plant located at DuBois, Pa., in my congressional district, where it is recognized as one of the key industries in that area. Therefore, I am deeply interested in the plea that no further reduction be made in the existing tariff rate on taximeters.

It is significant to state at this point that since the 1951 reduction of the tariff rate on "taximeters or parts thereof, finished or unfinished," from 85 percent to 42½ percent, the importation of lower priced foreign-made taximeters has increased by leaps and bounds.

For example, the Department of Commerce reveals that following the reduction of the tariff on taximeters by one-half in 1951, a marked increase occurred in the importation of foreign-made taximeters. In 1951, total imports amounted to $5,848; while in 1952 the volume increased to $38,436. It should be emphasized at this point that since 1952, the average annual imports have skyrocketed to $92,000. It is evident that the reduced tariff rate has not only seriously affected the domestic taximeter manufacturer but any further concessions to foreign manufacturers would sound the death knell to the industry in the United States.

I wish to emphasize my grave concern over any attempt to further reduce the tariff rate and to urge that serious consideration be given to the plight of the domestic taximeter industry in the wake of the 1951 tariff reduction which has had adverse effects on firms like the Rockwell Manufacturing Co. It is my considered judgment that the tariff rate should be adjusted upward; otherwise the taximeter industry is facing extinction.

In conclusion, I should like to have this letter made part of the public hearings and at the same time recall to public attention the great part played by the taximeter industry during recent wars when its highly skilled mechanics filled the urgent need for the precision work required in manufacturing war material and equipment which demanded the utmost in skill and dexterity.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. VAN ZANDT.

STATEMENT OF RALPH K. ULRICH, VICE PRESIDENT, ROCKWELL REGISTER CORP., AND SALES MANAGER, REGISTER DIVISION, ROCKWELL MANUFACTURING CO., PITTSBURGH, PA., SUBMITTED TO SECRETARY, U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, WASHINGTON, D.C., JUNE 27, 1960

COMMISSION HEARING

(Schedule 3, metals and manufactures 368(g) taximeters and parts thereof, finished and unfinished.)

The Rockell-Ohmer taximeter is produced by the register division of Rockwell Manufacturing Co. The Ohmer taximeter, the most widely used domestic taximeter in this country, has been known to the taxicab industry for over 45 years. Because of our desire to continue in the taximeter business and to insure the continued employment of highly skilled labor, we are making this statement to point out certain facts and figures covering the danger of any further tariff reduction on taximeters imported into the United States. We are also covering the extremely precarious position of this industry because of the low priced competition from overseas which exists today under the existing tariff rate.

Since it is our understanding that the function of the Commission is to make a "peril point" investigation as provided in section 3 of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1951, as amended, we are confident that it is not the intent of this Commission to take action which would lead to further serious curtailment in the manufacure and sales of domestic taximeters.

We will herein produce evidence that since the reduction in 1951 of the tariff rate on "taximeters or parts thereof, finished or unfinished," from 85 percent to 42½ percent, lower priced foreign-made taximeters have been imported in increasing quantities which have become alarming to American taximeter manufactulrers.

2. Because of the nature of the taxicab industry the taximeter business is limited in size. There are approximately 69,000 licensed taxicabs in 484 cities over 25,000 population in the United States, 11,860 or over one-sixth of which are in New York City. Of these 69,000 taxicabs approximately 52,000 are metered. The remainder operate on a zone rate basis. It is estimated there are over 50,000 taxicabs in cities and towns under 25,000 population, relatively few of which are or will be metered because of what is considered a reasonably satisfactory flat rate operation. There are perhaps 12,000 taximeters in use in the larger size small cities under 25,000 population, making a grand total of approximately 64,000 taximeters in use.

Since anticipated life expectancy of taximeters extends over an average of 12 to 15 years, the annual replacement requirements of the industry will not exceed from 4,000 to 5,000 units. Additional new meter sales will vary depending upon conditions and upon additional cities changing over from zone to metered rates. There has been practically no increase in the number of licensed taxicabs in use during recent years which would indicate no anticipated expansion in the industry in the foreseeable future.

3. It is evident from figures made available to us by the Department of Commerce that following the reduction of the tariff on taximeters by one-half in July 1951, foreign manufacturers of taximeters have found it very profitable to sell in this country. In 1951 the total dollar value of imports under this category amounted to $5,848. In 1952 imports were $38,436. Since 1952 the average annual imports have amounted to over $92,000 which represents an alarming percent of the estimated number of units sold annually by the industry. Please refer to exhibit I for data on imports by years from various countries.

Since 1954 the Department of Commerce has not provided us with detailed figures of the number of units imported from each particular country. However, based on 1952 and 1953 reports, it is evident that manufacturer's selling prices c.i.f. New York varied from $37 to $90 with the most popular models averaging $50 to $65 per unit.

4. Because of the importance of New York City as a market for taximeters, importers of foreign-made meters have so far concentrated their efforts in this area. It is estimated that already nearly half of the taximeters in use in New York City are of foreign manufacture with the percent increasing at an alarming rate. On an annual basis, it is estimated that over 65 percent of New York City taximeter sales are foreign-made taximeters. Our new meter sales in New York City have dropped continuously since low priced foreign-made meters were introduced in 1951; whereas otherwise, on a national basis we have maintained a fairly uniform volume of taximeter business. It gives the domestic taximeter manufacturer the feeling of gravest concern to anticipate just how soon the same paralyzing results will be duplicated in other sections of the United States.

5. The intricate construction of the taximeter results in a high labor content of the final product. The Commission is, of course, familiar with the differences in wage rates as between the United States and countries in Western Europe and Japan. For example, the wage rate for a skilled operator in Sweden is 94 cents, in Germany it is 55 cents, and in Japan it is 25 cents. This compares with our wage rate of about $2.50 per hour. For this reason foreign-made taximeters can be supplied to the United States at generally less than half of the production costs of American manufacturers, and it is not possible for the domestic industry to compete with imported products on the same basis. In an effort to meet foreign competition, U.S. manufacturers of taximeters have been forced to forego normal price increases since 1951. However, in the period 1951–60 labor costs have increased by 46.7 percent according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. At current prices profits in the taximeter industry are extremely discouraging.

6. The 1951 tariff reduction has already given foreign manufacturers a definite advantage in the U.S. market to the point where the existence of the entire industry is seriously threatened. My company manufactures a variety of products, and the discontinuation of our taximeter production, while it would cause us to suffer a serious capital loss of our investment in plant, machinery, tools, and dies specifically designed for the manufacture of taximeters, and in the good will and reputation of this Rockwell-Ohmer product, which has been developed over 45 years, it would not seriously effect our organization as such. We believe that, if necessary, we can protect our shareholders by having our meter manufactured in Europe and arrange for importation and distribution in this country. We cannot, of

course, insure and protect the employment of the highly skilled mechanics who have specialized in the manufacture of taximeters over many years. We believe that our position is an exception in the industry, which is mainly composed of a number of small, well-managed companies concentrating exclusively on the production of taximeters. For these other companies, the perilous position in which the industry finds itself today is far more serious. They may be faced with the closing down of their entire plants and organizations.

7. You will note from exhibit 1 that our major foreign competitors are in Sweden and Germany. In each case we are concerned with one single manufacturer in Sweden and one manufacturer in Germany. Both companies are large, highly capitalized industrial organizations, employing several thousand. The previous tariff reduction in 1951 has given them a definite price advantage over the local industry, and they have already obtained a substantial share of the U.S. market for taximeters. Any further reduction of the tariff on taximeters can have only one result and one intention, and that is the virtual dissolution of this American industry, largely composed of small individual American businesses. Two manufacturers have discontinued the taximeter business during the past 5 years. One, the Pittsburgh Taximeter Co., had been one of the leading manufacturers of taximeters for many years.

8. As previously stated, there are approximately 64,000 taximeters in use in this country. If the U.S. taximeter industry is forced out of business, individual operators and owners would have great difficulty in maintaining these meters due to their inability of securing spare and replacement parts.

9. The U.S. taximeter industry is composed of four manufacturers supplying the domestic market, and while this industry may not appear to be large as such, its importance in wartime and periods of national emergency is out of all proportion to its size. During World War II, the Ohmer Corp. (which is now the Register Division of the Rockwell Manufacturing Co.) produced the Servo motor assemblies for the Norden bombsight, aircraft gun-turret controls for the flying fortress, control (steering) columnns for the B-29 superfortress, and other bombers, components for radar equipment, and many miscellaneous aircraft parts and subassemblies which call for extreme precision working abilities up to .0002 of an inch. We have in our file citations from practically every segment of the Armed Forces, testifying to the skill and precision of our employees in governmental contracts.

During the Korean emergency this division likewise carried out contracts involving precision work in connection with the manufacture of oxygen regulators and other complex defense production items. We feel certain that this Commission would not wish to be responsible for the loss of the skill and availability of these essential keymen in the event of a future emergency.

EXHIBIT I

Imports of taximeters and parts thereof into the United States of America

Year	Country of origin	Units	Value in U.S. dollars	Total annual value in U.S. dollars
1951	Sweden	86	5,848	5,848
1952	do	553	29,862	
	Germany	53	3,498	
	Japan	2	160	38,436
1953	Sweden	383	34,775	
	Germany	209	15,773	
	Japan	2	160	
	United Kingdom	1	37	
	Switzerland	1	122	50,867
1954	Sweden	(1)	46,254	
	Japan	(1)	28,088	
	Germany	(1)	19,220	93,562
1955	Sweden	(1)	90,718	
	Germany	(1)	77,662	168,380
1956	Sweden	(1)	13,541	
	West Germany	(1)	77,123	
	Other	(1)	7,161	97,825
1957	Sweden	(1)	14,125	
	West Germany	(1)	36,159	
	Other	(1)	5,013	55,297
1958	Sweden	(1)	15,547	
	West Germany	(1)	52,758	
	Japan	(1)	8,274	76,579
1959	Sweden	(1)	44,527	
	West Germany	(1)	60,329	104,856

Imports of taximeters and parts thereof into the United States of America—Con.

[1] Not available.

NOTE.—These figures are taken from U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census Reports FT-110 U.S. Imports of Foreign Merchandise Schedule A.

Title: Slovaks Commemorate 1,100th Anniversary of Sts. Cyril and Methodius

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 22, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, there are in my First Congressional District of Wisconsin, many groups of descendants of the fine racial stocks of middle-European peoples. Many of these fled oppression and tyranny. Many of them migrated to this country because their great skills as craftsmen were known and they came to help in the building of our young country. For whatever reason they came, they and their descendants have made great and wonderful contribution to the building of this country, to the framing of its doctrines of freedom, the forming of its attitudes of charity and love of peace, to the development of its rugged and forthright character, and to its religious nature and faith. They have made great contribution to our culture, to our music, our dancing, and our folklore. The United States of America is truly blessed in history to have been able to provide the land and the haven to these fine people, amongst them, the tremendously colorful and robustly freedom loving, deeply religious Slovaks.

There are many Slovaks in my district. Their contribution to Wisconsin and to the Nation as a whole has been great, yet they have retained much of the culture of their native land. Colorful Slovak costumes are still worn at weddings and christenings. Their dances are beautiful, sometimes lively and lusty, sometimes slow and graceful, always exciting. Their musicians play most wonderful Slovak music. I had the greatest pleasure recently of witnessing these folk expressions at the National Folk Festival here in Washington last month—and I tell you it was an experience long to be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my rising today to address this House, this symbol of the free United States, is to join in the commemoration of an anniversary precious in the hearts of this stout and rugged people who, for more than a thousand years have fought for freedom, and through the greatest tribulations have held fast to their aspirations and their deep religious fervor. The Slovaks on July 4, National Slovak Day, whether at home or abroad, whether free or still in bondage, will commemorate as they have for centuries, that great moment in history when the intrepid and beloved Saints, Cyril and Methodius, left Macedonia to bring the religion of Christ to this group of Western Slavs in the shadows of the Tatra Mountains, more than 1,100 years ago. Just as the Irish venerate St. Patrick, the Poles cherish St. Stanislaus, and the Welsh revere St. David, so do the Slovaks pay honor and tribute to Methodius, first bishop of their beloved Nitra, and to his scholarly brother Cyril, the inventor of the first Slavic alphabet.

It is particularly fitting that the Slovaks' "great day" should be a religious anniversary. Anyone who is familiar with their magnificent history and has drunk deeply of their folklore in song and story, could not expect it to be otherwise. For, to a Slovak, religion and freedom are concomitant; love of country and devotion to God go hand in hand. In all of their turbulent and colorful history, Slovaks have held steadfastly to their faith, and no amount of oppression, however long or arduous, has been able to stamp out their yearning for liberty and freedom.

I would like to quote briefly from a short history of Slovakia written by nostalgic Slovakians in this country:

Along the northern shore of the central Danube where the eastern slopes of the Alps touch the western slopes of the Carpathian Mountains lies a country unknown to many Americans.

It was the first organized state in central Europe, a busy, noisy crossroads for nations seeking a home in the early centuries of the Christian era.

The country and its people from these earliest times to the present have had to deal with conquerors and tyrants, to win the necessities of life from a stubborn soil and through it all hold on to their growing culture, freedom of spirit, and way of life.

The Slovaks belong to the group of western Slavs and are one of the oldest historical nations in that sector of Europe. Already in the ninth century, they developed the first independent statehood known as the Kingdom of Great Moravia (A.D. 830-907). Even at the time of their subsequent incorporation into the Kingdom of Hungary, their Christian faith and political endurance was tested many times during the incursions of the Tartars in the 13th and of the Turks during the 16th and 17th centuries. In these struggles for national soil and cultural heritage they developed strong aspirations for independence. * * *

Even though its beautiful land serves as a huge prison behind the Iron Curtain, the Slovak Nation has not lost, but continues to confess fearlessly, its faith in God as the source of its strength and hope.

When the forefathers of our Slovak fellow citizens came to this country, it

was not, therefore, just by chance that they were endowed with solid potentials for fine American citizenship. For one quality they had in abundance—faith. Religion for them was not just an isolated phase of their lives. Their devotion to God was an integral part of their lives and the more than 300 parishes in America founded by Slovaks and their descendants serve as eloquent testimony to their rich spiritual heritage. And it was this very heritage, coupled with the Slovakian love for liberty that has made it possible for them to integrate themselves so firmly in our American democracy and to understand so well the essentials of loyal citizenship. A good Slovak could not help but be a good American because he has always known his true relationship with God, that man is a creation of God and is graced with qualities that are his, at birth, as a special gift from God.

In these days of intellectual and moral confusion, we ought to ponder the lustrous words of the Declaration of Independence. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In all history, of all the nations, the real national strength has been powered by a spiritual dynamism. The decay of nations is rarely the product of material deterioration or defeat in armed conflict. These are results, not causes. A nation really decays when it begins to weaken in its spiritual motivation. To continue strong, a nation must have faith in its traditions if it is to have faith in itself, and each citizen must feel he partakes of these traditions. All lovers of liberty can well emulate the doughty inhabitants of Slovakia today and for centuries past, who have refused to live under enslavement by the Turks and Magyars, and who will in the end repudiate the hammer and sickle for the torch of liberty. Each Slovak identifies himself with these traditions of love of liberty, knowledge of man's creation by and in the image of God, and, therefore, an inviolable entity not to be enslaved by other men. Each Slovak cherishes the memory of the great Sts. Cyril and Methodius, who taught and led his ancestors into the ways of faith and knowledge of freedom's meaning.

Our Slovak fellow citizens are possessed of a magnificent heritage, one which we all can cherish and take to ourselves with pride as part of the tradition which makes the United States great. We can take pride, with them, in a tradition which rejects enslavement of the spirit by whatever means, and in these turbulent days, hold on to this simple faith, holding our heads high, humbly proud in the knowledge of the heritage that is America. That heritage is in good hands when it is entrusted to the likes of the more than 1½ million Americans of Slovak descent. We have no nobler destiny than this, as Americans, to follow in the footsteps of such as these free spirits. I, too, and you, can thus cherish and take for our own, the great inspiration of wondrous men and great spiritual leaders such as the saints, Methodius and Cyril, whose lives the Slovaks are memorializing on July 4, our own Independence Day.

The Passing of a Great American—B. C. McElroy, Sr., of Marshall, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 23, 1960, the hearts of Texans were saddened by the passing of a great American, Benjamin Cameron McElroy, Sr., at Marshall, Tex.

Mr. McElroy, 85, had lived a long, full and useful life. He served as postmaster at Marshall for 15 years, retiring from that position at the close of 1949. Few citizens have served in as many civic undertakings and he was the fifth president of Marshall's Chamber of Commerce. He was a director of the First National Bank, on the board of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association, was an honorary Rotarian, for many years was a director of the Compress Association of Texas, and took an active part in various other Marshall undertakings.

Many beautiful tributes have been paid to him, but one editorial tribute in particular by Millard Cope, publisher of the Marshall News Messenger, I would like to include at this point. I concur wholeheartedly with the statement. The life of Benjamin Cameron McElroy, Sr., was dedicated to helping his fellowmen. His community, his county, the State and the Nation will be poorer by his absence.

The editorial is as follows:

B. C. McELROY

The death of B. C. McElroy closes a Marshall career that began more than half a century ago, when he came here as compress manager, and during which few persons became so deeply endeared to the entire community.

Time after time Marshall showed its appreciation and respect for Mr. McElroy, honoring him in various ways as he devoted time, efforts and talents to community progress; always kindly, always friendly, always lending a helping hand to a friend.

For a decade and a half he served Marshall as postmaster, after years in the cotton compress and other business ventures. It was as postmaster that he was best known to the present generation, until his retirement at the close of 1949; but old-timers remember his activity with the cotton compress and his activity in every field of business and civic enterprise.

After more years of service as a director of the First National Bank than any other, he was named an honorary director when illness prevented his attending board meetings. Like honors were paid him by the board of directors of the First Federal Savings & Loan Association when he no longer was able to be active in the organization. The rotary club, too, made him an honorary member in tribute to his long loyalty to the club.

He and the late Col. Myron G. Bialock teamed together as the Marshall Chamber of Commerce team responsible for highway development here and in this area, his efforts being to bring people to Marshall. Mr. McElroy was the fifth president of the chamber of commerce and for years was active on the highway committee, as well as in other phases of activity.

He became widely known in the cotton compress field in his earlier years, being honored by the State association in election to the board of directors. He was an outstanding layman, serving for many years on the vestry of Trinity Episcopal Church, and, just as he received so many honors locally from those who appreciated his efforts, he drew praise from James A. Farley as Postmaster General for his outstanding service to the patrons of the Marshall Post Office.

Mr. McElroy's contributions to Marshall were broad and varied, always with a human touch, and he devotedly served on the city's interracial committee that for so many years gave this community a high distinction for its understanding between the races.

Mr. McElroy was a friend of all. Kind, considerate, helpful, and devoted to his friends, Mr. McElroy's life was one for which Marshall shall always be grateful and appreciative. His deeds shall serve as a monument to his efforts. None did so much for so many, always unselfish; always striving for a better community in which to live; always constructive; and never with malice. No Marshall citizen has left a finer example for the generations to come.

Left to carry on in his place are a fine son, Cameron McElroy, Jr., who is chairman of the board of an international engineering concern—Turnbull, Inc.; a grandson, Cameron McElroy III, of Dallas; and two great grandchildren, Cameron McElroy IV, and Mary Lucille McElroy. His gracious and devoted wife also survives.

Fifty-Star Flag

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., on June 29, 1960, pertaining to the first official 50-star banner:

NEW FLAG THIS FOURTH

A ceremony at 11 o'clock on the morning of July 4 will give the final official recognition to the new State of Hawaii and the first salute to the new flag of these United States. The Quartermaster Corps, as required by law, will produce the first official 50-star banner and by tradition a unit of U.S. Marines, in colonial uniforms, will raise the national emblem over Independence Hall in Philadelphia.

From that moment on, the continental Nation and its two sister outposts will be as one. A larger, and certainly far richer, family of States than dreamed of by the men who met in Philadelphia 184 years ago to weld the final link in the chain of freedom they had so laboriously begun many years before. This land was a virgin one

then not much exposed to the settlements nor tameness of man.

Its natural wealth, exposed and hidden, added greatly to the enthusiasm of the sparse population of 1776. The richness of the land, the attraction of its endless forests and the very newness of its political freedom invited men to explore the vast terrain they could call their own. Little unexplored acreage remains today, but the undeveloped wealth and potential challenges of this land to its inhabitants remain undiminished.

Observers from the original Independence Hall era would find it disheartening to see to what extent Americans of the 20th century depend upon the Government for many necessities and some luxuries. But the Revolutionary Fathers would be pleased by the results of nearly two centuries of American initiative and industry.

In 1776 the United States was a loosely knit collection of a few fledgling States, each of them poor to a greater or lesser degree. This seed grew into the greatest stronghold of individual liberty human history has recorded.

Shall it be the destiny of the present generation, or the one now growing to maturity, or the one which will follow, to begin the dissolution of the American dream? There are men of influence today, as there were in 1776, who prefer other systems. Will their unrelenting attempts to divert the aims of the Founding Fathers into more confining channels be shunted aside in the future?

Anniversary of Philippine Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the independence of the Philippines the 4th of July, I wish to extend my warmest congratulations and best wishes to His Excellency, the President, Mr. Carlos P. Garcia, His Excellency the Ambassador, Mr. Carlos Romulo, and all the people of the Philippines.

Perhaps the most significant, modern feature the Philippines has so characteristically unfolded to the world is her recent attainment as the site for the first World Tourist Conference in Asia and the Pacific Area. Already quite renowned in travel lore as the "Pearl of the Orient," the Philippines have contributed immeasurably toward the drive to advance the cause of peaceful progress.

Advancing steadily into the climb of the jet age, as seen in the amalgam of her architecture, traditions, mores, and art, not to mention those intangibles in her national life that has made her nation the first in Asia to emerge from colonialism to independence after the Second World War, she has humbly accepted the best from other cultures to embellish her own nation, molding and enriching the Philippines she is today.

Nurturing her wounds suffered from the ravages of war, the Philippines have risen above her shortcomings and is counted today as one of the robust working democracies in the community of the free world. Formerly crippled, today she now stands firmly under the inspiring leadership of President Carlos P. Garcia, with her own government attending her own problems to secure her people with the maximum internal stability and prosperity.

She has lifted the veil of the mystic East to swing open her doors of hospitality to correct the deeply rooted traditions and fears inspired by ideological conflicts and political antagonisms.

A beacon, indeed, to world peace, the Philippines are certainly to be congratulated on this memorable day of their independence.

Landmarks an Asset

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as an extension of my remarks in the RECORD today I include a very interesting and informative editorial from the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Wednesday, June 29, 1960:

LANDMARKS AN ASSET

Announcement that the Swetland House will be opened again to the public on July 1 recalls to the community the generosity and farsightedness of Mrs. Franck F. Darte, of Wilkes-Barre, who gave the house to Wyoming Historical and Geological Society, provided for its renovation and furnishing and then, through a substantial endowment, assured permanent preservation of the landmark which is so intimately connected with the history of Wyoming Valley.

Mrs. Darte's gift has done much to enhance the stature of the community and prestige of the historical society.

Progress, as it is sometimes termed, has caused the loss of many landmarks in Wyoming Valley. From a multitude of examples, only a few need be cited to make this point. Older residents will remember the Pickering house, which stood on South Main Street, Wilkes-Barre, the Exchange Hotel, and the original Hoyt house, both of which stood on Wyoming Avenue, Kingston. All three have been razed in the past 30 years to make way for commercial development.

The Pickering house was the home of Timothy Pickering who was adjutant general to George Washington during the Revolution and later held posts in Washington's Cabinet and, until 1811, served as a U.S. Senator.

The Hoyt house, built by Ziba Hoyt, one of the region's earliest settler, was the boyhood home of Henry Martyn Hoyt who served as Governor of the Commonwealth from 1872 until 1876. The Exchange Hotel, built around 1800, was probably the oldest public building in northeastern Pennsylvania.

Fortunately, proponents of progress, who formerly gave little thought to the preservation of historic sites, are becoming aware that landmarks, such as the Swetland House, have more than a curiosity value. They form an important link in the chain of our local and national heritage and connect us with a past of which we can be proud.

There are few in the community who are unaware of the history of the Swetland House and of Luke Swetland—Mrs. Darte's great-great-great-grandfather—who came here before the American Revolution and built the house at the turn of the last century. For those who are unaware, Mrs. Darte's gift assures them the opportunity to learn, and the generations which will follow us will be able to say "There is the Swetland House" rather than "the Swetland House stood here."

Tax Used as Gag on Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Evening Herald, Rock Hill, S.C., of June 27, 1960:

TAX USED AS GAG ON FREEDOM

Earlier this year, the Evening Herald editorially lashed out at an Internal Revenue Service ruling that advertising to air political views was not tax deductible.

The test case was one against an electric company which tried to deduct expenses for advertisement in which the company had tried to warn the public about Federal encroachment. The Evening Herald agreed with the company stand that it was a business expense in that it was trying to protect the company's business.

The Evening Herald called the ruling "censorship by taxation."

A speech under the same title was delivered this month before the Arkansas Press Association. It was delivered by Alex H. Washburn, editor and publisher of the Hope (Ark.) Star.

Washburn gave a personal example of how he had tried to deduct from his income tax $6,000 which he spent in circulating a petition for a vote on the law exempting livestock and poultry feed from State sales tax. He said it was important to his business because it is in competition with sales-tax-free Texarkana, only 34 miles away.

The Internal Revenue Service said he could not deduct the expense and he is now fighting it in court.

He said: "The Treasury long ago collected income tax on the $6,000 I spent in the 1955 petition campaign. Of that money, $3,000 went to the canvassers who circulated the petition, $1,500 to lawyers, and $500 to Little Rock printers—and all these people paid income tax on these receipts, or were liable for same under the law.

"Now the Government attempts to double its take on that $6,000—claiming a second tax from me, who spent the money instead of receiving it. Merely because I went over the State with a petition and implemented an editorial fight I had been waging in my newspaper for years.

"I repeat: This is not a matter of income tax—the income tax law is merely the instrument by which the Federal Government is seeking to censor and fine a newspaper editor.

"An Asiatic dictator would send his police to handle a hostile editor—but not in America. In America we are enlightened. In America we send in the tax collector, to make the same threats, and do the same job."

This is not just the newspaper's fight. It affects everyone.

Taxes are collected on so-called lobbying expense, upon money spent to plead for justice to the public through advertise-

ments, and upon dues paid to organizations which spend part of the time advocating improvement or changes in governmental agencies.

It conceivably could affect everyone who pays dues to an outfit like the National Education Association or the American Legion, whose representatives spend much of their time talking to Congressmen.

A bill by Representative HALE BOGGS, Democrat, of Louisiana, has been favorably reported out of the House Ways and Means Committee. This bill would reverse the Internal Revenue Service ruling by congressional action.

The bill is expected to reach the floor of the House for action soon, and could be enacted this session.

A word to your Congressman that you favor repeal of this tax on freedom might be all that is needed to assure passage.

Income Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter the other day from a lady in my district which expresses very interestingly, I think, the attitude of many of our people regarding income taxes and gives an impression shared by most of us regarding the difficulty experienced in translating the regulations to our individual situations. I thought the Members would enjoy reading this letter as much as I enjoyed receiving it. The letter follows:

CORAL GABLES, FLA.,
June 15, 1960.

Hon. DANTE FASCELL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: I believe I can safely say I'm just about as patriotic as the next person—pledge allegiance to the flag of America before breakfast, wear red, white, and blue on all national holidays, stand at attention during the TV signoff, etc., but I'm getting mighty sick and tired of the deplorable condition of our honorable Government.

Being an honorable Representative, I would appreciate your using some of your honorable influence to get an honorable committee to revise our honorable income tax laws to give us honorable citizens a halfway chance of making a decent living. On top of having to pay an exorbitant amount of money each year we also have to pay some one to figure out the redtape set up to mystify and confuse the general public.

I'm sure you will agree that something is wrong when a person can make more money by not working than by working or when a business is actually ahead when it loses money. Now, does that make sense to you? It is no wonder no one has any initiative any more. You work hard to make a buck and the I.R. is there to take 99 11/100 percent of it before you even get to the bank. I would personally like to join the exodus to Switzerland but by the time I pay my honorable taxes I don't have enough money left to buy a ticket on a pogo stick.

I realize it takes a great deal of money to run a government and support 75 percent of the world, and I really don't mind paying taxes as long as I can understand why I am paying them. The income tax form might as well be written in Sanskrit for all the good it does. How about throwing out all the mumbo-jumbo and writing it so that we can understand it without referring to section C, paragraph 19, subclause 22 of clause 7, page 12.

Any clamor you can raise in the House in this regard will be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

BETTE LESLIE.
Mrs. Frank N. Leslie.

Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1960

SPEECH
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12677) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am griveously disappointed in the final results of minimum wage legislation. The Ayres-Kitchin substitute for the committee-approved Roosevelt bill, which passed the House, is completely inadequate and, in my opinion, has been correctly labelled a "political fraud."

The House had before it for consideration H.R. 12677, the Roosevelt bill entitled the "Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1960." This protected the little man, the small businessman. I favored its passage, free from crippling amendments, maintaining that anything less than the bill as reported by the House Labor Committee would be completely unacceptable to me and to the many millions who depend upon us for meaningful wage-hour legislation this year. Futile political gestures and pretenses of relief are a betrayal of the millions of workers of our nation who are not only deserving of, but entitled to, the benefits proposed in the Roosevelt bill.

After lengthy hearings and thorough consideration, the House Committee on Education and Labor reported a sharply scaled down Roosevelt bill. It represented a compromise but was fair and reasonable. Although it did not provide as much protection to as many low-income workers as quickly as I had hoped for, it did provide greatly needed improvements in the present law. I introduced a bill for a direct increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 per hour, H.R. 11080. The committee bill provided for an increase in the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour over a 2-year period for employees already covered by the law and over a 3-year period for newly covered workers. Also, the bill extended coverage to some 3.5 million low-wage workers in large businesses. These millions have been in dire need of protection for many years; their sad plight can no longer be ignored; it was the duty of this House to take cognizance of the hardships suffered by our underpaid workers and to give them the relief provided in the committee bill.

Consider the high percentage of our Nation's workers who receive as little as 60 cents an hour. Consider the new high we have reached in living costs; increases in food prices, medical and dental care, necessities such as medicines, household needs, clothing. How can a worker take care of his own needs, much less the needs of a family or family obligations on a wage of 60 cents per hour? He barely exists; substandard living is his portion. The minimum wage for wage earners now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act is inadequate and detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers.

I hoped that this body would come to the rescue of those who cannot help themselves, who look to us for fair action in their behalf and assistance in their present desperate state.

I consider the tactics involved in bringing the substitute measure before the House deplorable and the entire procedure highly objectionable. During the debate on the substitute bill, a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor stated: "This substitute measure never saw daylight in our committee. The bill was not printed until the day after the Rules Committee acted. It was hurriedly drawn up to scuttle the committee bill." Members of the House had insufficient time to study it before being called upon to vote. It is apparent that the President and Vice President favored the substitute measure and that the administration did not object to the killing of the moderate Roosevelt bill as approved by the committee.

I voted against substitution of the Ayres-Kitchin measure for the Roosevelt bill. I regretted the necessity of finally having to vote for the substitute measure, which provides for a flat increase to only $1.15 per hour, and which greatly cuts down the coverage as proposed in the committee bill and contains other objectionable features. I voted for the substitute bill only because I had no other choice and because, in the light of the great hardships now suffered by our underpaid workers, a tenth of a loaf was better than none.

Those of us who have the welfare of our workers at heart, can only hope that the Senate will vote out a bill at least as fair as the House committee bill. I look forward, with confidence, to the day when the Congress of the United States will take the bull by the horns and pass a minimum wage bill providing for an increase in minimum wage to at least $1.25 per hour, and adequate coverage for the many millions of workers not now covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act, as amended.

What Elections Really Mean in Czechoslovakia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD G. WOLF
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the purveyors of the Communist doctrine have been trying to pass off to the free world the idea that really communism is just a little different form of democracy. They have been attempting to make the world believe that a people's democracy is just that. A few days ago the Washington Daily News carried a letter to the editor by Mr. Peter Zenkl, former mayor of Prague, and currently serving as chairman of the executive committee of the Council of Free Czechoslovakia. His letter attempts to outline what elections are really like in Czechoslovakia—truly a mockery of democracy. I commend it to the full consideration of the Members of Congress:

THESE WERE NOT "ELECTIONS"

In the so-called "elections" to the National Assembly, the Slovak National Council and the National Committees in Czechoslovakia, held on June 12, the "National Front candidates" reportedly obtained close to 100 percent of the "votes" and almost 100 percent of all registered voters reportedly took part in the "election act."

This was nothing but a gigantic crude hoax committed on the citizens of Czechoslovakia and the world at large. Many may not fully realize the great tragedy that lies behind that official report issued by the Communist regime in Prague.

On April 11, 1960, the Prague Government announced that the elections would be held on June 12. The Politburo of the Communist Party and the lower party organs in the regions, districts and communities then selected one candidate for each office to be filled, and "presented" these candidates to the "electorate" at public meetings which were attended only by a small fraction of the population. According to the reports published in the press and broadcast by the regime radio, all the candidates were enthusiastically endorsed and not one case of dissent occurred.

By the middle of May, the candidates were officially registered. Further public meetings were then held at which the candidates informed the voters that their election program was the fulfillment of the current and the future 5-year economic plan and invited them to work toward this goal.

The election act does not provide for obligatory participation in the elections. It stipulates, however, that the elections are secret. This did not prevent the Communist regime from exerting violent pressure on the citizens to take part in the election, march to the polls in whole groups according to blocks of houses, streets, villages or plants, carrying flags and banners and accompanied by musical bands and to cast their ballots without using the screened-off part of the polling booth. After the elections the regime boasted that only a tiny fraction of the voters had not complied with this invitation.

Czechoslovakia has a long democratic parliamentary tradition. Between the two World Wars, when the country was surrounded by a sea of totalitarian dictatorships, it stuck to its free democratic institutions. The Prague National Assembly functioned right up to the Munich dictate which delivered Czechoslovakia to the Nazi Reich. The Czechs and Slovaks have always been proud of this tradition and record.

Imagine, then, what it means to them that they—the people of the great T. G. Masaryk, of whose picture on the recent U.S. Champions of Freedom series of postal stamps the Prague regime is so afraid that mail stamped with them is not delivered but either destroyed or returned—have now to participate in the gruesome farce which has been described above and to pretend to do so readily and merrily.

The fact that they are compelled to do so is at the same time a measure of the degree of terror and fear which the Communists are able to exercise over the millions of their subdued fellow-citizens.

PETER ZENKL,
Chairman, Executive Committee,
Council of Free Czechoslovakia.

Sensible Recess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the permission heretofore granted me by unanimous consent of the House, I include the following interesting editorial published in the Washington Evening Star of Thursday, June 30, 1960:

SENSIBLE RECESS

The decision to recess Congress was dictated by a very practical consideration—namely, that there will not be enough time to wrap up a decent legislative job between this weekend and the opening of the Democratic Convention. And in this situation it makes sense, we think, for the legislators to come back in August, when they can devote 3 or 4 weeks instead of 3 or 4 days to their important unfinished business.

In this last category are 10 appropriation bills, medical aid to the aged, school construction, minimum wage legislation, housing, refugee assistance, small business, the sugar bill, and several others. Perhaps it would be just as well if some of these should not become law. But if the whole package is going to be enacted, some real consideration of the merits of these measures is vastly preferable to a last minute stampede in which many Members would not know what they were voting for or against.

There have been and will be attempts to embarrass the Democratic leadership because Congress has not succeeded in winding up its legislative business. But these are not justified. For one thing, a great deal of time in this session was devoted to pushing through a civil rights bill. And, this being an election year, things were bound to move slowly. Even so, however, Congress ought to be able to come back to Washington on August 8 and wind up its business prior to the date of last year's adjournment, which came on September 16.

Finally, we do not think that the decision to recess is fraught with any momentous political significance. Republican Chairman MORTON is saying that the decision is proof of a deal for a Kennedy-Johnson ticket. With all due respect to the GOP chairman's crystal ball, we think he is talking nonsense. Our guess is that Senator JOHNSON intends to fight for the top prize right down to the wire.

Who Lost Face?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD at this point the following editorial which appeared in the June 29, 1960, edition of the Peoria Journal Star entitled "Who Lost Face?"

WHO LOST FACE?

President Eisenhower's return and report have done a great deal to restore some sober perspective and more sensible understanding of recent events. The passage of a little time has helped, too.

We now find responsible observers, including the top newsmen who actually made the trip, reporting these events in saner terms than some of the early, emotional Monday-morning quarterbacking that went on.

It is now generally accepted and well established that the President had a tremendous impact in those very critical Asian areas of India and Pakistan as well as in Korea, the Philippines, and on Formosa. No world figure brought out such fantastic and enthusiastic crowds in all history—and this in Asia.

It is now clearly established that rioters in Japan seldom numbered more than 15,000 and that the whole maneuver was a matter of trained Communist agents fanning an issue into a white heat. There is every reason to believe that the vast majority of Japanese have the same remarkable affection and regard for Eisenhower as in other Asian lands.

We, in America, sometimes seem to have an almost neurotic, masochistic compulsion to beat our own backs whether it makes any sense or not.

Thus many of us cried loudly about "losing face" in the Japanese incident—which we did. But the great loss of face was not ours, but that of the Japanese Government that failed to curb such conduct. It will be changed, and the new government will be friendly to the United States and our bases will be maintained.

This is a repeat of the situation when, in fact, the Soviet Union "lost face" terribly with its admission that U.S. photo planes have been flying unmolested the length and breadth of Russia for years. They tried to regain "face" by a lot of loud and insulting talk.

This failed, and instead they earned the condemnation of the world for blowing up the summit, and called up to the consciousness of the world the massive Red spying in all free countries.

In this welter of condemnation of the Soviet Union, again only our own Monday morning quarterbacks insisted on being blind to what happened to the Soviet Union and harping on the whole thing as losing face for us. Only some of these nervous types and the Russians blamed Eisenhower. The world did not.

His return and one of the finest TV talks he has ever made combine to offer us a far more sensible, more confident, and more reasonable approach in sharp contrast with the jittery and erratic and irresponsible criticism raised by some during this time of trial.

The Future of Government Installations?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a deplorable situation existing today within our Defense Establishment. We, as the Congress of the United States, cannot shrug our shoulders and say that nothing can be done with the present administration. We have a responsibility not only to the thousands of Federal employees affected by the deliberate malicious drive by the present administration to replace Government installations by private industry regardless of cost. On April 21, 1960, I addressed the House in a 1-hour special order pointing out in great detail how this policy is affecting one of our finest installations, the naval weapons plant, here in Washington, D.C. In this special order, I raised a series of questions that to this day have not been answered by the administration and, unfortunately, Congress has not, in my opinion, done its duty by requiring a full investigation into the circumstances leading to the closeout of this fine plant.

Since my special order, I now find that no assistance whatsoever is being given to the hundreds of skilled engineers and fine craftsmen in their efforts to secure new employment within the Federal Government. The contrary seems to be the case. Although the Army Ballistics Laboratory in Huntsville, Ala., has a desperate need for several hundreds of engineers, weapons plant engineers have been unsuccessful in their efforts to secure information from the Department of the Navy necessary to make an intelligent decision. Officials in the Department of the Navy have been ordered to divert work from the weapons plant and place it anywhere it can be placed without regard of cost to the Government. I have seen first-hand very costly equipment at the naval weapons plant purchased within the past year that has never been utilized and I have no doubt that it will be soon given away.

The Naval Weapons Plant is located literally within the backyard of the Congress and it would take only 5 minutes for those of us who profess an interest in making economical savings in the operation of the Government to substantiate for themselves the allegations I have repeatedly made over the past 4 years.

I will continue to urge Congress to do its duty and in August will renew my attempts to bring this forcibly to the attention of each Member of this body. I would like to include, in its entirety, an advertisement prepared by the International Association of Machinists appearing in the Washington Post-Times Herald on June 29, 1960:

WHAT ABOUT DEFENSE "PAYOLA"?

During the 1956 presidential campaign, officials of the 100 largest military prime contractors contributed $1,133,882 to the Republican Party, and $40,975 to the Democratic Party according to the Gore report.

The worst payola scandal in America is the one the American public knows the least about. This payola centers in defense procurement. The Republican administration created this modern payola. The Democratic majority in Congress has taken no concrete steps to correct it.

WHAT ARE THE SYMPTOMS OF THIS PAYOLA POLICY?

Navy spent $21.10 each for lamp sockets similar to those offered by retail stores for 25 cents.

The Hughes Aircraft-developed infra-red guided missile, Falcon, cost 10 times as much in mass production as a Navy-developed missile engineered to meet the same functional requirements.

Ramo-Woolridge, to whom the Air Force gave full responsibility for missile research and development, parlayed an initial $248,000 investment into a $29 million operation inside 4 years; 97.1 percent of Ramo-Woolridge's sales were to the Air Force.

In the past 10 years, the Renegotiation Board (for defense contracts) has recovered over a billion and a half dollars in discovered and proved excess profits from defense contracts. This did not, of course, count the excess profits which were successfully concealed.

Ninety-five percent of the number, and 86 percent of the dollar amount of defense contracts are not competitively bid for.

The Davis report in mid-1959 said that cost-plus contracting to private industry actually tended to eliminate some of the basic elements of private enterprise, thus making it difficult to ascertain the specific difference between Government-operated installations and the cost-plus contractor.

The Vinson-Trammel Act of 1934, still in force, requires an equal division of work between private and Navy yards. This is to use the Government yards as a yardstick to measure the relative costs of ships built by private contractors.

The House Armed Services Committee has asked Navy to divide its work according to the Vinson-Trammell Act. In 1959, the actual distribution was 5 for the Navy Yards and 73 for private shipyards.

In 1955, the administration issued an order requiring all Government establishments to contract out everything possible to private sources, regardless of cost.

In 1959, the same administration issued another directive, reinforcing the 1955 order, which has the effect of making all Government-operated enterprise illegitimate, and of setting up standards by which existing Government facilities would be eliminated.

In 1959, the Navy, operating under these orders, closed out 19 major field activities, many of them engaged in the production of defense materiel. Among them were such important plants as the Corpus Christi (Tex.) Naval Air Station, the Pocatello (Idaho) Naval Ordnance Plant, and the South Boston Annex to the Boston (Mass.) Naval Shipyard.

This year, the Naval Weapons Plant, Washington, D.C., a prime source of modern naval weapons, announced it will shutdown.

If these shutdowns were really evidence of a true reduction of Defense spending, it could be justified somewhat. However, the work which all of these shutdown activities were, and could be, doing, is still being done, for a profit, in private plants.

The highest-paid Government administrator makes $17,500 a year. Such a man is responsible for managing more men, materiel and money than the heads of most large private corporations. Yet in the private aircraft-missile field, for example, executives of at least three of the major aircraft companies earn in excess of $150,000 a year. These aircraft-missile executives are almost wholly dependent on Defense contracts for their existence, and all, therefore, ultimately derive their pay from the Federal Treasury—the taxpayers' pocketbook.

Defense is a public enterprise. No one has a right to profiteer at the expense of the taxpayer. Under the Eisenhower administration, profiteering is officially approved. The Democratic majority has done nothing concrete to change the course of events.

The cost of defense research, development and production is in excess of what it would be if the Vinson-Trammel Act were fully carried out in principle.

The economy is becoming so deeply involved in defense subsidies that our maneuverability on international disarmament is increasingly handicapped.

The ability of the new-style industrial defense complex to respond immediately to a national emergency is becoming seriously comprised.

The know-how in the production of key defense materiel is falling into the hands of a relatively few large corporations, who owe no obligation to the Government to reveal their methods and techniques.

The management of Government functions vital to national survival is no longer in the hands of officials directly responsible to the public. Instead, it is in the hands of persons responsible only to the boards of directors of private corporations.

The Republican Party has made a serious error in its "payola" policy. It should be changed now.

The Democratic majority in Congress owes it to the American people to stop the administration's "payola" shenanigans, through effective law.

We feel that the Democratic leaders, Senator JOHNSON, Speaker RAYBURN, Congressman VINSON (chairman of the House Armed Services Committee), JOHN KENNEDY, STUART SYMINGTON, and others, can and should stop this raid on the taxpayer's pocketbook.

Mr. Louis Hardtla of Philo, Ohio, Honored by the Weather Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today, Mr. Louis Hardtla, of Philo, which is in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio, will receive the Thomas Jefferson Award for 1960 from the Weather Bureau of the U.S. Department of Commerce. Mr. Hardtla is one of seven who have been selected from the United States for outstanding service in the field of weather observation and reporting.

The citation which he receives with his award reads as follows:

For an exceptionally long record of continuous climatological observations at Philo, Ohio, begun by Mr. Hardtla, because of his own scientific interest in 1892 and then continued as a cooperative observer for the U.S. Weather Bureau since 1901.

Mr. Hardtla, throughout these many years, has made a great contribution to the Weather Bureau and to the Nation. His observations and study have contributed in large measure to the overall study of weather conditions. I am proud that a constituent of mine has been chosen to receive this award and I extend to him my own congratulations and thanks.

Tribute to Garland Wheeler Powell, Co-originator of a National Flag Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. D. R. (BILLY) MATTHEWS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, on August 29, 1959, a devoted patriot and longtime resident of my congressional district died and was subsequently laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery. I refer to the late Maj. Garland Wheeler Powell. It seems fitting to pay tribute to his memory, as a new Independence Day draws near, for a unique and patriotic service rendered, not generally known and never appropriately acknowledged.

Garland Wheeler Powell was born in Allegany County, Md., on August 8, 1892. He attended the public schools of his native State and graduated from the University of Maryland. He served a term in the Maryland Legislature.

Garland Powell enlisted in the armed services of the Nation on June 5, 1917, and witnessed battle action as commander of the 22d U.S. Aerial Squadron. He was promoted to the rank of 1st lieutenant on September 13, 1917, and to captain February 19, 1918, later attaining the rank of major in the Reserves.

After the armistice in November 1918, Powell became very active in the early work of the American Legion and was for a number of years a member of the Legion's Americanism committee In this capacity he was helpful if not wholly instrumental in bringing into existence a U.S. flag code.

Major Powell never laid claim to being the "father" of the flag code, but acknowledged the idea originated with him and the late Gridley Adams. The latter became founder and director-general of the U.S. Flag Foundation, Inc. Adams and Powell presented their idea before the First National Flag Conference held in Washington, June 14–15, 1923, which conference was addressed by the late President Warren G. Harding, who supported the idea of a national flag code enthusiastically.

These two gentlemen in effect laid the groundwork for the later enactment of Public Law 623, approved June 22, 1942, "to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America," and the eventual passage of Public Law 829 which firmly established the use of the flag of the United States of America by civilians, civilian groups, and organizations.

In the files of the late Mr. Adams may be found a letter from his colleague, Garland Powell, reading, in part, as follows:

> Of course, Gridley, you and I are ultra-patriots and we realize that over the years millions of lives have been sacrificed in the defense of that flag. In my estimation, if schoolchildren could be taught that, our whole Nation would be better off. After all, the school is the place to start the children of the Nation along the path of understanding. That is said even in view of the importance of the church and the home. If the schoolchildren of today are taught respect for their flag, as the parents of tomorrow they will see to it that the home will be taken care of as well as the church. So, my friend, you and I have contributed something that should go down in history as a contribution to this great Nation of ours.

This was an intimate letter from one friend to another and not meant for the public eye. However, it is so appropriate to the subject and to the need of a renewal of patriotic fervor such as Garland Powell exemplified in his life and actions that I think it bears reading. Maj. Garland Powell, indeed, had a reverence for his Nation and its flag which might well be emulated by all of us.

South Texas Delegates to the National Convention of the Future Homemakers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Future Homemakers of America will have their National Convention here in Washington beginning July 11, 1960. Regretfully, for many of us, we will not be on hand to greet these fine youngsters from all parts of our country since the Democratic National Convention will begin on the same day in Los Angeles.

We are all aware of the outstanding record and achievements made by the Future Homemakers of America. In south Texas we have a particular pride for these youngsters, and it was with a great deal of pleasure when I learned of the group who will be in Washington to represent my section of Texas. The delegates are: Miss Carol Dennison, Liberty, Tex.; Miss Patti Jinks, Boling, Tex.; Miss Melva Jean Hand, Katy, Tex.; Miss Elsie Swendsen, El Campo, Tex.; and Miss Barbara Grayless, Richmond, Tex. The sponsors of this fine delegation are: Miss Margaret Koy, Bellville, Tex.; Miss Lenora Walters, Houston, Tex.; Mrs. Ruth Shurbet, Katy, Tex.; and Miss Marie Oatman, El Campo, Tex.

Communications Act Amendments, 1960

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 27, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 1898) to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to the procedure in obtaining a license and for rehearings under such act.

Mr. MACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of S. 1898. This bill known as the Communications Act Amendment of 1960 is designed to carry out the recommendations of the Legislative Oversight Committee after one of the most extensive and constructive investigations ever conducted by a congressional committee, which is designed to correct many irregularities which have occurred in these agencies. Our subcommittee has worked long and hard on this investigation. It has been a most revealing and fruitful investigation. Thousands of pages of testimony clearly indicate great deficiencies and this bill is the first part of a legislative program recommended in reports by our committee to correct these deficiencies.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend our very able and distinguished chairman in the way he was revealed the irregularities in the regulatory agencies. This investigation was successful despite the many efforts by industry and others to sabotage our operation. No investigating committee of Congress has ever encountered such a determined effort on the part of those investigated to block the investigation. No investigating committee has been subjected to such tremendous pressures. Multimillion dollar industries were investigated by this committee with only a limited staff. This committee revealed gross irregularities within many of the regulatory agencies. It exposed payoffs, payola, deceptive practices and rigged television quiz shows on programs carried on the publicly owned air waves.

In my opinion, this committee has rendered a great service to America.

Mr. Chairman, this bill would reassert governmental authority to regulate the Nation's airwaves. It would give the Federal Communications Commission new tools to deal with the industry it regulates. This bill does not provide for censorship in any form but it does reassert the Federal authority over the use of publicly owned airwaves and would permit the FCC to evaluate the performance of radio and television stations. It would give them the opportunity to reward television and radio stations which live up to elementary standards of honesty and integrity. In this way the FCC would not necessarily have to reward stations which thrive on sadistic westerns, rock and roll, deceptive shows, and other trash which have been appearing over the publicly owned airwaves.

Mr. Chairman, under the provisions of this bill it would be impossible for anyone to participate in payola or deceptive television quiz shows without committing a Federal crime. Because of the unusual nature of these slick operations, it is necessary to amend the law so that even an unenthusiastic regulatory commission would have the power to stop these deceptive shows and proceedings could be brought against the participants.

Mr. Chairman, payola was a national disgrace but perhaps the most colossal fraud ever perpetrated on the American people was the controlled or rigged quiz shows. These shows affected over $100 million worth of business and by dishonesty and deception almost succeeded in driving some of the competing firms out of business. The "$64,000 Question," apparently controlled from its very inception, according to the testimony of the sponsor, ran for some 2 years undetected. Its success was so fabulous that the producers started another rigged program called the "$64,000 Challenge." These programs were so successful and attracted such a large audience that the competing network found it necessary to start its own rigged television quiz shows. Millions and millions of Americans watched these shows week after week and even refused to believe the truth when they were told that these shows were rigged. It was perhaps the greatest job of "brainwashing" this country has ever seen and it was all done over the publicly owned air waves.

Mr. Chairman, I am not primarily concerned about the ethics of the contestants who participated in these controlled shows although it is a reflection upon our standards of morality. Many of the contestants were innocent but it was shocking to know that the district attorney of New York estimated that some one hundred contestants probably committed perjury as witnesses before the New York grand jury investigating this matter. While I feel that the law should apply to the contestants, I believe that the real crime was committed by the limited number of individuals who assisted in planning and rigging the shows. Therefore, this bill is designed to cover all those who were responsible for the productions as well as all of those who assisted each week with the rigging of the shows. This bill would include those people who represented the window dressing which set the stage so that these frauds could be perpetrated. In the quiz shows great precautions were taken to convince the audience that the controlled shows were not rigged. The "$64,000 Question" used a nationally known college professor and the vice president of an internationally known these frauds could be perpetrated. In has been revealed that the college professor assisted in rigging the shows by designing questions that the producers knew the contestants could answer. It was revealed in testimony that the vice president did not have custody over the question.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is enacted it will eliminate the slick Madison Avenue operations in the future years and the provisions of this bill would apply to all those who participated directly or indirectly in the rigging of shows.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a shocking incident for Americans. It is especially shocking for many people in our society to have been guilty of this deception. It has rewarded dishonesty in business as well as private life. It seems that our society hit an alltime low by the reprehensible practice of teaching young boys and girls to be dishonest while participating in these rigged shows.

Mr. Chairman, we wonder today why crime has been increasing especially among our young people and why we are having such a problem with juvenile delinquency. We wonder why many children today do not seem to know right from wrong and why many of our American homes do not provide the moral and ethical upbringing of youngsters which is necessary in a healthy and wholesome society. We wonder why business and politics appear to be more corrupt now than in years gone by. I have given considerable study to this problem and I am wondering if our Nation has failed to properly recognize and reward those individuals who do right and to penalize those who do wrong. It seems to me that in this day and age we have failed to recognize honest leadership, honest business and that we have had a tendency to accept dishonesty in all walks of life. We have even given some credence to the statement that money buys respectability.

We all recognize that television has had a tremendous impact on our way of life. It has had a substantial effect in formulating opinions in the minds of our young citizens. It can be used to formulate good or bad opinions. I hope that this bill will have a favorable effect.

Mr. Chairman, I hope very strongly that this bill is adopted so that millions of American viewers will be protected from these frauds in the future and that the FCC will have complete authority to act in these areas.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that this Congress last year passed the Captive Nations Week resolution and that the President, consistent with the provisions of said resolution, issued a proclamation designating the third week in July 1959, as Captive Nations Week. The resolution further authorized and requested the President to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world.

This year the observance of Captive Nations Week is scheduled for July 17–23 and in connection therewith I am pleased to submit the following statement:

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

We the people of this country are against all forms of dictatorships and regard them as the worst type of governmental machinery devised by men. At the end of the last war when we witnessed the spread rather than the limiting of Communist tyranny, we were rudely awakened from our wartime optimism. The Soviet Union's treacherous methods of capturing and enslaving the peoples of Eastern Europe was the most stunning shock to us. For more than 15 years the U.S. Government, working in cooperation with other governments of the West, has been trying to have these enslaved peoples, these captive nations, freed from the clutches of Communist tyranny. By establishing and proclaiming the third week of July in each year as Captive Nations Week, once more we affirm both our loyalty to the cause of freedom and our desire to see these freedom-loving peoples released from Communist totalitarian dictatorships. We shall continue to observe Captive Nations Week until the last of all enslaved nations is free in its homeland. I am glad to lend my wholehearted support for their freedom.

An Allen Special, Coming Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I happily include an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times which goes far toward expressing the respect and extreme good will every Member of this House holds for Congressman LEO ALLEN. No words can express, however, the grief with which his friends regret his departure from the congressional scene nor the void which those of us who have been privileged to enjoy his personal friendship and his counsel will continue to feel. The article from the Sun-Times follows:

AN ALLEN SPECIAL, COMING UP

Only three Illinoisans served longer in Congress than LEO E. ALLEN, of Galena. "Uncle Joe" Cannon spent 46 years in the House. Adolph Sabath was in 45 years. Henry T. Rainey's time totaled 30. When he retires this year ALLEN will have been in Congress 28 years.

ALLEN is a product of Jo Daviess County where he was born October 5, 1898. He was an artillery sergeant in World War I. He became a lawyer and circuit court clerk. Then he went to Congress and immediately was recognized as an able, affable and shrewd man of politics. Fellow Republicans, and Democrats as well, who may never have heard of his town of Galena (home of Gen. U. S. Grant) became aware of Allen and he rose high in the councils of Congress and the GOP.

ALLEN has been a stanch supporter of President Eisenhower on both domestic and foreign issues (81 percent last year).

Why is he retiring? He says he's tired of the same "diet" of 35 years in politics—that it's like having ham and eggs for breakfast every day.

Congress will miss ALLEN, but after 28 years of political ham and eggs ALLEN is entitled to a new menu if he wants one. We hope he finds it tasty.

Let's Help Prevent Another Roseburg, Oreg., Disaster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, there is on the Consent Calendar S. 1806, a bill which amends the Transportation of Explosives Act. Among other things this bill contains legislation which would place private and contract carriers under regulations now governing common carriers. Private and contract carriers carrying explosives and other dangerous articles could be fined up to $1,000 or imprisoned for 1 year or both for violating ICC regulations. If death or bodily injury of a person resulted the penalty would be a fine of up to $10,000 or 10 years imprisonment or both.

Why do I urge this action?

The city of Roseburg is in Oregon's Fourth Congressional District, which I represent. Shortly after 1 a.m., August 7, 1959, Roseburg was rocked by a blast which killed 13 persons, injured more than 100, and caused property damage of nearly $12 million. The city is rebuilding. Its citizens have done marvelous things. But what happened there when a private truck carrying explosives was left unattended in a downtown area could happen anywhere in this country.

The Interstate Commerce Commission approves S. 1806. The ICC held an on-the-scene inquiry in Roseburg in September to determine the cause of the explosion. The Commission found that it occurred as the direct result of the explosives laden truck being left locked but unattended while parked upon a public street in the congested part of a city.

The hardworking Judiciary Committee of this House has gone into S. 1806 and reported it.

This week the July 2, 1960, issue of the Saturday Evening Post carries a well-written and well-illustrated account of the Roseburg disaster. The magazine's lead article entitled "The Night Our Town Blew Up," is written by Mrs. Bonnie Wallace Riggs, of Roseburg. Photographs taken by Mr. Paul Jenkins of Roseburg illustrate the true account.

I recommend Mrs. Riggs' article. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the Saturday Evening Post account by Mrs. Riggs, a news release concerning my testimony before the House Judiciary Committee's subcommittee considering amendments to the Transportation of Explosives Act and a news story which appeared in the June 25, 1960, edition of the Roseburg News-Review:

[From the Saturday Evening Post, June 2, 1960]

THE NIGHT OUR TOWN BLEW UP

(By Bonnie Wallace Riggs)

(The people of this little Oregon town will never forget the night last summer that changed their lives. One of them tells about the holocaust.)

At about 9:30 p.m. a 2½-ton truck of the Pacific Powder Co. rolled into our town of Roseburg, Oreg. The driver, George B. Rutherford, jockeyed his rig into the driveway in front of the Gerretsen Building Supply Co. warehouse on Pine Street, three blocks from the main business district. He handled the rig gingerly, for his cargo was 2 tons of dynamite and 4½ tons of nitrocarbonitrate, part of which was to be delivered the next day to Gerretsen, at a powder magazine 5 miles out of town. The material was mainly for the use of work gangs constructing roads in nearby logging projects.

Rutherford turned off his switch, climbed down from his cab and walked three blocks to Roseburg's leading hotel, the Umpqua, to spend the night.

It was a typical Roseburg summer evening, August 6, 1959, warm and quiet. Most residents of this town of 12,000 located in a hunting and fishing area, had nothing more worrisome on their minds than the chances for Roseburg's American Legion junior baseball team to win the State championship playoffs during the weekend. Except for night shift workers in the lumber and plywood mills in the area and a few teenagers driving around in search of fun, most people were in bed well before midnight.

But at 1:05 Friday morning, a telephone call to the fire department reported a blaze at the Gerretsen Building. Nine minutes later the explosives truck blew up with a roar which many residents mistook for a nuclear blast. My family and I live 3 miles from Gerretsen's, and beyond a hill. Even so, the blast shook our house as if an earthquake had happened. But we were lucky and suffered no damage. Indeed, we concluded that a jet plane had shaken us with a sonic boom, and not until the next morning did we learn what had really happened.

The explosion killed outright, or fatally injured, 13 persons and wounded 125 others, many seriously. It overturned and twisted freight cars on a nearby siding, burning several. Seven city blocks were denuded and twenty-eight others—including the main business district—were reduced to a wreckage of broken glass, fallen cornices, and shattered roofs. Fire spurted from a half dozen major buildings. Windows were broken and plaster was cracked in almost every home within a 2-mile radius. Big stained-glass windows in churches clattered to the street, and chimneys jerked away from the houses they served, as fragments littered the floors of china and lamp stores and glass in automobiles popped in or out. Property loss approached $12 million. Where the truck and the Gerretsen Building had stood was a yawning crater more than 40 feet in diameter and 15 feet deep.

The explosion was a classic example of sudden and unexpected disaster. Now that almost a year has passed, the answers to many pertinent questions are available. How did those who died happen to be where they were at the critical moment? How did their fates intermesh? Was anyone there except those whose normal pattern of life called for them to be there? Was anyone absent, who, for one reason or another, likely would have been there, but was not? Were there outstanding feats of heroism?

To answer the last question first, consider the cases of two good Samaritans: dark, handsome, 17-year-old Dennis Tandy and Richard Knight, 20, who had learned many a lesson about fire control as an enlisted man in the U.S. Air Force before receiving a hardship discharge. He now lived with his mother and disabled father, and worked at a filling station.

Dennis Tandy worked at the Nordic Veneer Co. and had been learning to operate the big lathe which peels logs into veneer sheets for plywood. For a boy his age Dennis had special reason to work. Shortly after turning 17 he had quit his junior class at high school to marry Marilyn Hays, 18. The wedding was on December 31, 1958; and at the time of the disaster the Tandys were expecting a baby within 2 months.

Dennis' shift ended at midnight; but on this particular night he stayed a little longer to study his lathe and its operation. It was about 12:30 a.m. before he started his midget automobile, an ivory-colored Fiat 600, and picked up Marilyn at her parents' home, where he had left her on his way to work in the afternoon.

En route to their own home, they passed the Gerretsen Building. Dennis, thinking he had seen a little blaze in a row of trash cans, turned the car around and investigated. There was a blaze. Dennis jumped from his car and tried to keep it from spreading by rolling some of the trash cans into the street.

He shouted to his wife to drive somewhere and send in an alarm. She drove to a filling station a block or so away and told the attendant to telephone the fire department. The attendant did so. This was the 1:05 a.m. alarm previously mentioned. Marilyn Tandy then returned to the fire, now a good-sized blaze gaining headway inside the building. (Some authorities now believe the fire actually started inside the building, but nobody really knew then nor knows now.)

By 1:07 a.m. a firetruck manned by Assistant Chief Roy McFarland and fireman Lyle Wescott arrived, and soon the two men had a hose connected to fire hydrant and were playing water on the mushrooming blaze. Wescott was wearing black "turnouts"—protective clothing. But even though he was shielded by a parked truck—the truck bearing the 6½ tons of explosives—Wescott soon found the radiant heat unbearable and had to retreat. As he crossed the street, he realized that his chest was burned and flesh was sloughing from his hands. Police Officer Merle Jensen, arriving just then, immediately took him to a hospital. Wescott, in great pain, was relieved at his place operating the hose by Richard Knight, who had just arrived from his filling station. In his Air Force days Knight had received firefighting training and was heroically eager to contribute his skilled assistance. Another fire unit also arrived and began hooking up its hoses on the opposite side of the Gerretsen building.

On returning from giving the alarm, Marilyn Tandy parked the Fiat in a lot about 100 feet from the fire, and approached the Gerretsen Building on foot. Frightened by the size of the fire, she called out, "Dennis, let's go."

He answered, "No, but you get back to the car."

She stood rooted at first, but the heat became too much for her and she hurried toward the Fiat, looking back every few steps. Dennis Tandy had donned a protective jacket from the fire truck and was trying to chop open with an ax the locked cab of a Gerretsen truck which was in the way. He wanted to move it before it, too, caught fire. That was the last Marilyn saw of her husband.

Curiously, none of the little band of firefighters appeared to realize that the second

truck—the big 2½-ton rig which dominated the scene—was loaded with explosives. It was nearly 1:13 a.m. when a puff of breeze stirred the almost windless night, clearing the smoke and revealing the "Explosives" signs on all four sides of the truck. McFarland and Knight immediately turned their hose from the burning building and played water on the truck. Some 10 seconds later, someone—whose identity never was established—yelled, "Get the hell out of here; that dynamite's going to blow." But McFarland and Knight stuck with their hose, and Tandy kept on chopping at the cab of the second truck.

Meanwhile, Marilyn Tandy made it back to the Fiat and slammed the door. Then the explosives truck blew up. It was now 1:14 a.m.

The little car was blown, right side up, about 100 feet. Its back window popped out in one piece. Other windows shattered and blew inward, their fragments peppering Marilyn. But, oddly, she was not even cut, although her dress was torn from neck to waist and bobby pins were knocked out of her pin curls.

All about her fires were starting and fallen electric wires were crackling in showers of sparks. She got out, picked her way to the place of devastation and called out her husband's name; but he was beyond answering. So were, among others, Richard Knight and Roy McFarland. (Their bodies were found later under debris; Tandy's body was under the truck he had been trying to save.)

Great blasts usually produce freakish effects, and the Roseburg blast created its share. Union business agent Chuck Lynch, in the downtown area, heard the police and fire sirens and started in his car toward the center of commotion. When he was about 50 feet from the blazing building, someone flagged him down and yelled to him to turn around and get away. Lynch had just completed the fastest U-turn of his career when the explosives went off. Like a superpowerful hand, the blast belted Lynch's car up to 70 miles an hour within 200 feet. Then, as if to gratify a whim, the hand began to push from the front. In less than another 100 feet the car was slowed down to 35, although Lynch had the accelerator pedal on the floor board. Most of the car's exterior chromium trimming was ripped away, an unopened box of cigars on the seat beside him blew apart, and all the cigars were shredded into bits. Lynch was unhurt.

The ordeal of Carol Marical had its ludicrous moments, although they were overshadowed by tragedy. Miss Marical, a pretty redhead, was on her way home from the Umpqua Hotel, where she was taking instructions to be a restaurant hostess in the Indian Room, a popular eating place. She was accompanied by her friend, Bonnie Jean Berg. Miss Berg, by prearrangement, met her at the hotel shortly after 1 a.m., when the Indian Room closed. Together they began strolling toward Miss Marical's home, where Miss Berg was to spend the night as a guest. Dallying to watch the Garretsen fire, they stood in front of the Bill Stock Motors Co. building, across the street and a little more than 100 feet away. But after a few minutes, they stepped off the curb, intending to resume their homeward stroll.

Carol told her mother later, "I heard a sizzling sound and knew that something terrible was going to happen. I dropped to the pavement and curled myself into a ball, with my hands over my face, trying to make as small a target as possible. The big explosion seemed to come from down deep. An eruption like an ocean wave of flame rose high in the air, and I recall Bonnie Jean calling, 'Carol, Carol.'"

Carol Marical's dress was ripped and blown completely off her. Her glasses and shoes also were blown away. The shoes never were found, but later someone found her glasses—inside the Stock Motors building alongside the body of Bonnie Jean Berg. Bonnie had been only a couple of steps behind Carol, but they were blown in different directions. Blown 150 feet down the street, Carol never lost consciousness completely. When she stopped rolling, she got up and tried to run, but the paving felt hot to her shoeless feet. She fell and, unable to get up again, crawled on her hands and knees, seeking someone to help her.

Fred Siles, a millworker, lives half a mile from the Garretsen building and had driven over to watch the excitement. But no sooner had he parked his car than the explosion came. Siles was blown some 50 feet through the plate-glass window of another automobile agency, but was able to get up and step out through the glassless frame.

He then found Carol Marical, helped her into his car and drove her to a hospital, asking over and over, in a confused way, "Are you hurt, lady? Are you hurt?"

Miss Marical remembered that the question made her laugh in spite of her injuries. "There I was," she said, "with my dress blown away, covered with blood from head to foot and unable to walk—and someone keeps asking if I'm hurt."

She was hurt, quite badly, as she was to learn at the hospital. Her instinctive act of rolling herself into a ball had protected her face, but the rest of her body had been peppered with flying metal and glass. One metal bolt had driven through her arm and penetrated her chest cavity. The hospital already was jammed. No operating room was available until 2:30 a.m., but in the meantime attendants plucked out six bolts—possibly from the explosives truck—which were protruding from her skin. When she reached the operating room, teams of surgeons took turns working over her until noon, and 10 days were to pass before she was off the critical list.

While waiting at the hospital for the shock of his own experience to wear off, Fred Siles received a new shock when his 15-year-old son, Jimmy, was brought in on a stretcher. The elder Siles was shocked again when he learned that Jimmy had been lying unconscious about a block away when Siles was assisting Miss Marical to rise from the street.

Jimmy, an honor roll high school student, had nothing special to do on that fateful evening. His good friend, Larry Dysert, 17, dropped around after dinner in his 1948 automobile and suggested a ride. Their actions were typical of young boys with a car on a warm summer night in a small town. They stopped at the city swimming pool to chat for a while with other youngsters. They went to the Snappy Service, a restaurant, for something to eat, drove around some more, went to Larry's house and from there to a filling station where one of their pals was nightman.

It was well after midnight when the visit ended, and Larry Dysert and Jimmy Siles were homeward bound when they saw flames pouring out of the Gerretsen Building. They swung around and headed for the blaze. Larry parked alongside the Bill Stock Motors showroom, diagonally across from the Gerretsen Building, but this spot proved too warm, so they found another place a block away. As Larry pulled to the curb, Jimmy jumped out eagerly and called, "Come on, let's go" then sprinted toward the fire.

Then the explosives truck let go. Larry, who had taken just a few steps, was knocked down and his shoes were blown off, but his injuries were only bruises. Jimmy Siles lay unconscious, a 3-inch bolt driven into the base of his skull. The bolt was removed surgically and Jimmy lived, but he still is in a coma nearly a year after the accident.

Bill and Eleanor Unrath lived in a large, comfortable house next to their place of business, a Coca-Cola bottling plant. The bottling plant occuped a corner opposite the Gerretsen Building. An apartment on the second floor of the plant was occupied, and had been for some time, by Martin Lusk and his wife.

Fate, or coincidence, was about to play a grim joke on the Lusks. Lusk, who had worked for Unrath in the bottling plant, had quit the week before to return to his original home in La Grande, Oreg. The Lusks had their trailer packed with personal possessions and were ready to leave early in the morning.

Everyone in the two households was asleep when the sirens began to wail. Mrs. Lusk, awakening first, opened her bedroom window and shouted to the Unraths that the Gerretsen Building was afire. Bill Unrath ran for the bottling plant and, with Lusk's help, tried—without too much luck—to get the plant's protective hoseline through a skylight to the roof. From there they could have brought its stream to play on the Gerretsen fire.

While they were struggling, perhaps against a jammed skylight, Don Gerretsen, son of the owner of the building-supply firm, rushed into the bottling plant, looking for a telephone to call his father about the fire. Bill Unrath told him to use the one in the kitchen of the Lusk apartment. Young Gerretsen had just put in his call when the world around him rocked. He was knocked violently against a wall, and one foot was caught under some heavy object. To free it, he had to slip out of his shoe and leave the shoe behind. The stairway had been destroyed. Gerretsen climbed out a window and slid down an outside wall, escaping with minor injuries.

He was the last to see Unrath and Lusk alive. Trapped, they died either from the blast injuries or in the new fire which quickly destroyed the bottling plant, the Unrath home, the Lusk automobile and their neatly packed trailer.

Of the Unraths' two daughters, Sabra, 18, was to have returned that evening from a Camp Fire Girls' camp where she was a counselor. But by a stroke of good luck in reverse the camp's truck broke down, and Sabra didn't get home until noon the next day. The Unraths' other daughter, Mary Elise, 20, had as overnight guests two schoolgirls from Bremerton, Wash., Lauretta Rusher and Lorraine Ross. They were scheduled to leave the next day for a church youth conference in Los Angeles.

When the fire first got underway and Unrath and Lusk had gone into the bottling plant, their wives, thinking the blaze would be controlled quickly, stood on the sidewalk in front of the Unrath house. The dynamite explosion knocked the two women about 75 feet in different directions, as it had knocked Miss Marical and Miss Berg. But except for bruises and shock, they were spared. Mrs. Unrath stumbled back to the house, which now was on fire, to save the three girls. Because the blast had blocked the stairway with debris, she could only stand outside and shout to them to jump from a second-floor bedroom window.

All three girls were bleeding from glass-fragment wounds and were spattered with bits of black insulation materials from the walls, but they jumped as instructed, and only Mary Elise Unrath was seriously hurt. She fractured two vertebrae and was to spend 5 weeks in a hospital.

In discussing the heroes of the explosion, Roseburg citizens give a special place to Harry Carmichael, a 70-year-old veteran of two wars, who was driving home from the Monarch Card Room, a restaurant-tavern

rendezvous which he helped to operate. Hoping to be of service, he headed for the fire in his car. The explosion slammed the automobile and its driver mercilessly. Carmichael's left arm—which he may have had partially out the window—was severed by the blast or some flying piece of metal, and his chest was punctured. Nevertheless, this septuagenarian got out of the wrecked car, walked to a rescue squad, and helped them by directing them to spots where he knew people were trapped. Weakening at length, Carmichael gave in to the urging of others and allowed himself to be driven to the hospital. He died there while doctors were preparing to operate.

Wayne Townsend had the misfortune of living too near the spot of destiny. He and his wife Letta, occupied an apartment above the Stock Motors showroom. Townsend went down to move his car, which was parked too close to the Gerretsen building, but chose the wrong time. He never reached the car, and it was several days before his body was found in the rubble.

For the same period of time the bodies of two other victims lay concealed. They were those of Rufus Wiggins, Jr., a logger, and Mrs. Rollin J. McDonald, 62. Wiggins roomed near the center of town, and it was his custom to take "breakfast," shortly after midnight, in a restaurant not far from Gerretsen's. A truck usually picked him up at 2:30 a.m. and carried him to work.

After the fire, police surmised that Wiggins had left the restaurant to see the blaze—which is what Mrs. McDonald and her husband started to do from their home nearby. The blast caught them a block from the fire. McDonald, seriously injured, survived; but his wife's body was found under the rubbish which had been a farmers' cooperative building.

The Kuykendalls suffered the most of any family in town. Alvin Kuykendall, a steady, soft-spoken man, had spent his life building up a small business—a bicycle shop—and buying a house. Both were free of debt, and the business was showing a modest profit. But the location of their house and business, across the street from each other and half a block from Gerretsen's, was tragically unfortunate. The Kuykendall's were awakened by the sirens while young Dennis Tandy was attempting to put out the fire singlehanded. The whole family got out of bed and assembled at a big window which provided a grandstand box. With Kuykendall were his wife, Lela, and their two daughters, Janet, 22, and Virginia, a tyke of 4. A fire truck and a police car screamed to stops under their window. Out of the police car jumped Patrolman Don DeSues, who went to work immediately, trying to keep traffic lanes free of sightseers' cars so that the firefighters wouldn't be impeded. DeSues—who would be dead in 10 minutes—worked hard.

After a few minutes of watching the excitement, Kuykendall excused himself and went to the bathroom. He was still there when the monster blast hit the house with all its fire and fury. Mrs. Kuykendall and the girls were showered with thousands of bits of glass and knocked against the walls. In the bathroom Kuykendall was pinned against the bathtub by a 500-pound chest of solid oak. Burning lath was peeling off the ceiling in fiery gobs and falling all around him, and he was in great pain. But his family could not hear his cries for help. People outside the house responded, walking right through holes in the house, and helped the whole family into an ambulance. Ten minutes later both house and bicycle shop were in ruins.

Mrs. Kuykendall and little Virginia died of their injuries. For 5 days Janet could see nothing; but after doctors had removed 20 pieces of imbedded glass from her eyeballs, her normal sight began to return. She also had cuts and bruises over most of her body.

But Alvin Kuykendall was in more serious condition. His right arm and leg were fractured in several places and required months of pins, plates, and casts. Six weeks after the explosion the leg pins slipped and doctors had to operate all over again. Several weeks after that his arm was broken again in recuperative exercises, and this time it had to be reinforced with a bone graft and a metal plate.

Today he is in a wheel chair and faces many more months of sitting, waiting for his arm and leg to heal. His dream is to get another bicycle shop started. "It's all I know," he says. The only insurance he had was on the bicycle shop, and most of the yield of that has been spent on living expenses. Yet he looks forward hopefully to working again and getting out of debt once more. Ridding himself of debt is an admitted obsession with him.

Fortunately there was a happy ending for Janet—or, as she puts it, "a beginning." In June she was married to Einar Beck, Jr., a boy she knew in school.

Last October Marilyn Tandy's baby arrived on schedule, a healthy, plump boy. He promptly was named Dennis in honor of his heroic young father. Mother and son live with Marilyn's parents. Of her future and the baby's, she says, "When Dennis starts to school, maybe I'll go to a beauty school. I don't know what else to do."

Carol Marical was able to leave the hospital after 2 months, but did not feel well enough to return to her job at the Indian Room. For months she had nightmares in which, as in real life nearly a year ago, she heard the voice of her ill-fated friend, Bonnie Jean Berg, shouting, "Carol! Carol!" And she couldn't do a thing to help. But her story also took a happy turn with her marriage last spring to Frank Copeland.

George B. Rutherford, driver of the truck, ran from the Umpqua Hotel during the fire and himself was injured in the explosion, spending 2 days in a Roseburg hospital. He then went back to his home in Washington and later returned to work for the powder company, but as a workman in the production of explosives, not as a truckdriver. The company disposed of several remaining trucks, and early in 1960 was moving its explosives in rented vehicles.

Of course, the legal story of the Roseburg blast is only beginning. A Douglas County grand jury met in September 1959, hearing 22 witnesses in secret session. It indicted the Pacific Powder Co., owner of the explosives truck, for involuntary manslaughter. But in March 1960, Oregon Circuit Judge James Main sustained a defense demurrer, holding that the Oregon involuntary-manslaughter statute is not applicable to corporations. The grand jury returned no indictments against individuals. District Attorney Avery Thompson later gave notice of his intention to appeal the decision.

The Interstate Commerce Commission and the Oregon Public Utility Commissioner held a joint hearing at Roseburg, also in September 1959. Pacific Powder Co.'s plant superintendent and the driver of the truck both testified they understood the ICC requirement that vehicles transporting explosives were not to be left unattended during transit. They said an ICC safety inspector had warned the superintendent about the rule only a day before the truck left the company plant at Tenino, Wash. Both testified they discussed at considerable length the matter of making certain that the vehicle would be attended, just before Rutherford's departure on the trip to Roseburg. No decision was reached, however, as to a proper place for parking the truck, and the driver departed knowing that delivery could not be made until the next day.

The ICC, in its hearing report issued December 7, 1959, found that Pacific Powder and its driver violated motor carrier safety regulations in leaving the vehicle unattended, in failing to avoid congested places and in parking in congested places. The Commission concluded that if Pacific Powder and its driver had not violated these regulations, the explosion accident would not have occurred.

The Pacific Powder Co. of Washington, the Pacific Powder Sales Co. of Oregon, the Gerretsen Building Supply Co., W. H., G. H., and Donald Gerretsen, and Rutherford all have been named defendants in a long series of civil actions filed in the Douglas County courts. By early June nearly 30 cases were on file, each charging almost identically that the defendants had failed to move the explosives to their destination "without unnecessary delay," that they had failed to provide special care to guard the vehicle, and that they had violated ICC regulations in leaving the vehicle unattended and in parking it in a congested area.

The actions ranged from a $500,000 personal-injury suit on behalf of the comatose Jimmy Siles through a number of $20,000 suits by estates of persons killed—$20,000 is the maximum collectible for a wrongful death in Oregon—to property-damage suits in which insurance companies listed scores of claims already paid.

None of these cases had come to trial when this was written, and about 6 weeks ago Attorney David P. Templeton on behalf of the defendants asked changes of venue in several cases, claiming that his clients could not obtain a fair trial in Douglas County. His petition stated that insurance companies already had paid more than $4 million in property-damage claims because of the blast.

At about the same time an insurance underwriters' group in Portland, Oreg., filed an interpleader action in Federal district court, seeking consolidation of the various claims and court direction as to what they should do with the $500,000 for which the powder company was insured, in case judgments were entered against them. It seemed clear that the total assets of all defendants, including insurance, could not begin to equal the claims filed against them.

But in Roseburg all this is less important than living. Nearly a year after the explosion the flattened blocks still are mostly barren, the rubbish cleared, but very little building done. The main business district looks mostly new, with fresh paint and thousands of square feet of new windows. But around it are evidences of tragedy: A hotel boarded up except for the first floor; a church with a gaping hole where a huge stained-glass window had been; a row of small homes half occupied, half still as the blast left them, with roofs askew and chimneys tottering; charred wreckage where a feed mill once was.

Much of the rebuilding awaits a master plan, which an urban-renewal committee has been trying to formulate. Roseburg, which calls itself the timber capital of the Nation, would like to promote the use of wood in the rebuilding program, and planners want to utilize the natural beauty of the south Umpqua River, flowing past one edge of the blast area.

City Manager John Warburton is enthusiastic on the future of the community, with its plywood, lumber, and recreation industries backed up by agriculture and stock raising. "If people continue to work together as they did after the blast," he said recently, "we won't have any trouble in rebuilding right."

Although Warburton is only a rookie Roseburg resident, he almost qualifies as a native son. He had been city manager just a few months when the explosives truck

erupted—and knocked him out of bed. So he's a newcomer no longer.

In fact, many Roseburg people were blasted out of their beds that night last year, and many still are jumpy. Recently some military jets flew overhead, crashing through the sound barrier in thunderous booms that shook houses and rattled windows, giving everyone that same panicky, empty feeling we all had the night our town blew up.

NEWS RELEASE FROM THE OFFICE OF CONGRESSMAN CHARLES O. PORTER

Congressman CHARLES O. PORTER, Democrat of Oregon, today, May 25, testified before the House Judiciary Committee's subcommittee considering amendments to the Transportation of Explosives Act. PORTER told the committee he favored S. 1806 which contains legislation which would place private and contract carriers under regulations now governing common carriers. The Senate has approved S. 1806.

In his prepared testimony Representative PORTER discussed the August 7, 1959, explosion in Roseburg, Oreg., of a truck loaded with dynamite and nitrocarbonitrate. The vehicle, a private carrier, had been parked and locked and left unattended in downtown Roseburg. Its explosion at 1:15 a.m. brought death to at least 13 persons, injury to 125 others and property damage estimated at $12 million.

PORTER observed that the Interstate Commerce Commission following its on-the-scene investigation, September 1–3, had found that the explosion occurred as the direct result of the explosives laden truck being left locked but unattended while parked upon a public street in the congested part of a city. The ICC told PORTER it was done in disregard of regulations of the ICC designed to prevent such an accident.

The ICC has recommended that private and contract carriers be subject to regulations now governing common carriers. PORTER said he felt that equalizing the regulations would be a positive step. He said the Roseburg disaster could be repeated anywhere at any time, and he urged favorable subcommittee action. PORTER had written to the Judiciary Committee January 11, 1960, outlining in detail the need for legislation which has been approved by the Senate. At that time he supplied the committee with information on the Roseburg explosion.

Under the proposed legislation private and contract carriers carrying explosives and other dangerous articles could be fined up to $1,000 or imprisoned for 1 year or both for violating ICC regulations. If death or bodily injury of a person resulted the penalty would be a fine of up to $10,000 or 10 years imprisonment or both.

[From the Roseburg (Oreg.) News-Review June 25, 1960]

MAGAZINE STORY ON AUGUST 7 BLAST COMES NEXT WEEK

The coming issue of the Saturday Evening Post, which will reach mail subscribers over the weekend and go on sale on newsstands early next week, will contain a feature story on Roseburg's disastrous fire and explosion last August 7.

The story, indexed on the outside cover and appearing as the lead article in the magazine, is written by Bonnie Wallace Riggs. It is entitled "The Night Our Town Blew Up."

The author uses very interesting technique in which she relates the experiences of individuals connected with the tragedy. Little is told of property damage other than in a general way. Instead, the article deals with the personal side of the fire and explosion.

The article is profusely illustrated. Some of the photographs previously appeared in the News-Review. They were made by Paul Jenkins who recently retired from full-time photographic work with the News-Review.

The Case Against Paul Butler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I charged last year that Paul Butler was out to wreck the Democratic Party. His recent shocking display of ingratitude to one of our greatest and most loyal Democrats, the Honorable HALE BOGGS, was most repulsive. Now he insults our beloved Doorkeeper, the Honorable William M. Miller. He is showing the same unbelievable ingratitude to our former President, Harry S. Truman. We must not forget that last year he tried to undermine our leaders in Congress, Senator JOHNSON and Speaker RAYBURN.

The following is from today's Washington Evening Star:

OTHER COMPLAINTS

Among the complaints against Mr. Butler voiced by supporters of one or more of the other candidates are:

1. Mr. Butler's supposedly not-for-attribution dinner with newsmen earlier this year in which he predicted Senator KENNEDY would probably be the nominee. Reporters who had not attended the small private dinner—which was initiated by Mr. Butler—named the party chairman as the source of the stories, and Mr. Butler subsequently acknowledged this.

2. Mr. Butler's reinjection of the religious issue into the campaign in an appearance at the National Press Club last week. Supporters of other candidates feel he issued a thinly veiled threat that Democrats would lose the Catholic vote unless they supported Senator KENNEDY. He said in his own defense that he was merely responding to a question.

3. The party chairman's refusal until yesterday to grant convention space to supporters of Adlai Stevenson. In refusing the request for space Mr. Butler had said that Mr. Stevenson was not a candidate. But he also refused a request that Mr. Stevenson be invited to address the convention, basing that refusal on the ground that Mr. Stevenson was a candidate.

4. A tightening of convention rules last year by the national committee, which placed almost all power of decision in the hands of Mr. Butler. His critics charge Mr. Butler used this power to appoint a rubber-stamp arrangements committee which approved allegedly pro-Kennedy choices for some key convention posts.

Appointment of Representative CHESTER BOWLES, Senator KENNEDY's foreign policy adviser for the campaign, as platform committee chairman is cited as one evidence of this. The freezing out of Representative HALE BOGGS, who had been believed to have the inside track for permanent chairman, was cited as another example. According to this theory, Mr. Butler, a Catholic, did not want Mr. BOGGS, also a Catholic, presiding over a convention that picked a Catholic presidential candidate.

5. Supporters of other candidates feel they have been discriminated against in the assigning of hotel space at the convention. "If you're not for KENNEDY you are parked miles away from everything, in a hotel nobody ever heard of," said one. Many Congressmen, who generally get favored treatment at conventions, also are reported to be complaining about their hotel accommodations.

6. Tight control by Mr. Butler of the Democratic National Committee staff people to go to the convention, with anyone who leaned toward a candidate other than Senator KENNEDY being left at home.

7. Yesterday's announcement that Mr. Butler had told veteran House Doorkeeper William L. (Fishbait) Miller, who has volunteered his services to every Democratic Convention since 1948, that his services would not be needed this time. Mr Miller works closely with House Speaker SAM RAYBURN, unofficial manager of the LYNDON JOHNSON campaign.

RESTRICTIONS EXPLAINED

Mr. Butler has explained his restrictions on the committee staff people going to the convention from Washington as dictated by limited party finances. Critics cite a memorandum sent out by the chairman yesterday, however, which forbids committee personnel to go to the convention on their vacations, at their own expense.

The memorandum, dated June 29, read:

"No member of the salaried staff of the national committee are (sic) to be granted vacation between now and November 8.

"No member will be allowed to take vacation in order to attend the convention at their (sic) own expense."

It is known that some staff members, unhappy at missing the convention, had been making arrangements to go on their own, sometimes getting their expenses paid by working for one or another candidate. This course is ruled out by the June 29 memo.

New Republic of Somalia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a moment to pay tribute to Italian Somalia which today, July 1, becomes independent Somalia.

This nation was once an Italian colony, which the Italian Government voluntarily turned over to the United Nations in 1950. Somalia then became an Italian trusteeship.

During the past decade Italy has taken full responsibility for preparing the Somali people for free and independent status. Under Italy's guidance, Somalia has made considerable progress, both economically and in developing political maturity. Italy has taken her obligations under the U.N. mandate very seriously, and has vigorously applied herself to the task of leading Somalia toward full partnership in the community of nations.

The hopes and aspirations of the Somali people reach fulfillment today with the proclamation of the Somali Republic. We wish them well on this momentous occasion, and we hope they will achieve a full measure of prosperity and success.

Blunders of the Critics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the thoughtful attention of my colleagues the following, perceptive article by Gould Lincoln, as it appeared in the Washington Evening Star on June 30:

A FAR CRY FROM STEPHEN DECATUR
(By Gould Lincoln)

We have gone a "fur piece" down the road since the days of Stephen Decatur, a U.S. naval hero in the early 1800's. It was Decatur, responding to a toast, who said: "Our country: in her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be right; but our country, right or wrong." Today it has become popular in certain quarters to decry the President of the United States and the country's intercourse with foreign nations. The chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, no less—Senator WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas—at a time when this country and President Eisenhower are under bitter attacks by the Communists of Soviet Russia and China, has seen fit to charge that the prestige of the United States is at a new low due to the U–2 incident and Japan's withdrawal of her invitation to the President to visit Tokyo.

PLAY MR. K.'S GAME

Mr. FULBRIGHT's address to the Senate followed a few hours after President Eisenhower, reporting to the Nation on his recent trip to the Far East, laid the blame squarely on the Communists both for the blowup of the summit conference in Paris and for the riots in Japan which led to the withdrawal of his invitation to visit that country. And he said: "We in the United States must not fall into the error of blaming ourselves for what the Communists do; after all, Communists will act like Communists." He added: "Above all we must bear in mind that successful implementation of any policy against Communist imperialism requires that we never be bluffed, cajoled, blinded, or frightened. We cannot win out against the Communist purpose to dominate the world by being timid, passive, or apologetic when we are acting in our own and the free world's interests."

The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in his bitter criticism of what he called the "bumbling and fumbling" of the administration, said the country could not "begin to regain our position in the world until we can disabuse ourselves of the habit of self-delusion, of viewing defeats as victories and of advertising blunders as strokes of genius." He went on to say that Adlai Stevenson, another Democrat, had been right in his May 19 statement that this Government had given Russian Premier Khrushchev the "crowbar and sledge hammer" to wreck the Paris conference. And Mr. FULBRIGHT added on his own: "We might even go further and say that we forced Khrushchev to wreck the conference by our own ineptness."

Apparently the Democrats have now elected to make political capital out of the U–2 incident and the withdrawal of the invitation to President Eisenhower to visit Japan. In their efforts to discredit Mr. Eisenhower and the Republican administration, they seem to overlook the fact they are helping to play Khrushchev's own game, which is not only to divide the American people, but to make us appear weak and inept in the minds of our allies. This is not a pretty picture. It may in the end prove mighty poor politics.

Part of the Democratic effort, too, is to belittle President Eisenhower because of his good-will trips to many nations of the world. All their criticism is based on the fact that the visit to Japan did not come off. They overlook the wonderful receptions accorded Mr. Eisenhower when he visited capitals of our European allies, and then later India and other nations of the East, and later still when he toured South America.

President Eisenhower, in his report to the Nation, strongly pointed out that the Communist leaders had come to regard these good-will visits of the President of the United States to the nations of the world as a blow to the Communist drive for world domination. So much had they become aware of this danger, the President said that they had used false reasons for withdrawing the Khrushchev invitation to the President to visit Russia, and later had gone to great lengths to stir up riots in Tokyo that, in the end, compelled the Japanese Government to withdraw its invitation, too. The President couldn't be righter. Yet his critics in this country insist that these actions on the part of Red Russians and the Red Chinese are to be overlooked because of our own "bumbling and fumbling." How do these Eisenhower critics expect the American people to react to the critics' own blunders?

ATTACKS NOT NEW

Such attacks by Democrats on the Eisenhower administration and its handling of foreign relations of this country are not, in reality, new at all. When the late John Foster Dulles was Secretary of State, the Democratic shout was that we had lost all our friends abroad; that Mr. Dulles was constantly bringing us to the brink of war, and that he was either too adamant or too yielding. Indeed, Mr. Dulles was criticized for constantly traveling about the world on many missions. In those days the same charge was made, that the prestige of the United States had fallen to a low degree. Mr. Dulles died. The expressions of regret coming from our friends abroad were sincere—and they expressed their feeling of loss because of the death of a strong, valiant leader against world communism. We rediscovered, if we did not know it already, that we—and Mr. Dulles—had plenty of friends abroad.

The Democrats will have a tough time, if they try it, making the American people or our allies believe that President Eisenhower has sold them short in defense measures against the Communists, or that he has failed to lead a courageous crusade for world peace.

A Tribute to Mr. Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, June 29, a committee of the principal labor leaders of the United States, under the honorary chairmanship of George Meany, tendered a dinner to the Honorable James P. Mitchell, Secretary of Labor, at the Statler-Hilton Hotel here in Washington. Presiding over the dinner was George M. Harrison and the speakers were President Eisenhower, Jacob S. Potofsky, and William F. Schnitzler.

The dinner and the remarks of the speakers made one of the finest tributes ever given to a living American. The typically modest response by the guest of honor was heartwarming and full of the wisdom which so characterizes him.

An editorial in today's New York Times describes the occasion and the man so well that I ask unanimous consent to include the editorial in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A TRIBUTE TO MR. MITCHELL

The testimonial dinner given to Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, sponsored by 28 top leaders of the American labor movement, was a tribute to a man who has amply deserved it. The occasion was unique both because of the kind of people responsible for it and the character of the recipient himself. It would be almost unbelievable, if it hadn't happened, that so large and influential a group of unionists, whose politics are traditionally Democratic, should honor a Cabinet member in an administration whose policies labor has so bitterly attacked.

Remarkable, too, is the man who for almost 7 years has kept the confidence and respect of a Republican President and members of his Cabinet and of leaders of organized labor—with all of whom he often differed widely. This could only have been done by an unassuming person of stubborn integrity, dedicated to the welfare of the Nation's workers, intimately familiar with the conditions of their life and well aware both of the possibilities, and the limitations, of methods to improve their lot.

Mr. Mitchell, in short, is an idealist of rare sophistication. We, too, applaud his achievement.

Lassie Leaguers, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by me in regard to Lassie Leaguers, Inc.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LASSIE LEAGUERS, INC.
(By Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia)

I have noted that in the past few days, the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator SALTONSTALL, and the Senator from Pennsylvania, Senator CLARK, have been complimentary to the fine work of Lassie Leaguers, Inc.

This is an organization to help provide wholesome recreation for girls between the ages of 10 and 15 years. The organization was originated in Pennsylvania, and it now has its headquarters in Massachusetts.

I should like to join the Senators from those States in their support of this organization. It is franchised in Virginia, and I have been informed that the Lassie League activities mean much to the respective communities. I hope the league will grow.

The league is most widely known for its promotion of a new game called "lassieball," which I understand to be a game similar to baseball but modified for participation by girls 10 to 15 years of age.

Wholesome activities such as this for our young people is a project worthy of national support.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses cleared numerous bills for the President and when the Digest went to press the conferees on sugar extension were in session.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 14445–14487

Bills Introduced: Nine bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 3808–3816; S. Con. Res. 113; and S. Res. 350. Pages 14450–14451

Bills Referred: Two House-passed bills were referred to appropriate committees. Page 14466

Bill Rereferred: Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was discharged from further consideration of S. 2973, to increase pay of food-service and laundry workers under the Veterans' Administration, and the bill was then referred to Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Page 14446

Bill Placed on Calendar: One House-passed bill was placed on calendar.

Call of Calendar: On call of calendar 55 measures, of which 33 were private, were passed as follows:

Without amendment and cleared for President:

Italy: H. Con. Res. 225, expressing sense of Congress with respect to U.S. recognition of the centennial anniversary of the unity of Italy;

Pacific Festival: H.J. Res. 672, requesting issuance of Presidential proclamation with respect to the 1960 Pacific Festival;

Wartime loans—evaluation: H.R. 808, authorizing an evaluation in dollars of certain financial assistance loans expressed in foreign currencies arising from World War II;

Guam lands: H.R. 10997, granting to the government of Guam certain filled and submerged lands and tidelands;

Virgin Islands property: H.R. 11854, to clarify the ownership of certain church properties in the Virgin Islands;

Constitution anniversary: H.J. Res. 605, providing for the preparation of plans for the observance of the 175th anniversary of the Constitution of the U.S.;

D.C.—wills: H.R. 11931, relating to the time within which a caveat to a will must be filed in the D.C.;

FDIC: H.R. 12465, to provide a simpler method of determining assessments under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act;

Panama Relief Act: H.R. 10511, granting an additional benefit to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Cash Relief Act; and

Private bills: 24 private bills, H.R. 10793, 1422, 1493, 1588, 1643, 2117, 2124, 2705, 2716, 2944, 3804, 4555, 4970, 5647, 6804, 7367, 7425, 7551, 8384, 9042, 9610, 9960, 10002, and H. Con. Res. 660.

With amendment, to be sent back to House:

Imports—marking: H.R. 5054, relating to the marking of imports to show the country of origin;

Migratory birds: H.R. 12533, to amend the Migratory Bird Treaty Act so as to increase penalties for violations of such act; and

Private bills: Three private bills, H.R. 10376, H.J. Res. 722, and H.R. 4546.

Without amendment and cleared for House:

Securities Act: S. 3769, to amend in several respects the Securities Act of 1933;

Securities Exchange Act: S. 3770, to amend in several respects the Securities Exchange Act of 1934;

Trust Indenture Act: S. 3771, to amend certain provisions of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939;

Investment Company Act: S. 3772, to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940;

Investment Advisers Act: S. 3773, to amend in several respects the Investment Advisers Act of 1940;

Acreage allotments: S. 3533, to protect farmers making certain land use changes under the Great Plains conservation program against loss of acreage allotments; and

Private bills: Three private bills, S. 882, 2427, and 3432.

With amendment and cleared for House:

Iowa lands: S. 3247, providing that payment for the (Iowa) lands covered by act of September 9, 1959, be made on a deferred basis;

Agricultural commodities: S. 3146, authorizing the CCC to donate agricultural commodities for use in home economics courses;

Appendix

Research and Development: A Vital Contribution to Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I have just heard a most able, in fact, brilliant, address by one of America's greatest leaders in research and development, Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau. He never fails to make a most interesting, instructive, and profound address when he talks on the research and development program of the U.S. Army. It is, therefore, with pleasure that I present the address delivered by him before the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce awards banquet in Washington on the evening of Tuesday, June 28, 1960:

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT: A VITAL CONTRIBUTION TO SECURITY

(Remarks by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army, awards banquet, sponsored by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce, Washington, D.C., June 28, 1960)

Mr. Pafford, Mr. Palmer, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, fellow Americans, it is a distinct privilege and pleasure to be here tonight and to have this opportunity of speaking to such an outstanding group of worthy young Americans.

First, I would like to congratulate your mothers and fathers—many of who are here with you—stanch Americans who have instilled in you the sound character, patriotic fervor, and high sense of a citizen's responsibility which have brought you to this proud achievement tonight.

Next, let me commend you—the award winners for 1960—for the fine essays you have written and for the many original approaches you have taken to this vitally important subject—national security. The honors that you have won are a clear indication that you, one and all, are on the thresholds of great careers—careers that will be rich in reward. I speak of reward with little reference to rank, station, or wealth, but rather of personal satisfaction—the supreme satisfaction that comes from carving out a good life and living it to the hilt.

Surely, we all agree that dedication to our Christian civilization and our country—its concepts and ideals—is the strong fabric of our national security. How well we serve determines the effectiveness of our Government, our foreign relations, our world trade, and our military preparedness—in effect, our entire way of life. It was Lincoln who said: "bear in mind that not with politicians, not with Presidents, not with officeseekers, but with you is the question: 'Shall the liberties of this country be preserved to the latest generation?'"

I deeply believe that what's ahead for America tomorrow and the day after will depend upon how well you—and students in every classroom across our land—serve America. There is a growing recognition of this fact as America stands today at a critical moment of history—at the crossroads of destiny—fighting to halt the advancing growth and spread of the vast and amoral international conspiracy—world communism—an alien ideology dedicated to seizing unlimited power and domination over the globe. The challenge of communism is steadily growing in all of its aspects—the economic, social, and political as well as the military—and today it is at the full crest of its drive. Throughout the world—in the slave lands and in the free nations—Communist embassies, trade missions and other headquarters work unceasingly, blazing with light in the dead of night.

Pacing this vicious worldwide conflict are two other fast-moving phenomena.

One is the rising tide of ethic nationalism which burst forth from the agonizing struggles of World War II and from the wonders of communication and transportation—and which is creating truly significant problems in those vital areas of Africa and Asia, known as the "uncommitted world." These people—diseased, undernourished, illiterate, impoverished—call for an improved standard of living. They look to see which system—the free world's or the Communist—can best help them secure the economic necessities of life—and which system can do it more rapidly. We must find solutions to their problems and show them that economic growth and technological progress are in better harmony with our type of freedom—than with Communist slavery.

The other phenomenon is the explosion in science and technology—which is drastically reshaping our world, bringing to our generation and yours more changes than were faced by our forebears in any past period of history.

In the last 100 years—2 percent of recorded time—mankind has achieved 90 percent of his technological progress. The future is even more promising. Of all the men who have ever been trained in science and technology, it is estimated that nine-tenths of them are alive today.

The implications of this exploding technology are truly fantastic.

Not only will national security profit from this amazing age of technology, but literally all mankind if we can survive the challenge of our times. The peaceful benefits give promise of a life more full and free for peoples everywhere if we have the wisdom to employ them.

Truly, this is an age demanding unprecedented exertion and imagination as we face the task of conquering our terrestrial environment, and of exploring the depths of the sea and the boundless regions of celestial space. The golden rain of exciting new applications of scientific discovery promise to raise the world's standard of living—to give the world's hungry masses more food, better shelter and other necessities of life. We are making tremendous strides in the control of disease and improving our biological environment. We are also beginning to learn how to control our physical environment.

New sources of energy are steadily feeding the growing appetite of industry for power and increasing man's productive ability and his comforts. New machines, soon to be in production, will provide several times more mechanical and electrical energy than present models with great reduction in size and weight. Think about some of the fantastic promises of technology glimpsed through electronics and automation. Through automation, technology promises more of the necessities, comforts, and luxuries of life if we can only learn to utilize and distribute them in a more acceptable manner.

New advances in transportation, communication, shelter, and utilities should make it possible for more people to break away even more from large, urbanized areas and live a richer community life.

The future is challenging in every respect.

The discoveries that we shall reap through satellites and manned space vehicles probing the universe are impossible to predict. We must not lose our sense of balance but the impact of space on our daily lives will be staggering as the end of our century approaches. Satellites with radio beacons operating on solar batteries will serve as navigation aids. They will also keep the world's weather under observation and greatly assist in improving worldwide communications.

The implications of all these research-sparked advances are staggering beyond imagination, but they give us hope and promise for a dynamic future.

At the taproot of this marvelous technological age is the disturbing fact that nations have at long last achieved the awesome power of mutual destruction. With the key of science and technology, mankind has freed forces which cannot be reimprisoned. Today a single nuclear-tipped missile can equal in destructive power all the devastation created during World War II. There is worldwide concern that this terrible power will, by design or miscalculation, break loose and wreck havoc upon nations and peoples. In this life there are few certainties, but one of them is that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty—and today, even of survival.

Speaking of vigilance, there is a growing need for Americans in this land to become more security conscious. In industry—in government—yes, in the Armed Forces, we should all remember the Russian success in concealing a microphone within the great seal of the United States in our Embassy in Moscow. Our own State Department has estimated that 300,000 persons are being employed by Communist forces in espionage against the free world.

All of us here tonight will agree that maintaining security is no childish game of cops and robbers. Nor is it only an intellectual exercise of matching wits with the enemy. Security unquestionably is one of the most important elements of our struggle for survival as a free nation in a free world. The acquisition of intelligence of the enemy by all available means is a vital security measure. When dealing with the amoral, ruthless forces massed against us, we would be stupid to leave any stone unturned in our own defense.

Never must we forget that the Communists consider themselves perpetually at war. In their ugly, tortured logic, peace is a condition that can exist only on their terms. They cry peaceful coexistence when they actually mean coaxful nonresistance.

I wish I had the time to speak longer on this subject because it's a subject on which I feel very strongly.

As a people we must more meaningfully define our national goals and objectives and

again find the fuel that brightens the uplifted torch of liberty. We must back our leaders in finding ways and means to pierce the Red fog. This is a major challenge to you young people, especially—and you must do you job well in alerting America, else yours may be the last generation to know a free America.

I hope you all have read—and given much thought to—the splendid series of articles in Life magazine concerning this Nation's need to reexamine its pillars of national purpose. And I hope you are aware of the work of the President's National Goals Commission under Dr. Henry Wriston. I urge you to study and to keep abreast of these developments—they are guided by men who understand the deep meaning of our great but befogged national purpose. There is no doubt in my mind that with such guidance our country can rise to the current challenge and advance the vital interests of freedom throughout the world. We must not forget that the real capstone of all strength is in firm advancement of the spiritual values that have made America the greatest Nation on this earth. Our infatuation with things mundane can destroy us. The true strength of free men and nations everywhere comes from faith in a Supreme Being and dedication to a just cause.

There is evidence that the material comforts of an exploding technology tend to obscure the only philosophy which gives real meaning to life—the spiritual. In at atmosphere where many avoid or scorn moral and spiritual values, it is no wonder that so many seem unable to differentiate between our standard of living and our way of life.

In my work as Chief of Army Research and Development I deal with a great number of scientists every day, and I have the highest regard for those talented men. You will understand me, therefore, when I say that, with due regard for Ph. D.'s, what we need very badly in this country are more Ch. D.'s. By coining this euphonious term I mean doctors of character. While not everyone can be a Ph. D., it is possible for everyone to be a Cr. D. And if there is one attribute that needs more thought and attention today it is the advancement of those sterling qualities of character and adherence to sound moral principles that were the trademark of our forefathers and here the home, the church, and the state have much to accomplish.

As to the application of science, in this dynamic age, it is the sound and solid key to economic growth, industrial progress, better health, and richer lives. I include the social as well as the physical sciences in such an appraisal.

If technology is to continue to accelerate, greater emphasis must be placed on basic research for new scientific knowledge and on applied research for new hardware items. Our national ability to provide adequate defense or to compete in world markets—in the late 1960's and the 1970's will be determined by the research and development effort our country is willing to support today.

The Army's efforts in basic research—to penetrate the ever-expanding horizons of science—are extensive. We devote about $50 million per year to this effort, expended through more than 550 laboratories, universities, and industries and 80 Army and other Government installations and—important to many of you—through two overseas research offices: one in Frankford and the other in Tokyo.

Basic research is crucial. It is the chief determinant of how the weapon art will progress in the coming decades. The Army will continue to stress and expand such efforts; they are the key to future development—to progress in peace and victory in war. Breakthroughs in research today will perhaps do more toward reshaping favorably the world's balance of power tomorrow than any other single achievement.

Now, here are some of the more promising aspects of basic research that we can expect to see incorporated into future equipment.

Metallurgy is one dramatic field that will surge beyond the boundaries of our imagination in the next few years. Here, new metals with amazing characteristics are being created to exploit extremes of temperatures and pressures which we are encountering or using in this space age. They promise to provide alloys that will be stronger, more heat resistant, and lighter than anything that we know today. Missiles, vehicles, and electronic devices will benefit from such advances.

Electronics is another field that has seen a quantum jump in the last 10 years. Here, basic research already has led to the technique of microminiaturization of electronic components. A cubic foot of space which only yesterday held 7,000 parts, now holds 350,000; and even this figure can be increased by a factor of 10 in certain fuze applications. Using solid circuit techniques, even this is only a beginning. Other marvels in the electronic field are the ruby maser, the tunnel diode, and the parametric amplifier, promising to increase tenfold the sensitivity and range of many Army electronic systems.

These advances illustrate, moreover, the kind of basic research effort which is necessary to feed the insatiable appetite of applied research and development, for without new knowledge—without new science—applied research and development is limited to product improvement. Product improvement, important as it is, will not put us out in front, where we belong, or keep us there.

Let us look now at the general areas of interest in our applied research and development effort in the classic fields of military endeavor—firepower, communications, and mobility.

As you know, nuclear weapons have revolutionized firepower—missiles have boosted our ranges of delivery and tremendously increased our impact power.

Among some of the other more promising items of new equipment are aerial vehicles which utilize ducted fans and other concepts for both horizontal and vertical flight, more versatile and lighter tracked vehicles, new power sources, miniaturized radios and data computers, and better protection for the soldier in the hostile environment of the nuclear battlefield.

Other startling additions to our arsenal of future weapons may occur in the chemical field. Here we know that the Soviets are putting a high priority on development of lethal and nonlethal weapons, and that their weapon stockpile consists now of about one-sixth chemical munitions. Russian leaders have boasted that they are fully prepared to use new chemical weapons of great significance. If the Communists ever use chemicals, with which they are well equipped, we must be prepared to meet such an attack.

Let me tell you briefly about the interest now being shown in certain chemicals that are only temporarily incapacitating—agents that allow personnel to recover completely with no permanent aftereffects. These chemicals are basically of two types. One is psychochemical that disturbs the normal behavior pattern of the individual, causing apathy, fear, or disorientation of the mind. The other type is physically incapacitating, causing for example, temporary blindness or paralysis. These two chemical agents could be used against an enemy without causing fatalities or large-scale destruction of buildings, bridges, and other man-made structures.

We view all our contributions to the defensive might of America with pride. I should like to show you a short film illustrating some our latest technological Army developments. This film includes a few ground and air vehicles and the latest advances in firepower—rockets and guided missiles.

(Film sequence—continuous—R. & D. projects.)

(Armored personnel carriers.)

Here is the new armored personnel carrier. It can be both air-transported and air-dropped. It is highly mobile, swims inland waters, and transports a driver and 12 men with aluminum armor protection from atomic blast and heat, as well as from small arms and shell fragments. In addition to many other improvements, it only weighs half as much as its predecessor.

(Goer vehicle.)

This vehicle gives promise of true off-road mobility for transport of heavy cargo in combat areas. Here is a demonstration showing one prototype—the 5,000-gallon tanker—maneuvering through a mud lane, 30 inches deep. This tanker model is able to crab-walk through this mud, partly because of its low ground pressure and high ground clearance, but primarily because of its wagon steer. This characteristic allows the two-wheel cab to turn up to 90 degrees in either direction, thus giving Goer's higher maneuverability.

This concept, which is a new approach to logistical carriers for use in highly mobile Army forces, is an outgrowth of recent developments in heavy earth-moving equipment. The Goer is rugged and reliable and exceeds any other wheeled vehicle I know of in real off-road mobility. In addition, it can carry its own weight and has good amphibious characteristics.

Here, is another prototype—the 15-ton cargo Goer. This vehicle has the lift capacity of six 2½-ton trucks. Notice how easily it is going over large obstacles—a series of sandy hogbacks—which as you can see stop conventional trucks.

The Goer's exoskeletal construction, in which the structural strength of the vehicle is in its outer frame, permits the vehicle to swim on water, as shown here. Waterproof parts or submersible engines are unnecessary. The treads of the large tires act like paddle wheels to propel the vehicle at a speed of about 3.5 knots in calm water.

(Doak.)

The Doak test bed is designed to take off and land like a helicopter but operates in the air like a conventional airplane. Doak uses rotatable ducted fans as its source of propulsion. Here you see it taking off with the fans at a vertical position. Notice now that the propeller ducts are rotated to the full forward position permitting normal flight characteristics of the aircraft. To land, the engines are returned to the vertical.

(Piasecki Flying Platform.)

This test bed is commonly called the Piasecki flying jeep. It is one of two models which we have under development. The flying jeep employs ducted fans for its source of propulsion and has conventional type helicopter controls. The operation at this stage of research is cumbersome, as you can see. Much work remains to be done before stability and control reach the level desired, but the feasibility of this type of air movement has been established.

(Caribou.)

In 1956, the Secretary of Defense approved a deviation from the 5,000-pound empty weight limitation imposed on Army aircraft. With the weight limitation raised, the Army took steps to procure a new airplane suitable for our use in close-support of the battlefield. The plane selected is shown here—DeHavilland of Canada's new rugged, workhorse—the Caribou.

The Caribou is a twin engine, passenger, or cargo plane with a 3½-ton payload. Its range is 1,200 miles with a cruising speed of 160 knots. It is powered by two Pratt and Whitney 1,450-horsepower engines. Empty

weight is 15,000 pounds. We envision this plane as a troop transport and an important delivery means of critical supplies that can be flown in and out of semi-prepared, short landing strips. Its wide opening door will permit rapid loading and unloading of troops, supplies, and equipment. It can carry two jeeps or 31 troops.

With a full payload, the Caribou can take off in about 1,000 feet. We officially accepted it last October and it is now in production.

(Surveillance drone.)

In the surveillance field, here is the SD–2, our newest drone system for gathering information of the enemy in the battle area. It is launched from a standard Army trailer. Jet boosted into flight, the SD–2 is radio controlled to survey enemy positions. Its sensory compartment accommodates photo transmissions systems, infrared radar, or other new electronic devices which transmit or bring back data. Here, it is being recovered by its own parachute. Development is underway on a family of drone systems for employment by the various command echelons of the field Army.

(Little John.)

The first project in the firepower area is the improved or tactical Little John. Notice the battlefield mobility of this weapon now being developed to provide an atomic punch for our Strategic Army Corps. This version of Little John has improved accuracy and will give us a firepower capability to meet our special requirements.

(Lacrosse.)

Now for Lacrosse, another close-support guided missile of extreme accuracy. In this sequence you'll see it fired at a stake several thousand yards away. Notice how it homes on the target. Lacrosse is highly mobile—it can be fired from a launcher mounted on a standard truck, and it can be carried by a helicopter.

(Sergeant.)

Now let us look at Sergeant. This is the weapon that will supersede Corporal, and like Corporal can carry an atomic warhead to about a 75-mile range. It is smaller, more efficient—a supersonic, medium range, solid-propellant ballistic guided missile. It provides a much easier, faster, and simpler handling in the field. As you can see, Sergeant is launched in a near vertical position from a specially designed erector-launcher. The missile is transportable by air and by standard Army vehicles. The system is under advanced testing and should soon go into production. When operational, Sergeant will carry a variety of warheads.

(Hawk.)

Now look at this air defense weapon—"the bullet with the brain." It is called Hawk. It provides a low-level air defense capability. It is the counterpart of the Nike-Hercules. Here you'll see it reach and destroy an F–80 drone at a low altitude. This missile carried a high explosive warhead. You will see how accurate it is when the missile comes up and destroys the drone that is just entering the screen. Recently Hawk has intercepted targets below 100 feet and up to 50,000 feet in altitude. Hawk battalions now in training are expected to be operational within months.

As you know, Hawk is the antiaircraft missile that recently intercepted and destroyed Honest John, another ballistic missile. Let's look at that amazing bullet-hits-bullet demonstration that took place at the White Sands Missile Range last January.

(Hawk-Honest John.)

Here you see an Honest John being launched as the target. Now you see a Hawk missile being launched and rising rapidly to seek and destroy the target. Notice how the Hawk missile dives to kill its prey. The speeds involved here are supersonic.

Early this month—on the 5th of June—the Army repeated this bullet-hits-bullet demonstration, using our new improved Nike-Hercules against a much faster target—our Corporal ballistic missile.

(Hercules-Corporal.)

Here, you see the launching sequence of these supersonic missiles—first, the Corporal; then the Hercules. Finally, you will see the explosion of the high explosive warhead of the Nike-Hercules as it hits its target. Certainly this missile-against-missile feat is another proof of the high-speed intercept principle which the Army is exploiting in development of Nike-Zeus.

(Nike-Zeus.)

Here, you see a test model of Nike-Zeus—we judge this revolutionary weapon to be the Army's most important contribution in the future for the defense of the United States against enemy ICBM's—the only weapon system under development in the free world designed to attack incoming ballistic missiles. Note the ground support equipment, particularly the large acquisition radars and the fire control facility.

This launching from above ground was to determine the performance of the missile configuration. The huge fins on this test model are for the purpose of gathering flight data in the atmosphere. The tactical models will be considerably trimmer. We have successfully fired both the Zeus booster and sustainer rocket motor and are now approaching the testing stage of the complete system. In the near future we plan to fire it against our own ballistic missiles to test its full potential.

Recently, we successfully fired the test model of Nike-Zeus from our underground launcher at White Sands Missile Range. These firings, shown here, were the first tests of a new-type launching facility proposed for use when Zeus becomes operational. The 450,000-pound thrust Zeus booster engine is the most powerful single-unit, solid-propellant motor successfully fired in the free world.

There is an urgent requirement for this weapon while we are faced with the growing ballistic missile threat of the Communists. We are confident the Nike-Zeus can do this job in the 1960's.

(Cat and mouse.) The last project in the firepower area deals with nonlethal gases. Here is a graphic demonstration of one of these—a psychochemical—which is being investigated as a possible alternative to nuclear weapons or toxic chemical agents. Nonlethal gases of this type disturb the normal behavior pattern of the individual, causing either apathy, fear, or disorientation of the mind.

Here you see this gas used on a cat. Before inhaling, the cat, as you see, reacts normally to the company of a mouse. Now the cat is subjected to the harmless gas. Now notice the reaction of the cat to the mouse. The cat seems to be afraid of its visitor. Humans, after receiving a dose of this gas, will not react to orders or instructions but merely wander around aimlessly. Consider what this gas would do to enemy troops defending a hill or intermingled with civilians in a city.

What we are currently achieving in Army Research and Development is merely a milestone in our continuing effort to provide the best weapons and equipment that modern technology can produce for U.S. troops.

Yet, the task for all of us today clearly goes beyond that of supporting the Armed Forces, as important as that task is. Again, I emphasize that we all have a crucial part to play in strengthening the moral fiber and spirit of this free nation in meeting the Communist multiple-threat stategy.

The world is nobody's plum. It's a wrinkled old prune and will only be a charred pit unless wise and able leadership prevails and unless our people stop measuring our way of life by the false gages of material wealth and luxuries. Our future depends upon ourselves—our character, our ideals, our abilities, and our determination to achieve greater things for ourselves and for free people everywhere.

The time was never more urgent for us to take stock of where we are today and where we are going tomorrow. Your generation faces more crucial problems than any generation of the past, as we struggle against false ideologies, ignorance, annihilation and seek to meet the yearning of most of the world's peoples to share our blessings.

It is not from government, but rather from all of us as individuals that the wisdom and determination must come to create dynamic national policies and to translate them into action. Within each of us should burn the spark—the flame ready to kindle other fires. Our history clearly reveals that when the goal is set high for our people, great things are accomplished and new heights are achieved. Today, in this urging era—tainted with seeming grayness and indecision—the power to assure the progress and security of our country—as well as the whole free world—is still within our capabilities if we but know and use our strength.

This is where a continuous catalytic action is required. We are faced with a vital, national task to lift our horizon and rekindle the spirit and dynamism of our forefathers. It depends upon industry, on labor, on Government, and on the Armed Forces—but basically it is an individual task—demanding the dedication of every loyal American. Mere outlay of money or physical resources alone will not bring a day, an hour, or a moment of real security. That objective can only be realized by greater vigilance, wisdom and determination on the part of all of us, but of great importance also is the refurbished image of an alert America purged by sacrifices and brightened by policies that give greater hope to free men everywhere.

We must again become inspired with the spiritual strength, determination, and fortitude of our forefathers. We must replace fear with faith; complacency with courage.

The great days of America need not lie shrouded in past glories. We have but touched the mezzanine of national achievement. Unlimited is our future if we have the courage to seek it. The days of the coming years burn bright with promise—for those who dare. We must stop wasting our heritage and move on to a greater destiny. Freemen everywhere pray that we will find the wisdom and the strength to do so.

I can think of no better way to assert what I believe our national spirit and goal should be today, than to echo the challenging words of Daniel Webster—inspiring words proudly inscribed on the wall above the Speaker's chair in our House of Representatives:

"Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its power; build its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered."

The individual contribution of each of you toward this worthy goal will be a measure of the future success or failure that we, collectively, contribute to a greater America and a better world. This is the challenge of your lifetime. I hope your lifes will be stimulated and guided by the fires of the spirit and not immersed in the tepid waters of mundane comforts. What you give to America will be the best measure of your appreciation for what America has given to you. Let me congratulate you again on the accomplishment that brought you here.

I thank you very much.

Governor Rockefeller Points to Bright Future for Dairy Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we in New York State are extremely proud of the important part played in our State's economy by the dairy industry. Indeed, judged by all standards on the national level, the Empire State is a leading dairy center.

In a recent address in Syracuse, N.Y., Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller predicted a bright future for the Nation's dairy industry, and complimented the industry for the manner in which by research and promotion it has continually progressed and prospered. He pointed out that Government and industry must work hand in hand in the future in order to realize dairying's full growth potential.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from this excellent address by Governor Rockefeller be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER, OF NEW YORK, ON THE NATION'S DAIRY INDUSTRY

Speaking before the diamond jubilee convention of the Holstein-Friesian Association of America, held in Syracuse, N.Y., the Governor pointed to the population increase of the 1960's as opening up sizable new markets for dairy products.

Governor Rockefeller noted that the proportion of young people, who are bigger milk consumers than others, would increase substantially. He also noted that family incomes would rise in the 1960's, and that an increase in living standards was traditionally accompanied by greater consumption of dairy products.

The Governor added that both government and the dairy industry would have to make substantial efforts in research and promotion in order to take full advantage of the industry's growth potential. He cited the efforts of the New York State government in food research and in official promotion of farm products as evidence of what government could properly do to help the dairy industry and other branches of agriculture.

The Governor stressed the importance of overall economic growth to meet the Nation's urgent needs for better living standards, improved public services, and stronger defense and greater cooperation with other free nations.

Excerpts from Governor Rockefeller's remarks follow:

"I want to extend my most sincere congratulations to you all on the diamond jubilee of your association. In the 75 years of its existence, your association has not only brought great progress to you and great benefits to the consumers of dairy products; you have also demonstrated a principle that is relevant to every aspect of our American national effort today; namely, continuity of purpose. You know that true progress comes only through careful planning and consistent effort bent to a clearly conceived goal. This insight had guided you in the past, and it will stand you in very good stead in the future.

"The future of the dairy industry, it seems to me, looks promising indeed. I am very glad that this is the case, not only as the Governor of a great dairying State, but also as a citizen deeply concerned with the prosperity of our farmers throughout the Nation.

"The market for dairy products should grow faster in the 1960's than it has in the past because of the greater population growth that lies before us. Until now, our population has grown at the rate of about 1.4 percent a year. During the 1960's our population should grow about 1.8 percent a year—an almost 30 percent faster increase, an almost 30 percent greater possible growth rate for the dairy industry. The composition of the population will be favorably to dairymen, too. There will be a greater proportion of young people, who are bigger milk consumers than their seniors. Family incomes will rise too—and the evidence is that as people earn more, they consume more dairy products.

"However, you and I know that these potential opportunities will not be realized automatically. Other products compete for the dollars that can be spent on dairy products. The tastes and preferences of people change. Therefore, if the dairy industry is to stay strong and grow faster, both farmers and the Government agencies charged with assisting them must be alert and vigorous in research and promotion.

"I am happy to say that we have been mindful of these needs in New York State. Just last month, I dedicated a new food science and technology building at the New York State Agricultural Experiment Station in Geneva. This is the most advanced food research center in the United States—and the benefits of its work will be made available to anyone in the United States who wants them. Moreover, the State legislature at its last session appropriated additional funds for an expanded program of farm products promotion. Needless to say, I was delighted to sign the bill. And specifically for the benefit of the milk producing industry, we have abolished the outmoded milk dating requirement in New York City.

"The combination of Government-sponsored research, promotion and up-to-date regulation with the initiative and the enterprise of dairymen themselves is the key to the increased growth of your industry. This combination of Government service to the people—not Government dictation or imposition or duplication—and energetic effort by the people themselves is the key to the progress of all agriculture and to the accelerated growth of our economy.

"We ned economic growth in every front, and we need it to fulfill a mounting variety of legitimate private and public desires:

"The desire for a better life for all our people.

"The desire for better public services in education, health, recreation, highways and many other facilities.

"The desire—so urgent at this hour—for a stronger national defense.

"And the desire to build freedom throughout the world.

"All these goals are attainable if we provide the adequate material means to them through accelerated economic advancement.

"I know that you will do your part in the future as you have in the past for increased progress and prosperity. I pledge myself to do everything in my official power to assist the growth of the dairy industry and of the ecoonmy as a whole. Together, we shall lay more solid material foundations for the great and growing house of freedom."

Progress on Rayburn New House Office Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I have asked the Architect of the Capitol, George Stewart, to give me the current status of the new Rayburn House Office Building, which is under construction.

Architect Stewart has sent me a letter dated June 24, 1960, and a report which I am including under leave to extend my remarks.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL,
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1960.

Hon. JAMES G. FULTON,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN FULTON: In answer to your inquiry on the progress of the additional House Office Building (which has been referred to as the "Rayburn Office Building"), I am enclosing herewith three copies of a statement which I presented to the House Committee on Appropriations a few weeks ago. This statement contains practically all of the information you desire.

With reference to your question on occupancy of the garage, it is too early to indicate what portions of the garage might be occupied prior to completion of the total project; however, you may be sure if such occupancy proves feasible as the work progresses, I will be glad to make the necessary arrangements with the contractor.

Appreciating your interest in this project and with warm personal regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

J. GEORGE STEWART,
Architect of the Capitol.

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY, CONSTRUCTION, AND EQUIPMENT, ADDITIONAL HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION

Public Law 24, 84th Congress, "Additional House Office Building Act of 1955."

Amount of contract authorization: To be determined by the House Office Building Commission.

Amount of contract authorization appropriated to date:	
Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1955	$5,000,000
Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1957	10,000,000
Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1958	7,500,000
Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1959	22,500,000
Legislative Branch Appropriation Act, 1960	16,500,000
Total appropriated	61,500,000
Appropriation requested in the Budget for the fiscal year 1961	13,000,000
Acquisition of property, construction, and equipment, additional house office building	13,000,000

This project is authorized by the "Additional House Office Building Act of 1955," Public Law 24, 84th Congress, approved April 22, 1955. Under the provisions of the Authorization Act, the planning of the additional office building and other authorized changes and improvements and the determi-

nation of contract authorization are vested in the House Office Building Commission, consisting of Speaker RAYBURN, Representative VINSON of Georgia, and Representative AUCHINCLOSS of New Jersey.

The project is broken down into seven parts, as follows:

Acquisition of property as a site for an additional office building and for additions to the Capitol Grounds.

Construction and equipment of an additional office building.

Changes, alterations, and remodeling of the Old House Office Building.

Changes, alterations, and remodeling of the New House Office Building.

Construction and equipment of security vaults and other underground structures.

Subways and underground transportation systems.

Landscape development of five squares acquired for additional House Office Building project.

Numerous meetings have been held by the House Office Building Commission and various directives have been issued by the Commission to the Architect of the Capitol.

The following is a report on accomplishments to date:

ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY

All properties directed by the House Office Building Commission to be acquired for the additional House Office Building project have been purchased. The properties consist of five squares, located immediately south and west of the present House Office Buildings, known as squares 635, south of 635, 637, 691, and 692. Title, in fee simple absolute, to these properties now vests in the United States of America.

Square 635 has been completely cleared of structures and is one of the two squares on which the additional House Office Building is being erected. The other square (square 636) was already owned by the Government and, prior to commencement of the project, was used as a parking area for Members' automobiles.

Square south of 635 has also been completely cleared of structures and is now used as a parking lot for automobiles.

Square 637 has been cleared of all structures except the General Outdoor Advertising Building, now used by the Architect of the Capitol as a field construction office.

Square 691 has been cleared of all structures except the George Washington Inn, which is now being used to provide temporary office and committee facilities for the House of Representatives. The remainder of the square is being used as a parking lot for automobiles.

Square 692 has been cleared of all structures except the Congressional Hotel, which is being operated under lease by the Knott Hotels Corp. The remainder of the square is being used as a parking lot for automobiles.

These five squares have been acquired, cleared of structures, and graded at a total cost of $7,993,254.

ASSOCIATE ARCHITECTS AND ENGINEERS FOR PROJECT

By direction of the House Office Building Commission, the following architects and engineers have been engaged, by personal service contracts, for the additional House Office Building project. Under the terms of their contracts, they are compensated on a fee basis, in accordance with rates established for such work by the American Institute of Architects.

Additional House Office Building: John Harbeson, William J. Hough, William H. Livingston, and Roy F. Larson, architects of Philadelphia, Pa.

Changes, alterations, and remodeling work, Old House Office Building: Roscoe DeWitt and Fred L. Hardison, architects of Dallas, Tex.

Changes, alterations, and remodeling work, New House Office Building: Alfred Easton Poor and Albert Homer Swanke, architects of New York City.

Security vaults and other underground structures: Jesse M. Shelton and Alan G. Stanford, of Robert & Co., Associates, Atlanta, Ga.

Subways and underground transportation systems: Jesse M. Shelton and Alan G. Stanford, of Robert & Co., Associates, Atlanta, Ga.

Landscape development of five squares acquired for additional House Office Building project: Robert Wheelwright, Markley Stevenson, and Joe W. Langrant, landscape architects of Philadelphia, Pa.

CONSTRUCTION AND EQUIPMENT OF ADDITIONAL OFFICE BUILDING

The estimated cost of the new building, as approved by the Commission, to date, including sewer relocation cost, is $68 million.

As approved, the new building provides accommodations for 8 major standing committees and 15 subcommittees, 170 three-room office suites, storage facilities for Members, and other appurtenant and necessary facilities; also, parking accommodations for approximately 1,600 automobiles. The new building is to be located on the two squares immediately west of the New House Office Building. There two squares have been combined into one square through the closing of Delaware Avenue.

Contracts were awarded in 1955 for engineering soils analyses and in 1956 for foundation test borings, necessary to determine the proper foundation for the new building. Work under these contracts has been completed.

Contract was awarded, December 21, 1956, to Gunnell Construction Co., for construction of a large sewer in square 635, on the site of the new building. This contract included part of the excavation and foundation work for the new building, as the new sewer is located beneath and constitutes a part of the new building structure. As the new sewer integrates with the city sewer system, it was necessary to install it in this location to provide proper drainage. Work under this contract has been completed at a cost of $1,392,805.

Contract was awarded, May 8, 1958, to McCloskey & Co., of Philadelphia, Pa., for excavation, excavation bracing, foundation piles and pile caps for the new building. Work under this contract is now about 76 percent complete and is expected to be completed by October 1960. The present amount of the contract is $8,269,767.

Contract was awarded, July 9, 1958, to the Bethlehem Steel Co. for furnishing, delivery and erection of the structural steel for the new building. This part of the job was awarded as a separate contract in order to expedite construction work. Work under this contract is now about 40 percent complete and is expected to be completed by December 1960. The present amount of the contract is $6,893,573.

Contract was awarded, March 10, 1960, in the amount of $50,793,000, for the superstructure for the new building. Work under this contract is scheduled for completion by June 1963. Occupancy of the new building is expected to commence prior to completion. The contract was awarded to McCloskey & Co.

Changes, alterations and remodeling of the old House Office Building:

The estimated cost of changes, alterations and remodeling of the Old House Office Building, as approved by the Commission, May 17, 1956, on the basis of preliminary plans and estimates of cost, is $9 million.

As approved, the Old Building is to be remodeled in such a manner as to provide 135 three-room office suites, 3 major standing committee rooms, 5 subcommittee rooms, and other miscellaneous appurtenant and necessary facilities, including an underground garage in the courtyard. To effect these improvements, major structural changes will be necessary; also, a general rearrangement of existing physical facilities and major changes to the plumbing and toilet systems; electrical and lighting systems; heating, ventilating and air-conditioning systems; and elevator and other transportation facilities.

Contract was awarded to Kirk Lindsey, Inc., January 24, 1958, for construction of a 3-level garage in the courtyard of the Old Building, providing parking accommodations for 291 automobiles. Work under this contract has been completed at a cost of $1,326,082. The garage was occupied and placed in operation in June 1959.

Further remodeling work in the Old Building is being deferred by order of the Commission.

Changes, alterations, and remodeling of the New House Office Building:

The estimated cost of changes, alterations, and remodeling of the New House Office Building, as approved by the Commission, May 17, 1956, on the basis of preliminary plans and estimates of cost, is $9,500,000.

As approved, the New House Office Building is to be remodeled in such a manner as to provide 142 three-room office suites, 6 major standing committee rooms, 4 subcommittee rooms, 14 two-room office suites, and 16 odd rooms, and other miscellaneous appurtenant and necessary facilities, including a cafeteria building in the courtyard. To effect these improvements, major structural changes will be necessary; also, a general rearrangement of existing physical facilities, and major changes to the plumbing and toilet systems; electrical and lighting systems; heating, ventilating and air-conditioning systems; and elevator and other transportation facilities.

Contract was awarded to Irons & Reynolds, Inc., September 3, 1957, for construction of a one-story building in the courtyard of the New House Office Building, covering the entire courtyard, to serve as a cafeteria for the House, containing seating accommodatons for approximately 575 persons. Work under this contract has been completed at a cost of $954,560. The new cafeteria was placed in service February 5, 1959.

With the exception of remodeling the space vacated by the old cafeteria for use by the House Post Office and certain other minor changes, further remodeling work in the New House Office Building is being deferred by order of the Commission.

Construction and equipment of security vaults and other underground structures: Action has been deferred with respect to these items.

Subways and underground transportation systems: This matter is still under study, and plans and specifications for this part of the project are expected to be completed during the fiscal year 1961. The estimated cost of a subway and subway transportation system from the third House Office Building to the House wing of the Capitol is $5 million.

Landscape development of five squares acquired for project: This matter is still under study.

Appropriations, obligations, and expenditures: A total of $61,500,000 has been appropriated for the additional House Office Building project, to date. In the fiscal years 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959, obligations totaling $33,188,551 were incurred. In the fiscal year 1960, obligations totaling $51,362,894 have been incurred to March 25, 1960, and

additional obligations totaling $943,828 are expected to be incurred during the remainder of the fiscal year—or a total obligation of $52,306,722 for the fiscal year 1960. In the fiscal year 1961, the amount of obligations to be incurred is estimated at $5,420,000. This makes a grand total obligation—estimated and actual—of $90,915,273 for the fiscal years 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961.

Of these obligations, $23,236,073 have been liquidated to March 1, 1960, and $51,263,927 are expected to be liquidated during the period March 1, 1960, to June 30, 1961—or a grand total liquidation of $74,500,000 for the fiscal years 1955, 1956, 1957, 1958, 1959, 1960, and 1961.

As the appropriations available to cover these liquidations total $61,500,000, an additional appropriation of $13 million is requested for the fiscal year 1961.

Estimated obligations and expenditures, fiscal years 1955 to 1961, additional House Office Building project

	Obligations				Expenditures			
	Fiscal years 1955–59	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961	Total	Fiscal years 1955–59	Fiscal year 1960	Fiscal year 1961	Total
Acquisition of property, protection and demolition of structures, grading and miscellaneous incidental expenses	$8,146,756	$23,250	$20,000	$8,190,006	$8,097,989	$52,017	$35,000	$8,185,006
Architectural and engineering fees for additional House Office Bldg.	3,520,000			3,520,000	2,225,199	600,000	350,000	3,175,199
Construction of new sewer in square 635	1,378,092	14,880		1,392,972	1,292,188	100,784		1,392,972
Excavation, excavation bracing, foundation piles and pile caps for additional House Office Bldg.	8,245,901	529,099		8,775,000	4,474,784	3,800,216	500,000	8,775,000
Furnishing and erection of structural steel for additional House Office Bldg.	6,910,613	100,095		7,010,708		5,010,708	2,000,000	7,010,708
Superstructure and equipment for additional House Office Bldg.		50,973,000		50,973,000		1,500,000	35,000,000	36,500,000
Architectural and engineering fees for remodeling Old House Office Bldg.	786,250			786,250	452,023	100,000	100,000	652,023
Construction and equipment of garage in courtyard, Old House Office Bldg.	1,226,026	112,072		1,338,098	1,136,670	201,428		1,338,098
Architectural and engineering fees for remodeling New House Office Bldg.	881,875			881,875	383,664	150,000	150,000	683,664
Construction and equipment of cafeteria building in courtyard, New House Office Building	928,235	26,326		954,561	880,488	74,073		954,561
Architectural and engineering fees for security vaults and other underground structures	137,500			137,500				
Subway and subway transportation systems	137,500		5,000,000	5,137,500		180,000	3,000,000	3,180,000
Remodeling Old and New House Office Bldgs.	58,377	150,000	200,000	408,377	58,377	150,000	200,000	408,377
Landscape architectural services		178,000		178,000	13,500	33,750		47,250
Administration, test borings, soils analyses, miscellaneous, and contingencies	831,426	200,000	200,000	1,231,426	615,792	420,644	1,160,706	2,197,142
Total	33,188,551	52,306,722	5,420,000	90,915,273	19,630,674	12,373,620	42,495,706	74,500,000

The World Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, recently a very fine speech was delivered to the Kiwanis Club of Coral Gables, Fla., by C. Ellis Vaughn, a young high school student. The speech is an excellent one, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WORLD SITUATION

(By C. Ellis Vaughn, Kiwanis speech, Coral Gables, Fla., May 17, 1960

In our lifetime, it will be decided whether or not free life and virtually civilization as we know it will continue. Do you think this is quite a rational statement for an 18-year-old high school boy to make? Let us view the world situation for a moment and see how it looks. As we continuously progress through the 1960's, the most decisive years mankind has ever faced, here are some of the problems that confront us:

Never before in the history of mankind has there been such a rapid growth in population. Just 10 years from now, the population is expected to change as follows:

China: from 654 million to 800 million.
India: from 417 million to 504 million.
Europe: from 423 million to 452 million.
Russia: from 209 miloin to 254 million.
United States: from 179 million to 204 million.

In the entire scope, the world's population is expected to rise from 2.9 billion to nearly 3.5 billion, an increase equivalent to three times the present population of the United States.

Closely related to the population increase is the racial problem. We may compare the racial problem of the world to a premature volcano—it lies rumbling beneath us with an uncertain moment of eruption, if we are unprepared, it could be deadly. The world recognizes that colonialism is a thing of the past, but why is it willing to endure a system whereby countries are dominated satellites? This is our problem here, not the fact of whether the Asians and Africans shall have their rightful freedom, but whether or not they are prepared to accept the responsibilities of freedom, so that their countries will not turn into a chaotic voidness that will be filled with the wrath of communism.

Another phase of our world situation is one that we read about every day, we read about it so much that it is almost a regular item of news such as the funnies, and that is the destructive power that mankind, unfortunately, possess. It is appalling to think that within a matter of hours—not days, weeks, years, or decades, as in the past, but hours, a war could be started and finished—a war that would wipe out three-fourths of the population of the earth. Something that is also vitally important to mankind is: What are we doing to the health of the future generations by developing these destructive weapons?. Scientists all over the world continuously cry out that nuclear explosions are affecting the atmosphere and will cause future damage if continued. You have heard the statement: The Fourth World War will be fought with sticks and stones. Gentlemen, we must prevent a third.

For the past century the greatest percentage of the wealth of the world has been possessed by the United States. As time progresses, this situation is also changing. Other countries are eager to have their share of world riches. The production capacity of our competitors is rapidly increasing, causing us much damage. Also, nations are attempting to formulate trade pacts, which if accomplished would be very detrimental to our economy. Besides being a world of complexity, it is also one of rapid change.

Mark, that if mankind's recorded history of 50,000 years were compressed for the sake of analogy into 50 years, then history would read like this; 10 years ago man left his cave for some artifically constructed dwelling; 5 years ago, writing first appeared; 2 years ago Christianity appeared; 15 months ago Guttenberg developed western printing from movable type; 10 days ago electricity was discovered; yesterday morning the airplane was invented; last night radio was perfected; this morning television became a reality and a mere 6 minutes ago the jetplane was invented. The odyssey of man could be compared to the journey of a train—starting out slowly, gradually gaining speed, getting faster, faster, and faster, and upon going at a pace faster than it is able to endure, meets its end. But if it progresses in the correct stride, it will reach its immediate destination and then continue onward.

If we are to meet the world situation, there are problems that we as a nation must face. Are we physically and materially prepared to meet the world situation? I think so. Mentally? That is questionable. It appears that we are in a rather lackadaisical and complacent state of mind. "Eat, drink, and be merry" shouted the Romans, "for tomorrow you may die." And on the morrow, Rome died. "What are you trying to do, entertain yourselves to death?" a visiting European sociologist asked a colleague over here. "No, I'm afraid it is just our passion for escape," the colleague answered. "Escape. That is a good one," the European rejoined, "You have the richest, most bountiful civilization in all history, and you have the most satisfying way of life in the world, to hear you talk of it, and yet all you want to do is escape." That is a good one isn't it?—escape.

"One Nation, under God" is how a phrase of our pledge of allegiance reads. Yet, of all the people in the United States, only 56 percent belong to a church and only 30 percent of those who are members attend. This means about 15 percent of the people in the United States attend church.

Education is very vital to our existence. Permit me to use the words of the great

philosopher, Aristotle; "All who have meditated on the art of governing mankind have been convinced that the fate of an empire depends on the education of youth." History has proven this to be true. Surely, if we are to exist as a mighty nation we must improve and increase our educational system. Did you know that our Nation's birthrate leaves our schools short of 195,000 teachers and 140,000 classrooms? This past fall school began with 1,843,000 more students than there was room for—even with this lack of space, still only 33 million out of a possible 40 million attend school. Our schools are splitting at the seams, but we are not educating all that we should. This is a very serious problem that must be dealt with immediately.

Upon maintaining and after improving our strength internally, we have quite a job on the world scene.

The world's population increase is like a growing hungry monster, mainly because this increase is occurring in Asia and Africa—continents that can't feed their millions today. The rapid expansion of population threatens to block the efforts of many nations to improve their living standards. Nations must have food and homes for their people, and they will go to any means to obtain them, even submit to communism if necessary.

For the sake of humanity as well as for the sake of our economy, we must also work toward a disarmament plan. All told, the United States and Russia today are spending more on weapons (some $100 billion a year) than the combined national incomes of all the nations of Asia and Africa. We have smashed the atom and now it threatens to smash us. All of these problems will be difficult to solve—because of a lack of understanding and because they are deeply rooted—but, if they aren't solved soon, conditions will be much more difficult in the future.

As we continue to investigate, we see that we haven't been sitting on our hands all the time. There is much to be done, but we have accomplished something. We have made tremendous strides toward improving our educational system. The Nation is recognizing the need for more and better education. Recently, we have done such things as: Built new schools, hired more teachers, increased the salaries of teachers, and placed a greater emphasis on education. The Government has recently attempted to give students more of an opportunity to acquire higher education by creating the national defense student loan program—the mere title "National Defense" relates to you the realized urgency and need of this program. We are also giving the brighter student more of an opportunity to advance at a more rapid pace. For instance, on the local scene, next year in our school, students will have an opportunity to come to school early and take more subjects. Here in Dade County the outlook and progress is very encouraging, but we must remember that we have one of the finest school systems in the whole Nation and there is much to be desired on the national level.

Recognizing the racial conflict has led us to attempt to solve the problem, here in our own Nation and on the international level. We haven't been successful yet, but we must continue to try.

In reference to the population explosion, a few months ago there was the suggestion of such means of solution as birth control. You can see from the reaction that occurred after this suggestion, how difficult solving the problem will be. Successful or unsuccessful, it was an attempt, and there must be more. With 150,000 babies being born every day, this little world could get pretty crowded.

There have been many meetings held in an attempt to reach an agreement on disarmament. Although its chances have been dimmed, the summit conference still draws forth hope. Whether it fails or succeeds, there cannot be any ceasing of striving to create harmony among nations.

On this broad world picture, how does Key Club and Kiwanis fit in? Much of America's strength may be traced to the organizations which give people the opportunity to do unselfish service, thus preparing them for leadership in the Nation. These organizations also give people the opportunity to exchange ideas and collectively express a realization of our needs. Proof of this realization are some of the international themes of Key Club International: "Prove Brotherhood," "Wage Peace," "Forward Freedom," "Cultivate Creative Citizenship." The following actions of unselfish service, attempts to learn and experience, and the setting of examples that others might follow, blended with the study of themes and objectives, is the heart of Key Club International. Key Club does not involve the whole Nation I grant you, but it does involve 50,000 young men, giving them the opportunity to develop leadership through service. I think this is accomplishing a great deal. It is a wonderful thing when the adults of our Nation show an interest in the development of the youth. One day when the subject of youth was brought up to a man, he took out a small piece of string and laid it on his desk. "Look," he said, "if I try to push it, it won't do very much, but if I pull it, it can go anywhere." Gentlemen, this string can represent Key Club being led by Kiwanis.

Believing in the basic intelligence and desire of the American people, I think that we can meet the world situation. It will take our mightiest efforts, greatest amount of intelligence, and as our football coach likes to say, "that extra 10 percent," but we can do it.

Now as I close, I wish to leave you with these words:

"The life so short, the craft so long to learn.

"The future belongs to those who prepare for it."

Gentlemen, it has been my pleasure.

Thank you.

Carroll Reece Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, June 25, was Carroll Reece Day in Tennessee.

Our colleague was honored upon completion of 40 years of public service. The people of his district under the sponsorship of the Roan Mountain Citizens Club selected as a site for this occasion the Rhododendron Festival which has been held atop the 6,400-foot Roan Mountain as an annual event for 14 years.

The setting for this event was on one of the highest peaks in the East which presents one of the most beautiful panoramas and outlooks in America with 600 acres of purple rhododendron in the background and a clear vista in all directions as far as the eye can carry.

Thousands of east Tennesseans and many from out of the State converged on Roan Mountain to honor CARROLL REECE.

The program for Carroll Reece Day was on the format of "This is Your Life." He was 29 years of age when he was first elected to the 67th Congress in 1920. This was soon after CARROLL REECE returned from World War I where he received many awards for bravery, including the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Metal, Purple Heart, and Croix de Guerre with Palm. He was cited for bravery by General Pershing, Marshal Pétain, General Edwards, Generals Hale and Lewis.

On this memorable occasion he was saluted by many editorials in the Tennessee newspapers and by more than 600 letters and telegrams from his colleagues in Congress, Government officials, including the President, Vice President, and members of the Cabinet as well as from many of his friends and admirers throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it would be appropriate and of interest to bring to the attention of the House some of these well deserved tributes which were paid to CARROLL REECE on this occasion.

[From the Nashville Banner, June 25, 1960]

MR. REECE: AMERICAN

A vast majority of Tennesseans are able to put aside political partisanship and pay honor to a deserving native son, regardless of his political affiliations.

This refusal of Tennesseans to put party above the man has manifested itself twice in recent years. Though predominantly Democratic, the State gave President Eisenhower a majority in both 1952 and 1956.

And this independence is being exhibited today at Roan Mountain where B. CARROLL REECE, Tennessee's "Mr. Republican," will be the guest of honor as thousands gather for the colorful rhododendron festival.

The tribute will follow the format of the TV show, "This Is Your Life," and will trace the highlights of Mr. REECE's long and successful career which is marked by success not only in the political arena, but as a businessman and soldier.

Mr. REECE is a politician in the finest sense of the word. He is being recognized today upon the completion of 40 years' service as U.S. Representative from Tennessee's First Congressional District.

Congressman REECE is a party man and proud of it. Today he is serving as chairman of the Republican State Committee and he speaks with a strong voice in national party councils. During one of the few breaks in his long congressional career, the east Tennessee legislator was National GOP Committee chairman.

Today he serves as president of two banking institutions and as chairman of the board of a third. Mr. REECE also is a lawyer, having graduated from nearby Cumberland University.

And Tennessee has had few sons who have served in the Nation's Armed Forces with such distinction.

A battalion commander with the American Expeditionary Forces during World War I, he is a holder of the Distinguished Service Cross, Distinguished Service Medal, Purple Heart, and French Croix de Guerre. He was cited for bravery by both General Pershing and Marshal Petain, of France.

He is now 70 years old. His political career began at 30.

The Congressman is a candidate for an 18th term in the House of Representatives. He has never lost a Republican primary election and only once lost a congressional race, but at that Mr. REECE was only sidelined for one term. He won the next election.

During his lifetime, the veteran Congressman has received many honors, but this

recognition today by his fellow Tennesseans must rank with the best.

[From the Bristol Herald Courier, June 19, 1960]

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL REECE: HIS DAY AND YEAR

Representative B. CARROLL REECE, when he's in a reminiscent mood, likes to recall how he came down out of the mountains of Johnson County to the flatter lands which form the upper part of the Tennessee Valley.

That he did come down from those mountains is a fact of considerable importance to east Tennessee, for the years which followed led him into a career of public service matched by few men in America.

Next Saturday, Representative REECE will, as he has done on countless occasions in the past, reclimb the mountains which stretch between the Volunteer State and North Carolina.

Though not in Johnson County, his journey will be, in a sense, symbolical. And it will not be without deserving cause.

For, on June 25, during the annual Rhododendron Festival atop Roan Mountain, Carroll Reece Day will be observed. It will be a day of special tribute to a man who, through long, long years, has served his part of the mountain empire in the halls of Government.

The citizens of the First District of Tennessee, the citizens of many other great districts in our region and in our Nation, know of this service. They know the personal touch which B. CARROLL REECE has with his constituents. They know of the quiet effective manner he employs to move mountain-like obstacles which might hinder the growth of his district, his State, and his Nation.

So B. Carroll Reece Day will, undoubtedly, be a great success. But we trust the tribute will not end there.

This is another election year, another year in which Representative REECE will again place his record of service before the voters of east Tennessee, another year in a career which he chose long ago and which he has followed in a dedicated manner.

Let us, then, make this a B. Carroll Reece Year. And, in November, let us give him a mountainous majority as we return him to Congress to continue serving the First District.

We extend to Representative REECE our heartiest congratulations on being honored during the festival on Roan Mountain. We extend to him, too, our full support in his campaign for reelection.

[From the Johnson City (Tenn.) Press-Chronicle, June 24, 1960]

AT ROAN MOUNTAIN—CARROLL REECE DAY—A FITTING OCCASION

Tomorrow will be Carroll Reece Day at the Roan Mountain Rhododendron Festival, and in our view nothing could be finer.

It is certainly fitting that concrete action be taken in the First District to honor Mr. REECE, for he has honored the district and its people by consistent support of their interests in Congress since he was first elected in 1920.

It is to Mr. REECE'S enduring glory that his popularity among the people has grown as his service has lengthened. And, remarkably, this popularity knows no party boundaries; it is almost as widespread in the Democratic Party as in the Republican, under whose banner he operates.

The reason for such bipartisan support is, of course, obvious. It lies in the fact that Mr. REECE'S service to his constituents is bipartisan. A man or a woman seeking his help does not have to take a party loyalty oath. Mr. REECE does not ask, "Did you vote for me?" If the person is from his district—or another district, for that matter—he is immediately interested and concerned.

It is to the Congressman's credit that, though he has attained national stature, he has not lost touch with the folks back home. He still speaks their language and shares their philosophy, and that is important.

There are few Congressmen, perhaps none, who are more widely influential than he. He is a troubleshooter extraordinary. He knows the intricacies of national politics so thoroughly that he can cut through the red tape which so often ties down the unknowing. It is said of him that if he can't do it, nobody can.

Considering all this—and it is only a general appraisal—it is no wonder he is so highly regarded, no wonder he has no serious opposition when he comes before the people for reelection. In past years the First District split sharply into Reece and anti-Reece factions. That time is gone. Any opposition he has in these days is of the most token sort.

And so we join the sponsors of the Roan Mountain festival in saluting this man. And we express the hope he will have many more fruitful years in Congress.

[From the Kingsport News, June 22, 1960]

CARROLL REECE DAY

Saturday is Carroll Reece Day at the Rhododendron Festival atop Roan Mountain.

Certainly, no one in the 14-county First Congressional District is more deserving of such an honor than the man who has represented that district in Congress for 16 terms.

CARROLL REECE, the "Mister Republican" of Tennessee, has given the people of his district the kind of conservative representation they want.

Elected as a Republican, REECE has served the GOP faithfully in district, State, and Nation as national chairman, and now State chairman.

He is a personal friend of the President and of the Vice President. He has known all of the party's leaders for the 40 years he has been in politics.

But CARROLL REECE represents all of the people of his district, regardless of politics. When a constituent comes to him with a problem, he never asks whether that person voted for him or not.

Indeed, it is this very characteristic—the willingness to drop everything to look after a constituent's interests—that has made CARROLL REECE such a perennial favorite among Democrats and Republicans alike in his district.

One of the reasons that CARROLL REECE gives the First District such good representation in the House is his ability to understand his constituents' problems. He speaks their language.

REECE has been a combat veteran, a college professor, a farmer, a successful businessman.

He has known poverty and hardships. He has known what it is to work with his hands and his back. He has known what it is like to advance under enemy fire to assault an objective.

He is a family man and a churchgoer.

Thus, CARROLL REECE can listen with sympathy and understanding to the problems of a veteran, a farmer, a small businessman, a laborer, a housewife.

But what of REECE, the nationally known political leader?

As chairman of his party, he masterminded the campaign that returned a Republican Congress to power in 1946.

As a member of the powerful House Rules Committee, he helps channel the many pieces of legislation onto the floor for debate.

As chairman of the Reece committee, he exposed the leftist tendencies of some of the Nation's most powerful foundations and thus brought down on his head the wrath of the so-called liberals.

He is a trained economist and as such, has helped check the trend toward wayward spending that has for too long been typical of big government.

CARROLL REECE is essentially a quiet, modest man. He does not make a big splash in Washington. He is not a headline-seeker.

But in his deliberate, efficient way—through his many contacts in all three branches of government and on both sides of the aisle—he gets things done.

The First District, the State and the Nation have good reason to be proud of Congressman CARROLL REECE. He deserves being returned to Congress.

[From the Knoxville Journal, June 25, 1960]

CONGRATULATIONS EXTENDED TO REECE AND TO FORTUNATE CONSTITUENTS, AS HE IS HONORED AT ROAN FETE

This weekend, upper east Tennessee is putting on the 14th annual Rhodendron Festival sponsored by the Roan Mountain Citizens Club, of which Byron F. Graybeal is president.

The celebration is given interest to the whole of the First Congressional District, however, by the fact that today is to be celebrated as Carroll Reece Day, in special tribute to the district's Representative who is in the process of being nominated for reelection without opposition in his own party.

The fact that Mr. REECE is being singled out for special honor in the 4-day celebration in Carter County, with the site Roan Mountain, will appeal to many east Tennesseans as especially fitting.

CARROLL REECE this year rounds out his 40th year in public life. In all of the years since 1920, with the exception of one 2-year period in which he served as chairman of the Republican National Committee, Mr. REECE has not only represented the First Congressional District, but as leader of the Republican organization in the State, has placed himself at the beck and call of citizens of both party affiliations as their go-between in relationship to their Washington Government.

Above and beyond his service to the district and to our home State, from these four decades of public service, Mr. REECE has emerged as one of the political powers in the Capital itself. We have frequently heard the opinion expressed in Washington that the First District Representative is one of the most effective men in the Capital so far as getting things done is concerned, no matter whether the administration is, at the moment, Republican or Democrat.

We congratulate Representative REECE upon the honor which is being done him today by his constituents, and no less congratulate them upon their good judgment in keeping a man of his character and unusual abilities in Congress during all these years.

[From the Elizabethton Star, June 24, 1960]

B. CARROLL REECE

The people tomorrow of Carter County and east Tennessee will have an opportunity to display their respect and affection for a great Tennessean and a great American—Representative CARROLL REECE—by turning out to do him honor at the Carroll Reece Day ceremonies on Roan Mountain.

To those of us who have known this man, and that includes practically every man and woman in this district, CARROLL REECE symbolizes the great American ideal. Born of meager circumstances, Mr. REECE has attained high stature not only in his Nation but throughout the world.

Yet, perhaps his highest praise and greatest virtue is that he has remained a man of his people. His thoughts and concern have been first of his people's welfare, and many residents of Carter County and all of East

Tennessee can cite examples of his compassion to them in their hour of need. This to us is the measure of this man's greatness.

In the Halls of Congress, among the great and influential men of national affairs, he is known for his good works * * * as the brilliant boy professor at New York University, as the most decorated for bravery in all of Congress, as the holder of the Distinguished Service Cross, the Croix de Guerre, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Purple Heart and other high awards, as the former National Chairman of the Republican Party, as a great legislator whose 36 years in Congress have spanned a period which history shall record as being the momentous in the proud history of our Republic, as a man of his word, a friend of Presidents and Diplomats throughout the world, and as a counsel to mighty men whose hands have shaped the course of history, he will long be remembered.

This is the man Carter County and East Tennessee will honor June 25. And we claim him for our own.

[From the Greeneville Sun]

REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL REECE DAY AT RHODODENDRON FESTIVAL

On Saturday, June 25, the Rhododendron Festival at Roan Mountain will honor Representative CARROLL REECE for his service to that area and to all of east Tennessee.

Mr. REECE was born in the mountains of east Tennessee, and is a genuine example of the "Horatio Alger" story of hard work and success. In 1920 he was elected to Congress, the youngest Member of the 67th Congress. Then in 1946 to 1948 he served as Republican national chairman. It is interesting to note that under his leadership the Republican Party elected the greatest majority in Congress that they have known in recent years.

All of east Tennessee will join with the Rhododendron Festival on Saturday in paying tribute to a citizen who has served his area and his country well.

This community has on many occasions called on him for help. The quiet effective manner in which he was able to move mountains which might have hindered the growth of this area have made a lasting impression on his fellow citizens.

We extend our heartiest congratulations to our distinguished Representative in Congress on Carroll Reece Day. We hope that many of our citizens will journey to Roan Mountain on Saturday, not only to see the magnificent scenery, but to pay honor to a man who has distinguished himself by public service not only to his district, his State; but to his Nation.

[From the Newport Plain Talk and Tribune, June 23, 1960]

HE DESERVES THE HONOR

Congressman B. CARROLL REECE will receive recognition Saturday of this week when he attends the annual Rhododendron Festival on Roan Mountain. The occasion will be known as Carroll Reece Day and the Republican Representative will be honored for his public service at which he has spent over 40 years.

Congressman REECE'S outstanding public record is known like a book to Cocke Countians where he is known by practically every adult person. Cocke Countians know him as the youngest man to be elected to the 67th Congress in 1920; they are familiar with his 2 years as Republican National Chairman when the Republicans elected the greatest majority of their members in recent years; they know him as a public-spirited Representative and have followed his public life with interest down through the 40 years he has served them.

Yet, Cocke Countians know this man because of other reasons. They have learned to love and respect him due to his personal interest locally. They like to feel that he is a personal friend. They say with pride that they can write Mr. REECE and receive an immediate reply. They tell of instances where he has helped men in service, veterans of the wars and their families. They tell the story of the young man who has made good.

In short, Cocke Countians like Congressman REECE.

We are glad to see our neighbors do him honor and our congratulations are extended to Mr. REECE and those in charge of the big festival.

[From the Nashville Banner, June 27, 1960]

REPRESENTATIVE REECE TO CONTINUE LIFE OF PUBLIC SERVICE

ROAN MOUNTAIN.—Representative B. CARROLL REECE, who has spent nearly half of his 70 years representing the first district in Congress, has pledged the remainder of his life to the service of his people.

"Forty years is not such a long time," the nationally acclaimed Republican leader joked before a crowd of several hundred persons who had gathered to honor him Saturday on Roan Mountain in REECE'S native upper east Tennessee.

REECE'S address was the highlight of CARROLL REECE Day ceremonies held in connection with the 14th annual Rhododendron Festival. The special tribute was arranged in honor of the Johnson City Congressman's 40 years of service to his district.

Unopposed for reelection to an 18th term in the U.S. House of Representatives, the veteran Congressman told the audience that the United States will maintain "its position of military strength" which he described as sufficient to destroy the Soviet Union.

"As long as I am in Congress," REECE said, "I will devote all of my efforts and all of my energies, not only to doing things for the people of my district, but toward maintaining the Nation's strong military and economic position."

REECE'S famous broad smile appeared when Knoxville attorney, Ray Jenkins, master of ceremonies for the occasion, referred to the Congressman as "Mr. Republican." Cheers from the audience filled the air atop the mountain when Jenkins suggested that REECE would make a good running mate for Vice President RICHARD NIXON in the 1960 presidential elections.

Accompanied by his wife and his daughter, Mrs. George W. Marthens, III, and several other relatives, REECE appeared the happiest when messages of best wishes from President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON were read to the applauding audience. These messages, along with more than 600 others from every Member of Congress, every Governor, and several members of President Eisenhower's Cabinet, were presented, to the Congressman.

A plaque presented by the Roan Mountain Citizens Club, sponsors of the festival, praised REECE for his outstanding service during war and peace.

Jenkins introduced REECE, describing him as a meteor born to burn, and traced the Congressman's life from his early days in his native Johnson County.

* * * * *

REECE, who has maintained a reputation for speaking the language of the folks back home throughout the years, has never lost a Republican primary race.

Mr. Speaker, among the many messages of tribute which CARROLL REECE received, I feel that I should include in my remarks those from the President and Vice President:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., June 24, 1960.

RAY JENKINS,
In Care of K. Wayne Graybeal,
Roan Mountain, Tenn.:

It is a pleasure to join in the observance of Carroll Reece Day. This day should be celebrated in Tennessee and across the land. As an outstanding Member of Congress for many years, Congressman REECE has not only served his neighbors at home but also his countrymen throughout the Nation. An able and courageous leader in war and peace, he is a credit to America. Please give CARROLL my heartiest congratulations and best wishes.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C., June 17, 1960.

Mr. BYRON GRAYBEAL,
Chairman, Citizens Committee of Roan Mountain, Roan Mountain, Tenn.

DEAR MR. GRAYBEAL: This is just a note to extend my earnest best wishes for a splendid success for the Carroll Reece Day which your committee is staging in connection with the annual Rhododendron Festival.

I have known and counted upon CARROLL REECE as a loyal friend and valued adviser since I first became a Member of the House of Representatives and I know of no one in public life more deserving of the grand tribute you plan. By his diligence, his keen analyses of developing situations and his intimate knowledge of national affairs as well as of affairs in his home area, he has won the widest respect and admiration of his colleagues in the Congress. It is indeed an honor to join the innumerable friends of CARROLL REECE in wishing him well on the occasion of this recognition of his 40 years of public service. In my opinion, your area is indeed fortunate to have the leadership of CARROLL REECE.

With kind regards.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

Baseball Under Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] together with a letter from former Senator Edwin C. Johnson, pertaining to the Kefauver baseball bill.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 25, 1960.

The Honorable DENNIS CHAVEZ,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DENNIS: Like you, last week I received a telegram from Mr. Ford Frick, commissioner of the two major baseball leagues, and a few days later received from him a letter accompanied by a brief in which he urges the Senate to support the present major league baseball monopoly by defeating the Kefauver bill, which would place baseball under the antitrust laws.

May I take the liberty of writing you this letter to indicate the reasons why I deeply

feel that Mr. Frick is terribly mistaken and that the Congress should now seize the opportunity of turning baseball back to the Nation.

When a motion was made in the Judiciary Committee to strike out title II of the bill and put "baseball" in title I it was defeated by a substantial vote because a large majority of the committee realized that if such a policy were followed it would be a recognition by the Senate of the monopolistic conditions which the owners of the 16 major league teams now maintain in this country. It seems strange to me that Mr. Frick should urge this policy, because two of the National League teams under his jurisdiction, namely the Brooklyn Dodgers and the New York Giants, moved 2 years ago to Los Angeles and San Francisco, where they found extraordinary support from the baseball fans of the West and from the people of Los Angeles and San Francisco. By making this move the Brooklyn and New York teams demonstrated that the people of the Nation, who have never had major league teams within their areas, were eagerly awaiting the opportunity to support one. This is the situation that exists in the United States now outside of the comparatively narrow area in which the present major leagues had been operating.

By voting for the Kefauver bill the Senate can extend the opportunity to the people of the United States to establish major league baseball from coast to coast and from north to south.

The concept of Mr. Frick and his associates in the 16 major league teams that they can restrict major league baseball to the States and cities that they choose is in my judgment utterly wrong. The right to establish major league teams belongs to free independent owners who have money to invest and cities whose fans will support new major league teams with modern stadiums like those at Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Minor baseball leagues are not, as Mr. Frick would have us believe, beneficiaries of the major league monopoly. They are its victims, and so, also, are the baseball players who are held on farm teams or on major league benches until the present baseball monopolists are willing to release them.

I remember well the time when the old National League, like the present two major leagues, tried to prevent the organization of the American League because of their false concept that the whole Nation was not baseball minded. Ban Johnson had to fight with skill and courage to bring the American League into existence. We have a larger nation now than we had then. Our population has expanded; there are more baseball fans that there were then. Let us give them the opportunity to attend major-league games personally.

To repeat, let us give major league baseball back to the Nation by supporting the Kefauver bill.

Sincerely,

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
Washington, D.C., June 27, 1960.

HON. DENNIS CHAVEZ,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DENNY: I am sorry to bother you again about the team-sports bill but there is so much confusion regarding what this bill will and will not do that I feel obligated to do so. Title I of the bill deals with football, basketball and hockey and title II with baseball. Under Supreme Court decisions baseball has a different status from the others and its vast empire of minor leagues requires a different approach from other team sports.

In football a new league has no difficulty getting underway. That is positively not true of baseball. In football enough talented players to man a new league graduate from the Nation's colleges each year. In baseball practically all the professional baseball players are under contract to the two major leagues, directly or indirectly.

The purpose of title II is to make it possible for additional American communities to have major league baseball if they want it. But it is practically impossible for another baseball league to materialize without legislation unless it goes "outlaw." Many American cities are no longer satisfied with minor league ball. They want top flight baseball and they could have it if it were not for the present monopoly in baseball talent.

The Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate have held numerous hearings on this situation. Previously the House acted, but the Senate has not. The latest hearing was held in the Senate Judiciary Antitrust Subcommittee on S. 3483, the Kefauver bill, on May 19–20, 1960.

President Cronin of the American League and President Giles of the National League with their staffs of attorneys were present and their commisioner testified against the Kefauver bill. It was an excellent hearing and many points were clarified In an effort to compose differences, the subcommittee rewrote title II. This revised bill is before you and it is a good, sound bill.

To clarify various provisions of the first and second versions of the Kefauver bill, it would be well to review the Frick testimony, point by point:

"Mr. FRICK. Under this bill (the first version of the Kefauver bill) limiting us to 60 players * * * we could support only 9 minor leagues. Yet gentlemen, in order to operate three major leagues, experience has shown us and figures prove that you need 36 minor leagues to accomplish that end" (p. 94, hearings, May 19–20, 1960).

The Judiciary Subcommittee followed Mr. Frick's prudent advice and struck from the bill the limitation of 60 players. Please note what Mr. Frick says about needing 36 minor leagues when the Continental Major League gets underway. At present the existing majors have 21 leagues and the Continental has the West Carolina league, but they will need 14 more minor leagues. That evidence makes the argument that the Continental League will destroy the minor leagues ridiculous.

"Mr. FRICK. I cite section 203(2). This section provides—'In the event a player is drafted by more than one major league club, the election as to which club the drafted player's contract shall be assigned shall remain and be vested in the drafted player' " (p. 98, hearings, May 19–20, 1960).

This provision was inserted in the bill by Senator KEFAUVER to protect a player drafted from one of the existing major leagues by the Continental League if he didn't want to play in the Continental League. But Mr. Frick said this would defeat the basic purpose of the draft rule and the Judiciary Subcommittee struck it from the bill.

"Mr. FRICK. I agree more with what Mr. Rickey said about the unrestricted draft than I do with Senator JOHNSON on the player limitation. The player limitation, I think, is harmful. But I go back again that I want to emphasize and reemphasize that the worst part of that bill is not that. It is 204" (p. 126, hearings, May 19–20, 1960).

The Judiciary Subcommittee thereupon very wisely struck both the player limitation and section 204 from the bill as urged by Mr. Frick.

"Mr. FRICK. I have never fought the unrestricted draft on my record before this Congress. I have recommended it. I am not fighting that. I didn't say we had it now. I said I would favor an unrestricted draft. That is not the part of the bill I am objecting to" (p. 125, hearings, May 19–20, 1960).

"Mr. DIXON. Would you be content with this bill if the limitation were limited solely to 40 ballplayers and an unrestricted draft of all other ballplayers every year?"

"Mr. FRICK. Yes" (p. 126, hearings, May 19–20, 1960).

"Mr. DIXON. "Wouldn't this be beneficial to a team like Washington if we had something like you suggested, and I assume that is the reason you have recommended it, that there be an absolute unrestricted draft every year?"

"Mr. FRICK. Yes, I think it would help a lot of clubs. I think it would help all clubs.

"Mr. DIXON. I can readily see why it would make the game more competitive" (p. 130, hearings, May 19–20, 1960).

The Judiciary Subcommittee accepted Mr. Frick's views and inserted in the bill the unrestricted draft of all players controlled directly or indirectly by the major leagues except the 40 players on the roster of each major league club.

The presidents of the National and American Leagues and their counsel were in the hearing room and heard the Frick testimony and did not take exception to any of it. This was a complete victory for Mr. Frick and the bill was greatly improved by the suggestions he voiced. Nevertheless, Mr. Frick is still fighting title II of S. 3483.

The bill revised by the Judiciary Subcommittee also includes the Senator Hart amendment reading:

"That the unrestricted draft shall not apply to any player directly or indirectly owned or controlled by any major league baseball club at the time of passage of this Act until such player has completed 4 years in organized professional baseball."

That provision makes it doubly certain that no violence be done to the present major league clubs' property rights in player contracts. The Judiciary Committee has done everything possible to make S. 3483 absolutely fair to the two existing major leagues and the minor leagues.

"Mr. DIXON. I assume you would welcome exemption, as to the reserve clause, which is granted in section 203?

"Mr. FRICK. That is right.

"Mr. DIXON. You think that would be highly desirable?

"Mr. FRICK. That is right" (p. 114, hearings, May 19–20, 1960).

It seems to me that the Frick testimony and the action by the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee in response to it should be specifically called to the attention of every Senator. America wants and should have more major league baseball. If there is more major league baseball, there must be more minor league baseball, as Mr. Frick has stated I am authorized to pledge to you that when the Continental League gets into operation as a major league, it will sponsor one-third of the burden of providing minor league baseball.

Most sincerely,

ED C. JOHNSON.

The Tariff Commission's Cotton Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Tariff Commission this week refusing to invoke the safeguards of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act is further evidence of the policy of this administration and the Department of State to sacrifice the American textile workers and cotton

farmers to foreign textile mills which continue to flood this country with cheap textiles which are swamping the American markets.

The failure of this administration to properly safeguard the American textile industry is reflected in the fact that in the past 10 years over 700 mills have been liquidated in this country and some 325,000 workers have lost their jobs because of the competition of foreign manufactured products entering the United States.

The imports of cotton goods are so large in volume that in 1959 they were equivalent to some 350,000 bales of raw cotton.

It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, in view of the recent rebuff of our President at the hands of the Japanese, and the failure of the Tariff Commission and the administration to protect American industry, the time is fast approaching when the Congress must take the initiative and enact legislation which will assure protection of our American industry.

When the Congress reconvenes I shall join with other of my colleagues who are interested in this problem in the hope that effective legislation may be enacted which will put a stop-gap to the sacrifice of the textile and other American industries.

THE TARIFF COMMISSION'S COTTON REPORT

The cotton growers of the United States and the American textile industry which serves them were shocked and dismayed by the report of the Tariff Commission released on the afternoon of June 27 with a majority finding—by a vote of 4 to 2—that the rapidly increasing imports of cotton products were having no adverse effect on the cotton export subsidy program. The majority opinion concluded that there was no basis for favorable recommendation of relief under section 22 against these imports.

It seems incredible that there could be any possible theory upon which the record of these accelerating and damaging imports could be reviewed without arriving at an immediate conviction that the Department of Agriculture programs for the protection of cotton and cotton growers were being completely frustrated and destroyed.

However, the most shocking and dismaying feature of the report is the disclosure by the majority opinion that such majority considered the Commission was prevented, by Presidential directive, from considering the whole cotton program. The majority concluded that they were limited to a consideration of the cotton export subsidy program and could not even treat it as a part of the total program to which it is so intimately and closely related.

This limitation was the basis for the conclusion that imports of cotton articles could adversely affect the cotton export program only if such imports reduced the exports of American raw cotton. Examining that question, in the light of the limitation, the Commission concluded that the more foreign made cotton goods imported into the United States, the greater would be the consumption of cotton in the foreign mills, and the greater the potential market for American cotton exported to those foreign mills. In other words the Commission in effect said that if all cotton goods consumed in the United States were to be imported and the domestic cotton textile industry would close all its mills and dismantle all its machinery, the cotton export subsidy program would be helped and not rendered ineffective or interfered with.

Clearly this conclusion is in utter disregard of the effect of imports upon the cotton program as a whole or upon the cotton export program as an integral part of the whole.

The Commission said:

> We are limited by Presidential directive (p. 10 of the report).

This limitation by Presidential directive is something new in section 22 proceedings. It is one more step in administrative circumvention of the intent of Congress as expressed in the law of the land.

In 1939 when section 22 was first invoked for the protection of the cotton programs against increasing imports of both cotton and cotton products, the then President found no necessity for limiting the scope of the investigation or attempting to predetermine the maximum remedy that might be recommended.

In 1939 an almost identical situation was presented. There was a cotton export subsidy program in effect then, as now. Its purpose then, as now, was to reduce the accumulated surpluses of cotton in the hands of the Government. Imports of cotton, as well as cotton products, were showing substantial increases, although less then than now. Two investigations were instituted by the Commission pursuant to the Presidential directives of 1939. Investigation No. 1 related to cotton; investigation No. 2 related to cotton products. Priority was given to the first investigation. The President's letter went to the Commission on July 26, 1939. The investigation was instituted by the Tariff Commission, a hearing was held and a proclamation establishing import quotas on raw cotton was issued effective September 20, a total elapsed time of less than 2 months.

The corresponding investigation on cotton products was instituted simultaneously. However, by the time the first investigation had been completed, World War I had begun and the need for limitation of imports disappeared. Had it not been for the intervention of the war, quotas on imports of cotton products would have been established at that time for the protection of the cotton program just as quotas on flour were later established for the protection of the wheat programs.

Never before in any of the 21 investigations previously instituted under section 22 has there ever been any such studied and deliberate attempt on the part of the President to limit the scope of the investigation. The limitation in the present proceeding, as construed by the majority of the Commission, is such that it is now clear that there was no opportunity whatever, from the beginning of the investigation, no matter what the facts might be, to obtain a favorable recommendation for section 22 relief against imports of these products. The intent and objective of Congress with respect to the protection of agricultural programs against imports have been frustrated. The section 22 procedure set up by Congress has been rendered impotent.

The majority opinion concludes with the recommendation to cotton products manufacturers that they should seek relief through section 7, the escape clause procedure. That road has already been traveled to its dead end. Several such investigations instituted in 1956 ended without one iota of relief against imports. The section 22 proceeding was instituted on recommendation of the Department of Agriculture and the industry held high hopes that it would at least be the beginning of effective action to stem the rising tide of imports. Now the cycle of the familiar runaround has been completed.

And all this has happened against the background of continually increasing and rapidly accelerating imports.

Public Housing, a Great City Resource

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, what public housing, with wise and far-seeing management, can contribute to its resident families and to the whole community was ably set forth last week at the forum luncheon of the City Club of Chicago by Mr. Alvin E. Rose, executive director of the Chicago Housing Authority.

For the information of Members of Congress and others who still have some doubts about the great value of these public housing projects in our crowded cities, and as a helpful guide to those seeking to improve the operation of such housing developments, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the report of Mr. Rose's speech which appeared in the City Club Bulletin for June 20, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEES PUBLIC HOUSING AS GREAT CITY RESOURCE

It was an eye-opening and heart-warming story that Alvin E. Rose, executive director of the Chicago Housing Authority, told at the club's forum luncheon last Monday, when he discussed "A New Concept in Public Housing for Chicago."

Whatever the beginnings of public housing in this country, he said the tragedy of their original concept is still being compounded today "by many so-called business-

men who apparently can't see any farther than the distance to their own hip pockets and their personal prejudices—who can't realize that good public housing is good business, for everybody."

By good public housing, he said he meant "not just bricks and mortar but a new, meaningful, purposeful program of working with 20,000 low-income families and helping 50,000 kids to become good citizens." Because it is something no private landlord can afford to do or is interested in doing, Chicago has the unique opportunity to convert its public housing into a powerful tool for building a better community, he said.

Today less than 3 percent of Chicago's population occupies public housing. In New York a week earlier, Mr. Rose said he had closed a deal for the sale of $29 million worth of 40-year housing bonds, to cover 10,000 new units. This means that the CHA has now paid off all its borrowings of the past 20 years.

Those loans, he made it clear, were not from the Federal Government, as many mistakenly suppose, but from private Chicago and New York bankers. He said that few seem to understand, or want to understand, that the Federal Government is involved only to the extent that it guarantees the repayment of the bonds. Because it insists that CHA charge rents 20 percent below the going rate, the Federal Government advances annually up to 4½ percent of the bonds. This is not a gift, but is repaid, as are the bonds, out of CHA income from rentals.

According to the newspapers, said Mr. Rose, the Federal Government had predicted that the CHA would wind up a million dollars in the red last June. The record shows that after paying a million dollars to the county in lieu of taxes, the CHA came out over a million dollars in the black. For many years the county has realized from 2½ to 3 times as much from the CHA as from the slum properties it bought and reclaimed.

PRIVATE BUILDERS CANNOT MEET NEED

It is true, he said, that had private real estate operators cleared and rebuilt the areas, resulting tax revenues would have been much greater, but no private builder has been able to supply decent housing desperately needed for low-income families. It is a stark fact, he said, that there will always be thousands of low-income families in our city, and unless they have decent shelter they can well become a bigger problem to the whole city.

"What hundreds of families who desperately need public housing today really need most," he said, "is for the people who don't need it to understand what it's all about." To those who need to be convinced of what public housing in Chicago is like today and what the tenants are like, Mr. Rose extended an invitation to visit the projects. He said also, "Take a look at our books. They are wide open to any member of the City Club."

He stated that the 4 percent of tenants whose standards and behavior were so low as to discredit public housing generally, have been evicted and the CHA is now being "quite selective" in the admission of new eligible tenants.

He described the transformation that occurred when the CHA decided to reach beyond its legal responsibility for providing shelter for low-income families and instituted what is called its "good neighbor program."

"We enlarged our community and tenant relations staff," he said. "We began working with these families. We appealed to one of the most basic desires of man, to be considered worthy by one's peers."

A number of techniques were evolved. First, a prize of a year's free rent was awarded to the family chosen as the Good Neighbor of the Year, based on such factors as good housekeeping, parental responsibility, and contributions to improved living conditions. This award, as well as others involving financial outlays, was not approved or paid for by the Federal Government since it was beyond its concept of the function of public housing. The free rent was paid for by Bishop Bernard Sheil through the Sheil Foundation.

YOUTH RESPONDS

Next, CHA sponsored a competition among its teenagers to select the Top Teen in public housing each year, again based on accomplishments and qualities of character. Prizes for this competition were made available by Mayor Daley's Youth Foundation.

Then CHA encouraged each of its 34 projects to compete for a pennant presented every 60 days to the project judged best in "all-around appearance," inside and out.

"Frankly we were amazed at the response, at the results achieved, at the change," said Mr. Rose.

Just recently over 300 boys under 12 were organized as lawn patrols to help keep project grounds tidy and clear of litter. They were rewarded with T-shirts with a CHA insignia. Funds for these, and for such incentives as cokes and doughnuts, came out of $5,000 contributed by the Chicago Community Trust. This fund pays for floor-by-floor good neighbor activities in each building.

This year $300 in cash prizes, contributed by the Janitors Union, has been offered to the janitorial staff for the best kept grounds and floral displays in the 34 projects.

The results of the good neighbor program have been so obvious, Mr. Rose said, that a week ago the CHA board allocated up to $20,000 annually to promote and expand the program. This money is part of the interest accruing on corporate funds invested by CHA over which the Federal Government has no control.

"So long as public housing is considered only in terms of the cost of bricks and mortar, it can never reach its full potential as a citywide asset," said Mr. Rose. "People need more than clean, cold bricks and mortar. They need an opportunity to grow. We cannot do for people. We cannot impose a way of life on them. We must work toward community and city improvement through them."

One of many questions put to Mr. Rose at the end of his talk was, "How can the CHA good neighbor program be expanded to take in other neighborhoods in the city where it is needed?"

Such an undertaking is, of course, outside the CHA's province, but the question itself was eloquent.

Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein copy of letter addressed to the assistant executive editor of the Reader's Digest by Kenneth O. Gilmore, who wrote the article, "The Scandal of Unemployment Insurance," together with copy of communication sent to the Assistant Secretary of Labor by the executive director of the Reader's Digest:

THE READER'S DIGEST,
Pleasantville, N.Y., June 27, 1960.

Mr. NEWELL BROWN,
Assistant Secretary of Labor,
U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BROWN: I am forwarding herewith a letter we have received from Kenneth O. Gilmore, replying to your charges that his article, "The Scandal of Unemployment Insurance," in the April 1960 Reader's Digest, presented a "wholly inaccurate picture of the program."

Over the years that he has been associated with the Reader's Digest, Mr. Gilmore has proved himself to be an outstandingly reliable and conscientious reporter. His defense of his statements in connection with the unemployment insurance program indicates to us that his allegations have ample support in fact and that his investigation of the situation has indeed been in the public interest.

Far from being "baseless attack," his article and his vigorous, factual defense of it seem to us to contribute the very sort of "just criticism" which you assert is always welcome, and without which any needed improvements in the program are most unlikely to be effected.

Sincerely,

KENNETH W. PAYNE.

THE READER'S DIGEST,
Pleasantville, N.Y., June 17, 1960.

Mr. HARRY H. HARPER, Jr.,
Assistant Executive Editor, The Reader's Digest, Pleasantville, N.Y.

DEAR MR. HARPER: I have before me a copy of a communication from the Labor Department over the signature of Assistant Secretary Newell Brown to Mr. DeWitt Wallace, editor of the Reader's Digest. The letter characterizes the magazine's April story about "The Scandal of Unemployment Compensation" and the role of the U.S. Bureau of Employment Security as a "wholly inaccurate picture of the program."

As author of the article it is of the utmost concern to me that you be appraised of the facts surrounding the Department's allegations. For this communication was not just a private reply to Mr. Wallace. It is a rebuttal from the Labor Department mainly in defense of one of its subdivisions, the BES. And the BES has in turn sent this 16-page document to all the State agencies. It has also been furnished to members of Congress and on April 28 was put into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin.[1]

The article and its veracity will undoubtedly be discussed in a number of State legislatures meeting next year to consider changes in their unemployment compensation laws. It is therefore significant that the Labor Department and the BES have gone to such great effort to produce and distribute this elaborate reply. It is also ironic that this detailed response came forth with such speed. For it is a matter of record

[1] The BES will not tell us how many copies of the rebuttal it has distributed nor will it identify those Congressmen who were sent the document. In refusing to disclose this information, the BES informs me that we must officially write in our request to the Department's Solicitor in order for him to make a ruling.

that as far back as December 1958, while researching the subject, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Labor requesting that the BES release information about the program—a letter that has never been answered except for a routine acknowledgment despite continual promises to the contrary.

Seeking to undermine the article's documented evidence of laxity in the giving out of unemployment benefits to retired pensioners, the Labor Department communication supplies assurances (pages 1 and 8) that pensioned retirees collecting unemployment compensation are carefully investigated. Yet the General Accounting Office has been conducting an extensive investigation that has uncovered indisputable evidence right in the Labor Department's own backyard of jobless aid giveaways to pensioned retirees. This congressional watchdog agency disclosed in a recent report [2] that voluntarily retired Federal workers have been handed out unemployment compensation while they also draw generous Federal civil service retirement annuities. According to the GAO, this has notably taken place in the District of Columbia whose U.S. Employment Service significantly is directly operated by the Labor Department. In one case cited by the GAO a 56-year-old woman quit her Government job to retire on a $283 a month annuity or 72 percent of her former salary. Yet for 54 weeks she was given unemployment benefits totaling $1,629 although the GAO could find nothing to show that Federal officials had referred her to any employer.

And in summary Comptroller General Joseph Campbell stated: "The report expresses our opinion that unemployment compensation payments to voluntarily retired Federal employees are not in accordance with the basic objective of the program, which is to provide partial compensation for wage loss during periods of involuntary unemployment due to lack of work." You'll note these words not only closely parallel the theme of the Digest story but indicate that the attention given in the article to the payment of jobless aid to retirees was highly deserved.

One underlying theme in the Digest story was its documented evidence that unemployment compensation has long been dominated by Federal officials who attempt to cut down the authority of the States. The Labor Department declares this is false while totally ignoring undenied evidence right in the story of Federal interference, such as BES criticism of Ohio's disqualification provisions. Worse yet, the Department's naive denial of BES domination (pt. 8, p. 7) was received the very day that the BES launched a sledgehammer attack against the State of Indiana. On the exact date that the Department's communication arrived at the Reader's Digest editorial headquarters in Pleasantville, N.Y., the BES sent a letter to Indiana threatening to cut off the State's administrative funds and compel employers to pay additional taxes as penalty unless Indiana took steps to have a review board decision reconsidered. The case involved a claimant whose administrative appeal for benefits had been denied but who did not make a further appeal to the Indiana courts. The situation parallels action taken by the Labor Department in 1949 when it threatened California with loss of funds and tax credits due to an administrative benefit decision that the BES did not like. This Federal interference was judged so flagrant by Congress that it immediately enacted a law (the Knowland amendment) forbidding the Department to intervene in the handling of a benefit claim until the claimant had exhausted all the appeals procedures provided in the law. Yet now in complete disregard of that congressional provision to protect State authority, the BES is intervening in Indiana. And it is holding over Indiana's head the extreme penalty of withholding administrative funds and collecting an extra $80 million from employers.

The Department's apologia goes to astounding lengths to create an impression of Digest falsehood. It continually resorts to the old routine of setting up a straw man—something the Digest never actually said—and then knocking it down. For example, the Department's letter in one instance (point 15, p. 11) claims a Digest statement was "false." Yet it is able to level this charge only by badly misquoting the article. The Department claims that the Digest said: "For 6 months (in Pennsylvania) every person who had run through all his compensation hauled in an additional 15 weeks." It then replied that there were those who found work and dropped out before the 15-week period ended. However, the original article explicitly said "* * * every person on the rolls who had run through his compensation hauled in an additional 15 weeks of benefits." As the Bureau's defender, the Labor Department curiously omits the underlined words which make it clear that those who were still unemployed—"on the rolls"—collected for 15 more weeks.

Another instance of the straw man trick: Trying to destroy the story's documented evidence that the pressures of our welfare bureaucracy cause money to be wasted on loafers, the Department says: "Loafers, etc. have never been legally entitled to benefits" (point 2, p. 2). The article never said that the law intended that loafers should collect benefits. Mr. Brown completely misses the basic point of the story: that these abuses beat the system and thus go on within the law. In fact, on page 42, column 2, of the article this point was specifically underlined in regard to the question of fraud. The story stated: "While all the rackets mentioned thus far have beaten the system within the law, unemployment assistance is also plagued by illegal abuses."

A further method which the Department's defense has used to foster an impression of inaccuracy is the recitation of deserts of detail under the label of "The Facts." This was done in an effort to undermine the specific cases in the article, but not once do these details alter the validity of RD's summarizations. They only emphasize the senseless rationale that the Bureau relies upon to justify benefit payments. For example, a reading of the Hollywood case (point 6, p. 5) is just proof that our welfare apparatus has reached the point where authoritics can seriously talk themselves into letting a 12-year-old boy collect unemployment compensation rather than earn up to $28 a day.

The Labor Department's letter defends the BES refusal to release results of the 30,000 claimant investigations it financed with the explanation that these studies were not aimed at measuring the extent of fraud, and therefore the BES promised the States it would not give out the data. (Point 21, p. 16). This is an astonishing statement when, for example, during Congressional appropriations hearings for fiscal 1957 Mr. Robert Goodwin, BES Director, cited general figures from these same investigations in order to indicate the amount of fraud in the system.[3] Because Mr. Goodwin himself chose to use this material publicly as a yardstick for fraud, I contended that the Digest was entitled to an open State-by-State breakdown of the studies—the only way to check their validity and significance. Not only was this point made clear to Mr. Goodwin when I was assembling material for the article, but I personally went to Under Secretary of Labor James T. O'Connell and explained the reasons for wanting the full facts. He assured me that the request would be given consideration. Despite this and further promises last summer that a definite decision would be reached, the Department never gave us an official answer and by such stalling prevented us from obtaining the information.

The Department gives as a further reason for keeping the material secret the fact that the BES wanted "to avoid misuse of the data." The presumption that the fraud studies would be misused is not a valid reason for keeping them under cover. Rather it is an admission that the BES simply invested itself with the authority to prejudge how the information would be handled by the press and then for that reason suppressed the data. This is a dangerous form of government censorship.

One final point in this regard. The BES has consistently blocked my efforts to get hard facts about fraud. Last year it refused to let me look at any answers to a questionnaire on fraud sent in to the BES by the States. When an interview with Walter T. Niziol, BES "consultant" on the project, was sought, barriers were flung up. "All his answers will have to be in writing and approved by me and perhaps others above me," declared BES Assistant Director R. G. Wagenet. He added: "You've been busying yourself around here for months; you ought to know what the routine is by now."

But I am not the only one who has encountered difficulties in connection with fraud. Mr. Newell Brown, who signed the Department's communication protesting our article, also has had problems with the BES. Not too long ago when he was Director of New Hampshire's Division of Employment Security, he came to Washington and told a Senate Committee that "over the years" the BES had given him funds "for less than two people on fraud detection." He added: "I think I need more people for fraud. I have been unable to get the money." [4]

While I would be more than glad to provide a full rundown of every point raised by the Department, suffice it to say here that, as in the above instances, not one of them holds water when compared to the facts and the original story in its full context. Rather than being a solid finding of inaccuracy, the Labor Department's defense consists of mere countercharges, opinions and interpretations.

The article charged and proved that unemployment "compensation" was going extravagantly to freeloaders, with official sanction. And this charge still stands.

Sincerely,

KENNETH O. GILMORE.

[2] Report to the Congress of the United States, "Review of Policies and Practices Regarding Unemployment Compensation Payments to Retired Federal Employees, June 1959—Department of Labor, by the Comptroller General of the United States," transmitted to the Speaker of the House, Apr. 26, 1960, 33 pages.

[3] House Appropriations Subcommittee hearings for Departments of Labor, and HEW for fiscal 1957, p. 174.

[4] Senate Finance Committee Hearings on H.R. 5173, March, 1954, p. 47.

A Tribute to Mr. Mitchell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, yesterday there appeared in the

New York Times an excellent tribute to Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell.

I, too, was pleased to join with 28 top leaders of the American labor movement in paying tribute to a man whose forward-looking programs have always kept at heart the best interests of the working men and women of the country. As a fellow New Jerseyite, I am happy to see such ability, such dedication receive recognition.

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial from the Times printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 1, 1960]

A TRIBUTE TO MR. MITCHELL

The testimonial dinner given to Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, sponsored by 28 top leaders of the American labor movement, was a tribute to a man who has amply deserved it. The occasion was unique both because of the kind of people responsible for it, and the character of the recipient himself. It would be almost unbelievable, if it hadn't happened, that so large and influential a group of unionists, whose politics are traditionally Democratic, should honor a Cabinet member in an administration whose policies labor has so bitterly attacked.

Remarkable, too, is the man who for almost 7 years has kept the confidence and respect of a Republican President and members of his Cabinet and of leaders of organized labor—with all of whom he often differed widely. This could only have been done by an unassuming person of stubborn integrity, dedicated to the welfare of the Nation's workers, intimately familiar with the conditions of their life and well aware both of the possibilities, and the limitations, of methods to improve their lot.

Mr. Mitchell, in short, is an idealist of rare sophistication. We, too, applaud his achievement.

Thirteenth Anniversary of the U.S. National Student Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the U.S. National Student Association, an organization with headquarters in Philadelphia, will hold its 13th anniversary meeting from August 21 to September 1 at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis. I know that many of my colleagues in Congress will want to join me in sending anniversary greetings to the association.

USNSA is a confederation of the student governments in nearly 400 colleges throughout the Nation, dedicated to increasing students' recognition of their responsibilities in regard to local, national and international affairs. It has succeeded in increasing student awareness of current issues to a remarkable degree.

Successful student exchange programs with Latin American nations have been forged by the National Student Association at times when diplomats from those countries and ours have found it difficult to sit down at the same table. The association has sponsored valuable study projects in fields of human relations and educational resources. Letters from association members in favor of the repeal of the National Defense Education Act disclaimer affidavit provided valuable expressions of student opinion.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement of the aims, achievements and makeup of the U.S. National Student Association be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRTEENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. NATIONAL STUDENT ASSOCIATION

The U.S. National Student Association (USNSA) is a confederation of student governments in colleges and universities throughout the Nation. Its national leadership—this year as in previous years—has been elected by the National Student Congress, the largest single meeting of college students in the Nation, comprised of delegates elected by the member schools of the USNSA. This year the National Student Congress will be held August 21 through September 1 at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis, making the 13th anniversary of this nationwide organization of American students.

USNSA's National Student Congress is a legislature for the expression of student opinion while at the same time affording students an opportunity to experience democracy and develop leadership skills. USNSA's work is both domestic and international jn scope.

The work of the USNSA in the international student community was recognized in a statement of evaluation adopted by the three major deans' organizations in the United States—the National Association of Women's Deans and Counselors, the American College Personnel Association, and the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators—declaring that the USNSA has "spearheaded and led the mobilization of the unions of students of the free world in combating the partisan propaganda and distortion of truth fostered by the Communist-led International Union of Students."

USNSA's 1959–60 program in the international student community included:

USNSA's foreign student leadership project entered its fifth year of operation, with special scholarship provided for 14 foreign students from underdeveloped areas. The student leaders spent a full academic year on selected American campuses with reduced study loads, in order to study the structures and operation of American campus organizations. Seventeen students arriving in this country next month will bring the total number of foreign student leaders participating in this project to 75.

The Eighth International Student Relations Seminar now in progress at USNSA's office in Philadelphia, Pa. Fifteen outstanding student leaders have been awarded full scholarships for an intensive 9-week seminar in international relations and the international student community.

Continuation of a program in which regional international student relations seminars are conducted throughout the Nation during the acedamic year.

Twenty-one academic scholarships have been made available for Algerian refugee student leaders. The program is now in operation with 16 Algerian refugees studying in American colleges and universities.

USNSA will send five representatives to the International Student Conference in Geneva, Switzerland, this August. As a member of tthe International Student Conference, USNSA will be one of 66 national unions of students represented.

An emergency appeal for funds to aid students in Chile following the devastating earthquakes and tidal waves.

Establishment of a program of special technical assistance to all national unions of students which is being administered by the coordinating secretariat of the International Student Conference.

A program of travel in Latin America to ascertain the needs of student communities there so as to develop programs through which some of these needs may be alleviated.

Representation at the Latin American Student Conference in Caracas, Venezuela, in September 1959 and at the European Student Welfare Conference and the International Student Travel Conference in the Benelux countries in October 1959.

Completion of a long-term academic exchange agreement negotiated by representatives of USNSA and the Polish National Union of Students, under which two American students studied in Polish universities and two Polish students spent an academic year in the United States. The program will be continued next year and both national unions of students are in the process of selecting qualified participants.

USNSA representatives are now negotiating with representatives of the Soviet Union for a long- and short-term academic exchange. Under the terms of the agreement, two American students will study for one full academic year in the Soviet Union and two Russian students will come to the United States. A special section of the agreement guarantees to participants of the exchange complete access to all necessary records in both countries. The terms of the short-term exchange are not yet complete. The program is expected to begin in September of 1960.

USNSA raised funds for the development of a work camp project in Sakiet-Sidi-Yousef to rebuild an educational institution destroyed during a bombing of that city.

In the 12 months since the last National Student Congress, the USNSA has completed an impressive series of successful programs domestically, including:

Campus consultations: USNSA staff members have traveled to over 150 member and nonmember campuses, providing local student leaders with help in evaluating their own performances and in improving their liaison with their counterparts in other areas of the country.

Publication of a series of four books upon completion of the student responsibility project, a major innovation in educational programing financed by a $25,000 grant from the Ford Foundation, and involving experimental programs on 15 pilot campuses and in 2 pilot regions. The student responsibility project stressed three areas: Student reponsibility in college teacher recruitment, student responsibility in counseling and tutoring, and better utilization of existing educational resources.

Completion of the first year of the southern student project, a program involving work with southern student leaders toward increasing understanding in human relations, financed by a $60,000 Field Foundation grant. This program includes a southwide student seminar on human relations to be held this August at the University of Minnesota, bringing together 15 student leaders, 5 each from all white, integrated, and all Negro colleges, for a 5-week period.

The Second Annual Student Editors' Conference on International News Coverage, cosponsored with the Overseas Press Club of America and financed by Time magazine, Seventeen magazine and the Foundation for Youth and Student Affairs. Approximately 125 student editors and 60 club members spent 4 days in February in the club headquarters in New York City.

Completion of the first year of operation of the University Press Service, a simulated wire serivce for college newspapers resulting from the desire of student editors to receive news from other campuses in order to strengthen the ties of the student community.

The National Student Conference on the sit-in movement, held April 22 and 23 in Washington, D.C., brought together student body presidents from colleges and universities throughout the Nation to learn about and discuss the southern student protest movement.

Supplying information to students at member campuses on the status of legislation pertaining to students and education in the U.S. Congress, so that students may take informed and responsible action on issues affecting them.

The USNSA also provides low-cost student tours of Europe through its travel subsidiary, Education Travel, Inc., located in New York City. This year also marked the opening of a west coast office in Berkeley, Calif.

Recognition of the work of the USNSA was expressed in messages of encouragement to the participants of the 12th National Student Congress held in August 1959, at the University of Illinois.

* * * * *

The programs and policies of the USNSA have been carried out this year by young leaders elected at the 12th National Student Congress.

Donald A. Hoffman, 24, president. A second-year law student on leave from the University of Wisconsin where he served as student body president in 1957–58. He was selected as 1 of 15 student leaders to participate in the Seventh International Student Relations Seminar in 1958.

Curtis B. Gans, 23, national affairs vice president. A graduate of the University of North Carolina where he served as editor of the Daily Tar Heel in 1958–59. He was a participant in the 1958 International Student Relations Seminar.

Isabel S. Marcus, 22, international affairs vice president. A senior on leave from Barnard College where she was elected student body president in the spring of 1959. She was selected for the 1958 International Student Relations Seminar.

B. James Kweder, 22, program vice president, is a graduate of Allegheny College when he was a student body president in 1958–59. He also participated in the 1958 International Student Relations Seminar.

Richard Rettig, 24, program vice president. A graduate of the University of Washington and former chairman of the great northwest region of USNSA.

The 382 colleges and universities, with a total enrollment exceeding 1,200,000 students, constitute the U.S. National Student Association.

Review of a Congressional Internship Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, our Nation—if it is to meet the great challenges of our times—requires a citizenry closely attuned to, understanding of, and cooperating with the Government of the Nation.

Despite the constructive efforts of our school system to implant such knowledge, however, I find evidence, time after time, that folks—well-meaning, honest, civic-minded Americans—have not, in many cases—had a real opportunity to see, observe, and understand the practical workings of government.

In recent years, the Wisconsin Citizenship Clearing House, headquartered on the campus of the University of Wisconsin, has been participating in a congressional internship program. The purpose has been to enable outstanding students to come to Washington, for a week or a month, to acquire a better knowledge of the practical workings of the Federal Government, of political life itself and of the broad scope of duties and responsibilities of Members of Congress.

From experience, I believe the program is a highly useful, enlightening and educational effort to provide more of our outstanding young people with a real knowledge of operations of the Federal Government and the work of public servants, like ourselves.

This year, I was privileged to have a fine outstanding student, Miss Barbara Chryst, of Madison, Wis., as an interne in my office. Miss Chryst, selected by the Wisconsin Citizenship Clearing House, attends Edgewood College of the Sacred Heart of Madison.

Prior to the completion of her internship—which terminated yesterday—Barbara reviewed briefly the significance of her participation in this fine program. Reflecting the deep impressions of her experience—in a keen, sensitive, understanding way—I ask unanimous consent to have the brief review printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY BARBARA CHRYST, CONGRESSIONAL INTERNE

When I first heard of this opportunity to spend a month in the office of a Senator, I must admit it sounded appealing but very remote with regard to myself. When I found out I was to spend a month with Senator WILEY, I could not imagine what I would do in this capacity.

Now that the month is over I can say that it has proven to be one of the most thrilling experiences of my life. It has been an education and a vacation at the same time. My only hope is that I have made the most of this tremendous opportunity.

I have come to realize that the life of a Senator is one that consists of a good deal more time and effort than most of us are willing to spend with probably less compensation in the long run than most of us would be satisfied with. In the case of Senator WILEY, I was particularly impressed with his conscientious interest in everyone who stopped in to see him or who wrote to him. This interest was manifest also in his staff who saw that everything possible was done to satisfy the Senator's constituents.

In my case in particular, the staff took time to explain to me their individual function in the procedures of the office and to answer any questions I might have. They saw to it that I became familiar with the kinds of work that are handled in the office of a Senator. In addition, they provided me with opportunities to see the various phases of the Government process, such as observing sessions of the Senate, the House of Representatives, the Supreme Court and attending committee hearings. They also made arrangements for tours for me of various points of interest including the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the White House, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Bureau of Printing and Engraving.

Probably the greatest impression I will take from this month's internship is the conviction that our Government is not the nebulous institution that is portrayed in textbooks. Congressmen are real individuals and our Government is really "of the people, by the people, and for the people."

I am certain my life has been enriched by this experience and that I will be a better citizen because of it and only wish that I could adequately express my appreciation for it.

Prejudice in Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the Honorable Boyd Leedom, Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, before the National Paperboard Association at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., on May 24, 1960.

Entitled, "Haunting Problems in Labor Relations," it contains much sound thinking on the problems of prejudice and discrimination.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

HAUNTING PROBLEMS IN LABOR RELATIONS

I have been under a compulsion to make a speech entitled "The Anatomy of Prejudice." I presume this is because prejudice relating to politics and racial disturbances has been so much in the news. Doubtless, the word anatomy has been greatly overworked in titles lately, and some of you may well wonder whether such a subject falls within the area of expertise of the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board.

Instead, I have chosen as my title for today's talk, "Haunting Problems in Labor Relations." Before discussing these haunting problems, which involve prejudice in the field of industrial relations, I must allude to prejudice in other aspects of our lives, for the purpose of revealing the character of bias.

A definition of prejudice is: preconceived judgment or opinion; unreasonable predilection or objection; especially an opinion or leaning adverse to anything without just grounds, or before sufficient knowledge.

This definition is relevant to my subject because certain problems in labor relations, some that legislation cannot cure, relate to attitudes having no justifiable basis. A couple are basic—one, a prejudice that many people have against labor unions just because a union is a union; and two, the assumption by some labor leaders that management is blind to the viewpoint of its employees and always seeks to serve itself and to exploit them.

This is not to say that problems growing out of prejudice are the most distressing at the Board, or that there is not at times good reason and some grounds for distrust and opposition between management and unions. But, such grounds would not relate to the

union or to management, as such, but rather to corrupt or selfish leadership, or unreasonable or arrogant or undemocratic or backward officers, within these institutions.

BASED ON EMOTION

Since prejudice is unjustified opposition based on emotion, it goes far beyond, in fact often engulfs and obliterates, a reasonable opposition. For emotional conduct is stronger and more persistent than reasonable conduct, and this is especially so when it is improperly motivated or sparked by prejudice.

A colleague and I attended the opening day of baseball this season. Some of the Washington Senators, both varieties, have not been doing too well these days, as you know. There was a big crowd, people were milling around on their way into the stands, and the police officers were having a hard time in keeping them separated from the automobiles and in controlling traffic.

One eager motorist sought to sneak over a cross walk ahead of an oncoming horde of pedestrians, contrary to a colored traffic officer's direction. The officer yelled at him loudly—gave him a typical "cop's" bawling out, but good.

At that moment, an immature, insecure foot soldier hurried by us and bravely said to his companion, "If that black s.o.b. yelled at me that way, I'd run over him."

Washington, as you may know, is now pretty well integrated. My colleague commented wryly and very realistically, "He had better not run over that cop in this crowd. He'd be lynched."

Pure prejudice prompted the pedestrian's appraisal of the conduct of the officer. Assuming that there was reason to complain, the reason clearly had nothing to do with the dark skin of the policeman. The officer had had his training at the hands of light-skinned officers and had observed their performances. He was like them. And he may have added to his performance on this particular day a little of his own perverse nature, which, in turn, had little or nothing to do with his complexion.

My colleague's statement about the lynching indicates the dangers that lie in prejudice, for, given somewhat more aggravated circumstances, real trouble approaching a riot, wholly unwarranted of course, could have followed.

MAKINGS OF PREJUDICE

Modern American prejudice is acutely sensitive to color. But the color factor must be only a symptom and not really a cause of this dangerous infection of our society. Prejudice seems to be the weapon of majorities their conflicts with minorities. Unfortunately, it is quite certain that those who now suffer from prejudice will utilize it whenever the tables are turned.

Just why prejudice develops in some conflicting situations and not in others is hard to understand. Prejudice is very devious. It seems that in certain situations it grows out of reasoned opposition. Thus, for example, an ever so intelligent expounder of the protestant viewpoint, expressing reasonable concern over such a problem as the American political principle of separation of church and State, is very apt to depart from reason and reveal real prejudice through a display of obvious rancor. Where hateful expression occurs, there prejudice is most likely lurking.

The factor that imparts prejudice to a conflict is elusive, as I have indicated. Often however, when reason clearly fails, expediency opens the door, and prejudice comes in.

Thus it is, I am quite sure, with many businessmen and union leaders in their attitudes toward each other. Because people love their own prejudices, it is not unusual to find businessmen who instinctively bristle at a suggestion that their opposition to unions is based on emotion rather than reason, or to find union leaders who bridle when criticized for outrageous attitudes toward business.

UNION-MANAGEMENT PREJUDICE

My purpose here is not to suggest the removal of all opposition between union and management but to urge only the elimination of prejudice as a cause of opposition. A brief look at the historical conflict between labor and management is in order.

The conflict began with man's effort to work out his existence. The acquisition of the essentials of food, clothing, and shelter, puts each man in competition with all other men. This most basic conflict revealed in history assumes larger proportions when man's selfish nature compels him to seek and acquire much more than he could possibly need; and man has done this aggressively and with avarice, even though his effort in some parts of the world still impede his fellowmen in eking out their bare existence.

Out of this struggle have come various forms of domination of one group by another, along with various forms of restraint on the dominating group in an effort to hold the conflict within reasonable bounds. History has witnessed such economic systems as ancient slavery, the feudal system, craftsmen's guilds, modern slavery, trade unionism, American democracy, and the Soviet's scheme of subjugation of man to the state. Judged by all the gross imbalance between those who worked and those who hired or enslaved under all other systems, the present national labor concept of America under the much denounced Taft-Hartley Act and its more recent and equally maligned offspring, the Landrum-Griffin legislation, is nearly perfect. In appraising our present regulation we will do well to keep in mind the experiences of other peoples and other times.

CHANGING CONCEPTS

Scarcely anything is as hard to accept as change. There has been ingrained in the human being for numberless centuries the notion that he who hires should dictate terms. It is, therefore, very difficult for some to accept wholeheartedly the American concept that the worker has the right to join with his fellow workers to bargain concerning his working conditions. It is a tribute to our democracy that, in the main, there is good acceptance of this concept, for American industry does have enlightened management that not only accepts willingly the provisions of the Labor-Management Relations Act but relies heavily on its employees' union representatives and counts them indispensable in our present highly productive industrial system. I have been told by some big business operators that they could not possibly operate successfully if their industrial plants were not organized.

It is, however, also true that this resistance to change still manifests itself among some in their unwillingness to conduct their labor relations within the true spirit of the act. Analysis of such resistance both among unions and management discloses that some of it grows out of prejudice.

In some parts of the country the notion still prevails that one local union cannot represent employees of mixed races. A device that has been worked out to serve this particular prejudice is something like the separate but equal theory applied to schools before the Supreme Court held such theory unconstitutional.

Two locals are formed to represent the same unit of workers, with white employees in one and colored in the other. Whether or not such an arrangement impinges on the National Labor-Management Relations Act has not been directly before the Board in recent years; indeed, not during my time under the Eisenhower-Nixon administration. But when it was last before the Board, the system of two locals—with separate but equal representation being given the workers—was approved because it did not raise a question of racial discrimination in contravention of the act.[1]

RELATED QUESTION

About that time, a related question arose as to whether, after a Board certification of a local union for a unit of both colored and white employees, it was proper to establish a separate local for the colored employees, with the certified local (1) remaining, as it had always been, the local for the white employees, (2) executing a contract with the employer, and (3) applying such contract terms as the checkoff and inferentially the maintenance of membership provision to members of the colored local, as well.

Again, the Board said that the establishment of a separate local for the Negro employees did not constitute per se a subversion of its unit finding. The Board, however, felt that the union had abused the standards of conduct required under section 9(a), in that it had used its statutory power as exclusive representative to compel dues payments and continuance of membership with respect to the colored local, an organization which was not the certified union and which, under the certification and the contract, had no legal standing.[2]

Sometimes, unions will refuse membership or apprenticeship to Negroes with the result that where an employer seeks workers from such a union, Negroes are not referred. This problem has been much in the news as the AFL–CIO and the Committee of which Vice President DICK NIXON is Chairman, that is, the President's Committee on Government Contracts, have moved with vigor against this practice.

NIXON'S SUMMARY

Perhaps one of the best summations of the basic problem of inequities among races on the job was given by Vice President NIXON when he made this simple, eloquent statement:

"America cannot afford the moral, economic and the international cost of prejudice and discrimination * * * the American Revolution will not be complete until the ideals of independence, equality, and freedom * * * are a reality not only for Americans but for people throughout the world."

Aside from the fundamental issue of a man's right to his fair place in the labor market, on sheer moral grounds, there is also the matter of the tremendous manpower loss we sustain when we do not make full use of all our people's talents. The Vice President has spoken of this often. He has enthusiastically upheld the President's civil rights proposal of last February and declared, "This problem of racial relations is not just a southern problem; it is a northern problem too * * *." He recognizes it as a global problem as well.

NONDISCRIMINATION CLAUSES

Because Government contracts carry nondiscrimination clauses it can be presumed that the employer involved in such a contract intends to adhere to his contractual obligation. Of course, it would be a violation of Taft-Hartley by both the union and the employer if the union caused the employer, who was subject to the act, to refuse to hire an employee, no matter what his color, for want of union membership.

It also follows that any employer confronted with this situation and recognizing that racial prejudice is the obstacle, could employ Negroes and once hired could retain them, notwithstanding a union security contract, if the Negroes tendered union dues.

---

[1] *Atlanta Oak Flooring*, 62 NLRB 973.

[2] *Larus & Brother Company, Inc.*, 62 NLRB 1074.

The practice of denial of union membership to colored employees cannot be justified on the ground that mixed locals do not function well, when so many unions throughout the land have demonstrated to the contrary. Rather, it seems to stem from one of those attitudes which has no justifiable basis.

ISSUE IN NLRB ELECTIONS

Similar problems have found their way into Board-conducted elections because one of the parties injects the racial issue. In such cases, the union has a policy with respect to race in the allocation of jobs which is at odds with that of the employer, or with that of a competing union. The one injecting the racial issue endeavors by speeches or otherwise to tie in job retention or job loss for one of the races with the outcome of the election.

While some might seek to justify such statements as mere predictions which fall within the free speech provisions of the act because they are neither threats nor promises and only forecast what will happen as a result of union selection or rejection, I do not so view them.

As I said in just such a case,[3] "The consequence of injecting the racial issue where racial prejudices are likely to exist is to pit race against race and thereby distort a clear choice on the issue of unionism. Clearly, to draw the issue along these lines does not effectuate the policies of the act. The implications are far greater, in my opinion, than the reaches of the act, for they bespeak an assault upon the spirit of our Constitution."

THE BIG PREJUDICE

Then, in addition to the foregoing problems growing out of bias of one kind or another, there is the big prejudice to which I have already made reference.

On the one side, we find the emotionally charged determination on the part of some employers that no union, however good for his employees or his business, is going to work its way into his business affairs. On the other side is the fractious type of union leader who spends much of his time in villifying his own organizations' sources of being, that is, the business enterprises which pay wages to his own union's members.

This latter attitude puzzles me greatly, for I can imagine no more useless member of society than a trade union leader whose tactics, if followed to a logical conclusion, could lead only to the extermination of business enterprise and the elimination from the ranks of labor of his own dues-paying union members.

ALTERNATIVE IS PLAIN

The alternative to this is plain. The segment of management about which I am speaking should yield its stubborn antiunion position in favor of our national enlightened concept of labor's right to bargain collectively. It should accept this concept as part of the mores of our American society with a degree of enthusiasm no less at least than that with which it surrenders so much of its profits to the Internal Revenue Department. The higher living standards, increased national prosperity and human happiness which flow from the implementation of this national labor concept are benefits comparable to those which flow directly from government through the income taxes we pay.

As for the type of leadership in unions of which I have spoken, it is plain that their constituents would do well to replace them with men of broader vision and with attitudes more compatible with a well-functioning society. Their shortsightedness, if allowed to continue, is but a guarantee of industrial strife.

How can we assure this much needed harmonious teamwork between American business on one hand and union leadership on the other? Although at times within our grasp, it seems to have eluded us.

I have witnessed during my 5 years as Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board several years of real labor peace and an alltime low in time lost through strikes.

But this was not to last; as recently as 8 months to a year ago the picture again looked dark. There seemed to be a hardening of attitudes, and the huge steel strike was a point of climax. Then, out of the blue, came the settlement of that strike. The industrial picture has brightened ever since.

IMPROVED OUTLOOK

Welcome signs of spring have followed this big freeze in labor-management relations. Old molds of prejudice seem to have been broken.

Labor leaders have been photographed in apparent moods of cooperation with Government leaders of a political party in which labor leaders ordinarily have not sought to wield their influence; Vice President DICK NIXON, sometimes maligned by some labor leaders, garnered an amazing write-in vote for President in a section of Pensylvania where the electorate is made up largely of union members; the first quarter of 1960 showed that the number of work stoppages has been less than in any other similar period since the end of World War II, with the exception of the first 3 months of 1958; and, best of all, among these signs of lessening of prejudices is this: Through the untiring efforts of Mr. George Meany of the AFL–CIO, of distinguished leaders of business, and of Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell, President Eisenhower managed to arrange a labor-management conference at the summit. While no great and immediate achievement may now be recognized, this first meeting was surely a progressive step.

SAD MOMENT IN HISTORY

Recent international events establish this as a sad moment in history. An honest man, our President, was confronted at a most unfortunate time with an ugly and embarrassing fact made necessary because of the imperfect state of the world society. He acted with great dignity, as an honest man should act, that is with simple candor, and a reasonable effort to amerliorate. It seemed a novel and high point in diplomacy.

Thank God for the bipartisan support he got at home when the powerful forces of evil turned on him with unrelenting ferocity; and for the grand backing that came to him from America's friends in all parts of the world.

Now here at home all of America must eliminate prejudices that divide us and exemplify, in all that we do and say the great principle that sets up apart from our detractors, that is, the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. Now more than ever we must hold fast to charity and justice.

In this critical time, the least that labor and management can do is to stand firmly together, to wipe out all differences not based on reason, and with new determination provide for America, in an hour of great peril, what she and the world need most—a thriving, sound industrial system that will sustain free men everywhere, whatever may befall.

[3] *Westinghouse Electric Corporation* (119 NLRB 117).

Price of Sugar Versus National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, although this discussion taking place here today is limited and restricted, there can be no doubt as to its grave importance on the world scene.

Forgetting for the moment the overall picture of sugar quotas, their desirability and even if needs be—their necessity—one cannot help but comment on the impact of our action today upon the world leaders, both pro- and anti-United States.

Insofar as I can ascertain from the report of the committee and from the history of this legislation, there appears to be a fixation in this Nation as to what is required from us as members of the world society to be allowed to stay free and secure in our rights.

It seems that we may have become the world's chief scapegoat under the all-embracing, high-sounding title of "World Savior" aided and abetted by our own national desires for physical security in our homeland.

You wonder what the price of sugar has to do with national security and anyone sometimes wonders the same thing. Nevertheless, it is true that we pay about twice as much for sugar as any other nation on earth. We do so, some say for the simple reason of safeguarding our breadbasket by assuring our people's supplies for domestic consumption from year to year.

This means that we allocate to each sugar producing country a quota of sugar purchases at a price about double the world market price. Of course, this does guarantee us the first claim of the sugar crop and also as our planners have it figured, it buys us friendship and helps our neighbors economically.

All of this may be true, but the time is coming when we must face the realities of life.

Our barrel is finally getting near bottom in both gold and friendship.

Too many of our friends are so used to being paid for being our friends that like some personal friends, they are beginning to take unwarranted privileges with both our national security and our international reputation. This, in turn, causes our true friends to wonder whether it is better to kiss us or to kick us.

This is not the time to discuss the right or the wrong of our policy of world sugar subsidy since the whole question of subsidies is one of our gravest national problems and our economic sickness and will compel us to either change prescriptions or get a new doctor in the foreseeable future.

Until that day comes, it is useless to beat your head against a stonewall of old ideas, old customs, new slogans and half-explained formulas.

Sufficient to say that this Congress will pass the sugar bill, it will play politics with the Cuban issue and in a few days about 90 percent of the American people will be fed a line of logic through the press, radio and television and the Congress will go back to arguing about other things.

In the meantime, the "little King of Cuba, Castro" will make hay in the propaganda market screaming about American imperialism, economic aggression while at the same time confiscating billions of dollars worth of American enterprise which has contributed more

to Cuban economic well-being than any other single factor since its emergence as a nation. Of course, he can do this with impregnability so long as the American taxpayer pays him 6 cents a pound for sugar and buys most of his crop while he demoralizes the world market by selling to all comers at 3 cents a pound.

In plain words, the Congress is giving Castro millions of extra dollars to create in our hemisphere a festering sore that may grow into a Latin bloc of cancer and the victim can well be the very good neighbor—one United States of America.

It would be foolish to try to cut off our sugar quotas without a reasonable adjustment but to say that we can never get away from our policy of dependency upon Cuba's sugar supply is to admit that we are failures.

We have thousands of sugar acres lying idle; we can bring in the world market as much sugar as Cuba supplies us with from friendly Latin American countries who have surplus and need our business and appreciate our friendship.

Our aim is not to strangle Cuba's economy—it is to make it healthy again by cutting out the venomous poison that is being fed into its bloodstream by a self-centered, misguided leader. I tried to get action on a 3-point program but lacking both seniority and prestige, and the one is dependent entirely upon the other, my suggestions were almost completely ignored.

For the benefit of those who are critical of the Congress of the United States, I at least want to place on the RECORD the suggestions that I believe are reasonable and logical in this crazy, mixed-up sugar festival.

One June 27 I called upon the House of Representatives to give serious consideration to the three-point program in the sugar allotment quota as it affects Castro's Cuba.

I suggested a three-amendment approach:

First, cut out all sugar quota as of the end of this year, or sooner; if the House deems it advisable, give to the President of the United States the right and the power to restore all or part of the quota as he finds it to be in the best interest of the people.

Second, reduce the sugar quota by the amount of sugar sold to Russia or Communist satellites at any price less than the subsidized price paid by the United States on the sugar program.

Third, put the difference between the U.S. price and the world market price into certain escrowed funds to be paid to any American enterprise injured by the Castro policies of expropriation or confiscation. I pointed out that there would not be a deficiency in sugar because every sugar producing area in the world practically has a surplus, notably our friends in Mexico with over a million tons and our friendly Latin American countries and the Philippines.

The Castro Cuban Government recently sold Russia sugar under a 5-year program at a price which is about one-half charged to the United States. This is an outright subsidy to Russia out of the kitchen money of American housewives.

This is a program based upon commonsense and sound logic without any feelings of reprisal or economic straitjacketing, but rather a measure to bring back some similarity of sanity and economic soundness.

I still believe the approach to be one consistent with American needs for both sugar and prestige.

The Cuban Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WAYNE MORSE

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Cuba and the Revolution of Our Time," written by Theodore Draper and published in the New Leader for July 4, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUBA AND THE REVOLUTION OF OUR TIME

(By Theodore Draper)

Under the banner of nationalism, Castro's regime is heading for "socialism in one island."

It is a long way from the rioting students of Japan and Turkey to the ruling ex-students of Cuba, but the distance is not so great politically and socially. Both the rioters and the rulers belong to a revolutionary type that is little understood in the United States, where the equivalent in social background is anything but revolutionary. On a recent visit to Cuba, I went to some trouble to find out what the social background of the leaders of the Castro regime was. It was not an easy task because they prefer to be known as majors and captains of the former rebel army. Finally I prevailed on one of the young ministers to make a list of the professions and ages of every member of the Government. The result was not far from what I had expected.

Every member of Castro's government attended a university, came from middle- or upper-class homes and became or intended to become a professional or intellectual. Of the 18 members of the Cuban Government in April 1960, there were eight lawyers, one professor, one architect, one engineer, one naval captain, one doctor, three ex-university students, and two unspecified. Castro's father was a well-to-do farmer who sent his son to Jesuit schools and the University of Havana for a career in law. Castro's most influential lieutenant, Ernesto Guevara, is a doctor whose father was an Argentine architect and builder. Castro will be 34 in August, almost exactly the average age of the entire group.

The Cuban revolution was not a rebellion of the workers and peasants; it was a rebellion by the sons and daughters of the middle class in the name of the workers and peasants. In its present stage, the peasants are benefiting from it the most, the workers very little or not at all, and the middle class as a whole has been marked for destruction.

I have tried elsewhere to define the nature of Castro's revolution and its place in the Communist family of revolutions. In brief, despite important differences in background between Castro's circle and the official Cuban Communists, the former seem to be heading toward a Cuban variety of "socialism in one island" which the latter can unconditionally support as the best available means for fulfilling their own long-range objectives. Yet the two groups have fallen out in the past and it cannot be ruled out that they may fall out again in the future.

In poor, backward countires like Cuba, revolutions still issue out of the middle class but not in behalf of the middle class. The sons and daughters of the bourgeoisie dedicate themselves to the destruction of their own class in the name of nationalism and socialism. In this respect, Cuba was particularly vulnerable because its middle class was relatively too big as well as too weak. The island's five universities enrolled about 25,000 students, with the University of Havanna alone accounting for about two-thirds of the total, all turning out too many lawyers and too few engineers. Only a growing, dynamic economy could have assimilated so many would-be intellectuals and professionals. Middle-class fathers provided their sons with educations which their society was too constricted and stagnant to utilize.

The social conditions which led to Castro's victory were painfully familiar to every student of Cuban life. Ten years ago, the still unrivaled report on Cuba of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development devastatingly exposed what was wrong with Cuba—dependence on a single crop, sugar; chronic unemployment of the mass of sugarworkers for about three-fourths of every year; the appallingly high rate of illiteracy; the habit of rich Cubans of investing their capital abroad, hoarding it or sinking it into non-productive real estate; the "unstable and static nature" of the whole economy. It was no accident that Castro's rebellion owed its success to its original base in Oriente Province at the eastern end of the island. This largest and most populous of Cuba's provinces ranked first in the production of sugar, lowest in the proportion of white population, highest in the illiteracy rate, lowest in school attendance and highest in the percentage of rural population. Yet the peasant-like guajiros of Oriente Province could not make their own revolution; they provided the friendly environment and some of the recruits necessary for the victory of the predominantly middleclass boys from the cities.

Thus, the Cuban revolution is partly a struggle of classes and partly a struggle of generations in a form which makes the younger generation of the bourgeoisie the revolutionary cadre of the more or less passive workers and peasants. This is not a wholly new situation: Lenin also came out of a middle-class landowning family and, like Castro, first adopted the law as his profession. But the Cuban case is even more extreme than the Russian. Whereas the Bolshevik intellectuals and professionals were most closely linked politically and psychologically to the Russian working class, the revolutionary intellectuals and professionals behind Castro identify themselves emotionally with the guajiros and Cuban collectivism has taken an agrarian far more than an industrial form.

It does not help understanding much to dismiss these students and ex-students as Communist inspired. Why is Communist propaganda so much more effective in one place rather than another? Why should the younger generation of the middle class be so susceptible to Communist propaganda?

This situation conforms to no Marxist schema; it more nearly corresponds to the ideas of the Polish anarchist, Waclaw Machajski, made familiar to us by the writings of Max Nomad, that a new middle class of intellectual workers would install itself in power by exploiting the ideals of socialism; but Machajski hardly worked out the mechanics of his central thought and could not foresee that it would be more applicable

to backward than to highly developed capitalist countries.

Classical Marxism conceived of socialism as the culmination of capitalist development without which the prerequisites of socialism—an advanced industrial economy and a preponderant, impoverished proletariat—could not be fulfilled. But Marx expected capitalism to develop too successfully in some places and not successfully enough in others. Where capitalism has not been successful, the prerequisites of socialism could not be fulfilled, and where capitalism has been successful, the prerequisites of socialism also could not be fulfilled—but for different reasons. In the former case, the middle class was not strong enough, and in the latter case, the middle class was too strong. Where capitalism has been stunted and the middle class is stagnant, a different development from the one that Marx envisioned takes place, urged on by a segment of the middle class but anti-middle class in nature, and in the name of socialism but ultimately antisocialistic in character.

The enraged, uprooted, superfluous children of the bourgeoisie in underdeveloped countries gravitate irresistibly toward the ideology of socialism, but they can make use only of those aspects of socialism which conditions permit them to realize. They cannot pay heed to the idea that the proletariat should liberate itself. They cannot recognize the existence of prerequisites of socialism, above all an advanced industrial economy. They cannot conceive of socialism as the fulfillment and complement of political democracy. But there is one aspect of socialism on which they can seize without delay and without restraint—the full use of the state to change the social order. In classical Marxism, this aspect was only one of several, conditioned by the stage of development at which it was put into effect and the social relationships which would govern its realization. According to this caricature of socialism, however, there is only one prerequisite—the seizure of power, wherever and whenever possible.

In the end, the attempt to force socialism on a predominantly agrarian society generates the pressures that produce a Communist form of totalitarianism. With the best will in the world, the order of development cannot be inverted—first the revolution, then the prerequisites of socialism—without resulting in something other than the classical prospectus of socialism had contemplated. Despite vast differences between Cuba and Russia, Castro's "socialism in one island" assumes some of the essential features of Stalin's "socialism in one country."

This is the revolution of our time. It is a genuine revolution, bursting out in so many places so far apart that it must respond to a common set of circumstances and answer a similar range of needs. It cannot be dismissed as merely a diabolical aberration because it does not live up to our expectations or its own advertisements. It demands understanding on its own terms, less in terms of its theory than of its practice. It ushers in a new type of system that is neither capitalist nor socialist, but contains elements of both, and emerges where capitalism has not succeeded and socialism cannot succeed.

Sparks From the Forge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the Rutland (Vt.) Daily Herald on June 29, 1960. The writer, Sam Ogden, columnist for the Rutland Herald, is widely known in Vermont as an independent thinker and for his efforts to promote wise natural resource policies. He is also known as an outspoken advocate of the way of life of Vermont small towns. Sam Ogden frequently makes a fresh analysis of current affairs, and I believe the Members of Congress will be interested to read this commentary:

SPARKS FROM THE FORGE
(By Sam Ogden)

I am not a Communist sypmathizer, nor is my firm conviction that we are on the wrong track in our handling of atomic weapons based on fear of death and destruction. I think that one or the other of these two motivations is usually ascribed to those who come out against further atomic testing. Many intelligent people have assumed that such positions have been taken out of fear of personal harm. The truth of the matter is that the very reverse of this may actually be the case; the truly moral person may prefer to lose all, his life, his family and his liberty rather than to participate in any such immoral bestiality as is implicit in the use of atomic weapons.

I would like to have the leaders of the Republican Party admit to the possibility that there can be disagreement with our current foreign policy, which is not Communist inspired; and I insist that as far as political aspirants are concerned, whatever their party, explicit statements must make it clear where each one stands. It is improper to insist that disagreement with the policies which have forced the United States into the position of being the most hated Nation in the world, shows a lack of patriotism. To make clear what I am talking about here is an excerpt from an editorial in a London newspaper: "The State Department (of the United States) has become too accustomed to blame anything that goes wrong on the Communists and to believe that any objection to American policy must be automatically Communist led and inspired." I think one would have to go no further than the "Letters to the Editor" column in this paper to find evidence of the same attitude.

I have become involved in this essay on communism and atomic warfare because of a conversation I had recently with one of our Republican candidates for Congress, and also because of James Reston's article in the Boston Sunday Herald of June 19. This latter will speak for itself, and I hope that many will read it. Reston says, in part, "We are establishing military bases on the fringe of the Communist empire, and establishing bombers and rockets on those bases * * *. We are justified in doing so, but we should not be surprised if the Communists use every possible device to frustrate our efforts, particularly if we reflect on what we would do if they established rocket bases in Cuba."

As for my conversation with Bob Gannett at Mrs. Ripley Swan's "meet Bob Gannett Party," it was never carried through to its proper conclusion. The setting was perfect, such as only a rare day in June in Vermont can supply; the Swan's garden was lovely, the hospitality impeccable, and the assembled guests as distinguished and intelligent a group as might possibly be imagined, and so it was neither the time nor the place for a long and serious political discussion. In spite of this I did sound off by saying what I thought about the necessity of candidates for Congress stating their position on such matters as atomic testing and the use of atomic weapons.

I had the feeling that had we been permitted to discuss the thing through, I might have come away with a feeling of mutual understanding. But the interruptions were continuous, and I took leave after suggesting that he read a book called "Fallout—A Study of Superbombs, Strontium 90, and Survival." This book is edited by John M. Fowler, and published by Basic Books. It is a collection of 12 essays on the various aspects of atomic warfare and testing, each one written by an acknowledged expert on the subject, and each as objective and unbiased as anyone could hope for. It is an important book, and I expect that Bob will read it. More than this, I hope that all candidates for office, no matter what the scope of their ambitions, will read it.

I will conclude this with a quotation from the third essay in the book. "A decade after the bombing, scores of Hiroshima citizens were dying each year of leukemia and other diseases attributed by Japanese doctors to the bomb's radiation. On August 6, 1957, the 12th anniversary of the bombing, 20,000 citizens assembled in the rebuilt city's Peace Memorial Park, heard their mayor, Tahao Wantanabo declare:

"It is only a foolish illusion to try to maintain peace by the might of possessing atom and hydrogen bombs, and experimenting with them. Present tests of nuclear weapons are undermining the existence of mankind. Radioactive elements, once taken inside the body, not only corrode from within but continue wreaking generic havoc with the offspring."

A National Fuels Policy Is One of America's Most Urgent Items of Unfinished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, yesterday the National Coal Policy Conference issued a statement noting that recent developments in the international competition between America and the Soviet Union are warnings that the Congress of the United States should immediately undertake a study of the overall fuels situation in this country.

I agree with this conference representing coal producers, the United Mine Workers of America, coal-carrying railroads, coal-burning electric utilities, and mine-equipment manufacturers, that a national fuels policy is one of America's most urgent items of unfinished business. It is a matter of real concern that legislation pending in this Congress which would cause a joint committee to be formed to inquire into the question of whether or not such a fuels policy is indicated has been subjected to most unfortunate exaggeration and a propaganda barrage of abuse.

A few days ago, the National Coal Policy Conference noted in a memorandum that I was joined by 42 Senators in sponsoring Senate Congressional Resolution 73, while 30 Members of the House introduced similar resolutions—all of which would authorize Congress to inquire into the need for a national fuels policy.

Recently, the American Legion called for such a policy as being vital to national security. More recently, Labor's Economic Review, an oracle of the 13½-million member AFL–CIO, declared for

"a progressive, integrated, national fuel policy." This publication noted a prerequisite to such a policy would be a far-reaching national energy survey which should provide the foundations for an integrated national policy comprising first, abundant supplies at lowest possible cost; second, protection of consumer and public against monopolistic practices; third, Federal leadership, and cooperation by States, localities and the private sector of the economy; fourth, employment of research and technology to solve major energy problems; and fifth, integration of a national energy policy with a national resources policy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two significant paragraphs from the article in the latest issue of Labor's Economic Review.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Labor's stakes in such a policy are immediate and vital. Increased productivity, maximum employment, and rising living standards of workers, all are dependent upon future supplies of energy in abundance and at the lowest possible cost.

Less than a quarter of a century ahead looms the problem of how to provide a steady and expanding stimulus for economic growth to secure job opportunities for millions more Americans who will be entering the labor market.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, Joseph E. Moody, president of the National Coal Policy Conference, pointed out in the conference statement yesterday that the anti-American demonstrations in Japan, the imminent invasion of Soviet oil into American-owned Cuban refineries, and other symptoms of international disorder and trade pressures as evidence that the United States urgently needs a fuels policy as an essential ingredient of national security.

In connection with the NCPC statement there was released a booklet by that group entitled "A National Fuels Policy: One of America's Most Urgent Needs." This publication examines the serious problems plaguing all three basic domestic fuels industries—oil, coal, and natural gas.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed further in the Appendix of the RECORD, extracts from the booklet to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The world glut of oil is causing serious concern among domestic American petroleum producers as prices are slashed and high costs make new exploration and drilling in the continental United States unprofitable. The natural gas industry, hampered by rigid controls, rising pipeline construction costs, and the swelling importation of gas from Canada is facing an uncertain future. And coal, America's most abundant fuel and her main dependence for the tremendous growth expected in electric power and industrial capacity, is existing today at little more than a standby production level—a level that is dangerous to national security and threatens our future industrial growth.

All of these facts point to the very critical need for development of a sound national fuels policy, a need that must be met at once if America's essential domestic fuels industries are to prosper and continue to serve the Nation in the critical months ahead as well as the years of the future. * * *

The present unhappy situation of domestic fuels can be traced to the lack of a single, integrated policy to guide the energy industries. It should also be pointed out that many agencies of government—Federal, State, and even local, have developed literally hundreds of separate policies dealing with separate energy industries in separate, limited ways. * * *

Sometimes these policies overlap, sometimes they conflict, sometimes they leave large and important areas completely uncovered. As long as this situation goes unchanged, our Nation's energy industries will be in trouble—perenially faced with the problem of basing their operations on the ever-shifting foundations of bureaucratic whim. * * *

If the United States is to protect itself, if it is to insure its continued strength, if it is to be able to meet any demands placed on it in peace or war, it is absolutely essential that a single, integrated, overall policy be adopted to guide the future of our vital energy resources.

If this basic segment of our economy is allowed to languish unattended the United States will be placing itself in very real jeopardy—an action which the Congress cannot and must not countenance.

Address by Ambassador H. Freeman Matthews on the 10th Anniversary of the Signing of the Fulbright Agreement Between Austria and the United States, Given in the Great Festsaal of the University of Vienna, June 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, 10 years ago, on June 6, 1950, an agreement was signed by the representatives of the governments of Austria and the United States which provided for the exchange of professors, scientists, teachers, and students. I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by Ambassador H. Freeman Matthews on the 10th anniversary of the signing of that agreement.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF AMBASSADOR H. FREEMAN MATTHEWS ON THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SIGNING OF THE FULBRIGHT AGREEMENT BETWEEN AUSTRIA AND THE UNITED STATES, GIVEN IN THE GREAT FESTSAAL OF THE UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA, JUNE 1960

Ten years ago, on June 6, 1950, an agreement was signed by the representatives of our two Governments. It was an unusual agreement. Unlike most treaties between government, it did not provide for peace, or war, or alliance, or reduction of tariffs. It did not settle any dispute between our countries. It simply provided a basis for the exchange of professors, scientists, teachers, and students, in a variety of fields. This agreement ran for 5 years, and was then renewed for 5 more years by a simple exchange of diplomatic notes.

In that 10-year period, over 1,200 Austrians and Americans have participated in this program, crossing the ocean both ways to teach, do research, or study.

But before this unprecedented exchange between the intellectual leaders of our two countries took place, the financial and legal basis for the program had to be established.

The first step was taken by the United States well before the end of the Second World War. As early as 1944, it was found that American military equipment and supplies worth millions of dollars were left in country after country following the liberation by the allied forces. It was obvious that much of this material—such as transport trucks and cars, fuel, medical supplies, and food—would be of inestimable help to the countries most ravaged by war. It was however also obvious that such countries had no dollars to buy these materials. The Congress of the United States therefore passed a law authorizing these military surplus materials to be sold at nominal cost to the countries concerned in exchange for payment in their own currency. This was done, and many of you may remember how useful this material was here in Austria in the first difficult years following the end of the war. The resulting sales surpassed all expectations, and the American Government soon found itself in possession of huge sums in foreign currency and credits, not only in Austria but in some 20 other countries as well.

The question was: How to dispose of these funds most wisely? It did not seem right simply to give them away; there was already serious inflation in many countries which would only have been made more dangerous by such a gift. Also, the American people were the true owners of these funds; they had paid with their taxes for all the military material which had been sold. It seemed only fair that these funds should be used in a way that would bring at least some benefit to the American people.

It was at this point that an American Senator proposed an amendment to the 1944 law, which has probably made his name better known throughout the world than those of 99 out of 100 of the Generals and Admirals of the Second World War.

This amendment is officially known as Public Law 584, 79th Congress, but it is better known as the Fulbright Act; the program it provided for is known throughout the world as the Fulbright program, and the scholars and professors who have participated are known to one another wherever they may be simply as Fulbrighters.

I wonder what other statesman in the world's history has during his own lifetime been able to see such a noble monument in honor to his achievements.

It was the hope of your Government as well as of his magnificence and myself, that Senator FULBRIGHT might be able to join us here in Vienna on this occasion. I informed him of this hope, knowing that it would be extremely difficult for him to leave his duties in the Senate during the busiest month of the year. I should like to read to you the letter which he wrote to me in reply.

"MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: It is with profound regret that I find I am unable to be present at the celebration of the 10th anniversary of the exchange program with Austria. Please convey my respect to the President, the Chancellor, and to Education Minister Drimmel.

"The exchange program with Austria and the other countries with which we have such programs contributes materially, I believe, to better relations between these countries and seeks to maintain a free and enlightened society. All of us can learn much from others, and I know of no way that is more effective than the exchange of students and professors.

"Those who have charge of the administration of this program in Austria have done an outstanding job in every respect. There have been no instances of inefficient administration of the program. I believe that in the years to come these exchanges will contribute even more to the improvement of international relations which is essential to the preservation of peace. If the United Nations and other international organizations designed to promote peace are to succeed, the confidence and good will necessary for the success of these organizations will be created, I believe, by the knowledge and understanding which result from the exchange programs. I am hopeful that these programs can be expanded and that perhaps they may elicit a greater participation and support in many other countries.

"Again, may I thank you and the Chancellor for having extended the invitation to me.

"With all best wishes, I am,

"Sincerely yours,

"J. W. FULBRIGHT."

It would not be fitting for me to try to tell you how much good the Fulbright program has done for Austria. That can best be done by his magnificence, Prof. Dr. Antoine, by his colleagues in the other Austrian universities and colleges, and above all by your Federal Minister of Education Dr. Drimmel, for whose wholehearted support we are deeply grateful. I can tell you something of what has been done for America through the participation of Austria in this program. Some 500 Americans have come to Austria as Fulbrighters since 1950. Of these, 340 were students, not ordinary students, but the best we could select from the entire United States. Almost one-third of them came to study that field which the whole world associates with Austria, the art of music. Many came to study your literature and your language; others came to study your history and to work in your archives, your libraries, and your museums. Some have come for geology, chemistry, and other natural sciences.

In addition to the students, American scientists and scholars, many already world-famous in their fields, have come to Austria to do research, and others have come as exchange teachers for a year in Austrian schools.

Over 700 Austrians have participated in the Fulbright program in America. I hope they have brought back with them knowledge and experience which will prove of long lasting benefit to Austria. But I know that they have given much to America during their stay in my country. Many of them taught German language and literature at our schools and universities. I have heard that it is possible to recognize those American universities which have had Austrians helping in their German departments; the students say karfiol instead of blumenkohl.[1] But seriously, there is hardly any field of study in America where we have not been helped to some extent by the presence of Austrian professors and researchers who have come to us under the Fulbright program.

Lest anyone suppose that our real aim is to steal away the best brains of Austria for our own permanent benefit, let me interject that we ask all Austrian candidates for Fulbright grants to give written assurance that they will return to Austria after completion of their study in America. I must admit that the power of Cupid sometimes thwarts our sincere efforts to prevent the export of Austrian intelligence to America. Several of your most promising, most industrious, and most beautiful young lady students have married Americans and have found ways to stay in America permanently. However, I am glad to assure you that an equal number of our American girl Fulbright students in Austria have been overcome by Austrian charm and have married and settled in Austria. One of our girls was even successful in marrying her Austrian professor. I mention this only as a slight warning to any unmarried members of the senate of this university.

I have tried to give you some idea of the wonderful benefits America has gained through the better knowledge of Austria and the Austrians which we have acquired as a result of the Fulbright program. Perhaps even more important than the exchange of academic and scholarly knowledge and know-how has been the dispelling of countless ancient prejudices and misconceptions which are so frequently characteristic of the attitude of one people toward another. Many of us have learned not to generalize about one another so much.

Some of us now realize that not all Austrians yodel, and some of you now know that quite a few Americans never chew gum. We are beginning to realize that in spite of your famed Gemütlichkeit, most Austrians work very hard indeed to achieve a better life, and those of you who have been in the United States have seen that many Americans are more concerned with spiritual and cultural values than with the eternal chase for dollars which is so frequently (and I believe mistakenly) ascribed to us by Europeans.

In fact, the Fulbright program has helped us to see that we are more alike than unlike; in the great ideas of Western civilization, we as Austrians and Americans share a common heritage which if we will only realize it, should make us friends and brothers for all the centuries to come.

[1] Austrian and German words for cauliflower.

Veto-Leaping Pay Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAM J. ERVIN, JR.
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Washington Post and Times Herald of July 2 carries an editorial entitled "Veto-Leaping Pay Bill" expressing views somewhat similar to those expressed by me in the statement published on pages 14278 and 19429 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETO-LEAPING PAY BILL

Almost everyone in Washington is pleased to see Government employees get a raise, but the circumstances in which the present salary increases have been voted over the President's veto certainly reflect no credit on the Congress. Both the House and Senate responded to pressure on the eve of the national campaigns, despite the glaring inequities in the bill before them. It seems highly improbable that this measure would have become law if Congress had had the restraint to wait until January, when political pressures will be less acute and when the grade-by-grade salary study which Congress itself had ordered at a cost of half a million dollars will have been completed.

President Eisenhower's complaints against the bill were neither trifling nor partisan. In view of the fact that the cost of living has increased only 2.1 percent since the last salary adjustment of 10 percent in June, 1958, the new adjustments ranging from 7½ to nearly 9 percent are clearly excessive. The Government should, of course, be fair to its employees, but these pay boosts at a cost of three quarters of a billion dollars have to be weighed against the many other demands on the Treasury. It cannot be reasonably said that Federal pay adjustments should have preference over all the other public needs that Congress has thus far failed to approve.

Congress refusal to act on the recommended increases in postal rates, while adding $248 million in salary costs to the immense deficit of the Post Office Department, is certainly an irresponsible performance. Though Congress has set up a balanced budget for the postal system as an objective, it recklessly boosts expenses without concern as to where the revenue is coming from.

The complaint of inequities in the bill also seems to be well founded. Why were postal employees given more generous raises in general than employees under the Classification Act? The bill also magnifies the inequities in the present Federal wage structure by giving the largest raises to employees whose salaries are already high relative to those paid for comparable work in private industry. The extension of Federal retirement and insurance benefits to groups of county employees who are not responsible to the Federal Government seems to be utterly inexcusable. This precedent is certain to arise to the embarrassment of future Congresses.

There are indications that some legislators originally voted for this unfortunate pay bill on the assumption that it would be vetoed and would not become law. If that is the case, their reliance on a veto proved to be a costly mistake. Having committed themselves, the vast majority of legislators in both Houses could not turn back without serious political embarrassment. More than anything else, the performance on this bill proves the unwisdom of allowing Federal pay legislation to come to a head at a time when Congress is not really in a position to deliberate upon it.

U.S. Foreign Policy: Statesmanship Can Often Be Regional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. Presiednt, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Statesmanship Can Often Be Regional," written by Holmes Alexander and published in the Indianapolis (Ind.) Star of June 30, 1960. The article deals with U.S. foreign policy.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATESMANSHIP CAN OFTEN BE REGIONAL

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Statesmanship in America is often regional, as well as personal. Peculiarism of this sort is apt to enhance the quality of the statesmanship, rather than otherwise. Lincoln, the prairie lawyer; Calhoun, the southern planter; La Follette, the agitator of the middle border, were better

Americans because of their intense and enlightened indigenousness.

STRONG AMERICANISM

In modern times, the Southern and the Western States have a strong affinity in Americanism. It has seemed to me during the last decade in Washington that the United States of America is well served whenever southern and western sentiments are spoken in concert.

Something like this happened recently, when, on consecutive days in the Senate, a pair of southerners, LONG, of Louisiana, and RUSSELL, of Georgia, withheld their approval of the Japanese Treaty and a westerner, MANSFIELD, of Montana, gave a review-in-depth of American misfortunes through the loss of the U–2 plane over Russia, cancellation of the summit meeting and withdrawal of Mr. Eisenhower's invitations to visit Russia and Japan.

TWO AGAINST TREATY

Senators LONG and RUSSELL cast the only two votes against the Japanese Treaty, and for almost identical reasons. LONG is tired of ratifying the military treaties which bind the United States of America to do the spending and bleeding, but which obligate the allies to do little except wring their hands.

Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, and a major statesman by any standard, saw the treaty as far less favorable to the United States of America than the one we imposed by conquest after World War II. He seemed aghast at the provisions which surrendered another phase of American sovereignty to a foreign land. Without Japanese approval, we could not, under this treaty, go to war from American bases in Japan.

Senator MANSFIELD characteristically took several weeks to reach the conclusions he offered. His considered judgment is that the administration's excuse for U–2 spying—"Do we want another Pearl Harbor?"—is typical of the leadership we're getting. The Senator judges from the public record that our country is being run on "bureaucratic inertia" rather than executive decisions.

BREAK UP BUREAUS

MANSFIELD's solution is brisk and logical. Break up the bureaus. Put the human brain back to work.

Specifically, he recommends the butcher's ax for a whole herd of sacred bureaucratic cows: the National Security Council staff, the Vice President's extracurricular setup as a policy mastermind, the independent status of the International Cooperation (foreign aid) Administration, and the U.S. Information (propaganda) Services, the international policymaking functions of the Atomic Energy Commission, as well as of the Agriculture, Commerce, and Defense Departments and—biggest bump of all—reduction to the ranks of the Central Intelligence Agency which has been swelling in size and significance to super-Cabinet status.

In place of these decapitated bureaucracies, MANSFIELD wants the responsibility back where it belongs—to the President and two or three of his Cabinet members.

Defense Cut Represents Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

OF ALASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, my colleagues from Alaska, Senator GRUENING and Representative RIVERS, have repeatedly called the country's attention to the serious weakening of our air defense structure by the Air Force decision to withdraw entirely from Ladd Air Force Base near Fairbanks, Alaska. That is to say, the withdrawal will be complete excepting that about 30 persons connected with the aeromedical laboratory will be left.

What this means is that at the critical juncture in our history one of the three operating airbases in this highly strategic area will be put in mothballs. If our relations with Soviet Russia had improved, if coexistence with the Communist world had been proved practical, then the decision to close the base would be one thing; now it is quite another. Likewise, it might—but not surely—be logical if we had truly moved into the missile age. But we have not.

Over the last several years the defense strength of Alaska has been sapped, element by element. No previous cut, however, has been so devastating, so alarming, so completely without merit.

The situation is set forth in strong but understandable terms in an editorial which appeared in the Fairbanks (Alaska) News-Miner, June 30. I ask unanimous consent to include that editorial with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REDTAPE—BLACK CREPE

Those who are old enough should remember the gravel-voiced American radio commentator who oftener than not started his broadcasts with a booming: "There's good news tonight."

If he were around yesterday he could have put the phrase to good use by adding that the good news was for the Russians.

We are sure that the decision to rub out air defenses in the heart of Alaska is being viewed with satisfaction in Moscow today. Yesterday's announcement restating the Air Force intention of pulling out of Ladd Air Force Base—and doing so virtually lock, stock and barrel—certainly is a blow to Alaskan defense.

We have stated many times before and we state again, we do not believe this is a wise decision; we still contend it is foolhardy and dangerous to weaken the air defenses of Alaska when there is obviously a great need for strengthening them. We are still baffled by the fact that within 8 weeks, the Air Force shifted from a policy of improving the capabilities of the 449th Fighter Squadron to a policy of disbanding it entirely.

It is now obvious that high level military men in Washington have swept aside logic, the protestations of military experts, including those within the military, the views of the Alaskan commander and the Alaskan congressional delegation and are going full speed ahead with their move to strip this area of its fighter defenses.

A valuable airbase is going to be largely written off as expendable. The 449th will go out of existence; some planes will go to Elmendorf, a few to Eielson.

Heretofore, all our objections to the move have been based on a conviction that it is ill advised from the standpoint of U.S. defense. At no time have we interjected any arguments involving the economic impact such a move might have on the community of Fairbanks. This is not only because we feel American defense comes first and the economy of one area or another second. A close examination of the overall picture convinces us that while an Air Force cutback will have economic repercussions here, the present economic outlook for Fairbanks is not all black.

Though the Air Force is transferring its personnel and planes, it has no way of transferring runways, buildings and other properties worth more than $220 million.

We do not think cobwebs are going to appear in the magnificent Ladd Air Force Base hospital or that grass is going to grow on the modern runways.

The aeromedical laboratory is firmly entrenched here and undoubtedly will continue its studies, keeping its personnel here.

Once the Army is in control of Ladd, the facilities will act as a vacuum to bring in units now located at various points in Alaska and the other States—including some who are now conducting cold weather studies in Canada.

The personnel complement at Eielson is being increased.

Housing at Ladd will still be in demand; the base will remain in operation. For a time there may be a smaller on-base population but this will undoubtedly move back up in the near future.

The economic gap left by the Air Force move will be compensated in large part by the gradual transfer here of RCA personnel and other technicians associated with the big Clear project.

It must be remembered that each civilian newcomer to the community—and shortly there will be hundreds—contributes more to theh economy than several military men. This is because the average serviceman does most of his purchasing from the commissary and PX. He usually goes to a base theater, drinks at a military bar and has his meals in a military cafeteria. In most cases, he lives in base housing.

RCA and other civilian newcomers, on the other hand, will be full-fledged consumers, requiring all the trades and services available in the city. It does not take many of these full-scale consumers to equal the "trickle-down" benefits gained by this community from another self-contained community located on the base.

Militarily the Air Force move is detrimental—not only to Alaska but to the security of the entire Nation. We are deeply concerned regarding this military decision and its effect on national safety. As businessmen dependent on Fairbanks' economy, we're not about to "write off" the economic future of Interior Alaska.

The end of the telescope we're looking through shows continued expansion of this area's economy. Those who insist on looking through the opposite end cannot help but see a darker, smaller view which is only the reflection of their own lack of faith in Fairbanks.

We'll place our chips on a great future for Fairbanks, redtape and black crepe notwithstanding.

Cameron County Commissioners Court Favors Establishment of Padre Island National Seashore Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, of all those who have been working to assure the creation of a National Seashore Park on Padre Island, none have worked harder or more effectively than

the Honorable Oscar C. Dancy, judge of Cameron County. He has done an outstanding job of presenting this project not only to the residents of his own county, but to many other residents of the gulf coast area of Texas.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the resolution favoring this project which was passed by Judge Dancy and the members of the Cameron County Commissioners Court, together with the names of all the commissioners.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it remembered, That on this, the 1st day of December A.D. 1959, there was held a special or called meeting of the commissioners' court held in the regular meeting place in the commissioners' courtroom, in the courthouse at Brownsville, Tex., at which the following members were present, to wit: Oscar C. Dancy, county judge; Ted R. Hunt, commissioner, precinct 1; Tony Tamayo, Jr., commissioner, precinct 2; Jack Ehlers, commissioner, precinct 3; Guy Leggett, commissioner, precinct 4; H. D. Seago, county clerk; J. R. Snoeberger, county auditor; which said meeting was duly called to order by proclamation of the sheriff,

Whereupon, the following proceedings were had:

Commissioner Ted R. Hunt, of precinct No. 1, presented resolution as follows:

"On this day, there was presented to the court copy of resolution of the Cameron County Park Board in words and figures as follows:

"'Resolved that the Board of Park Commissioners of Cameron County support the various bills in Congress to establish a national seashore area on Padre Island subject to agreement between the State of Texas, and the U.S. Government.'

"And the same being duly considered by the court, the court is unanimously of the opinion that said resolution should be unanimously adopted and approved as the position of the said commissioners' court of said county.

"Premises considered, it is decreed, adjudged and ordered by the court that the above and foregoing resolution is in all respects approved and adopted as the position of the commissioners' court of Cameron County in the matter referred to.

"Said Commissioner Ted R. Hunt moved the passage of the foregoing resolution, which was duly seconded by Commissioner Tony Tamayo, Jr., and the same being considered and the question being called, all members of the court including the county judge voted in the affirmative and none voted in the negative and said resolution was declared to have unanimously carried."

Government Policies on the Disposition of Patent Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL B. LONG
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it may be recalled that the Junior Senator from Louisiana has, on two different occasions this year, delivered rather lengthy speeches in the Senate on the prevailing Government policies concerning the disposition of patent rights to inventions and discoveries obtained from Government-financed research and development contracts.

On the second occasion, I introduced a bill which would make the patent policies of all the departments of the Federal Government uniform in retaining for the Government the rights to these taxpayer-financed inventions and discoveries.

I am happy to report that at least one newspaper has taken up this cause. I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Rewards of Patriotism: Taxpayers Pay Twice Over for Defense Research Patents," which appeared in the June 25, 1960, issue of the AFL–CIO News, the official weekly publication of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REWARDS OF PATRIOTISM—TAXPAYERS PAY TWICE OVER FOR DEFENSE RESEARCH PATENTS

It has been said that the question of Government-financed research and the private patents that result from it is such a technical matter that it is almost impossible to get the public interested.

Yet there is a side to the question that is far from technical and should be within the grasp of everyone who has the interests of the United States at heart.

That is the immense cost to our people involved in spending billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money annually on research only to permit private corporations to obtain private commercial patents on the discoveries that they make through the use of these same public funds.

Those costs have been estimated as high as $30 billion over the next quarter of a century in higher prices.

Even more importantly they involve the strengthening and even perpetuation of monopolies that it has long been public policy to destroy.

The question of Government-financed research and resulting private patents is more than a technical matter.

Congress is debating whether it should insist that patents obtained through Defense Department research should revert to the Government or should be permitted to revert to private interests as has been taking place ever since World War II.

In the House an amendment was introduced to the Defense Department appropriations bill providing that all patents resulting from Government-financed research become the property of the United States.

The amendment was defeated 37 in favor to 104 against. So as far as the House is concerned, powerful American corporations can go on patenting discoveries made with Government money even though in their own private contracts with scientists they have strict clauses under which patents are automatically assigned to the corporation and not to the employee making the discovery.

Senator RUSSELL LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, has made several major speeches in the Senate on the subject and has introduced a bill making patents resulting from Government-financed research Government property.

His speeches and his bill have brought strong opposition from the American Patent Law Association, made up of patent lawyers, many of whom represent leading corporations. These corporations do research for the Government at the cost of billions of dollars annually, but are far more interested in the additional billions to be gained through commercial exploitation of the discoveries made through the use of public research funds.

Their concern over the possible cutting off of an immensely lucrative operation is understandable from the viewpoint of private profits. And, as debate in the Senate made clear, the same concern is understandable from the viewpoint of the public interest.

The history of private corporations with relation to defense research and private patent profits and monopolies is not too edifying. LONG told the Senate that many defense contractors in World War II "took the position that they did not want to do the research and development unless they could get the private patent rights. The Government reluctantly yielded on that point."

Having "taken" the Government so patriotically on the patent point, they have been "taking" the Government and the public ever since.

Here are some of the comments made in Congress during discussion of this issue:

Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska: "What is the use of talking about the enforcement of antitrust laws when the present administration is at the same time creating patent monopolies that cost the American public billions of dollars?"

Representative HARRIS B. MCDOWELL, Democrat, of Delaware: "I have been astounded to discover that in the absence of any legislative enactment by Congress establishing a patent policy for the Federal Government, officials of the Department of Defense have themselves undertaken to develop a patent policy of their own, which is in direct conflict with the repeated enactments of Congress as expressed in the Atomic Energy Act, the National Aeronautics and Space Act, and other legislation where Congress has spelled out a national patent policy which protects the interests of our country."

All of which should not be too technical for the public to understand if it is to avoid paying through the nose twice—once for the research and again for the commercial products of the research because of monopolistic prices protected by 17-, 34-, or even 51-year patents.

Jennings Randolph Lauded as Leader for World Understanding; W. H. M. Stover Urges President Eisenhower To Pursue New Peace Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Last evening the able and distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] made an eloquent, informative, and thought provoking speech on our strivings for world peace, under the caption "Personal Diplomacy." It appears at page 14443 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Senator RANDOLPH has been an able advocate for better American diplomacy for years, and has spoken in the Senate and out of it for his aims and ideals for America.

Recognition of his achievements and ideas have come from many quarters, one of the most recent being contained in a letter from "Bill" W. H. M. Stoner, president, Leadership Training Institute of the District of Columbia, addressed to the White House, and dealing with recent events abroad. Mr. Stoner's recognition of Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH'S contribution to the cause of world peace in our time is so well stated that I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD pertinent extracts from his letter of June 30.

There being no objection, the extracts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 30, 1960.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Welcome home.

* * * * *

"On February 2, at the International Christian Leadership prayer breakfast, in the most eloquent speech of his career, and in what probably was his most significant speech on world peace, President Eisenhower said: 'There has been too much of the world that believes the United States is completely materialistic, boastful, proud, and arrogant.

" 'America still is a nation that is founded on religious faith, with great concern for the sentiments of mercy and compassion—we want others to know this.

" 'The conviction that the United States is trying to follow in the footsteps of the Prince of Peace is a tremendous gain in this day of fears, hysteria, and great—sometimes too great—a reliance on force.

" 'We intend to remain strong, but let us always do it with the certainty that anyone who will come in integrity, observing the moral values that we know are embedded in this great religious faith, that he will be received as a friend, and taken with us down the road to the future in peace.' "

You, Mr. President, from your high office, can do much even now to help set up the structure and plan for world peace. * * *

It is respectfully suggested, Mr. President, that the time has arrived when a U.S. Department of Public Relations is sorely needed. A separate department, in the hands of our greatest statesmen, appointed with permanent status to avoid political moorings, with funds automatically appropriated at the rate of 1 percent of all defense and foreign aid appropriations, could, if officially created and properly and promptly functioning, do much to create better understanding among men and nations, whether friendly or unfriendly.

We use this public relations device quite effectively in business. In fact, in any large corporation today, a public relations department is almost as essential as the sales, advertising, or operating department. Why wouldn't the same idea work for our Government? Could it not find ways and means to help build good will for America, to sell freedom and the dignity of man, at home and abroad, and generally to create an atmosphere conducive to peace around the world? Would not the exchange of ideas and ideals for peace be a project worthy of our serious, sincere consideration?

* * * * *

May I respectfully suggest, Mr. President, that you throw the full weight of your high office and your own high personal integrity behind pending legislation S. 2332 to create a U.S. Department of Peace?

It is significant to note that S. 2332 was introduced into the Senate on July 2, 1959, by the same man who first introduced H.R. 3628 into the House in 1945. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, from West Virginia, repeatedly introduced similar legislation each session while a Congressman, and traveled over America for 6 years lending his voice eloquently for this idea, from 1948 to 1958.

One can only surmise how much different the recent summit conference might have been, if indeed necessary at all, had a public relations Department been functioning efficiently for the past 15 years as Mr. RANDOLPH'S constituent, Mr. R. M. Davis, of Morgantown, W. Va., initially conceived it, in the interest of peace.

We're living in an age when it seems as if at any moment "man's inhumanity to man may destroy mankind." For today, as never before, we are conscious that, with one overt act or mistake, the world could be plunged into a fiery furnace of hell, destruction and death. May God grant that this may never come.

* * * * *

I would like to see a dedicated man like JENNINGS RANDOLPH set up as Secretary of a Department of Peace. Starting with a man of high integrity who has tenaciously clung to this idea for 15 years in and out of Government, with all need for political considerations stowed away, such a man could be most effective. I suggest a Deputy Under Secretary, or Cochairman.

Give to such men an advisory board consisting of all living ex-Presidents of the United States for a life term and at a similar salary. What a wealth of wisdom and experience Mr. Herbert Hoover, Mr. Harry Truman, and Mr. Dwight Eisenhower together could make available in their final contribution to the good of mankind and the peace of the world.

Add to this a working board of directors, by whatever name, equip the department or agency with an intelligent, well-selected, effective staff, with ample authority to act and with perpetual appropriations automatically fixed by a small percentage of the amount appropriated for defense in all its aspects, and it still may be possible to help build a world in which men might work out their differences in harmony and peace.

Such a public-relations department could go a long way toward humanizing the world. Each day the tempo of tensions and unrest increase and with it the hazards increase by leaps and bounds. It's later than many think—much later. God grant that it may not now be too late.

Would it not expedite possible legislation and allay all partisan considerations on this vital issue if both political parties at the coming conventions were to advocate such legislation as a plank in their respective platforms? Wouldn't this very action tell the world in unmistakable terms that America is above all else united in its desire for peace?

Who else but you, Mr. President, could dare make such an appeal? Yet I suggest that the boldness of the suggestion, backed up by your absolute integrity, recognized and acknowledged by friend and foe alike, would be all that would be necessary. Certainly your own party would follow your lead, and almost as certainly the opposition party would, after due deliberation, accept and adopt such a plank.

* * * * *

Pardon this long epistle. I set out last week, while you were absent from the country, to write you a brief note to welcome you back home. Instead, I arose one morning with the strong compulsion to write you more fully concerning this matter of peace. I feel that this is a God-inspired message which ought to be brought to your attention for the good of mankind.

* * * * *

You have the fervent prayers of many whose destiny you guide. "May you prosper and be in health even as your soul prospereth."

"BILL" W. H. W. STOVER,
President, Leadership Training Institute of the District of Columbia.

The Great Need of Our Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the people of American—of the world—will, I believe, require of their public servants, as leaders, an ever-higher sense of responsibility.

In the space age—in which a push-button, nuclear-missile war could kill off millions of people—this is a necessity.

Yesterday, I was privileged to comment on the need for realistic, objective leadership as well as to attempt to put the facts of life—as I see them—in proper perspective on foreign policy. In my talk—and it was a straight-from-the-shoulder talk—I took serious issue with the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee on evaluating the significance of the U–2 flight and the Paris debacle.

However, I want to make it clear—and I am sure the chairman understands this—that our differences are a matter of issues, not of personalities. By no stretch of the imagination would I want my commentary to be considered to reflect upon the chairman himself.

On the years, I have developed a great respect for the keen, scholarly mind of the distinguished Senator; for the constructive contributions—of which there are many—which he has made in the field of foreign affairs; and for his long, faithful service to the people of Arkansas and the country.

However, I strongly felt—and I make no apology for doing so—that the distinguished chairman's "slashing attack"—as the newspapers called it—on the administration's handling of foreign policy was absolutely unjustified. Frankly, I felt it "out of keeping" with the calm, cool, objective perspective with which the Senator normally approaches problems in this field in which he has long experience.

The target of my own commentary was to refute the adverse impact which the distinguished Senator's comments—however justified he may have thought them—would have upon the public and the world mind and, yes, upon U.S. foreign policy.

This, then, brings me to my point today. The people of America—particularly in political life—have fallen into a bad habit. What is that bad habit? Just this: All too often there is the false idea that in creating the new tools and ideas upon which to meet the challenge of and build a better future, there is a need to damn and deprecate the achievements of the past or present. This is pure nonsense. All of us—Republicans, Democrats, and independents—building upon the great heritage handed down from our forefathers, have helped, in our time, to create the policies and programs that have made the United States the greatest nation in the history of the world.

It pains me to see the great minds of America, the great leaders, the great

thinkers, dissipate so much time and energy deprecating the past, deprecating the opposition, deprecating policies, or deprecating leaders with which they may be in disagreement. What a great tragic waste. Why, in heaven's name, is it necessary to spend so much time, thought, and energy tearing down the other fellow? To the contrary, the great crying need of our time, as in all time, is to utilize the resources, manpower, and, above all, good ideas for building a better future. If the Democrats have some good ideas, let us have them; if the Republicans have good ideas, let us have them. The country needs them all.

Frankly, I believe it is high time that, as a world leader, we adopted a new, mature attitude toward our responsibilities.

Let us stop tearing ourselves down.

Across the seas the Communist—controlling nearly a billion people and vast resources—are trying to accomplish that objective.

Instead, let us try to "grow up a little," discard the outmoded and useless tactic of damning the opposition, of deprecating past policies and programs.

In this battle, all of us have a responsibility—in political life, in private life, and, yes, in the press and information media of the country. Too often—and perhaps this is a fine shade of meaning but all too often, efforts to put forward new ideas for the world of tomorrow are by interpretation, if not outrightly presented as such—displayed as bad or critical reflections on past programs or perhaps on present administrations.

This is not necessarily true.

If President Eisenhower were a candidate for reelection, I am sure that, as in the past, he'd have a good, sound, constructive program to present to the people for the next year and the following 3 years.

As Democrats and Republicans alike present their ideas on how to cope with the complex problems of the future, I believe it is important that these not be put forward as deprecating present or past programs and that they not be so interpreted.

Following the committee report on the U–2 and summit incidents, many editorials have appeared in newspapers across the country. Today I would like to present two of these which I think reflect the real factors of the significance of these events in world affairs:

First. An editorial from the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press, entitled "Fourteen Senators Take Strange View of U–2."

Second. From the Youngstown (Ohio) Indicator, an editorial entitled "Mountain and Mouse."

I ask unanimous consent to have these editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Burlington (Vt.) Free Press, June 27, 1960]

FOURTEEN SENATORS TAKE STRANGE VIEW OF U–2

Fourteen members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, including Senator AIKEN, conclude that had the U–2 incident not occurred there would have been a summit conference.

They are not sure that the summit conference would have been a success, but, at least, Khrushchev would not have had a pretext for breaking it off.

Therefore, the Senators contend there is good reason to conclude the May 1 flight should not have been permitted.

We, too, regret the U–2 incident, but only as an unfortunate accident in the entirely necessary pursuit of gaging Russian strength and estimating Russian intentions.

If any good was derived from the capture of an American pilot and the loss of a plane, it lies in the fact that the incident brought Khrushchev's summit intentions to the surface for all to see and sooner, rather than later.

Judging from past performances at the top, the summit meeting presented much greater risks to the free world's position than did the possibility of losing a plane during 4 years of flights over Russia.

Two members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee reasoned straight to the mark in a minority report—Senator FRANK J. LAUSCHE, Democrat, of Ohio, and Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican, of Wisconsin.

Members of Congress responsible for reviewing details of intelligence-gathering activities knew of these flights and approved them. Congress has appropriated money for development and operation of high-flying spy planes for years.

The U–2's operated successfully for 4 years, obtaining information indispensable to an adequate defense.

Khrushchev had decided the allies could not be divided at the summit and that he could not accomplish his objectives. While the U–2 gave him an excuse, it was not the actual reason he wrecked the summit conference.

The Soviet Union has the largest espionage organization of any nation in the world and possibly the largest in history. Communist activities were not suspended May 1 or during any period preceding the summit meeting.

Those who launched the May 1 flight had 4 years of unbroken success behind them and had no reason to believe that this particular flight would be any different from those in the past. If they could have foreseen the failure, they would not have launched the flight. This would hold true, of course, for any flight. Bad luck, not bad judgment, brought on the incident.

Had diplomatic reasons for not sending planes over Russia been overriding, it would have been difficult to find any time at which flights could have been sent.

The May 1 flight having failed, the Federal agencies involved failed to coordinate their public reactions. Both the committee majority and minority agree on this.

It developed that President Eisenhower had to make a statement regarding the incident. Since he had to make a statement, he had to tell the truth.

The concluding point of Senator LAUSCHE and Senator WILEY is a masterpiece of summation:

"The gathering of intelligence has been practiced by nations from time immemorial and though it is an unsavory and hateful occupation its omission would come fairly close to constituting criminal negligence in the responsibility of a nation to provide for its common defense."

[From the Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator June 27, 1960]

MOUNTAIN AND MOUSE

On the basis of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee's published report, the investigation of the U–2 spy plane failure prior to the ill-fated summit conference produced nothing of any great value to anyone.

Once the public familiarizes itself with the report of the 17-man committee (11 Democrats and 6 Republicans) it may not even become a good campaign issue although the Fulbright group seemed desperately intent on trying to make it one. Evidently the committee found out little that was not already public knowledge. The American people, the best informed in the world, have had ample time to make their own deductions and, having done so, refuse to fashion a crisis out of the event.

The committee had a perfect right to inquire into the incident * * * President Eisenhower could have lied about the whole thing, disclaiming any knowledge of the project, but this does not fit in with either the President's code or that of his countrymen. If he had lied, it is to be presumed that Khrushchev would have gone on with the summit meeting.

At least this is the way the committee second-guesses the affair. However, it seems to be well established that Khrushchev had no intention of going through with the meeting because he knew in advance that he couldn't dominate the West.

Ten Democrats and four Republicans signed the report. Apparently the Democratic majority's stiffest task was to come up with a report which would not be an all-Democratic product, and more than a dozen meetings were required to tone down the findings to a point where the GOP representatives would consent to signing. Even then Senator CAPEHART voted against it because, he said, it did not promote the best interests of the United States. He will find considerable public agreement with his stand.

Two other members of the committee abstained from approval and returned a minority report of their own. They were Senator WILEY of Wisconsin, ranking Republican member, and Senator LAUSCHE of Ohio, both of whom agreed coordination was lacking after the failure of the flight but defended it on the basis that past experience justified expectation of success.

On the whole the report reminds one of the old fable: "A mountain was in labor sending forth dreadful groans, and there was the highest expectation throughout the region. But it brought forth only a mouse."

Are We Too Lax in Carrying Forward a Positive Program in World Affairs? William Randolph Hearst, Jr., Says We Must Do More

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, many of our colleagues have spoken in recent days on the continuing problems of the so-called cold war. Citizens in our country are asking the question, "Are we too lax?" in our purpose to do a more effective job in dealing with Russia and other countries, including Cuba.

I have read and reread the editorial in the Hearst newspapers of June 26, written by the editor in chief of these daily journals, William Randolph Hearst, Jr.

Mr. President, the penetrating and persuasive comments of Mr. Hearst are

challenging. I wish his beliefs could be carefully considered by all Americans—especially by those persons who are too complacent in these perilous times.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the editorial referred to in my remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A pretentious phrase you read and hear too much of nowadays is "National Purpose." Heavy thinkers (accent on heavy) are asking in thousands of words: Do we have one? What is it?

This evidently got a little too much for my friend, columnist Arthur Krock of the New York Times, which by the way, ran a series of deep-think pieces on the "National Purpose." On the basis of a fascinating news report that porpoises appear to have brains larger than ours, Arthur suggested that "what this country really needs is a good 5-cent national porpoise."

Without in the least disagreeing with A. K., the answer to the pundits is of course we have a purpose. It is to beat communism in the cold war and to prevent the Communists, by our deterrent strength, from turning it into a hot one.

Everyone but the experts knows that.

But the biggest question all of us face today is:

Are we carrying out our purpose to win over communism in the most effective way?

I think the answer is: We're trying hard but we're not doing all we could or nearly as well as we might.

One of the reasons for the two Hearst task force visits to Moscow in 1955 and 1957 was to assess how effectively we were conducting the cold war, or competitive coexistence, vis-a-vis Russia. After the second trip, our reports, and conclusions were issued in a booklet titled "How Russia Is Winning the Peace." We fixed on this title after spirited discussion. It represented a realistic appraisal and was intended as a challenge. Just a few quotes will give you the idea.

"The Communists will avoid a hot war and move adroitly when the opportunities arrive to score further gains.

"They will search for disruptive factors * * * and aggravate them whenever possible" (i.e. Japan).

"We are convinced the Communist leaders believe they can achieve world domination by peace offensives in the political and economic fields.

"A totalitarian government always can channel its resources in a matter that periodically will produce spectacular achievements.

"But America and its allies in the free world possess essential resources in depth unmatched by the Communists, not to mention the spiritual strength that should flow from our religious and cultural heritage."

We had said very must the same after our journey to Moscow in 1955.

And that brings up a recommendation we made some 5 years ago, first presented in a speech I made to the National Press Club in Washington, January 28, 1955. The proposal has been urged on various occasions since by our newspapers and has received support from some distinguished individuals.

It is for "establishment of a permanent planning board commissioned to formulate an all-fields, all-fronts strategy for winning the battle of competitive coexistence * * * the board should be scrupulously nonpartisan. It should be culled from the finest minds and talents available. It should coolly survey the whole global scheme and develop plans for getting the people of the world on our side."

Quite independently, a strikingly similar idea was advanced a few months later by Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff, chairman of the board of the Radio Corp. of America.

Although the idea has received approving pats on the head from time to time, it has never, as far as I know, been thoroughly studied by the administration. But just last month, Senator HENRY JACKSON, the Democrat from Washington and chairman of the Subcommittee on National Policy Machinery, mentioned the Hearst plan in saying that one of his principal concerns was how to get and keep the best brainpower to cope with the complex problems of the cold war.

It matters not a whit to me whether it is known as the Hearst plan, the Sarnoff plan or the Jackson plan.

What does matter a great deal to every American is that our purpose to beat Russia in the cold war needs the best intelligence we can enlist to do the job.

In this connection, Premier Khrushchev made a very significant speech a few days ago in Bucharest that created a sensation in the Communist world and appeared to indicate a widening ideological split between Moscow and Peiping.

By reiterating his belief that the Communist and capitalist worlds can get along by "peaceful coexistence" (I prefer competitive coexistence), Khrushchev committed what almost amounts to Communist heresy. He declared that some aspects of Marxist-Lenin theory, including the teaching that the existence of capitalism makes war inevitable, are outdated.

"We live in a time," he said, "when we have neither Marx nor Engels nor Lenin with us. If we act like children who, studying the alphabet, compile words from letters, we shall not go very far. We cannot repeat today mechanically what Lenin said many decades ago that imperialist wars are inevitable as long as socialism has not triumphed over all the world."

Mao Tse-tung—who, like Castro, uses Uncle Sam as the whipping boy to cover up the shortcomings and failures of enforced communism and who daily warns his poor, duped people of the imminence of U.S. war-like intentions—disagrees violently and openly. Peiping issued a blast saying capitalist governments are "vicious and unchangeable" and that the Communists have no choice but "to organize strength to fight them."

It reminded me of a remark Sir Winston Churchill made to the Task Force after our first trip to Russia. He said the time might come when Moscow would turn to the West for help against the Chinese comrades.

That time may be far away, but the evidence of ideological differences between Moscow and Peiping is strong.

There are two related courses of action we ought to take right now.

The first is to exploit the differences by every means possible.

The second is to meet the challenge of competitive coexistence the Khrushchev has flung at us with everything we have.

With our techniques of salesmanship, advertising and persuasion to back up the moral validity of democracy and freedom, we ought to be able to win.

The fact seems to be, I am sorry to say, that we haven't been working hard enough at it. We have lacked the continuous, day-by-day concentration of thinking and planning needed to win.

It's as if Casey Stengel managed the Yankees only 3 days a week. What we need is a competitive coexistence council of Caseys on the job all the time.

One area where Congress seems to be facing up to hard reality and getting ready to do something about it, is Castro's Cuba.

Secretary Herter made an impressive appearance Wednesday before the House Agricultural Committee and appeared to have won over opposition to the administration's request for Presidential authority to cut the favored Cuban sugar quota at the President's discretion.

We have been buying approximately half the Cuban crop at premium prices 2 to 3 cents above the world market rate. There is no good reason to continue to do so in view of the increasing Communist domination of the Castro government, of Castro's increasing hostility toward the United States, and of the benefits our true Latin American friends would gain by reapportioning part of our quota to them.

Castro has reacted violently with charges of economic aggression and threats to seize all American-owned property. He has seized one-third already. In other words, he insists on the right to bite the hand that feeds him while demanding it continue to feed him as before.

Why, even Khrushchev, at the height of one of his bombastic tirades, sounds like a logical professor of philosophy compared to the fuzzy-faced Cuban psycho. The way Castro's been ranting he's nearer Mao than K. in his anti-Americanism and war talk. We should work on widening their ideological schism, separate K. from his belligerent Commie cronies and beat him at the coexistence game.

WILLIAM RANDOLPH HEARST, Jr.

A "Perfect" Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, as we leave these Halls for home, and for our respective conventions, the following article by the great editor and columnist David Lawrence, on the "Perfect" Administration is one to read and reflect on during the coming months.

Mr. Speaker, we will hear promises as absurd, yea even more so, than any in the following article. As we go about our work to choose and elect the next President of these United States let us never forget that: "Those whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad."

The article follows:

A "PERFECT" ADMINISTRATION?

(By David Lawrence)

Judging by some speeches, inside and outside Congress, that are getting headlines nowadays, there is a perfect way to run the foreign policy of the United States.

The critics have encouraged us to believe that the way to win the cold war is to elect a President next time who will know in advance what the Communist regime in Moscow is planning and will promptly take just the right action to defeat its purposes.

This, to be sure, is a very large order. It asumes that the President will always be in perfect health, that he will never need any time off for recreation—especially, that he will never play golf—and that, with a telephone at his bedside, he will be able at any hour of the night to issue orders to his thousands of subordinates. Indeed, it is asserted that the President should know

what military pilots are taking off for any destination throughout the world every minute of the day and night. He should, it is said, be able to suspend any airborne alert which our bombers occasionally fly in an attempt to get warning of the enemy's preparations for a surprise attack.

The President should also be turned in—legitimately, of course, and not through any espionage device—on the deliberations at the Kremlin. He should be able to regulate his overseas trips so that he will not run into such a dilemma as he did in Paris or Tokyo. In fact, the President is to know in advance the temper of the mobs that are gathering in any foreign country to demonstrate against our prestige. Above all, he is to be an expert in diagnosing the psychopathic aberrations of a Khrushchev.

More than this, the President must never fail to spend enough money to keep us "ahead of the Russians" in everything—from missiles to professors of science and all other categories of education. One ingenious way to accomplish all this supposedly is to use Federal funds to increase the number of classrooms in the country and, of course, raise teachers' salaries.

If anyone so much as mentions the budget as a possible barrier to big spending programs, the President is to rise up to denounce "budget considerations" as old fashioned or as thwarting our "national purpose."

Money, we will be told, grows on trees. Anyone who thinks that a perennially unbalanced budget will produce inflation and a 10-cent dollar is to be given a simple and pious lecture about the need for a 5-percent increase annually in our "national growth." This presumably will at once dispel all fears of fiscal chaos.

Under the perfect administration, to be sure, the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee will conduct our foreign policy, and the Secretary of State will take his instructions from Capitol Hill, despite the fact that the Constitution says this is solely an executive responsibility.

As for domestic problems, by waving a magic wand, we will have just the right wages, the right prices and adequate receipts from higher taxes. The Government would regulate all business.

The "perfect" administration will regard as outmoded any protest decrying all this as destructive of private initiative. Instead, the slogan is to be "more spending for more growth, and more government in more business." Anyone who objects will be called a misguided disciple of "big business" or an old fogey who is far behind the times. The demand is for "bold and imaginative ideas" no matter what they cost. Taxpayers are to be dubbed "illiberal" if they object to paying more taxes while their dollars shrink in purchasing power.

As for money spent abroad, the foreign countries receiving it are to be given constant aid and yet do nothing for the United States in return. Our military bases there are to be regarded as superfluous and as annoying to the Communists—hence they would be withdrawn, as recommended by Moscow. If this brings us to a posture of "isolation," then it will be urged that we quickly get more missiles and intercontinental bombers, even if it costs many times what our allied bases cost us now. As for our allies, they are expected to enjoy these "disengagement" policies, comforted by the thought that all this is "peaceful coexistence."

What candidate can assure the "perfect" administration? If any would-be nominee cannot do it, his campaign promises, whatever they are—even before the conventions take place—must be held up to scorn. Only someone with the ability to awe Communists into immediate acquiescence in, if not submission to, our demands should theoretically be given serious consideration by the delegates of the two national conventions.

Will the American people be misled into believing that Utopia is just around the corner and that, if only we will give up all our armament, including nuclear weapons, the lion and the lamb will lie down together? Fortunately, the average voter has plenty of common sense, and he will recognize that the "perfectionists" are really partisans who are overplaying their hand.

Walter Lippmann To Be Guest on "CBS Reports" Thursday, July 7, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, as a critic of the television networks for their failure to use that great medium of communication to serve all elements of our society, I was very happy to read in John Crosby's TV column in the Washington Post the good news that Walter Lippmann, would be a guest on "CBS Reports" next Thursday. Not only is this good news for the millions who enjoy the solid commentary of this distinguished columnist in the daily press; it is a good indication, as well, of the recognition of the network officials that a better balanced diet of TV programing is necessary to fulfill its ultimate destiny to inform and elevate the American people about the serious problems of our time.

I hope the forthcoming Lippmann program will be followed by other programs of equal appeal to those who wish to know more about the problems the world today must face.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Lippmann's TV Debut Promises a Major Event," written by John Crosby, and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUBJECT: LEADERSHIP—LIPPMANN'S TV DEBUT PROMISES A MAJOR EVENT

(By John Crosby)

I would like to invite your attention to "CBS Reports" next Thursday (7:30 p.m., e.d.t.) which is entirely devoted to a talk with Walter Lippmann, one of the Nation's great senior citizens. Lippmann is one of the few people alive who speaks what he considers the truth without caring a hoot about whether or not what he is saying is popular.

I am very happy that Lippman has consented to make his television debut (it took months of persuading by Howard K. Smith and Fred Friendly), and I hope that he will make this a regular occurrence. Not too regular. About once a year, I think, would be refreshing and stimulating and, in the best sense, inspiring.

I have not seen the film, but I have Friendly's word for it that the Lippmann personality comes through with great clarity and force. I'm not surprised. People who have towering integrity and great intellectual power—of whom there are very few—make a tremendous impact on television, which is an entirely different kind of communications medium than anything we have known. A man like Bertrand Russell or Robert Oppenheimer—or Lippmann—comes to you on the screen as the sum of all the things that he has thought or that he has done in this life. All of it is imprinted, as it were, on his brow, so that he cannot even say "it's a nice day," without imposing authority.

I have felt most urgently that television should more often use its unique powers to bring us the great leaders and thinkers of our time, to inspire and to lift and to shape our thinking and our personalities. Instead of seeking—as it so incessantly does—to be popular, it should strive, at least some of the time, to tell the truth—and damn the torpedoes. Instead of everlastingly feeling the public pulse, TV should have a few independent thinkers of its own who might say: "The whole country is going to such-and-such a movie, but it's a terrible movie. Stop it." Or: "This is a book that has caused no stir at all, but it ought to. Read it." Or: "So-and-so is a very popular Senator, but we think he's a bum. Don't vote for him."

Some of the clear, bracing, cold-water quality of truth is contained in the hour-long talk with Lippmann, which ranges over a dozen subjects. Nowhere is he so eloquent as on the subject of leadership. Lippmann feels strongly that what he calls the old gentlemen who have run the world during and after the war are about to retire from participation.

He talks at length about the great leaders he has admired in the past—Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson and Winston Churchill and—his current enthusiasm—De Gaulle. A great leader, Lippman says, must have the "ability to see what is. He must be able to see through the excitement of daily events. He must be able to see through the latest headlines to what is permanent and enduring. This ability—this second sight—is, to my mind, the quality of great leaders."

One person who has not got this quality of second sight at all in the Lippmann view is President Eisenhower, of whom Lippmann speaks with crushing candor that the Ike fans are not going to like. Of the Presidency, Lippmann says the ideal man should be—as all leaders should be—articulate, but this articulateness must not be aimed at the lowest common denominator. Rather, it should be aimed at the best minds in the country, and they would carry it on down to the lowest level. (That is a thought that the broadcasting industry might think about a bit.)

Here are the Lippmann thoughts about another leader that might intrigue you: "One of the most handsome, attractive young men—quite superficial, rather uneducated, but so charming that everybody likes him, but nobody ever conceived of him as President of the United States." That sounds like a thumbnail portrait of Senator KENNEDY, but actually it is Lippmann's view of the prepolio Franklin D. Roosevelt, about whom Lippmann says he has "long and mixed and confused feelings."

In his interview Howard K. Smith asked Lippmann what he thinks is the biggest single job the President of the United States has to face. His answer to this is not quite what you might think, but you had best listen to him yourself next Thursday. I think you will be heartened especially by what Lippmann says about the Soviet Union's desire to avoid war. You will be depressed by what he says about the U–2 incident—his appraisal being the only honest one I have seen.

Story of Hiroshima Bares Secrets Hidden Until Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following review by Carter Brooke Jones, of the Washington Evening Star, of the new book by Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey II, "No High Ground." Their book is about the dropping of the first atomic bomb and the problems and decisions of the people concerned. It is a book for the general reader and does a good job of presenting this huge undertaking simply and interestingly.

The review follows:

THE FIRST ATOM BOMBING: STORY OF HIROSHIMA BARES SECRETS HIDDEN UNTIL NOW

(By Carter Brooke Jones)

Two Washington correspondents have told fully for the first time the story of how we developed the atomic bomb, what led up to its devastating use at Hiroshima and what happened on that fateful mission.

Much hitherto secret material is woven into their narrative, which not only is an authoritative general account of pertinent events, but a tightly written documentary that holds breathless interest.

WELL SORTED FACTS

Naturally volumes could be and have been written about technical phases of the unleashing of atomic power and the military historian could write endlessly about the exchanges of orders, the conferences and controversies that led up to the bomb. But Mr. Knebel and Mr. Bailey, addressing their story to a general audience, sorted their mass of material expertly, keeping the most interesting and significant. And, like good journalists, they've written simply and clearly.

The authors, in expressing their gratitude to the Air Force and the Navy for making available all the secret papers sought, thank the Army for turning over a few specific papers. They add: "But we cannot accept without protest the Army's refusal, in the name of 'national security,' to open the rest of these papers to responsible historical research. It is perfectly clear to the authors that personal and policy considerations, not security, dictated the withholding of these 15-year-old papers."

DEBATE CONTINUES

In telling the story of the bomb and of its first use on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the writers have not neglected the ethical debate which preceded the decision to drop the weapon that changed history—a debate that still goes on and undoubtedly will continue. It was when the moment came, President Truman's terrible responsibility to make the decision. And yet, as the authors point out, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill had agreed tentatively that the atomic weapon, which seemed near completion, would be used against Japan.

The administration, however, and the military commands, were split. While Secretary of War Stimson felt it should be used to end the war, Assistant Secretary John J. McCloy and Navy Under Secretary Ralph A. Bard held strong reservations. Adm. William D. Leahy, then the President's Chief of Staff, was most unhappy over the decision, feeling that Japan was beaten as it was and would soon surrender. Gen. Henry A. (Hap) Arnold, commanding the Air Force, was opposed to using the bomb.

General Eisenhower expressed hope that we wouldn't have to drop it, because he hated to see the United States the first to use a weapon with such an incredible destructive potential.

It is interesting to learn that neither General Eisenhower, then supreme commander of the European theater, nor General MacArthur, Pacific commander, was let in on the closely guarded secret that the bomb had been made until days before it was dropped.

Those who felt the bomb should be used argued that it was no worse to wipe out a city with one bomb than to lay waste much of Tokyo with a mass of incendiary bombs, as we had done, at a cost of 78,000 lives. More than 70,000 were killed at Hiroshima or died within hours.

THE FLIGHT ITSELF

The historical flight of the bomber *Enola Gay*, commanded by Col. Paul W. Tibbets, which dropped the first atomic bomb, is described vividly. Each member of the crew comes to life in these pages.

Security measures guarding the Manhattan District (designation for the farflung operations involved in making the bomb) were unprecedented. And yet two spies leaked its design to Russia—an ally we did not trust.

"No High Ground" is a remarkable achievement. Fletcher Knebel, who writes the "Potomac Fever" column which appears in the Star and many other newspapers, and Mr. Bailey are in the Washington bureau of the Cowles publications. They have written objectively, leaving it to the reader to form judgments.

Press Conference by Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, at Governors' Conference, Glacier National Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, during the past few days, a considerable amount of discussion has taken place concerning a press conference conducted by Gov. G. Mennen Williams, of Michigan, while he was attending the Governors' conference at Glacier National Park.

Some of the statements and published reports appear to be based on a misconception and a misinterpretation of what actually took place.

According to those who were present, and who are familar with the matter, an article published in the New York Times of June 27, 1960, represents an accurate and comprehensive account of the event.

So that the RECORD will contain a fair and unbiased report, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 27, 1930]

JOHNSON ALLEGED TO HAVE USED POST TO STOP KENNEDY—WILLIAMS SAYS HE WAS TOLD ENDORSEMENT OF BOSTONIAN MIGHT BLOCK AGED BILL—STORY CALLED UNTRUE—DANIEL SAYS SENATE LEADER WOULD NEVER EMPLOY POWER TO FURTHER CANDIDACY

(By W. H. Lawrence)

GLACIER NATIONAL PARK, June 26.—Two Democratic Governors clashed head-on today over alleged use of congressional influence by Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, of Texas to advance his own presidential aspirations.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams of Michigan reported that an unsuccessful attempt to delay his endorsement of the candidacy of Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts had been made in the name of Senator JOHNSON.

The Governor said he had been warned that such an endorsement might imperil congressional enactment of legislation providing Federal medical care for aged persons.

Senator JOHNSON'S effort, Mr. Williams said, was made through Walter P. Reuther, politically powerful leader of the United Automobile Workers of America with whom the Governor is closely allied.

Mr. Williams did not volunteer the story. It developed entirely as a result of questioning in his news conference.

CALLED A FABRICATION

Gov. Price Daniel of Texas branded the Williams account as pure political fabrication.

Mr. Daniel said he was certain that Mr. JOHNSON, the Senate majority leader, would not use his office to promote his own candidacy and would not determine his position on legislation on the basis of whether persons were for or against him for the Presidency.

Governor Daniel said he had not asked Senator JOHNSON directly about the incident, because he knew it could not have happened and "it would be an insult even to ask him."

From other pro-Johnson sources, however, it was established that, through a New York intermediary, Senator JOHNSON had approached Mr. Reuther in the hope that he could at least persuade Governor Williams to delay an announcement for Senator KENNEDY.

The New Yorker said that on instructions from Senator JOHNSON he had told Mr. Reuthers that an early Kennedy endorsement might make it more difficult to pass any medical care bill for the aged.

At the same time, the New Yorker made it clear for Senator JOHNSON that the auto union would have to compromise for something less than the Forand bill because Senator JOHNSON had said he "would not take on the doctors." Medical groups oppose the Forand bill as strongly as organized labor supports it.

BILL HELD IN COMMITTEE

At that time, the medical-care bill was locked up in the House Ways and Means Committee. Senator JOHNSON was reported to have said he might not be able to count on southern Democratic votes needed to report the measure to the House if Michigan started a bandwagon rolling for Senator KENNEDY.

The Daniel-Williams clash highlighted preliminary festivities for the 52d Governors' Conference, which will start formally tomorrow morning and continue through Wednesday.

Not surprisingly, Governors Williams and Daniels differed widely on the prospects of their presidential favorites.

Mr. Williams forecast that Senator KENNEDY would reach the required 761-vote majority for nomination before the end of the first ballot at the Los Angeles convention.

Governor Daniels, asserting that Senator JOHNSON could win on the third or fourth ballot, predicted that Senator KENNEDY's first-ballot strength would be his peak, and that he would lose votes on succeeding roll-calls.

The Texas Governor predicted that Senator JOHNSON would have 502 votes on the first ballot and climb to 664 votes. He also said he assumed that Senator STUART SYMINGTON of Missouri would withdraw after the first ballot, and that most of his strength would flow to Mr. JOHNSON.

SAYS DATE WAS JUNE 2

In answering questions at his news conference, Governor Williams reported that the indirect effort by Senator JOHNSON to delay his pro-Kennedy endorsement was made on June 2. That was the day the Governor met with Senator KENNEDY at Mackinac Island and issued his announcement.

Mr. Williams said the Johnson warning had been given to Mr. Reuther but had been relayed to him by Mrs. Mildred Jeffrey, a U.A.W. staff member and a Democratic party official.

Asked if he had checked Senator JOHNSON to establish the facts of the incident, Governor Williams said he had not done so, but that he had complete confidence in the veracity of Mrs. Jeffrey and of Mr. Reuther.

As Governor Williams told it, the Johnson message said that he would support the Forand bill if the Michigan announcement were delayed, but oppose the bill if Michigan came out for KENNEDY.

VIEWED AS "BLACKMAIL"

When a reporter suggested that this represented an accusation of political "blackmail" against Senator JOHNSON, Mr. Williams repeated that he had not brought up the issue, that he simply was answering press inquiries, and that he had not characterized the nature of Senator JOHNSON's effort.

He said he assumed that the Texan, in seeking the presidential nomination, was employing all the means of persuasion at his command.

Governor Daniel's suggestion that Senator JOHNSON would gain on the second ballot because Senator SYMINGTON would withdraw after the first ballot, was the first time that such a statement had been made.

Conceivably, Mr. Daniel's suggestion could cause trouble between the Johnson and Symington forces because the Missourian's friends, including former President Harry S. Truman, may be angered at this attempt to write him off so early.

Minimum Wage Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein a resolution adopted by the City Council of the city of Peabody, Mass., on June 23, 1960, on minimum wage legislation:

RESOLUTION INTRODUCED BY COUNCILLOR JOHN MICALCHUK CALLING UPON THE 86TH CONGRESS TO ENACT S. 1046 AND H.R. 4488

Whereas the present Federal minimum wage of $1 an hour is inadequate to provide a bare subsistence in the United States today; and

Whereas more than 20 million Americans lack the guarantee of even this inadequate figure, and are without any legal limitation on their hours of work; and

Whereas these shocking facts constitute a grave threat to our national economy, a challenge to our moral standards as a people and a peril to our reputation as democracy's showcase throughout the world; and

Whereas the existence of underpaid and overworked wage earners is a particular danger to the well-being of the citizens of Peabody, Mass.; and

Whereas there is now before Congress a bill (S. 1046 and H.R. 4488) which would greatly ameliorate this problem by raising the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 and include nearly eight million additional workers under the protection of the Fair Labor Standards Act; and

Whereas 165,000 citizens in Massachusetts will be protected by this needed legislation and have available $50 million to spend locally: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of Peabody, That we call upon the Congress of the United States to give prompt and favorable consideration to S. 1046 and H.R. 4488, so that the conditions above described can be

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the U.S. Senators from Massachusetts and to the Congressman from the Peabody area (Seventh Congressional District), namely, Congressman THOMAS J. LANE.

Salute to ACLU

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Preisdent, this year has marked the 40th anniversary of the American Civil Liberties Union, and many who cherish freedom have paid just tribute to its unflagging efforts to defend the liberties of all, however unpopular their views may be.

I am glad to join in these tributes because of the central importance to American life of freedom of speech, thought, assembly, religion, communication and dissent, freedom from racial and religious discriminations and the right to equal justice and due process of law.

In the world struggle in which we are now engaged, it is these freedoms that most clearly distinguish us from the Communist tyranny which strives to dominate all.

In its upholding of these freedoms, the ACLU has had an honorable, courageous and often distinguished record, even though some of us have disagreed at times with positions it has taken.

As an indication of the widespread praise that has come to it for its work, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD editorials from recent issues of the Chicago Daily News, the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago American.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, Apr. 18, 1960]

SALUTE TO ACLU

The American Civil Liberties Union and its Illinois division are observing the 40th anniversary of the ACLU at a dinner here Thursday. The choice of Chicago for the accompanying conference is a salute to the leaders in this area of the work of the organization.

Civil liberties are something like pets; your own are the dearest things in the world, but the other fellow's often appear to be either a nuisance or a downright menace. This fact not infrequently gets the ACLU in dutch with those who forget that everybody's pets must be protected before any individuals may be safe.

When the ACLU has gone to the defense of Reds whose legal rights seemed in jeopardy it has been denounced as a Communist front. When it supported the constitutional privileges of Nazis, others have called it Fascist. It has come to the aid of anti-Semites and Ku-Kluxers, as well as members of minority groups, whenever the rights that should be available to all were denied.

Inevitably, many of the causes it has championed have been unpopular. The fighter for free and untrammeled speech must defend some unsavory characters who abuse their liberty. It follows that many sincere lovers of freedom have at times found themselves at odds with ACLU policy.

The alternative, however, is infinitely worse, and the ACLU has earned a welcome from all who cherish the ideal of a government of laws under which all men enjoy equal privileges.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 21, 1960]

FORTY YEARS OF FREEDOM FIGHTING

Back in 1954, during the darkest days of McCarthyism, the American Civil Liberties Union reaffirmed its stand against "guilt by association, judgment by accusation, the invasion of the privacy of personal opinions and beliefs, and the confusion of dissent with disloyalty."

That 1954 stand on McCarthyism was one of hundreds of such defenses of the Bill of Rights that have marked the ACLU's 40 years. Today, as it observes its 40th birthday with a dinner and the opening of a national conference here, the ACLU also can look back on such important battles as the Scopes trial, the Sacco-Vanzetti case, and the Scottsboro trial. In these and other well-remembered cases, the ACLU fought for preservation of the basic American rights—freedom of thought, religion, communication, assembly, dissent, freedom from discrimination, and the right to due process of law.

However, there will be little looking back as 1,000 ACLU delegates gather here today. They will be busy with problems of 1960—the rights of racial minorities, separation of Church and state, censorship and sex morality, and the threat of police authority to civil liberties.

These are among the continuing problems to the ACLU. But in 1960, as it has for the past 40 years, one thing remains constant—the ACLU's pledge to "defend the civil liberties of any person however unpopular that person or his views may be and regardless of any political party organization, denomination, race, or nationality to which that person may belong."

[From Chicago's American, Apr. 20, 1960]

THE ACLU ALARM CLOCK

The American Civil Liberties Union, which celebrates its 40th anniversary tomorrow at a dinner in the La Salle Hotel, works something like an alarm clock, in that it is doing its job best when being a pain in the neck for somebody. The ACLU realizes this and is resigned to it; in fact, we suspect it enjoys the situation.

The ACLU is a permanent nonpartisan organization, devoted solely to defending anyone whose civil liberties appear to be threatened. It is supported wholly by mem-

bership dues and contributions; there are 40,000 members, 4,000 of them in Illinois, and one purpose of the week-long observance is to attract new members.

By the nature of its job, the ACLU is constantly on the side of unpopular causes—the kind of cause that inclines people to say, "Sure, free speech is fine but this case is different." The ACLU is there to remind us that if we keep making exceptions to the constitutional guarantees of free speech eventually speech will be free only for statements that nobody quarrels with.

Since its founding in 1920, the ACLU has defended Communists and has been attacked as a pro-Communist organization; it has also defended pro-Nazis and Ku Kluxers, and has been assailed just as bitterly from the other side.

We have differed strongly with the ACLU in the past, and have every expectation of doing so again. But we wholeheartedly salute it for keeping the American people alert to basic freedoms that are sometimes very easy to forget.

We wish the ACLU a happy birthday and a lot of interesting fights.

Start Them Young

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to an editorial which recently appeared in the Washington Daily News regarding the great need that exists in America today for our youngsters to become proficient in foreign languages. This editorial quite properly points out that the foreign language gap is one of America's failings.

Throughout the world it is now common practice for youngsters to learn not only the native language of their respective country, but to learn at least one additional language so that they are better prepared to face the challenge of a world that is ever becoming smaller and smaller.

I think one of the great shortcomings in our Foreign Service is the fact that so many of our State Department employees do not speak the language of the country in which they are stationed. I think that this language gap creates many serious problems and to a great extent weakens the effectiveness of our diplomatic representatives.

We are today stressing a tremendous growth in international commerce and in this field also we will need bilingual Americans.

I do not think we can emphasize strongly enough how important it is to encourage the study of foreign languages in our country. This in no way suggests that we should lessen the emphasis on the English language and grammar, but I sincerely believe that we must create an atmosphere in this country where youngsters now attending school will firmly believe that "it is smart to be bilingual."

The editorial follows:

START THEM YOUNG

The foreign-language gap is one of America's failings. A proposal just submitted by three national organizations interested in education points the way to close it.

These are the Carnegie Corp. of New York, the Modern Language Association of America, and the National Education Association. They urge that foreign languages be taught as early as the third grade, at an age when children learn, and remember, most readily. They suggest, furthermore, that studies be continued for 4, 6, or even 10 years to give apt students thorough understanding, rather than the relatively worthless knowledge of languages they get in short courses.

Through our neglect of foreign language studies Americans severely limit their ability to communicate with and to understand the aspirations of other lands. In this respect we are far behind Europe where most with any pretention to education speak at least one language besides their own.

The organizations making this report have considerable influence on educational techniques. They should be able to get their findings to school officials across the land, with a consequent strong improvement in this much-neglected field.

National Football Foundation To Build Hall of Fame at New Brunswick, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement regarding the National Football Foundation, and its plans to build a Football Hall of Fame at New Brunswick, N.J., Edward Durell Stone, one of the great American architects, has been engaged to design the hall of fame and grounds.

Mr. Chester J. La Roch is president of the National Football Foundation, and it numbers among its membership many of the distinguished leaders of our country. As the very excellent statement points out, one of the purposes of the foundation is to foster and promote football, as a sport whose emphasis on discipline, competitive spirit, physical fitness, teamwork and courage contributes to the vigor, and moral and physical fiber of our country.

I am glad that the executive secretary of the foundation, Mr. Gould B. Martin, who prepared this informative statement, is my old friend and classmate at Yale University. He has given his services freely to Yale, and has served with distinction in business and in many positions devoted to the public interest. I am sure the statement will be read with interest by my colleagues in the Senate, and in the House of Representatives, and by many throughout the country.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FOOTBALL FOUNDATION TO BUILD HALL OF FAME AT NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.

It has recently been announced that the National Football Foundation has commenced the raising of a national fund of $2 million to build the Football Hall of Fame at New Brunswick, N.J., on the site where Rutgers played Princeton in the first intercollegiate fotball game in the United States in 1869.

The foundation is an organization of dedicated men who believe that the establishment and maintenance of high aims and purposes in the world of amateur football serve not only American youth, but the Nation as well. In an age when there has been considerable tendency to softness and the relaxing of our standards of fortitude and physical preparedness, the foundation believes that football will continue to be a significant and vital factor in helping to strengthen and prepare the physical and moral fiber of the Nation for our defense in the years to come.

Football is one of the great builders of men in our country, in our time. Properly played, properly administered, it does more for the boy of school and college age than any other sport or comparable activity. It is not only, as indicated by President A. Whitney Griswold of Yale, a vital part of education as physical recreation and exercise, but more, it is, like other organized sports, a challenge to the spirit, a test of mettle, a way to educate our youth to go far beyond their surface resources.

In the words of General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, who in 1959 received the foundation's gold medal award in recognition of a "lifetime of devotion to American intercollegiate football": "The game has become the symbol of our country's best qualities—courage, stamina, coordinated efficiency. Many believe in these days of doubt and indecision that through this sport we can best keep alive the reality and enterprise which has made us great. Upon the fields of friendly strife are sown the seeds that upon other fields, on other days, will bear the fruits of victory."

President of the United States Dwight D. Eisenhower, who received the foundation's first gold medal a year previously, phrased it this way: "In football, in business, in the trades and the professions, the normal urge to excel provides one of the most hopeful assurances that our kind of society will continue to advance and prosper. Morale, the will to win, the fighting heart, are the honored hallmarks of the football coach and player. This morale, this will, this heart, we need not only in athletic teams as individuals, but collectively."

Col. Earl H. (Red) Blaik, great West Point coach, is even stronger in his analysis of the game: "Football represents one of the few last vestiges of real discipline for American youth and personifies the development of physical fitness."

Chester J. LaRoche, president of the foundation, has stated that "football trains a boy in stamina, courage, competition, teamwork, sportsmanship, self-reliance, and imbues him with the many qualities which help to build our manhood and maintain our competitive spirit vibrant."

It is because of these beliefs that the foundation has dedicated itself to these purposes: To promote football as an integral and wholesome part of our educational processes; to encourage the beneficial direction and playing of the game at schools and colleges; to establish the true concept of football as an amateur sport throughout the country; to gain recognition for the important role football plays in the preservation and advancement of our way of life; to provide the proper incentives and ideals for American youth and set standards of sportsmanship for the individual player.

That it may accomplish these aims and purposes, the foundation has an extensive program of operations. Among them are: Honoring through the Hall of Fame those former players and coaches whose deeds and

lives during and after their playing days have been exemplary and inspiring; honoring through its chapters the outstanding scholar-athletes in schools; rendering many practical and valuable services to colleges, schools, institutions, organizations, and individuals connected with football; combating through the various channels of public relations the unwarranted attacks sometimes made on football by those who are ill informed or prejudiced; actively aiding and encouraging the playing of football at schools and colleges, particularly in those cases where it has been dropped because of improper or insufficient reasons; answering the questions or doubts of those who do not have sufficient knowledge or means of obtaining information about the background and place of football.

The National Football Foundation is organized in New York State as a non-profit corporation, and in the past 5 years it has grown until it encompasses some 200 college and institutional members and thousands of individual members. It serves all the official groups connected with playing, conducting and reporting the game.

It has a national board of directors of 100, including the representatives of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, the American Football Coaches Association, the Football Writers of America, the College Sports Information Directors of America, and various unofficial groups, including many thousands of ex-football players and enthusiasts.

The affairs of the foundation are guided by an executive committee who meet once a month in New York. The members of this committee are all prominent business and professional men who spend a large amount of time and effort to handle the affairs of the foundation. They represent the major facets of professional, industrial and commercial activity and many colleges from the traditional Ivy League through the conference groups, the service academies, the religious institutions, the State universities and smaller colleges.

In additon to the executive committee the foundation has a strong national advisory committee, headed by General of the Army Douglas MacArthur. This committee numbers many of the country's top business executives, as well as college presidents, U.S. Senators and Representatives, and professional men of distinction.

At the local level, where the foundation penetrates the grassroots of football throughout the United States, the operations are through the chartered chapters and their membership. There are chapters organized in each of eight districts of the country, as far north as Minneapolis, as far east as Portland, as far south as Miami and as far west as San Francisco. There are at present more than 30 such chapters and the number will be much greater at the end of 1960. Some of them have as many as 100 members and the membership is constantly growing.

One of the most important of the activities of the foundation is the Football Hall of Fame which will play a large part in its overall work, and which will be a challenge to all those interested in the great American game. It will be the living symbol of the foundation and the focal point of its many interests.

With the example of the men enshrined in the Hall of Fame to inspire them, the youth of America can have few better guides. Familiarity with the names and deeds of such men as Pudge Heffelfinger, Frank Hinkey, Willie Heston, Red Grange, Ernie Nevers, Jim Thorpe and other outstanding players cannot but fill a youngster's heart with desire to emulate the deeds of those great athletes. And what young boy wouldn't thrill to the stories of teams coached by Knute Rockne, Alonzo Stagg, Bob Zuppke, Walter Camp, Percy Haughton, Pop Warner and the other coaching immortals?

As America's greatest sport, the one that sets the standard for all amateur athletics, football deserves ta place in the history of our country, and the Football Hall of Fame will fill this need. The evolution of the game from its earliest days to the present will be unfolded and the game's greatest moments relived. The Football Hall of Fame will become a national shrine devoted to fair play, courageous action and the will to win. It is with these aspects of the game—its influence on national character, its hardening and tempering of the will—that the hall of fame is most concerned.

Those enshrined in the hall of fame are the truly great All-America players. They have been selected on the basis of performances and elected by judges who can justly qualify as experts.

The names, exhibits, and memorabilia in the Football Hall of Fame will recreate the spine-tingling excitement of hundreds of thrilling moments in America's sports history and will pay a well earned tribute to the men who made this history.

There are now 127 players and 45 coaches in the Football Hall of Fame, elected from the more than 1,500,000 who have played the game. A player becomes eligible for consideration by the foundation's honors court only after 10 years from graduation; a coach 3 years after retirement.

Edward Durell Stone, one of the great American architects, has been engaged to design the hall of fame building and grounds. As creator of the U.S. Pavilion for the recent international exhibit in Brussels, our Embassy in New Delhi, the Museum of Modern Art, the Huntington Hartford Museum, and many other structures of outstanding significance, Mr. Stone brings to the hall of fame a talent insuring artistic design of the highest order.

The building itself will be on spacious grounds ideally located and accessible to automobiles, buses, and trains. It will comprise a complete shrine for amateur football as well as national headquarters for the foundation. There will be a central hall to honor those who have been elected by the honors court, the most complete sports library in the world, a large and extensive museum for every feature of the game, a gallery, exhibition rooms and auditorium, projection and music rooms, a theater, workrooms, and offices for the foundation. The Football Hall of Fame, when constructed by the voluntary contributions of all citizens and institutions interested in perpetuating and furthering the incentives, ideals, and accomplishments of the game of football, will stand as one of the great American centers of a culture and way of life important to our whole national concept of competitive strength and courage.

GOULD B. MARTIN,
Executive Secretary.

No High Ground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following book review by John K. Hutchens in the New York Herald Tribune for June 6, 1960. It discusses thoroughly and with understanding a new book by Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey 2d covering the events and people concerned in the dropping of the first atomic bomb. This is a highly readable account of this point in history:

BOOK REVIEW BY JOHN K. HUTCHENS—"NO HIGH GROUND"

("No High Ground" by Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey II, Harper, 272 pages.)

Shortly after a 5-ton weapon dropped out of the belly of a B–29 over Hiroshima at 8:15 a.m. plus 17 seconds on August 6, 1945, and launched a new era in warmaking, a Japanese official broadcast declared: "The effectiveness of this bomb * * * should not be regarded as slight." Truth and the Japanese Imperial Government's wartime admissions were not often on chummy terms, but here at least they met in a momentous understatement at one of the turning points in all history.

To a couple of able, hard-digging journalists it rightly appears a tale worth still another telling.

REPORTERS AT WORK

They are Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey II, of the Washington bureau of the Cowles Publications, and what they have done is to round up and present, in layman's language, as many significant aspects as are available of a story that shook the world and changed it forever.

A glance at the bibliography of "No High Ground" tells you that much of what they report is well known. Any reader of, say, William L. Laurence's "Dawn Over Zero" and "Men and Atoms," John Hershey's "Hiroshima," Arthur H. Compton's "Atomic Quest," must feel himself on generally familiar ground here. It could hardly be otherwise if this book were to have any value at all.

But if there are no major revelations in "No High Ground," its authors have made their own specific, valuable contribution. They quote from hitherto guarded documents in the archives of the Manhattan Project and the armed services. Like good reporters not averse to legwork, they have searched out and interviewed surviving participants in the great saga and followed through on the later careers of some of them. They have considered, without passing judgment on, the first atomic bomb's political and moral implications.

MANY PEOPLE, MANY PLACES

All save some Rip Van Winkle, implausibly asleep these 15 years, must know by now the story's main outlines, the prelude and the event itself—Albert Einstein's historic, urgent letter to President Roosevelt in 1939, the long delay in Washington, the all-out drive of the Manhattan Project under Maj. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, the fears (scientists wondering if the bomb would crack the planet's crust, ignite the nitrogen in the air and the hydrogen in the seas), the cynicism (a Michigan Congressman describing the bomb's cost as New Deal boondoggling), the drama at Los Alamos, the takeoff of the *Enola Gay* from Tinian at 2:45 o'clock one morning a month later.

From one front to another go the Messrs. Knebel and Bailey as the cataclysmic point approaches—from Hiroshima, hungry and vaguely apprehensive, to the sealed-off testing ground in the desert, to Washington and a new President with a fearful decision to make, to Potsdam where Stalin, told of the bomb by Mr. Truman, smiled what seemed to be indifference but could have been secret amusement at hearing what he already knew.

WHO KNOWS?

All along the way are points about which historians will be arguing through the years. If the Potsdam Declaration had assured the

Japanese that their Emperor would be retained, might they have surrendered in time to prevent the use of the bomb? Joseph C. Grew and Henry L. Stimson had so advised, and Mr. Stimson, for one, thought it possible that history would find we had prolonged the war, though he urged the use of the bomb after the allied ultimatum was rejected.

Here are both sides of the debate among scientists and Government officials about whether we should have made a demonstration drop. And here—for the first time, as far as one reader knows—is a cross section of the reactions of the men who flew the *Enola Gay* and the two weather planes accompanying her. They, like the public at large, differed, some holding that the dropping of the bomb was justified by the shortening of the war and the lives saved on both sides, others uneasy in their consciences.

"This is for history, so watch your language," said Col. Paul Tibbets, pilot, informing his crew that the intercom conversation on the *Enola Gay* was being recorded. The Knebel-Bailey chronicle puts into focus more of that history than any one book that comes to mind, and is the more welcome for that.

Comparative Merits of the American and Russian Systems of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, ever since the advent of sputnik, there has been a good deal of discussion in this country as to the comparative merits of the American and Russian systems of education. Criticisms of our own system have been widespread—even though the United States has the finest overall program anywhere in the world.

It has been asserted by many so-called experts that our system lacks much of what the Russian system possesses—namely, a heavy accent on mathematics and the sciences. Russia has been pictured as constantly accenting this phase of their program and reports have circulated that this concentration is increasing.

In light of this, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a very fine article which appeared in the Wednesday, June 29, issue of the Wall Street Journal, in which much evidence is presented to show that Russia is turning to a greater accent on vocational education. This article is significant because it points up a new challenge to America. The United States has become the most powerful and most productive nation in the history of mankind due in large measure to the productivity of our people. Much of this has been a direct result of the fine vocational education program carried on in the country over the past 40 years.

This article points out that Russia is now in the process of putting more and more emphasis on vocational education and this could prove serious to the security and economic well-being of the United States. The fact that our people have stressed vocational education over so long a time has contributed immeasurably to the strength of our Nation. Russia undoubtedly has learned a lesson by our example and is now attempting to copy us in this respect.

The vocational education program in this country is a joint Federal-State-local effort and is one of the finest educational programs we have. The contribution made by this program over the years has been tremendous and the fruits of this endeavor are visible all around us.

On June 16, 1916, 44 years ago, the late Congressman Dudley M. Hughes in a speech on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives, while the Smith-Hughes vocational education measure was under consideration, said, and I quote:

> National efficiency is the sum total of efficiency of all individual citizens, and the national wealth is the sum of their wealth-producing capacity. In the markets of the world we compete, not as individuals but as a unit against other nations as units. This * * * unquestionably introduces a national element into vocational education.

Not long ago Russia's Khrushchev said to an American newspaper publisher, and I quote:

> We declare war upon you—in the peaceful field of trade. We declare a war we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the intercontinental ballistic missile, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this, and it will prove the superiority of our system.

I include the Wall Street Journal article herein and commend it to the reading of the Members of this body:

RUSSIA'S SCHOOLS—MR. K STARTS MIXING FACTORY, CLASS WORK—PROTESTS IMPEDE PLAN—PROGRAM'S AIMS ARE TO CUT SKILLED WORKER SHORTAGE, EASE UNIVERSITY CROWDING—BRIBES, "PULL" AID PUPILS

(By Edmund K. Faltermayer)

Moscow.—The much acclaimed Soviet education system, which helped inspire the spirited postsputnik reappraisal of U.S. schools, is undergoing a massive upheaval of its own these days—one that has brought a host of readjustment troubles and exposed some of the deeper rooted problems of a Communist society.

Curiously, while American educators are shifting emphasis from vocational learning to old-fashioned book learning, their Soviet counterparts are rushing headlong in very nearly the opposite direction. Their goal: To transform Russia's 200,000 primary and secondary schools into "polytechnical" schools that will equip all graduates to go directly to work in factories and farms. The science-heavy academic load, which has awed so many U.S. educators, won't actually be reduced. But high school pupils will have to spend a third of their schooltime learning a manual trade, even if they plan to go on to a university. To help make up for the time given to manual training, a year is being added to the Soviet curriculum.

The purpose of this most drastic school shakeup in three decades, according to its instigator, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, is to bring the schools "closer to life" and combat the "lordly contempt for labor" that has developed among the intelligentsia—a grave development in a society supposedly moving toward a completely classless Communist state. The study-and-work scheme, unlike so many recent changes in the Soviet system, harks back directly to the writings of Marx and Lenin.

PRACTICAL AIMS

But Mr. K. also had some practical aims in mind: To discourage youth from seeking admission to jam-packed universities and technical institutes, and to remedy the serious shortage of skilled labor in Russia's increasingly mechanized factories.

What distinguishes Mr. Khrushchev's school reform from some of his other sweeping changes in the Soviet system is the nondogmatic way in which it's being implemented. Says enthusiastic Mikhail Kashin, deputy minister of education for the Russian Federation, biggest of the U.S.S.R.'s 15 republics: "We're taking an experimental rather than a rigid approach."

Even more intriguing, for the light it throws on the present-day workings of the Soviet system, is the way in which powerful vested interest groups appear to have watered down some of the plan's more drastic features. This process unquestionably has its limits. But it demonstrates the strength of the opposition to Mr. Khrushchev's plan, at least in the form first suggested. Opposition to the plan came from three groups affected by it. These include the professional educators who don't like sharing dominion over their charges with factory directors, the harassed factory directors who don't like the idea of youngsters cluttering up their plants anyway, and the big new middle class which is determined that its children shall not have to spend their lives in factories.

EDUCATIONAL ADVANCE

When Mr. Khrushchev first agitated for a revamping of the schools in April 1958, he said, in effect, that all students, except for a few gifted ones, should go to work after 7 or 8 years of schooling and complete their eduction in evening institutions. At least, that's the impression he gave to many Russians, though others dispute this. But by the time the Supreme Soviet passed the school reform law in December 1958, a lot of influential people had gotten Mr. K.'s ear. It now appears, partly in the light of later developments, that just as many children—about a third of the total—will go on to a full-time high school education as at present, except that they'll also have to do the part-time factory or farm stint. And the children of the prosperous middle class will still have a chance at a higher education.

Thus, some Western authorities say, the school reform may never achieve one of its stated purposes, which is to wipe out inherited privilege. In practice, they say, those who continue on to high school will continue to be those who have the best grades—and aren't forced to go to work for economic reasons. One observer here sees a propaganda problem, too. "The school reform," he says, "points up a basic contradiction in the Soviet system: The idea of equalitarianism versus the party's pressure on people for self-improvement."

Despite these difficulties, the plan is getting into high gear and is scheduled to become universal in the U.S.S.R. in the fall of 1963. During the academic year just ended, some 80,000 high school pupils in 2,000 schools spent a third of their time on manual labor. In Moscow alone 161 factories participated in the plan. Next fall, half the country's 31,000 high schools will be on the new curriculum. Even in the lower grades, manual work has been stepped up, although it's limited to labor in the schools themselves.

BOARDING SCHOOLS

Boarding schools, the feature of the school reform which aroused perhaps the greatest interest in the West, are also proliferating rapidly, though not as fast as the regime

would like. This year 400,000 youngsters were enrolled in these full-time institutions, which are designed to provide a Communist upbringing under ideal conditions and ease the lot of poorer class families from which most of the pupils come. Under present plans, the number of pupils in such schools is to grow by 2.5 million by 1965 and to several times that figure by 1980. Ultimately, Mr. Khrushchev would like to see boarding schools become universal. But even the shorter range goal may not be reached on schedule. One reason is lagging construction. During 1959 building of boarding schools in the Russian federation ran 50 percent behind schedule.

An even more crucial limiting factor is the cost of maintaining a pupil in these institutions. According to Mr. Kashin, this cost—nearly all of which is borne by the state—runs between $600 and $700 a year (figured at the tourist exchange rate of 10 rubles to a dollar), compared with only $70 to $80 in an ordinary school. The same fiscal factor will probably limit the spread of prolonged-day schools set up to achieve some of the aims of the boarding school. Thus, for the next decade at least, the place where most Soviet youngsters will feel the impact of Mr. Khrushchev's school reform will be in the new polytechnical primary and secondary schools.

To see this new system in action, visit Moscow's school No. 465, a five-story gray concrete building on Big Torchlight Lane, about a mile east of Red Square. Last fall, according to Director Mikhail Lebedev, the school's 134 ninth grade pupils became the first class to operate under the new system. In 2 more years, they'll be the first to graduate under the new scheme, which takes on an extra year to the former 10-year curriculum in order to compensate for the extra factory work. Under the new law, the school is technically referred to by the mouth-filling title of "secondary general labor polytechnical school."

CLASSROOM QUIZZING

Four days a week the nine graders of school 465 study the usual academic subjects. On the third and fourth floors you can see bright-eyed boys and girls in uniforms and red ties performing chemistry experiments and being quizzed in a history class about the short-lived Paris commune of 1871. In the latter class brown-eyed Gennady Trostnikov, wearing the standard blue-gray boy's uniform with brass belt buckle, is getting a grade of "four"—out of a possible five—for saying, among other things that "although it lasted only 72 days, the Paris commune was important not only for France but for the fact it was the first proletarian state."

On two other days of the six-day school week these same youngsters will turn up at four different factories in the neighborhood, depending on the trade each child has chosen to learn. Students can choose among the first watch factory, the factory of universal assembly fittings, and garment factories Nos. 4 and 18. There they can learn everything from dressmaking (girls only) to watch assembly and lathe operation (mostly boys). According to Mr. Lebedev, each day at the factory consists of 2 hours of instruction and 4 hours of actually turning out goods under the factory's regular production plan. The total weekly work load is a grueling one by American standards; 24 hours of classroom instruction, a roughly equal amount of homework, plus 12 hours at the plant.

Nevertheless, says Mr. Lebedev, a bespectacled blue-eyed man in his fifties, the ninth graders think the new setup is just dandy. Only two pupils, girls who wanted to switch from dressmaking to watch assembly, have complained, he says, and they later changed their minds. "The rest of the students are quite happy in the factory work and doing well at it." He scoffs at the idea that factory work on top of study overloads his pupils. "It's not difficult to study academic subjects under this system," he says. "The pupils spend only 4 hours working on the days they go to the factories. That's not overloading. Besides, the academic course has been spread out over 3 years." Before the factory work was inserted into the curriculum, he says, the same academic program was squeezed into only 2 years.

COMPLAINTS PLENTIFUL

Mr. Lebedev's optimism notwithstanding, there have been plenty of complaints in the Soviet press about the way the new system is being organized. The director of Moscow's school No. 330, a certain A. Mostovoi, complains in a letter to Pravda about "serious shortcomings." The problem of deciding which pupils shall go to which factory, he charges, is being solved in a "disorganized fashion." The 104 regional economic councils which now boss Soviet industry, he complains, haven't come up with a "long-range plan" to tie the part-time instruction in with factories' projected needs for skilled workers.

Moreover, Mr. Mostovoi frets, students approaching the ninth grade are being "poorly" counseled in choosing which factory trade they want to take up next year. The choice of vocations, he says, is artificially limited by the types of factories in a school's neighborhood. In cautious language he also hints that combining manual and brain work is disruptive. Taking up a factory task and then leaving it for 2 or 3 days, he says, gives students only an "intermittent" acquaintance with production. The official says he's "inclined" toward a different plan under which all factory work would be concentrated in a 2- or 3-month period, leaving the rest of the school year for academic subjects.

In any event, the idea of combining a healthy dose of manual work with academic study seems here to stay in the U.S.S.R. The old school system, Mr. Khrushchev says, was "divorced from life." Modeled on the old czarist "gymnasiums" and dating in their present form from 1931, the old schools with their identical academic curriculums (the only "elective" is a student's foreign language) were almost exclusively designed to prepare pupils for college. This, plus the fact that a college education in the U.S.S.R. means the difference between grim subsistence and a halfway tolerable living standard, had led most pupils to expect a college education.

DEMAND FOR ADMISSION

By 1958 the situation had become serious. The expanding high school network was annually turning out 1.5 million graduates, nearly all of whom wanted to get into universities and engineering schools. But these can admit only 225,000 full-time students (plus a roughly equal number of evening and correspondence students) and the daytime figure is being frozen because of the country's "surplus" of college graduates. Simultaneously, a shortage of skilled labor was making itself felt. Moreover, the number of persons reaching working age was declining because of the low birth rate during the war years—a serious development in view of the formidable tasks of the current 7-year plan.

To cope with the backlog of university applicants, which may have gotten as high as 4 million, the regime at first took stopgap measures. A rule was introduced under which institutions of higher learning only had to take 20 percent of their applicants directly from high school. The rest were to be people with the papers to prove they had done 2 years of full-time work after high school. But this regulation has not stemmed the tide. Many institutions are admitting up to 50 percent without the 2-year "production stage." Bigwigs are using "pull" to get their children into universities without this and other new requirements. Bribery has reared its head, with payments running as high as $2,000.

While it might seem so at first glance, the Soviet school reform is not really a step backward. To be sure, the new law junks the goal of a free 10-year education for all, proclaimed ever since 1918 and as recently as 1956. Under the new scheme the amount of compulsory schooling has been boosted from seven years to eight, effective in 1962. But upon completing this requirement most pupils will go directly to work at age 15 and complete their formal schooling in evening schools, which are to be greatly expanded. Some will go to technical institutes where they acquire a semi-professional status, or to vocational schools, as at present. But only a minority will go on to the ninth grade and beyond in daytime schools.

EVEN QUALITY

Despite this appearance of "turning the clock back," it appears that the quality of Soviet schooling won't decline below its present level. To understand why, it's necessary to know what that level is. It's not as high as many Americans think, despite phenomenal gains since the revolution. It's still true that a Russian high school graduate gets more science and mathematics than most U.S. college graduates, and that the U.S.S.R. spends between 10 percent and 15 percent of its national income on education compared with about 5 percent in the United States. But as late as 1958 Mr. Khrushchev himself admitted that only about 80 percent of Soviet children finished the seventh grade. By the end of the 10th grade, it's been figured by Western experts, only between 30 percent and 35 percent have survived.

The reason for this is not a teacher shortage. There are four or five applicants for each opening in Soviet teachers' colleges. Nor is it due to a shortage of plant, even thought new construction lags and about half the schools still operate on a two-shift system. The real reason is the low living standard of the average Russian family. Most children have to go to work at 15 to help support their families.

From this standpoint, the Soviet school reform can only be considered progress. Pupils will be getting a year more of compulsory schooling than they would have gotten before. Moreover, there are signs that the number admitted to full-time high schools will be about the same as at present.

Address of Congressman Victor L. Anfuso

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, 30 years of dedicated work in behalf of human welfare, world peace and human justice by my old and dear friend, VICTOR L. ANFUSO, the distinguished Representative from the Eighth District in New York, was recently recognized by the Order Brith Abraham at that great fraternity's 73d annual convention.

Presentation of Brith Abraham's Humanity Award was not the first honor to come to this able and outstanding public servant. In 1946 Congressman ANFUSO was appointed by Pope Pius XII as Knight Commander of the Knights of

the Holy Sepulchre for his humanitarian work on behalf of youth.

So that we might set down in his own words the thinking of this great American, I ask unanimous consent that Congressman ANFUSO's speech, delivered at the time of the presentation of the Brith Abraham award, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, GRAND MASTER'S DINNER, ORDER BRITH ABRAHAM, CONCORD HOTEL, KIAMESHA LAKE, N.Y., JUNE 28, 1960

Grand Master Maurice Goldstein, Past Grand Master Irving Hodes, Judge George Radar, members of the national executive board, my good friends of the Order Brith Abraham, ladies and gentlemen, I feel highly honored by the decision of your national executive board to present the annual Brith Abraham Humanity Award this year to me. I am very flattered to join the illustrious men who have been the recipients of this award in the past. I had hoped that my very good friend and great majority leader of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, could have been here too, but as someone aptly put it here tonight—somebody has to mind the store in Washington.

This is indeed a signal honor, especially cherished by me since it comes from Brith Abraham, the oldest national fraternal order. In accepting this award, I am thinking of the old but wise observation in chapter 28 of Proverbs in the Bible, which says:

"He that tilleth his ground shall be filled with bread; but he that followeth idleness shall be filled with poverty."

I'd like to think that your award to me today, although I assure you that I feel as though I do not deserve it, is the bread for tilling the soil of humanity all these years—the recognition for my labors in the vineyard of mankind. I did not follow the course of idleness, and so today I am not a poor man; I have many friends—all of you—and you have been very kind to me.

We live in a very exciting age, but also a very dangerous age. Two opposing ideologies are waging a life-and-death struggle for survival, and we are not merely witnesses to this struggle—we are participants in it. Consequently, we cannot afford to come out second-best, for that would mean the destruction of our way of life and our civilization.

Speaking of being second best, reminds me of the topsy-turvy way of looking at events as they are practiced in the Communist countries. When they speak of democracy, they mean their brand of "peoples' democracy" which is actually dictatorship. When they refer to political freedom, they mean freedom to preach only communism. They think in different terms and act in different ways, and we will have to learn to understand their ways because the first requisite in this ideological conflict is to understand your enemy.

By way of illustration, let me tell you a little story. A very important international sweepstakes took place one day. The only entries in that sweepstakes were one American horse named "Reluctant Capitalist," and one Russian horse named "Glorious Revolution." The winner of the sweepstakes was the American horse. But here is how the outcome was reported by the Soviet press and radio:

"Our great Soviet horse 'Glorious Revolution' came in second. The American entry 'Reluctant Capitalist' came in next to last."

An enemy of that kind of mentality is never wrong, he will not tolerate any kind of criticism. In a democracy such as ours we have learned to appreciate criticism and to live in tolerance with our neighbors of different racial or national origin, or different religious faiths.

To be sure, we have our problems here. We have problems of discrimination and prejudice against people who have a different color of skin, or worship a different God. We have problems of the perverted minds who find a thrill in smearing a swastika on a synagogue, or burning a cross near the home of a Negro or a Jew or a Catholic. They do not understand that their deeds are merely testimony that their minds are perverted and their hearts are full of hatred for their fellow men. We have the fanatics who are using the U.S. mails to distribute "hate literature," in an effort to divide the American people and to undermine the fabric of our national existence.

And while I am on this subject, allow me to digress for a brief moment to pay a well-deserved tribute to Brith Abraham and to grand master Maurice Goldstein for waging a campaign to stop the distribution of this trash through the U.S. mails. I remember well your grand master's excellent editorial "Crime Against Humanity" and his letter to President Eisenhower a few months ago urging him to take action against the spread of racial hatred, because it was "destructive to our national peace and unity." I had both, the letter and the editorial, inserted into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wish you success, Maurice Goldstein, in your new campaign against discrimination and to better our youth.

I should also like to pay tribute to the oldest living grand master of Brith Abraham, but—I assure you—young at heart, Judge Adolph Stern. Also to the second in seniority of the past grand masters, my very dear friend and president of my club, if you please, the honorable Samuel Goldstein.

Finally, and certainly not last in my esteem, the unsung hero of Brith Abraham, a man who doesn't know how to say no to any good cause of any faith, the man who—believe me, my friends—is more deserving of your great award than I am—everybody's friend, Sam Rubenstein.

My friends, we have reached a stage where it is no longer possible or desirable to justify racial and religious discrimination—and yet maintain that we are a moral nation. If we deny to certain groups the opportunities to develop their skills and talents—be it Jews, Negroes, Italians, or others—then it is a contradiction of our own democratic principles and we are actually causing irretrievable harm to the interests of the Nation.

I believe the time is long overdue to eliminate all manifestations of hatred and intolerance in this country, and thus keep clean the good name of the United States throughout the world. It was not so very long ago that we fought a savage war against the Nazis and their theories of racial supremacy. In that struggle our country stood forth as the world leader of democracy and human dignity. Freedom-loving people everywhere have not forgotten that struggle, they still look to the United States as the leader in the cause of democracy and human rights against those who are trampling on these rights now.

Today we find great nations, who in the past have made wonderful contributions to civilization—such as the Russians and the Chinese—now spreading hatred against their fellowmen. I cannot recall a period in history when the world was so full of hatred of man against man, of the Communist world against America and the free world, of black against white, of Arab against Jew, etc. Instead of love, instead of neighborliness and understanding, instead of cooperation and the desire to establish peaceful relations among the nations for the benefit of all mankind—we see a world torn by hatred, divided by suspicion, and tottering on the brink of a new holocaust which threatens to destroy both victor and vanquished.

I do not know whether we shall ever succeed in convincing the Communist world that we are anxious for peace, and that it must be a peace based on honor, freedom, and dignity. Perhaps our best answer to communism and those who preach the Communist ideology is to maintain and preserve human rights throughout the free world, to assure freedom to all peoples, and to guarantee them a life of dignity and honor for all, regardless of race, color, or creed.

Here, in the United States, we fought a revolution to attain our own independence. Yet, we cannot understand the surge for freedom in other nations. We call it Communist-inspired. We are wrong. It may be encouraged by the Communists, but the inspiration and surge for freedom and independence exists in all peoples—whether black, yellow, or white. When we understand this we will have these peoples as our friends and prevent the influence of communism—and only then.

Let us have one thing clear in our minds: America is today the only major power that is able to thwart the efforts of the Communist leaders to gain world domination. That means, unless we decide to guarantee the freedom and the human rights for all people, we are in danger of losing them for all people, including ourselves. And that is what I had in mind earlier when I said that we live in an exciting age, but a dangerous one.

I should like now, with your kind indulgence, to devote the concluding part of my remarks to a subject which is undoubtedly of utmost interest to all of you, namely, the controversy over the so-called Eichmann case. Before I discuss this case, however, might I say that it is my firm conviction that the people of Israel are not capable of an injustice and I am sure they will give Eichmann a fair trial.

I wish to, first of all, commend the United Nations for its mild censure resolution and Argentina for its restraint. I interpret the resolution as not denying to Israel the right to try this barbarian.

I regret that this matter has become involved by all sorts of legalisms which only detract from the main purpose, namely, to try the greatest and most despicable Nazi war criminal who directed the extermination of 6 million Jews in Hitler's gas chambers. This is a case involving a crime which has no parallel in human history; hence it requires unusual action.

I have nothing but respect for a people which for many long years pursued and finally tracked down the murderer of 6 million of its kinsmen. Any other people suffering a similar tragedy would do the same, and having apprehended the killer probably would have taken his life. But in the tradition of the "People of the Book" Israel has seen fit to permit this mass killer to survive, to be brought before the bar of justice so that a complete story of the abominable history of annihilation might be placed on the record.

I am certain that the United Nations recognized the international agreement which applies to this situation. That is the declaration signed on October 30, 1943, at the height of World War II between the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union in which they agreed that the principle of "territoriality of jurisdiction" does not apply because the Nazi crimes were not limited to a "specific geographic location." Furthermore, the declaration states that "Nazi war criminals may be tried and punished by the people whom they have outraged." Since the Jews were the primary victims, there can be no question as to their right to try Eichmann.

It is fitting that an Israeli courtroom be the forum where a detailed history of Nazi genocide should be recorded. There the full tale will unfold with the identify of all who aided, abetted or condoned the dastardly acts fearlessly exposed. No person, no nation, should escape exposure. In this bastion of democracy the world will be assured of complete disclosure of all the facts without fear or favor.

Let Israel invite the nations of the world to send their finest legal talent to assure that justice prevails. Thus the forum of this trial will be given an international atmosphere, appropriate for the trial against one accused of a crime against all humanity.

Israel's trial of Eichmann is not motivated by the concept of revenge. It will be guided by the supreme judaic concept of justice. Since Eichmann was brought to Israel, the people there have not made any outraged demands to destroy him without trial. They have not threatened lynching—they are calm and collected—only awaiting the final day of judgment before the bar of justice.

I know that justice will prevail. A democratic Israel in the tradition of the prophets and judges shall record for posterity a verbatim account of the Nazi atrocities, and will mete out justice in accordance with the wisdom of a Solomon.

It may interest you to know that there is no capital punishment in Israel for an ordinary crime of murder. But the law of the land does provide execution for genocide. However, it is very possible that after Israel has exposed this heinous crime against all humanity, Israel may propose to turn this arch-war-criminal to an international genocide committee for punishment. It will be a great tribute to Israel to make such a move as an international warning that the free world will not tolerate the whim of a despot, dictator or any government responsible for mass destruction of a race without regard to human rights.

I want to commend to you a little prayer which, I think, best expresses our feelings on this occasion:

"God give us the patience to accept that which cannot be changed.
Give us the courage to change that which can and should be changed.
And, above all, give us the wisdom to know which is which."

It is with a great deal of humility and deep appreciation my friends that I accept the "Humanity Award" of the order of this great family of brothers and sisters—Brith Abraham. I want to thank the officers and leaders of this great organization for bestowing this honor upon me. I want to assure you that I shall continue to exert all possible effort towards the fulfillment of the noble principles of your organization—unity, liberty and justice.

A Reminder to All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in a recent address delivered before his fellow alumni of Columbia University in New York City, Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine Ambassador to the United States and former President of the United Nations General Assembly, spoke of Philippine-American relations emphasizing the new trends in Filipino thinking as a result of recent global happenings.

In the course of his speech, he mentioned some of the problems now facing our two Governments: The Zablocki bill which makes good a commitment we made to pay the Filipinos' war damage claims; the recognition of the Filipino veterans' rights and the Teague bill, H.R. 261; increase in the Philippine sugar quota; pending negotiations regarding civil jurisdiction in our military bases in the Philippines, and others.

After discussing each of these questions at length, General Romulo mentioned the welcome accorded by the people of the Philippines to President Eisenhower as another evidence of the friendship and good will of the Filipino people for the United States and in a subtle but effective manner contrasted it with what happened in other countries where American prestige suffered a severe blow.

The Philippine Ambassador concluded his thought-provoking analysis of Philippine-American relations by quoting the following column of Ralph McGill, printed in the Washington Evening Star, which General Romulo referred to "as a timely reminder to all Americans, a moving and soul-stirring reminder of Filipino loyalty that should find a responsive chord in every American heart":

BROWN HANDS THROUGH THE WIRE—MEMORIES OF CORREGIDOR POINT UP FILIPINOS' INTENSE LOYALTY TO UNITED STATES

(By Ralph McGill)

The President's welcome in Manila stirred two memories:

A few weeks after the second great war I talked one evening with an Army officer who had been one of those in the desperate surrender at Corregidor and the infamous death march which followed.

"When I think back on all that happened," he said, "on the death of companions, the suffering, the brutalities, the one thing most vivid in my mind is not of those things. I remember first the many small-brown hands which so often reached through the wire of the prison camp, slipping me, and others, a bit of food or a cigarette. Time will help me store the harsher memories on the back shelf. But nothing will erase my image of the great loyalty of the Filipino people. Their soldiers fought with us. They hid our escaped prisoners and formed guerrilla forces with them. We will never know how many American men, women and children survived because of the kindness of the Filipino people. * * *"

One thought of that when the people of Manila roared their welcome to President Eisenhower.

This is a story which somehow has never been put into perspective. The Filipino people are Asian. But they are distant from the peoples and the lands which knew colonial government under the Dutch, the French, the British and the Portuguese. Nowhere in all of the vast area of colonial Asia was there any loyalty to colonial power which compares even remotely with that of the Philippines.

The British have accumulated a magnificent record of assisting units of their once farflung empire to orderly independence Wherever the British governed there was at least some public education, a trained bureaucracy of indigenous people, and, most important of all, a system of courts and an understanding of the process of law.

But the one Asian experience of the United States is unique. From the beginning there was not merely the promise of independence. There was a planned progress toward it. At the end of the war the tremendous power of revolutionary forces loosed in the world were in evidence in the Philippines. But the leaders had faith in the United States and the transition to independence was a happy one.

The image of the brown hands reaching through the wire is not in any degree lessened.

The second memory is a later one. It is of several conversations with an earnest, intelligent young lady school teacher from the Philippines at a graduate school seminar in this country.

The few signs of questioning opposition to the President's visit were placards asking why Japan has received more economic assistance than the Philippines. There were others from the distressed producers of copra (dried meat of coconuts used in manufacturing oil and soap). These recalled talks with her.

The young teacher could bring herself close to indignation on the subject of U.S. assistance to Japan. It is difficult for a Filipino to understand * * * recalling the presence of the Japanese and all the suffering and sorrow thereby produced. The need for bases and of economic sufficiency for Japan to save her from turning, of necessity, to the Communists for trade, was not clear to the Filipinos who were themselves in want of so many things.

This little reminder, from the tiny opposition in Manila, makes us see again that world trade likely will be the hottest feature of the cold war. We must particpate. And we aren't doing much planning. The Government soon will reduce some tariffs, but there will be howls from the Congress—echoing hometown business forces. The adjustment will be the more painful if we wait until it is forced. And that is what we seem intent on doing.

House Resolution 366

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the House I am calling to the attention of my colleagues House Resolution 366 which I introduced August 27, 1959:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States that:

(1) The House Office Building, commonly known as the Old House Office Building, be renamed for and dedicated to the Honorable Joseph Gurney Cannon of Illinois, who served as Speaker of the House of Representatives when the building was constructed under authority of the Act of March 3, 1903 (32 Stat. 1083, 1113);

(2) The new House of Representatives Office Building, commonly known as the New House Office Building, be renamed for and dedicated to the Honorable Nicholas Longworth of Ohio, who served as Speaker of the House of Representatives when the building was constructed under authority of the Act of January 10, 1929 (45 Stat. 1071); and

(3) The Additional House Office Building, commonly known as the Third House Office Building, be named for and dedicated to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN of Texas, who is serving as Speaker of the House of Representatives while its construction is in progress under authority of the Additional House Office Building Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 41).

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the last war calamities and tragedies on a scale unprecedented followed each other in quick succession. Even before the victory of democracries over Axis totalitarianism was assured, Communist totalitarianism had already shown its grasping and greedy hands by occupying and annexing a number of hitherto independent countries in Europe and thus enslaving their inhabitants.

As the result of the Soviet Union's treacherously aggressive policy there are today nine nations which are captives of the Soviet Union, and a part of another nation shares the same fate. These countries, between the Bay of Finland and the Black Sea, include Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, Bulgaria, Albania and Rumania. Peoples in some of these countries have been suffering under Communist totalitarian dictatorships, imposed by the Kremlin and maintained with the aid of the Red Army, for 2 decades. Thus Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians have endured the oppressive Communist rule longer than peoples in other countries in eastern Europe. Their countries have been annexed to the Soviet Union, and as far as the Soviet Union is concerned there are no such independent and sovereign entities as Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania.

The other countries, including East Germany, are called—mistakenly—independent and sovereign. In the West these countries are denominated as Soviet Satellite, but actually they may be best described as captive countries, and their inhabitants captive nations. In their foreign and domestic policies, also in their political, economic, educational, and social structure, the governments of these countries and their helpless subjects are compelled to follow the Kremlin line. No deviation from that Communist line is tolerated or permitted, and any infraction on the part of any government is severely punished. Thus, the peoples and governments in the Baltic countries, in East Germany, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Albania, Bulgaria, and Rumania are captives of the Kremlin in the real sense of the word. They have been sealed off from the free West by the Iron Curtain deliberately and most effectively imposed by the Kremlin between East and West. The peoples of these countries, the Germans in 1953, the Hungarians and the Poles in 1956, tried to free themselves from the clutches of Communist tyranny, or at least to loosen its grip, but unfortunately by themselves their valiant efforts did not succeed and could not have succeeded against the almost unequalled might of the ruthless Red army.

The people of this country and their Government have always shown utmost sympathy with the lot of these unhappy and unfortunate peoples, the captive nations. Their fate has been, and continues to be, a serious concern of our Government. Then too, these captive nations feel that they have a claim upon us, upon our sympathy and humanitarian feelings. We are fully aware of our sacred moral responsibilities towards these peoples. As proof of that awareness, last year a joint resolution was enacted in Congress for the establishment of a Captive Nations Week, as an annual observance. The Presidential proclamation issued on July 17 designated that the third week of July of each year should be set aside as the Captive Nations Week. In making this sincere move the Congress and the President were not only carrying out the wishes, and the mandate, of the people of this country, but they were also following the firm and fortright policy of this country in championing the cause of freedom and justice. We have always felt and still feel that the cause of the captive nations is a righteous cause and a just cause, one of freedom and humanity. I am indeed glad that the Captive Nations Week was made a national observance week and of course am delighted to join hands with all friends in observing it.

Countering the Communistic Threat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to insert into the RECORD an address made by Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, at commencement exercises, North Oklahoma Junior College, Tonkawa, Okla., on May 19, 1960.

Admiral Burke's speech is particularly significant due to recent international developments. He has emphasized the importance of the individual American's role in order for our country to continue to provide world leadership and to effectively counter the threat of communism.

Admiral Burke's speech follows:

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE, U.S. NAVY, CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES—NORTHERN OKLAHOMA JUNIOR COLLEGE—TONKAWA, OKLA., MAY 19, 1960

Dr. Easterling, distinguished guests, members of the graduating class, it is a particular privilege for me to address these wonderful young men and women and their justly proud parents, relatives, and friends.

We in the Navy have a special kinship with Northern Oklahoma Junior College. Dr. Easterling is an outstanding educator whom we have learned to respect—and admire during his long and close association with the Navy.

This is a memorable occasion for all of us—an unforgettable day for the members of the graduating class. Those who are departing face a far different world than the one which greeted the first graduates of this college, almost 40 years ago.

The whole tempo of the world has been changed by rapid, dynamic technological progress. The pace is faster. The community of nations is now drawn close, by the speed of modern transportation, by tremendously improved communications. This is accented by nearly every development in science and research, by the new and challenging dimensions of the space age.

But even more important than the challenge of this changing environment is an aspect which your predecessors of 40 years ago did not have to face. For today, you enter a world threatened by the ruthless, aggressive expansion of communism, of Communist imperialism.

Regardless of your chosen career, you will be called upon to participate in the struggle between the forces of freedom, and the forces of slavery, and of godlessness. To do that effectively, to fulfill your obligations as citizens, you must fully understand the nature, and the totality of the conflict.

We face this threat not just in the military area, but in every area of endeavor, economic, political, cultural, and social. The free world looks to the United States for leadership in every phase of this struggle.

Leadership, however, is not possible without respect. Such respect for us, as a nation, must be more than admiration for our military power, or our wealth. It must be a respect based on what we do, on how we live up to our national principles, how we adhere to the precepts contained in our Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

Our task is to show, by example, that we do uphold them. The old adage, "Actions speak louder than words" still holds true, on the international—as well as on the national scene.

We have clearly shown that our economy most efficiently serves the material needs of the individual, that we are a progressive society. But, throughout the fabric of progress, there must also be the strong thread of moral principle.

No country or society ever flourished long without principles, or without the courage to live up to them.

The Communists know this. They know they can be successful, only if they get us to lower our standards, get us to abandon our moral principles. This is one of communism's methods—in its move toward world domination.

They try to distort beliefs and convictions, to eliminate religious faith, to confuse concepts of right and wrong, all to weaken the individual. They do this to make the individual distrustful of others, doubtful of his own abilities, and consumed with fear.

Do this to individuals, and ultimately, you can do it to an entire nation. The nation itself becomes weak and fearful and the weak and fearful are the natural prey of the Communists. The record shows that Communists are contemptuous of the weak, and merciless in dealing with them.

This is the danger we must guard against, in order to maintain our strength, our leadership, our very freedom.

Yet today, prominent men in education and business, in politics and religion, have commented pointedly and intelligently, that our ethical values, our standards, are being endangered. They point to the evidence around us, to scandals, to corruption and

dishonestly, and worse than that, to the acceptance of these evils as a normality, by too many Americans. The picture they paint is not a pretty one, even when we realize that such a picture is neither a complete, nor a true image of American society.

Unprincipled acts are magnified by our interest in the sensational, they make the headlines. But the headlines seldom emphasize the wonderful deeds, the daily acts of devoted teachers and workers, of hard-working civil servants and nurses, and of the millions of other fine solid citizens, who make up our great Nation.

The fact remains, however, that no irresponsible minority of American society can play its part in conveying a bad image to the world, at a time when it is so important for our Nation to convey a good image. Fortunately all of us, you and I, can, and must do something about it.

In their search for the best way to progress, to improvement, the underdeveloped countries of the free world need clear-cut proof that social justice and a high code of ethics, are part and parcel of our way of life. They need this proof, even more than they need practical help, in advancing their technical and scientific skills, more than they need help in developing armed forces for their security.

To these young countries, vigorously searching for direction, we must offer a positive philosophy by individual, and national example. Should we fail to do this, communism will give them its own destructive ideology, one which denies the basic spiritual values we cherish and believe.

We must show that these values are the basis of our free society, the society which has fostered our unparalleled growth. We must maintain and constantly improve our standards of conduct.

It is a demanding task, and an important one. The fate of the free world may well be decided by the ethical leadership we provide.

Fortunately, we have the noble American ideal to guide our way, an ideal founded on trust in God, and motivated by a strong sense of responsibility. This ideal determined our direction in the past. It is this ideal that will draw us into the future. The American ideal is our most powerful weapon.

We hold fast to the principles of our forefathers, freedom, justice, honesty, belief in the dignity of man. They are principles which have grown with our Nation. They must remain the driving force behind our actions, the standard against which those actions are measured.

Such a standard provides the ethical code of American society, the basis for our national conscience. It demands more than mere lip service. It is our job to apply these principles to our actions, continually, and consciously, or run the grave risk of losing both standard, and conscience. Such a loss would spell disaster.

The task of maintaining our standards of ethics, however, is not our only challenge. We face another, on a broad front. It is the challenge of communism's so-called peaceful competitive coexistence.

Remember the word "competitive." It is the key that sets the stage for the contest, a contest between a free society and a slave society. We must outperform the Communists, or pay the price. That price is only too obvious. It is the desperate plight of the enslaved, living almost without hope on the edges of the free world.

The concept of competition is certainly not foreign to us. It is as American as the hot dog. We have been challenged at our own game. They have taken on the Yankees and in their own ballpark.

The courageous men who cleared our wilderness, who developed our industries, and founded our institutions, were all motivated by competition. They asked for no aid in the form of paternalism. They were not seeking security, but they found it through hard work, and unceasing effort, through free competition under law.

We have grown great, cherishing free competitive enterprise. By its strength, we have become a model of economic growth, and our prosperity has been an eloquent argument for our way of life.

Communism, having met determined opposition to its aggressions, is now employing other means, to attain world domination. The Communists have adopted one of the free world's strongest drives, competition.

Every success communism gains in the field of competition, has a tremendous impact on newly independent countries. These countries are desperately seeking rapid growth and propserity. The Communists wish to delude them, to delude them into following the Soviet pattern, without assessing the costs to their own freedom, and to human dignity.

The basic issue is, how well will we respond to this Communist challenge? The answer rests with all of us, particularly with you of the younger generation.

We should welcome this competition. The major advantages are on our side. We base our plans upon the ability, the courage, and the effectiveness, of the freeman. Our high standards of health and living prove the success of this concept.

The Communists boast of their system being progressive. Perhaps it is, but the American system is far more progressive. It is more progressive both in principle, and in practice.

We have 200 years of successful experience in competition. The Communists are just beginning, and beginning in an environment hardly conducive to lasting success.

Our competitive spirit remains vigorous, bursting with fresh ideas, challenging the talents and aspirations of America's youth.

But now to answer the threat of world communism, we must exploit our advantages to the utmost. Traditional American alertness must prevail over complacency, a spirit of adventure over the desire for security, service over selfishness.

To win this contest, we need far better than average performances. Contests are not won by average scientists, average managers, or average workers. The need for excellence, and the highest standards of performance is greater than ever before.

The pursuit of excellence, however, is never easy. The very fruits of our labor, our progress, often make it more difficult. The wonderful material benefits that spring from these advancements, often reduce, the very incentives that inspire us to excel.

Emphasis on group achievement, so helpful to the growth of our great industries, has reduced the recognition for superior individual performance. In some areas the respect for high standards of workmanship is obscured, there is less distinction between the mediocre and the excellent. However desirable, high wages, when awarded equally to the skilled and unskilled, hide the value of the superior over the inferior, the direct connection between effort and reward.

But the connection is there. It must be recognized. It is there in material benefits, it is there in the satisfaction of a job well done. Superior performance always provides significant incentives, if we retain significant goals.

American manufacturers now face increased competition from the growing industrial strength of the free world, as well as from communism. It is a competition that some firms are facing with vigor, and with success. To the management and labor of these firms, ingenuity, invention, and innovation are watchwords. They are not complacent, the cannot afford to be. They are too busy to indulge in self-pity. Theirs is an example which others must follow.

Our forefathers stressed the virtue, and the importance of hard work. It is still a virtue. It is needed now more than ever. So is increased efficiency. So are imagination and initiative.

Comfortable prosperity is fine, as a Nation we have worked for it, and achieved it. But our efforts will have been in vain should we permit the individual initiative which was responsible for that prosperity to be dulled by self-satisfaction or by complacency.

Nations, too, can squander their inheritance. Should we become complacent now, we can lose the very prosperity for which our forefathers worked so long, and hard, and courageously.

We have come a long way. American workers now turn out three times as much in a 40-hour week as their grandfathers did in 70 hours.

But we still have a long way to go. For management and labor, greater rewards stimulate growth, even the Communists recognize this. But, to deserve these rewards, each must contribute more. We must all perform to the limit.

As we move into the future, our emphasize must be on quality, as well as quantity. It is the old story. We must "build better mousetraps" and we can. But it takes work and sacrifice and craftsmanship. It takes this and more, it takes skills.

To compete successfully, we must have those skills. The need is growing. Your fine college has already recognized this requirement. It has developed an active program of vocational training, as well as the normal college courses.

Developing skills, and enlarging human knowledge, are basic sources of growth as a man and as a Nation. Many of you will continue your formal educations. Some of you will move out into the world. Whether you leave college life now, or later, you cannot allow your educations to stop when you depart. Education is a vital process that must continue all your lives.

Education and the willingness to be educated will be vital to our Nation's future. America needs the wisdom of educated men, and the depth of understanding that comes from continued study. They are needed to defeat the tactics employed by the Communists. Our progress will demand judgment, and critical evaluation, to keep us on course, to avoid the reefs.

But we must exercise caution lest we become hypercritical. If we speak only of failures, others will soon be convinced that failure is all we achieve, and will lose confidence in our ability.

Our accomplishments have been tremendous. Working in freedom, guided by a sense of moral responsibility and social justice, we have developed the strongest, most prosperous Nation in the history of the world.

We have good reason to be proud and optimistic. Our optimism is warranted, but complacency, complacency in any form is not.

Today we are being challenged to our utmost, by the gnawing threat of imperialistic communism. It is a life and death struggle for survival. We must anticipate a protracted struggle, anticipate it and work hard.

This task cannot be left to others. It cannot be left solely to the Government, to any superior authority. This may appear to be the easy way, it does avoid personal responsibility and duty, at least temporarily, but it will never provide the solution.

Insistence on the highest moral standards and on the highest standards of performance must be supplied by each of us as citizens.

Experts in various areas can advance specific courses of action. But it will be up to the young and eneregtic men and women of America, you in this graduating class, to

develop them, to make them work, to carry them out.

Your responsibilities are great ones, because of your higher education, and because of your role as the leaders of the future. Seize these responsibilities eagerly, carry them out with enthusiasm, with true patriotism and with integrity. Do this and our cause, the cause of freedom, the cause of all mankind, will be won.

Milada Horakova

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, those who fight for freedom and against tyranny are not to be found solely among the soldiers and statesmen whose courage and sacrifice receive the greatest attention.

The contribution of women to the cause of liberty is no less important for being so often overlooked.

An outstanding example of the noble women who have given their lives for freedom's sake is Dr. Milada Horakova of Czechoslovakia, the 10th anniversary of whose execution on July 27, 1950, by the Communists was memorialized earlier this week at the All Souls Unitarian Church here in Washington.

I am very glad that the Czechoslovak National Council, the Council of Free Czechoslovakia and related groups have thus acted to keep alive the memory of one whose valiant and determined resistance both to nazism and communism is a continuing inspiration to free men and free women everywhere.

In further recognition of that anniversary, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief biographical sketch outlining the principal events in Dr. Horakova's life, together with a testimonial chapter on "Milada Horakova" by Betka Papanek, taken from the memorial booklet recently published by the Council of Free Czechoslovakia.

There being no objection, the biographical sketch and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHO IS DR. MILADA HORAKOVA?

(A biographical sketch)

Who is Dr. Milada Horakova? A noble and courageous Czechoslovak woman, wife and mother, parliamentary deputy and chairman of the Czechoslovak Women's Council, whom the Red regime of Czechoslovakia executed 10 years ago and to whom Czechoslovak exiles in the free world now pay tribute.

Dr. Milada Horakova was born on December 25, 1901, in Prague, Czechoslovakia. She studied law at the Charles University in Prague, and took her doctor of laws in 1926. Before graduating she started to work with Senator Frantiska Plaminkova, the leader of the equal rights movement and president of the Czechoslovak National Women's Council (who was executed by Nazi gestapo on June 27, 1942). She married in 1927. Soon thereafter she started work in the social welfare department at Prague City Hall, where for years her chief was Dr. Peter Zenkl, then mayor of Prague, later Vice Prime Minister of Czechoslovakia and now chairman of the executive committee of Council of Free Czechoslovakia and Mrs. Ruzena Pelantova, director of the welfare department, for whom she headed the legal section. She took a direct and indirect part in the statutory regulations of matters appertaining to education, the training of young people, the betterment of family life and the improvement of the position of women.

In August 1940, during the Nazi occupation, she and her husband were arrested. She was subjected to torture during gestapo interrogrations, and the Nazi Superior Court in Dresden in October 1944 sentenced her to 8 years imprisonment (the prosecutor having demanded that she be sentenced to death). She was in prison at Aichach in Bavaria in May 1945 when the American Army liberated the region.

After her return from Nazi gaols to her reunited family in Prague, she once more took up the pursuit of social welfare questions and held a leading position in the national and international women's movement. She was chairman of the Czechoslovak Women's Council and a member of the International Federation of Democratic Women, vice president of the Union of Former Political Prisoners, where she valiantly fought against the Communist infiltration and terror. She enter also national politics as a member of the Czechoslovak National Socialist Party, founded on the principles of President Thomas Garrigue Masaryk and led by Eduard Benes, was elected to the Provisional National Assembly and then to the Constitutional Assembly.

In the frenzied days of February overthrow 1948, she fearlessly maintained contact between democratic political leaders then already under Communist guard in their homes, but still struggling to avert the Red avalanche led by delegates from Moscow, among them Valerian Zorin, and backed by the Red Army maneuvering across Czechoslovak borders. She refused every approach of Communists in the attempt to win her over their side before "the inevitable victory of the revolution," resigned all public offices, and went underground again in the struggle to regain national liberty.

Then she was arrested on September 27, 1949, and after 9 months in prison without contact with counsel or the outside world she was brought, with 12 others, before a People's Court of one judge and two Communist Party henchmen, was sentenced to death on June 8, 1950; she was executed on the gallows in Pancrac prison on June 27, 1950, along with three others of the group, Dr. Oldrich Pecl (an advocate and national economist), Jan Buchal (former member of the Corps of National Security), and Zavis Kalandra (former lecturer at Charles University and member of the Communist Party until 1936).

Throughout the trial Dr. Horakova's character shone through that gloomy courtroom as a beacon of courage and indestructible patriotism. Her last words before the sentence rang across the nation like a challenge to dauntless resistance.

MILADA HORAKOVA

(By Betka Papanek)

I had known of Dr. Milada Horakova's long association with Senator Frantiska Plaminkova in the National Council of Women of Czechoslovakia. As a lawyer and as executive secretary she was extremely useful to the Council's president, Senator Plaminkova, when legislation under consideration in Parliament concerned women or the family in any way—education, family relationship under law, women in the labor fields, working conditions, hours, minimum wages, child labor, etc. They were both concerned that the laws were enforced.

I had known that she and her husband had been arrested in August 1940 by the Nazis for helping persons wanted by the Gestapo, aiding families of Nazi victims—for helping her fellowman. I had heard of the long and numerous interrogations, the mental and physical tortures she endured in jails, solitary confinement, and concentration camp. Her trial in Dresden in which the prosecutor advocated the death sentence and the people's judges sentence of 8 years in Aichach near Munich was described to me in a way that aroused my admiration and respect to a degree reserved for someone truly great.

It was difficult to imagine what scars 5 years of uncertainty, anxiety, mistreatment, physical deprivation and hard labor would leave on a body and soul. When I first met Milada Horakova in September 1945, I saw a lovely woman who greeted me smilingly with a warmth and friendliness that charmed me. Her dedication to her work was revealed as she spoke of her efforts on behalf of the political prisoners who had survived the years in Nazi concentration camps and the families of those who had died there. Her all-absorbing concern and sense of duty to serve these victims of injustice, cruelty and oppression left no room for bitterness or hate. She knew of the work of my husband for the cause of Czechoslovakia and the Red Cross and spoke admiringly of our teamwork.

We talked of reestablishing ties with women in the international organizations, particularly the International Council of Women. She had rallied the surviving leaders of the National Council of Women of Czechoslovakia to reactivate the organization dissolved by Nazi decree, as she had promised to do when Senator Plaminkova was executed. She was elected its president. I gladly acceded to her request to speak at the next meeting of the Council's Executive Committee on the work of the women of the United States during the war. It was evident that Dr. Horakova had Communist influence to contend with even then, but was doing everything possible to strengthen the democratic forces. She was instrumental in arranging to have me address the university students on the role of the United States in the war, perhaps to make up for the lack of enthusiasm I met with in the Council. The university students packed the hall until there was no more room for standees and I have rarely had a more interested and enthusiastic audience.

I promised Dr. Horakova that on my return to New York in December, I would contact Dr. Lena Madesin Phillips of the International Federation of Business and Professional Women to discuss the possibility of arranging for a sale of Czechoslovak women's handicrafts—embroideries, laces, toys, etc., similar to that arranged for the Council in 1938 after Munich. In April 1946, Dr. Horakova wrote to tell me that Dr. Phillips had initiated a project in Federation clubs to collect and send packages of clothing for the needy victims of persecution. She was happy to announce that the Czechoslovak Federation was organized again and that international contacts were growing and being renewed very rapidly. She mentioned attending the World Congress in Paris and becoming members of the Women's International Democratic Federation and at the same time fostering equally cordial contacts with our former international coworkers. Mme. Maeaterre-Sellier, the vice president of the International Alliance for Women's Suffrage had just been to Prague to discuss the possibility of holding its first postwar congress there. Close cooperation had already been reestablished with the International Council of Women. She requested any and all information about American women, especially about their political influence and positions. She ended the letter

saying, "We here are completely occupied with our election campaign and we believe that the election will assure democracy and freedom," with a personal message.

Much as she wanted to come to Philadelphia to the Conference of the International Council of Women in August 1947, she wrote to me: "Unfortunately the Women's International Democratic Federation is meeting in Sweden at the same time and it is not very possible that I be absent there." Her role in the WIDF was to try to rally the women who believed in democracy and freedom to resist the Communist control of it. The struggle was unequal in this international organization, since its leaders were Communist directed. In Czechoslovakia, too, the Communist infiltrators were becoming bolder, even though there were clear indications that the Communist Party would lose strength in the elections scheduled for May 1948.

The Communist coup d'etat in February 1948 dashed hopes for democratic elections to deal with subversive Communist efforts. Milada Horakova resigned her seat in Parliament the day after the coup. She was prevented from calling a meeting of the National Council of Women of Czechoslovakia to protest the Communist seizure of the government. She was locked out of council headquarters and ousted from all organizations to which she belonged. She lost her means of livelihood. She knew she was watched and marked for persecution. She was arrested in September 1949, accused only of being unfriendly to the U.S.S.R. and friendly to the western democracies. On June 8, 1950, Milada Horakova was sentenced to death with 3 men, while 9 other men and women received life or long-term prison sentences.

On June 9, 1950, Mrs. Ruzena Pelantova, Dr. Jan Papanek, and I began to campaign to try to save her life. More than a hundred letters were sent over the signature of Dr. Papanek, the former Ambassador and Permanent Delegate of Czechoslovakia to the United Nations, the presidents and past presidents of international organizations, asking that they and their organizations intervene to try to save the life of Milada Horakova, whose only guilt lay in unfailing loyalty to the democratic ideals, freedom and justice. These letters were sent to the International Council of Women, International Federation of Business and Professional Women, International Federation of University Women, International Federation of Friends of Young Women, International League for the Rights of Man, International Union of Catholic Women's Leagues, Liaison Committee of Women's International Organizations, World Y.W.C.A. Letters went to members of the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women, women members of delegations to the U.N. and many others. Personal appeals were also made to the Secretary General of the U.N. Trygve Lie, Mrs. F. D. Roosevelt, then chairman of the Human Rights Commission and others. The letters suggested that protests be addressed to U. N. officials, delegations, Commissions on Human Rights and Status of Women, Klement Gottwald, Premier Joseph Stalin, and the International Society of Red Crosses. These efforts were in vain. She was executed on June 27, 1950, firm in her belief that she had lived and worked for what was right and was content to die for it.

One of many memorial meetings was held at the Julia Richman High School in New York on October 20, 1950. The huge crowd of individuals and representatives of international, American and Czechoslovak organizations was a testimonial to the admiration and regard for Milada Horakova and the sorrowful protest of her execution. The speeches of those participating in the program of this unforgettable event also reflected these sentiments, Malcolm Davis, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, De Witt Poole, Dr. Petr Zenkl, Andrew Valusek, David Martin and I. Thelma Votipka of the Metropolitan Opera sang.

There were many other meetings in memoriam. There were resolutions passed by international women's organization deploring the fact "that our 20th century civilization permits such acts," renewing "allegiance to the causes she espoussd with energy and deep conviction," calling upon their entire membership to increase its strength and influence to become a living force to prevent repetitions in the future.

The inspiration of Milada Horakova's life after her death continues, year after year.

On the occasion of the 10th anniversary of her tragic loss the members of the National Council of Women of Free Czechoslovakia gratefully remember her long sustained and courageous service to women and the victims of oppression in Czechoslovakia and solemnly pledge our faithfulness to the ideals she held high as she lived and died.

Time Has Come for United States To Take Positive Action To Put Halter on Castro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, Editor Jack Gore, in the Fort Lauderdale News of Fort Lauderdale, Fla., asks "How long is the United States going to sit calmly by while Prime Minister Fidel Castro continues to convert the nearby island of Cuba into a communistic state and a bastion for the Reds to stir up anti-American sentiment throughout the length and breadth of this hemisphere?" This is a question many of us here in Congress have been asking, and one we expect the State Department to answer soon, by action.

Because Mr. Gore's editorial will be of interest to all Members, I have asked that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

[From the Fort Lauderdale News, June 30, 1960]

TIME HAS COME FOR UNITED STATES TO TAKE POSITIVE ACTION TO PUT HALTER ON CASTRO

(By Jack W. Gore)

How long is the United States going to sit calmly by while Prime Minister Fidel Castro continues to convert the nearby island of Cuba into a communistic state and a bastion for the Reds to stir up anti-American sentiment throughout the length and breadth of this hemisphere?

As has been noted quite frequently here of late there is no longer much doubt about Castro's motives in Cuba. He has clearly and conclusively demonstrated his close ties with the Communists, and his hatred for this country and all that it stands for has now become so intense that the man becomes virtually a raving maniac every time he makes a public address.

In recent weeks Cuba has become increasingly unsafe for American visitors and American businessmen who have financial investments on the island. Many American-owned properties have already been confiscated in Cuba, and yesterday Castro threatened to seize them all "penny by penny until nothing is left" if the United States cuts its purchases of Cuban sugar.

Up to now our official policy in regard to what is happening in Cuba has been one of extreme patience combined with a somewhat forlorn hope that Castro will be taken care of by him own countrymen.

But, as Congressman PAUL ROGERS pointed out on the floor of the House the other day, the situation in regard to Cuba has now reached the point where more positive action by this Nation is called for to meet the threat posed by Castro and his Communist pals.

The Florida Congressman said that the Communist pattern of takeover in Cuba is marked and unmistakable. The promised free elections have not materialized; schools have become vehicles for the dissemination of Communist propaganda; the press and radio have ceased to exist as free entities, and anyone who dares to criticize or oppose the activities of the government is promptly branded as a "counterrevolutionary" and imprisoned or executed after a "circus" atmosphere trial which makes a mockery of justice.

"It is all too apparent," Representative ROGERS declared, "that the so-called political revolution is, in truth, an anti-Democratic revolution aimed at establishing a Communist stronghold in the Western Hemisphere a scant 90 miles from our coast.

"The rapid spread of Communist activity in Cuba, Representative ROGERS continued, "has grown to such proportions that it has transcended the realm of Cuban-American relations and now threatens the collective security of the entire hemisphere."

Representative ROGERS then proposed that Secretary of State Christian Herter take immediate cognizance of this threat to our hemisphere by requesting a meeting or consultation of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of American States in accordance with the charter of the Organization of American States for the avowed purpose of considering collective action necessary for defense against the aggressive activities of international communism.

Representative ROGERS declared there was ample precedence for such a meeting and that any further delay in bringing the Cuban situation before the OAS would strongly jeopardize our position as the leader of the free world. The smaller nations throughout the hemisphere have been patiently waiting for us to initiate positive action to thwart the Communist conspiracy in Cuba and to maintain our position as a leader we must take the lead, ROGERS said, rather than continuing to sit back and wait for another nation to take the initiative.

We heartily concur with Representative ROGERS' viewpoint. It is ridiculous for us to continue spending billions of dollars a year fighting the spread of communism in nations thousands of miles removed from our shores while we blind our eyes to the emergence of an even more serious Communist conspiracy right in our own backyard.

Granting the point that the United States has no grounds, as yet, for intervening in the domestic affairs of another nation, we do have a multitude of grounds to justify the convening of a meeting of the OAS to consider collective action by the members of this hemispheric organization to combat Communist objectives in Cuba.

It is foolish and it is dangerous for our State Department to go on doing nothing about Fidel Castro under the expectation that he will be taken care of in due time by his own people. That could happen, but it isn't likely under the iron-fisted Communist-directed dictatorship that Castro has inflicted on his countrymen today, and every additional day that Castro goes unchallenged gives him that much more time to consolidate his position.

The time for laughing about Castro's antics is over. He is the ready and willing

tool through which the international Communist conspiracy hopes to make vast inroads into the Western Hemisphere and the sooner our State Department recognizes the man for what he is and initiates positive action to meet the threat he poses to our own security, the sooner will all the freedom-loving people of this hemisphere breathe a little easier.

A Declaration of Principles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege, on June 4, 1960, to address the 51st annual convention of Bnai Zion, held at Kutschers Country Club, Monticello, N.Y.

Bnai Zion is a national fraternal organization which has grown in stature through the years until today it is recognized as the outstanding organization of its kind in this country, with a membership that reaches from one end of the country to the other.

During the course of its deliberations the convention adopted the following declaration of principles which I believe deserve the widest publicity. The text of the declaration follows:

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES OF B'NAI ZION

Dedicated to the ideals of Americanism, zionism, and fraternalism, B'nai Zion in the more than five decades of its existence has adhered steadfastly to the principles laid down by its founders.

We take pride in our loyalty to the United States of America and our dedication to the belief that its ideals of social justice and equality of opportunity for all are the basic and abiding principles essential to a free and democratic world.

In the firm conviction that zionism is consistent with these American ideals and that the Zionist belief in a Jewish homeland as the unifying force of the Jewish people is indispensable to the continued survival of our people, we reaffirm our support of and affiliation with the World Zionist movement and pledge ourselves to continued activity in:

1. Furtherance of mutual understanding and ties of friendship between the United States and Israel.
2. Strengthening of the bonds of fellowship between the Jews of our own country and our brethren in Israel and other lands.
3. Economic aid to the people of Israel.
4. Aid to immigration and absorption of refugees into the State of Israel.
5. Furtherance of Hebrew culture, education, and language, and Jewish traditions in the United States.

We proclaim our position as a nonpolitical body, neither affiliated nor identified with any political grouping in our own country, Israel, or elsewhere. We welcome into our ranks members of all shades of opinion united under the banner of Americanism and zionism.

We strongly believe in the importance of fraternalism in American Jewish life and will continue our efforts toward the advancement of the physical and social welfare of the individuals and families that constitute our membership.

New York Port Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, when the officials of the New York Port Authority did not produce all the internal memoranda, worksheets and day-to-day correspondence of the Authority as requested by the subpena of Subcommittee No. 5 of the Judiciary Committee, they were acting under instructions from the Governors of New York and New Jersey.

Governors Rockefeller of New York and Meyner of New Jersey, who had previously requested an adjournment of the return date of the subpena in order to present to the committee their views on some questions of Constitutional propriety, directed the officials to refuse to produce the materials if the initial request was denied.

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD a copy of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller's letter of instructions to the Honorable S. Sloan Colt, chairman, Port of New York Authority. Gov. Robert B. Meyner sent an identical letter to the Honorable James C. Kellogg, III, vice chairman, Port of New York Authority:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, June 25, 1960.

Hon. S. SLOAN COLT,
Chairman, Port of New York Authority,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. COLT: On June 23, 1960, as you know, Governor Meyner and I sent telegrams to the members of the House Judiciary Committee requesting the opportunity to meet with the Judiciary Committee at a mutually convenient date to present for the committee's consideration our position on the grave questions of constitutional propriety arising from the subpena served upon you, as chairman, Austin J. Tobin, the executive director, and Joseph G. Carty, the secretary of the Port of New York Authority. We requested an adjournment of the subpena to permit such a presentation to the committee. We took this action because of our deep concern for the basic principles of our American form of government which reserves to the States all powers not delegated to the Federal Government.

We have sought by these means to resolve the important constitutional issues involved in a cooperative manner. The subpena at issue appeared to us and our legal advisers to constitute a novel intrusion by the Federal Government into areas reserved by the Constitution to our respective States and to constitute a precedent which could subject various agencies of State government throughout the Nation to be similarly answerable to Federal authority. As the responsible chief executives of our States, we could not allow such action involving a State agency to proceed without our having an opportunity to present our objections.

The chairman of the Judiciary Committee has refused our request for a meeting and has refused to adjourn the date for the return of the subpena to permit us to present our objections. Accordingly, in order to insure that these basic issues may be presented and decided in an orderly way and with full opportunity for the States to present their views on these crucial questions, I am instructing the New York members of the Port of New York Authority to direct you, Mr. Tobin and Mr. Carty, when you appear before the subcommittee on June 29, to renew our request for an adjournment of the return date of the subpena to permit the Governors of the respective States to present their States' views to the committee. Failing the grant of this request, due regard for the important questions of constitutional propriety and legality presented and the necessity to have these questions determined by the appropriate tribunal, constrains me to instruct the New York members of the Port of New York Authority to direct you, Mr. Tobin and Mr. Carty not to produce the internal memoranda, worksheets, day-to-day correspondence and other materials now requested by the subpena.

As we understand it, you have already produced the minutes of the board and committees, the reports of the agency to the Governors and legislatures, and a great volume of other documents delineating the scope of the agency's activities. Of course, similar board and committee minutes and agency reports may be supplied for any period now requested.

The furnishing of the internal records now requested, in the opinion of my legal advisers, would represent a serious infringement on the rights of the State under the Constitution and could constitute a dangerous precedent as recognition of Federal authority in an area of State responsibility.

My only purpose is to insure that these basic questions of constitutional propriety and legality will be fully considered and determined by the appropriate tribunal.

I regret any inconvenience this may cause you personally, but I know you share with me the desire to have these basic issues decided with due regard for the substantial matters of State concern which are involved.

Sincerely,

N. A. ROCKEFELLER.

House Joint Resolution 649

SPEECH
OF
HON. PETER F. MACK, JR.
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, June 24, 1960

Mr. MACK. Mr. Speaker, I certainly could not take issue with the purpose of this bill. It undoubtedly would have some effect in advancing health sciences here and abroad through cooperative endeavors with other countries.

As in the past I still strongly favor health research and research training.

I have introduced amendments on this subject and plan to introduce another bill next year. I did, however, have some reservations about $50 million or even $5 million to establish a new International Health Agency.

I want to give all the aid and assistance to our scientists that is possible. I want to find the answer to the deadly killers, such as cancer, but I am not thoroughly convinced that this can be accomplished by appropriating $50 million for this International Agency.

During the consideration of this bill I suggested the use of counterpart funds to carry out this program and I am pleased that the sponsors of the bill have conducted an investigation and found that these funds can be utilized.

Mr. Speaker, under these circumstances I strongly support this bill and hope that it receives the support of the majority of the Members of the House.

Why in the World Is It That There Are No [Labeling] Standards on Shoes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, on June 23 a subcommittee of the other body held a hearing to consider a bill proposing the establishment of a Department of Consumers. During the course of the hearing before the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organization Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY and Federal Trade Commision Chairman Earl W. Kintner discussed the labeling of shoes.

In the course of the colloquy Chairman Kintner was asked by Senator HUMPHREY, "Why in the world is it that there are no standards on shoes?"

The ensuing discussion, made at this public hearing, points up, I believe, the need for full hearings, as promised for next year by the subcommittee chairman, on the shoe labeling legislation I have introduced—H.R. 1320.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a portion of the colloquy between Senator HUMPHREY and Chairman Kintner:

FROM THE COLLOQUY OF EARL W. KINTNER, CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION, WITH SENATOR HUBERT HUMPHREY, FOLLOWING THE STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN KINTNER

Senator HUMPHREY. I surely feel that there has been a decided step-up in activity along the lines that you have indicated.

My response to you is one of appreciation for what you do. It is a lot of hard work. It is a tremendous economy to attempt to have an overall surveillance, and we surely do not want Government in every aspect of our economic life.

We have to work with the private, the voluntary, the citizen groups seeking law observance, as well as applying law enforcement. I know that has been your philosophy.

I have been interested in one other matter. This is way off on the side.

I was talking to my shoe repair man the other day. Why in the world is it that there are no standards on shoes?

Mr. KINTNER. You mean labeling standards?

Senator HUMPHREY. Labeling standards. Isn't there some way that you can prevent people selling shoes for $15 made out of cardboard?

Mr. KINTNER. We have an investigation underway to determine what abuses, if any, exist there.

Senator HUMPHREY. I can send you to a shoe repair man that showed me six pairs of shoes, gave me the prices of these shoes, the closest he could identify them, and pointed out to me just exactly what kind of material was being used, and nothing but paper in some of the most high-priced shoes.

He said, "This is just outright unbelievable misuse of the word 'leather.'"

For example, they would have a leather piece in the shoe, and on that piece they would have the word "leather," and the rest of the shoe would be made out of paper or plastic.

Of course, the plastic is quite observable, you can see what you have. But you can take paper and make it look very much like leather. You would have a little piece in the instep, for example, of the shoe which wouldn't be any bigger than, let's say, an inch long, or an inch wide, and that would be the total amount of leather. The rest of it would be cardboard.

Mr. KINTNER. We have an inquiry going on in that area, and I understand there is pending legislation for shoe labeling.

Senator HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. KINTNER. I would imagine that eventually these facts will be brought out in connection with that legislation.

Senator HUMPHREY. I wish they had done it before my wife and daughter bought so many of those cardboard shoes.

Mr. KINTNER. I think they would rather have something that looks a little better, with plastic and other froufrous on it, than solid leather.

Senator HUMPHREY. The thing that gets me is:

You go to a good, plain responsible, hard-working man like the man out on McKinley Street who repairs my shoes, and he tells me all about this. I can't understand why it is such a secret from Government. He is a very honest man who works long hours, knows what is going on, repairs these shoes, open them up and shows me nothing but paper.

I remember when I was a kid we used to get a hole in our shoes once in a while and we would wad up some paper, but I never thought they would make a business out of it.

Mr. KINTNER. It raises a very difficult problem.

Senator HUMPHREY. Is there any authority that you have over that?

Mr. KINTNER. We have authorities where deception of consumers of the public can be indicated by the practice.

Senator HUMPHREY. Maybe you ought to look into it.

Mr. KINTNER. We are. We have an investigation.

Senator HUMPHREY. A good shoemaker who really puts out a leather product gets a raw deal if you can have a substitute product where the word "leather" appears on a very small item on the shoe and indicates to the unsuspecting consumer that this may be a leather product.

Mr. KINTNER. You have just made a very important point there, because the thrust of our law not only is a protection of the public generally, but the protection of the honest businessman.

Senator HUMPHREY. Exactly.

Well, I got my shoestore fixed up. You see, I have to have these occasions to remind myself that there are some of these things that I haven't taken care of. I promised my shoemaker that I would do something about this, and I hadn't gotten around to it.

Mr. KINTNER. You take care of these points very effectively, if I may say so.

Our Hazardous Maritime Gap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS N. DOWNING
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Speaker, recently the Department of Defense issued a regulation which will become effective on September 1 of this year, in which it states that no military personnel will be transferred by ship. If this regulation is put into effect, not only will it deprive our merchant marine of these needed revenues, but it would tend to indicate that the U.S. Government is again neglecting to protect the well being of our American merchant marine.

Our merchant marine has always been considered the fourth arm of our national defense and every effort should be made to keep it strong and ready. Recently, Mr. W. F. Carey, president of the National Defense Transportation Association, in a statement published in the May issue of the Merchant Marine Bulletin, warned that preoccupation with missiles to the exclusion of merchant ships, is a maginot line delusion in a new form. I believe my colleagues would be interested in this timely statement and under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

OUR HAZARDOUS MARITIME GAP

(Statement by Walter F. Carey, president, National Defense Transportation Association and president, Dealers Transit, Inc.)

Our ocean sealanes are essential links in America's national defense transportation picture.

Ships, like automobiles, trains, trucks, buses, and planes, are vital to our national security. Today, as never before, the story of this linking chain of service must be told to the great American public. We want no Maginot Line thinking here; yet, in my mind, the Nation is on the verge of accepting such a philosophy. Missiles are extremely important, but that aspect of public attitude known as "missile thinking" is fraught with danger.

Without an active, privately owned American merchant marine, a future war would have to be fought out largely on our own shores. I am not speaking of the first phase, the missile phase (if there is to be one). I am thinking of the followup or the limited war. Without ships, any such operation cannot successfully be conducted overseas. This is the crucial fact that is too often forgotten these days. We hear talk of our missile gap. An equally real problem in our maritime gap.

Today's American merchant marine is carrying about 10 percent of our export and import trade. This means that 9 out of 10 ships serving our commerce are foreign vessels. If we learned anything in the last two great wars and in the Korean war, we learned that America cannot rely upon foreign merchant ships to transport our supplies and materiel of war. This is the lesson that must be brought back into focus.

The National Defense Transportation Association is dedicated to the proposition

that all links in our transport chain must be strong and the chain complete. The finest roads or railroads in the world end at our shoreline. The finest automotive industry in the world is useless unless the tanks and war vehicles it can produce in an emergency can be transported to a possible overseas war front. Let's not have our missing link. Let's not have a maritime gap.

"Yankee, Go Home," From Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, June 13, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Donald I. Rogers as it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of June 12, 1960:

"YANKEE, GO HOME," FROM CUBA
(By Donald I. Rogers)

Some measure of the gravity of the world situation may be adjudged from the fact that not one columnist, editorial writer, or humorist found anything amusing in the fact that unshaven Fidel Castro made one of his major political speeches the other day before the assembled members of the Barbers' Union and this, it seems certain, indicates that the American temper has changed somewhat toward this man who dislikes us so bitterly.

Perhaps the time has come, then, when the American people can view forthrightly the problem presented by this man who now hides behind our hemispheric agreements and the Monroe Doctrine itself to welcome into his bosom Nikita Khrushchev, who less than a month ago berated our President in such schoolboyish terms as to set world diplomacy back a thousand years.

There is only one way to deal with Castro, and that is through straightforward economic pressure.

It is not nice to say "I told you so," but this correspondent, after lengthy research in Cuba, wrote a column warning of Castro's intentions long before the revolution, when the bewhiskered bolshevik was burning sugarcane fields back in Oriente Province. While most newspaper reporters were hailing the potential liberator (including one who acquired a coveted prize for his work), only one other paper, to my knowledge, found anything alarming in Castro's conduct. That was the New Bedford (Mass.) Standard-Times, whose executive editor, Charles Lewin, wrote some pointed editorials warning of Castro's philosophies.

HOW TO HIT BACK

If Americans are now alarmed enough about Castro, perhaps they will be willing to consider some voluntary retributions against the Cubans.

First, and most important, let's discourage tourism. If the Yankee dollar is as repugnant to Cubans as Castro says it is, let's spend it in friendly Puerto Rico or the neighborly Virgin Islands, or Nassau, or Bimini, or a dozen other Carribbean islands, if we must go to islands—or simply in easily accessible Florida, if we need tropical inspiration.

If Cubans think their independence can come only at the expense of ours, we should be able to control our urge to pour money into their cause through tourism. There are other places to visit.

Second, let's serve notice, through our State Department, that any nonsense about seizure of American-owned properties in Cuba will bring instantaneous retaliation. We can expect the same treatment in the United Nations that Russia received after the Hungarian incident, a vote of censure.

Third, let's tell Castro that, if there's any repetition of the childish little gesture of firing at an American submarine—or at any American vessel—the U.S. Marines will arrive next day.

SUGAR CUTS URGED

Fourth, since President Eisenhower possesses standby authority to change the sugar quotas affecting Cuba, let him invoke immediate economic reprisals against the Cuban Government. Let's, for example, cut the Cuban quota right in half; then let's remove the premium price we pay Cuba for its sugar and inform the Cubans we will buy it in the open market, at current market prices.

In doing so we would be complying with Castro's wishes. Not long ago the dictator denounced the United States for paying Cubans as a gift about $150 million a year in the form of a subsidy overpayment on their sugar. Looking the gift horse right in its sugar-decayed molars, Castro said the subsidy was enslaving.

The United States buys more than 3 million tons of sugar annually from Cuba at a premium price of 5 cents a pound, which is just about double the price Cuba gets for sugar in other free world markets.

Castro writhed in ecstasy when he announced that his great friend Khrushchev had agreed to buy Cuban sugar at the going world price. Why can't we be just as friendly? Our sugar bill would be cut in half. Moreover, some of our own sugar farmers could put back into production some of their own land which is now being subsidized or remaining dormant.

FOR VACATION AID

Castro announced last week that it is his intention to create more jobs in Cuba by giving everyone longer vacations, an idea that even Huey Long never conceived. If Cubans are naive enough to subscribe to this distorted economic reasoning, then let's help them in their search for idleness.

Let's pay them less for their sugar; let's give them no more than other nations do. Let's not patronize their wining and dining and gambling casinos. Let's not even go there at all. Then they can really vacation, and in some idle moment perhaps enough of them will grasp the verities of life and economics to a point where Castro will find less support.

Delayed Medical Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Post on Thursday June 30, 1960, entitled "Delayed Medical Aid":

DELAYED MEDICAL AID

The decision of the Senate Finance Committee to hold hearings at this 11th hour of the congressional session on medical insurance for the aged can hardly be construed as other than a delaying tactic. It will serve in all probability to prevent Senate action on the bill passed by the House and the amendment to it offered by Senator McNAMARA and 23 other Senators—at least before the recess. And this may suit the political meneuvering of those who want to trade support of the measure for convention votes next month. But it will hardly promote the interest of the aged.

The provision of medical insurance for retired Americans, either as a new feature of the Social Security system or, as the administration prefers, by direct appropriations in the annual budget, will be an important innovation in American life which deserves careful consideration by Congress. It has had such consideration. The proposals before the Finance Committee have not been hastily drafted on the spur of the moment. For more than a year the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging has taken testimony from experts in hearings all over the country and has thoughtfully reflected on the problem. The Finance Committee is unlikely to be able to add much to the subcommittee's painstaking recommendations.

We think that Congress knows quite enough about the problem to act on it now. It can do so by using the McNamara amendment to transform the pitifully inadequate health measure passed by the House into a comprehensive program providing for hospitalization, nursing home care, home health and diagnostic services, and assistance in paying for expensive drugs. This would give real aid to the aged. Whether in this Congress or the next, a program of this kind is bound to be enacted in response to an inescapable national need.

Address of Maj. Gen. Armistead D. Mead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent address of Maj. Gen. Armistead D. Mead to the Military Government Association Conference in San Francisco on May 14, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. General Mead is Chief of the Office of Civil Affairs in the Department of the Army, and his able remarks should be of interest to the Members of Congress and persons interested in an effective national defense.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF MAJ. GEN. ARMISTEAD D. MEAD, TO MILITARY GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION CONFERENCE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., MAY 14, 1960

Mr. President, members of the Military Government Association, ladies and gentleman, I have looked forward with a great deal of anticipation to the privilege of addressing the members of this distinguished patriotic association. I'm very happy to have the opportunity to speak to you because of my deep personal interest in and responsibility for the civil affairs function within the Department of the Army.

Aside from my official interest in your activities, I would in any case look forward to being with you because of the great pleasure I have derived from my personal contacts with many of you. These contacts have given me a good insight into your goals, ideals, and inspirations and a great admira-

tion for your accomplishments. I know that you are competent in your respective professional fields and that you share an enthusiastic dedication to civil affairs/military government.

My purpose today shall be first to highlight recent civil affairs developments and then to touch on the role of civil affairs in civil defense.

Current developments indicate a growing understanding and appreciation for the vital and indispensable role of civil affairs. Our activities are receiving more recognition in planning, development of doctrine, training and operations. This improvement is not limited to our forces but is noticeable in the forces of many of our allies. I had the opportunity to observe this during an orientation trip to Southeast Asia as well as in Europe while observing a large NATO exercise which stressed the refugee problem.

Recognition of the commander's responsibility for civilian-military relations has been obscured in the past by a tendency to consider the military government phase as the beginning and the end of civil affairs. This hampers the development of a comprehensive civil affairs concept since it tends to confine the civil affairs function to occupation of enemy territory during and immediately after combat. Military students in the main are most familiar with this aspect of civil affairs. I think we must consider that the civil affairs function involves a spectrum of operations extending from the most complete control of a civil population by military government to the simplest type of military-civilian liaison, such as the relationship between a commander and the civilian communities that surround his command. In limited war and in operations short of war, civil affairs activities will likely be conducted under civil affairs agreements as was the case in Lebanon year before last. These are agreements between friendly countries which define the nature and extent of the civilian-military relationship in the host country. Whether our forces are involved in operations, or are by their presence alone lending stability in a friendly country, there must be—clearly defined, mutually understood, civilian-military relationships. This broader approach to the civil affairs function identifies each individual commander's responsibility for civilian-military relations in every location except where there are no civilians as in the polar regions.

What are the new developments of importance to civil affairs with which we should be familiar? The first one which I should like to mention is the issuance of a Joint Chiefs of Staff publication, on November 25, 1959, entitled "Unified Action Armed Forces." The purpose of this publication is to set forth principles, doctrine and functions governing the activities and performance of the Armed Forces of the United States. The section devoted to civil affairs operations covers definition, purpose, policies, general principles, mission, authority and responsibilities. Previously much of this material existed. However, it was scattered in various JCS documents, some of which were classified. Now, all the fundamental aspects of civil affairs operations are combined in one simple, clear, available document. The publication defines civil affairs as those phases of the activties of a commander which embrace the relationship between the military forces and civil authorities and people in a friendly country or area, or occupied country or area when military forces are present. A narrow interpretation of this definition would exclude the United States and would thus make it applicable only abroad. To remove any ambiguity or doubt on this point, we hope expressly to include the United States in a pending revision of the definition. Thus, civil affairs would then be defined as the relationship between military forces and the civil authority and people wherever.

"Unified Action Armed Forces" outlines the responsibilities within the U.S. Government for civil affairs operations in the various agencies including the National Security Council, the Department of State, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Chiefs of Staff of the three services, joint commanders and unit commanders. As executive agent for the Joint Chiefs of Staff for civil affairs planning, the Chief of Staff of the Army initiates actions for appropriate consideration by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, required to discharge their responsibilities in this field. The Army is responsible for establishing and operating training facilities for the basic branch material training of all U.S. civil affairs personnel and units. The Army also mobilizes, trains and provides all civil affairs units and personnel required in the joint commands except to the extent that this responsibility may be assigned to the Chief of Naval Operations or the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

The manual directs each commander of a unit of the U.S. Armed Forces, regardless of its size or subordination, except as otherwise directed, to look to appropriate civil affairs units and personnel to secure for him necessary assistance, supplies, and facilities from indigenous sources, and to deal with local civilians and Government on his behalf.

The second development I should like to mention has to do with a comprehensive reexamination of civil affairs doctrine. My office is constantly reviewing doctrine and searching for ways to improve it and the techniques involved in civil affairs operations. Doctrine and techniques of operation must fit the new concepts of hot war and, equally important, the current concept of cold war which seems to be bound by neither Robert's Rules of Order nor the Hague Convention. I should like to invite your attention to two studies in progress which perhaps will improve doctrine and techniques of operation. The first concerns the Agadir disaster—the sudden, drastic, and completely devastating nature of the Agadir disaster produced problems similar to those which could be encountered anywhere by civilian and military authorities in the event of nuclear or other types of major catastrophies. The U.S. Army Civil Affairs School in conjunction with my office is analyzing all the available written and pictorial material pertaining to the Agadir disaster. The purpose of this is to develop the lessons to be learned therefrom in the various civil affairs functional fields.

The second is a classified study initiated in September 1957 by the Operations Research Office, ORO, of Johns Hopkins University. Currently forecast for completion next month it is entitled "Optimum Civil Affairs/Military Government Operation and Functioning After 1960." This study considers the civil affairs aspects of cold as well as hot wars.

The third development has to do with the role of civil affairs in meeting the threats of Communist subversion in underdeveloped friendly countries. The cold war is presenting civil affairs with new challenges, particularly in Southeast Asia. The Communists believe that these underdeveloped countries represent the Achilles heel of the Western World.

Adequate deterrence of Communist aggression requires alert, dynamic adaptation to the changing circumstances upon which Communist aggressive options rest. The most prominent form of Communist aggression in the cold war rests primarily on a single means: A fifth column constituted internally as a local Communist Party or externally by nationals who make up the nucleus of the party to be formed and used when the occasion arises. This is the enemy.

The target of this enemy is the people.

They are the real stakes in the cold war. Although Southeast Asia has only 6 percent of the world's total area it has 660 million people, about one-fourth of the world's population.

A cold-war operational doctrine has evolved among these weaker nations which offers considerable prospects of success. This doctrine is based upon the use of the nations' armed force as a civil support agency. The military forms the principal dynamic and cohesive force in many underdeveloped countries. Usually the army is the largest governmental organization. It is commonly the most stable element of the government. Its units are stationed throughout the country with uniforms that clearly identify its people as government personnel. The military communication net may be the only really efficient communications system in the country. The armed forces may be the only agency upon which the government can place full reliance. Thus, the national leaders turn to the armed forces for national duties far beyond the traditional role of the military.

Their main purpose deals with the Army-people relationship for winning the full support of the people for the Armed Forces and thus for the Government. Civil affairs activities become a primary weapon in this war to convince the villager that his ultimate good lies with the non-Communist world.

One very effective method employed in southeast Asia for improving the civilian-military relations is what we call "civic action." Civic action is a project of a self-help nature undertaken by armed forces in conjunction with the local population for the benefit and well-being of civilian communities—in the fields of public welfare, public works, transportation, communications, public health, public safety, education, and other such areas of community concern. A number of countries where we have military assistance advisory groups are conducting such civil affairs activities or civic action programs. A new Department of Defense directive contains a statement referring to the civic action role. This follows closely suggestions made by the Draper Committee which recently undertook an exhaustive survey of our military aid program.

The new Department of Defense directive prescribes that "Military assistance programs should, where feasible, encourage the use of indigenous military and paramilitary forces in underdeveloped countries in the construction of public works and other activities helpful to economic development, provided that such participation does not significantly detract from the capability of the forces to perform essential military missions."

In order for a country to integrate an effective civil affairs operation into its total military effort an indigenous civil affairs capability is required. The development of this capability is facilitated by providing civil affairs advisers in the U.S. military assistance advisory groups: by furnishing U.S. Army mobile civil affairs training teams and by offering training for foreign officers at our civil affairs school. We are urging greater utilization of the civil affairs training and experience.

The development of civil affairs techniques in the cold war is a two-way street.

We are learning much from the southeast Asian officers. Their ideas on the role civil affairs plays in their national security is realistcally based upon necessity. If half of the United States were occupied by the enemy and the people in the remaining half were not fully confident in the ability of our Government, we would be just as realistic. The U.S. Army Civil Affairs School teaches the development of a good basic civil affairs capability which is most useful in hot war. This was the mission of the school when originally established. Within this limit some recognition is given to the cold war aspects of civil affairs. However, this is not sufficient to meet the increasing requirements to train foreign officers and our MAAG

advisers required for the areas where the war is being pressed by our Communist enemy. The demand is not limited to southeast Asia. South America is an area of some concern. We are confident that our civil affairs school will adjust adequately to meet the new demands placed upon it.

My second purpose, you will recall, concerns the roll of civil affairs in civil defense.

Recently, General Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff, indicated that "fast-moving events of current history are bringing into clear focus the interrelationship between civil defense and military strength—both of which are essential elements of our national security posture." He further indicated that the Army is ready and able, not only to assist in civil defense should that become necessary, but to plan now concerning the form such assistance should take. He believes that the saving would be out of all proportion to the amount of time, effort, and expense involved in the planning. It must be remembered, only the absence of a military mission, together with the presence of an important and pressing civil defense mission, justifies diverting military units from their combat role. Therefore, it is impossible to earmark military units for a primary civil defense role. Major elements of the military will be required for purely military operations. While civil defense and military defense are inseparably linked, civil defense must, nevertheless, remain primarily a civil responsibility.

The Army is charged with coordinating both the planning for and the rendering of military support by all of the services in civil defense emergencies. The Army effects close coordination with civil defense authorities at national, regional, State, and local levels in planning for support of civil defense emergency operations. Thus, the military can minimize post-attack diversion of military resources for emergency assistance to civl authorities by helping these authorities to increase civil defense readiness. This will maximize the capability of the military for purely military missions. The Army will assist in efforts to improve civil defense preparedness during the preattack period to the extent permitted by budgetary and other resource limitations and the requirement to maintain its combat readiness.

In brief, Army assistance in civil defense emergencies shall be rendered when such assistance is requested or directed in accordance with appropriate public laws and Executive orders. The active and Reserve components of the Army will be prepared to support the maintenance of and/or the reestablishment of law and order in areas critical to national survival. Such military assistance will be withdrawn when the civil authority no longer requires it.

How may civil affairs units assist the Army in this civil defense role? These units are most suitable to support the Army effort. They are fashioned to function amid civilians in the crisis, confusion, and danger of combat. They are organized to offer assistance and advice in the conduct of the essential governmental functions at all levels of government. They are trained to cope with civilian-military relationships under the most extreme circumstances. In fact, in the combat zone part of their support entails the supervision of local civil defense.

What is the task of civil affairs and particularly the civil affairs reserve units in the military role in civil defense? I believe you already have the answer. It is the same sort of support to the combat troops as we envisage for combat. The reserve civil affairs units can provide valuable assistance to commanders now—particularly in the preparation of plans now for military assistance which may be required later and on short notice. This type of assistance is being rendered already in some Army areas. Civil affairs units in the 2d Army area have been assigned planning missions concerned with certain major target complexes. The 1st Army is employing a similar procedure. Future plans should make full use of the talents of civil affairs units in all Continental Army areas. This would provide excellent training for the units and valuable assistance to the ZI Army commanders and civil authorities.

It is not necessary to dwell on the assistance civil affairs units can render if called upon in the wake of a thermonuclear attack on the United States. It is clear that, in the initial phases, our national recovery effort would be decentralized. Any local commander employed to assist in the recovery of a community would require civil affairs personnel to assist him effectively to handle this vital civil defense support responsibility. His need for trained civil affairs personnel would be even greater should he be faced with the necessity for assumption of civilian control in the temporary absence of local authority. Thus, reserve civil affairs units perform a twofold mission in a civil defense operation: Preplanning for an atomic attack, and, if required, post-attack operations. Your careful preattack planning and realistic postattack training will contribute directly to national security. It will contribute indirectly by improving national confidence. Confidence derived from the knowledge that the situation is not hopeless. Confidence in our ability to survive and prevail even if a thermonuclear disaster should engulf us.

Civil affairs is moving ahead on many fronts. Because trends depart from traditional concepts of military government, we must have an open mind and the vision to make the necessary adjustments to provide the best response to the challenge.

The Congressional Cemetery of Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12326, the public works appropriation bill for fiscal year 1961, recently approved by the House, permits a modest increase in the sum allowed for maintenance of Federal gravesites in the Congressional Cemetery and, since many of the present Members may not be informed as to the Federal interest in this cemetery which prompts this annual appropriation, I would like to take this occasion to furnish a brief statement of the pertinent facts.

EARLY BEGINNINGS OF THE CEMETERY

In 1795, before the Federal City came into being, the Maryland Legislature authorized the establishment of Washington Parish whereupon the Christ Church Washington Parish was incorporaaed, vestrymen elected and a rector appointed. In those early days, the transportation of the remains of deceased persons more than a short distance was not feasible and the need for a place of burial in the new Capital for Senators and Representatives who might pass away while attending sessions of the Congress was early recognized. Certain influential members of the new church undertook to acquire an appropriate tract of ground subject to an agreement that when the graveyard, with its improvements, shall be unencumbered of debt, they would assign over all the right and title of said ground not subscribed for to the vestry of Washington Parish. By March 24, 1812, the cemetery was free of debt and at a meeting held by the vestry Easter Monday, March 30, 1812, the vestry accepted the said burial ground, with the deed, plan, list of subscribers, proceedings, accounts, and transfer of ground.

GRAVES RESERVED FOR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Shortly thereafter, the vestry reserved for the interment of Members of Congress 100 sites. In 1820, this reservation was extended to include heads of Departments of the General Government or their famliics, or the families of Members of the Congress.

Thereafter, until the establishment of the Arlington National Cemetery, additional sites in Congressional Cemetery were, from time to time, reserved for Government use and, in return, the Government appropriated moneys, labor and material toward the upkeep and improvement of the cemetery property. For instance, the act of May 31, 1832, (4 Stat. L., 520) appropriated $1,500 toward the erection of a keeper's house, for planting trees, boundary stones, and otherwise improving the burial ground allotted to the interment of Members of Congress and other officers of the General Government; the act of August 10, 1846 (9 Stat. L., 93) appropriated $500 for repairs to congressional burying ground, rendered necessary by the late freshet, and so forth.

FURTHER LEGISLATIVE ACTION

The act of July 25, 1848 authorized the Commissioner of Public Buildings of the city of Washington to sell so much of Hospital Square not exceeding 6 acres as the vestry might choose to purchase for an addition to the cemetery and provided further that the Government of the United States shall be entitled to purchase from said vestry, and to occupy as a burial ground, for Members of Congress and such other members of the U.S. Government as the President shall deem it expedient and proper to allow, a portion of the land hereinbefore authorized to be sold.

It is not surprising that this cemetery has been known almost from its establishment as Congressional Cemetery and is usually so designated in acts of Congress and by the public generally. It is often referred to as our first national cemetery and is perhaps our only true national cemetery due to the fact that Arlington and all other so-called national cemeteries are dedicated primarily for interment of the remains of those who have served in our Armed Forces, whereas Congressional Cemetery is primarily civilian.

PRESIDENTS INTERRED IN CEMETERY

From the time of its establishment until the close of the War Between the States, the remains of 3 Presidents, at least 2 Vice Presidents, possibly 75 Members of the Senate and House of Representatives were carried to and interred

at Congressional, as well as those of many high-ranking administrative and military officers of the Government.

The three Presidents who died in Washington during this period were William Henry Harrison, Zachary Taylor, and John Quincy Adams, although Adams was a Member of the House at the time of his death in the Capitol February 23, 1848. The remains of these Presidents and of a number of Senators and Representatives were later removed to home cemeteries, as were those of Dolly Madison, but there still remain in Congressional the remains of 14 Senators and 42 Members of the House of Representatives, including those of Vice President Elbridge Gerry (who also served as a Delegate and a Representative from Massachusetts) and Senator James Burrill, Jr., of Rhode Island, great-grandfather of Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN, now representing the same State.

GRAVE MARKINGS

It early became the custom for the Congress to erect on these graves imposing sandstone "cenotaphs" according to a design said to have been created by Federal Architect Latrobe (whose child's remains are in Congressional) and many of these were erected in memory of Senators and Representatives whose remains were not interred at Congressional or were interred there only briefly. This custom terminated pursuant to criticism of these sandstone memorials by Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, with the act of May 23, 1876 (ch. 103, 19 Stat. 54; 2 U.S.C. 51), directing the Sergeant at Arms of each House to have a monument erected "of granite" only "whenever any deceased Senator or Member * * * shall be actually interred in the Congressional Cemetery." Since that time, there have been only three such interments, Representative Roach, of Maryland, in 1902, Senator Thurston, of Nebraska, in 1916, and Representative Tilman B. Parks, of Arkansas, in 1950. It may eventually be found desirable to remove all of these sandstone memorials and (a) replace those over actual remains with more pleasing granite memorials, and (b) substitute for those that are merely honorary a single suitable memorial of modest proportions in memory of all Senators and Representatives who died in office.

TEXANS INTERRED IN CEMETERY

As a Texan I have been interested to note the following further information about the cemetery.

In January 1851 the remains of Representative David S. Kauffman, one of the original Texas Representatives in the Congress, were interred in Congressional but were removed to Austin in March 1932. In July 1857, upon the death of Senator Thomas Rusk of Texas, a cenataph was erected and still stands at Congressional in his honor; and in June 1858 the remains of Senator James Pinckney Henderson, who served as the first Governor of Texas and succeeded Senator Rusk, were interred in Congressional and removed to Austin in 1930.

LISTING OF CERTAIN GRAVES

I am appending hereto a list of all Senators and Representatives and of a few of the other official personnel whose remains are interred in this historic cemetery, showing in most cases the location of the grave and the date of death:

Range	Sites	Identification	Date of death
24	1-2	Senator Uriah Tracy (Connecticut)	May 24, 1800
	3-4	Representative Ezra Darby (New Jersey)	Jan. 27, 1808
25	1-2	Senator Francis Malbone (Rhode Island)	June 4, 1809
	7-8	Representative Thomas Blount (North Carolina)	Feb. 7, 1812
27	25-26	Maj. William Riley (Maryland)	Mar. 4, 1820
28	14	Col. Tobias Lear, secretary to George Washington	Oct. 11, 1816
	39-41	Vice President Calhoun's child	1820
29	6	Representative Tilman B. Parks (Arkansas)	Feb. 12, 1950
	9-11	Vice President Elbridge Gerry	Nov. 23, 1814
	12-13	Representative Elijah Brigham (Massachusetts)	Feb. 22, 1816
	14-15	Representative Richard Standford (North Carolina)	Apr. 9, 1816
	16-18	Child of Senator Henry Clay (Kentucky)	1816
	19-20	Representative George Mumford (North Carolina)	Dec. 31, 1818
	21-22	Representative David Walker (Kentucky)	Mar. 1, 1820
	23-25	John H. Purviance, State Department Executive	Nov. 7, 1820
	26-27	Capt. Hugh George Campbell, U.S. Navy	Nov. 11, 1820
	28-29	Representative Nathaniel Hazard (Rhode Island)	Dec. 17, 1820
	30-31	Representative Jesse Slocumb (North Carolina)	Dec. 20, 1820
	32-33	Senator James Burrill, Jr. (Rhode Island) (great-grandfather of Senator Theodore Francis Green)	Dec. 25, 1820
	34-35	Senator William A. Trimble (Ohio)	Dec. 13, 1821
	36-37	Senator William Pinkney (Maryland)	Feb. 25, 1822
	38-39	Representative William L. Ball (Virginia)	Feb. 28, 1824
	40-41	Senator John Gaillard (South Carolina)	Feb. 26, 1826
	42-43	Representative Christopher Rankin (Mississippi)	Mar. 14, 182
	44-45	Representative Alexander Smyth (Virginia)	Apr. 17, 1830
	46-47	Senator James Nobel (Indiana)	Feb. 26, 1841
	48-49	Representative Charles Johnston (Maryland)	June 17, 1832
	54-55	Representative George E. Mitchell (Maryland)	June 28, 1832
	56-58	Representative James Jones (Georgia)	Jan. 11, 1801
	59-61	Senator James Jackson (Georgia)	Mar. 19, 1806
	62-64	Representative Levi Casey (South Carolina)	Feb. 3, 1807
	65-67	Representative Phillip Doddridge (Virginia)	Nov. 19, 1862
30	9-10	Representative John Smilie (Pennsylvania)	Dec. 30, 1812
	11-12	Representative John Dawson (Virginia)	Mar. 31, 1814
	13-14	1st Secretary of Senate Samuel A. Otis (Massachusetts)	Apr. 22, 1814
	24-25	Lt. James Morrison (8th Pennsylvania)	Apr. 23, 1823
	28	Lt. William Rose, 4th Artillery	Nov. 22, 1825
	32-33	Commodore Ridgely, U.S. Navy, wife of	Aug. —, 1830
	34-36	Son and daughter of Commodore Isaac Chauncey, U.S. Navy	
	37-38	Representative Thomas Tucker (South Carolina)	May 2, 1828
	39-40	Wife of Representative Daniel D. Barnard (New York)	Mar. —, 1829
	51-53	Representative Thomas Singleton (South Carolina)	Nov. 23, 1833
	54-56	Representative Timothy J. Carter (Maine)	Mar. 14, 1938
	66-68	Representative Warren R. Davis (South Carolina)	Jan. 29, 1835
	72-73	Representatives James Blair (South Carolina)	Apr. 1, 1834
	69-71	Representative Littleton P. Dennis (Maryland)	Apr. 14, 1834
	97	Maj. James Kinney (New Jersey)	July —, 1832
31	24	Children of Senator William E. Purcell (South Dakota)	
	25-27	Wife of Surgeon Edw. Catbush, U.S. Navy	
	32-34	Prussian Minister Frederick Gresham	Dec. 1, 1823
	38-40	Commodore Richard Henry O'Brien, U.S. Navy	Feb. 14, 1824
	41-42	Choctaw Chief Push-Ma-Ta-Ha	Dec. 24, 1824
	43-44	Senator Joseph Anderson (Tennessee)	Apr. 17, 1837
	45-46	Acting Quartermaster General L. C. Pickett et ux	July —, 1872
	47-49	Representative Theodoric Bland (Virginia)	June 1, 1790
	50-52	Representative George Holcombe (New Jersey)	Jan. 14, 1828
	53-55	Representative Joab Lawler (Alabama)	May 8, 1838
	56-58	Delegate Narsworthy Hunter (Mississippi)	Mar. 11, 1802
	62-64	Representative Jeremiah McLene (Ohio)	Mar. 19, 1837
	74	Lt. Henry E. Sill, U.S. Army and children	Dec. —, 1845
33	16	Surgeon Elisha Harrison, 4th Maryland	Aug. 28, 1819
	30	Architect George Hadfield	Feb. —, 1826
	32	Astronomer William Elliott	Dec. —, 1827
	39-41	Dr. William Thornton, Architect; 1st Commissioner of Patents	Mar. 28, 1828
35	111	Robert Mills, 1st Federal Architect	Jan. —, 1856
40	44	Capt. John Looney (Cherokee)	May 16, 1846
50	49-51	Senate Sergeant at Arms Mountjoy Bailly	Mar. —, 1836
	169-170	Attorney General William Wirt and family	—— —, 1853
52	24-25	Gen. Philip Stuart (Virginia)	—— —, 1830
54	104-106	Representative John W. Hornbeck (Pennsylvania)	Jan. 10, 1848
	116-118	Representative Henry Frick (Pennsylvania)	Mar. 1, 1844
	119-121	Representative William Taylor (Virginia)	Jan. 17, 1846
	131-133	Representative Albert G. Harrison (Missouri)	Sept. 7, 1839
	140	Children of Senator Samuel L. Southard (New Jersey)	
	146-147	Children of Capt. Beverly Kennon, U.S. Navy	
	149-152	Surgeon General Joseph Lovell, U.S. Army et ux	Jan. —, 1844
	153-155	Representative Benjamin Thompson (Massachusetts)	Sept. 24, 1852
55	101-103	Representative Francis J. Harper (Pennsylvania)	Mar. 18, 1837
	107-109	Representative Edward Bradley (Michigan)	Aug. 5, 1847
	113-115	Representative Felix G. McConnell (Alabama)	Sept. 10, 1846
	140-142	Senator and Secretary of War Samuel L. Southard (New Jersey)	June 26, 1842
	147-149	Maj. Gen. Alexander McComb, U.S. Marine Corp	June 25, 1844
	150-152	Commodore Patterson, U.S. Navy	Aug. 25, 1839
	162-164	Senator William Upham (Vermont)	Jan. 14, 1853
173	----------	Gen. Archibald Henderson, U.S. Marine Corp Commandant for 39 years	Jan. 6, 1859
56	12	Child of Architect Latrobe	
	96-98	British Minister Henry Stephen Fox	Nov. —1847
	101-103	Representative William A. Burwell (Virginia)	Feb. 16, 1821
	104-106	Representative Daniel Hiester (Pennsylvania)	Mar. 8, 1834
	137-139	Representative Joseph Lawrence (Pennsylvania)	Apr. 17, 1842
	140-141	Major General Gibson	Sept. 30, 1861
	145-152	Secretary of Navy (Commodore) John Rodgers	Aug. 1, 1838
57	1	Capt. Thomas Tingey et ux. (1st commandant Navy Yard)	Feb. 23, 1829
	144-146	Supreme Court Associate Justice Philip P. Barbour	Feb. 24, 1841
	150-152	Maj. Gen. Jacob Brown	Feb. —, 1828
	159-161	Child of Secretary of War Benjamin Stoddert	

Range	Sites	Identification	Date of death
59	82–83	Senator John M. Thurston (Nebraska)	Aug. 9, 1916
	84–86	Senator William N. Roach (Maryland)	Sept. 7, 1902
	87–89	House Page Davidson	Jan. 7, 1896
60	57–59	Senator James Gillespie (North Carolina)	Jan. 11, 1805
	60–62	Representative Lemuel J. Bowden (Virginia)	Jan. 2, 1864
67	82	Lt. Gustav B. von Buchenhagen, Company D, 79th New York Infantry	Jan. —, 1863
	103	Lt. Col. Randolph Knight, 10th New York Heavy Artillery	—— —, 1862
72	119–120	Photographer Matthew Brady et ux	Jan. —, 1896
75–78	162–165	Marine Band leader and composer John Philip Sousa	Mar. 6, 1932
81	55	Gen. Charles F. Henningsen, Confederate Army	June —, 1877
	94	Lt. Col. Gustav von Gerber, 68th New York Infantry	Nov. 19, 1831
	95	Lt. and Adjutant Ludwig Haak, 29th New York Infantry	Jan. 28, 1862
	85	95	Lt. John F. Kleefish, 68th New York Infantry	Sept. 22, 1862
	86	60	Capt. R. S. Farrow, Confederate Army	Apr. 1, 1865
	87	293	Maj. (Choctaw Chief) Peter Paul Pitchlynn	Apr. —, 1881
	95	88	Major Pettigrew	Dec. —, 1862
	96	300	Capt. Lewis A. Livingston	Nov. —, 1882
97–98	142–146	21 young women who died following explosion of U.S. Arsenal in District of Columbia	June 17, 1864
	147	258	Col. E. A. McHenry, U.S. Marine Corps	

Economic Sanctions Can Influence Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, because South Florida is such a short distance from Cuba, and our people have been friendly to each other throughout our history, the people in our area are particularly concerned by developments in Cuba, and our Government's reaction to these developments.

An editorial in the Pompano Beach Sun-Sentinel June 29, by editor Harvey Call, points up the problem with Cuba clearly and resolutely. The House of Representatives has acted since this editorial appeared, to give the President the authority he says he needs in dealing with Cuba, by authorizing him to set whatever sugar quota he believes should be granted Cuba.

I believe all Members will be interested in reading Mr. Call's remarks on this important matter, and I ask that his editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD:

ECONOMIC SANCTIONS CAN INFLUENCE CUBA
(By Harvey A. Call)

Representative PAUL C. ROGERS, our congressional spokesman from this district, has stepped forward with a demand the United States assume a positive role of leadership in the matter of Communist Cuba.

He views America's prestige as a world leader slipping in Latin American countries as our passive "wait-and-see" attitude produces no results.

Certainly nations throughout the world must be bug-eyed to see communism gaining a foothoold on our doorstep. Many people must wonder why those closest to us find living under communism preferable to democracy.

Truly this challenge will go far to determining our future in world affairs.

Mr. ROGERS believes a call should be issued for the Organization of American States to convene. He maintains the countries of the hemisphere have every right to expect that we will assume positive leadership and take positive action.

The American people have a right to expect the same. We have a right to expect a foreign policy that will put us in a stronger position and guard against enemy threats a few miles from our homes.

Possibly Mr. ROGERS is right in the call for an OAS gathering.

But what can be accomplished unless we have a definite policy to lay before the American States?

There are not too many choices.

We can continue our wait-and-see policy, hoping the Cuban people may rise up and unseat Castro. That, of course, is a negative, ineffective policy.

We can wage a battle of diplomatic notes—none of which would be as pointed nor heated as Castro's tirades.

We could stage repeated shows of military might, parading our warships around and around the island and massing air fleets in the area for maneuvers.

We can mass Armed Forces at our Cuban bases.

We could and probably should pick up the idea of Radio Free Europe and jam Cuban airways with a Radio Free Cuba operation.

We could, but certainly would not, attempt any military operations infringing on Cuba's sovereignty.

We could launch a program of economic sanctions.

Whether our Government will do any of these things remains to be seen. It remains to be seen whether the people are at all interested in positive action.

The people of south Florida are closest to all that Communist Cuba represents. Yet we wonder if many people here would support any specific action—economic sanctions, for example.

Let's see what would be involved.

First, economic sanctions in some degree have been applied already. Cuban tourism has fallen virtually to zero.

This has not come about because of any desire to retaliate financially against Cuba. Rather it has been a desire of prospective tourists to protect their own skins from the bullets of radicals and to avoid possible imprisonment on trumped-up charges.

However, economic sanctions would involve cutting off Cuban sugar imports among other things. Congress is leaning toward this. People of Florida and throughout the United States are contributing more than $150 million in taxes this year to subsidize the Communist workers and Castro's radicals through the sugar prices.

Why should we spend our tax dollars to help Castro and his Red henchmen build up a propaganda organization and a military stronghold against us?

Is this wise even though American money is sunk into Cuba's sugar operations?

Our present situation is very much like that preceding World War II when scrap iron was being shipped out of our ports to Japan where it was made into munitions used later against our Armed Forces.

We could take our sugar trade and all other trade to more friendly nations. Whether this would bring Cuba to its knees and hasten the ouster of Castro and his ilk remains to be seen. At least we would not have an enemy build-up nearby at the expense of American tax dollars and American consumers.

We could go farther and make it clear to other nations that trading with Cuba would be considered unfriendly and might well bring related economic reprisals.

As consumers, we certainly could bring pressure to bear on American companies dealing in Cuban products.

If the American consumers chose to take the initiative, it would not be the first time in our history they led the way rather than followed meekly. The Boston Tea Party will be remembered as the classic example of such action against foreign goods and their related implications.

Bostonians, however, were more concerned over the principles of taxation and representation.

Our concern is the threat to our way of life, the threat of foreign military action, which is a far greater concern—or seemingly it should be. As Mr. ROGERS told Congress, the Cuban situation "now threatens the collective security of the entire hemisphere."

Surely that is impelling enough to move all of us sitting ducks to make up our minds and do what we can to fight back.

Commonwealth Edison's Atomic Power Reactor at Dresden, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave ot extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include a statement in regard to America's first large-scale, privately owned, atomic power reactor operated by Commonwealth Edison at Dresden, Ill.:

CHICAGO, ILL., June 30.—Commonwealth Edison's Dresden nuclear power station, the Nation's largest atomic power plant has demonstrated full-power operation sending 180,000 kilowatts of electricity over transmission lines into Chicago and northern Illinois, it was announced today.

At full power the Nation's first full-scale, privately financed station produces enough electricity to supply the needs of a city of more than 200,000 population.

After this demonstration, tests at various power levels will be performed.

Officials of General Electric Co., designer and builder of the $51 million plant, called the first full power operation a milestone which indicates atomic energy has at last assumed its place alongside coal, oil, gas, and hydro electric as an important source of power for peacetime generation of electicity.

The achievement at Dresden, located 50 miles southwest of downtown Chicago, comes almost 18 years after the atomic age was ushered in here when Enrico Fermi achieved the first atomic chain reaction under the stands of Stagg Field at the University of Chicago on December 2, 1942.

Dresden, which was under construction 3 years—and completed within the original

schedule—will be one of the prime sources of information on the operation of large nuclear electric plants for the next 4 years, as it will hold the distinction of being the Nation's largest operating nuclear power reactor for at least that long.

Dresden produced its first electricity in April when it was operated up to the half power levels for 2 weeks as part of the start-up test program for the station.

The station's boiling water reactor achieved its initial atomic chain reaction on October 15, 1959, after the first 28 uranium fuel elements were installed in the reactor core.

Since then the reactor has been loaded to its present 452 fuel elements as testing operations were conducted at various levels of fuel loading.

Extensive reactor fuel development will continue during coming years in connection with power operations. Information gained from these programs is expected to lead to significant improvements in the design of later nuclear power stations and to reduce the cost of nuclear electric power.

Electricity from the Dresden station is the same as that from other powerplants. Steam is produced by the heat from the nuclear fuel rather than from coal, gas, or oil, and is fed to a turbine-generator unit to produce electricity in the usual manner.

The steam is made directly in the reactor, which takes the place of the boiler in the conventional power station.

Commonwealth Edison engineers estimate the 66-ton uranium dioxide fuel supply will provide 3½ years of heat for full capacity operation of the station.

A conventional coal-fired plant of the same capacity would consume 2 million tons of coal during the same period.

While Dresden will not produce electricity as cheaply as a conventional plant, it was felt that construction of large nuclear plants is essential to help develop the technical information necessary to reduce the cost of nuclear plants in the future.

General Electric built Dresden for a fixed contract price of $45 million. Site and overhead costs added an additional $6 million to the cost of the station.

Commonwealth Edison Co. is paying $30 million, plus the site and overhead costs. The $15 million balance of the contract price is being paid by the Nuclear Power Group, Inc., as a research and development expense.

General Electric also is contributing substantial amounts above the contract price for additional research and development expense.

The Nuclear Power Group consists of Commonwealth Edison, American Electric Power Service Corp., Central Illinois Light Co., Illinois Power Co., Kansas City Power & Light Co., Pacific Gas & Electric Co., and Union Electric Co.

"People's Capitalism" Through Stock Ownership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the continuing increase in the number of American families who own stock is a welcome indication of the health of our economic system. This is what has often been called "people's capitalism"—evidence of the great stake which all our people have in the private economic system. A recent study by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan indicates however, the extent to which individual and family participation in our private economic system can grow through wider stock ownership. Thus, while 14 percent of U.S. families now own publicly traded common stock, as compared to 10 percent in 1955 and 8 percent in 1952, there is still a large, untapped opportunity for our society. The "Own a Share of America" campaign of the New York Stock Exchange and other national security exchanges has contributed greatly to this trend and can continue to do so in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that an article in the New York Times of June 26, 1960, reporting on these common stock ownership trends, may be printed as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 26, 1960]

STOCKOWNERSHIP BY FAMILIES RISES—SURVEY FINDS 14 PERCENT, MOSTLY IN UPPER-INCOME BRACKET, HOLD COMMON SHARES

ANN ARBOR, MICH., June 25.—The number of families owning publicly traded common stock has increased greatly in the last few years, according to a study by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center. But the ownership of this stock continues to be highly concentrated in upper-income families.

The report, made public recently, compares stock ownership and income on a family-by-family basis. The findings were based on interviews with a representative sample of 4,773 families conducted between last November and February.

Among the study's highlights were these:

Slightly more than 14 percent of U.S. families own publicly traded common stock today, compared with about 10 percent in 1955 and less than 8 percent in 1952.

Of those owning common stock, one-third estimate their total holdings are worth less than $1,000, while another third put the value of their stock at between $1,000 and $5,000.

One family in fifty has holdings worth $25,000 or more.

The 2½ percent of all families who have incomes of more than $15,000 and are stockholders own 42 percent of the value of all privately held stock.

Among all those who own stock, 2 out of 5 have shares in only 1 corporation. An average of less than 1 out of 5 has a diversified portfolio of 7 or more stocks.

Stock ownership, the survey showed, is concentrated among professional and managerial families, and those whose breadwinners have a college education. When viewed by age, stockholders in general—and especially large stockholders—are most frequently found among family heads whose age is between 45 and 65.

Only a small proportion of those families with incomes of less than $5,000 owns stock. Even among families with incomes of more than $15,000, only 55 percent own publicly traded stock.

Prof. George Katona, director of the Survey Research Center's economic behavior program, said that attitudes toward taking risks and inflation tended to explain why some upper-income families owned stock and why some did not.

But he said that the study showed more people with lower incomes were buying stock now than did in the past.

"More and more families," Professor Katona continued, "are interested in diversifying their financial reserves. Yet overwhelmingly, the amount invested in common stock by new shareholders is small."

Panama Canal Zone Citizens Express Concern for U.S. Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, the growing concern of U.S. citizens in the Panama Canal Zone for the deteriorating condition of American prestige over the sovereignty issue is attested to in two letters I have just received from the Canal Zone in this morning's mail.

The letters follow:

VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Balboa, Canal Zone, June 30, 1960.

Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: In going through my March issue of the VFW magazine, I came across a couple of photographs, pages 21, 22, respectively; which clearly indicates in more ways than one, that you are a lifelong friend of the veterans organization I represent. More so, you are a boyhood friend and fellow Pennsylvanian of our VFW National Commander in Chief Louis G. Feldmann. It is my sincere desire that you consider me a personal friend you have known for a number of years; that I too am a member of this wonderful organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, always fighting for our human rights which our forefathers fought and died for which is now vested in our Constitution of the United States.

A few days ago, I had occasion to speak to Mr. Frank Wilder, who is a member of the Panama Canal Company's internal security staff, directly in charge of the surveillance of communism in this area. Quite a coincidence, but Mr. Wilder was one of my schoolteachers at the time I attended my former alma mater the Balboa High School.

He is much concerned with the recent developments and the manner in which communism is spreading in the Republic of Panama in recent years, as well as the flag-raising of the Panamian flag in the Canal Zone. He expounded emphatically the legislative resources our organizations and other veterans organizations have resorted too in the past in order to make ourselves heard within our U.S. Congress, in order to make the preventative measures which would help curtail the flag-raising in the Canal Zone. Therefore, it is due to this matter that I am writing you in order to receive some more strong support in the desires of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the Department of the Panama Canal Zone that the Panamanian flag shall never wave on the Canal Zone's soil.

Another matter of grave concern is that since last November 3, when the U.S. flag was torn from its staff in front of the American Embassy in the Republic of Panama, the Embassy since that time has not flown their flag. However, all other nationalities embassies in the Republic of Panama fly the flags of their respective country daily. Therefore, why is it that the State Department will not compel the American Ambassador to Panama to fly the flag of our country, the United States of America.

Our present, and newly elected VFW department commander for this district will be attending the national convention in Detroit in August, however, being that time is so short before Congress adjourns, he is also forwarding a letter to the national com-

mander also advising him regarding this matter herein mentioned.

We expect to have strong support at the national convention concerning our flag controversy.

I may also add that a resolution is going forward by this department to the national convention in order that the matter will be properly brought before the convention body in session.

We do not want the Panamanian flag flying on the Canal Zone, under no circumstances. Make them have their titular sovereignty without the flag.

I am hoping that this letter reaches you in time, prior to the adjournment of Congress, in order that some action may be taken by the President upon the adjournment of Congress.

I am certain that you will be receiving other letters in the mail soon from other civic and veterans' organizations in this area pleading for your continued effort in backing this flag-raising issue.

Enclosed you will find a page copy of the recent issue of the Panama American, one of our evening dailies within the Republic of Panama, in order that you can appreciate more so the problem I am referring to in my letter.

Thanking you for your patience in this respect, I remain,

Yours truly,

FELIPI CAZOBON.

JUNE 30, 1960.

DEAR SIR: From what I can see the United States is cooperating with its own funeral giving ground every day in every way with the Communist method of seizure day by day anything and everything it can grab. Down here even the colored maid is wise to the game being played and now regards the American with a mixture of contempt and amusement that people of any race could be so stupid. With the courage and confidence that some people get when they know they are on the winning side. Cowardly is the word for us. We disregard warnings, take another sleeping pill when we are faced with a fight, bow and scrape and turn the other cheek. Right now we are practically living on Panamanian food at their prices, sold in the commissaries and the colored girls who work in the stores loot and raid every week or so. Thieves wander the streets in the Canal Zone grabbing anything they see loose, it's a ridiculously one-sided battle. Everyone is afraid to protest—afraid of losing their jobs—afraid one honest outburst of temper will upset the delicately balanced political apple cart and endanger our places in Latin America. By this time our enemies are more confident than ever, so much can be accomplished under the table.

DISGUSTED AMERICAN.

P.S.—Kindly destroy this letter. I don't want my husband to lose his job.

A Plea for Shorter Presidential Campaigns

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, another powerful voice has been heard from in support of reducing the length of our presidential campaigns, a result which would be effected by the enactment of either House Joint Resolution 547 or H.R. 9584, both of which bills were introduced by me and which would restrict presidential campaigns to 60 days.

The article "Is the Presidential Campaign Too Long?" which appeared in the June 27, 1960, issue of Time is an eloquent plea for this intelligent political reform.

The article follows:

IS THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN TOO LONG?—BOTH ALLIES AND CANDIDATES THINK SO

Every 4 years, in just about the length of time it takes to produce a baby hippopotamus, the United States brings forth a President. From the first, frosty preprimary campaigning in February until the last hurrah in November, the Nation becomes increasingly absorbed with its own inner stirrings, increasingly detached from the affairs of the outside world. In happier times, the United States could afford its quadrennial "year of paralysis" while an indulgent world stood by until everything was once more in order in Washington. But in the presidential election year of 1960—the year of the Communists' world propaganda push—the flaws of the long campaign are more and more apparent. Among them:

During lengthy campaigns too many foreign policy pronouncements are designed for domestic consumption, to the confusion of the U.S. allies. "As the date of the American elections grows nearer," said sagacious old Konrad Adenauer last week, "a difficult time in foreign policy begins. Public opinion in the United States will be increasingly preoccupied with domestic affairs. It is not excluded that Khrushchev will take advantage of this period for his designs. It is now all the more necessary to pay closest attention to what Khrushchev does and says."

The 22d amendment, restricting U.S. Presidents to two terms, tempts foreign nations to put less and less trust in a second-term President's policies. Khrushchev, in his airy dismissal of the Eisenhower administration ("Within 6 to 8 months, we shall again meet * * * in a new, more favorable atmosphere"), had not missed the point.

The long campaign is debilitating, tedious, and expensive for the candidates. "Obviously a year of perambulating, incessant exposure is exhausting," says Adlai Stevenson. "You grow weary, frustrated, and bored. Any man who has listened to himself several times daily since February is not likely to inspire his countrymen in October." In the 5 months between New Hampshire and Los Angeles, Front Runner JACK KENNEDY will have traveled an estimated 65,000 air miles, spent at least $700,000, and delivered 350 speeches—an exhausting pace even for a relatively young candidate, and a whopping bankroll even for a millionaire. KENNEDY is not likely to complain, since seven primary campaigns have made him the best-known hopeful. But even if he wins the Democratic nomination, KENNEDY will be no closer to election day than the halfway mark.

Despite democracy's built-in respect for political debate, the public actually gains little enlightenment from prolonged campaigning. Today's candidate carefully parcels out his program over the length of the campaign and understandably saves the best for last. He usually avoids debates like the plague for fear of making an embarrassing slip. Said Woodrow Wilson, from the rear platform of a 1912 campaign train: "I would a great deal rather make your acquaintance than leave a compound fracture of an idea behind me." Adds Vice President RICHARD NIXON: "The longer the candidate is in the field, the greater the hazard to him. No candidate wants to lay out an entire program for 1961 in January 1960."

Even with an extended campaign, the best man is not always selected (Clay, Webster, and Greeley were all defeated by lesser statesmen). Nor is a razzle-dazzle road show a prerequisite to victory on election day: William McKinley, in 1896, and Warren G. Harding, in 1920, won easily with "front-porch" campaigns, letting the groups of voters and the politicians come to them. And Franklin Roosevelt used the pressures of wartime as a reason for limiting his campaign appearances outside Washington to a bare minimum in 1940 and 1944.

National elections in Britain and France are run off in 3 to 6 weeks. Even in such leisurely oriental nations as Burma and Cambodia, where political campaigns are measured off by astrologers, an election is no more time-consuming than 2 months. In an age of jet planes and television, and short-order speeches by ghosts, say the critics, U.S. campaigns are as outmoded as the Stanley Steamer.

While the reformers would all foreshorten the election year, they all disagree on the methods of change. Some would eliminate the State primaries; others would settle for a national primary, or 50 State primaries in the same week. The conventions might be pushed forward to August or September, or election day moved back. There is no universal panacea. Says DICK NIXON, facing the toughest campaign of his life: "The campaigns are certainly too long for the well-being of the candidates. Here is one place where I think our British cousins have a good word. They have a 3-week campaign, and I'd be for it. But I doubt if the American people would ever stand for it." Historian Allan Nevins is not so sure: "There is no ideal solution for something so complicated. Democracies always work in a partially unsatisfactory way and are necessarily clumsy. There is no one highly efficient method for the 180 million people who live in our democratic society. But the need for drastic reform of our political campaigns is obvious."

Keenotes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIZABETH KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a copy of my newsletter released today.

KEENOTES

(By Representative ELIZABETH KEE)

The other day I had the unique experience of voting against a proposal which earlier I had endorsed and fully expected to support.

The legislation in question authorized the United States to invest almost $400 million in the International Development Association—a new international agency designed to make investment capital available to the underdeveloped areas of the world.

In effect, this is a "distressed areas" bill on a world-wide scale. It may be a sound approach to the urgent need for providing capital for new nations to use in building necessary business and industrial facilities.

I voted against it because it is part of a growing trend which seems to establish a "double standard." We seem to be willing to undertake programs abroad which are turned down at home.

The President vetoed economic redevelopment legislation that is urgently needed in West Virginia and other States. But the President put the full influence of his administration behind the new international agency to do the same thing on a world-wide scale.

I felt compelled to vote against IDA as a protest against this "double standard."

VETERANS' HOME LOAN PROGRAM EXTENDED

I voted for legislation to extend for 2 years a program for guaranteed and direct home loans for veterans. The direct loans are urgently needed in small towns and rural areas where guaranteed loans are simply not available.

The legislation makes $300 million available during the 2 years for loans to veterans. This will meet only a part of the anticipated need. The hope is that during the next 2 years mortgage money will become available at interest rates veterans can afford and thus will do away with the need of legislation such as this.

COAL RESEARCH LEGISLATION CLEARS SENATE

The Senate approved legislation setting up a new coal research program in the Department of the Interior. Earlier in the session the House passed similar legislation.

The bill has been rewritten to meet objections raised last year when the President vetoed a research bill along the same lines. There would be absolutely no justification for the President refusing to sign this bill.

We need urgently to develop new uses for coal and to make coal more competitive with other fuels. Research is an indispensable tool in this campaign. The petroleum industry spends about $300 million a year on research. Only $17 million goes into coal research.

It is significant that all segments of the industry carried on a united and determined campaign in favor of this legislation.

RECESS CATCHES EVERYONE BY SURPRISE

The announcement that Congress would recess and reconvene in August, after the conventions, was a big surprise to just about everyone in Washington. We had been making good progress on a large backlog of bills. But the leadership felt some of the bills, highly controversial in nature, should have more deliberate consideration than they could possibly receive in the closing hours of this session. So a recess will be taken. I hope that the people of the country will benefit by this action.

National Defense Cutback in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, about 6 months ago the Air Force made known its intention to strengthen the 449th Fighter Interceptor Squadron at Ladd Air Force Base, Alaska, which was consistent with Alaska's strategic nearness to Russia and its importance as a bastion of national defense. In May the Air Force declared a plan to deactivate the 449th during the latter part of this year, just before the U–2 incident and the summit collapse. These events intensified the protests from Alaska and other States, and in turn, prompted the Secretary of Defense to state that the Air Force decision would be reviewed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Now, without any reference to the study and deliberations if any, of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Air Force has announced that it is also going to transfer other activities from Ladd AFB by 1961, leaving 30 military and 25 civilians to operate the Aeromedical Laboratory, which constitutes a virtual close down of Ladd Field. I consider that this would be a shocking cutback in the face of the worsened cold war situation. The following news article from the Anchorage Daily Times of June 30 quoting both Alaska's Gov. William A. Egan, and Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, head of the Alaskan command, illuminates the issue, and is as follows:

WASHINGTON.—Alaska's congressional delegation and governor joined today in protests against the Air Force plan to shut down its big Ladd base at Fairbanks.

Senators ERNEST GRUENING and E. L. BARTLETT and Representative RALPH J. RIVERS wired President Eisenhower asking for an appointment to discuss the Ladd situation.

Gov. William Egan, attending the national Governor's conference at Glacier National Park, Mont., said the Air Force action is "like calling the sentry in from the main lookout post on a night of danger."

BARTLETT called the Air Force decision "a deplorable step backward when the need is for build up in Alaska defenses.

"Even allowing for transfers from Ladd Air Force Base to other installations in Alaska," BARTLETT said, "the plans announced yesterday call for a net loss to the 49th State of 2,420 trained military personnel and 455 trained civilians.

"It makes no sense to reduce even further all defenses in the most strategic area under the American flag."

In Anchorage, Lt. Gen. Frank A. Armstrong, head of the Alaskan command, said "My feelings and recommendations on this subject remain unchanged. However, the decision having been made, I am confident that it is recognized that it is my duty as commander in chief of Alaska to accomplish the mission of the Alaskan command with the forces made available to me."

The Air Force made public yesterday its plans to deactivate the 449th Interceptor Squadron at Ladd. It hinted of a possibility of the Army taking over the base.

Egan's warning came a day after Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller told the Governors' conference that the United States is wide open to a nuclear attack, and virtually incapable of retaliating.

"This means we would have nothing in Alaska," Egan said.

In an interview at Glacier, the Governor said:

"The people of the United States generally feel that Alaska is a bastion of defense-offense. Such is not the case, even if Ladd Field would continue functioning as it is now.

"With the deactivation of the 44th Interceptor Squadron it meant that in all of Alaska—based on statements of the Defense Department itself—there will be only 33 interceptor fighter planes.

"This means the weakening of an area that is now strictly defensive at the present time from the standpoint of offensive-defensive weapons.

"I also say that, because last September, General Armstrong, the commander in chief of all Alaskan military, said if Alaska was attacked we would be in one hell of a fix. Those were his words.

"Ever since that time, we in Alaska have been doing everything possible in an attempt to convince the powers that be in the Pentagon that we were not offering proper protection on the firing line for the citizens of the United States.

"In Alaska, we have no intermediate range ballistic missiles or intercontinental ballistic missiles.

"The withdrawal of Ladd Field would mean that everything in the offensive-defensive makeup of our new State would be concentrated at Elmendorf AFB near Anchorage."

"In a conversation with our senatorial delegation—Senators BOB BARTLETT and ERNEST GRUENING—Gen. Curtis LeMay, the vice chief of staff for the Air Force, several weeks ago said any attack by an aggressor would be launched against our west coast.

"It just doesn't make sense to me or to our Senators that with Alaska miles from an area where we know there exists 26 or 27 missile sites of the Russians, that we would leave Alaska wide open and wait for help to come from the lower west coast, regardless of how fast our start of bombers or our fighter squadrons are.

"Valuable time is bound to be lost in our Alaskan area, where they could save valuable minutes or an hour or so.

"I imagine they are planning to move the Army units from Eielson AFB to serve more or less as custodians of the strategic base that has existed at Ladd Field.

"I made a vigorous protest to Defense Secretary Gates. He assured me right at the top level that there would be a total evaluation before any definite decision was made regarding the deactivation of Ladd AFB.

"It is my strong opinion that the Congress of the United States, or the appropriate committees should institute an immediate investigation into the entire thinking of those who are presently charged with our defense."

The Alaska Governor, a Democrat, said when the New York Republican Governor was assailing the national defense setup, he was aware of the peril to Ladd AFB. He added:

"I refrained purposely from the discussions. I felt the situation insofar as Alaska is concerned was receiving sincere consideration. I didn't want to be placed in a position—just prior to the national political conventions—that might be construed to cause the military not to consider our situation in Alaska.

"However, now this has become utterly ridiculous from the view of anyone who is remotely interested with the Alaskan defense, that may mean more than any other single State in the United States."

The Alaskan Governor said earlier talks with the military indicated the high costs of transportation involving Alaska figured importantly.

"I am pleased to know that our Air Force generals are trying to hold down costs," Egan said. "But to have them allow the cost of transportation to be a prime factor in deciding whether they shall allow the United States to have necessary defenses in any place on the globe is completely off base."

What Has Happened to Our Independence?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of one of the most glorious events in our Nation's history, I respectfully ask the Members of this body to take note of an editorial which succinctly places in focus what I agree seems to be the motivating philosophy behind the national and international policies and programs of our Government today.

This editorial is from the July 1 issue of the Home News, of Hialeah-Miami Springs, Fla.

I share the writer's hope that on the occasion of the 184th celebration of Independence Day by our citizens, serious thought will be given to the need for refreshing and invigorating our national philosophy and purpose with the spirit of independent leadership, courage, and the kind of positive American thinking which led to July 4, 1776.

The editorial follows:

WHAT HAS HAPPENED TO OUR INDEPENDENCE?

On July 4, 1776, the Colonies that later became the United States of America declared their independence of Britain.

Independence—what pride it gave birth to. What vast energies it unleashed. What dreams it sired into glorious realities.

One hundred and eighty-four years have passed since that magnificent July 4 when our independence as a nation was declared.

Thanks to a kind providence, we are still a sovereign nation, still proud, still strong, still energetic.

No foreign tyrant occupies our shores. No taxes do we pay to an alien government. No arbitrary dictator tells us for whom we shall vote, or what we shall do with our individual lives.

ESSENTIAL INGREDIENT MISSING

Yet it takes no pundit to realize that somewhere along the line we have misplaced an essential ingredient of our national independence—call it the part that is emotional and intellectual.

The truth of the matter, as this writer views it, is that we are reacting to Russia instead of vice versa. It would seem that Russia itches and we scratch. Russia is bilious and we burp. Russia lets out a notch in her belt and we breathe a sigh of relief.

In the spirit of our forefathers' hopes and deeds, we would very much like to see us as a Nation again initiating our own independent thought and action.

We would like us to be free, once and for all, of that national neurosis in which we seem to be playing one angle of a romantic triangle—with Russia at the opposite end and both countries, like jealous rivals, striving to win the favor of the rest of the world.

HANG ON RUSSIA'S WORDS

Through the endless repetitions of radio, television, and the syndicated press, we have been hanging on every word and gesture of Russia and have been tailoring our actions accordingly.

We rushed to improve our educational system—for example, not because it is fundamentally sound to provide the best kind of education for our youth—but because Russia is concentrating on superior education and we became fearful.

We have been giving foreign aid to certain countries—not because it is decent to help countries in need—but because we fear that if we don't, Russia will get there first and win it over through its own aid program.

HASTE TO DESEGREGATE

Much of our headlong haste into desegregation has been engendered by trepidation of how Russia will use facets of our country's internal situation for propaganda purposes.

Thus, without being consciously aware of it, and in a wholly negative way, we have allowed Russia to dominate both our domestic and our foreign policies. We have, in the process, permitted ourselves to fall into neurotic thralldom to a country we neither respect nor admire.

This is not to imply that our feeling is that Russia is to be disregarded as a military threat—quite the reverse. But we yearn for the time when our great country stops behaving like one of the children of Hamelin, with the Red Pied Piper calling the tune.

We yearn for the spirit of independent leadership inspired by such Presidents as Teddy and Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Yes, we yearn for the self-confident, glorious, inspired, stubborn, magnificent spirit of 1776.

U.S. General Raps Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, U.S. Army, retired, is widely recognized as a student of the history and evolution of the Communist threat to world peace. His criticism of Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery's statements on Red China is worthy of study by all:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Evening News, June 30, 1960]

U.S. GENERAL RAPS MONTGOMERY

EDITORS, TIMES-LEADER NEWS:

Field Marshal Viscount Montgomery deservedly won the acclaim and gratitude of the British people and of the Allied nations for his outsanding achievements in World War II. I have been privileged to know the field marshal—not intimately, but sufficiently well to admire his intellectual integrity, exemplary leadership, and sound judgment in military tactics. However, his recent comments concerning Red China convince me that this fine old soldier should relax on his laurels within the soldiers' domain and avoid the pitfalls within the international arena.

I find it difficult to rationalize the fact that the loquacious field marshal is oblivious to the problems created by Communist China and their relation to the future status of the entire Far East, including Hong Kong-Kow-loon. I am reminded of Katherine Mayo who, after a brief visit to India many years ago, became a self-styled expert concerning the diverse problems in "Mother India." Similarly, Lord Montgomery made a 4-day visit to a country extending over 4 million square miles, within whose borders live more than half a billion people, where he was exposed to the archconspirators Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai—both sly and shameless, both particularly adept at distorting facts. He expressed the following provocative views concerning his visit:

"China is commonly supposed to be a nation of unhappy and depressed people, downtrodden, and exploited by ruthless leaders and starved into submission, with fear abroad throughout the land. This may be true of the old China, but this is not true of the new China. Such ignorant comment about China does immense harm to the affairs of the Western world * * *; too many people exploit falsehood as truth and imaginaries as realities."

The field marshal continued: "I saw in Communist China everywhere a happy, laughing people—cheerful, friendly, and seemingly contented with their lot."

Obviously he is unaware of ample evidence concerning the massive famines in China of recent date and the official police action required to crush ruthlessly the dissident elements rioting for food. Nor has he heard the testimony of Chinese refugees in Hong Kong and Macao, where over 300 are slipping across the borders daily to leave the land that Lord Montgomery describes so glowingly.

He expressed admiration for the Communist leaders Mao Tse-tung and Chou En-lai. During World War II, I had occasional contacts with these two men, as I had with others of both the Nationalist and Communist Parties. Of course the Red leaders were charming and disarming with the British field marshal. But there is the irrefutable proof, which is available throughout the free world and therefore to Montgomery, that they are crafty, rapacious individuals who operate completely within the discipline of the Communist movement.

The American labor organization AFL–CIO conducted a thorough research and analysis of conditions on mainland China. This revealed that approximately 14 million people have been killed by the Communist regime in the last decade; a congressional committee estimated that 20 million had been killed in the same period; and the Free Chinese Government on Taiwan estimated that upward of 40 million have been murdered by the benevolent regime which so favorably impressed the British Field Marshal.

Naively Lord Montgomery accepted Mao Tse-tung's statement that there is widespread hatred of the United States throughout China and that this had its genesis at the time of the Marshall mission in 1945. Mao Tse-tung expressed Chinese resentment of United States interference in the affairs of the nation. If the British field marshal were knowledgeable concerning the facts, he would have, as a respected representative of the Western World, pointed out that the Americans were in China by invitation of responsible officials of the recognized government. Then he might have properly asked if the Chinese Communists had been likewise invited into Tibet, Indochina, Malaya, India, and Korea—all recent victims of naked Chinese Communist aggression.

Suggesting that the free world has nothing whatever to fear from Red China, the British field marshal stated, "China has far too much on her own plate to want to expand outwardly, either physically or ideologically." Viewed realistically China must expand in some direction, for her arable land is much too limited to provide for an ever-increasing population, already denied sufficient shelter, food, and sources of employment. Furthermore, every avowed Communist is pledged to spread the Marxist doctrine, by fair means or foul, and the Red Chinese are no exception.

Finally, our British friend suggested that Taiwan (Formosa) should be handed over to Red China. I wonder what his reaction would be to a suggestion, which I do not, of course, make seriously, that Hong Kong be handed over to Red China or that North Ireland be handed over to the Republic of Ireland?

To be subjected to Communist Chinese propaganda emanating from Peiping, Moscow, and other Communist centers is a daily experience throughout the free world, but to have it dished up and articulated by a distinguished military leader of the West is indeed difficult to swallow.

A. C. WEDEMEYER.

The President Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been disturbed as have been many Americans by the tendency of the Republican

administration to decry any and all criticism of the recent foreign policy disasters including the U–2 incident and the Japanese riots and national upheaval.

I was most interested, therefore, to read in the Waterbury (Conn.) Republican of June 29, 1960, a brilliant and luminous editorial which eloquently states the case for freedom of criticism in these difficult times and excoriates those who would for political reasons equate any questioning of the administration with treason.

I am pleased to append the editorial herewith:

THE PRESIDENT SPEAKS

(Whatever feelings one has for Dwight D. Eisenhower, they are aware that there has developed an attitude that it is un-American to criticize the President or the policies of his administration. This is not un-American and to believe so is undemocratic.)

President Eisenhower addressed the Nation Monday night and told the American people exactly what he was expected to tell them. The theme and tone of his speech was closely akin to his pronouncements after the first sputnik and the abortion of the summit conference. In essence, it was this: Nothing has gone wrong. If our good intentions have been slightly frustrated, it is because of the evils of communism. We are blameless.

President Eisenhower's immense charm, personal popularity and unimpeachable honesty are valuable assets to the United States. But they have, in recent months, shown that too much of a good thing can lead to confusion. It reduces itself to appearance versus reality, to images. Mr. Eisenhower's millions of admirers, both at home and abroad, cannot, without difficulty, resolve their opinions of the programs and policies of his administration without involving their personal liking for "Ike."

Dwight Eisenhower has led a charmed life in the Presidency. Perhaps no other President has gone quite as unscathed. It has reached the point where critics of the administration take pains not to appear critics of President Eisenhower. Democratic leaders have impugned the administration's foreign policy, defense allocations and general management while studiously avoiding mention of the Chief Executive.

One of President Eisenhower's foremost abilities is to inspire people with respect and to reassure them, with incontrovertible sincerity, in times of misgiving. He has done this on numerous occasions, often in the face of dissident clamor from his colleagues and military underlings, but always he has triumphed.

The Far Eastern trip, which the press and many Western diplomats remarked coincided with a plummeting of American prestige, was, Mr. Eisenhower told the Nation Monday, a success. The ratification of the United States-Japanese security treaty was an important victory for the free world and a defeat for international communism. That is the President's word and we sincerely hope he is right. But we would like to see a more specific assessment that includes events prior to the Tokyo demonstrations.

We would like, for example, a detailing of the psychological process that transpired in Japan before a militant minority frustrated the will of the reigning government and denied the President of the United States his invitation to their country. It is deliciously simple to ascribe the ugly incidents in Tokyo to the evil workings of Communists. But Communists must have something to feed on.

Is there no relationship between the U–2 incident, the security treaty and the snubbing of President Eisenhower? Was there no Japanese reaction to Marshal Malinovsky's threat to retaliate against U.S. bases in foreign lands if Soviet territory was again penetrated?

The President, James Reston writes, "is not answering criticism; he is merely brushing it aside as the work of Communists and opposition Democrats."

"He feels no responsibility for anything that went wrong and therefore no need to do anything except carry on as before."

Public Funds for Nursing Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD the address of Mrs. Margaret Baggett Dolan, chairman of the Department of Public Health Nursing School of Public Health, University of North Carolina, delivered on May 5, 1960, in Miami Beach, Fla., at a program on "Legislation and Nursing Practice," at the 1960 biennial convention of the American Nurses' Association.

I believe all members of the nursing profession will be interested in Mrs. Dolan's fine and informative statement, which follows:

PUBLIC FUNDS FOR NURSING EDUCATION

(By Mrs. Margaret B. Dolan, R.N., professor and head, Department of Public Health Nursing, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill)

To locate a point of departure or a take-off point for a presentation on legislation providing public funds for nursing education is a difficult task. In not knowing where to begin, one frequently takes a look at the past in order to gain perspective and to see what has happened to bring us to the present. When we look only at the present we often are discouraged by what we see—the seeming lack of progress, the many obstacles in our way, and the magnitude of the problem as we view the future.

In order that we may view this issue from a common perspective, join me in a brief historical review of nursing education beginning with the Florence Nightingale era. The most striking characteristic about nursing education is that from the beginning it has been outside the domain of our general educational institutions. Although Miss Nightingale had a broad conception of nursing as a community service, she provided for the training of nurses in hospitals. A few of the early schools of nursing in the United States were established independently on the Nightingale principles of nursing education. The primary purpose of these schools was the training of nurses for the public. However, the success of these early schools of nursing in improving the care of the sick stimulated a number of hospitals to organize schools for the primary purpose of securing student nursing service for the care of their patients.

In less than 30 years, by 1900, there were 432 schools of nursing in the United States; but, with very few exceptions, they were completely under the control of hospitals. The financing of the schools was always difficult. Even the ones established independently contracted to provide nursing service and even then had difficulty augmenting such funds. By 1910 there were just under 1,200 schools of nursing, most of which had started for economic reasons—to ensure a low cost supply of nursing service. This rapid increase in number of schools sharpened the awareness of the nursing organizations to the need for standards of education and of practice. The same criticism we hear so often today was leveled at the leaders in nursing in 1910; namely, "leaders in nursing are more interested in the education and advancement of nurses than in the development of nursing services." At the same time it was not uncommon for schools to graduate students who would not be employed by their home institution or even be recommended for employment by another agency.

Although there were affiliations, with educational institutions in a few instances, there were no basic programs in nursing education under the administrative jurisdiction of a publicly supported educational institution until 1909 when the University of Minnesota School of Nursing was established. In 1916 the University of Cincinnati School of Nursing and Health was the first to offer a 5-year program leading to a degree, to be followed in 1923 by collegiate schools at Yale and Western Reserve Universities.

From the publication in 1912 of Miss Adelaide Nutting's study, Educational Status of Nursing, to the report of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation in 1951 numerous studies of nursing reiterated the need for adequate financing of educational programs in nursing and pointed out the paucity of endowment money in nursing education and the small amounts of public funds in nursing education. The President's Commission stated: "We believe that nursing like other professional education should become a part of the general educational system of the Nation."

The nursing student traditionally and to a great extent today pays for her training through the service she renders. When moves have been made to place nursing schools under the jurisdiction of general educational systems, frequently hospitals were reluctant to agree. The performance of services has often interfered with the nurses' education and under this apprentice-type system the primary objective of the institution must have top priority. Until we break away from this heritage of service for education and nursing education becomes a part of our general educational system will we solve some of the major difficulties facing the nursing profession today.

When income from nursing student services and fees do not cover the cost of the nursing educational program, patient fees frequently make up the deficit. With the rising cost of medical care and hospital costs it is unfair and unjust that one segment of our population, one burdened with illness, must bear a large part of the cost of nursing education.

The problems of financing nursing education in hospital schools presents a dichotomy of purpose that affects nursing education. The development of a profession is dependent upon its educational foundation. When the clinical experience of the student is geared to meet the service needs of the institution, the educational objectives of the student are frequently disregarded. The apprenticeship system will continue in nursing as long as the majority of nurses receive their preparation in institutions whose primary objective is the treatment of the sick and injured. This is not to say that service institutions and hospitals do not have an importan part to play in nursing education, it is that they should not have to bear the cost of nursing education and to administer and support an educational institution.

Education of professional nurses should be placed on a true professional basis. This will

only be accomplished when schools are placed under the jurisdiction of universities and colleges and when both cultural and professional instruction are provided. Students of nursing should have the opportunity for contact with persons whose primary interest is education. They must learn how to engage in the intellectual process, and the best means available is through participation with students and teachers from many areas of learning who are developing ideas and skill in communicating these ideas. "Increasingly it is being realized everywhere that no technical training, however good, is sufficient as preparation for professional personnel. A broad understanding of the physical and social sciences on which professional practice is built and of the society which the professions serve is essential." Only the college or university can provide the money, qualified teaching personnel, and other resources required in present day professional education.

FEDERAL AID TO NURSING EDUCATION

What has happened at the national level in terms of Federal funds for support of nursing education?

In 1941, with war clouds on the horizon and the country emerging from the great depression, nursing could see the first results of the use of Federal funds for nursing education. Approximately 3,000 graduate nurses had received stipends under the Social Security Act while attending colleges and universities for preparation in public health nursing.

There was an increasing demand for graduate nurses as the preparedness program moved forward. Studies revealed that the supply of nurses was not adequate; that nursing schools could not increase their enrollments to any great extent without financial assistance. The National Nursing Council and the Subcommittee on Nursing of the Health and Medical Committee of the Council of National Defense submitted through the USPHS a request to Congress, for Federal funds for nursing education. With the leadership of Congresswoman Frances P. BOLTON and the effective work of the ANA a 2-year Federal-aid program for nursing education was secured. From July 1941 until June 1943, approximately $4.5 million was expended. Schools of nursing increased their enrollment by 13,000; over 4,000 graduate nurses were provided postgraduate study; and 2,000 received refresher courses.

In June 1943 the 78th Congress enacted Public Law No. 74, the Nurse Training Act. Congresswoman BOLTON sponsored this legislation, known as the Bolton Act, which provided for the organization and development of the U.S. Cadet Nurse corp. It also provided for postgraduate preparation for graduate nurses. This 5-year program (1943–48) cost the Federal Government approximately $160 million.

Under the Lanham (National Defense Housing) Act of 1940, the USPHS authorized expenditures of over $25.5 million for new facilities, such as living quarters, classroom and demonstration rooms, and library space for 239 schools of nursing.

Despite this amount of Federal aid to nursing education, nursing schools at the midcentury showed that 65 percent of the cost of nursing education was being borne by hospitals, 24 percent by tuition and fees, 3 percent by gifts and endowments, 4 percent from State and local funds and 4 percent from university and college funds.

The ANA included a strong statement on nursing education in its 1950 platform. ANA approached the U.S. Congress through Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON, and a bill known as the Nursing Education Act of 1951 (H.R. 910) was introduced. The political climate of Congress was unfavorable to aid for professional education, and the bill was tabled. The ANA continued its legislative efforts, and in the fall of 1956 additional Federal funds were provided through enactment of Public Law 911 known as the Health Amendments Act.

The first three titles of the act pertained to education for health professions. Title I was concerned with the preparation of public health workers, including doctors, nurses, engineers, health educators, sanitarians, et cetra. Title II provided for advanced preparation for graduate nurses in teaching, supervision, and administration; and title III provided for the expansion of vocational education programs for the training of practical nurses. This program was for a 3-year period.

The program has served to reverse the downward trend of the number of graduate nurses enrolled for full-time study in advanced nursing programs. From 1951 to 1956 there had been a rather marked decline of full-time students in advanced nursing programs. This was occurring at a time when there was a desperate shortage of teachers in nursing schools and nurses prepared in supervision and administration. It is estimated that about 3,800 nurses received Federal assistance during the first 3 years of the professional nurse traineeship program. This can only be considered a beginning when we estimate the present and future needs for nurse teachers, supervisors, and administrators. In 1959, through new legislation, the program was extended for a period of 5 years.

According to the NLN's "Nurses for a Growing Nation" in 1956, 13 percent of the 430,000 active graduate nurses were in leadership positions. In 1959, the ANA, NLN and Public Health Service released information stating there were 460,000 active graduate nurses in 1958. It was estimated that 59,800 or 13 percent were in administration, supervision, and teaching. To maintain this 13 percent ratio 3,953 additional teachers, supervisors, and administrators were needed. This is more than double the number of full-time students enrolled in 1957 in the 44 advanced nursing programs participating in the professional nursing traineeship program.

The two major programs of Federal aid to nursing education have been the cadet nurse program and titles I and II of the Health Amendments Act of 1956. The first provides scholarships to basic students in nursing, and the latter to graduate nurses for advanced study. Both programs have been in the nature of emergency measures to meet existing situations that were of national concern and both bear definite cutoff dates.

We are still faced with the basic problem of public funds for continuing support of nursing education.

In January 1958 the American Nurses' Association board of directors authorized that the ANA prepare and have introduced in Congress a bill to provide financial aid to baccalaureate programs, and to graduate nurses in supplementary programs leading to the baccalaureate degree.

The American Nurses' Association, with cooperation of its constituent units, promoted this legislation with all the resources at its command. The association was committed to this action by the fourth plank in the 1958–60 ANA platform which states, "Promote legislation which will provide public funds for research, scholarships, and continued improvement in nursing education."

There was excellent response to this legislation from nurses throughout the country as evidenced by the hundreds of letters received by Mrs. GREEN, Senator HUMPHREY, and other Members of Congress urging favorable action on these bills. In fact, the response was much greater and more enthusiastic than had been anticipated. We all know the legislative process is a slow one and that it generally requires continuing effort and repeated attempts to accomplish legislation. We believe much progress has been made although it is extremely doubtful that any action will be taken on this legislation during the current session of Congress. Promotion of this type legislation should be the major concern of the association during the next session of Congress.

There is precedence for this type of legislation. The National Defense Education Act of 1958 was a major step in meeting the needs of higher education. It was a recognition by Congress that higher education is a vital part of the Nation's strength. However, this act emphasized science and mathematics. Nursing and medicine were not considered in the context of this legislation as scientific fields. It is my belief that an adequate supply of professionally educated nurses to meet the health needs of our rapidly expanding population is also essential to the strength and defense of our Nation. Therefore, the Federal Government has some responsibility in this area.

In November 1957 the ANA sent to all State nurses associations "A Discussion Guide on Public Funds for Nursing Education." The board of directors recognized there were many complex issues involved in seeking State and Federal funds for support of nursing education. It is essential that the membership of the ANA study the issues, acquire information and make some important decisions regarding the type of educational programs the profession will ask the public to support with increasing amounts of tax money.

This guide has been used in various ways by State associations and by directors of schools of nursing. Discussion of the questions presented in the guide, and others raised by nurses, need continued exploration until every nurse is informed and has participated in decisionmaking and in the legislative efforts of the American Nurses' Association.

If nursing is to achieve professional status, and accorded this recognition by society and other professions, it must establish its educational foundation in institutions of higher learning. Only in this way can nurses continue to enlarge the body of knowledge of nursing which is initiated within the profession. I believe this body of knowledge includes the science and art of nursing in direct patient care as well as the functional activities of planning, directing, educating, and supervising nursing personnel.

With practically every thoughtful study of nursing and nursing education recommending that the preparation for the profession of nursing belongs in institutions of higher learning, how do we account for the slow progress? Is it because the majority of nurses have not accepted this recommendation?

I believe we have reached the stage in our development as a profession that we must accept the concept of two types of nursing, namely, professional and technical—the basic preparation for professional nursing provided at the baccalaureate level and basic preparation for technical nursing at the associate degree level in community or junior colleges. Both should be and must be supported by public funds and both are essential in providing competent and skilled nursing care for our population.

The majority of professional nurses in practice today have not been educated in institutions that were primarily educational institutions nor was the educational program supported by public funds. Therefore, our background makes it difficult for us to accept this change. Yet, we are the nurses who have accepted the legislative principle which states, "Public funds should be available only to schools which qualify as educational institutions as defined by the National League for Nursing in 'Criteria for the Evaluation of Educational Programs in

Nursing which lead to Baccalaureate or Masters'." We all recognize that change is difficult, and there are ambivalent feelings associated with change. It takes courage, a dedication of purpose and belief in the future of our profession. I believe we must accept this concept and work vigorously for its implementation if nursing is to fulfill its responsibility to society as a profession.

It is also the profession's responsibility to develop way to show the correlation between the preparation of the nurse and the quality of service. The public will assume the cost of nursing education when we are able to demonstrate this correlation and the public has an understanding of the differentiations in levels of nursing ability and functions.

We must at the same time uphold standards of nursing education as defined by the profession and seek public support only for those programs which meet such standards.

Some progress has been made towards this objective. According to the 1959 edition of "Facts About Nursing" there was a 2.6 percent decrease in the number of graduates from diploma schools of nursing in comparing the academic year 1955–56 with 1956–57. More and more hospital administrators are beginning to realize providing the type of education necessary to prepare the nurse to function effectively on today's health team is an expensive undertaking. This fact has facilitated the development of nursing programs in colleges and universities and community colleges. For the same period there was a 9.5 percent increase in graduations from associate degree programs and an 11.9 percent increase in graduations from baccalaureate degree programs. Although the percentages are encouraging, the picture, when we see the actual numbers involved, is not impressive.

There are interesting regional differences in the number of graduations in basic professional programs. In 1956–57 the western region had approximately 3,000 graduations with 23.8 percent from baccalaureate degree programs while the North Atlantic region had over 11,000 graduations with 9.1 percent from baccalaureate degree program (1.73). Can we assume that the West does not have the weight of tradition to retard its progress in moving basic nursing education into educational institutions? For the same period the West also had five times as many graduations from associate degree programs as any other region in the United States.

The quality of education in institutions of higher learning is dependent to a great extent on the quality of public education provided by the elementary and secondary schools of our country. We have become acutely conscious of the staggering needs for skilled teachers, enriched curricula, additional physical facilities, instructional equipment, and continuing financial support for public education. This is important to nursing education, and nurses as citizens have an obligation and responsibility to actively support legislation to meet these needs.

STATE LEGISLATION FOR AID TO NURSING EDUCATION

In 1945 legislation was enacted in Wisconsin permitting the State Department of Nurses to use for scholarships to aid graduate nurses, unemcumbered money in excess of $15,000 in the department's funds on June 30 of each year. Since then 11 other States have enacted legislation to provide scholarship aid to graduate nurses. Many of these scholarships carry commitments to work in a particular field of nursing, such as psychiatry, tuberculosis, or in a teaching or administrative capacity. The total amount appropriated varies from $1,650 to $319,000.

From 1950 to 1958, 14 States made appropriations for scholarships for students in basic professional nursing education. The total amount appropriated during this period varies from $17,000 in one State to $615,000 in another.

Although some progress has been made, the public has as yet made small provision for the support of nursing education. This is in sharp contrast to the financing of the education for physicians, teachers, social workers, lawyers, and engineers. Yet the nurse has been ranked close to the teacher as a social necessity. She is needed many times during the life span of every individual.

According to the 1959 list of State Approved Schools of Professional Nursing, 172, or only 15 percent of the 1,126 schools, are under the administration of a college or university. Where nursing education has developed in institutions of higher learning there has been disparity in the adequacy of financial support in comparison to that of other professional schools in the same institution.

The public, through donations or tax funds, bears approximately half the expense of all other forms of higher education but contributes only 7 percent of the cost of nursing education.

On October 15, 1958, there were 113,518 students enrolled in the 1,126 schools of nursing. Of these, 19,195, 17 percent were enrolled in baccalaureate degree programs. Thus, we have 15 percent of our schools with 17 percent of the total number of students in collegiate schools of nursing. (In January 1946, 1 percent of the 1,214 schools of nursing in existence at that time stated they were independent of hospital control.)

As we look at the standard of nursing education in our basic collegiate schools in 1959, we find 79 of the 172 collegiate schools are fully accredited by the National Nursing Accrediting Service (the 1960 list includes 87 schools accredited).

Two States—Alaska and Delaware—and Puerto Rico have no basic collegiate nursing program. There are 20 States with no fully accredited degree program and 12 States with only one accredited degree program. Thus, only 17 States have more than one fully accredited basic baccalaureate program while a little less than half of the States have no accredited basic collegiate nursing program. In 1959 less than half of all basic collegiate schools were in educational institutions supported by public or tax funds.

This is the situation today. We believe the public has not accepted its responsibility to invest in the preparation of a group giving an essential service. For over 10 years the ANA has had a plank in its platform to promote legislation for this purpose. Shall we as members of the nursing profession be content to continue the present practices of financing nursing education which have no justification except that of tradition? Or will we actively pursue a program of action to see that public support is provided as stated in the ANA platform?

How true today are the words of Miss Annie Goodrich in 1912, when she said: "Our place * * * has been found in the institutions of the sick, but we shall never render our full service to the community until our place is also found in the university." I believe we will find that place when every professional nurse takes collective action as a member of her professional organization in carrying forward the Association's legislative program.

There Is a Lesson for America in Student Riots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, in recent years there have been many so-called student uprisings and they seem to be on the increase in the United States as well as in other countries. A very interesting analysis of this situation is found in the July 1960 issue of Nation's Business.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the aforementioned article:

THERE IS A LESSON FOR AMERICA IN STUDENT RIOTS

(By Felix Morley)

When the dictatorship of Premier Adnan Menderes was recently overthrown in Turkey, the first action of the new regime was to honor the student leaders jailed during the demonstrations which touched off the rebellion. It was the same in South Korea, when senile Syngman Rhee was ousted at the end of April.

University students were also highly instrumental in the Cuban revolution which replaced Batista by Castro 18 months ago. And the role of youth in the herioc attempt to end the Communist tyranny in Hungary in 1957 is not forgotten.

The picture of youth at the barricades is undeniably romantic and emotionally appealing. But these instances, from four widely separated countries, are sufficient to emphasize the always doubtful outcome. On the one hand, the Cuban people have not gained self-government by substituting Castro for Batista. On the other, Hungary is no happier for the immolation of those who vainly battled Russian tanks in the streets of Budapest. As for Korea and Turkey, it is still too early to pass judgment. We know that seemingly intolerable dictatorships have been ousted. We cannot as yet be sure that the change is other than the proverbial fryingpan-to-fire alteration.

Nevertheless, there is something that stimulates optimism in the idealism of these youngsters who stake their lives—and often lose—in the hope of building a better society for their countries. Those whom a government conscripts in its defense are mechanized pawns compared with those who voluntarily combine to overthrow their government. Often the latter are misguided, but they are never lacking in the attribute of courage and seldom in the virtue of self-sacrifice.

Rebellious youth, moreover, has played a large role in our own history, tending to justify Thomas Jefferson's strong assertion that "the tree of liberty is watered by the blood of revolution." Both Alexander Hamilton and James Madison, gratefully remembered as two of our greatest statesmen, began their political careers as student agitators against British rule. Just a century ago, as we now recall with melancholy pride, a whole generation of Southern youth was preparing to turn its ardor into bitter resistance to the Government of the United States.

A few years prior to that, in 1848, French students raised the banner of revolt against absolute monarchy, thereby establishing republican institutions which, in spite of

changes and setbacks, still endure. This constitutionalist movement quickly spread to most of what are now our NATO allies. Its stern repression in Bismarck's Prussia promoted that solid German immigration which had added so greatly to American stability and strength. A current book, "Intellectual Revolution in Modern China," recalls the role of Chinese students, many American educated, in the abortive rising against the Peiping government of 1919. One of the youthful leaders who then was jailed for this activity was Chou En-lai, now the ruthless ruler of Red China.

In view of the recent disastrous events in Japan there is a tendency to discover Communist influence behind every domestic protest against a government allied with us, while regarding such risings as wholly spontaneous when attempted against Red rule. The universality of student restiveness, and its long history, make that interpretation suspect. Communists undoubtedly seek to infiltrate and stimulate any movement that opposes a regime receiving aid from the United States. But to assert that without communism there would be no such opposition to established authority is not demonstrable.

The causes of political agitation in the universities are not identical at all times and in every country. But there is certainly one common characteristic explaining, for instance, why Turkish students broke into demonstrations immediately following the triumph of similar protests in South Korea. This common denominator is the admirable loyalty of youth to the concept of justice. And since justice is most likely to be lacking under dictatorships, it is against these that students are generally most eager to act.

This being the case, one would expect to see the universities of the Communist world, where tyranny is strongest, most active in protest against it. The logic fails for a reason other than the readiness of Red leadership to stamp out any protest before it can gather strength. There is the further fact that where Marxism controls, almost without exception, we find a background of authoritarian rule of an even more primitive nature, against which communism can still be pictured as a liberating force. With the passage of time, the Red dictatorships will probably have much more trouble with their expanding intelligentsia. One cannot stimulate the spirit of scientific inquiry and expect it to remain unquestioning about political dogma.

There is more intellectual ferment in the free world precisely because it is, at least relatively, free. Turkish students marched against Menderes not because of Communist promptings but because they resented a regime that seems to have flattered the Kremlin by imitation. Revolutionary changes, which at first glance may seem a weakness for our side, are more correctly envisaged as evidence of the vitality of freedom. If it were moribund this side of the Iron Curtain, youth would not rise in its defense.

That is a thought to be remembered by American parents as their sons and daughters begin to demonstrate in campus rallies here at home, a trend already apparent and likely to gather force during the coming academic year. We must admit that we have reluctantly gone a long way toward accepting authoritarian principles in this country. Everywhere else, that has eventually produced undergraduate protest. Those with our heritage of freedom are unlikely to be an exception to the rule.

It is to be noted, however, that such demonstrations are likely to take wholly irrational forms, reflecting the lack of critical ability in the participating youngsters.

At my own college, for instance, student picketing erupted this spring, in front of local chain stores whose national management maintains lunch-counter segregation where local opinion favors the practice. In the rhetorical words of the undergraduate newspaper: "If young people are not outspoken on problems of equality, then who shall be?"

If this admirable sentiment were uniformly applied, it would carry more weight. Student pickets would be thrown around the offices of labor unions which insist on membership as a condition of employment. The right to work where one wants is surely as fundamental as the right to eat where one wants. To deny the former to nonunionists is certainly as discriminatory as to deny the latter to nonwhites.

Reasoning power, however, is not highly developed among our college students and is sometimes perceptibly absent among their teachers. In these deficiencies lies the danger of undergraduate demonstrations. As our Government becomes more and more remote, unwieldy, all-embracing, and irresponsible, we may expect such demonstrations to increase. As an outlet for exuberance they are preferable to "panty raids." By the same token they should be more mature.

It is the business of educators to develop that maturity. But it isn't found in statements like that currently made by a professor of government in a highly respected small college. He naively confesses to a sudden discovery of "the enormous importance of local government" as follows:

"Those of us whose eyes are firmly fixed either on Washington or international affairs have so often lost track of town, city, county, and State governments that it comes as quite a shock to realize that democracies really begin by people managing local affairs well on a local level."

Better late than never. If our college boys are beginning to learn that good local government is all-important in this Federal republic, then their political demonstrations could well become something better than mere foolishness and waste of time.

Responsibility

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert into the RECORD an address Adm. Arleigh Burke, Chief of Naval Operations, made before the first class midshipmen, U.S. Naval Academy, on April 20, 1960.

Admiral Burke certainly points out very well the importance of accepting responsibility—from ordinary day to day obligations each individual faces, to the responsibility of the United States on other less fortunate countries in our world today. His address follows:

ADDRESS BY ADM. ARLEIGH BURKE, U.S.N., CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, BEFORE THE FIRST CLASS MIDSHIPMEN, U.S. NAVAL ACADEMY, ANNAPOLIS, MD., APRIL 20, 1960

Admiral Melson, members of the faculty, midshipmen of the first class, it is always an exhilarating experience to return to the Naval Academy. Every alumnus gets a lift, a feeling of pride from a visit to his alma mater.

Recently, I was asked in a letter, what I considered my most important professional decision. That is a tough question, and frankly, I was unable to single out any specific answer. At the time the decisions were made, each seemed the most important, at least to me. But, in thinking back, in reviewing them, a thought kept repeating itself, again and again. It was the important part that responsibility plays in every decision that you make, major or minor, large or small.

There are a lot of channel markers to help you make decisions, but one of the best, is a well-developed sense of responsibility. It is one of the most important things in your lives. It was important before you came to the Academy, it is important while you are here, it will be even more so after you graduate.

Basically, responsibility means being accountable to someone, for something. It involves an obligation. In battle plans and operations orders, for example, we refer to an area of responsibility. Here we mean that commanders are responsible for certain tasks, and will be held accountable for their execution. It may be to attack something, to perform some special job, or just to stand ready to act when called upon. With every duty, comes responsibility, to the authorities above you, and just as important, to your subordinates. Responsibility is the very heart of all authority.

Another significant thing is that you can never avoid responsibility. Sometimes it can be put off temporarily, but it can never be avoided completely.

We all face multiple responsibilities, to God, to our country, to our fellowmen, and to ourselves.

As a nation, we also face responsibilities, grave ones. Today, the free world is threatened by imperialistic communism. It is a ruthless, godless, form of expansion, dominated by one thought, to impose slavery upon the entire world.

But there is an obstacle, a big obstacle, in communism's path toward world slavery. It is all of the nations of the free world, all those whose people realize their responsibility for freedom. Greece, Turkey, Thailand, and all the others, whether large or small.

The United States is a leader among nations. This leadership was not sought, it was thrust upon us. It was thrust upon us, because we are respected, respected for our principles, and our willingness to live up to them, for our military power, and our economic strength.

Our very freedom has given us the obligation to continue to earn it, to protect it, and to help others attain it. We have the duty to safeguard the freedom of every country, because theirs is inseparable from our own. Unless free men and free nations stand together, then assuredly, one by one, men and nations will lose their freedom.

The Communists hope that we will sit on the sidelines, hope that we will turn away from the problems of others. They hope we will ignore the hunger, ignorance, disease in the world, in short, shirk our responsibility. With every increase in discontent, in poverty, Communist lies, and false promises, would appeal to more people, would be believed by more people. Little by little, the free countries could be lured away from freedom, to disappear into the dark depths of Communist slavery. We would then stand alone, and vulnerable.

That is one reason why we must use our wealth, to aid those less fortunate, and our strength to protect the less strong. It is everybody's job and it is a tough one. All the Armed Forces play a big part in it.

Our wonderful Navy stands, ready to act, swiftly and decisively in any area. It carries tremendous responsibilities for meeting the Communist challenge to freedom, and to freemen everywhere.

By treaties and agreements the United States has obligations to more than 40 na-

tions. We assist in developing their forces, help keep their lifelines open. As our national obligations overseas increase, so do the Navy's responsibilities. They loom large in peace or war, in war, of any temperature.

To deter general nuclear war, our naval forces, partcularly our attack carriers, insure that retaliation is inevitable. Soon, by the end of this year—we will add greatly to this capability. Two fleet ballistic missile submarines, with 32 remarkable Polaris missiles, will be at sea, ready to strike back at any aggressor. No ballistic missile assault can rob these forces of their strength. By dispersal, by concealment, by the mobility that makes them invulnerable to ICBM's, we guarantee our retaliatory power. We guarantee that the awesome power of Polaris, and our attack carriers will remain intact, even after a surprise blow.

In case of limited war, our job is equally significant. The Navy must be ready to act on short notice, ready to bring power to bear, where needed, when needed, and in the exact amount needed. The Navy, and those wonderful fighting Marines, are always ready to bring seagoing capabilities, air, amphibious, full seapower, to the many trouble spots, spots that can be reached only from the seas. No other nation has this capability. It is one of the strongest deterrents to limited aggression.

In the cold war, the forces afloat, carry a full load of responsibilities. Our powerful 6th and 7th Fleets guard the interests of the United States, and underwrite the freedom of our allies. We stand alert in the Far East, in the Mediterranean, ready to be first on the scene. When Lebanon asked for assistance, we landed marines on its beaches. We did so only 7 hours after the orders were given. This kind of readiness keeps situations in hand. We will need it for a long, long time.

And while we stand alert, our fleets promote good will, friendliness, and confidence in the United States. To every country the men in our ships bring hope, and assurance for the continued security of the free world.

This is the picture, your place in it is important. You inherited responsibilities at birth, as citizens of our great country. Your duties are just as real, and vital as when you are assigned a watch. No buddy is going to be able to stand your watch. It is up to you. As members of a democracy, you must make the system work. Self-government requires self-participation.

Millions, in other countries, would give anything to carry out the responsibilities you have. Many, in fact, have given their lives trying to gain the right of self-government.

Hungary is a good example. There the Communists denied this right, and ruthlessly crushed those who tried to do something about it. Throughout the Communist empire, it is the same. The few do the planning, the dictating, for the many, who must do the labor.

The Communists are eager to do the same to us. But they never will be able to, not as long as we keep alert to the peril, and act with determination to meet it. Our freedom, brings with it the need for action.

You all know how little is accomplished when you, "let George do it." George is usually equally determined on getting somebody else to do it. It works the same way, on the international scene. World problems are not solved by the world. They are solved by responsible individuals. That is how any job gets done, winning an E, or establishing justice and progress in the world.

We are engaged in a competition with communism. It is a deadly one. It is no spur-of-the-moment softball game. It is a competition where national survival is at stake, a competition which invades every facet of our lives. Our cultural, political, economic, and military strengths, have all been challenged. Our very way of life is under fire. This is a challenge that can be met only with hard work and personal sacrifice. There is no other way.

Your responsibilities will grow with you, and as our Nation grows. They are part of maturity. Some, those already existing, will be broadened, and new ones will be assumed. As a matter of fact, unless I miss my guess, many of you are already planning to assume new responsibilities in the chapel, right after graduation.

Marriage is a wonderful thing. A wife can be a real source of happiness, and strength, but she will also be an added obligation, and there will be other additions, both large and small.

All this is good for a man. Responsibilities give purpose and meaning to life. Many people devote all their lives to chasing frantically after happiness. It is a tragic thing to see, because they never find it. Some, fail so badly, are so disillusioned, and frustrated, they end up in mental hospitals.

Real happiness comes to those who do their jobs, and do their best. You see this in the fleet. The taut ships, the ones that win the E's, and the competitive exercises, the ones you want with you in battle, are the happy ships.

The people who really put out have the secret to happiness, and to growth. When you put out, when you take on the tough jobs, when you turn the worst division into the best, when you bring your department from unsat to outstanding, you bring yourself up with it. You grow mentally, and you build self-confidence.

As naval officers you will have additional responsibilities. Our Navy is the most powerful in the world, and it is the most capable. But remember, the effectiveness of any organization is based on the reliability of each man, on how well he pulls his oar.

Each of you will share a full measure of your Navy's obligations. On your shoulders will rest the lives and welfare of men, the success of your unit, your ship. The accomplishments of the Navy, the security of our Nation, in turn, rest on each man, unit, and ship.

In a few months, you will be officers. You will be called upon to exercise authority, and to lead. You must be fully aware of your obligations, large and small. You will have to answer for your actions, or lack of action.

Men trust, and follow, those who hold themselves accountable. That is why effective leadership depends on a strong sense, the very strongest sense, of responsibility. It will be your job to develop it. You will need it.

You will need it every single day. There will be many situations where the proper courses of action, cannot be preplanned, or predetermined, for you, or by you. These situations will require many qualifications. Most of all, they will require a willingness to decide, to act, to do, and to stand responsible.

You have heard of that fateful night in June 1944, when Admiral Mitscher turned on the lights of the task force.

Our ships were darkened. We were close to enemy-held islands. The Japanese fleet was still around. We had struck the enemy, and successfully. There was still a very real danger, counterattack by submarines and aircraft.

Our planes, returning home in the darkness, were low on fuel, desperately low. They were not yet home, they needed help. Admiral Mitscher gave it to them. He ordered the lights turned on, to guide them home. Here was a really tough decision. It involved the safety of thousands, the security of the striking force. He knew this. He knew he alone would be accountable. He made the decision. It paid off.

This was a magnificent moment in the life of a great man. Here was responsibility at its peak. This is the sense of responsibility all of you must learn.

Developing this sense is a big job. It is a difficult task, but not an impossible one. At first, you have to work at it consciously, but eventually, it becomes almost second nature.

When you get to your first unit, your first ship, start right in. Extra effort, extra interest, are the marks of the really fine officer, and that is just the kind we need.

Responsibility is displayed in combat, in emergencies. It is displayed in the daily routine, in drills, and training.

One of your first duties will be on deck, in port. You will be responsible for the appearance of every man leaving the ship. Nobody ashore knows whether a man is in your division. But, there are always those, who know he is from your ship. It will be up to you to see he reflects credit on it.

This is the type of obligation each officer faces, because he is an officer. The captain alone is responsible for the ship, but each officer carries a responsibility for it too.

Letting something slide by, overlooking an obvious wrong, a safety violation, particularly when they do not involve your division or your department, may be easier. But responsibility extends beyond your division, or your department, and you must exercise it. That is the way we get better ships, better squadrons, and a better Navy. We all have to work at it, to feel and act personally responsible for improvement. It should be a matter of principle for each of us, and principles are of prime importance.

Man's principles, our principles, the ones our forefathers fought and died to preserve, represent our greatest strength. The Communists realize this only too well. That is why they want us to relax them, let them slide, let them fall away.

Nothing can be more destructive to a nation, or to an individual, than the loss of principles, or the failure to live up to the ones he has.

During the Korean war, for example, there were a few young men, in uniform, who lacked convictions, were confused in their loyalties. As a result, when captured, they fell prey to the fictions handed them by the Communists. The terrible thing is that there were some among them who gave in, and did so without a real struggle. Some become informers. Others gave up their will to fight, even their will to live. They just rolled up in a corner, and died. This could befall any individual, any society, and nation, whose principles become lost.

This applies to those principles, governing our relations with other men, with the Navy, and with our country. It applies just as strongly to those principles, which guide our moral conduct, the way we live with ourselves.

Keep a constant weather eye on your personal conduct, on your morals. We live and work in a world of machines, but morality is man's business, your business, not a machine's. This requires self-discipline and self-control. You will need it, because to control the powerful weapons of warfare, we must first be able to control ourselves.

And there is something else you will have to have to discharge responsibilities properly; that is knowledge.

Before you can plan and direct a course of action, you have to understand the issues. You need a knowledge of details, for it is only after a man has a thorough knowledge of a subject, that he has the self-confidence needed to lead.

You are receiving fine educations. It will be your obligation to further them when you graduate. You can do this by reading, by seizing every chance to broaden your experience, by qualifying in a wide variety of jobs. You can improve your skills by postgraduate work.

The forthcoming competition for acceptance as a Rhodes scholar is a marvelous op-

portunity. The Navy has a great need for line officers with advanced education of this type. That need will be even greater in the future.

Officers who complete graduate studies, who are successful as Rhodes scholars, do not fall behind their contemporaries. Actually they have taken a major step ahead. They have prepared themselves for greater responsibilities.

Responsible men must be able to stick to their guns, to persevere. You are bound to run into difficulties, and you will make mistakes. You will have to stick your neck out, good leaders always do. You will run into criticism.

There will always be some, who will resent your accepting responsibility. But do not let that bother you. Life is no popularity contest. You will find your real rewards in the satisfaction of a job well done, in increased responsibilities, and in greater opportunities. As life becomes more challenging, the mastery of it becomes more rewarding.

This all sounds like a big order; it is. The opportunities are equally big. Measure up to your responsibilities, and you will perform a great service for our Navy, our country, for all mankind. My best wishes to all of you, in the important tasks that lie ahead.

The Deadly Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the attached editorial from the Wall Street Journal of June 27, 1960, titled "The Deadly Growth":

THE DEADLY GROWTH

We have lately been in the garden putting fertilizer on our shrubs and poison on our weeds. The fertilizer feeds a growth that's slow and sturdy. And, curiously, our weed spray kills by also stimulating growth. It makes the plant grow so fast they burn themselves out—and die.

So when the politicians start talking about the Nation's economy and how they are going to make it grow we are prone to ask, What kind of growth? The drugged and overstimulated kind? Or a growth that puts down roots deep and solid?

For a good many political candidates these days, ranging from Adlai Stevenson to Governor Rockefeller, tell us our economy isn't growing fast enough. They lament the fact that our growth rate is "only" about 3 percent a year while the Russian economy, depending on what statistics are used, is expanding at the rate of some 7 percent or 8 percent. And then they declare that we "must" expand faster or woe betide us in the race with the Communists.

Now there are a number of phony things about this argument. For one, percentage figures are meaningless without taking into account the base from which each is figured; and the base of the U.S. economy is many times that of Soviet Russia. For another, the argument suggests that Russia is already "closing the gap" with the United States. Yet as Vice President NIXON pointed out recently, 20 years ago Soviet production was about 45 percent of U.S. production—and today it is still only about 45 percent of ours.

But quite aside from the fallacies in measuring the relative growth of the United States and Russia, there is another disturbing thing about this argument. It assumes that growth, any kind of growth, is an absolute good, and then goes on to conclude that therefore anything that stimulates growth is good.

Mr. Stevenson has mentioned 5 percent as the necessary growth rate; Mr. Rockefeller talks of 6 percent; others have their own figures, mysteriously arrived at. But all those of this persuasion are united in insisting that the Government must do something to force the rate higher. And common to the prescription of each is more spending in the Government sector, more direction by the Government of spending in the private sector. All to the feeding of the great god Growth.

Of course, stimulating growth temporarily is not a great trick. The Government can multiply farm production by simply lifting its price supports. It can enlarge our oil production by squeezing tighter the controls against oil imports. It can stimulate the housing industry by easier money for mortgages. It can make many an industry boom by just pouring out enough paper money for roads, hospitals, schools, dams, power projects or whatever captures the planners' fancy. In short, with sufficient doses of inflation it can give the whole American economy the exhilaration of frenetic activity.

But so far among the political candidates, Vice President NIXON alone seems to have given any thought to "what kind" of growth this would be. He too wants more growth and he does not reject Government activity to encourage it. But he spurns the idea of growth for growth's sake only.

"The growthmanship school," he observed, "argues that the Government should plan and manipulate the economy to arrive at an arbitrary, fixed percentage rate of growth. * * * They believe that Government spending regardless of its purpose spells growth and, therefore, is good in and of itself."

But the lesson of nature is that growth is not automatically good, in and of itself. And the lesson of history is that inflationary spending will, in Mr. NIXON's phrase, "wreck the economy, not expand it, because true growth is based on sound money, not phony money."

America will grow, we need have no fear of that. But we had best remember that growth is good only when its roots are deep and lasting. And never forget that a drugged growth can be deadly.

Strength: The Sure Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union of June 23, 1960:

ANSWERING THE CHALLENGE—STRENGTH: THE SURE PROTECTION

The international situation can be explained in terms of diplomatic and political maneuvers, pressure points, actions and reactions, etc. But what it all boils down to are two facts:

1. The cold war—the espionage, subversion, the psychological pressures, the political and economic thrusts—will continue indefinitely, or as long as the Communists think they can gain without risk of all-out war.

2. On the present cold war collision course a military clash between communism and the free world is almost inevitable. But this probably will happen only when the Reds decide their cold war tactics are sterile and unproductive, or when they make an error of judgment as to our capabilities.

What we have to remember is that the advance of Communist control has been braked to a stop only when free men have been willing to stand and fight.

The words of Fleet Adm. Chester W. Nimitz sum up the challenge that faces Americans:

"I am concerned about the readiness and willingness of our citizens to face up to the grim possibility—and probability—that only a clash of arms will settle our disputes with the Communists. * * * Our general policy should be 'hope for the best and peace but prepare for the worst and war'—and we should prepare ourselves mentally, morally and spiritually to fighting to support our policies."

The Communists certainly are ready and willing to make any sacrifice that will win the world for them. We cannot afford to let their resolution exceed ours.

Our strength is composed of many things. Missiles, guns, ships, planes and dedicated armed services to man them are but one manifestation of our strength. It goes deeper, for it touches on faith in our country, confidence in our leaders, the unity of our purpose, morality, the understanding of and devotion to the processes of our Republic and the free society it shields.

In times past we have had a word to describe the qualities so necessary to the maintenance of America's strength. And the word is patriotism. Patriotism is not just a word that we trot out on the 4th of July, Armed Forces Day, or Memorial Day. It is the cement that holds our free Nation together. It is the will that enables us to stand up to tyrants, to rebuff defeatists and political crepehangers. It is the unquenchable resolution to stand, fight and die, if necessary, for freedom and all it represents.

If our patriotism comes to the fore—as it has in every time of trouble in our history—then we will have the mental, moral, and spiritual strength so vital to our survival. We live with crisis, but we also live with deep and abiding faith in our country and ourselves. With that faith as a base for our military power we can do anything asked of us.

Break Diplomatic Relations With Castro's Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the more interesting manifestations of the failure of our current Caribbean policies are the positive views of thoughtful Cubans on Cuba.

Among many such expressions is the letter from Rafael Lecuona, of Tallahassee, Fla., published in the June 29, 1960, issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

A CUBAN ON CUBA

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

Please allow me to congratulate you on your editorial of June 9, "Cuba: Restraint but Not Inaction."

It is certainly encouraging to realize the importance your newspaper gives to the tremendous menace a Communist regime in Cuba offers not only to the United States but to all the Latin American countries. However, your answers to your own question—What can be done? (about this serious danger to our democracies) fall short of the right solution.

Have you, or the American people stopped to consider what would happen if Cuba and Russia sign a mutual security treaty? And you can bet that this is in the making. Perhaps some naïve people believe such a treaty will provide the right "excuse" for the United States to use the Monroe Doctrine, which would permit an American intervention in Cuban affairs. However, they better think twice about the consequences of such action after a Russian-Cuban agreement has been signed. There will be no way to break it up, except by risking a third world war.

Let us not forget Russia's grip on Hungary, Poland, and the rest of the Soviet satellite countries. What would happen if we try to liberate any of these countries? The same goes for Cuba, after it has signed a security pact with Russia.

Cuba, as a new "Socialist State of the People" will be the trampoline from which a more direct Communist infiltration in Latin America will bounce off. Russian planes and submarines will be watching our shores, waiting for the right moment to act. Ballistic missiles will not be hard to set up, and at only 90 miles from us. And, worst of all, democratic governments in Latin America will fall one after the other. The end, then, is obvious.

It is because of the above-mentioned premises that the United States must act now, before it is too late.

Among the things the United States should do, as of now, the following are paramount:

1. Break off diplomatic relations with Castro's government. (The rest of Latin America will follow because they know that in this struggle between democracy and communism there is no middle ground, and they know their place is with the United States. After all, for less reasons Colombia has broken up diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic; and Guatemala with Cuba; and many a Latin American country has broken up diplomatic relations with another Latin American nation for practically no reason.)

2. After this initial step, all Cuban delegations and consulates, and 26 of July clubs in the United States will have to pack up and take their Communist propaganda with them. This, at least, will stop men such as the director of La Graceta—a Spanish newspaper published in Tampa—from saying that the President of Cuba is not a Communist, when it is well known by all of us (Cubans) that the President of Cuba ran for representative to the low chamber of Cienfuegos (Cuba) in the Communist Party in the elections of 1944; and that he was an officer of the Communist Party's local committee of said city of Cienfuegos during 1940–44; and that he was personal secretary of Juan Marinello, No. 1 Communist of Cuba for more than 30 years.

3. It will be very easy then (for the United States) to cut off the tremendous subsidy paid to Cuba's sugar industry, which will be forced to sell its sugar to Russia at the price they are so proud to brag about: little over 2 cents a pound. Certainly, the Cuban people will suffer. But they stand to suffer 10 times more under the Communist regime of Castro.

Then, let Castro bring petroleum from Russia—after the three American and English refining companies have finally pulled out, even if they lose millions of dollars (they are going to lose them anyhow). Eventually, a new and democratic government will take over in Cuba. And with it, and with the rest of the democratic governments of Latin America, the United States can go back to its job of closing the gap between its tremendous high standards of living and the tremendous low standard of living of most, if not all, of the Latin American countries.

RAFAEL LECUONA.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA.

Views on Milk Marketing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. COOK
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, at an open public meeting on June 10, 1960, a group of milk producers presented their views on Federal milk marketing orders to Congressman ROBERT W. LEVERING, 17th District of Ohio, and myself. The meeting was held at the Ashtabula County Court House at Jefferson, Ohio. There were approximately 120 people in attendance, including milk producers, farm machinery dealers, retailers of dairy products, and contract haulers of milk.

It was the general conclusion of those present that milk marketing orders serve a useful purpose in the dairy industry. However, the view was expressed that certain changes should be made in existing law to better carry out the original intent of the legislation. Some of the suggested changes in the existing law are as follows:

First. Abolition of "block voting" on amendments to the Federal order. The practice of producer cooperatives to vote their total membership for or against an amendment was criticized as being an undemocratic method of voting. Because of this method, the views of nonmembers have little opportunity to prevail.

Second. Abolition of marketwide pool. Producers said this type of marketing allows out-of-State producers to share in a high-class, one-utilization pool, thereby lowering the price to producers within the market area.

Third. Revision of the pricing formula used under milk marketing orders. It was stated the procurer price is arrived at by a complicated manner which he cannot follow or understand. The view was further expressed that the information used by the administration in arriving at the minimum price for milk in a marketing area should be made available to the participating producers upon request.

Fourth. Revision of the milk marketing order to permit farmers to produce milk by class of utilization. It was the consensus of opinion of the farmers present that a new plan be devised whereby the producer would produce milk to be priced and sold by class rather than the present plan of permitting the needs of procurers determine the class of farmers' milk and the subsequent price received by the producer. One producer pointed out that with only one cow he could still be shipping milk classed as surplus or class three. Most producers favor a production quota system which would stabilize supply to processors.

Fifth. Revision of the order to permit rejection of an amendment to the order without rejection of the entire order.

Sixth. Amend or repeal the milk marketing law so that the producer through cooperatives has the right to bargain collectively for fair prices for dairy products. A producer introduced a chart showing that during the period 1952–60 the corporate earning of the processors increased while the prices paid to the producer has decreased.

A retail sales outlet owner who has sold over 2 million quarts of milk stated that, since 1953, the price of milk to him has increased 4 cents per quart and the price paid to producers has decreased 64 cents per hundredweight.

A producer stated that as an operator of a family-type farm, he had doubled the size of his herd, thinking that this was the solution to lower prices. In his words, he stated, "I found out I was wrong in my thinking."

In the opinion of Congressman LEVERING and myself, this meeting was a very worthwhile event in that it gave the individual farmer producer of dairy products an opportunity to give his views to his Congressman and, in addition, to a member of the House of Representatives Agricultural Committee and the Subcommittee on Dairy and Poultry. It is sincerely felt that this type of grassroots opinion will be of assistance to the Members of Congress in enacting future needed farm legislation.

One Hundred and Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Hebron, Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, the House today approved House Resolution 594, a resolution extending the greetings and felecitations of the Members of this body to the good people of Hebron, Ohio, a fine little village situated in my congressional district. I submitted this resolution to honor the village on the occasion of the celebration of its 125th anniversary on July 4, 1960, the birthday of our freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I extend special congratulations to the Hebron Planning Committee for this celebration, Robert Walters, Stanford Queen, and Rev. Raymond Sturm, and all others who have exhibited a high degree of native pride in arranging for this celebration which serves the good purpose of pointing up to all those who live in this area of Ohio the early history of the village.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my resolution, as well as a fine article written by Beverly Walker, which appeared in the June 25 edition of the Newark Advocate:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives hereby extends its greetings and felicitations to the village of Hebron, Ohio, on the occasion of the celebration to be held on July 4, 1960, in honor of its one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary, and extends its best wishes for the continued progress and prosperity of such village and its residents in the future.

[From the Newark Advocate, June 27, 1960]

HEBRON READIES FOR BIG CELEBRATION—125 YEARS TO BE MARKED JULY 4

(By Beverley Walker)

Two direct descendants of one of the founders of Hebron Village; a Licking County history dated 1881, and a group of interested residents are the nucleus of a July 4 program being planned to celebrate Hebron's 125th year as a chartered village.

Since the village of Hebron came into being largely because of the Ohio Canal and the Cumberland Road which crossed at right angles in the village, the July 4 activities will be held at the site of the Hebron firehouse, which at one time was the old canal basin.

The raising of the 50-star flag at 1 p.m. will begin the celebration. Judge Henry Ashcraft will be the guest speaker. The activities will continue throughout the day with dramatic skits and contests.

Hebron historians recall proudly many of the early-day happenings of their village. Probably the most frequently told story is how at one time shortly after Hebron's charter was issued in 1835, the town nearly became the county seat. It lost to Newark by only one vote.

Licking County's first canal boat was also a product of Hebron, built in 1827. It was destined to remain in Hebron. The boat, too large to navigate the locks, was laid up in the Hebron turning basin. It was left there and later converted into a saloon.

FIRE RECALLED

Another event frequently recalled, but none too pleasantly, was the great fire of 1901. The entire business block on the south side of Main Street was destroyed as were some of the buildings on the north side.

The fire occurred the night before the Ohio Electric Co. opened the interurban line from Columbus to Newark and Zanesville through Hebron. The line opened as scheduled and the interurban made its first run through the ruins.

There has always been a mill in Hebron, oldtime residents will tell you. During the days when whisky was the common medium of exchange, there were two distilleries in Hebron, one for corn whisky and one for rye. Workmen digging the canal received 30¾ cents per day and four "jiggers" of whisky for working from sunrise to sunset.

Old photos reveal that harnessmakers, shopkeepers and hatters were also operating in Hebron. Thomas Cully an early settler and one of the founders of the village made his living as a hatter.

His great granddaughters, Miss Mary Rosebraugh and Mrs. Clarence Henry, who live in Hebron today, still have Cully's apprentice release dated 1803. At that time, young men learning a trade were bound to their employer for a certain period, then given an apprentice release enabling them to go out on their own.

Hebron, during its prosperous years, was most famous as a pork, beef, turkey, and grain market, historians relate. In 1835 the Atlantic and Lake Erie Railroad was constructed through the village. Although it circled the development of Hebron, at the same time, it contributed to the demise of the Ohio Canal.

This decline had some adverse effects on the business life of the village. One early historian wrote: "Hebron * * * situated at the crossing of the canal and National Road was once a fine business point and in the days of its glory the largest and best grain and pork market in the county, if not in the Licking Valley. But since the men that made it such have passed away and railroad facilities have attracted the commerce to other points, Hebron has lost its prestige as a commercial point and with it, much of its moral and religious enterprise."

Present-day residents do not share this historian's pessimism. "We feel we're still pretty important," one resident said. According to the latest census figures the village's population is 1,255, an increase of about 395 in the last 10 years.

Armed Services Day Address, Lubbock, Tex., by Lt. Gen. Ben A. Schriever

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Gen. Ben A. Schriever on May 20, 1960, under the auspices of the chamber of commerce of Lubbock, Tex., made an Armed Services Day address in that city.

General Schriever is the distinguished commander of the Air Research and Development Command. He guided our ballistic missile development programs until he was promoted to his present position where, of course, he still supervises these programs. No one in the military services or otherwise has been more vitally concerned with our missile and military space programs. I speak from firsthand knowledge when I say that General Schriever has made a tremendous contribution to the security of the United States.

I wish to insert in the RECORD a copy of General Schriever's speech at Lubbock. His opening remarks are omitted.

U.S. AIR FORCE—AEROSPACE POWER FOR PEACE

I feel at home when I come back to Texas for as you know Texas is where I grew up and received most of my education. I find it especially gratifying that so many representatives of Reese Air Force Base, military Reserve units, and the Texas National Guard are assembled here, along with faculty members and students of Texas Tech, and citizens of Lubbock.

The purpose of Armed Forces Day is to bring military and civilian groups together, for a clearer understanding of our common interests and problems. My subject tonight is the basic one of our time, and it concerns all of us equally—that is, national security in the space age.

My own interest and concern in space activities, quite naturally, is that which is seen from the eyes of the military man whose first responsibility is the development of an aerospace force sufficient to deter any armed assault on our Nation.

It is axiomatic that there is no longer safety in distance on earth. We are literally next door neighbors to all peoples—and to their governments—whether they choose to live with us in hostility or in friendship. With the advent of megaton-yield nuclear weapons, supersonic airplanes, and ballistic missiles, the space age has caused the world to shrink in terms of time to a mere fraction of its former size. Thus the development of the ballistic missile which has made it possible for us to operate in space has concurrently made it necessary for us to develop military space vehicles for reconnaissance, surveillance, warning, and communications. Accordingly, in discussing national security in the space age, I shall discuss briefly the Air Force ballistic missile program and then I will cover our military space requirements.

The missile, as a forerunner of space vehicles, encompasses a part of history that at least dates back to A.D. 300 when Hero of Alexandria used the opposite reaction principle to propel an experimental device. Nine hundred years later in about A.D. 1200 the Chinese used gunpowder to propel arrows of flying fire equivalent to present day skyrockets. Our own Dr. Robert H. Goddard fired the first successful liquid-fuel rocket in 1926; however, it was not until 1954 that the United States initiated its all-out ICBM program at Inglewood, Calif. The decision to embark upon so broad and extensive a missile program was based on the judgment of a group of scientists drawn from colleges, universities, industry, and the military establishments. Their judgment was that such a system was technically feasible despite the fact that none of the elements of the ICBM program existed in 1954. We had no lightweight, high-yield warhead—we had no suitable nose cone that could withstand the intense 12,000° F. heat generated by its reentry into the atmosphere—we had no adequate guidance systems—we had no proper or suitable powerplant, nor any of the many facilities necessary to make the missile work as a complete weapon.

All of this has been accomplished since 1954 by a compression of time, employing the concept of concurrency—for it was a race against time—the most difficult race that can be undertaken. I will not belabor you with the details of what may be termed as recent ancient history—rather, I prefer to speak of the missile miracle which transposed an idea into a reality in 5½ short years. This was a miracle that was wrought by tens of thousands of dedicated, talented and devoted men and women throughout the length and breadth of the Nation, great numbers of whom came from this State. This has been a maximum effort in the Nation's most urgent business of perfecting American defenses and insuring our security. Many of these men and women may perhaps be found in the audience today. It is to them, in science, industry, in the universities, in the research laboratories and in the military services, to whom high praise and great credit must go for without them the reality of operational ICBM's and IRBM's could not have taken place in such a very short period.

In the few short years since our ballistic missile program was accelerated, the Atlas has progressed from a concept to an operational weapon system. It performance exceeds that which was thought possible at that time and just this morning, an Atlas flew 9,000 miles from Florida to the southern tip of Africa in 50 minutes. The Titan also was conceived, designed, produced and tested during this period. All elements of the Titan missile have successfully demonstrated their capability for operational use.

As these ICBM's enter the operational inventory, we already have more advanced systems underway. The Minuteman, which is a solid propellant ICBM, is in test now. This system will provide a more economical ICBM and is planned to be built in quantity. The Minuteman system will be operational in mid-1962—and by 1963 quantities of Min-

uteman, both hardened and dispersed, and mobile, using our vast railroad network will be added to the deterrent strength of the free world.

Intermediate range ballistic missiles have been developed and deployed during this same time interval. Thors have been turned over to the Britain's Royal Air Force and are operational now. In addition, the Thor has been used as the booster for most of our satellite launchings. Recently a Thor-Able placed Pioneer V in orbit around the sun; another Thor provided the booster for Tiros, the weather satellite, pictures which you have seen; and on April 13 of this year, the navigation satellite, Transit, was placed into orbit by still another Thor. As you can see this Air Force missile has been serving as the workhorse of the American space effort in addition to its military role.

What has been the impact of the development of these ballistic missiles? I have already stated that the advent of these weapons has caused the world to shrink in terms of time. This compression of the time factor has given a new and ominous definition to the element of surprise. For the first time in the history of our Nation, the United States is open to a destructive surprise nuclear attack. This change has had a revolutionary effect on every aspect of our national life—on our thoughts and behavior habits, on our trade, our political activities, and most of all on our basic feeling of security.

For example, an aggressor nation having complete target information and military forces armed with nuclear ballistic missiles, will enjoy a new and decided advantage. Under these conditions, our own deterrent posture must be one in which, first, the vulnerability of our offensive force is reduced to the maximum extent possible; second, our warning and surveillance systems must greatly reduce the possibility of a surprise attack; and third, our communications or command and control systems must provide the capability of making decisions in a matter of minutes.

These are cold, hard facts that must be acted upon and not just theories to be contemplated.

Now, what must be done? There are things that can and are being done to reduce the vulnerability of our retaliatory forces. There is hardening of our bases and facilities, dispersal of our forces and equipment, and mobility which is being built into our missile forces as well as the capability of an air alert for our bomber forces.

We must have these forces in sufficient quantity to enable those surviving an attack to counterattack and win. These are actions generally understood by the American people.

Not so well understood, however, is the importance of surveillance and warning in eliminating the possibility of surprise attack. Nor is there a clear understanding of the need and nature of the command and control systems required to speed our national decision making. Even less appreciated is the significant contribution which can be made by space vehicles toward the attainment of these objectives.

Now, why are these capabilities, namely, for surveillance, warning, and communication—of such great importance to the United States, and of little relative value to the U.S.S.R.? As I have already said, an aggressor nation, with superior target information, has a tremendous advantage in our nuclear-rocket world of today. Our national policy, which has been supported by our actions, firmly establishes the United States as a nonaggressor Nation.

This is not necessarily true for the U.S.S.R. Certainly then it is obvious that the nation which requires warning against attack is the United States—not the U.S.S.R., and, here, space vehicles can play a most vital role.

One such system under development is the Midas satellite program to detect missile firings by the use of heat sensors. Midas will double the warning time we can get from ground-based systems. However, our command and control systems must permit immediate dissemination of such a warning. Our present communication systems are not quite good enough.

Here again, the potential improvement inherent in space systems—namely, communication satellites—can be expressed in as many times as that which we have today. In short, adequate and reliable communication between globally dispersed land, sea, and air forces is possible—through space vehicles. This will permit us to exploit our warning to the fullest, even if the time is only 15 to 30 minutes in length. An enemy, knowing that he could not achieve surprise, would certainly be reluctant to attack. Thus, warning and communications satellites would greatly enhance the deterrent posture of the United States and the free world, while they would be of little military value to the U.S.S.R.

Now in the field of military intelligence, the U.S.S.R. has no problem. It can easily assess the strengths, weaknesses, and intentions of the United States and the free world. In peacetime, because of our democratic principles, only our most vital technical information can be kept secure. And even here, we have not always fully succeeded. On the other hand, the Iron Curtain has been extremely effective.

The advantage of reducing this gap in intelligence is obvious. Again, space vehicles—in the form of surveillance satellites—possess the greatest potential to accomplish this objective.

All of these satellite systems are entirely passive in nature. They represent no threat to any other nation. They will indeed be servants of world peace and security.

To make these systems truly effective will require that our command and control systems permit immediate dissemination of warning information. These systems must also provide us with the capability of making decisions in a matter of minutes since the drastic reduction of available time in the space age lends an irrevocable nature to our decisions. Thus we can see that the development of ballistic missiles has generated requirements for military space vehicles and for modern command and control systems.

The impact of these developments has created requirements for new industry and new technology. In a short period of time, a multibillion dollar missile and space industry has been created. Today, over 100,000 people are working full time in the Air Force Ballistic Missile and Space program. Tens of thousands of people are also working in other missile programs.

I do not need to tell you that Texas takes an active part in these developments. This State already has an established group of companies manufacturing aerospace components. It also has a rapidly growing list of firms in the important electronics field.

Texas consistently has ranked third among the States in prime military contracts. During the last fiscal year, new contract awards of this kind in Texas amounted to $1½ billion. In addition, military personnel and civilian employees of the Defense Department in Texas number about 225,000 people. They bring the State an annual payroll of nearly $1 billion.

Here in the West Plains and in the Panhandle, you have made tremendous strides industrially in the past two decades. This growth has been based largely on the great oil and gas production just south of Lubbock, and the area to the north, above Amarillo. As is always the case, the expansion of basic production facilities has been followed by a substantial influx of new manufacturing establishments of many different kinds.

In the past 22 months, military contracts totaling more than $57 million have been awarded for work in west Texas and the Panhandle. These contracts cover a wide variety of products and services, ranging from engine fuel in Big Spring, Wichita Falls, and in Borger to the construction of guided missile training facilities of Sheppard Air Force Base, Wichita Falls. Just across the New Mexico line, at Roswell, an underground launching site for Atlas intercontinental missiles is to be constructed.

All these military and industrial activities are reflected in the remarkable growth of Lubbock—and the other modern cities of west Texas. The spacious auditorium in which we are now gathered is a fitting symbol of the industry and of the progress being made here.

As our American missile and space technology moves forward, we will find that we have an ever-increasing capability for flight beyond the borders of our atmosphere. To take every advantage of that capability, and to realize our full space potential, we must understand that space is a medium in which vehicles can travel on missions, for both peaceful and military purposes. We must also recognize that many military missions—and civilian services too—can be performed more efficiently, and more economically, using space vehicles than by any other systems available today.

In closing, let me summarize briefly. The primary responsibility of the military is the defense and security of the United States. Space is a medium which we can and must use in carrying out our primary task of maintaining the peace. It is hoped that this peace, which is the dream of mankind, can be achieved and become a reality. I personally believe that this will be accomplished by the continued dedication of the people here and those throughout the entire Nation.

The Most Significant Date in the 20th Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, two Washington journalists, Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey II, have written a remarkable book about the events surrounding the first use of atomic bombs. Under unanimous consent, I include a review of their book, "No High Ground," published by Harper's, by Orville Prescott in the New York Times:

BOOKS OF THE TIMES
(By Orville Prescott)

If civilized men still study history in the 21st century it seems probable that they will agree that August 6, 1945, was the most significant date in the 20th century. It was on that day that an American B–29 bombing plane flew over a Japanese city called Hiroshima and dropped a new kind of bomb. A new age was opened with the first use in war of the destructive power of atomic energy. Since then in less than 15 years gigantic stockpiles of unimaginably more destructive bombs have ben accumulated and the peoples of the world have learned to live without shuddering for more than a few minutes a day. And also since then atomic energy has been put to many useful and peaceful purposes. But even today, after the publication of dozens of books and millions of words in papers and magazines, most

of us know very little about the decisions and debates that preceded the epochal flight of the Enola Gay. In their "No High Ground," Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey 2d have assembled quantities of facts about the dramatic debut of the bomb, many of them hitherto unpublished.

RELIVING OF DRAMATIC DAYS

This is reportorial, informal, popular history written by two reporters. Mr. Knebel is the author of a syndicated daily political column, "Potomac Fever." Mr. Bailey is a member of the Washington bureau of the Cowles Publications. The two men have studied every available documentary source and have personally interviewed scores of men who played parts in the tremendous drama—scientists, statesmen, soldiers, diplomats. They have quoted copiously from verbatim transcripts of once top-secret memorandums and coded dispatches.

The result of their joint efforts is a clear and lively narrative that seems to cover everything important and certainly includes many less important matters, adding piquant details and suggesting the high-tension atmosphere in which everyone who shared in the fateful project lived. But too many characters are introduced too briefly. It is easy to remember who's who among the major personages sitting in the seats of the mighty; it is impossible to keep track of many of the minor figures.

The authors call their book "the full and controversial story of the first atomic bomb." "No High Ground" may not be so comprehensive as this suggests; but it does cover a lot of ground the tentative, halfhearted peace proposals of the Japanese; American plans for the invasion of Japan; a description of Hiroshima and of the lives led there by a half dozen individual Japanese; a review of the history of the secret and gigantic project called Manhattan Engineer District, "the most prodigious scientific-industrial-military enterprise ever conceived by man"; an account of the organization and training of the special Air Force unit assigned to deliver the first bombs; a collation of the divided opinions among scientists and Government officials about the use of the bomb, whether there should be a warning or demonstration first, etc.; the reasons why President Truman and the majority of his advisers decided for a surprise attack; a blow-by-blow narrative of the raids on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and a quick look at the horrors unleashed in Hiroshima.

ETHICAL IMPLICATIONS HAZY

Mr. Knebel and Mr. Bailey have not tried to explain the scientific mysteries of nuclear fission or the methods by which atomic bombs are manufactured, which is understandable and just as well. They have devoted a generous amount of their attention to the debate among scientists and among soldiers and statesmen on the use of the bomb. Even now after 15 years the moral and military rights and wrongs are by no means clear. Undoubtedly the lives of many American and Japanese soldiers were saved when an invasion of Japan was made unnecessary. Undoubtedly also the killing of many civilians with two atomic bombs profoundly shocked millions of people who had not been particularly shocked by the killing of as many civilians with many ordinary bombs.

Nevertheless, the following excerpt from a report submitted by seven atomic scientists under the chairmanship of James Franck still seems prophetically cogent:

"If the United States were to be the first to release this new means of indiscriminate destruction upon mankind, she would sacrifice public support throughout the world, precipitate the race for armaments, and prejudice the possibility of reaching an international agreement on the future control of such weapons.

"Much more favorable conditions for the eventual achievement of such an agreement could be created if nuclear bombs were first revealed to the world by a demonstration in an appropriately selected uninhabited area."

This book gets its title from an old military maxim recommending ground forces to seize the high ground. Since the coming of atomic bombs there has been no high ground.

Congressman Feighan Honored by American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, June 25, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it will be of interest to the House to learn that the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations held a testimonial dinner in Cleveland, at which our colleague, Honorable MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, was the honored guest, and delivered an address before the members and friends of this organization.

On this occasion the American Friends of the Anti-Bolshevik Bloc of Nations presented our colleague, Congressman FEIGHAN, with a plaque which carries an inspiring accolade for his many years of hard work in behalf of the cause of justice among all nations and all people, which reads as follows:

In recognition of his firm stand and staunch efforts on the liberation and sovereignty of all enslaved nations as well as against communism and Russian colonial imperialism.

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the full text of Congressman MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN'S address:

This occasion has significant meaning because I attach great importance to the work carried on by the ABN and associated organizations in support of a peace with justice and to keep the American people informed of the dangers of Russian imperialism and Communist imperialism to our free American way of life.

This occasion provides me an opportunity to discuss some of the major problems confronting our country as a consequence of the Russian effort to dominate the world.

There is the Berlin crisis. The Russians have been attempting to take over complete control of all Berlin since 1947. They attempted to drive us out in 1948 by cutting off our lines of supply and communication. President Truman responded with a firm determination to remain in Berlin—the Berlin airlift—the Russians backed down when they saw we meant business.

In 1955 the first summit conference was held. The Russians agreed with the Western leaders that Germany should be united by means of free elections—this was played up as the big accomplishment of the conference. A reading of the communique released at the end of that meeting makes this fact startlingly apparent. Yet, nothing was done to implement this agreement. A dangerous drift set in, the Russians took advantage of this vacuum. Having serious internal troubles with the captive non-Russian nations in their slave empire, fearing a repeat of the Hungarian freedom revolution on a much broader scale, they began to call for a status quo in the affairs of nations.

Khrushchev was the spokesman on this new demand—he made no less than 10 major addresses in the empire on this theme. The United States did not look with favor on a status quo arrangement and told the Russians so.

Therefore, Khrushchev provoked a political crisis on Berlin—his demand that the United States, France, and Great Britain get out of Berlin by a set date or be driven out by Russian military force. President Eisenhower's first reaction was, we would stand fast on Berlin—the Russians have to take full responsibility for their actions on Berlin. In this he received complete support of Congress and the acclaim of the American people. It was then clear that our people had become sick and tired of being pushed around by the Russians and the time had come to take a stand.

Khruchchev recognized this and quickly claimed he had been misunderstood—that he wanted to negotiate on Berlin—that he was ready to meet with the Western leaders to negotiate. Here is where the Eisenhower administration weakened. The offer was made to the Russians that if Khrushchev would remove his deadline threat, we would be willing to negotiate. Now imagine this. We said we were willing to negotiate something on which no negotiation was legally possible because our legal right to be in Berlin was clearly established. By accepting Khrushchev's demand that we negotiate on our legal right to be in Berlin, we thereby admitted our right to be there was not clear; that it was something subject to negotiation. This, in my opinion, was a blunder; an admission of weakness. We let Khrushchev get off the hook after we called his bluff and he had backed down. It seems our leaders lack the political sense to know when we have won a victory and how to exploit such a victory.

It is now clear that Khrushchev used the Berlin crisis as a political blackjack to force the leaders of the West into a second summit conference. He must have needed this meeting very badly to take the risks he did on this crisis.

And now it is clear that Khrushchev so desperately needed a recognition by the free world of a status quo that he was prepared to take grave risks to win this goal.

Now let us look at the meaning of status quo—its significance to the Russians in their plot to conquer the world.

To the Russians status quo means that the United States recognizes the finality of the captivity of all the non-Russian nations within the empire. It gives a permanency to the Iron Curtain—at least a permanency so far as the emancipation of the captive nations is concerned. It does not mean, however, that the Russians would give up their ideas of extending their Iron Curtain to all the still free countries of the world. For the Russians it means the right to do as they please with the people held in bondage behind the Iron Curtain—to continue on with genocide and their other crimes against humanity, to ruthlessly crush all opposition, to kill off more millions of non-Russian people. It would give the Russians the right to be above the conscience of all humanity.

To the enslaved non-Russian nations it means the United States has deserted their cause—has turned its back upon their legitimate aspirations for liberty, freedom, and national independence. It is cold water thrown upon the torch of human freedom which they hold up in a sea of tyranny and despotism. It is a denial of the cause of those millions of martyrs of all faiths who gave their lives in the cause of justice and all humanity.

It is a temptation for those who may grow weary of the struggle for freedom to take the easy way out—to compromise their conscience and their moral convictions—to be opportunists—to make their peace with the tyrant, it is in fact an invitation to accept communism as the wave of the future—and this is the key to war—a war in which the United States would be deprived of its proven allies behind the Iron Curtain—the non-Russian people of the empire.

For the United States recognition of a status quo would mean that we have surrendered our heritage as the citadel of human freedom—that we fear the power of our political ideals—that we consider our political ideals as theories reserved for after dinner talks and fillers for history books. Worse still, that the United States had lost its faith in the power of the common man and his aspirations for peace with justice. It would signal the beginning of a new era in power politics, an era in which the United States would turn back to the 9th century, to indulge in the immoral peace of empires. And finally, it would deprive the United States of its most potent weapon for peace-moral leadership in a world which is crying out for a return to fundamental morality in the affairs of nations and peoples.

With this background we can see the hidden importance of the conference which will open in Paris on May 16. The great challenge to American leadership in Paris next month is whether we will take advantage of a golden opportunity to strike a blow for peace—that is—a just and lasting peace. We will fail in this opportunity if our leaders sit back and wait for the Russians to take the initiative. We must seize the initiative and state our case for all the world to hear it—and to understand beyond any doubt that we reject any and all proposals which could lead to recognition of a political status quo with the Russian slave empire.

On March 21, 1960, I introduced a resolution in Congress—calling upon the President to do just this. It is House Concurrent Resolution 636—copies of which some of you have had an opportunity to study. In my judgment, the terms of this resolution state our case for the Paris summit conference.

I call to your attention the fact that my resolution includes all the nations occupied by the Russian Communists—not just a few—but all of them. It is my judgment that none will be free until all are free. That is the nature of the struggle for the world.

* * * * *

It is my fervent hope that the "spirit of the Paris conference" will be based upon these foundations of international justice.

The "spirit of Camp David" needs an airing, it needs the clean airing of just what did take place between President Eisenhower and Khrushchev. Only the Russian version has been made public. The American version has been withheld from everyone—particularly the American people. We shall judge the meaning of this strange silence by the results obtained at the second summit conference—not in terms of platitudes and slogans, but, specifically, in terms of what the American delegation did on the question of status quo and the future emancipation of all the captive nations.

The American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago on Friday, June 11, a young man, 17-year-old Stephen Bayne, president of Westbury High School student organization, told an audience of almost 1,000 classmates, parents, and school officials at Senior Awards night that he could not accept a citizenship award from the local American Legion Post because he did not respect the American Legion. As the award was about to be made to him, he jumped up and shouted, "Wait. I refuse to accept an award from an organization I can't respect." Someone cried, "I demand the boy be ejected." The audience was stunned but the proceedings—in which Stephen Bayne was awarded other prizes—went on.

I wonder if this young man fully realized the significance of his remark. What incited this young high school student leader to take such drastic action to express his lack of respect for one of the most patriotic organizations in our country. Several weeks ago in San Francisco, we witnessed a shameful organization of students led by well-known expertly trained Communist agents in their riotous demonstration against the functioning of a Committee of the U.S. Congress, the Committee on Un-American Activities. The American Legion has always been vigilant on the issue of communism and loyally supports the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities in its work in opposition to the Communist tyranny.

Does the young man Stephen Bayne have disrespect for the American Legion because it is an organization "for God and country"? Or is his disrespect the result of Communist teachings?

Mr. Maurice Stember, department adjutant of the American Legion, Department of New York, made an address on this subject wherein he said:

There is a segment of our society, including a few columnists and teenagers, who, because they are uninformed, or do not care to learn the true character and purposes of the American Legion, occasionally break into print attacking the policies of our organization, as best illustrated by the recent incident that took place in Westbury, here in Nassau County. It is most unfortunate that a few columnists who have a great affinity for defending people and organizations that we regard as leftists seize upon the action of an immature youth to make a Roman holiday of it. They should be reminded that the American Legion is an organization of men who fought in three wars to maintain the kind of country in which a youngster can speak his own mind without fear of the Gestapo. The American system which guarantees the right to speak up also gives the same right to other people to speak their own mind and, if anyone has earned this right, the members of the American Legion have done so. They certainly deserve a tolerant attitude on the part of others, and good manners. That is not too much to expect.

In contrast to this group there are a great majority of people, maybe not honor students, but people with much more honor, who gave thanks that there were and still are men who believe in their God and their country and have joined together under the name of the American Legion.

The Legion has never been prone to compromise or evasion, whether in time of war or uneasy peace. There is no question as to where our organization's first allegiance lies or where its devotion centers. Its loyalty is not subject to debate for it is attested in the soil of 100 battlefields and pledged in the blood of thousands who died on them. We have as members the President and Vice President of the United States, 61 U.S. Senators, 241 Members of the House of Representatives, and 31 Governors of States.

The American Legion includes in its ranks more disabled veterans, more holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor and other decorations than all other organizations combined. Yet, we are not old soldiers reminiscing and recalling empty shades of past glories. There does, however, exist among us an unspoken testament that we shall keep faith with the comrades we have known; those men who through pain and bitter sacrifice have learned a hard lesson that perhaps can be taught in no other way, and the lesson is this: The great battle of our age is not waged on land or on sea or in the air, but in the souls of men and the time of battle is not fixed, but is of continuing urgency.

It follows then that the defense of our homeland is basically anchored in the moral strength of the Nation, and it is for this reason that the Legion marshals its energies in the promotion of a sound patriotism. We have laid down a direct, hard-hitting diagnosis of the critical problem of our time and our country and this problem briefly is the gap which exists between the free world and communism, not in terms of armament and material achievement, but in terms of a spiritual dedication to a cause. Communism is a faith, a godless one. It has its own zeal and its own spirit of sacrifice and the question that the American Legion constantly poses is this: Can we counter their faith with one of our own? A faith must have an objective, it must be built upon convictions. If the object of our faith is material, then our faith differs little from the faith which has already gripped half the world in chains of tyranny. If, on the contrary, our faith is pointed to the God-given dignity which lifts man above beast, then there exists a barricade which can never be yielded to the enemy.

It is the American Legion's task to build that faith or rather to rebuild. For we had it once. It is woven through a national tradition which remembers the ragged Colonial Army praying in the snow and a somber Lincoln proclaiming this to be a Nation under God.

Of that tradition, the American Legion is the heir and trustee and we have the moral courage to herald that tradition, to give it continued voice and to pledge to it an unashamed loyalty and devotion.

For taking strong positions, for emphasizing the value and virtue of loyalty and patriotism we have been called unkind names and otherwise attacked. But neither the violence of the language nor the source from which it emanates shall deter us from our belief. The American Legion will continue to focus attention on the blessings of our Nation's constitutional form of government. We shall continue our nationwide oratorical program in which more than 5 million boys and girls have participated in competition, in which knowledge of the Nation's Constitution is the requirement. We shall continue our all-inclusive magnificent child welfare program wherein last year we spent alone over $8 million.

We shall continue to raise our voice in strong opposition to any traffic with communism, with its denial of God's existence and its complete disregard for human dignity. We will continue and enlarge our great Boy's State program wherein each summer we send thousands of outstanding high school boys to college campuses and other facilities to receive an intensive training in the operation of our form of government. We will always concern ourselves with the problem of veterans' rehabilitation, feeling that a soldier is a special person, and despite the sporadic attacks and incidents, we shall, as members of the American Legion, strive to keep alive the spirit of patriotism, of love of God and country. This is our pur-

pose. This is our challenge. No one, but no one, shall swerve us from it.

On March 15–17, 1919, 463 officers and men of the AEF met in Paris, France. They represented the combat divisions and major units of the Service of Supply of the American Forces then in France. The announced purpose of the meeting was to form a veterans' organization.

Bennett Champ Clark, later Senator from Missouri, was elected as the first chairman of the meeting. Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., one of the original group, was appointed to set up the first meeting in the United States. On May 8, 1919, in a theater in St. Louis, Mo., 1,100 delegates, representing all of the Armed Forces and other veterans' organizations met.

It was in St. Louis that the immortalized preamble was put into final form:

PREAMBLE TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

For God and country, we associate ourselves together for the following purposes: To uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States of America; to maintain law and order; to foster and perpetuate a 100-percent Amercanism; to preserve the memories and incidents of our associations in the great wars; to inculcate a sense of individual obligation to the community, State and Nation; to combat the autocracy of both the classes and the masses; to make right the master of might; to promote peace and good will on earth; to safeguard and transmit to posterity the principles of justice, freedom and democracy; to consecrate and sanctify our comradeship by our devotion to mutual helpfulness.

The American Legion is a great patriotic organization, dedicated and devoted to advancing the ideals of America—justice, freedom, democracy, and loyalty—and to exalting, under the motto "For God and Country," the sacredness of human personality and the inestimable gift of American citizenship.

Numbering its members in the millions, the American Legion has become a great and influential organization. In just one of its many programs—child welfare—the Legion last year spent $8 million. It has marshaled its resources on behalf of retarded children. It has used its facilities and its influence to relieve the loneliness and the financial distress of the aged.

Since its beginning, the American Legion has sought to raise the standard of patriotism, of respect for the flag, of reverence for men who fell in battle; and it has tried to enkindle in each man's heart a love for his country.

Because the American Legion must always speak with the strong voice of patriotism, of knowledge, and of creative thinking, it needs and wants the membership of all war veterans who believe in individual freedom in the days of dark peril. It also needs their active and thoughtful participation.

I salute and thank God for the American Legion and the VFW. Our country would be morally stronger, safe and secure, if all Americans would dedicate themselves to the preamble to the constitution of the American Legion.

It is my belief that the overwhelming majority of the American people have deep respect and gratitude for the American Legion. The deeds and records of this great and patriotic organization speaks for itself.

Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Western Interstate Commission for Higher Education—WICHE—is an organization which has been a source of real pride to the Western States. Recognizing the interstate nature of the problems of education, our 13 Western States have attempted to meet their mutual problems by consulting frequently in order to make possible the most effective and efficient use of their total educational resources.

Recently, a report was issued jointly by WICHE and the Council of State Governments, poining to the necessity of increasing the supply of trained personnel to help curb juvenile delinquency. On the basis of this report, the Western Governor's Conference established a Committee on Juvenile Delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Education and Labor has recently reported a bill, H.R. 12108, which would make available Federal assistance in the training of these professional people so urgently needed in the fight against juvenile crime. The bill has not yet been acted upon by the Committee on Rules, although a substantively identical bill has been approved by the other body. I ask unanimous consent that an article from Higher Education in the West, a WICHE publication, pointing up the need for the passage of such legislation, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks:

GOVERNORS URGE REGIONAL TRAINING FOR JD WORKERS

The Western Governors' Conference has established a committee on juvenile delinquency, after hearing a WICHE-Council of State Governments report on western needs for expanded training and exchange of professional personnel in the juvenile corrections field. The committee will recommend specific programs of action to the western States, and will attempt to "marshal all public and private efforts to combat juvenile delinquency" in the region.

The Governors in setting up the committee noted "shortages of professional skills available to the Western States" in the juvenile corrections field. They urged that the Western States, with CSG and WICHE help, establish cooperative training programs and exchanges of information and expert personnel in this specialty.

The WICHE-CSG report was presented by Dr. Garrett Heyns, a member of the WICHE mental health council, and dealt with ways of improving facilities for "special problem" juvenile delinquents who are emotionally disturbed or mentally defective. It was developed at the western Governors request, with the help of U.S. Public Health Service officials and heads of Western State mental hospitals, correctional schools, and schools for the mentally retarded.

Strengthening of overcrowded, understaffed western institutions with more highly trained professional personnel is the basic need in dealing better with special problem juvenile delinquents in those institutions, the report said. Community-based agencies to combat juvenile delinquency should also be given more emphasis, it noted, and State institutions should work within a network of agencies concerned with the problem.

Correction of delinquents in State institutions is only one part of a larger problem close to all of us, Dr. Heyns noted; prevention is just as important. "Too many people are concerned momentarily—particularly if some act of vandalism occurs in the neighborhood—but they forget as soon as the police have taken over," he said. Specially trained police officers, juvenile court judges, and probation staffs are needed, with better public financial support, he stated.

High-level inservice training programs for staffs of juvenile correction institutions in the region would help greatly, the report continued. It recommended interstate cooperation in the establishment of several types of training programs for professional personnel, along with better staff recruitment methods for these institutions. New ways must be found for training clinical personnel to apply psychiatric and social work knowledge in juvenile correction, the report said, since "there is likely to be a shortage of psychiatrists for a long time."

McCulloch's Schedule of Conferences in the Fourth District of Ohio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a Congressman should be in his district to confer and visit with his constituents whenever official duties do not require him to be in Washington.

When Congress recesses, I expect to return home and to be available for conferences and visits with residents of the Fourth District in the courthouse of each county seat between 8 a.m. and 4 p.m., in accordance with the following schedule:

Allen County, Lima: Tuesday, July 19, and Wednesday, July 20.

Auglaize County, Wapakoneta: Thursday, July 21.

Darke County, Greenville: Monday, August 1.

Mercer County, Celina: Tuesday, August 2.

Miami County, Troy: Wednesday, August 3.

Preble County, Eaton: Thursday, August 4.

Shelby County, Sidney: Thursday, August 11.

No appointments will be necessary. Any problem with, or opinion concerning, the Federal Government will be proper subject for conference.

Of course, I will be glad to see residents of the district, in my Piqua office, any time that Congress is not in session, except on the days scheduled above.

Masterpiece of Patriotism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including a series of three articles on patriotism. They were written by Mr. George Todt, a columnist for the Valley Times, published in North Hollywood, Calif., and circulated in the district I represent.

Mr. Todt's editorial views would seem of importance not only to his readers but other Americans as well:

(By George Todt)

"When all else is lost, the future still remains"—Bovee.

What was probably the greatest ideological and moral message this writer has listened to in recent years was delivered in the Los Angeles Biltmore Bowl last Tuesday by Attorney Martin B. McKneally, national commander of the American Legion.

The occasion was the annual civic luncheon sponsored by the Los Angeles American Legion Luncheon Club. Attending were more than 1,000 of the outstanding leaders of the southern California community. It was "a really big show."

The chairman and master of ceremonies for this worthwhile event was a World War I veteran and member of my own Hollywood Post 43, Robert Mitchell, president of Consolidated Rock Products Co. His able assistants included such Legion standouts as Leon V. McCardle, Harry Engelund, Robert Berry, Leo Hubbard, William B. McKesson, Steve Foote, Harry Meyers and Al Weinberg.

On November 2-3 I reported in this space a magnificent local address made by Commander McKneally, a New Yorker, which I thought at the time would be difficult to top. But he did it at the Bowl last week. He was, in fact, even better than before. And this is the most interesting feature of all: McKneally employs no ghost writers—he wrote this particular speech by himself the night before.

His delivery was excellent, reminding me somewhat of a young Douglas MacArthur, to whom McKneally bears a striking resemblance.

Let me bring to my readers some of the excerpts from the address which impressed me most by their correct patriotism and morality—which is the best kind of American ideology. Consider these words:

"One who visits this great community," said McKneally speaking of our own City of Angels, "full of industry and prosperity, blessed by great beauty and natural resources, unexcelled in its rise to eminence as one of the great cities of the world, and dedicated in its origin to the Mother of God, cannot but ask himself what lies ahead for Los Angeles and what lies ahead for the society and system which produced it?

"Will men here continue prosperous and free in an age in which personal liberty is dying all over the world? Will men's prosperity endure in an age in which enslaved men with enslaved minds have performed technological and engineering feats of incredible dimensions? Will men remain loyal to the values and virtues which alone guarantee life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness? Or will they be betrayed into a series of modifications and alterations of their basic thinking which will involve them in a full scale acceptance of a new philosophy of life based upon materialism alone?

"Communism proposes that life is material and that man is a product of nature with no purpose, no will and no soul. This is a harsh doctrine but Communists believe it to be true—and they are ardent in their faith and faithful to their cause. Their cause is not a relative superiority in ballistics or space satellites, or trade or productivity, or even military power.

"This is not what they seek. It is nothing less than the domination of the Earth and all of its peoples that Communists demand of themselves, and they are capable of great sacrifices. Are we? Can we counter their faith with one of our own?

"If we cannot, then the city of Los Angeles is lost and so are all the people within it—for one can only fight the intensity of religious fervor by more religious fervor—and unless we believe that man was created by God in his image and likeness then we cannot fight communism, for that is the basic idea on which the conflict with Marxism exists. If we shall triumph in this struggle for men's minds, we must redevelop among us a doctrine of belief.

"And that, my dear friends, is what the American Legion is seeking to do. We have sought since the beginning to raise the standards of patriotism of respect for the flag, of reverence for men who fell in battle—and we have tried to rekindle in each man's heart a love for his country.

"We have felt that this is necessary: for history is strewn with the wreckage of great nations whose citizens lost their regard for their country. And history also discloses that the most easily lost of man's possessions is his freedom.

"Our history, with all its sacrifices, means one thing to Legionnaires—and that is freedom."

LEGION'S VOICE STRONG

(By George Todt)

"Sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish with my country was my unalterable determination," John Adams—Works.

"For taking strong positions," said American Legion National Commander Martin McKneally to more than 1,000 civic leaders in the Los Angeles Biltmore Bowl last week, "for emphasizing the value and virtue of patriotism, we of the Legion have been denounced and insulted by certain people.

"We have been called superpatriots, flag wavers and many unkind names—but neither the violence of the language nor the place from which it issues shall dissuade us from our doctrine of belief • • •

"We are not without pride in our record, and we are confident that everyone in this room approves of our pride.

"The American Legion has been vigilant on the issue of communism. In 1933, the American Legion, through its national commander, raised its voice in strong opposition to any traffic with Communist tyranny. For it discerned too clearly that the Marxist philosophy with its denial of God's existence, its proposals of egalitarianism and its disregard of human dignity, would lead to the abasement and slavery of men.

"For this position, it has drawn the fire of some as being an abridger of freedom, an enemy of advancement, anti-intellectual, and of following a philosophy suited to another age. In short, of not knowing what it was all about.

"We submit to you that the positions taken by the American Legion in its conventions have been based upon its doctrine of belief—belief in individual freedom—and the conviction that communism is its relentless enemy.

"We have supported the principle that congressional committees are not only right, but are in duty bound to investigate influences inimical to the best interests of American freedom.

We have watched with mounting dismay the demeaning uses to which, in the last several years, the fifth amendment has been put by witnesses before congressional committees.

For their brazen and successful attempts at evasion, hundreds of witnesses who have availed themselves of the protection of the fifth amendment have been hailed across the land.

And what of the men who asked the questions to which the Nation deserved answers? No one needs to elaborate on that.

Ladies and gentlemen, only minds calcified by prejudice, vanity, and error can operate as if the freedom of the United States was in peril. We live in a highly confused world.

The fifth amendment has become, in the words of a professor at Harvard, not a protection for the innocent but a shield for the guilty—and a refuge for those who seek to avoid telling the truth. Flight from truth will serve neither man nor society.

We have seen recently a strange spectacle of television programs whose stars were sunk deep in deception. We have been witness to high tolerance on the part of too many of our people of this failure to serve truth. This constitutes a grave indictment of our schools and universities to teach the fundamental that truth is what man must live by.

Far from being conditioned by compulsion to tell the truth, the university student in recent years has been conditioned by a compulsion to evade the truth.

My friends, the crisis in which our country finds itself is essentially moral. It is a crisis of our own making. It is the blighted harvest of three decades of drift and detachment from our historically moral moorings.

The voice of the American Legion will always be raised in defense of, and in behalf of, eternal verities. We have dared to stand on the ground of objective truth—and we stand there unmoved and uncompromised by those who criticize and would convert us in the name of modern materialism and relativism.

When we have said that we object to the participation of Communists in the great communications arts, it is because we feel that a Communist is dedicated to a cause that does not serve the cause of truth and will, where he can, serve the lie.

For this position, we have been accused of seeking to destroy an industry, of operating beyond the field of our competence and of proceeding in ways that are not truly American. These criticisms we do not take too seriously—for we know that what we stand for is right and embraces the thinking of the millions of Americans whom we represent.

In all these matters, which touch close to the very essence of American beliefs, we shall be heard.

PATRIOTISM NEEDS ORGANIZATION

(By George Todt)

"Liberty's in every blow; let us do or die," Burns—Bruce to his men at Bannockburn.

"I call to your attention as proof positive that the soul of America is in great danger," said the American Legion national commander, Martin McKneally, as he addressed a large and distinguished civic audience in Los Angeles last week, "to a book of recent publication, written by Eugene Kinkead, entitled 'In Every War But One.'

"This book is a treatment of the collapse of morale among prisoners of war in Korea. One out of three technically collaborated with the enemy. One out of seven did the business of the enemy, 21 elected to remain with the enemy and 75 returned home as espionage agents of the enemy. Some 38 percent died in captivity. No one escaped.

"For the first time in America's long record of military exertions, Americans were found to have lost the bond that unites free men together.

"For the first time the inevitable kinship among men, which is the result of service to a great ideal, was broken and Americans were at war with one another—a war in many of its aspects more cruel and more distressing than the one they fought with the enemy.

"In this war, Americans fought Americans, Americans betrayed Americans, and Americans murdered Americans.

"I suppose that unmatched in the whole catalog of human infamy will be the crime of one Gallagher who cast two of his fellow prisoners, sick with dysentery and fatigued to the bone, out into the night where they died of the cold in shock and in disbelief of their fate.

"Where, I ask you, do you fit these statistics into a nation with an exalted mission—a mission which has never been matched in the history of mankind?

"For the great burden of our country, ladies and gentlemen, is to keep the fires of individual freedom burning brightly in the hearts of all Americans—and to keep this America of ours clean and sure of its purpose as the continuing hope of all free men and women everywhere.

"Not only must our sense of mission be strong but the policies of our country, in this duel with communism, must be courageous and responsive to the will of the people.

"The Korean experience must never be allowed to happen again. In the home, in the school and in the church our youth must be taught that the principle of morality is alone for them. They must learn to direct responsibly their individual freedom and the way of life which produced it for them.

"We, as members of the American Legion, strive to keep alive the spirit of patriotism and love of country. This is our challenge.

"To those who have grown listless in their appreciation of individual freedom and the great gift of citizenship in our Nation, let us constantly recount for them their blessings. They are neatly summed up in a passage written by a refugee—one who came to these shores from Adolf Hitler's concentration camps and eventually became a citizen of these United States. He wrote:

"'I am an American citizen * * * a member of the greatest fraternity on earth * * * the brotherhood of free men because a million Americans have died and millions more have suffered in the wars of our Republic. I have greater freedom than any other citizen of any other nation in any other period of mankind. I have greater freedom to work, to worship, to love, to learn and to play. Mine is the freedom to compete, to invent, to save, to invest, to create, to promote and to own. I have freedom to choose, to join, to vote, to speak, to travel, and to walk erect with head held high. I am to be my own self as a individual human soul. I am free to glorify God'."

It was on this note that Martin McKneally ended his address and one might have heard a pin drop in the Biltmore Bowl most of the time he was speaking—so rapt was the attention of his distinguished audience which comprised more than 1,000 of the leading citizens of the Los Angeles area. The applause at the conclusion was deafening.

In this and the preceding two articles I have brought my readers excerpts of the timely ideological message—based on morality and the spiritual heritage of America's noble historical past—from an admirable and dedicated patriot who counsels us to take action now before it may be too late to save our God-inspired Republic.

Since the precepts of the Founding Fathers of our country were based originally upon the moral principles of God, we may be sure that they are presently the principal targets for destruction by anti-God forces among us today. What can we do to fight against such wicked and evil erosion?

One practical step which could be of significant worth would be to beef up the membership of the American Legion and other pro-American patriotic societies without delay. Why not?

Isn't it something of a national disgrace that only one out of every six eligibles in the United States have seen fit to team up with the Legion to resist Communist inroads in our threatened land?

And, specifically, how about the much-publicized Golden State—meaning California, Bub—where less than 1 out of 20 eligibles have cared to share in responsibilities of citizenship?

Let's think it over in the critical days ahead of us.

How about that?

Four Ways To Reduce Administrative Delay—Address by Stuart Rothman, General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, June 15, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an informative address delivered by Mr. Stuart Rothman, General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, which was delivered before the labor law section of the Tennessee Bar Association at Gatlinburg, Tenn., on June 9, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR WAYS TO REDUCE ADMINISTRATIVE DELAY

(Remarks of Stuart Rothman, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, before the labor law section, Tennessee Bar Associations at Gatlinburg, Tenn., June 9, 1960)

Mr. Chairman, members and guests of the labor law section of the Tennessee Bar Association, I consider the call to talk to the labor law section of the Tennessee Bar Association a very high honor. It is a wonderful feeling to be here in this inspiring mountain retreat of Gatlinburg and in a room with fellow lawyers who meet without their briefs but who come in the spirit of doing what they can to raise the standards of justice.

As an agency having a prime impact upon the welfare of employers and employees in America, we at the National Labor Relations Board are also interested in improving the administrative justice dispensed by our agency.

The saying "justice delayed is justice denied" has perhaps become a cliche, but I believe it can now be fairly said that justice is no longer denied by delay in the procedures of the Office of the General Counsel.

I believe too that there has been a sincere willingness by practitioners before the agency to consider constructive changes objectively and to help to make them effective if they will tend to give better service to the public.

It is a matter of common knowledge that until recently large backlogs in the Office of the General Counsel were considered commonplace, chronic, and practically insurmountable. This does not need to be the case in an administrative agency. Today these backlogs are gone, and what was considered most difficult or almost impossible is accepted as commonplace and routine today. When a workload of more than 25,000 case situations a year—each of which must be processed as a case of unique importance to the individuals affected—is fairly and quickly dispatched, as the Office of General Counsel has been trying to do, there continues to be high hope for the administrative process as a way of achieving justice effectively in the modern society.

But to discharge its mission an administrative agency must have the confidence of the public it serves, and the first step toward earning such confidence again lies in the expeditious dispatch of the business entrusted to it effectively and with integrity; with such detachment from any extraneous influences relating to the cases before it as to assure an impartial judgment.

Time and performance improvements have not been made by the introduction of mass production methods which are an abomination to the adjudicative process, but by more precise work and increased expertise on the part of the staff and by a more realistic use of statistical reporting as a tool. I can say from observation that it has not been done so as to cause a hardship to any of the staff.

Early investigation of charges and precise decision making do not result in a speedup at the expense of quality. On the basis of investigation of any specific criticism in this respect, I am convinced to the contrary. And, as a matter of fact, quality evaluation techniques which the office has developed bear out this conclusion. An investigation started quickly, when the evidence is fresh and the factual situation needs a minimum of reconstruction, is a more rounded investigation. Precise decision making, based upon a better knowledge of the law and its application to the fuller facts, assures a more just result.

With a little more time, a little more effort, and a limited number of additional management and procedural improvements, the National Labor Relations Board will be recognized by the public as being among the best, if not the best, of Government regulatory agencies, with its regional offices carrying out their functions fairly, expeditiously, and in the public interest.

But the few additional procedural changes which should be made will require much understanding between regional offices and private practitioners. I shall have more to say about the need for the regional offices and those in private practice to focus attention upon common problems in the functioning of the administrative machinery.

Much has already been learned about dealing with the time factor in overcoming administrative backlogs and delay, and if you will allow me, I should like to review some parts of the work with you, because it becomes important in considering what the office ought to do next to improve its service and its performance as an arm of government. The problem, of course, is one of doing things in a way which gets a hammerlock on both the time and performance standards together. That is, as we isolate factors in the time problem and wrestle them down, it must be done with machinery which simultaneously identifies quality control problems and feeds back improved quality in regional and Washington performance.

Four broad areas or categories for concentration in eliminating delay in the Office of the General Counsel have emerged from our experience and perhaps others may find some interest in what we have learned. These four principles relate to (1) work, (2) modern management procedures, (3) juristic science, and (4) communication. Very often the simplest solutions for improving the administrative process are missed or disregarded.

The first principle for eliminating backlogs in the administrative process is for every member of the work force to devote a full day each workingday to the job.

I have come to the belief that there probably isn't any backlog problem in the Office which cannot, with the additional manpower which the Congress has given us, be eliminated through plain hard work. When hard, consistent work is applied to such problems, many troubles that appeared insurmountable just seem to go away.

The second principle in eliminating backlogs and overcoming delay is the inculcation of a positive attitude, if such a change is necessary, toward modern management improvements and a willingness to accept such improvements if they will serve the public interest without sacrificing any procedural or substantive safeguards.

Of course, management improvement may take many forms. You in Tennessee are undoubtedly aware of some of them. For example, the Memphis subregional office has been elevated to the status of a regional office. This has expedited case handling between the field and Washington. Task forces from other offices have been and are presently being used at Memphis to put the office on a current basis.

I do not think that we as an agency need to worry, as some bureaucrats are alleged to do, that if we reduce all backlogs within the agency we shall not have enough to keep us busy. Many improvements in this respect have already been accomplished and more are underway.

In April 1959, 49 unfair labor practice hearings were closed, with a median age of 139 days from the filing of the charge to close of hearing. In April 1960, 71 hearings were closed with a median age of 91.5 days. Stated differently, this means that in April 1960, it was taking the average case only 91½ days to be processed from the filing of the charge to the close of the hearing before a trial examiner. This is significant, too, in that the goal established for this phase of case handling, 90 days, has been all but achieved.

On April 30, 1959, there were 1,838 unfair labor practice cases pending under preliminary investigation with a median age of 38 days. Today in this category there are pending 960 cases with a median age of 20.5 days. This means that the backlog of cases in this phase of casehandling has been eliminated, and the regional offices are operating on a current basis because about 1,000 unfair labor practice cases are filed each month.

The important thing, we have learned, is that once the regions and Washington overcome their backlogs we are then in a position to avoid their recurrence and the task of operating on a current basis seems to be easier.

In April 1959, 95 unfair labor practice complaints issued within a median time of 78 days from filing of the charge to the issuance of complaint. In April 1960, 126 complaints issued within a median time of 44 days. This means that the time required to process a case in this phase of casehandling has been reduced by more than a month, with a reduction of more than 40 percent within the past year.

The months of April 1959 and April 1960 have been selected because they are typical and comparative. The office has been operating on these new time schedules for several months, in some cases since the first of the year.

But aside from median or average statistics, which do not mean too much to the individual litigant or to me because what happens in specific cases is what really counts, this agency had a backlog of 700 unfair labor practice cases in July of 1959 that had not been investigated in 30 days. It is a rare case today when complete investigation and regional office disposition on the merits has not been made within 20 days from the date of filing of the charge, and 30 days is now the outside or overage limit for the investigation and disposition of an unfair labor practice charge on its merits.

Today with regional offices on a current basis, 88 percent of all unfair labor practice cases brought before the agency are finally disposed of within a month of the time they are filed.

Management improvements in the administration of the National Labor Relations Act were included in two programs known as Operation 60 and Operation Challenge. We think that, allowing for certain things that had to be done anyway, there has been a direct causal relationship between these programs and the improvements which have taken place.

In essence, Operation 60 was a training program in the 60-day period between the enactment and effective date of the 1959 amendments to the Taft-Hartley Act. Operation Challenge started, and continues, as a long-range sustained effort in two parts; the first, to defeat delay through management improvements, taking into consideration what can be learned from modern business management and judicial administration, and second, to insure precision and increased expertise in the judgment factor of administrative decision in the Office of the General Counsel by careful selection and training of personnel and other internal personnel actions. Emphasis on the quality of the staff is especially important in an administrative agency for many reasons, but one is that to deserve public confidence, each member of the staff must conduct himself so as to maintain detachment from alliances which in any way may give the semblance of partiality.

It is said that the trial of any civil case, generally speaking, should take place not later than 6 months after the filing of the case. It goes without saying that an administrative trial without a jury should take place more quickly. But I submit that the recent performance in this respect of the Office of the General Council and the Division of Trial Examiners is most creditable. At the present time, generally speaking, less than 30 days elapse from the issuance of the complaint in an unfair labor practice case to a trial on the merits. For this I must salute the Division of Trial Examiners who, with the Office of General Council, have reduced the trial calendar from a 14-week period to a 5-week period in the short time between February and June of this year.

Representation cases have not, of course, been overlooked in this program to reduce backlog and expedite case handling. On December 1, 1959, 29 percent of all representation cases in the pre-election stage were overage. Less than 3.9 percent are in this category today. On December 1, 1959, more than 61 percent of the postelection cases in which objections or challenges to the election had been filed were overage. Today there are no overage cases in this category.

Of course, backlogs have a way of accumulating unexpectedly and to prevent them, regions must be constantly on the alert. But even beyond that, we must ever be on the lookout for new methods for administrative improvements.

Let us turn now to the third principle for eliminating delay in the administrative process, and that is by applied juristic science as distinguished from internal management improvements along administrative lines.

I have had occasion in another talk to liken the several regions of the National Labor Relations Board to an administrative judicial circuit of its own, consisting of some 30 administrative judicial districts; that the territorial areas of the various regional and subregional offices.

It seems that in some of these districts, office personnel and practitioners, generally spaking, have apparently operated on that theory that the only way to dispose of pending cases is to try them; at least, that is what appears from certain statistical studies we have completed as a part of Operation Challenge. Large parts of regional efforts and facilities as well as the time of regional personnel and private practitioners, are devoted to trials.

For example, a statistical study based on the period July 1 through March 31, 1960, shows that only 21.7 percent of all meritorious unfair labor practice cases were settled in two of our largest regional officers. Two others, one in the South and one in the Midwest, had only slightly better records. On the other hand, 80 percent of the meritorious cases were settled without the necessity for litigation in the Memphis office. One of our northeastern offices and one on the west coast follow close behind. The national average for meritorious cases settled without litigation was 47.6 percent during this period. There seems to be no geographical connection between offices where a majority of the cases are settled and those where most of the cases go to a hearing. Therefore, our efforts to increase the number of cases that are settled must be nationwide.

The NLRB administrative process insofar as it pertains to the trial of cases, exhaustion of appeals, and possible judicial review, will probably continue to be a slow process or appear to be a slow process even with the improved management procedures we all seek. This is because the trial of any case is slow work. Modern judicial administration indicates that trial processes are hard pressed to lick backlogs alone, and this seems to be as true for the administrative as well as the judicial process. Trial litigation can take a long time, and the ultimate resolution of the legal question may leave the parties without real satisfaction as to the outcome, or may even leave in question whether substantial justice has been done.

But our democratic processes, it is said, must demonstrate their efficiency. We in the administrative process must solve our problems not only efficiently, but to the satisfaction of the people. A case which takes a long time to try and to resolve on appeal may not satisfy the expectations of the people directly affected.

Since the practice of law is a public service, from time to time we need to look beyond the mechanistic application of the statute and try to discern its true meaning in terms of the legislatively intended objectives for the individual men and women who are the employees and employers subject to the act. When these persons have troubles that may be resolved quickly and justly, are they concerned with long-drawn-out trial litigation, looking toward long-range interpretations for the benefit of the business community as a whole, or to remedies which in the end may not reduce the disturbance, or are they interested in ending their own troubles and getting back to an amicable employer-employee relationship?

It is submitted that if our regional studies in this area mean anything, and given the confidence in the workings of the National Labor Relations Board I have mentioned, there are situations where the individuals interested in an unfair labor practice charge could seek to avoid the necessity for the trial of issues and consider the increasing use of voluntary informal avenues of settlement.

I suggest that tendencies toward informal settlement should be encouraged in those

regions where experience reveals that the media of amicable informal settlement have not been used nearly as extensively as in other regions. Informal disposition is a particularly honorable method of ending a dispute in the field of labor-management relations because in so many instances it is not feasible for the contesting parties to sever their relationship and it is often desirable for the disputants to agree to make up quickly.

Of course, there will be many situations under the new act which raise novel questions of law that may not be subject to amicable and informal settlement, or the parties just cannot agree with the region on its factual analysis. But after a thorough study of our regional experience under Operation Challenge, the Office of the General Counsel is now proposing that more effort be made in a number of regions to encourage settlements of disputes that ought to be settled.

In each region all cases that, after investigation, have been found to have merit will go in an informal fashion before a settlement officer who will usually be the regional director himself.

In other words, after a determination that an unfair labor practice charge has merit, the parties should go almost immediately into conference with the regional director or his representative. This unquestionably is the practice in many regions and it will become the practice in many more regions. Regional officers will know that they cannot force settlement, nor can this Agency mediate disputes arising out of economic questions. We shall seek, however, to offer litigants practical methods for obtaining more speedy justice in cases arising under the act.

It is not necessary to give this conference a special name. It is an informal procedure through which the issues in a dispute may be truly joined. In the process, unquestionably the relative wisdom of settlement over any other course of action will be considered and encouraged. If settlement is not reached, the conference will at least have the desirable effect of sharpening the issues and eliminating matters that could be taken care of in a pretrial conference.

We are all aware that the most litigated statute on the books is the Taft-Hartley Act. As a result there is a continuous outpouring of cases which find their way into the judicial processes and add to the burdens of the judicial system. We have a duty, I believe, to do what we can fairly and equitably to minimize the number of cases which must enter the judicial stream. That, as I understand it, is one of the purposes of the administrative process.

There is no magical formula for avoiding controversy and litigation or encouraging informal disposition of disputes. If there were, there would be no problem. For success, each regional office must have the confidence of the public it serves. The aim of projects such as Operation 60 and Operation Challenge has been to improve regional office quality and operating proficiency so as to merit this confidence.

If we are to be accorded the special recognition due an administrative organization because of its expertise in its particular field, then it is our duty to act as experts and to be experts. The avoidance of unnecessary litigation which taxes the facilities of the organization and of the courts as well, is, and should be, a part of that expertise.

Improvement in techniques and facilities for the informal resolution of disputes arising under the Taft-Hartley Act should result in derivative administrative benefits. Experience has taught us that there is less tendency to file the frivolous or strategic unfair labor practice charge when it is known that it will be investigated immediately. With the clearing up of the trial calendars, it is not unreasonable to expect that if there are fewer cases to be tried, cases can be eliminated earlier which are strategic only and are not settled until "high on the courthouse steps."

* * * * *

In addressing the American Bar Association in 1958, the Chief Justice of the United States concluded his remarks on the need for improvements in judicial administration by saying:

"Finally, I urge all of you—in every jurisdiction—to fight court congestion as you would a plague, and to eliminate stoppages and delays from whatever cause, regardless of the effort called for or the personal feelings involved."

We may well ask whether this appeal is not equally applicable to the interrelated administrative process. With this question I shall leave this subject, but not without first thanking you for the opportunity of assessing the general situation of the place of procedural improvements in the regional performance of the NLRB; one of our basic current problems.

I shall be pleased to answer any questions you may have, if I can, concerning the office's procedures, or any developments in the substantive law arising under the new act.

The Lowell, Mass., Fire

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I spoke on Monday of the tremendously spectacular fire that took place just two buildings from my office in Lowell, Mass. I spoke of the heroism of the chief of the fire department, Mr. Fracis Kelleher, who directed the firefighting. In the beginning the fire was completely out of hand. It was a roaring, raging fire. It did not seem possible that anyone could survive. The picture which I have in my hand shows the fire when it was raging at its worst, but the firemen, with the help of other cooperating firemen from other towns in my district got it under control and eventually put it out. They performed herculean service.

I spoke of certain persons the other day who showed great heroism and great executive ability. I would like to speak again of the head of the fire department at Lowell, who directed all the firefighting activities, and of the firefighters from other towns in my district and from the U.S. Air Force firefighters from Bedford in my district who volunteered their services. I would like to speak also of the action by the police department in Lowell that worked tirelessly, getting people out of the way who had been overcome by the fire, by the fumes, by the smoke. And I would like to tell the people here that nobody was seriously injured and nobody was killed. It is almost beyond belief that that could have happened in such a raging fire. It was a miracle. But the firemen put a moat of water around the building.

I would like to speak of the very great and efficient action of our postmaster at Lowell, Mr. James Gallagher, who sent away his disabled veterans who worked there, those who had any difficulty with their lungs. Then he put one of the post office custodians, Mr. Kenneth Earle, and Arthur Garrabedian on the roof with hose and fire-protection apparatus. Nothing happened to the post office building. That would have gone also if it had not been that they had got the fire under control or if the wind had changed.

Then there was the auditorium beyond, the Lowell Auditorium. That would have gone, too, if they had not had the fire under control.

I am so sincerely grateful to the Lowell people for their wonderful self-sacrifice and their real heroism and for the way in which they adjusted themselves to the demands of this terribly spectacular fire.

The Lowell Sun Newspaper Building where I have my office, was so very near the fire and the people in it, like the owners, Mr. John and Mr. Clement Costello, behaved remarkably when they had burning sticks coming over on their window ledges. But still they kept the fire away, and remained calm.

I have such pride, Mr. Speaker, in my Lowell people. I wish you all knew them. They are modest and great Americans.

Colorful "First" for Greater Portland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. OLIVER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, on July 1 of this year, there appeared in the Portland, Maine, Press Herald an article describing a picturesque and colorful telephone book cover, depicting many aspects of Maine's economy. The occasion for this "first" in the area served by the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. is the 200th anniversary of Cumberland County. I commend the progressive officials of the phone company for this excellent example of participation in the ceremony of the area they represent. The article follows:

GREATER PORTLAND PHONE SUBSCRIBERS TO GET COLORFUL DIRECTORIES NEXT WEEK

(By Charles C. Sutton)

Greater Portland telephone subscribers are in for a colorful "first."

New directories, to be issued next week, will have a full color cover instead of the traditional pale green.

Dana A. Jordan, Portland manager of the New England Telephone & Telegraph Co., said Thursday the colorfully designed covers are the first ones ever printed for the New England Telephone & Telegraph system.

"Actually they are an outgrowth of the 1959 directories which featured black and white designs," Jordan said.

In addition to a multitude of colors, the covers give a plug to the 200th anniversary of Cumberland County by displaying the celebration's seal in a prominent place.

Joseph A. Kilbride, chairman of the Cumberland County anniversary, told Jordan his

committee was very pleased the telephone company dedicated the full-color cover to the county's bicentennial.

William A. Hatch, assistant executive manager of the Maine Publicity Bureau, congratulated Jordan on the "spanking" new cover.

He wrote Jordan:

"This year, Portland, Cumberland County, and the State will get an even greater boost from this beautiful, full color, layout featuring many phases of Maine's economy."

Hatch referred to the numerous sketches showing Maine products, vacational attributes, and industries.

He also noted the book was printed on Maine-made paper. New England Telephone & Telegraph Co. spends $5 million a year for Maine papers.)

Hatch also said the book would be of great promotional value to the State.

According to Jordan 100,000 new telephone books are being published. He said 5,000 will be sent out of State to libraries, industries, hotels, chambers of commerce, and others.

Aside from the cover, Jordan said the book would be slightly larger—some 1,500 new customers will be listed.

"It will have 133 pages of numbers instead of the present 127," he added.

The front section will also have more information on dialing, telephone procedures, and so forth, and a larger area for writing down emergency numbers.

Others to get an early glimpse of the cover were Charles O. Spear, Jr., chairman of the county commissioners; Mitchell Cope, chairman of the Portland City Council; and William S. Linnell, president of the Greater Portland Chamber of Commerce.

Spear said the commissioners were "pleased and proud" of the new cover. Cope found it "very attractive" and a good advertisement for Portland and the surrounding area.

Linnel termed it a rare incident when a public utility puts so much effort and consideration into publicizing the area it serves.

The new directories will arrive in Portland Tuesday by truck. Distribution will start Wednesday morning.

Price Bill Strengthens Relationships Between United States and Ryukyu Islands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1157, the Price bill, a bill to assist in the economic development of the Ryukyu Islands, is now the law of the land. The author of this bill is the most distinguished Congressman from the State of Illinois, the Honorable MELVIN PRICE. Many Members of this body have had the opportunity of visiting the Ryukyu Islands in the recent years. I am most certain that all of such Members will agree that of all the legislation relating to the Ryukyus that we have considered in the body, the Price bill has generated the greatest interest and concern among the Ryukyuans. The news of the enactment of the Price bill has been received in the Ryukyus with great joy and favor. The Price bill will undoubtedly foster better and friendlier American-Ryukyuan relationship. The Congress of the United States owes a great debt of gratitude to the Honorable MELVIN PRICE for his deep understanding of and the forward looking approach to the problems of the Ryukyuans. Recently, the gentleman from Illinois received two telegrams from the Ryukyus. One, from the Honorable Seisaku Ota, the chief executive of the government of the Ryukyu Islands; and the other from General Booth, U.S. High Commissioner. These telegrams very clearly express the great gratitude of the Ryukyuans. I am taking leave to insert these two telegrams into the RECORD for consideration by the Members of this body.

The telegram to Congressman PRICE from the High Commissioner, General Booth, follows:

Deeply appreciate your sustained interest in the Ryukyu Islands. Passage of the Price bill is being interpreted locally as a reflection of your personal interest in the welfare and well-being of the Ryukyuan people and this strengthens the relationships between the United States and the Ryukyus. I have transmitted your message to the Chief Executive and he has asked me to express his gratitude. You will be hearing soon from him personally.

Subsequently, Congressman PRICE received the following message from the chief executive, Seisako Ota:

We are highly gratified that H.R. 1157 was finally approved by the Congress, thanks to your continued efforts. This legislation is sure to promote greatly economic and social development of the Ryukyus. Your accomplishments for the Ryukyus Islands will long live in the mind of the Ryukyuan people. On behalf of all the Ryukyuan people I hereby express our hearty gratitude for your distinguished services.

Problems of Safety in the Electric Utility Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, the matter of industrial safety is one which affects the livelihood, well-being and happiness of most American families. It is a matter to which this Congress has directed considerable attention in the past and it is a matter which requires our continued concern and consideration. Nothing could be more clear than that safety standards and regulations which may be adequate today will be rendered obsolete by the technology of tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, this is particularly true in the electric utility field. The responsibility for safety in this area is extraordinary in that accident hazard is inherent in the duties and service performed by utility workers. An employee of an electric utility company must be concerned not only for his own life, but for the safety of his coworkers and the general public as well. Making this triple responsibility even more demanding is the serious handicap under which the utility worker must perform his work as a result of inadequate safety measures and out dated safety equipment.

In the electric utility industry, it is essential that limitations be placed on the number of consecutive hours worked, that certain procedures be established and followed in deenergizing electrical conductors or equipment for maintenance purposes, and that safety requirements be established for work within contact distance or for equipment energized at a high voltage. This giant industry, while striving to satisfy the increasing demands of its consumers by expanding the systems of distribution and modernizing the techniques of generating power, has failed for budgetary or other reasons to demonstrate a proportionate concern for the safety of its employees. Thus, voltage limitations are designed for the lower primary voltages of a bygone era and enclosures of modern high speed generators and turbines do not provide adequate protection from moving parts.

The neglect of the electric utility industry in this area becomes clear from a study of safety records—which, when available, are far from complete. For example, the Accident Prevention Committee of the Edison Electric Institute published a summary report of fatalities which listed 136 fatalities for 1955. This figure, while alarmingly high, includes only members of the Edison Electric Institute. What about the fatalities of the nonmembers—independents, municipalities, REA and other cooperatives? Figures for these utility companies are not readily available but one can easily imagine the impact their statistics would have on the overall picture.

The number of fatal injuries reflects only a part of the disturbing accident figures. Included in this grim picture must be the accidents which leave victims either totally or partially disabled. In 1958, 7.1 percent of the disabling injuries in the private electric light and power utility industry resulted in permanent impairment. This was a higher permanent impairment ratio than occurred in any other section of the transportation and public utility industry, the contract construction industry and, with few exceptions, the mining industry. The average time length of disability per injury was 226 days.

In my opinion, the accident rate itself is compelling reason for consideration of legislation to establish a uniform code of safety regulations for the electric utility industry. But the tragic accident record has equally discouraging collateral aspects which must also be considered. Economic loss to the worker, his family, the company and the community is staggering. The accident record of one Ohio company—the Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co.—affords an example of how great this wage-time loss is in terms of lost purchasing power and diminished consumer demand.

Statistics for the Columbus district for 1955 show a loss of 6,263 days, based on an average hourly wage rate of $2.09, amounting to a total wage loss to injured

employees of $104,717.36. In 1956, the wage loss rose to $153,410.32 when injured employees lost 8,837 workdays. Again, these are only one company's figures. And, of course, there are no statistics, figures, reports or records by which we can measure the discomfort and insecurity of a worker and his family during the days lost, nor is there any way to ease the pain when a family loses its breadwinner completely.

Several recommendations have been put forth for remedial legislation by Congress which would improve safety requirements and conditions in the utility industry. At this point, it might be well to recall that it was not too many years ago that mine workers were urgently pleading for better safety regulations and that the 77th Congress saw fit to enact legislation resulting in vastly improved working conditions.

As a first step, uniform minimum safety standards should be established. The present safety record and the miserable failure of many companies to follow adequate safety procedures are evidence enough of the need for industrywide safety regulations. Such regulations could be either statutory requirements or regulations prescribed by a Government agency. The statutory requirements might be used for certain basic rules, such as limitation on the number of consecutive hours worked, materials used for protection of wires, and so forth, but the establishment of a safety agency would appear to offer several advantages. Such an agency, composed of persons familiar with the field of industrial safety and in particular with the problems of the electric utility industry would be competent to establish effective safety regulations and because of its continuing responsibility in the field would be able to modify and streamline safety requirements to keep pace with technical innovations.

Closely related to the establishment of a code of minimum safety regulations is the necessity for adequate inspection. Inspection of safety equipment to determine whether it meets standards established by the safety agency, and appropriate approval stamps issued to the equipment manufacturer should be required. Inspections should be made of electric utility plants to determine existence and degree of danger. In cases of immediate hazard the agency should be empowered to order the removal of workers from the area as well as require corrective action. Inspection would be an essential tool in the enforcement of minimum safety regulations.

Accident reporting would be a third arm of the projected safety program for electric utility industry. Included within the statutory framework of the safety agency should be authority to require that all accidents be immediately reported and a uniform method of accident recording should be established for this purpose. Although most States require a report of accidents and fatalities, the time lapse between occurrence of the accident and filing of the report varies with each jurisdiction. In addition, the accident records of the State utility commissions are often incomplete and not readily available.

The effectiveness of any safety program depends in large measure upon the expertness with which accident and other investigations are conducted. Far too many accidents are now attributed simply to that nebulous cause—human error. The challenge is to determine what factors cause or contribute to this human error and to define areas of accident potential. Investigation of every fatal mishap and spot checks of other less serious accidents by trained personnel are needed to track down accident causes and furnish vital accident prevention information.

These, then, are a few of the possible approaches to improving the safety record of electric utility companies. Perhaps the most serious problem in initiating a safety program is to determine just where the responsibility lies. Voluntary action by individual companies has, to date, been inadequate and unsatisfactory. Employee-company safety committees are desirable but hardly the answer to a nationwide problem. It would appear, therefore, that the existing accident record in the electric utility industry calls for responsible Government action. In the absence of an effective industry program, it is only at the Government level that safety standards can be instituted and enforced. Creation of a new Government regulatory agency or additional authority delegated to an existing agency is necessary for the performance of the functions which I have suggested. Provision could thus be made for both a safety agency and for a board of review to be staffed by company and worker representatives.

There is ample precedent for authority to regulate within the utility industry. The Federal Coal Mine Inspection Act of 1941 and the 1952 Federal Coal Mine Safety Act are similar legislative actions which have been taken in another industry. Although the electric utility worker is not faced with the kind of accident that reach the catastrophic proportions of the major mine disasters, the overall record of deaths and disabling accidents is great enough to warrant consideration of the advisability of legislation in this important field.

Senator Kennedy and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD an excellent editorial from the June 29, 1960, issue of the La Porte (Ind.) Herald-Argus, a first-class newspaper published in my district, concerning the views of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, on the important issue of civil rights.

As the La Porte Herald-Argus says, Senator KENNEDY's recent speech in Washington in the presence of African diplomats "added to his stature as a politician who speaks out bluntly and courageously on basic principles to which he adheres."

The editorial follows:

KENNEDY AND INTEGRATION

At a recent Washington luncheon and in the presence of African diplomats from both established and newly independent nations of that continent, Senator KENNEDY added to his stature as a politician who speaks out bluntly and courageously on basic principles to which he adheres. His forthright pronouncement of his antipathy to segregation was certain to arouse heightened anger among the Dixiecrats and other Deep South traditionalists who bitterly insist there will be no change in the racial situation—ever.

The Senator might be accused by his political foes in the Democratic Party of shooting down a strawman inasmuch as the Deep South Democratic politicians consistently oppose him for the presidential nomination and want either Senator JOHNSON or some completely unreconstructed rebel like Senator EASTLAND, but at least the Massachusetts candidate made it crystal clear he favors a more aggressive program by the Federal Government to help bring about integration and equal rights.

This Nation's efforts, he said at the luncheon, "must increase to achieve equal access to the voting booth, to the schoolroom, to jobs, to housing and the public facilities, including lunch counters." The Senator continued by endorsing the sit-in as a legitimate, peaceful way to win equality. "It's a good sign—a sign of increased responsibility, of good citizenship, of the American spirit come alive again," he declared in referring further to Negro students and their sit-in demonstrations in eating places.

The Senator also aimed a dart at the Union of South Africa's apartheid policy of separateness for Negroes, and told the African diplomats that the U.S. must have a threefold role in Africa, to aid in education there, to help Africans to have more food and to aid with development capital for young African nations.

In trying to assess the political advantages, and those are always a factor when a man seeks the Presidency as ardently as does KENNEDY, his luncheon remarks place him solidly in that segment of his party which is liberal in its race relations attitude and believes the United States is lagging badly in its attention to human rights and material development where races of color are concerned. His attitude should further strengthen his already considerable strength in northern urban Democratic ranks, it also represents an effort to broaden the image of the candidate as a man well aware of his Nation's global tasks and responsibilities.

Why an Apology?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I would include a timely and important editorial viewpoint by Mr. George Todt, columnist

for the Valley Times, published in North Hollywood, Calif., and circulated in my district.

The U–2 incident has been viciously attacked by the press. Here is a newspaperman's refreshing view:

WHY AN APOLOGY?

(By George Todt)

"What's sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander."—American proverb.

The asinine nonsense that this Nation ought to bow its collective head in shame and mortification over the much-discussed Lockheed U–2 reconnaissance plane incident is almost too idiotic to comment upon. Almost, but not quite.

Why should we apologize for "getting thar fustest with the mostest," as capable old General Forrest used to say? The Reds, particularly the Soviet Union, have been giving us the business for years. They had their spies here even during World War II, while we were busy feeding and saving them from Adolf Hitler.

Ever hear the old saw about "biting the hand that feeds you"? Ask the Soviets how this is done. They are past masters of the game. Their treachery is only matched by their ingratitude.

I was merely one of many millions of Americans who fought for our country in the last war, but I would like to have the privilege of saying just one word to Mr. K. now as he berates President Eisenhower over the U–2 incident. And that one word is: Phooey. Maybe an even better word choice would be: Phony.

Either way is all right with me. As Khrushchev and his many heroes of the Soviet Union scream like wounded eagles because our planes have demonstrated their capability to penetrate the aerial defenses of the U.S.S.R., we can afford to be happy about it.

I think we have a better chance for peace now that the "Butcher of the Ukraine" has the picture of U.S. airpower in better perspective. Our planes have been going too high for Mr. K.'s vaunted rockets to knock down in the past. How could he stop a mass attack by SAC in the near future? (Provided he asks for it.)

What right has Mr. K. to protest our gaining intelligence of his installations? Hasn't he been doing the same to us? What about our stolen atom secrets? The spy rings operating out of Red consulates and embassies?

The quisling "Communist Party of the United States," an information-gathering apparatus for the massive war machine housed in the Kremlin?

What has now been revealed, to Mr. K.'s vast chagrin, is that modern American technology housed in a high-flying U–2 can take as many pictures as thousands of Communist spies operating on the ground in the United States. We have simply beaten them at their own intelligence game.

It is all very well for Khrushchev to insist that we should not penetrate the skies over Russia to take pictures of his military installations. But what about the numerous land-based Red spies here? Is it right to ask that one of us give up his advantage, and not the other one? I, for one, do not think so.

Now is the time for us to put the old Mosiac Code into practice: an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth. If the Reds want us to withdraw aerial reconnaissance flights—let them withdraw their quisling party espionage apparatus from our soil.

It can be done whenever Moscow gives the nod to its flunkies in the United States. The later invariably do whatever instructed by their Kremlin masters. So why not bargain together?

Let's permanently withdraw our U–2 flights only on condition that the Kremlin make concessions to us, too. Let the Soviets give the order to the comrades in the United States to cease and desist their fifth column activities forthwith. Otherwise more flights from our side over the U.S.S.R.

Need for Coodinated Defense of the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of this body to a most timely and significant address prepared for delivery by my predecessor in the House, Senator KENNETH B. KEATING before the New York State Convention of the Italian-American War Veterans, at Rochester, N.Y., on June 18. Senator KEATING was unable to attend this convention in person, because of the extended sessions of the Senate. In his absence, the Senator's speech was read by Judge John J. Lomenzo, an eminent Rochester jurist who has long been an outstanding leader in the Italian-American Veterans organization.

The theme of Senator KEATING's address is the need for the coordinated defense of the free world in the face of the massive and single-minded Communist plan of global conquest.

Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I ask that this address by Senator KEATING be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR KENNETH B. KEATING, PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT THE DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK CONVENTION OF THE ITALIAN-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES, HOTEL POWERS, ROCHESTER, N.Y., JUNE 18, 1960

I am always happy to talk to a group of veterans. You men have fought for our freedom. For that reason you have a sharpened sense of what it means to defend something you hold dear. That is why you have organized—because you know that freedom is not something you lock up in a vault—not something you can forget about once you have won it. And it is about winning it and holding it that I want to talk to you tonight.

In these times we live in, defense is no longer a purely military term. The man with a gun—the man who fires a missile—the man who commands a submarine—each of them is only a cog in the total machinery of defense—and that machinery is so expanded, so complex, that every American citizen, whether he realizes it or not, is a part of the defense posture that we maintain against the potential enemy.

We must realize this new concept of defense. We must act as though it existed—because it does. The battlefield we used to know were specific areas of terrain or of ocean. There is only one battle area today, and it is the globe.

There are only two opposing forces, only two types of fighter—on the one hand the man who is battling to overrun the free world, on the other the man who stands defending the ramparts of freedom, and says, "They shall not pass." It is that simple. It is that tremendous—that fateful—and don't think it isn't a war because you can't hear the whine of bullets, or see men die around you. Men are dying—but it is a death of the spirit—the death of those who were once free, but who have been overrun by the advance patrols of tyranny.

The great challlenge to men like yourselves—to men who have known war—is to alert those about you to the tremendous fact of the reality of the silent struggle in which our lives, our futures, the futures of all humanity, are involved this hour, this day. And if they don't think freedom is at war, that freedom must defend itself—tell them to read the casualty list—give them the names of the battle losses—Hungary, Poland, Rumania, China, Lithuania—and all the rest of the fallen. And show them Cuba, mortally wounded, struggling before our very eyes. This is not a dry run.

Freedom is being shot dead—and because the weapons are lies and promises, and trade concessions and duplicity doesn't make the killing any less brutal, any less final.

In our early history we could see the enemy we fought. They marched abreast against us, and it was their markmanship and courage against ours. Today, we face a ghost army across the world—an unseen enemy whose battle plan is precise, intensive, and devastating. They know what they want—a Communist world—and all the fire of their energy, all the scheming of their intellect are directed toward the accomplishment of that mission.

That is what I meant by the new concept of defense. It must be new—must be retooled—to cope with this new kind of menace. And that defense doesn't begin in an arms factory—or on a launching site. It begins in the minds and in the hearts of the American people. It begins when we burn into those minds and hearts the sense of danger that exists, and the critical and compelling need to face up to the life-and-death implications of that danger.

The first thing many Americans must do is to wash their minds clean of outmoded ideas of what war is, what danger is. Victory is no longer something that can be turned out of factories operating on round-the-clock shifts. War today has a new dimension, and that new dimension has changed everything. The tree of freedom isn't blasted by a bomb. It is infiltrated by thousands of termites—and, if left unchecked, they do the work of a bomb, silently but no less thoroughly. And these termites fatten on each freedom tree that falls—and are the stronger to attack new trees—to lay waste the entire orchard of human freedom.

If we want a more recent, more striking example of the Communist technique of subversion—of their termite activities—we have only to consider the current situation in Japan. Red China and Moscow set up these demonstrations, planned their strategy well in advance, and financed this spectacular—and rehearsed it—with all the skill and cunning at their command. When I say financed, I mean financed. Don't think for a minute that the funds for this supercolossal manifestation of hatred came from the coffers of the Japanese Communist Party. It's not that big, not that strong.

A report I have received from the most reliable source says that the hard core of Communist demonstrators were paid $1.65 a day—a fantastically high labor wage by Asian standards—simply to light the fires of revolt and keep them burning until the Communist objective was achieved. This is how the Kremlin and Peiping operate. This is how they keep boring into freedom like worms into an apple. This is the raw technique of conquest—the use of the mob—the trained and well rehearsed mob—as a bludgeon to beat down the forces of duly constituted government, to create the anarchy in which communism thrives and gains power.

Because communism is a massive aggression, it must be met by a massive defense. We must see this drama on the wide screen of global perspective. We must not think of freedom as an American family jewel locked safe within our borders. Freedom is bigger than that, bigger than any nation, than any individual. Wherever it is threatened, we are threatened. Wherever communism gains ground, we inevitably lose ground.

The trouble with many of us is that while we concede that a shooting war is expensive, we have a feeling that peace ought to be available at bargain rates. The error, of course, is clear. We're not buying ships and tanks and rifles.

We're buying freedom—we're buying national security. And in the world we live in right now freedom and security have a price tag on them—a big price tag—but a price tag we must pay.

In this connection, let me say a word about our mutual security program—because this strikes at the heart of the matter. The popular cry of "giveaway" has been directed at this program. It is referred to by its opponents as "foreign aid." Indeed, I doubt if any program in our history has been so maligned, so misunderstood. Actually, this whole program, is a part—a vital indispensable part—of our defense posture.

To call it a gift is like trucking a load of live ammo up to your buddies in the line, and saying, "This is a little gift, boys, in case things start to get hot." The simple truth, of course, is that when you face a worldwide enemy, you use a worldwide strategy of defense. If you don't, you get boxed in—and by then your line of defense has shriveled to your own doorstep. When that happens you've lost your chance to buy defense. You're in the market for survival.

The recent summit conference didn't actually happen. It exploded on the launching pad—because Khrushchev wanted it to explode.

But this very failure drove home to us a lesson that we cannot learn too well—the fact that the Kremlin grand strategy is to split the free world alliance. And the reason they seek to split it is because a solid NATO mass of power is the prime roadblock to Communist ambitions for world conquest.

That is precisely why we must seek an ever closer relationship with the nations that stand beside us in opposition to the Soviet grand strategy. That is why mutual security is not a slogan, not a catchword. It's the life insurance policy of the free world.

The closer identification of ourselves with other free nations—this welding together of our common energies and purposes into our shield of freedom must not remain a wistful dream. It must be made a hard reality—a policy, not just a proposal. To this end we must think big if we are going to be big. We must welcome every opportunity—indeed, we must create opportunities to strengthen the sense of oneness, of solidarity that is the basic source of free world strength.

Barriers must be broken down, bridges must be built to bring us ever nearer to our friends—in a world where freedom needs all the friends it can find.

The history of America is the history of the transfusion of vitality, of energy, of talent, yes, of genius, that we have received from foreign lands through immigration. No other land, surely, has excelled Italy as a source of these gifts and those qualities that have contributed so much to the development and prosperity of our Nation. Indeed, your own fine veterans organization is a living and dynamic symbol of the historic blood brotherhood that exists between America and the great Italian Nation. It is this spirit of brotherhood, of solidarity that must be extended throughout the entire free world—if we are to present the massive and impregnable shield that fends off the driving blows of communism.

Let us be thankful, each of us in his own heart, that we meet here tonight as free men. Let us feel, too, what we have a right to feel—the pride of men who have fought in freedom's name—of men who have fought to preserve the things we hold dearer than life: the right of free man to his personal beliefs, to his sense of dignity, to the shaping and control of his own destiny.

The freedom we fought for—that Americans have fought for on all the battlefields of our history—cost many lives, many sacrifices, many sorrows. Let us pledge ourselves, therefore, to protect and defend it. It is the most precious heritage we possess. It is the most precious legacy we can leave our children.

The New Price Inflation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues the below editorial from the New York Times of June 28, 1960, entitled "The New Price Inflation":

THE NEW PRICE INFLATION

The Consumer Price Index of the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics moved into all-time high ground again in May. Contrasted with the jump of a full half of a percentage point in April, the May increase of one-tenth of a point was nominal. However, it represents the fourth consecutive monthly advance this year and the 11th in the past 14 months. It leaves the composite index at 126.3, a rise compared with its 124 of May a year ago of 2.3 points, or roughly 1.9 percent.

During the approximately 6½ years since the third quarter of 1953 there have been two periods of sideways movement in consumer prices and two periods of rising trends. Prices were stable for 2½ years between late 1953 and the late spring of 1956; for the next 2 years they rose almost uninterruptedly, the extreme advance for this second period amounting to about 8 points. The second period of sideways price movements lasted about a year, or from the spring of 1958 to the spring of 1959. A resumption of the advance then set in and is now in the beginning of its second year. The rate of this second advance has been about half that of its most recent predecessor.

This pattern of behavior of the consumer price emphasizes the distinguishing characteristics of postwar price inflation—namely, what is appropriately described as its ratchet effect. While prices have been advancing only about half of the time over this span of more than 6 years, all that advance represents a net advance. While the index has held steady the other half of the time, at no point has there been any perceptible decline. If this postwar pattern (and it is not a pattern that has by any means been confined to the United States) is here to stay it is obvious that it not only makes anti-inflationary policies more urgent today than ever before; it also means that the task of combating price inflation is more difficult than it was in times past.

To the old familiar cause of excessive overall demand two others have in recent years taken on new importance. The first of these is the autonomous wage push that goes beyond the average rate of increase in productivity; the second is the concentration of demand in one sector, such as, let us say, durable consumer goods, which may be able to increase wages without raising prices. The secondary effect of such concentrated demand may be an increased demand for basic materials such as steel, where costs are high and where a comparable wage increase can be justified only if accompanied by an increase in prices.

Auto U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD the following article entitled "Auto U.S.A." Everyone in America is vitally concerned about the number of deaths and fatal accidents on our highways today. This article tells about a film which proves that many communities can help with the traffic congestion and elimination of accidents.

The toll of deaths on the Nation's highways over the Fourth of July weekend, and the fantastic traffic jams in which motorists found themselves trapped brings home with dramatic impact our fast growing urban traffic problems. A method by which communities throughout the country can decrease its accident and traffic statistics and increase its safety quotient was demonstrated here recently:

On June 15, a group of some 125 experts in traffic safety, Government and automotive fields met to watch the premiere of a new motion picture on traffic and safety. The film "Auto U.S.A." was premiered under the auspices of the Automotive Safety Foundation and the Institute of Traffic Engineers. Its purpose—to demonstrate to individuals and community groups how they could initiate action to develop their own traffic control systems. The film dramatically points out the demoralizing effect traffic congestion has on the economic and social life of many communities and, at the same time, shows how many communities, faced with such a problem, have effectively solved these traffic and safety problems.

At the end of the film the experts, some of the Nation's leading industrial and Government experts on traffic, safety and the auto in general, gave the producer of the film, Dynamic Films, of New York a resounding burst of applause and an equal round of applause for the Perfect Circle Corp. of Hagerstown, Ind., which provided a special public service grant for the production of the film. The public service effort these organizations have made is indeed a worthy one.

The message this film gives is important. Its story I think should be made available to every community in the country faced with the problem of constricting traffic congestion. It should

bring home to communities the fact that they have a stake in their own cities and towns and this film gives them the information necessary to help them help themselves.

We are continually faced with the bugaboo of traffic congestion and accidents and our communities are constantly on the lookout for methods that will help solve these problems before they become too drastic. I think this film will be of interest to all these communities and will help simplify the planning of traffic programs for future years to come.

Traffic is nobody's fault but it should be everybody's business.

Responsibility for the free flow of goods and services and the pleasurable use of the auto rests with all of us, with every individual and corporate citizen. Solutions for traffic problems which often threaten business, industrial and civic growth can be and have been found.

That is why "Auto U.S.A." is such an important film. It is a how-to-do-it package. And Americans who are almost congenitally inclined toward finding practical ways to solve problems will respond once they see it. In 28 minutes, this film proves that many communities already started dissolving traffic congestion through the serious application of existant know-how.

Proceedings of the 43d Annual Convention of the National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers, Hotel Kingsborough, Gloversville, N.Y., June 23, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, last week in my district in New York State, at Gloversville, the heart of the glove-making industry of the Nation, was held the 43d annual convention of the National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers. The business sessions of this great group of businessmen, who are engaged in directing an important and critical defense industry that has been traditional in my district, were held in the Hotel Kingsborough, with the principal session on June 23, 1960.

Because the deliberations of this association are of especial interest to all Members of the House who are concerned with the growing problem of foreign imports and their effect on our own domestic economy and employment, I include herewith three articles from the Gloversville Leader-Herald of June 24, detailing some of the most recent thinking of this organization in meeting this problem in their particular field. The articles follow:

BACHNER NAMED PRESIDENT OF NATIONAL GLOVE GROUP—CASEY AGAIN ELECTED EXECUTIVE SECRETARY; DIRECTORS ARE CHOSEN

Joseph Bachner, vice president of C. J. Bachner & Sons Glove Co., of Gloversville, was elected and installed as president of the National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers, Inc., last night at the 43d annual business session at the Hotel Kingsborough.

Other officers elected and installed were Roscoe Stanyon, Jr., president-treasurer of the Imperial Glove Co. of his city, vice president; Carl Ross of the Ross Glove Co. of Sheboygan, Wis., vice president; Joseph Perrella, owner of Joseph Perrella Glove Co. of this city, treasurer; and James H. Casey, Jr. of Gloversville, executive secretary. Casey was reelected.

The membership adopted a memorial resolution in honor of nine members who died during the past year. Copies of the resolution were ordered sent to the families of the late members.

Those honored were Ellery Willard, Ted A. Lindfelt, Bernard J. Shields, Clarence Shutts, Russell B. Barter, Wilbur Snyder, Francis T. Sutton, Gordon Hyde and Bert Zimmer.

DIRECTORS NAMED

Members of the association elected to serve 3-year terms on the Board of Directors were: Milton Gluckman of Fownes Bros. & Co. of New York City; Julius Higier, president of Superb Glove Co. and Crescendo Gloves, Inc.; Walter Scherf of Northern Glove & Mitten Co. of Green Bay, Wis.; Dominic Papa, treasurer of Mario Papa & Sons Glove Co. of Gloversville, and Carleton B. Adams of Eisendrath Glove Co. of Marinette, Wis.

TWO-YEAR MEN

Those named to the Board of Directors for a term of 2 years were:

John Burnham of Frederic Burnham Co. of Michigan City, Ind.; John D. Widdemer, president of Hilts-Willard Glove Corp., Gloversville; James Green, president of Daniel Hays Co., Inc., Gloversville; Elmer E. Little, president-treasurer of the Elmer Little & Sons Co. Johnstown, and Theron Serfis of Serfis Glove Co., Northville.

ONE-YEAR MEMBERS

Named directors for a term of 1 year were: Forrest P. Gates, treasurer of Gates-Mills, Inc., Johnstown; Louis Rubin of J. M. Rubin & Sons, Gloversville; Jerome Fox, president-secretary of Louis Meyers & Son, Inc., Gloversville; Joseph Conroy, president-treasurer of Joseph Conroy, Inc., Johnstown, and Joseph Lazarus of Boyce-Lazarus Co., Johnstown.

NEW PRESIDENT CALLS FOR RENEWAL OF FORMER 'BUY AMERICAN' THEME

"We should revitalize our former 'Buy American campaign.'" Joseph Bachner, vice president of C. J. Bachner & Sons Glove Co., said last night in accepting the presidency of the National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers, Inc.

The 43d annual business meeting of the association was conducted at the Hotel Kingsborough with approximately 75 persons in attendance.

He said that in the light of events which have transpired in the past years, in relation to the glove industry, it is apparent that the manufacturers should make every effort to foster manufacturing right here in America. "We should revive the 'Buy American Theme.'"

Bachner went on to say "it is true that we were denied aid by the Tariff Commission. However, all of our efforts were not wasted in Washington. I believe that largely through James Casey's efforts, gloves have been excluded from the list of items on which concessions will be granted. The tariff on gloves will not be lowered in the immediate future.

"Let us also look at the problems of European manufacturers. In France, Germany and Italy, they are confronted with rising costs of labor. They are also experiencing a shortage in better grades of leather, and therefore must pay more. We all know that we can make gloves better than our European competition. With costs rising in Europe the difference in price between American made goods and European goods appears to be narrowing. Last year more ladies' dress gloves were imported than were made here. I believe that this trend has seen its limit. I believe many retailers realize that they need domestic manufacturers."

The president said that "many manufacturers present here, import gloves from many countries, including Japan, governments, particularly in the Far East, are unstable. Look at what transpired in Japan recently. Already there is a definite feeling among the buying public to boycott Japanese goods. The same thing could happen in the Philippines or in Hong Kong.

"I myself have learned that it is not easy to do business 12,000 miles from home.

"For these reasons I believe that we should all try to keep as much manufacturing as possible right here in the United States. We should impress upon retailers that they need domestic resources. We should revitalize our former 'Buy American campaign.'"

GLOVE BUSINESS IS ASSURED OF 2 YEARS WITHOUT TARIFF REDUCTIONS, HIGIER REPORTS

While the request for escape clause relief was rejected by the U.S. Tariff Commission leather glove manufacturers were fortunate to have leather glove items left off the GATT bargaining list, Julius Higier, chairman of the Foreign Trade Committee, reported last night.

Speaking at the annual business meeting of the National Association of Leather Glove Manufacturers at the Hotel Kingsborough, Higier noted that only two inconsequential fabric items were listed, together with wool glove linings.

Being off the bargaining list, he said, means that the industry will not be subject to further reductions for a period of at least 2 years.

NEW NEGOTIATIONS

He pointed out that since the hearing on the escape clause relief application by the association, negotiations have been undertaken under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade to reduce all listed commodities 20 percent.

This, he pointed out, the President has a right to do under authorization given him by the Congress. He said that 2,400 items had been listed for reductions but that no leather glove items were found on the list.

Taking up the escape clause proceedings, Higier said that at last year's annual session of the association the membership discussed the advisability of bringing an escape clause action before the U.S. Tariff Commission, and, after careful consideration, it was unanimously voted to proceed with the matter.

WOOL GLOVES EXCLUDED

The original application filed, he said, covered the importation of women's leather dress gloves, men's leather dress gloves, both of which are classified under tariff paragraph 1532(a), and, in addition, gloves of horsehide in which the leather is the component of chief value, classified under paragraph 1532(b). This, he pointed out, automatically excluded wool gloves.

He said that after preliminary conferences in Washington, the association was asked to withdraw this application, the Commission being of the opinion that such a case would be too cumbersome to handle and that the association would be better off giving them an opportunity to hear each case separately.

The application, Higier reported, was withdrawn in its entirety and a second action filed, covering women's leather dress gloves. This item was selected first because it was here that the industry felt the impact of imports most severely.

ASKED TRUE COMPARISON

In the second application, he said, the association specifically requested that imported gloves be compared to domestic production of fine dress gloves only. The association, he said, felt that, by doing this, it would show a true comparison and the actual portion of the domestic market now controlled by imports.

At the hearings, he said, the Commissioners refused to accept this, and all comparisons were then considered on an industrywide basis, regardless of the type of manufacture.

In spite of the fact that imports have taken such a large portion of the domestic market, Higier declared, the Commission refused to consider relief for the industry, and in its findings, stated that the evidence they were able to accumulate was not sufficient to warrant a favorable recommendation to the President.

Annual Official Tour of the Fourth Indiana District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. ROSS ADAIR
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of this session of the 86th Congress, I plan to conduct my annual official tour of the Fourth Indiana District. This will enable me to meet personally with constituents and discuss the legislative actions of this Congress. Furthermore, we can take a look at the issues they feel will be important when the new Congress convenes, following the elections this fall.

In looking back over the many problems which were before the 86th Congress, I believe that the greatest were related to maintaining peace, and preserving the Nation's strength and security. It is significant that at the same time, however, the Nation has continued to prosper and now enjoys its highest level of employment and income in our history.

During both sessions of this Congress, I supported legislation which would curb excessive Government spending and help to keep the budget in balance as requested by the President.

Along with a number of other Members, I introduced a bill providing for long-range tax reform, as I believe that the taxpayers and the economy ultimately must have tax relief and a reappraisal of our present tax policies. This bill did not pass, but some such measure must be considered in the future. We must encourage thrift and at the same time eliminate burdensome taxes to permit more money to be channeled into the development and expansion of our economy. Such a program of incentive would stimulate national growth and increased employment rather than putting tax dollars into the Washington bureaucracy and needless Federal projects.

I also introduced a bill which would have raised the present limitation on earnings of those who are receiving social security, but this likewise did not come to a vote in the House.

In voting against foreign aid, as I have in the past, I felt that our Nation could better our relationships and help the free world and our own people, by using a substantial portion of such funds for domestic purposes. The gigantic expenditures we have made for foreign aid in the past have not won and retained for us friends throughout the world, as we had hoped. Person to person contacts are most helpful in maintaining world friendships.

I have supported all efforts to ease world tensions and halt the Communist conspiracy in its tracks. It is now apparent that we must speak up most firmly to the Communist leaders. Never will we stop the evil menace of communism by failing to recognize it for the atheistic menace it is. We must be tough on Communists and expose their every effort to take over the world.

As we are entering an entirely new era of space exploration, which calls upon us to further our scientific knowledge and research, I have favored proper action and expenditures in this field. We need to keep ahead of the world in utilizing our ingenuity and experience in this space age to see that we advance in the direction of peaceful and constructive uses of these new developments rather than letting some other nation pervert them to weapons of destruction and fear.

I have also worked for a strong national defense program with concentration of modern weapons and military supremacy for our protection from any would-be aggressor.

In fact, I feel that the general conservative approach to our national problems has been sound and one which merits the confidence and approval of our people generally and particularly of those in the Fourth District of Indiana whom I am privileged to represent.

This official tour which I make annually through the eight counties of the district—Allen, Adams, Whitley, Noble, De Kalb, Steuben, Lagrange, and Wells—has always afforded an excellent opportunity of talking over our national problems. It enables us to get firsthand views and information from the folks in the district as to their attitude on these matters and how I may best serve them and contribute to good government through congressional action.

The tour will not be held until after the national political conventions, and I have set up the following dates and places to meet with my constituents. I invite all to meet with me and to feel free to discuss their problems, whether it be on legislation, issues, my voting record, or personal governmental business that they may have on matters of pensions, military service, veterans' affairs, or whatever.

Following the final adjournment of Congress, I will open my district office to serve constituents at 925 Lincoln Tower, Fort Wayne, Ind., and my Washington office, room 1511, House Office Building, will, of course, be open.

The tour dates and places where I will be and the hours are:

Monday, August 1, 9:30 a.m., post office, Ossian.

Monday, August 1, 11 a.m., post office, Bluffton.

Monday, August 1, 2 p.m., post office, Decatur.

Monday, August 1, 4 p.m., post office, Berne.

Tuesday, August 2, 10 a.m., post office, Garrett.

Tuesday, August 2, 11:30 a.m., post office, Auburn.

Tuesday, August 2, 2:30 p.m., post office, Butler.

Tuesday, August 2, 4:30 p.m., post office, Waterloo.

Wednesday, August 3, 10 a.m., post office, Angola.

Wednesday, August 3, 1:30 p.m., post office, Fremont.

Wednesday, August 3, 4 p.m., post office, Lagrange.

Thursday, August 4, 10 a.m., post office, Albion.

Thursday, August 4, 1:30 p.m., post office, Kendallville.

Thursday, August 4, 4 p.m., post office, Ligonier.

Friday, August 5, 9:30 a.m., post office, Columbia City.

Friday, August 5, 1:30 p.m., post office, South Whitley.

Friday, August 5, 4 p.m., post office, Churubusco.

A Great Book by a Great Author

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEWELL A. GEORGE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, recently I read a brief, but excellent and well-written review of CHESTER BOWLES' "The Coming Political Breakthrough." This review written by Mrs. Tempa Watson of Oklahoma, now residing temporarily in Hawaii, should be read by every Member. Mrs. Watson's remarks will probably induce a reading of the book.

Mr. Speaker, under previous consent, I include this review in the extension of my remarks:

"THE COMING POLITICAL BREAKTHROUGH," BY CHESTER BOWLES

(Review by Mrs. Tempa Watson)

CHESTER BOWLES is Congressman and ex-Governor of Connecticut and former Ambassador to India. He has been a Connecticut delegate to four Democratic National Conventions, and recently selected as platform committee chairman of this year's Democratic National Convention. He is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, and has served in various capacities in the United Nations. He has drawn on his experiences in business and public affairs in writing this book.

"The Coming Political Breakthrough" shows concretely the nature of our national

problems, foreign, domestic, and military, that we must now face up to. He suggests a detailed course of action that the political parties could well consider. According to Senator Kennedy, ex-President Truman, and Governor Stevenson, it is a book for all of us to read—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents alike.

CHESTER BOWLES tells us that we are confronted with a new set of problems which are "breathtaking in their variety and explosiveness." In Asia, Africa, and Latin America 800 million newly free, or soon to be free people are straining to create new societies or improve the old which cannot be done with existing technical and capital resources. The economic gap between the rich minority, living largely in North America and Western Europe, and the poor majority, living largely in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, continues to grow. Mr. BOWLES points out that the Soviet Union has suddenly emerged from a peasant society into an industrial power that challenged the economic and political position of the United States. That the opposing power blocs are as old as history but now there is a difference in that each side is armed with nuclear weapons that could destroy most of civilization. A failure of communications or a human error on either side could lead to nuclear catastrophe.

The author states that the "new China," the Communist dictatorship in Peiping, which is allied with Moscow and antagonistic to the United States, is forcing 650 million able, hard-working human beings into a new center of Communist strength; that the inadequacy of natural resources in relation to her vast population suggests that at some future time she may attempt to occupy areas to the south.

Since 1953 our domestic economy has been growing at the slowest rate in generations, inadequate to meet our increasing population needs; that our educational needs are urgent, and that housing, medical research and improvement of transportation systems and industrial plants all require immediate attention. Our civil rights are behind times. Nearly a hundred years after the Emancipation Proclamation Negro Americans are still denied the right to vote and to obtain equal education. In almost every State the Negro is denied equal rights in housing and employment. I agree with Cochairman Camile F. Gravel (a newly created office of the National Democratic Committee) a moderate southerner, that "segregation is morally wrong, but that it would be socially and economically disastrous to impose integration on the South by force at this time."

The author states that all these domestic and international realities have not been adequately recognized; that the slow rate of economic growth has been to revert to the scarcity view, that inflation can only be completely checked by leaving idle a big portion of our men, machines and capital, and that more schools, housing and hospitals remain beyond our means. Mr. BOWLES believes we can have full employment, reasonable prices without harmful inflation and recessions, that it is possible for us to have adequate defense, to provide foreign economic assistance, to expand our construction programs in housing, schools, research, urban renewal, dams (hydroelectric and flood control), highways, to balance the budget, and to either reduce our national debt or reduce taxes without impairment of the national economy.

Mr. BOWLES states that the world yearns for us to apply the force of our tested democratic values to the solution of these new problems. He further sets out that from the birth of our political parties to the present, three great eras of consensus are discernible (Jefferson-Jackson, Lincoln, and F.D.R.) each in response to public insistence on a broader interpretation of human freedom to meet new conditions. The public demonstrated the strength of the third consensus by electing a Democratic President in five successive elections.

According to the author we are now moving into a fourth period of political consensus which will reaffirm and broaden our commitment to full employment without inflation and without sharp recessions. It will call for a more realistic, nationwide approach to civil rights, will encourage an improvement in the quality of our day-to-day living, and will bring world relationships into a fresh perspective. He believes that the political leadership of America in 1960 will be entrusted to the party which most boldly and effectively identifies itself with the fourth consensus, and the leaders and programs of action consistent with it. If one or the other of our two political parties succeeds in making itself the action instrument, the public interest will be the gainer and the party itself will be the winner.

CHESTER BOWLES states that the political breakthrough may depend upon ability to clarify our national purpose in terms of developments both at home and abroad. He is very explicit in establishing a course of action which would enable us to regain the initiative in our dealings with the Communist nations and place our relations with the two-thirds non-Communist people of the world on a more enduring basis. Required is coordinated political action, economic action, military readiness, and a cohesive American view of the world that reflects our national purpose. It is important to note that it will require that we rethink the whole nature of the present world crisis and to bring our objectives into closer harmony with those of the non-Communist peoples everywhere. It will require us to rally the two-thirds non-Communist people in the common defense of certain principles of human conduct which are deeply rooted in most religions and which have provided the driving force for human freedom and betterment. He sets out five points of an international policy which are more than an American policy and more than an anti-Communist policy. These principles in practical terms must be spelled out.

The author reminds us that the Presidency is the central office of action in our national life. It is the one focal point which gives unity, direction, and purpose to the American people as a whole. This fact must be uppermost in our minds when we choose a President in 1960. Our sights are raised beyond the here and now.

CHESTER BOWLES emphasizes that it is necessary to look for a man who will not only recognize our national domestic needs, but who also advocates our highest aspirations to live and grow in peace and friendship with the family of nations. For this reason foreign policy since 1940 has been the dominant element in the selection of America's Presidents. The growing and already primary importance of foreign policy in selecting our presidential candidates is almost certain to lessen the traditional eligibility of Governors, and to increase that of Senators who deal regularly with foreign policy matters. Exceptions are Stevenson and Rockefeller, whose reputations were largely made in foreign affairs. This knowledge is a decisive influence in determining the outcome of presidential elections and is now shared by all the leading candidates for Presidential office.

CHESTER BOWLES believes the Democratic Party is by all odds the best equipped to carry out the fourth consensus struggling to come into existence; and that the liberal heritage of the Democratic Party "Rights of Man" slogan used by the founders of the Democratic Party of 1796 enables us to communicate with all people in every corner of the earth. The political record of 1960 will certainly depend upon the choice of candidates and the choice of issues.

After reading this book, one can readily understand why CHESTER BOWLES was recently elected chairman of the platform committee of the Democratic National Convention to oversee what issues the Democrats will stress in the fall campaign.

Mrs. Flora Whitehill Put Her 11 Children Through School Without Federal Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting story from the Nonpareil, Council Bluffs, Iowa, about an Iowa mother who did not ask for or receive Federal aid to put her 11 children through school. With honest toil and God's blessing Mrs. Whitehill, of Tabor, Iowa, has proven there is no substitute for hard work and right living.

The news article follows:

HARD WORK "OLD HAT" TO TABOR MOTHER

(By Don Patton)

TABOR.—Any contest to name the outstanding mother in Tabor would be a cut-and-dried affair.

The honor would go to Mrs. Flora Whitehill without any campaigning at all.

Mrs. Whitehill operates a ladies' ready-to-wear store here. While doing this—and many other jobs on the side—she has raised 11 children and put them all through high school and all but one through college.

In 1939, Mrs. Whitehill was shouldered with the enormous task of caring for her brood of nine daughters and two sons. Her husband Frank died suddenly of a heart attack while watching their two oldest daughters play basketball at Strahan.

She sold their farming equipment and with her late husband's insurance money, purchased a large house in Tabor.

The road was mighty rough for several years, Mrs. Whitehill recalls. "I did all sorts of jobs to keep the family together. I hung wallpaper, painted, sold cosmetics door to door—anything to bring in grocery money."

In 1941, she entered business for herself "on a shoestring." But she continued her outside work, too.

"Many nights I left the store, went out and hung wallpaper until 5 o'clock in the morning, then home for a couple hours sleep and back to the store," she said.

The pace finally began to tell on her, especially after she suffered an injured knee in a fall. The injury is now causing her pain and is "sort of slowing me down," she admitted.

After World War II, Mrs. Whitehill said, it looked as if things were going a little better. But on July 4, 1946, new tragedy struck.

The family home was nearly destroyed by fire. All the children's clothing and most of their personal belongings were burned.

Tabor and the surrounding community came to their aid and soon the family was outfitted again, Mrs. Whitehill rebuilt their home with the insurance money.

Since that time, things have gone along pretty smooth, although she still works hard.

"As I look back on the past 21 years, I know that God was with me," Mrs. Whitehill said

humbly. "Without His help, I don't think I could have done it."

Her children gave her a lot of help, too, she proudly added. "They did all sorts of jobs to bring in money and the older ones took care of the younger ones so I could operate the store."

Mrs. Whitehill is very proud of the accomplishments of her family. Seven of her nine daughters either have or are now teaching school. All but one of the 11 attended college.

All but two of the family are married and "they all had big weddings, too," the mother boasted.

At home with her is her oldest daughter Irma who taught school at Thurman last year. She will teach in the area again this coming year.

In order of age the other children are:

Joyce—Mrs. Ellsworth Schilling, Columbus, Nebr., a teacher there; Helen—Mrs. Raymond Morical, a former teacher, now a farm wife near Tabor; Jean—Mrs. Newell Lorimor, Bartlett, former teacher, now a farm wife; Frank Jr., employed with Iowa Power & Light Co., in Tabor; Arlene—Mrs. Bob Ewaldt, a farm wife near Randolph.

Phyllis—a teacher in Council Bluffs, now attending the University of Omaha, working on her master's degree; Jeannette—Mrs. Millard Plum, a farm wife near Hastings; Richard—farming land he and his brother purchased on the river bottom near Tabor.

Vida and Verda, twins, are both teachers. Vida is Mrs. Richard Flint of Council Bluffs and Verda is Mrs. Leo Stabas, Omaha. Vida will teach in Council Bluffs next fall and Verda, now in Colorado Spirngs, Colo., where her husband is in the service, will return to Omaha to teach.

Mrs. Whitehill has 12 grandchildren and "when the kids bring their kids and come home for Sunday dinner, it looks like a convention around the place," she mused.

What does a person who has worked hard all her life do for relaxation? "I go home and work in my yard and garden," she said. "It's the most enjoyable part of the day for me."

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, the Soviet Union's rise to the status of a great world power is the most striking phenomenon in contemporary world history, and its treacherous acts, committed in the name of world communism, constitutes one of the blackest pages in all history. One of these acts was the capture and enslavement of nearly 100 million innocent and helpless people in Eastern Europe. Since the end of the last war, under the guise of people's democracies, the Soviet Union has made captives all peoples between the Baltic and Black Seas. They have been sealed off from the free world by the Iron Curtain imposed upon them. And all efforts on the part of the West to see these peoples freed from Communist dictatorship have been of no avail. No government in the West will relinquish the hope of seeing these peoples freed. The people of this country will continue their efforts to that end, and the observance of the Captive Nations Week, as enacted by Congress and proclaimed by the President, is an eloquent testimony of their desire to see justice done to these millions of innocent and helpless people.

Let's Get Tough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR W. HIESTAND
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HIESTAND. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including an article of interest to those watching the domestic and international scene. It was written by Mr. George Todt, columnist for the Valley Times, published in North Hollywood, Calif., and circulated in my district.

Mr. Todt brings us up to what he calls the "moment of truth":

"To do my duty in that state of life unto which it shall please God to call me"—Book of Common Prayer.

The spectacle of 10,000 leftwing demonstrators besieging the automobile of Press Secretary Jim Hagerty in Tokyo recently is one which ought to go a long way in awakening apathetic Americans.

Even Adlai Stevenson and Senator JOHN KENNEDY, for that matter. Wonder if these gentlemen will recommend that the United States apologize now for this latest outbreak in diplomatic relations—this time with one of our stanchest allies in the Pacific area.

Let Adlai and JACK—and Eleanor, too—moan and groan to their hearts' delight about the "ugly Americans." But I, for one, invite them to take their appeasement-minded apologies in hand, and you know just where they can take them. We all should be sick to death of such decadent weaknesses by now.

The most incredible thing which comes to my mind at this time is this: Never before in history has a nation been so strong as we are now and yet permitted every pipsqueak on the world stage to slap us in the face—even Castro of Cuba. I have too much respect for canines in general to call this airedale what his overripe personality deserves.

But why do we take it? The truth, if it must be known, is that we are able to annihilate the Soviet Union and Red China this year or next—with only trifling losses to the United States. The Reds cannot stop our overwhelming Sunday punch, the U.S. Strategic Air Command (SAC). It provides "the moment of truth" for our enemies.

What has happened to us is simply this: The Reds, playing a careful hand of international poker, nuclear blackmail type, have been making noises like they were superior to us in military power. They have gotten away with this monstrous piece of nonsense because we have made it something of a national policy not to call their bluff.

Instead, we have permitted these blusterers unwanted margin and full leeway to conduct their atrocious noises by proclaiming needlessly that we would "never, never strike the first blow" in modern warfare.

This is a silly policy. For it has permitted our bellicose opponents full opportunity to take every aggressive measure against us short of nuclear war. Failing to take that final step, the Reds are safe from retaliation of any kind that is effective. Why continue?

Under this strange—and ineffective—policy we have been placed in a near-untenable position. Our Vice President has been stoned by Communist mobs in South America. Our President was insulted in Europe. And now Hagerty, the President's secretary, has been threatened by Communist-directed mobs in Asia.

I think it is time for the United States to get tough for its own good. We need the spirit of Teddy Roosevelt throughout our country again. We should always be just and honorable—but we must permit none to disgrace our flag wherever it may be shown. If we have to go to war to protect our just rights, we ought not to fear.

The truth is that in 1960 we have more power than all the rest of the world combined, friend and foe together.

If we want peace, we must be fully prepared to go to war, if necessary. And we must relieve our opponents in the world jungle of the notion that we do not possess the intestinal fortitude to use our superb arms unless and until the time comes when they first unleash a nuclear blitzkrieg against us.

Re Cuban Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH Q. ALEXANDER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the United States, through our State Department, should take a new look at Cuba.

Only 90 miles from our shores we find this small country with less than 6 million people who not only figuratively, but literally, through its dictator, Fidel Castro, thumbs its nose at us.

America has shed blood to win freedom for Cuba, and throughout history has played the role of big brother, giving bountifully of friendship and aid. At the expense of the American taxpayer we have consistently stabilized the price of their sugar, paying more for it than any other country.

While I am of the opinion that the Cuban people generally, are still friendly toward the United States, the diplomatic sins of its leaders are legion. In my judgment it is foolish to declare Castro a mere tool of the Communists, and not recognize him as a practicing Communist.

Without any compensation at all he has taken over properties belonging to the United States, his warships in peacetime have fired against American ships, and he has physically mistreated and deported U.S. citizens, including members of our foreign service. He has endangered the security of the entire hemisphere by entering into pacts with the Communists states, thereby establishing a beachhead for Russia in Latin America. Red dictatorship is now in full control in Cuba, making it criminal to make statements unfavorable to communism or to the Government.

Russia has appointed Sergei M. Kudryavtsev as Ambassador to Cuba. This is the Communist who headed a Soviet espionage ring in Canada early in the 1940's. Premier Khrushchev, has of course, already accepted an invitation to visit Cuba. It is likely that he may be followed by Communist Chinese Premier Chou En-lai. And worse still, it has been reported that Cuba is preparing to establish diplomatic relations with Peiping. This would be a bitter blow to the United States.

Among Castro's closest advisers is Maj. Ernesto "Che" Guevara, who is Communist trained. He has written a book telling Latin Americans how to overthrow their governments and take power. Another who is very close to Castro is his brother, Raul, who is first in line of succession, and also Communist trained. And there is also Antonio Junez Jimenez who heads the National Institute of Agrarian Reform, and is known as a Communist.

These men and others are waging a vicious hate-America campaign on our very doorsteps. Day after day they hurl vitriolic tirades against us and employ calumny in order to degrade the United States.

Castro is not content to turn only Cuba against the United States, as alarming and distressing as that is. His ambition is to extend the Red dominance to include all of Latin America, converting to communism a group of countries that traditionally have been friendly to us. Therefore, his fellow Communists are active in Cuban embassies all through Latin America.

And so while Soviet influence increases in Cuba, our position there is greatly deteriorating, economically as well as diplomatically. Just the other day Cuba confiscated the Texaco Oil Co. there because the crude oil is not bought from the Communists.

I firmly believe that it is imperative that this must be stopped. We must not sit idly by and vainly hope that Castro will hang himself if given enough time and rope.

The State Department has failed to follow through with its protests. Our security is at stake. The influence of our administrative leaders is already being questioned through the world. Their ability to cope with the situation is doubted. A change in policy should be adopted. We must let Castro and his henchmen know in no uncertain terms just where we stand and exactly what our policy is. Then, if necessary, take action to protect our sovereignty, guard our prestige and maintain our good name.

The hour is late.

Veteran and Armed Forces Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following platform pertaining to veteran and Armed Forces affairs adopted at the 1960 American Veterans Committee convention held at Atlantic City, N.J., on June 12, 13, and 14:

VETERAN AND ARMED FORCES AFFAIRS

I. VETERANS' BENEFITS

The American Veterans Committee has constantly reiterated, since its founding its fundamental belief that rehabilitation and integration of veterans into the community is the proper scope and purpose of a veterans program. The achievement of economic security for veterans through sound economic planning, for all citizens rather than through special grants or favors to veterans is basic AVC policy.

For many years, AVC has pointed out the need for a thorough review and reappraisal of this Nation's policies on veterans. AVC's current position on veterans policies is as follows:

1. We oppose bonuses and general pensions as being class legislation and unrelated to the real needs of individual veterans and tending to set veterans apart from their fellow citizens.

2. Two basic standards should be applied in evaluating veterans' benefits. They are:

(a) For death or disability incurred in military service: Are the benefits sufficient to provide a decent standard of living for the veteran, his family or survivors, taking account of the veteran's ability and opportunity for gainful employment?

(b) For all veterans who did not incur disability: Are the benefits so designed as to enable the veterans to readjust from military service to civilian life with minimum economic loss?

3. Veterans' benefits should be administered without regard to race, creed, color, sex, or national origin. Since benefits are a Federal responsibility, uniform standards of administration and compensation should be applied throughout the Nation.

4. The present scale of compensation for disability, and for compensation to survivors, provides amounts which we believe are not commensurate with an adequate standard of living.

5. Provision should be made to maintain automatically the purchasing power of the benefit dollar. Monetary benefits should be adjusted annually on the basis of the year-to-year change in the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index.

6. We endorse the proposal of the Bradley Commission that special consideration should be given to disabilities rated at 10 and 20 percent to determine whether significant economic impairment exists. Consideration should be given to discharge of the Government's obligation in static cases rated at 10 and 20 percent by an appropriate lump-sum or short-term settlement.

7. We believe in some veterans' preference for positions in the Federal civil service. However, this consideration should be limited in three major respects:

(a) No veteran should receive a position unless he is fully qualified to perform duties entailed.

(b) Preference for nonhandicapped veterans should be limited to initial appointment only.

(c) Absolute preference for nonhandicapped veterans should not be granted in any event, nor should any job be reserved for such veterans exclusively.

8. We endorse the provision for mustering-out pay as necessary to bridge the gap between military service and civilian life.

9. We urge equalization of benefits, aimed at eliminating differences in the present treatment of veterans, widows, and orphans of World War I, World War II, and Korea.

II. VETERANS' HOUSING

AVC believes that steps must be taken to discourage the practice of discounting, and adding special charges on GI mortgages, during a tight money market. AVC urges that the Secretary of the Treasury invest up to 25 percent of national service life insurance premium reserves in VA guaranteed GI mortgages to provide, if needed, supplementary financing in this field.

At the same time, proper steps must be taken to insure that the administration of such financing by the purchases of GI mortgages with VA and Treasury funds will not serve to perpetuate discrimination against Negro home buyers under the FHA program.

AVC proposes the eventual integration of the veterans' housing program into the Federal Housing Administration to eliminate the duplication of administrative costs for both programs.

III. PEACETIME GI BILL OF RIGHTS

Experience with the World War GI bill of rights has given ample evidence of the value in increased productivity to the Nation and to the increased taxes to the Government of that law's education and training provisions.

AVC endorses a modified GI bill of rights for peacetime draftees and volunteers who have been on extended active duty. It is our belief that such men who enable our country to maintain peace and meet its commitments and responsibilities to our allies are entitled to basic readjustment benefits to enable them to return without distress to civilian life at the end of their service and become useful and productive members of their communities.

AVC is mindful of the concern of the Bradley Commission that the enactment of (too liberal postservice) benefits could serve as an inducement to men to leave the armed services and discourage enlistments for longer periods of time. We call for enactment of legislation entitled "Peacetime Ex-servicemen's Readjustment Benefits" modeled on the provisions of chapter 14 of title 38 of the United States Code (the Korean GI bill) with the major change that the ratio of educational credits earned for months in service at the rate of 1½ months' education to 1 of service. Thus, a peacetime ex-serviceman enrolled in a typical institution having a school year of 9 months could obtain 4 years of training and education by serving a minimum of 24 months. The benefits should not accrue to 6-month trainees or to anyone serving less than 12 months, unless separated at an earlier period for a service-connected disability. The provisions of such a law would apply retroactively to all servicemen on extended active service subsequent to January 31, 1955, and discharged under honorable conditions.

IV. GENERAL PENSIONS FOR NON-SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABILITIES

We believe that general pension benefits should be eliminated entirely for World War II and Korean veterans due to the greatly expanded social security, public assistance, and veterans' benefits programs, to which World War I veterans and their dependents were not entitled. We endorse the recommendations of the Bradley Commission, to continue the general pension program for World War I veterans as the reserve line of economic defense.

AVC believes that the Government should rely on the social security program to the greatest possible extent in providing income-maintenance benefits for veterans and nonveterans against some of the economic and medical hazards of life.

The VA non-service-connected pension program should be essentially a reserve line of economic defense for veterans and their dependents until such time as their minimum income requirements are met under OASI or through their own sources of income. Benefit and eligibility provisions of this program and OASI should be coordinated to eliminate overlapping and duplication of payments with pensions being reduced by

OASI benefits rather than the present reversed situation.

V. UNIFICATION OF THE ARMED FORCES

AVC believes that the Department of Defense has not sufficiently exercised its authorization to reduce, if not completely eradicate, the continuing public rivalry between the several branches of our Armed Forces.

AVC urges that the authority of the Department of Defense be strengthened and that the command structure be reorganized so as to eliminate duplication and waste, permit cross-utilization of ideas, inventions, procedures and research, and to reduce the opportunities for interservice disagreements.

VI. SEGREGATION IN THE ARMED FORCES

We maintain that no assignments of any personnel should be made to oversea posts on the basis of segregation by host nations.

VII. ARMED FORCES TRAINING

We owe the men of our armed services the best possible training to equip them for the rigors of combat under the most adverse conditions of weather, terrain, supply, and enemy action. While we support a training program which is rugged, disciplined, and challenging, we decry brutality, sadism, or lack of judgment in training.

VIII. MILITARY MANPOWER, RESERVE FORCES AND NATIONAL SECURITY

The world we live in, despite recent changes in the climate of international hostilities, with its emphasis on speed of operation and technical superiority, demands standing Armed Forces of sufficient size, training and equipment and organization to be immediately effective for defense and counterattack. No matter how effective the Reserve program of the future may be, it is apparent that the Regular Armed Forces must remain our first line of defense. They must be of sufficient size and mobility for deployment anywhere on the globe within a minimum of time so that we may continue to provide, when necessary, those forces needed for collective security under our international obligations in peripheral conflicts occurring in the strategic localities of the world. Reliance on strategic airpower and massive retaliation alone is not only insufficient in the long run, but may weaken our military security and increase international tensions.

AVC believes that any Reserve program, present and future, which does not completely revoke segregation in the Armed Forces is incompatible with democratic ideals and frustrates the moral fiber of our society. It is essential for the future security of this Nation that our manpower resources be used for the defense of our way of life without regard to regional prejudices. We urge therefore, that an antisegregation amendment be added to the Reserve law, and the Congress prohibit racial segregation in any federally recognized and/or federally aided National Guard units.

We believe that reservists and National Guardsmen should not suffer loss of job rights and privileges and employment opportunities because of their participation in Reserve or National Guard training.

AVC is opposed to any policy whereby the Armed Forces award discharges other than honorable to Reserve personnel based upon the political or other activities in which these individuals may participate following separation from active service under the draft law.

We believe that the conditions of discharge should be based solely upon the military activity and efficiency of the reservist.

IX. UNIFORM CODE OF MILITARY JUSTICE

The Supreme Court has invalidated the provision of the Uniform Code of Military Justice with regard to the trial after discharge of ex-servicemen for offenses committed in service. We believe that ex-servicemen should not escape punishment for serious offenses committed while in service, but should be tried before civilian courts; and we urge Congress to enact legislation covering these situations. The legislation should be limited to crimes of the same degree of seriousness as felonies at common law. It should also grant such ex-servicemen the same rights to a preliminary hearing before removal from the Federal district of apprehension as persons apprehended under other law.

The Supreme Court has also invalidated the provision of the Uniform Code of Military Justice which extends jurisdiction over civilians accompanying the Armed Forces. We believe such civilians should not be allowed to escape punishment entirely. We urge Congress to enact legislation which will provide a constitutional means of dealing with this problem.

South Carolina Industrial Growth Breaks Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a newsletter from the South Carolina State Development Board entitled "South Carolina Industrial Growth Breaks Record":

SOUTH CAROLINA INDUSTRIAL GROWTH BREAKS RECORD

The amount of industrial building commitments announced in South Carolina during the fiscal year just completed reached an alltime high of $245,410,000.

State Development Board Director Francis M. Hipp hailed the results of the 12-month period as evidence of the success which can be gained through cooperation and hard work.

Significantly, facilities for the manufacture of such diversified items as glass and related products, chemicals and metal products accounted for a major portion of the recordbreaking total.

James C. Self, chairman of the board's industrial committee, pointed out that expansion in South Carolina in the glass products category alone resulted in the awarding of contracts amounting to $50,149,000.

Confidence in the future was also expressed by the State's textile industry which poured $51,246,000 into new and expanded facilities, and by the paper industry's huge contribution to South Carolina's fiscal year total.

During the past 10 years the amount invested by industry in the State during calendar year periods has averaged about $117 million. For the 12-month period ending last December 31, the value of new and expanded industrial building was $207 million.

"Our first objective is the creation of jobs in South Carolina for South Carolinians," Gov. Ernest F. Hollings said. "The work of the board, Director Walter W. Harper, his staff and the many cooperating groups resulted in 12,129 new jobs during the past 12 months. This result is one of which we can all be proud."

Developments during the past 12 months included the announcement that plans called for the expansion of Chemstrand Corp.'s new nylon plant at Greenwood prior to its completion. Bowater Corp. also announced a huge expansion program less than a year after its original plant opened near Rock Hill.

Owens-Corning Fiberglas plant at Aiken went into production as did Florence's new electronics plant, Electro Motive Manufacturing Co. Draper Corp. announced a second plant for the State to be located between Marion and Mullins.

American Lava Corp., a subsidiary of Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co., and the Dunlop Tire & Rubber Co. were added to South Carolina's growing industrial list with plants at Laurens and Westminster respectively.

South Carolina's own industrial leaders such as Greenwood Mills and the Springs Cotton Mills began extensive expansion programs. "Such confidence shown by industry that has always made its home in South Carolina is truly gratifying," Mr. Harper said.

In addition, the 1960 general assembly provided a new tool for long-range economic development by approval of legislation creating the State Organization for Associated Research.

Officials of the new organization will work with advisers and faculties at the University of South Carolina and Clemson College expanding economic and technical-scientific research at University of South Carolina and scientific and agricultural research at Clemson. The general assembly also appropriated $250,000 to implement the program.

"With continued cooperation such as South Carolinians have shown during the past year," Mr. Harper said, "we look forward confidently to the future."

Our Espionage: We Must Improve It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call attention today to an excellent article by Rear Adm. Ellis M. Zacharias, which recently appeared in the Chicago Sun-Tribune magazine section. I believe this article is self-explanatory and deserves the widest attention of all Americans.

The article follows:

OUR ESPIONAGE: WE MUST IMPROVE IT

(By Rear Adm. Ellis M. Zacharias)

When Genghis Khan's nomad horsemen galloped over Asia and Eastern Europe in the 13th century, there was a curious sameness about their approach to each city that lay in their path.

Trained spies always were sent ahead to search out the city's defense secrets and to spread confusion and fear among its citizens. The techniques of Genghis Khan and his Mongol tribesmen succeeded so well that the Russians, in whose veins runs a strain of Mongol blood, employ them still—with improvements.

But the espionage was not invented on the Mongolian steppes. It must date back to the dawn of time, to the first raid made by one tribe upon another. It is mentioned in the Bible. Nowadays it is practiced in one form or another by every nation of stature, because the warped mentality of man makes it necessary for a nation's security.

Yet no nation—at least until recently—would admit that it engaged in spying on an

international scale. The cardinal rule had been: Espionage is never admitted. Most Americans just didn't like the implications of espionage at all; they considered it somehow unsporting.

It is a pity that we cannot afford to indulge ourselves in such idealism. Actually, espionage is not a subject for the idealistic to delve into very deeply. Since it is illegal, its methods are often immoral and sometimes criminal. Not infrequently it involves bribery, blackmail, seduction, forgery, and sometimes murder.

Even the most successful agent has little hope of reward. The unsuccessful agent goes into oblivion. Sometimes he chooses suicide to preserve the secrets that torturers know only too well how to extract from him. The delicate art of bamboo-slivers-under-the-fingernails is many centuries old. It has been expanded and refined by Communist counterintelligence operatives.

Such things being true, we might as well face up to the fact that espionage is no field for amateurs. It is a skilled profession, requiring abilities far beyond those of most men. Today, with the advent of intercontinental missiles and the relative ineffectiveness of early warning systems, the profession has outgrown its old back-alley, cloak-and-dagger days and has assumed status as essential to our national survival.

That is why it is eminently fair for an American to ask: How are we doing in the field of espionage? Are changes needed in our methods? Can we do better?

To appreciate the problems involved, we must contemplate what the opposition is doing. Russia maintains the largest espionage operation in the world's history, with trawlers off our coast to watch our Polaris submarine tests, with submarines off our coast to record data on our missile firings at Cape Canaveral, Fla., with spy networks invading every country of the world.

In my first book, "Secret Missions," I pointed out that:

"The sudden arrival of enemy operatives in a peaceful country is a sign, only too often disregarded, that the country has been singled out as a military objective in the plans of aggressor nations. Spies precede invading armies and air fleets, and their appearance should reveal to the watchful observer the plans made behind closed doors by operations sections of busy general staffs."

Fortunately, we have been able to uncover some—perhaps most—of the Soviet espionage networks in the United States. But the Communist Party itself remains a well organized and hidden danger, much more so than it is presently fashionable to admit, already penetrating our economic life to help the Soviet Union in its drive to "bury us" by flooding the world markets with slave labor goods. Let us remember that Khrushchev has said: "We desire trade less for economic reasons and more for political reasons."

The Soviet leaders have maintained both open and secret organizations in the United States since the end of World War I. The Communist Party membership gave their allegiance to Soviet Russia, and openly conducted espionage activities against the interests of the United States. But the more effective professional work was carried on by American traitors, as a Communist underground working directly with Soviet agents in this country. When exposed, some of these traitors saved their necks by becoming informers, not because of love for the United States but for reasons never disclosed. We do know that some of their information planted with ambitious individuals created chaos in the U.S. Government at a time when Soviet Russia was making it greatest strides. The effects of that era are still with us.

It will be pleasing to the American people and to our allies to know that our intelligence estimates of the Soviet military posture have been based upon reliable data collected during a period of 4 years by overflights of the Soviet land area, while they were flying over our Alaska, Canada, Britain, Japan, Pakistan, Turkey, and other land areas of our allies. We had given orders not to shoot at these intruders, while at the same time our planes had been subjected to no fewer than 15 attacks by Russian MIG's between 1950 and 1959, often with the loss of both plane and crew.

The effectiveness of our Central Intelligence Agency in the world espionage field is difficult to judge, because its work must be secret. But doubts have been raised in the minds of the well informed. I feel there is grave need of some reform, especially in the field of organization.

In order to prevent surprises, and to make certain that we have security both external and internal, it is necessary to have a complete reorganization of the Central Intelligence Agency, and to give it complete control of all intelligence, counterintelligence, and security.

It must be headed by a civilian in order to prevent any fears of a military Gestapo.

However, to obtain the necessary cooperation and coordination which we do not have today, and to eliminate needless duplication, inefficiency, and amateurish handling, the Deputy Directors of the Central Intelligence Agency should be ex officio the Directors of Navy, Army, and Air Intelligence.

Under these conditions, those Government investigative agencies which desire to assist the CIA in investigations relating to counter-espionage and countersabotage will be free to do so as so many of them did effectively in the past when naval intelligence was carrying the full load.

There is a misapprehension regarding our internal security today. Actually, we do not have much, for to obtain the security that would be necessary in an emergency a complete military operation would be required. Because of the extensive personnel required, only the Army would be able to perform this mission. A detailed plan would be necessary to safeguard all the areas necessary to defense, the railway facilities, and especially the mountain tunnels to the west coast.

Arresting a few top Communists is not going to solve this problem. The next echelon is always ready to take over. In view of the complacency that has grown up lately about the internal Communist threat, it may be hard to eliminate disbelief that the Communists have not penetrated our labor unions, all phases of our economy, and other areas which will assist the Soviet leaders in their program to bury us.

Countermeasures on our part will have to be supplemented by a full-fledged campaign to inform the peoples of the world and our own people what is being done to them. By this, I mean an effective psychological warfare, political warfare, or propaganda campaign—by whichever name it is called. The most effective campaign is the constant repetition of the truth, together with appropriate comment.

Firm Leadership Best Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been some criticism of the approach taken by President Eisenhower in reporting to the American people on his trip to the Far East. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including, in the form of an editorial from the Syracuse, N.Y., Post-Standard of June 29, 1960, a particularly effective answer to this criticism:

IKE OUTSMARTS CRITICS: FIRM LEADERSHIP BEST POLICY

When the President of the United States addresses the Nation, he is also addressing the world.

He speaks not only to his fellow Americans but to all the peoples of free nations who look to him for leadership and to the United States for protection in the cause of freedom.

He also speaks to as many men and women in Communist-dominated lands as may have access to factual news reports by press or radio.

When President Eisenhower makes a major report such as he delivered Monday evening, he must perforce weigh his entire approach carefully for its effect around the world, and he must consider every word and every point which might be distorted for propaganda purposes by Communist leaders.

Many are those who scan every sentence the President utters for a possible slip which might work to the advantage of the Soviet bloc.

Mr. Eisenhower Monday night chose to answer the bullying tactics of the Communists by taking a calm approach, by emphasizing the continued desire of the American people for world peace, by pledging complete cooperation by the United States with its friendly allies, and by stressing the positive gains of his trip to the far Pacific.

He made this essential point, and all good Americans should ponder it seriously:

"We in the United States must not fall into the error of blaming ourselves for what the Communists do; after all, Communists will act like Communists."

In other words, we should not blame ourselves for Khrushchev's frenzy at the summit, for the Soviet walkout at Geneva, for the Communists-inspired riots in Tokyo. Those who claim the United States lost face as a result of these demonstrations play directly into Soviet hands.

If the President had indulged himself the opportunity to answer his critics on American foreign policy and on personal diplomacy, his most delighted listeners would have been Premier Khrushchev and his gang at the Kremlin.

At last they would have had the American President on the defensive before his own Nation and before the world.

Mr. Eisenhower would have been lowered off the pedestal he has created for himself as the symbol and the hope of uncounted millions around the globe to the status of a political leader trying to justify himself before critics at home and enemies abroad.

His personal prestige would have been shattered, and the positive leadership of the United States against the evils of communism would have suffered a body blow.

That is why it is distressing to read yesterday's news analysis of the Eisenhower speech by such a perceptive writer as James Reston, of the New York Times, usually is.

"President Eisenhower has devised a simple procedure for dealing with his critics and his defeats," wrote Scotty Reston. "He simply ignores the critics and claims victories.

"The effect of this is serious in a democracy, for it confuses the public, infuriates the political opposition, and leaves mistakes unexplained and uncorrected," commented the Times' man.

We have great admiration for Mr. Reston as a reporter, but we submit that in this instance the President accomplished far more good than he could have done by airing the faultfinding of political opportunists and second-guessers.

Building Bridges of Understanding—by Dr. Ramon Villeda Morales, President of the Republic of Honduras, at the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Chamber Commerce of the Americas, Miami, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently in Miami, Fla., we were privileged to hold the 10th annual meeting of the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas. This growing vigorous organization is making a most significant contribution to inter-American cooperation and understanding. Its interests are very broad and are not limited solely to economic considerations.

There was an exciting address by Costa Rica's ex-President Senor Otilio Ulate. Also present and participating was Senor Alfonso Rochac, Minister of Economy, El Salvador, who is also an Executive Director of the Inter-American Development Bank. There was presented a resolution by the President of El Salvador, Jose Maria Lemus, through his Minister of Economy.

The keynoter was the President of the Republic of Honduras, Dr. Ramon Villeda Morales, who brought most of his cabinet with him. There were also present Senor Rafael Durand, head of Puerto Rico's Transportation Authority, Dr. Enrique Paez del Rio of Bogotá, Colombia, and our own Government was represented by Mr. George Wythe, Director, American Republics Division Office Economic Affairs, U.S. Department of Commerce, and Mr. Peyton Kerr of the State Department.

There were many other important people who participated and who were delegates who came from all over Latin America. Chamber President Levy, of Jamaica, is to be congratulated for a most successful annual meeting. All who attended were tremendously impressed by the principal address of the President of the Republic of Honduras, Dr. Ramon Villeda Morales. His presence and attendance was a great honor to the people of Florida and the United States. He brushed aside formalities and protocol to deliver a hard-hitting, straight-from-the-shoulder speech which deserves the reading and the consideration of all my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to present the clear-cut analysis of the problems, suggestions, and inspiration of the President of the Republic of Honduras, Dr. Ramon Villeda Morales—"Building Bridges of Understanding":

Perhaps this is the first time that the president of a free republic, not traveling incognito, has visited a friendly country without being embroiled in official formalities, heeding exclusively the cordial invitation of a group of businessmen.

If so, I am delighted, because in the world of today each of us is rated according to the social function he performs, rather than in regard to his rank, or title; and being either an ordinary citizen or chief of state, if each is conscientious, means assuming equal responsibility, albeit on different levels, with regard to the national welfare and the welfare of the peoples of the world.

On the other hand, today's world demands of anyone who would understand current events, that he keep abreast of what is going on throughout the world, here or elsewhere, and that he visit the United States of America as a citizen or simply as president of a republic.

The Chamber of Commerce of the Americas, setting a precedent among the countries of this continent, has expressed the wish that I, the President of the Republic of Honduras, should attend the inauguration of this assembly, as guest of honor, and thereby, together, build a bridge of understanding among our countries.

This precedent initiates a tradition which, like everything we must do in this America of ours, breaks the established molds, and the prejudices of outmoded customs. Like Emerson, I believe that the America of the New World, beyond being a geographic concept, has always meant a new way of life and human relations.

If this is so, my presence at the Chamber of Commerce of the Americas should surprise no one, because here is exemplified the vital strength of American enterprise, which serves as a model for the Western World.

The pan-American idea is now many years old. Honduras, my little country located in the heart of America, is honored to have been the birthplace of one of the great thinkers who foresaw our high and common destiny. From 1822 onwards José Cecilio del Valle visualized the future of our hemisphere as a permanent sanctuary of justice, a mighty fortress of liberty to assure to all the enjoyment of individual dignity, economic well-being, and a just and lasting peace.

Perhaps no one understands the full greatness of the meaning of union as well as the citizens of the United States, for this country awoke to independent political life as a federation constructed on the pattern of a democratic republic, and then, as a consequence of its solid institutional structure, developed a sense of national unity and integrity which raised the United States to the stature of a world power; to paraphrase what once was said of Washington: first in peace, first in war, first in responsibility to assure the survival of democratic institutions in a free world.

We Central Americans also awoke to independent political life as a federation, but then, as a result of a feudal situation only partially destroyed, we broke up into five pieces which form the small republic of today. So we Central Americans are aware of the misfortune of separatism and we preach the gospel of our unity, and even more, the gospel of continental solidarity, because the union of the American republics is for us, so to speak, a promised land, since the Central American is a citizen of a divided nation, just as any citizen of any country in our hemisphere is only a fragment of our great American family.

And so, gentlemen, I visit you as the citizen, the President, the Central Americanist, and the pan Americanist; bearing in my spirit the full meaning of the words spoken by our great forebears; interpreting them in the light of our social, political, and economic reality; and I have come to build with you, my northern neighbors, bridges of understanding.

I know I am talking to businessmen. I know our Central American countries have been almost unknown. I know that the words "Central America" have meant, to some people, a handful of poor countries in the middle of the continent, entirely lacking in investment appeal. On the other hand, it is well known that our countries have poured forth their wealth of resources to those who have attempted the technical cultivation of bananas, or the reasonable exploitation of our mines.

Ignorance about a country is usually related to its inability to advertise its wealth. In this time of extravagant advertising it isn't enough for countries to possess open or hidden resources. We must also create a security which safeguards capital investments lest they be frightened away by our Spanish-American temperament.

The stories of our countries with their many internal revolutions, and the fact that governmental changes have at times been accompanied by a failure to fulfill contractual obligations of former regimes have justly awakened the apprehension of foreign investors. These unfortunate facts of our history have seldom been analyzed from the sociological point of view which, even though it might not justify them, at least would explain them to ourselves and to others. The truth is that the feudal regime inherited from the colonial period and the low level of agricultural and other productive activities which resulted from this regime caused an unequal distribution of wealth which, in itself, was enough to cause outbreaks of revolutions and counterrevolutions among us which prevented us from keeping abreast of the developing countries of the Western World.

Nevertheless, we are making progress now, and we are determined to construct effective bridges of understanding. The drive for political stability is characteristic of Latin America during the present century, its purpose being to attract capital for the reasonable exploitation of our natural resources. In our legislative chambers we have attempted to organize a system of progressive laws which will prevent a return to that period of insecurity for invested capital.

But political stability is often the result of the prevailing economic situation at a given moment. A sound, well-oriented economy in Spanish America will have to exist as an indispensable foundation for a solution of the politico-social ills which have plagued us since the beginnings of our life as independent nations. Our backwardness in many respects is the consequence solely of economic underdevelopment, but, in turn, this institutional and cultural stagnation acts as an impediment upon our efforts to develop our productive resources. So most of the Latin American Republics are victims of a vicious circle from which they can be rescued only by joint action of all the nations of the hemisphere, as called for by the Charter of the Organization of American States, which points to cooperation as the irreplaceable instrument for promoting the economic, social, and cultural development of America.

Our struggle for economic development must unfold along two parallel lines: First, as an internal or national activity; and second, as an international or inter-American movement. We are, at one and the same time, men of America and citizens of our respective nations; toward both continent and country we have clear and well-defined individual and collective obligations. I, therefore, believe that there is a constructive nationalism which is not incompatible with hemispheric integration. Nationalism, properly understood, is justice applied to the internal life of each country. Cooperative action among nations is justice in the field of international relations.

But there is an exaggerated nationalism against which stand the political leaders of America who believe, as I do, in democracy as the rule of Christian life among men in a free world. History counsels us to link our interests from Alaska to Tierra del Fuego. This is not a question of fostering continental isolationism through artificial means, but rather of giving life and reality

to a whole gamut of ideas and concepts which have already proved effective in lessening or removing the effects of the painful convulsions that have so often shaken humanity.

Our forefathers understood American solidarity in a fundamentally institutional sense, free of any idea of conquest or of submission by one country to the force of another. They looked upon the integration of the American nations in a supranational entity as a deliberate, conscious act of goodwill, and even accompanied their thought by the clarion call of burning idealism characteristic of the emotions of founders of nations. Said Bolivar: "For us, the fatherland is America." And José Cecilio de Valle exclaimed: "America from this day forth, shall be my one, exclusive business: America by day, when I write, America by night, when I think. The proper study of an American is America."

I am convinced that the American nations, without losing their universal aspirations, must bind themselves in a cultural and economic bloc, in which democracy may be assured as the permanent norm of life, and the joint strength of the 21 Republics of the continent may guarantee the preservations of free institutions and the irrepressible advance of the men of the New World to heights of dignity, well-being, wisdom compatible with the possibilities and aspirations of mankind.

We are making an experiment in Central America, in a regional area. We are integrating the Isthmus economically. We have already achieved concrete steps between Honduras, El Salvador, and Guatemala, and the day is not far distant when Costa Risa, Nicaragua, and Panama will enter this economic alliance which will set in motion vast natural resources and huge reserves of capital.

Central America includes a half a million square kilometers, with a population estimated at 12 million. This means that together we are larger territorially than Sweden, Germany, Norway, Italy, England, Greece, Portugal, Denmark, Switzerland, Holland, or Belgium, and that the Central American population is greater than any of these European countries with only three exceptions.

The Central American rate of population growth is one of the highest of the continent. If our demographic increase keeps up at the present rate, under normal conditions, by 1980 we shall have 20 million inhabitants in the Central American Isthmus, settled on a fertile land where a long list of natural resources are practically inexhaustible, if properly exploited, where immense potential wealth is accumulating awaiting capital to exploit it, where the variety of climates favors agricultural diversification, where there are first-class natural harbors and bays on both oceans, and a highway network, anchored on the pan-American highway, whose rapid improvement guarantees widespread circulation of people and goods.

Our problem at the moment is whether we shall continue living in an economically backward Central America, or whether, on the contrary, we shall achieve better standards of living for our inhabitants by every means within our reach. The statesmen of Central America see clearly that a population increase like ours demands a larger economic framework. I am one of the Central American Presidents who has been most interested in breaking down the barrier of isolationism and stressing the benefits of economic cooperation. And it is against this background that I have described, that we combat the fallacy that foreign capital, public or private, when applied to the development of industry, agriculture and commerce, must, of necessity, constitute imperialist penetration.

It is interesting to talk of these things with businessmen because our countries are a great American business opportunity, now that we have undertaken a systematic struggle against inferior development, or economic underdevelopment, as it is often called. Our peoples have been struggling for a better life ever since their beginnings as free countries. They would like to be removed from the position they now occupy in the geopolitics of hunger, and only if they are can they assume the civil tranquillity of a national life dedicated to progress.

The Hondurans, in particular, are situated at this crossroads. Our geography and the state of our resources are such that capital is more necessary for us, but we have less of it. Attracting foreign capital and protecting its investments is for us a necessity of vital importance. The more so as we are engaged in diversifying our production as much as possible in order to escape at last from the straitjacket of a one-crop economy.

The present Government took office with a fundamental constitutional reform in tune with the economic tendencies generally observed in less-developed countries. This new constitution has been supported by secondary laws to stimulate and protect the establishment and operation of agricultural and industrial enterprises. This, the first legislative reform to be put into effect in our country, depends for its fulfillment entirely upon honest government, for our basic interest lies in fostering with all possible measures and facilities the raising of our standard of living. Actually, we make no difference between national private capital and foreign private capital, so far as privileges or responsibilities go, because we believe that there is wealth enough in our territory to establish a republic where men of good will of the free world may wish to come and make their living.

Honduras and the United States have had close relations for a long time, and everyone knows that this country in the North is the principal market for our exports and our first source of supplies of all kinds. We sincerely believe that these already mutually convenient relations can improve and multiply if we learn to know one another better, to speak to one another with frankness as we are trying to do today.

Though the world in our time is cleft in two by two opposite systems of life which together throw a clear light and shadow upon its history, it is no less true that the second half of the 20th century is marked by the efforts of the underdeveloped countries to achive the standard of living today made possible by industry and techniques placed at the service of man—the whole man, with his inalienable right to be respected by his fellowmen and by the state, respected in his political and religious belief and in his freedom to obtain for himself the highest standard of living, material, cultural, and spiritual.

I salute you cordially with the motto which should be that of the entire Western Hemisphere: "Everything units us, nothing separates us."

God will light our way. Miami with its feverish spirit of progress and the natural beauty that surrounds us in this marvelous city is a fitting frame for our hopes of improvement. There is no time to lose. We are living the solemn and propitious hour, the more solemn because it is the most propitious: Let us build our bridges of understanding now.

RAYMON VILLEDA MORALES,
President of the Republic of Honduras.

Is It Too Late To Win Against Communism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a deep and penetrating address, both philosophical and practical, about the conditions that exist in the world today, made by Dr. Charles Malik, former president of the United Nations General Assembly at Williamsburg, Va., on June 11, 1960, appearing in the U.S. News & World Report of July 4, 1960. The entire life of Dr. Malik has shown a great dedication to the progress of mankind. There is no man who understands the evil minds of the Communists and particularly those in the Kremlin than Dr. Malik. The address he rendered at Williamsburg should be read as widely as possible. In his address, he not only effectively exposes the inherent evilness of international communism and its destructive intent, but he presents an affirmative program to meet, combat, and ultimately defeat the evil intents and efforts of international communism. It is a pleasure for me to insert in my remarks this address of Dr. Malik which I consider to be one of the greatest in connection with the present world tension that I have ever read.

IS IT TOO LATE TO WIN AGAINST COMMUNISM?

Communism started from zero 43 years ago, and today it rigidly controls one-third of mankind and has penetrated and softened up in varying degrees the remaining two-thirds. Was this phenomenal development inevitable?

The victory of communism in the late forties in China means that the largest compacity homogeneous mas of humanity, numbering some 600 million people, are now sworn enemies of everything free and western. Was this development inevitable?

The Korean was, despite all its heroic exertions, ended in a draw. Was this outcome inevitable?

In southeast Asia there has occurred during the last 10 years an advance of communism and a retreat of freedom. Was this advance and retreat inevitable?

Whereas international communism was effectively absent from the Middle East 10 or 15 years ago, and in the consideration of Middle Eastern problems communism was treated as though it did not exist, international communism enters decisively today into the determination of every Middle Eastern problem. Was this development inevitable?

Whereas 10 or 15 years ago communism was effectively absent from Latin America, today it is visibly present. Was this development inevitable?

The Communist Party, receiving orders directly from Moscow, is certainly more active and influential today in Asia and Africa than 10 years ago, and several responsible United States officials said recently that the Communists have markedly intensified their

activity in the United States. Was this penetration inevitable?

Backing international communism as its embodiment and vehicle is the most superbly organized international political party in history, the Communist Party, with the most advanced techniques of intellectual, social, economic, and political penetration and subversion ever devised. Was the impotence of the West in developing any comparable counterforce inevitable?

Backing international communism materially is the second most industrially advanced state in the world, the Soviet Union, which might at the present rate of development surpass the United States in two decades. Was this discrepancy in the rate of growth, and in the rates of change of the rates of growth between East and West inevitable?

This supporting industrial base appears to command atomic and nuclear weapons in abundance, whereas 10 or 15 years ago the United States had a monopoly of these weapons. Was this decline in western relative strength inevitable?

We are today more than 2 years and 8 months since Sputnik I and, while the West has made enormous advances in rocketry, it is not clear that, in this revolutionary technological field, it has caught up with the Soviet so far as thrust power is concerned. Is this persistent lag inevitable?

In the matter of economic international competition, there is no comparison between the economic status of the Communist world today and its status 10 years ago. Was this decline in Western relative economic strength inevitable?

The visible struggle appears to occur all on this side of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains: in Europe, in the Middle East, in Southeast Asia, in the Far East, in Latin America; and when people expect a crisis to break out tomorrow, they do not expect it in Albania or Rumania or Russia or China, but in the home of freedom. Freedom, then, is on the defensive, and not communism. Is it fated that the West should be always on the defensive, always reacting?

The West today appears gladly to welcome neutralism in areas in which it would not have countenanced this phenomenon a decade ago. Was this constant retreat of Western influence inevitable?

In the nascent nationalism of Asia and Africa, which is otherwise a natural and good thing, there is an admixture in varying degrees of antiwesternism, if not procommunism that leads to antiwesternism. Was this spread of antiwesternism as a concomitant of the growth of nationalism inevitable?

In the very nations that have attained the dignity of political freedom and independence, other dimensions of freedom have been severely curtailed; namely, personal freedom, intellectual freedom, social freedom, spiritual freedom. Was this contraction of the domain of freedom inevitable?

Communist literature has during this decade inundated Asia, Africa, and Latin America in relation to non-Communist literature. Was this advance in the relative abundance of Communist literature inevitable?

Communism has been more persistent and effective in presenting to the Asian and African mind a well-thought-out interpretation of existence—the Marxist-Leninist ideology—than any outlook that has been forthcoming from the West. Was this timidity in the articulation of the ideology of freedom inevitable?

The apparent unity of purpose and action among the international Communists impresses the Asian and African mind, whereas the squambbles among the members of the Western family produce an air of internal division and weakness. Were these squabbles and divisions inevitable?

The simple fact that the free world has not succeeded in 40 years in pushing back the tide of communism by 1 inch from where it really got political control leaves the strong impression that we are here dealing with an irresistible and irreversible thrust which will inevitably inherit and transform in its own image all the kingdoms and cultures of the earth. Is this creeping tide of communism completely irreversible?

IN THE WEST: SOFTNESS, LAXITY

Perhaps the most distressing fact is the self-satisfaction and self-congratulation that prevails in the West; the softness, the laxity, the lack of determination and decisiveness, the general decadence, the uncritical readiness to settle for peaceful coexistence. Are we then face to face with some ineluctable judgement of fate or God?

In terms of the ultimate world struggle, how are we to assess the net performance of the immediate past from the comparison of the two sides of the balance sheet which I have just drawn up?

I can draw the provisional conclusion that, while things could have been much worse, in my opinion they could have decidedly been much better. International communism is today on an overall basis relatively stronger than 10 or 15 years ago, and the free world is relatively weaker; there is a marked overall advance by the one and a corresponding overall retreat by the other.

In history it is impossible at any moment to work out a neat, final balance sheet, for at no moment in history does history come to an end. It all depends then on the future. The future could redeem the past or it could confirm it. But it will redeem nothing unless the question of the inevitability or otherwise of the developments of the immediate past is first squarely and honestly faced. For either you believe that these things were inevitable or you believe that they could have been helped.

If you believe that they were inevitable; namely, that the outcome of the struggle in China, in Korea, in Indochina; that the Communist penetration of Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America; that the absence of any effective counteracting force to the Communist Party; that the relative decline in Western influence and Western economic and military strength, etc.—if you believe that all these developments of the fifties of the 20th century could not have been helped, then you are already a Marxist.

For Marx, Lenin, and Khrushchev hold firmly—and Khrushchev repeats it every day—that the iron laws of history are precisely such that, whatever happens, communism will come out on top. Therefore to them—and to you, if you believe in the inevitability of these developments, namely, if you refuse to assume moral responsibility for them—the Communist advance and the Western retreat did not come about by accident: The universe was such, history was such, the nature of human society and its development was such, the economic, social, and political situation in Asia, Africa, Europe, and America was such, that the advance and the retreat had to take place.

I warn you therefore against declining to assume full moral historical responsibility for what happened during the last two decades, for, if you do so, you are already a Marxist, and Marxian communism will have already won in your soul.

The only hope, therefore, is to believe, on a basis of truth and not of darkness or sentiment or dogmatism, that nothing of what transpired was inevitable, and that everything could have been prevented or reversed. Only on the basis of radical moral responsibility can you overcome the fatalism of the cosmologists and the determinism of the dialectical materialists.

The future will never redeem the past, and we will only pass from one fiasco to another, from one pathetic drift to another, unless in contemplating the past we can put our finger with certainty on such and such an act and such and such a decision and such and such a person, and honestly say that this act or decision or person could have been different and therewith the course of events would have taken a radically different turn.

If only people rose to the occasion, if only they were not overwhelmed by their softness and apathy, if only they overcame their greed, if only they were morally strong, if only they were not selfish and narrow, if only they were not petty and spiteful and stupid, if only they were big, if only they knew what was at stake, if only they were not hypocritical, if only they trampled under foot the wide and easy way.

I know of more than one instance in which precisely and only because people lacked some of these moral perfections we are where we are today.

I shall not go into any detailed moral-historical-political evaluation of the past. Taking upon ourselves the whole moral guilt of the past, believing that the present would have been entirely different if only people measured up to the historic requirements of the moment, and therefore determining that the future which will be the responsibility of this generation shall redeem the past, let us now quietly inquire into what must be done in the immediate future to reverse the trend of the immediate past.

HOW THE WEST CAN SAVE ITSELF

Four conditions are absolutely sine qua non (indispensable): unity among the Western Allies, deeper understanding and statesmanlike assistance toward the peoples of Asia and Africa, winning the technological competition, especially in the matter of armaments, and winning the economic competition in productivity.

If the Atlantic World breaks up, whether from internal friction or external pressure, there will be complete disarray in the free world and little will be left to oppose effectively the onward march of communism anywhere.

If the Asians and Africans are not understood on the deepest possible plane and if the Communists prove that they are more friendly and helpful to them, then Asia and Africa will gradually fall to their wiles.

If the Communists do better in the technological revolution, especially with respect to weapons, then all will be lost. If the West does not outproduce them, both quantitatively and qualitatively, then the rest of the world will be socked into their system.

On the subject of Western unity, the question is whether the Western nations can morally rise above their narrow nationalisms into a realization that it is their whole civilization that is once more today at stake. I believe they can. Nothing is half as important today as that the spiritual unity of Europe, American, and the Mediterranean world be understood and affirmed.

Putting aside the question of vision, will, softness of living, and unity of effort among the diverse factors involved, there is no doubt whatsoever that, by any standards of measurement, the material and human resources of North and South America, of Western Europe, of Japan, of Australasia, and of as much of Africa—and there is no reason why all of Africa should not be included—and Asia as may be persuaded to cooperate, can be so marshaled and coordinated as to outdo the Communist domain, in any field of human endeavor, by a ratio of at least five to one.

It is all, therefore, a question of vision, will, overcoming the softness of life, and

inducing the necessary unified efforts. The free world has nobody and nothing to blame but itself if it cannot so order its house as to beat the Communists decisively in every realm.

STAND FIRM AGAINST RED EXPANSION

The West should stand firm at all costs against any further expansion of communism, including above all the test case of Berlin. In a possible showdown, the obvious strategic handicaps notwithstanding, there should be no question in anybody's mind that the West would not accept a weakening of its position in Berlin. Some Western commenators have darkly hinted that the West would not fight over Berlin.

It is fair then to ask, Over what would the West fight?

But merely holding the line is patently not enough. This was the error of the doctrine of containment. It is a passive, defensive, unchallenging policy—and such a policy, except as a necessary first step, is doomed to failure: first, because this is a dynamic universe; second, because you are dealing with the most aggressive enemy who will always swirl around and underneath and above all your containing devices; third because a merely defensive or containing attitude means that you are so fat and satisfied yourself that all you wish to achieve is to get away with your own skin—and thus you have no vision, no concern for the rest of the world, and he who has no concern for others will sooner or later find that others, including his erstwhile friends, have no concern for him—and, fourth, because you cannot be true to your own freedom if you do not wish and work for freedom for others.

It is interesting to note the sort of qualifications that responsible leaders sometimes use for peace.

The Communist spokesmen employ peace without qualification, by which they mean that they should be allowed to carry out their internatoinal proletarian revolution in peace. But the spokesmen of the West speak of peace with justice and freedom. This is a correct qualification from the Western point of view: Peace without justice and freedom is no peace. But what interests me most is which of the two qualifications do they drop when they wish to use only one?

You will find they usually drop freedom and leave justice. This is to me wrong. It could betray an unconscious readiness to sacrifice freedoom for what is sentimentally called justice. Both are certainly necessary, but freedom is more fundamental. Freedom creates justice, but not conversely; for justice could be something mechanical without the ultimate freedom of the spirit which demands and creates and recognizes and enforces justice.

The West can only be true to itself if it says, "I am prepared to settle for peace with freedom and justice"; and if it wants to use only one of the two, "I am prepared to settle for peace with freedom."

It follows that an active policy of liberation is of the essence of any sound Western program for the coming years.

When the late John Foster Dulles spoke of liberation shortly after he became Secretary of State, was there a Communist or fellow-traveling or Olympian or softheaded or pacifist or appeasing voice in the world that did not attack him? This synchronization of all these voices against anyone who would dare stand up and actively challenge communism is one of the strange phenomena of this age. It measures the success of international communism in intimidating and softening up the free world.

But only a believing, active, sustained, and bold-looking forward to a free Eastern Europe, a free Russia, and a free China is worthy of the magnitude of the gigantic world struggle. A radical distinction must be made between the great peoples of these countries and their Communist governments. Policies should be devised and pursued in conformity with this distinction.

KEEP FLAME OF FREEDOM BURNING

The flame of freedom must be kept burning in the soul of the oppressed. The hope of liberation must never be allowed to fade away from their hearts. As free peoples, they have an honorable and equal place in the company of the free. Their energies will be given the freest scope. Their spiritual and cultural contributions to the whole world are awaited and welcomed.

With vision and leadership, the West should be able to promise them greater material benefits than they have been able to achieve under communism, benefits which they themselves would acquire by their own free exertions. But they should be promised much more. They should be assured of the freedom to criticize, the freedom to think, the freedom to create, the freedom to live, the freedom to work, the freedom to choose and turn out their own governments, the freedom to lead on the basis of merit in a world freed of the poison of mistrust, subversion, and intrigue.

The Russians should be loved for their great spiritual heroes, such as Pushkin and Dostoevski, and should be constantly reminded of them. The wonderful spiritual genius of Russia should be separated from the alien Marxism with which the Russians are now afflicted.

The promise of freedom with equal material benefits to the oppressed should be far more potent than the allurement of a material revolution coupled with enslavement to the free.

The Communists never tire of assuring the rest of the world that peaceful coexistence only means that they will realize their unalterable aim of communizing the world without war, and that, where they do not succeed in this, they will keep in mind the possibility of nonpeaceful means.

They are therefore absolutely determined to dominate the world with or without war. This was explicitly stated by the international Communist congress. They therefore speak of the "doomed classes" and of "burying" you and me.

We should not be misled by the terms they use, such as "capitalism," "imperialism," "American imperialism," "Anglo-Saxon or Anglo-American imperialism," "bourgeois society," etc. These are only revolutionary slogans employed by them to excite and enlist people in their international proletarian revolution.

What they are saying behind all this jargon is that the international Communist movement wants to overthrow every existing government, regime, system, outlook, religion, and philosophy and bring the whole world—all human thought, aspiration, action, and organization—under its absolute control. This is their declared, unchanged, and unchanging objective.

I am yet to hear one Western leader who, assured to his face that he is doomed and will be buried, can muster enough courage and conviction, if not to use the vulgar phrase "bury" with respect to communism itself, at least to use some such civilized expression as that the days of communism are numbered and that communism will one day be completely forgotten.

When Mr. Khrushchev assures Western leaders that their children or at most their grandchildren will all be Communist, I am yet to hear one Western leader who assures Mr. Khrushchev with the same gusto that his children or at least his grandchildren will live to regret and be thoroughly ashamed of the fact that their fathers are grandfathers were ever Communists.

And whereas international communism believes and acts on the belief that the days of everything non-Communist are numbered, my deepest fear is that Western leadership believes no such thing with respect to communism. My fear is that the softening-up process has reached such an advanced state that all now believe that communism is here to stay and that therefore the utmost they can do is to manage somehow to coexist with it.

The deepest crisis of the West is the crisis of faith in its own values. Whereas communism believes that non-Communist values must be eliminated from the face of the earth, and acts on this belief, the West no longer believes that Communist values themselves are doomed to utter destruction and oblivion, and therefore no longer acts on this belief.

I am yet to meet or know of one important Western leader who entertains a dynamic vision for the Communist realm which includes the certainty that the children of present-day Communists will have completely repudiated communism and will have adopted the fundamental values of freedom.

LET WEST FACE DECAY IN ITS OWN SOUL

Let the West face up to this advanced state of decay in its own soul.

But what is pre-eminently at stake in Mediterranean-Western civilization today is its human and universal elements.

It is man who is denied, it is the affirmation that there is nothing that binds and cements all men into one family that is the prime danger, it is the fragmentation of humanity into endless exclusiisms, whether national or cultural or racial or economic, that poses the deepest challenge.

Western civilization is doomed until, jolted out of its complacency, self-satisfaction and sense of apartness, it rediscovers and reaffirms what is genuinely human and universal in its own soul. This means not only economic and technical sharing with Asia and Africa, but intellectual, moral, and spiritual sharing.

What is supremely good must be good for all. Those who keep on repeating as though they discovered a transcendental wisdom, that their ideas, their way of life, their civilization are "not for export," but only their industrial products, do not know that they are thereby digging the grave of their civilization and the grave of their way of life.

Those who come to Asia and Africa and tell them, "You stay where and what you are and we stay where and what we are; we have nothing to give save our goods and gadgets," little know that the day will come, and perhaps is already here, when Asia and Africa will turn upon them and spit in their faces. Man can live without goods and gadgets but he cannot live without something human and universal that joins him to his fellow men.

A civilization in which the human and universal has atrophied can relate itself to others only through force; and force is not an enduring mode of relation, and it can always be broken by force.

I am not speaking of diplomacy and propaganda; I am thinking of a whole philosophy of history. I am saying that a civilization is doomed if it is not creatively conscious of something universal and human it can and must give; and I am saying that Western civilization need not be doomed because no civilization conceived and developed the human and universal more than it did.

Most certainly it is not a question of "imposing" anything on anybody. What is genuinely human and universal is never imposed; it is awaited, welcomed and embraced.

What is nonuniversal in your civilization you keep to yourselves: Nobody wants it. Not until the businessman from Manchester or Detroit and the peasant from Iran or India can come together on a much deeper basis than the exchange of goods and money can the West really begin to have a chance in the ferocious competition going on at present for the heart and soul of Asia and Africa.

Asia and Africa do not want to deal only with businessmen. They crave for human and spiritual fellowship. There is no exchange of soul, there is no sharing of life and ideas, there is no community of spirit, there is no fellowship of man with man. This is Asia's and Africa's deepest challenge of the West: What have you to give me, not of your trinkets, but of your mind; not of the external husks of your life, but of the substance and marrow of your soul?

Again, I am not speaking of the requirements of any immediate emergency: I am thinking of a whole philosophy of history.

COMMUNISTS BELIEVE IN SOMETHING

The Communists bring in a message. It affects the whole of human life. It provides a total interpretation. They are not afraid to be revolutionary; to say, "This is good and that is bad." They are not afraid to shock and challenge the received customs and habits and ideals. They believe in something.

The West does not want to be revolutionary. It is afraid of being revolutionary. It does not want to shock and challenge. It is civilized; it is afraid lest it offend. Its trouble, therefore, may lie precisely in the fact that the content of its belief is very thin.

For that which you really believe to be true and human and universal you will want to share with others, you cannot keep under a bushel. The question is whether there is a profound part of your being that you honestly feel you must share with others. The question is whether you honestly feel that you are not complete or happy so long as others are humanly incomplete; that you are not self-sufficient so long as others are miserable or subhuman, a prey to every superstition and every dark fear.

The self-sufficiency of the Anglo-Saxon world, its age-old protectedness by seas and oceans, is its greatest present spiritual trial. It has not needed the rest of humanity. But the world has suddenly become physically one, and minds and ideas are much more critically and instanteously and perpetually interacting with one another.

Only he, therefore, who feels with humanity, who is at one with all conditions of men, who is insufficient and incomplete without them, who is not protected and separated from them, can help them and lead them and love them and be loved by them.

The incompleteness of the Communist until he completes himself in others is what gives him the dynamism, the vision, the appeal in the eyes of Asia or Africa.

WHAT THE FREE WORLD HAS TO OFFER

If there were no universal and human elements in Western civilization the thing would be hopeless. But it happens that the deposit of humanity and universality in this civilization is the richest in the world.

The civilization at whose heart pulsate Aristotle and Augustine and Aquinas and Dante and Newton and Shakespeare and Pascal and Kant and Lincoln, the civilization which has been blessed and transformed by Christ, needs only a mighty hand to shake it out of its slumber. And, once shaken, once really awakened to the world responsibilities which it and it alone can shoulder, there is nothing it cannot dare and do.

The Americans forsook the Old World and their one desire was to forget all about it; the Russians stayed in the Old World and never ceased to interact with it, east and west and north and south.

In this simple difference in fundamental existential orientation, the whole secret of the present and the future may be hid. Can the Americans quickly recover the intimacy of relationship with the Old World which the Russians never lost?

Negotiations and contacts must never be broken. The United Nations must never be abandoned or weakened. Cultural exchanges must be deepened and enlarged. The Russian people must be brought into intimate spiritual community with the West.

Nationalism is not enough, and the new nations must be afforded the opportunity of belonging to larger worlds with wider horizons.

The universal declaration of human rights, which is one of the greatest documents of this age and which owes so much to the Virginia Bill of Rights, must be vigorously held up as a standard of achievement for all nations and all peoples. The West must know its ultimate values and believe in them. The field of struggle must be transported to the intellectual and spiritual plane. The prevalent softness and complacency must be overcome.

The area of decision must not be left to the initiative of the Communists. The West must itself choose it. And, so long as the head of international communism in Moscow remains unchanged, there is no hope.

Can the future redeem the past? I believe it can.

Will the future redeem the past? That depends on four things; on depth, on wisdom, on daring, and on leadership. I believe, without high leadership, daring to act in wisdom and depth, the future will not learn from the past.

These are things for which we should yearn and work. But in our own effort we may not achieve them. It is only as God wills that depth, wisdom, daring, and leadership be granted the free world at this crucial hour in history that the future will redeem the past.

Payment of Relocation Allowances by Federal Aviation Agency

SPEECH

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2467) to amend the act of September 7, 1950, to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to reimburse owners and tenants of lands acquired for Chantilly Airport for their moving expenses.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that there is anything I can contribute to the discussion on this bill that has not already been said. As far as I am concerned, this is a bad bill and I am opposed to it. I would be constrained to offer a motion to strike the enacting clause, but I think the thing to do is to let the proponents down as easily as possible, but nevertheless let them down. If we are going to enact this type of legislation it should be made government-wide. There are some farmers out in Iowa that are being dislocated by virtue of the road-building program, and I am not going to be a party to passing a bill here today that does not take them into consideration.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Would the gentleman also be in favor of repealing the act granting authority to the Secretary of the Interior and the Department of Defense to do the very same thing?

Mr. GROSS. I do not know anything about that, but I would prefer repeal to enactment of this bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Until general legislation is passed?

Mr. GROSS. I am dealing with the bill I have before me now. But, I am not in favor of singling out any group for preferential treatment. You know, we are doing a pretty good job of building bridges for Virginia and Maryland. It seems to me they are doing pretty well as it is. I am opposed to this legislation.

What a Doctor Says About the Problems of the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 21, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting talk by a noted doctor on the problems of the aged has come to my attention. It was delivered recently by Dr. William D. Miller, president of the Osteopathic Society of the City of New York, over radio station WMGM on the program "Listen Here, New York."

In the course of his talk, Dr. Miller announced the launching of a very interesting study in New York City on the problems of our aged citizens, particularly the emotional, economic, and social factors. In the light of current interest in the aged and their needs for medical care, I commend this talk to my colleagues:

Good evening. Medical care for the aged has become a most vocal cry these past few months. Few would deny that the great mass of these people do not have the savings and resources to adequately pay hospitals, nursing homes, drugs, and professional care. The annual income of persons over the age of 65 in the United States is $6 to $10 billion below what it should be for this segment of our population. All agree it is essential that complete medical care be available to our older people. It is estimated now that there are approximately 15,500,000 persons in the United States at or beyond the age of 65. By 1970 this will have grown by more than 5 million. A sizable group by anyone's standards. How and why has this occurred? Our population has grown tremendously in the last two decades, despite a devastating war, because of the advances made in medicine and the improvement in our general economic stature. A scant 50 years ago man's lifespan was measured in four or five decades, while today it has been extended to seven and beyond.

All of this has produced certain problems. Fortunately in our land of abundance, the basic needs have been met through Federal, State, municipal, and private sources, but we still have much ground to cover. The question of care to our rapidly expanding

older population is not one that can be solved through funds for medical care alone. We recognize that this problem exists, but we feel the question is even more basic.

No study of geriatrics, which is that branch of medicine dealing with the diseases of old age, will admit we have reached a utopia. However, now that this question has been brought to the fore, let us examine it in some detail.

The issue of rising medical costs has been one that has revealed many conflicting results. The average family spent, last year, $324 for medical care, while spending $304 for tobacco and alcohol. In terms of value received, I don't believe anyone would question which has produced the better bargain. Our rapidly rising population is proof that medical care is now at its highest level. As more knowledge is obtained on the ills that befall man, our population will continue to grow.

We in the osteopathic profession have long been cognizant of the problems of aging. The osteopathic physician of today is trained in all branches of medicine and surgery. Some doctors of osteopathy upon graduation from professional school chose to enter a specialty practice such as surgery, obstetrics, pediatrics, or internal medicine. The majority of doctors of osteopathy are general physicians; family doctors who know their patients well. They are prepared to employ all acceptable agents in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disease. In addition, osteopathy as a school of medicine emphasizes the importance of the musculoskeletal system. It is this musculo-skeletal system (under the direction of the nervous system) through which man, like other mammals, expresses his life. By this approach the osteopathic physician has and will continue to offer his contribution in the way of research and study, of man's ills. Toward this end, the Osteopathic Society of this city of New York has announced the initiation of a study on the problems of aging. This is to be an all-inclusive study, not only concerned with the organic ills that befall man from the sixth decade and beyond, but also how our surroundings, those under which we have some control and those we cannot contain, will influence the aging process and contribute toward disease. Specifically we refer to the emotional, economic, and social factors. We know that in many business organizations it is standard practice to retire an employee once he has reached the age of 65. How this can affect the emotional and physical health of the individual, will be studied.

Basically we are a youth-oriented society. Emphasis has always been placed on keeping young and fit. Yet very few have spoken of keeping fit in old age. The pursuits of youth have been advocated over the vocations of the aged. We have lacked full utilization of the full potentials of our older people because we have chosen to concentrate in developing the full potentials of our youth.

In following this philosophy what has happened to one-sixth of our population? We hope to be able to find the answers in our study. A recent survey conducted at Cornell University has shown that those employees voluntarily staying on the job after the age of 65, had a performance record that was astounding, 99 percent had given a satisfactory service. This is an amazing record—one that deserves and needs further study. In industry, what the older worker lacks in speed he may make up in efficiency. Chronologic age is no longer as important as the capacity of the individuals to handle work. In addition to the question of the employability of the older person there is the question on how he fits into the life of the community. He should, with his experience, play an important role in this sphere. Too often, however, the older person is either rejected or lacks the initiative to join with others in the community. This we plan to study and try to ascertain if these community and personal problems within the home, itself, are factors in predisposing to disease.

Mention must also be made of emotional, psychiatric and neurological problems as they affect the oldsters' outlook. Thus, it can be seen, that the Osteopathic Society is undertaking a survey of fairly comprehensive means. We do this as a service to the citizens of the city of New York.

Through the facilities of the Osteopathic Hospital and Clinic of New York we shall be able to conduct this study. Since 1914 this institution has been rendering care to the indigent sick of our community. It has been done without the aid of municipal, State or Federal funds, but with the contributions generously given by friends and patients of osteopathy.

The problems presented by the aged are vast and evergrowing. We can only expect that our older population, will within several decades, make up almost 25 percent of our population. In truth then, as is said in the Book of Genesis "and the Lord said, my spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh, yet his days shall be 120 years."

Thank you and good night.

Interstate Road Program Endangered—Opponents Wage Propaganda War To Discredit It

---

SPEECH

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, the highway program has been under attack from many quarters in the past few months.

Since writers, newspapers, and magazines generally feel that stories of waste, inefficiency and corruption make better copy than do success and accomplishments, we have had from all over the country a series of intemperate articles dealing with mistakes and shortcomings of the highway program. Little if anything has been said about its fine and tremendous accomplishments in the face of many almost insurmountable roadblocks.

As a result, many people, including Members of Congress, are getting the impression that this entire, vitally needed road program is riddled with inefficiency and fraud.

As I have said many times, when you have a program of this magnitude, the biggest public works project in the history of the world, one that is 35 times as big as the St. Lawrence Seaway, the Panama Canal and the Grand Coulee Dam combined—a program involving the expenditure of billions of dollars and millions of people both in and out of government at all levels—you are bound to attract the chiselers and the grafters.

If this highway program is to survive and public confidence in it be maintained, we must keep its shortcomings in proper perspective with the magnitude of the undertaking and its thousands of fine accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the Cincinnati Enquirer and its outstanding publisher, Mr. Roger Ferger, and Mr. Phillip Swatek, its capable, informed and discerning Washington correspondent, have rendered a great public service by devoting a full page of the July 3 edition to the fairest and most objective analysis of the current highway problems and controversies.

Every Member of the Congress and all those interested in the continuance and successful completion of this vitally needed program should read and study this article and have the benefit of Mr. Swatek's presentation of the various issues:

INTERSTATE ROAD PROGRAM ENDANGERED—OPPONENTS WAGE PROPAGANDA WAR TO DISCREDIT IT

(By Philip M. Swatek)

WASHINGTON, July 2.—A swelling propaganda barrage of distortions, half-truths, and plainly dishonest generalizations is threatening to sink the biggest and most important public works project ever attempted in this or any other country—the Interstate Highway System.

The interstate project, launched with great hope in 1956, is intended to link the Nation's cities with a 41,000-mile network of fast, safe superhighways. It will also breathe new life into traffic-choked urban areas, where two-thirds of our population lives.

Now critics are proclaiming it "our great big highway bungle," a "nightmare," a "rat hole" of waste, and extravagance, and a scandal of such potential that Teapot Dome will be peanuts by comparison. More responsible and restrained critics intone that the program is "in trouble."

The interstate project is in trouble. But it is the relentless effort to discredit the program that has it tottering. Some of the criticism is justified, but fair criticism often is not weighed against accomplishment and progress, and a distorted picture emerges.

Actually, the program, measured in any objective way, is going extraordinarily well, but this side of the story is lost in the storm of abuse.

"No charge has been too thin or too ridiculous to exploit," Bertram Tallamy, Administrator, Bureau of Public roads, said, "Old reports were exhumed and mined for whatever negative comments they might yield."

MANY HAVE AX TO GRIND

"Historic opponents of the highway program welcomed new members, recruited from the disgruntled, the misinformed, and those having some personal ax to grind. A good many of them are vicious and their motivation must certainly raise questions in the minds of neutral observers," Tallamy said.

Forces behind this campaign spring from both industrial and political life, boosted along by some doubtful judgment in the newspaper and magazine business. Those fighting to save the program—on Capitol Hill and within the administration—have searched evidence of a conspiracy in view of the remarkable cohesiveness and cumulative effectiveness of the propaganda, but none has turned up.

"It may not be a conspiracy, but as far as the Interstate System is concerned, it's academic," Representative GORDON H. SCHERER, Republican, of Cincinnati, says. "If this keeps up, they're going to kill it."

SCHERER, ranking Republican of the House Subcommittee on Roads, a part of the Public Works Committee, is one of the most conservative and tight-fisted Members of Congress. So his concern over the program's

fate is not the routine response of a big spender. He is anything but that and still is convinced the Nation cannot afford to lose the $40 billion interstate program.

MONEY IS ONE OF ISSUES

While SCHERER is a Republican, the political forces at work are not necessarily organized along party lines. Representative GEORGE FALLON, Democrat, of Maryland, ranking Democrat on the Roads Subcommittee, shares this concern. Nor for that matter, is everyone within the Eisenhower administration as determined to keep this program going in its original and bold concept as the two Congressmen.

An explanation of why the interstate program, which promises so much to a nation on wheels, should be the target of abuse must start with money—in this case, the taxes which finance the program. But there are some other issues involved, as well. The winds of controversy were blowing even before the program was implemented by law in 1956, although they didn't reach gale force until last year when the financing bogged down.

Basis for most of the early squabbling was the "needs" formula for apportionment of Federal funds, which replaced the old formula favoring rural States and the political seniority system in Congress. The Interstate System was to be built to answer the needs of the Nation and demands of automotive traffic.

This meant getting people in, out, or through cities, where highway construction is very expensive, as well as between cities, where right-of-way costs are lower. As the Federal Government was going to provide 90 percent of the cost of this interstate construction, the "needs" concept of distributing the money did not arouse much enthusiasm among legislators from sparsely populated areas.

ARGUMENT OVER URBAN AID

There are still many who object to the fact that 42 percent of the Federal moneys will go toward building only 11 percent of the interstate mileage which happens to be in congested urban areas. They are not moved by arguments that nearly everybody driving on the highways is heading for some city or town and a system which just dumps them on the outskirts isn't going to be much help.

Nor are they swayed by arguments that, on the basis of traffic volume and mileage, urban projects are more economically justified than rural miles, and that nearly half of the pay-as-you-go money financing the program comes from automobile use on urban expressways, the volume more than making up for the shorter distances.

There also were objections to the pay-as-you-go financing concept of the program, largely from the manufacturers of automotive supplies—tires and other equipment—and the petroleum industry. New taxes were added to their products to go into the highway trust fund, from which Federal aid was to be disbursed to the States on a cash-in-hand basis.

But it wasn't until last year, when the trust fund nearly ran dry and the administration asked for another 1½-cent Federal tax on gasoline to keep the program going, that the propaganda storm broke.

"Immediately some began to look for a scapegoat and whipping boy," SCHERER said. "Some of the people who were responsible at least in part for the financial dilemma yelled the loudest."

ADDED TAX FINALLY VOTED

During the struggle to keep this program solvent and moving ahead by means of an additional tax, most of the charges dwelt on over-design, waste and extravagance. This apparently was meant to make it politically hazardous for lawmakers to add a further burden on highway users, since it was claimed the money was going down a rat hole. However, an additional 1-cent tax finally was passed, after a prolonged struggle.

During the fight the interstate champions did explain—at least to the satisfaction of a majority in Congress—why the original cost estimates were low and why a program barely under way needed additional financing. Congressman SCHERER, who led the battle on Capitol Hill, gave these five reasons:

The trust fund absorbed about $1.5 billion owing from older highway programs. That was never contemplated when the financing provisions were set up.

Because of the recession in 1958, Congress accelerated the program by $1.6 billion, without facing up to the problem of providing increased revenue.

An additional 1,000 miles was tacked on the original 40,000-mile network—on which the financing was used—to placate legislators who felt their areas were being discriminated against. Again, no additional revenue was considered.

In a number of localities the estimated requirements or standards had to be raised almost immediately because of the increasing number of motor vehicles. Just like the Nation's population, the number of automobiles is growing far beyond what anybody expected just a few years ago, and the Interstate System is being built for traffic in 1975. At that time the Nation will have 110 million motor vehicles, compared to about 70½ million today.

ESTIMATES ONLY A FIRST BASIS

The original estimates were made rather hurriedly by all the States' highway departments in 1954 and there were some miscalculations. More importantly there was a lack of understanding of what building highways to interstate standards means, even in the cost of small things, such as signs and lighting.

In any case, the estimates were only used as a basis for figuring out the financing system, and a miscalculated estimate does not mean the erring State will be stuck with a low figure or rewarded with a high one. Each mile of road has to be approved by the Federal Bureau of Roads before any reimbursement is made, and this includes the cost.

In addition to that, inflation was a problem. Cost of construction and of right-of-way increased about 12 percent in the period 1954–57—the interval between the two estimates.

Despite logical explanations of what happened to the program is financing, one of the most frequent indictments during this period was that the interstate highways were extravagantly overdesigned.

This indictment covered the number and width of lanes, the number of interchanges, the sharpness of curves and grades, and frills, all of which were part of the expensive extravagance.

This indictment usually was accompanied by one or two explanations. The first was that the States were indifferent to expense as long as the Federal Government was going to reimburse them 90 percent of the cost.

IMPORTANT FACT IGNORED

In fact, the more it cost the better; it was worth every dollar to bring $9 in from outside the State. This, of course, ignored the fact that every project must be approved by the Federal Bureau—including its cost—before the State became eligible for reimbursement.

"It also ignores the fact that maintenance of the new highways is entirely a State function and, as a rule of thumb, the more elaborate a highway, the more expensive is the maintenance bill," SCHERER added.

The other explanation was that private consulting engineers, which virtually every State employs to augment its righway department staff while the program is getting underway, and for highly specialized work, are paid on the basis of a percentage of the cost of the projects which they design, so they deliberately made them expensive.

The real answer to these charges was not—and still is not—heard very clearly. In the Highway Act it is clearly stated that the Interstate System shall be built to meet the requirements of traffic in 1975. This was to be the first real attempt to look ahead in highway construction, rather than just catch up, as tradition had it.

Some people, perhaps honestly, just could not visualize American automobile traffic in 1975, even though there have been some pretty good hints. The New Jersey Turnpike, for example, was up to the estimated 1980 traffic level a few years after it opened in 1952.

"We need to build permanence into the new superhighways to protect the multi-billion-dollar investment being made in the Interstate System," warns Charles Noble, chief engineer on the New Jersey superroad and until recently head of Ohio's Highway Department.

STORIES TOLD AND RETOLD

"Probably our most crucial failure in highway construction has been in underestimating traffic," he said. "We have failed to recognize the potential of the automobile and the urgent need for sufficient highway capacity."

But these overdesign and financial issues never really caught the fancy of the more flamboyant critics, and it has been only recently, with the discovery of some scandal, corruption, and boondoggling that the campaign against the Interstate has really heated up.

Some of these cases, which were real failures in the program, are being retold with such regularity that they may eventually become as familiar as "The Little Red Hen."

First among these is the Indiana case, in which members of the highway department improperly used their knowledge of future highway locations to make a profit on land acquisition.

In this scandal, indictments were returned by an Indiana grand jury, and of the $78,802.80 involved in the worst instance, all but $786.51 has been returned to the State.

The other popular favorite is the Skelly bypass case at Tulsa, Okla. Actually, this scandal, involving an estimated $524,000 worth of materials which were never put in the road, was discovered and prosecuted in Tulsa some time before it became part of the big drive against the Interstate.

A new scandal, developing in Massachusetts, involves appraisal of property for rights-of-way.

After these clear-cut cases of wrongdoing, charges against the Interstate program get a little fuzzy. There are the Nevada situations, for example. One involves three interchanges along an isolated section of the road, the other involves the Interstate route at Reno.

FOUND LESS EXPENSIVE

In the case of the interchanges, the Interstate route in question runs parallel to an old highway and a railroad in the Truckee River Valley. Some access to the new Interstate Highway in the area was necessary, and it was found that because of the cramped and rough valley floor it was cheaper to build three interchanges than build a feeder road which would bring the traffic to a single interchange. At that, total cost of these three interchanges is $221,000.

In the Reno case, the issue is whether the Interstate route should go through the downtown area, or along a northern bypass. Because Representative WALTER S. BARING, Democrat of Nevada, wrote to the President declaring the selection of the downtown

route would be "the biggest swindle ever perpetrated in the State of Nevada," a special House Government Operations Subcommittee was appointed to investigate the problem.

The subcommittee decided, along with the Bureau and the State highway department, that while the downtown route would be more expensive initially, it was the only one which answered the need. This decision was based partly on the fact that most traffic in the region is bound for the center of Reno, a major tourist attraction. In this Reno presents a different problem from other cities of that size.

While Reno is a special situation, the argument for running the Interstate System around cities, rather than through them, is heard again and again. Examples are cited in Omaha, Macon, Ga., and Wilmington, Del., among others, and it is always the same—building the system into the city is a terrible waste, because bypass routes are so much cheaper.

DON'T ERASE CONGESTION

"But the point is that these bypass routes do not eliminate the traffic congestion, which is the objective of the program," Scherer said.

"And charges that cutting these rights-of-way through the heart of industrial areas result in tax loss for the community are without foundation.

"The evidence is conclusive that these superhighways so increase property values in the entire area that actually considerably more dollars go into the tax coffers."

Another popular approach in the sabotage of the Interstate System involves the height of bridges. In this, the recurring waste theme is livened up with charges of bureaucratic boondoggling so blatant, in view of one magazine writer, that a single telephone call between the Pentagon and the Bureau of Public Roads could have prevented construction of 2,000 undersized bridges and underpasses. There also is the suggestion that this bureaucratic failure is damaging to our national defense.

As a matter of fact, this problem was handled honestly but not particularly adroitly by either the Bureau or the Department of Defense. But the trouble was that nobody knew the size and shape of weapons to come—weapons, such as missiles, which might be moved on the Interstate System—and they still don't know. Charges that the two organizations just weren't in touch on the problem are preposterous.

DECIDED ON 14-FOOT CLEARANCE

The military and the Bureau have been jockeying back and forth on the matter of bridge and overpass heights since 1922, almost from the beginning of the Federal-aid program. There was regular liaison on the matter from 1949 through 1956, when a minimum of 14 feet was decided upon. As late as October 1, 1957, the Army, Navy and Air Force all said the 14-foot clearance was adequate for anticipated equipment.

With the coming of the space age and its oversized vehicles, another look soon was in order and the Bureau determined on January 27, 1960, that the minimum height was to be 16 feet, rather than 14. Critics claim this tardy decision will cost the taxpayers $730 million, but the Bureau can't see where that figure comes from.

On the basis of official Bureau figures, if all the bridges authorized from the start of the interstate program until January 27, 1960, were reconstructed or reengineered, it would cost about $176 million. But the total is not expected to come to that because alternate routes around many of the overpasses will eliminate the need to change the height.

When the military was put under fire about this waste, Perkins McGuire, Assistant Secretary of Defense, wrote that when the decision was made in 1957 to accept 14 feet, "it was clearly understood by the military departments, the States, and the Bureau of Public Roads that some of the military items of equipment exceed 14 feet when loaded on available highway vehicles.

"But no one believed there was sufficient justification to request changing the vertical clearance standard and increasing further the cost of the Interstate System," McGuire said.

MOSTLY ABOUT ATLAS TRANSIT

Actually, most of this controversy involves the Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile, which is made in San Diego, Calif., but has been fired mostly from Cape Canaveral, Fla. Moving the big missile across the country by highway does create a number of clearance problems, and there is no question about that.

When the trucker who has this moving contract appeared before the special House subcommittee investigating the program, he testified that it took 9 days and cost $12,000 for him to deliver one Atlas missile to Canaveral.

But when the subcommittee got Lt. Gen. Ben Schriever of the USAF Research and Development Command, to testify on this problem, he said the size of military missiles will be getting smaller than the Atlas from now on, as rocketry advances, and future space exploration vehicles will be far too big to move overland at all.

He agreed with the general proposition that it is possible to move a bigger load under a higher bridge, but he could offer no definite figure as the minimum practical height of all bridges on the Interstate System. This has been the difficulty all along—guessing a practical minimum without knowing the shape of things to come—and there is no assurance that someone won't want to move 17-foot military loads across the country right after the 16-foot bridge level is established in concrete.

While the decision to go to 16 feet might have been made earlier, there is little justification in this case for the wild charges made against the entire program and the Bureau, any more than there was in the other cases.

ALL PART OF BROAD ATTACK

But they all seem to be part of the broad attack to discredit the program, to make the public suspicious because of the bungling, resentful of the taxes already imposed because of the waste, and, most important, unwilling to bear any further taxes on highway users or the products they buy.

The billboard business, railroads, or various individuals—such as the disgruntled or publicity minded politicians or clever writers—may have their own reasons for sniping at the program, but the big push springs from the taxation issue.

"Some of the groups and industries who want these highways and who will benefit perhaps more than anyone else contributed to the throttling of the program right at the height of the crisis," Scherer said.

"The American Automobile Association, the trucking and oil industries have always contended that they contribute in user taxes mores than their just share of the cost of the program. Further, AAA and the truckers have had a little private fight of their own, each accusing the other of coughing up disproportionate amounts," he said.

"These three beneficiaries made an all-out campaign against the additional tax when the President asked for the 1½-cent increase. The petroleum industry felt so strongly that it cut off its nose to spite its face by joining with those who for political and other reasons charged that the entire program was permeated with waste, inefficiency and fraud," the Congressman declared.

REMARKABLY FREE OF WASTE

Despite the outcry, the interstate program is remarkably free of waste and irregularities, particularly in view of its historic size and the traditional, double-jointed Federal-State arrangement. Further, it is coming along well. Some 8,800 miles or one-fifth of the system now is open to traffic, roughly one-half of it new construction since the program started 4 years ago. The other half is toll roads and expressways already built, which are on designated interstate routes and are up to interstate standards, such as the New York Thruway and most of the Ohio Turnpike. These roads simply were incorporated into the system.

Authors of the 1956 act expected difficulties would arise in such an enormous undertaking and they ordered two comprehensive studies to be made at the time legislation was passed. These reports will be made to Congress next year. They should provide unbiased, solid information on every controversial question plaguing the program. Answers are expected on these issues:

What will be the ultimate cost of the Interstate System, now that State highway departments have had time, and the experience, to come up with careful estimates?

Are ordinary motorists paying too much or too little of the cost?

Are commercial users too much or too little?

Should the tax base be broadened to include more than users, such as owners of land adjoining the system who stand to benefit greatly?

Should the standards—number and width of lanes and number of access points, as examples—be increased or cut back?

Should the 90–10 reimbursement formula be changed?

ANSWERS TO COME IN 1961

Answers to these questions certainly should resolve most of the honest controversy battering the interstate program. They should be available next year, though it may not be that every interest will agree with them.

What the defenders want to do is keep the program from being forced onto the rocks and fatally damaged in the public eye before knowledgeable and fair corrective action can be taken.

They do not claim there is no waste in the world's biggest public works program, nor that it is free of fraud.

"What seems only fair is that the failures of the program be measured against what success there has been, so the people of the Nation will have a basis to judge its progress and worth, as well as a basis for understanding what must be done to improve it," Tallamy said. "In view of the importance of the interstate program to the Nation, it seems little enough to ask."

My True Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, West Virginia is proud of Miss Marjorie Meldon of Ravenswood, W. Va., whose essay on the subject of "My True Security," won the statewide contest and also the honor of representing West Virginia in the national contest. I was very honored to join Miss Meldon at the awards banquet held at the Hotel Statler-Hilton along with the winners of the other 49 States and the District of Columbia. A 1960 graduate of Ravenswood High

School, Miss Meldon is a credit to the State of West Virginia. Her essay is written in a direct and cogent fashion:

MY TRUE SECURITY

(By Miss Marjorie Meldon)

In this hectic era of tension, doubt, and suspicion, security has becomme the Mecca of the herd. Such a solid, definite word, security. All their lives men stumble along the trail of the Great Star of security, seeking an uncertain goal. Do they crave shelter or protection, safety, or freedom from worry? They want, again, "security." I find myself examining this word with cynicism; a word with numerous meanings, none of them applying to me. My security is my brain and my soul, the confidence I have in my own ability.

Every meaning of security hinges on the state of affairs existing today. These can change at the drop of a few hydrogen bombs. Faith in myself will not end with the destruction of my home or a new mode of existence. To me, I am the only definite quantum in a world of unknowns. A person must have a religion or an ideal to keep faith in; even an atheist believes in his unbelief.

Today a person enjoys "security" if he commands a good job, has a nice home and happy family, and has put aside a small nest egg for the future. The multitude is so dazzled by this visible spectacle of security they fail to recognize or simply ignore the more important aspects. These tangibles of daily existence depend upon the ability of an intellect and the determination to succeed. I am not satisfied with existing situations; I am and shall continue to strive for something better than what I now have.

Too many people blindly accept traditional ideas of happiness and security, never pausing long enough to decide if they are patterned after true values. If all of us would stop just for a moment to take stock of ourselves, realizing we are individuals and have particular needs, we would stop acting like a herd of cattle, placidly chewing our cuds of blissful ignorance. Our Nation was not envisioned, conceived, and carved from this fertile land by complacent acquiescence. It took foresight, knowledge, patience, and a zealous determination to achieve this land of opportunity we take for granted. We cannot expect our country to remain a respected, secure world power if corporal possessions are uppermost in the minds of all. The continued existence of America depends upon our mental attitude toward security; an issue of tangible versus spiritual.

As long as I have the initiative and self-reliance necessary to succeed in this world, I shall do so, confident in my own abilities and accomplishments, secure in the world of tomorrow. It is up to me to develop, nourish, and prune my intellect and my soul; my true security.

We Can't Afford To Waste a Good Defense Plant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, to present certain facts which I think are material to the further consideration of locations or plant availability for the Department of Defense, I think it is important that something be inserted in the RECORD to pinpoint or document a situation which calls for immediate attention before it becomes too late.

Last February, at Kansas City, Mo., the Navy Department canceled their contract with Westinghouse Electric Corp. for the production of J–34–WE–48 jet engines. Shortly thereafter, the Bureau of Naval Weapons stated they had no requirements for this Naval Industrial Reserve Aircraft plant in connection with any other Bureau program, and that they would not continue the operation of the plant. They further stated that it was possible there would be a move to declare these facilities as excess as soon as the contractor—Westinghouse—released them. It is announced that if there was no defense requirement for the plant, it would be reported to General Services Administration for disposal after congressional approval had been obtained.

Now it is my understanding that the General Services Administration has the authority to make the determination as to whether or not other Government departments or agencies might have a requirement for the facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my appearance on the floor of the House today is to again bring into focus or perspective the great value of this plant as well as its trained personnel which may soon be lost and scattered away from the area. Here is a plant in a perfect state of maintenance with an estimated value, including land, building, and equipment, of $90 million. The contract recently provided employment for more than 2,000 men and women civilians, with a payroll of close to $18 million a year. I have asked the Navy Department for an itemization of this equipment, which was necessary only to be completely accurate, because I have visited this plant and gone through every corner of it. I have seen these huge machines in operation and also the very fine laboratories and testing units. I shall not take your time to make a detailed inventory, but there are nearly 200 boring machines, about 350 huge lathes, 200 milling machines, 400 grinders, about 400 shapers and polishing machines, a large number of bending and forming machines, 20 drop hammers, over 100 hydraulic or mechanical punches, including presses, shears, and hammers.

It is a plant which is fully equipped with cranes, furnaces, and every type of testing apparatus. Here is a plant that is fitted up, tooled up and, with only a minimum of modification, ready to go into the production of almost any defense item. You can realize it must have a large space area because it was large enough to accommodate all this equipment and over 3,000 employees. Here is a plant that is ready made and ready for immediate use. It is a plant of which any area would be proud.

The real issue here is whether this plant should be, in effect, wasted or whether it should be put to good use in the manufacture of other items of defense. Another collateral, but an important consideration, is that at present there is trained personnel which may soon be dispersed and scattered over wide areas. At the present time they remain in the Kansas City area, and if some new defense use could be determined, this trained personnel would stand by to be available.

As of now, it appears there will be, for some considerable time, large defense requirements. This is not the way that many of us would wish it, but these are the hard facts. The cold war is not now so cold as it was before the collapse of the summit.

Accordingly, I feel immediate attention should be given in determining the feasibility of continuing production in this modern plant, equipped with modern tooling machines.

The theme of my remarks here today, Mr. Speaker, is that proper officials in the Navy Department, or the Department of Defense, as well as those Members on the Armed Services Committee of this House, should conduct a most thorough survey of this valuable and expensive equipment, and carefully check this fine plant, worth $90 million, which is now—or soon can be, available for use. I am confident they will reach the conclusion that it could—and should be—utilized at once in order to regain the valuable services of these already trained personnel, and to save the taxpayers millions of dollars by avoiding the enormous expense of constructing a new building elsewhere and purchasing all new equipment.

On Adjournment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it seems advisable for some one to speak about a situation that prevails here in Congress this year. It is distressing to note the obvious admission on the part of the leadership of majority in the Congress that it has done a poor job with respect to handling the business before us during this session.

On Wednesday it was announced that the session would be recessed and reconvened in August. This means that we will just have time to get home and it will be necessary to come back to complete work on legislation which should have been completed a long time ago.

It is especially distressing when you thumb through the pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and note the number of legislative days which have been lost through the operation of the "Tuesday Through Thursday" club and for other reasons when the leadership did not program any business even though the club members were here.

When you check the activity of the other body, you wonder if the business of legislating in the national interest has been relegated to a position of secondary importance while the matter of politics occupies the attention of the leadership. With so many aspirants for President in the other body, the establishment of na-

tional images and the writing of personal platforms has made the Senate little more than a launching pad for personal ambition.

We Representatives from the great breadbasket of the world are particularly upset about the fact that we have had no legislation dealing with one of the most pressing domestic problems of our time—the enactment of legislation which will provide for a sound farm program.

At the very outset of this session, the President made it clear that he would approve any "constructive solution which the Congress wishes to develop."

We have had some weak attempts to come forward with legislation in this area, but they certainly did not qualify according to the President's definition of "constructive." This failure is understandable when we come face to face with the fact that our Committees on Agriculture in the Senate and House are dominated by Members from the South where cotton, peanuts, and tobacco receive the most attention.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is sufficient cause for wonder about the purposes for which the Congress is convened when we go through 6 months of a session and come up with so little to justify our being here. Suddenly it is realized that all of the necessary work cannot be done, even though the first national political convention is more than 10 days away. So, we recess and arrange to come back in August.

That means "we ain't seen nothin' yet." If politics has been the malady which has prevented us from buckling down to the task at hand, we are in for a relapse when we come back here after the conventions and head into that supercharged atmosphere where politics will have reached epidemic proportions.

I feel that we should stay on the job—work day and night if necessary; get out the necessary legislation and then adjourn for the conventions. Then, we will be fulfilling our major responsibility of serving in the public interest.

The Honorable William H. Hill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that when Republicans convene in Chicago on July 25, the dean of the delegates will be a constitutent of mine, and a former Member of this body, the Honorable William H. Hill, who will be attending his 10th national convention. To mark this event, I include an article on Mr. Hill, written at my request by Robert N. Dixon, State editor of the Binghampton (N.Y.) Sun:

THE HONORABLE WILLIAM H. HILL
(By Robert N. Dixon)

When the Republican National Convention convenes in Chicago on July 25 the dean of delegates will be William H. Hill of Johnson City N.Y., publisher of the Binghamton, Sun, and for more than 60 years a leader of the Republican Party in upstate New York.

As a delegate from the 37th Congressional District of New York Mr. Hill will be attending his tenth Republican National Convention. At the 1912 convention he was an alternate delegate, and since 1924 he has been a delegate to every convention but one. The exception was the 1936 convention, when illness prevented his attendance.

Now in his 85th year, "Billy" Hill continues to be chairman of the Broome County Republican Committee, a post he has held for many years. He is also Republican State Committeeman for Broome County and is a member of the executive committee of the State committee.

His amazing politcial career began when he was elected mayor of Lestershire (now Johnson City) New York at the age of 21. He then became postmaster of that community, serving from 1902 until 1910 when he entered newspaper publishing. He was a member of the New York State Senate from 1914 to 1918 when he was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives as a Member of the 66th Congress. He was appointed a member of the New York State Parks Commission in 1925 by Gov. Alfred E. Smith, and has been reappointed to this commission regularly by both Republican and Democratic Governors of New York.

In 1928, Mr. Hill was chairman of the New York Hoover-for-President Committee, and was Mr. Hoover's floor-manager at the convention which nominated our 31st President.

Each year as he celebrates his birthday on March 23, a New York member of the United States Senate rises to pay him tribute on the floor, as Senator KENNETH B. KEATING has done the past 2 years. At the same time, friends and political figures from all over southern and central New York gather in Mr. Hill's office to wish him well. These office gatherings have become so renowned they are covered by news media in the area.

One of his long time personal friends, incidentally, is Jim Farley, who, on the opposite side of the political fence, will also be attending his 10th national convention.

There's no doubt about it, Billy Hill is one of the grand old men of the Grand Old Party.

Citizenship Day and Constitution Week, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the President's proclamation designating the week of September 17 through 23, 1960, as "Constitution Week" and also a reprint of an article from the September 13, 1959, issue of the New Orleans Times-Picayune by Comdr. Robert W. Collins, U.S. Navy Reserve. They follow:

CITIZENSHIP DAY AND CONSTITUTION WEEK, 1960
A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Whereas our life as a nation is founded upon the Constitution of the United States, the oldest and most tested written Constitution in the world; and

Whereas it is fitting that our citizens, both native born and naturalized, observe the birthday of the Constitution and reaffirm their determination to support its principles, which have a universal appeal and application and are an inspiration to freedom-loving people everywhere; and

Whereas by a joint resolution approved February 29, 1952 (66 Stat. 9), the Congress designated the 17th day of September of each year as "Citizenship Day" in commemoration of the signing of the Constitution on September 17, 1787, and in recognition of those citizens who have come of age and those who have been naturalized during the year; and

Whereas by a joint resolution approved August 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 932), the Congress requested the President to designate the week beginning September 17 of each year as "Constitution Week," a time for study and observance of the acts which resulted in the formation of the Constitution; and

Whereas the aforesaid resolutions of the Congress authorize the President to issue annually a proclamation calling for the observance of Citizenship Day and Constitution Week:

Now, therefore, I, Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States of America, call upon the appropriate officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings on Citizenship Day, September 17, 1960; and I urge Federal, State, and local officials, as well as all religious, civic, educational, and other organizations, to hold appropriate ceremonies on that day designed to give our people a clearer understanding of their rights, responsibilities, and opportunities as citizens of the United States.

I also designate the period beginning September 17 and ending September 23, 1960, as "Constitution Week"; and I urge the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities in their schools and churches and in other suitable places.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 15th day of March in the year of our Lord 1960, and of the independence of the United States of America the 184th.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

By the President:

CHRISTIAN A. HERTER,
Secretary of State.

[From the Times-Picayune, Sept. 13, 1959]

HISTORY OF U.S. CONSTITUTION PROVES IT HAD TO BE GOOD

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—President Eisenhower at the request of Congress has proclaimed September 17 as "Citizenship Day," and the week beginning Thursday as "Constitution Week," a time for study and observance of the acts which resulted in the formation of the Constitution. This article traces the early history of the document, commenting on the impact it has had on the lives of Americans from Washington to Eisenhower.)

(By Comdr. Robert W. Collins, U.S.N.R.)

When I accepted this invitation to give a message on appreciation of the U.S. Constitution from the viewpoint of a Naval Reserve legal-specialist officer, I did so in serious thoughts and reflections on that day so many years ago when I was first commissioned in the U.S. Naval Reserve and swore "that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same."

In celebrating the 172d anniversary of the adoption of the U.S. Constitution, we are paying just tribute to the very foundation of our Government, that is, the Constitution itself.

On the 17th of September 1787, a convention of delegates of the people of the United States, selected from the Original Thirteen States, adopted and made public that document, which consisted of a preamble and seven articles expressed in the language of the common law.

When accepted and ratified by those States on behalf of the people of these United States, our Charter of Government came into being.

It should be remembered that the Constitution at that stage in American history was much clearer in its definition of responsibility and its imposition of obligation on its citizens and member States than at a shortly later date in our history.

Four years later there came into force and effect the first 10 amendments, commonly called then and at all times since, including the present moment in history, the Bill of Rights. These early amendments did not alter in any manner the form of our constitutional government. However, they did write into the charter itself certain rights, largely of the individual, guaranteed to them by their Government in this basic compact of their own creation.

Perhaps the Constitution was better understood in its terms and in its meaning at the time of its adoption than it is presently understood, although thoughtful Americans have at all times recognized that the obligations of citizenship are implicit and inherent in the Constitution. To support and defend the Constitution is part of the oath required in all services, but it is a definite obligation on all citizens with or without a formal oath. The struggle to maintain the Constitution of the United States is an unending one, and we would do well to remember the old adage that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

As we take time from our ordinary pursuits to honor such an event as the adoption of our Constitution, it is well for us to consider whether or not the American people had the same appreciation then as we now have of this basic instrument of our lives and Government.

The people did understand the document, but appreciation and support was far from unanimous. History teaches us that only 55 of the 65 delegates of the Constitution convention attended that convention. Only 12 of the Thirteen Original States were represented in the deliberations. Of the delegates in attendance participating in the drafting of the Constitution, 16 failed or refused to sign the document at the time of its adoption. When the secrecy was broken and the proposed plan was published, a tempest of debate over its merits began to blow. Critics fell upon it. Scarcely a single sentence or line of the Constitution escaped attack. While this public debate over the plan was in full course, conventions duly elected in the States assembled to pass upon it.

Within 3 months three States ratified it, Delaware and New Jersey and Pennsylvania, after a hot contest. Early in 1788, Georgia and Connecticut added their approval. By a close vote Massachusetts accepted it in February. Maryland and South Carolina soon followed. The New Hampshire convention, at first opposed or hesitant, decided favorably before the end of June. Nine States, the number necessary to make the Constitution effective and binding between the States so ratifying same, had now made their fateful decision. Two large States wavered. In New York and Virginia the result was long in doubt, and it was not until the late summer of 1788 that New York and Virginia ratified on the same day. Two States still remained aloof. North Carolina withheld its approval until November 1789, and Rhode Island, which had sent no delegates to the convention, would have nothing to do with the new Constitution until the spring of 1790, when it added its own ratification. Upon that event the full acceptance of the charter was accomplished. It had stood the test of scrutiny and searching criticism and survived. Its great ideal, its great body of principles, its great hope for the human race then became the basic charter of the United States binding and effective at the same time on all of the people in all of the States of our great Nation.

If proof be needed that the Constitution was clear and explicit, permit me to show briefly how that document provided the basic authority for the existence of that department of the Government in which we of the Navy League have particular interest. The Department of the Navy exists due to the following items:

Article I, section 8, provides:

"The Congress shall have power—

* * * * *

"(13) To provide and maintain a navy;

"(14) To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

"(18) To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

The only other reference to the Department of the Navy in the Constitution is contained in article II, section 2(1), which provides: "The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States."

It may be interesting to note that during its first years the Navy operated without the benefit of being a separate department. It was a great soldier-statesman who urged the creation of a permanent Navy and the founding of the Department of the Navy, which was accomplished April 30, 1798. Washington's recommendation hereon contained the following language, which we cherish: "To secure respect of a neutral flag requires a naval force, organized and ready to vindicate it from insults and aggression. This may even prevent the necessity of going to war by discouraging belligerent powers from committing such violations of the rights of the neutral party as may, first or last, leave no other option." The prime mission of the Navy Department was then, as it is now, to assist the people of the United States to provide for their common defense, and this is one of the people's prime obligations under the Constitution.

When the Constitution was adopted our Nation was living in a period described at that time as "These are the times that try men's souls." There have been various times during our history when the expression would have been appropriate and it is particularly appropriate today. We are fortunate that the framers of the Constitution were moralists. They were to a man moralists to the degree that they held that every right has its corresponding responsibility. They knew that benefits and rights flow from the fulfillment of just and honorable obligations.

The Constitution as framed by the great Convention and reluctantly and somewhat grudgingly ratified by the American States was at the same time the wisest and the noblest assertion of constitutional morality in the annals of statecraft. If the Founding Fathers were dubious of the future of that Constitution, it was not they questioned its wisdom so much as they doubted the willingness of successive generations of American citizens to accept its wise restraints and fulfill its implied and inherent obligations. Washington himself was very reserved as to the merits of the Constitution, but as months passed he came to feel that the result had been wiser than he had anticipated. After stating that the powers of Government had been wisely distributed so as to prevent any undue concentration of power in any one man or body of men, he stated that the new Government would not be other than good, "so long as there shall remain any virtue in the body of the people."

It is recorded in our history that the great Delegate from Pennsylvania, Benjamin Franklin, with tears in his eyes implored his fellow Delegates to sign the compact. He said in an answer to those who saw fatal objections in the Constitution: "There is no form of government but what may be a blessing to the people if well administered for a course of years, and can only end in despotism, as other forms have done before it, when the people shall become so corrupted as to need despotic government, being incapable of any other."

In these statements, Washington and Franklin were giving similar advice and warning of an earlier statesman of our colonial era. It was William Penn who expressed the same principle in this simple analogy. He said: "Governments, like clocks, go from the motion men give them; and as governments are made and moved by men, so by them they are ruined, too. Therefore, governments depend upon men rather than men upon governments."

Our Constitution, as a scheme of government, is a government under law, and not under men. Nevertheless, our Government depends upon its citizens to fulfill their individual responsibilities in the manner set forth in the precepts handed to us by those great early Americans we have mentioned. The Constitution is the organic expression of our national unity and has brought unbounded blessings to the millions of Americans that have come and gone.

The great English historian, Macauley, nearly 70 years after the adoption of the Constitution, made this studied criticism: "Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor." The terms of that critique stimulate my interest. What that great writer probably had in mind was the suggestion that no written document could wholly restrain the excesses of democracy. His underlying suggestion is not incorrect, but possibly it would be more accurate to state that the Constitution has proved to be more of a rudder than an anchor. No state of human society is wholly static; there was no occasion for the Constitution to be an anchor. Its purpose was, and is, to guide rather than to hold.

Another great and disinterested witness of American institutions rendered his opinion on the occasion of the centennial anniversary of the American Constitution. Gladstone, the English statesman, wrote the committee in charge of that celebration: "I have always regarded that Constitution as the most remarkable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect, at a single stroke, so to speak, in its application to political affairs." We have reason to consider that he believed most strongly that opinion, for earlier the same Gladstone had written the following: "The American Constitution is the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

We Americans and generations which follow us will do well on occasions such as this if we will remember the advice of the ancient proverb in our actions in relation to the Constitution of the United States: "Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set."

Narcotics as a Communist Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, 1960, I introduced a bill, H.R. 12120, to provide for grants-in-aid to the States for the treatment of narcotic drug addicts in closed institutions. In the short time since then my bill has received support from many quarters, including leading organizations, newspapers, Government officials, and others.

It has been suspected for many years that the Communists, especially Red China, is smuggling narcotics into most of the Far East countries in an effort to subvert the youth of those countries. The recent riots in Japan are a case in point.

In this connection, I wish to insert into the RECORD a most interesting article on the subject by the noted columnist Ruth Montgomery "Reds Use Drugs as Weapons," which was published in the June 28, 1960, issue of the New York Journal American and other newspapers. This matter deserves immediate attention before it gets out of hand, and my bill is a step in the direction of dealing with the problem in an effective manner.

The article by Ruth Montgomery reads as follows:

CAPITAL LETTER—REDS USE DRUGS AS WEAPON
(By Ruth Montgomery)

WASHINGTON.—The bearded egomaniac who rantingly presides over Cuba is giving U.S. narcotics agents a king-size headache.

Only 18 months after Fidel Castro's seizure of power, smuggling of cocaine from Cuba into the United States has more than trebled.

Cuba itself, since falling under the spell of the Communist-tinged Castro regime, now uses more cocaine than any other nation in the world, despite its comparatively small population.

A top official in our Narcotics Commission discloses that Cuba has become the "chief staging area" for illicit traffic in cocaine, since Castro came to power.

The official said Castro has rebuffed all our appeals to deport "Italian-American, French Corsican, and Canadian gangsters and narcotics peddlers who are now holed up in Havana."

International communism has long employed narcotics as a favorite means of subverting underprivileged peoples, and obtaining cash to finance its undercover activities abroad.

We need look no further than Japan to discover the horrifying disruption that can occur when students and leftist agitators are hopped up on drugs. Narcotics Commissioner Harry J. Anslinger has been fighting for years to stem the smuggled flow of heroin into Japan from Red China and North Korea.

As long as 5 years ago, the Senate Judiciary Committee heard expert testimony on the subject from L. G. Deverall, former member of General MacArthur's labor education staff, who was then the representative in Asia for the AFL's free trade union committee.

Warning of the dire consequences that could result from the continued flood of narcotics into Japan, he said: "The Chinese Reds predominate as smugglers, and the North Koreans as pushers. As the Japanese press has very bitterly said, 'The Chinese and Koreans sell the stuff and we foolish Japanese plunge it into our blood veins'."

Deverall pointed out that, at the end of World War II, Japan had only a few thousand heroin addicts. Within 10 years they had increased to 50,000, and the number is now many times multiplied.

Flushed with its extraordinary success in subverting Japanese youths by use of drugs, international communism is now turning its attention to America—thanks to the hospitable political climate and convenient location of Castro's Cuba.

To help curb the appalling new menace, Representative VICTOR L. ANFUSO, Democrat, of New York, has introduced a bill to provide much needed facilities for curing our nearly 50,000 addicts. A companion bill has been offered in the upper Chamber by GOP Senator JACOB JAVITS, of New York. Both have the blessing of Commissioner Anslinger.

It is fitting that two New Yorkers should take the lead in this move. Nearly 46 percent of all our known addicts reside in the Empire State, and 80 percent of the Nation's dope fiends are centered in New York, California, Illinois, and Michigan.

Unless we hurry, we could have a taste of Japanese-style rioting in our home stamping ground.

Progress Report on Local Service Turboprop Aircraft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include a condensation of a very interesting and informative report, submitted before the aviation division of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers at its aviation conference in Dallas, Tex., in June by Mr. G. Robert Henry, executive vice president of Bonanza Air Lines, Inc. I am sure this will be of interest to all Members of Congress who are concerned with the future of local service airlines.

PROGRESS REPORT ON LOCAL SERVICE TURBOPROP AIRCRAFT
(By G. Robert Henry)

THE NATURE OF THE LOCAL SERVICE AIRLINE INDUSTRY

In order to understand properly the effect of a turboprop aircraft on a local service carrier, it is necessary to give a brief description of the local airline industry. Local service carriers are certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board for scheduled airline service in different regional areas of the continental United States. As such, they concentrate primarily on local or so-called "short-haul" markets. A local carrier provides air service between many of the smaller communities within its area, between small communities and major air terminals, and between some of the larger air terminals themselves. It serves both the local and connecting requirements of the traveling public in its area.

In 1959, the local carriers served a population of 111 million people in 511 cities. Three hundred of these cities received their only air service from the local carriers. In addition, the local carriers served 327 military bases. Of these, 59 bases are entirely dependent upon the local airlines for commercial air service. This industry consists of a number of highly skilled, highly trained operating organizations that are capable of turning their abilities and services to the national defense needs at a moment's notice.

The local service airlines employ more than 10,600 people, with a total payroll which exceeds $59 million per year. There are 13 of these airlines currently in operation. More than 6,000 route miles were added to the local service carrier systems in the last 3 years. Their route miles have increased 64 percent since 1950.

Today, not one of the 13 local service airlines operates a route system which is self-sustaining. Inherent in the route systems operated by the local service industry is the fact that the traffic density obtainable is insufficient to cover the costs of providing the required service. It is, therefore, necessary for the Federal Government to make public service payments to these carriers in order to enable them to provide the services found by the Civil Aeronautics Board to be required by the public convenience and necessity, and to enable these carriers to earn a reasonable return on capital investment.

Although their public service payment requirements have increased 2½ times in the past 10 years, the industry's traffic generation has grown more than sixfold during that period. In other words, in 1959 each subsidy dollar bought almost three times the public benefit that it bought 10 years ago. For some years past now the vast majority of these services have been provided with the pre-World War II DC–3 type aircraft. This aircraft, as you know, has been extremely reliable, but it has not been economical. Even were the local carriers to be admitted to high-density self-sustaining markets, the character of the DC–3 is such that even under the most favorable traffic circumstances the aircraft could not be operated on a self-sustaining basis.

The problem thus faced by the local airline industry and by the Government which has fostered this industry was obviously twofold in character. In addition to the authority already granted these carriers to provide much needed service to smaller communities and over relatively lean traffic segments, the Civil Aeronautics Board would have to authorize these carriers to provide service in profitable markets. Otherwise public service payments by the Government to these carriers would be required to the end of time. Not only would it continue ad infinitum, but the required dollar volume of such payments would continue to mount as service was extended to additional communities that could demonstrate a legitimate need for air service; for there can be no justifiable basis for concluding that only those people living in the densely populated metropolitan areas of the Nation are entitled to air service.

The second aspect of this problem was that even assuming admission of these carriers into more densely traveled markets, or markets that are inherently profitable, it was necessary to find an aircraft for this industry which could be operated economically in such markets. If the need for public service payments was to be reduced by the operation of some profitable segments together with loss segments then an aircraft must be found which could be operated profitably at a reasonably obtainable load factor.

ACQUISITION OF THE TURBOPROP

In consequence several local carriers have purchased and placed in operation a considerable number of F–27 jetprop aircraft. As of the end of 1959, there were four local service carriers operating the F–27 on a regularly scheduled basis within the continental

United States. These carriers were operating 23 such aircraft and more were on order. A fifth local carrier started F–27 operations in early 1960 with three of these new aircraft. In addition, one of the airlines in Hawaii has six of the aircraft, and two of the airlines in Alaska operate five of them. Moreover, several foreign airlines were also operating the F–27 in 1959.

Meanwhile, following the availability and selection of the F–27 jetprop by several of the local carriers, two other types of jetprop aircraft have been manufactured and sold or contracted for to certain of the local carriers. One of the larger local service airlines conducted an experimental operation in 1959 with a single Canadair 540 jetprop, powered by Napier Eland engines. The published 1959 cost and operating data for this experimental operation are too limited for inclusion in this report. Nevertheless, the results of this experiment have been sufficiently satisfactory to that carrier that an order has been placed for five aircraft of this type. Still another local service carrier has determined to order the converted Convair 340, powered by Allison jetprop engines. These are scheduled for delivery in late 1960.

Of the local service carriers operating Fairchild F–27 jetprop aircraft within the continental United States, only four operated the aircraft for a sufficient period during 1959 to provide a basis for evaluation. Although the aircraft of these carriers went into service at various times and with varying frequencies during the past year, there are nevertheless certain facts available which permit us to perform a highly indicative appraisal.

THE TURBOPROP OPERATIONS

Now we are able to ask, Has the turboprop met the rather sizable demands that a replacement aircraft was expected to meet? On the basis of the information which is now available, the F–27 jetprop is proving that it can do all that was expected of it and more.

Better service to the traveling public: In response to the requirement that the replacement aircraft must provide better service to the traveling public, the Fairchild F–27 jetprop has a normal cruising speed of about 100–115 miles per hour faster than the DC–3. Seating and cabin accommodations are more commodious and comfortable. The high wing configuration permits unobstructed visibility. The cabin is pressurized, permitting comfortable flights at high altitudes in contrast with the nonpressurized DC–3. The F–27's high altitude capability and its weather radar permit selection of the smoothest possible flight plan. The extremely reliable Rolls-Royce turbine engines have reduced cabin noise level substantially and have virtually eliminated vibration. And, last but not least, the aircraft is extremely attractive. The local carriers using the Fairchild F–27 are indeed providing substantially better service to the traveling public.

Operational costs: With respect to the operating cost of the replacement aircraft, a comparison with the DC–3 becomes extremely difficult. This is true because of the different times at which the jetprop aircraft entered into service with the individual carriers, because of the changing route characteristics of a number of those carriers, because of individual carrier differences with respect to the proportion of plane-miles operated with the jetprop equipment, and because of differences between the carriers in problems of integration of the new jet-powered equipment. Nevertheless, by using the third quarter of 1958, during which period all four of the carriers previously referred to operated piston-type aircraft almost exclusively, and the third quarter of 1959 in which those carriers operated with a mixed fleet including turboprop equipment, a reasonably pure comparison can be obtained. The average of the four local service F–27 operators produced an actual decrease in total operating cost per available seat-mile between these periods. Admittedly, the decrease was not substantial. It was, however, greatly encouraging, for in each case the carrier was still in the integration stage of its new jetprop equipment. Each had yet to learn the maintenance and other operating efficiencies that would come with increased experience with this new type aircraft. Moreover, this reduction in cost was made in the face of innumerable cost increases, many of which were entirely unrelated to type of equipment, such as increased costs in connection with supplies, rentals, wages, outside services, and the like. It should be noted, too, that the DC–3 operating costs, which are included in total operating expense for a carrier, have also increased substantially.

Traffic generation: With respect to the additional traffic required to be generated by the replacement aircraft, the results obtained by the four F–27 operators during the calendar year 1959 have been greatly encouraging. On the average, this group produced a nearly 30-percent increase in revenue passenger miles over the year 1958, while the increased miles flown by the group were slightly less than 12 percent. Using the third quarter of 1959 versus the third quarter of 1958, which is again a relatively pure comparison, the figures show a 40-percent increase in revenue passenger miles with an increase in plane-miles flown of only 14 percent. The average number of passengers on board on all flights increased by 22 percent.

Operating performance characteristics: The fourth major requirement for the replacement aircraft was that it must meet, and even exceed in many instances, the operating and performance characteristics of the DC–3. The short-field landing and take-off capabilities of the F–27 match those of the DC–3; its speed, stability, rate-of-climb and single-engine performance are far superior to that of the DC–3; its Rolls-Royce engine reliability has established a record unsurpassed in the history of commercial aviation. Thus we find an aircraft that far more than meets the operating and performance prerequisites for the replacement of the old DC–3.

The potential for self-sufficiency: And now we turn to the final condition which had to be met by any aircraft being considered as a replacement for the DC–3, and that is that it must have the capability for the substantial reduction or total elimination of the requirement for public service payment support. The goal of all local service carriers is, and must be, self-sufficiency. This new local service aircraft must be sufficiently attractive to the public and sufficiently economic to be operated effectively and profitably in such high density and potentially profitable short-haul markets as may be granted by the Civil Aeronautics Board. Our belief in the economics of the F–27 are rapidly becoming a reality. It is believed that, as experience is accumulated with the aircraft and engines, the break-even need load factor requiremets for an all F–27 operation will ultimately settle at a figure in the neighborhood of 55 or 56 percent. Thus, if opportunities are presented to operate this aircraft in high-density, short-haul markets, it is clear that the opportunities for self-sufficiency will be at hand, for it is already abundantly clear that the attractiveness and the capabilities of the F–27 are quite sufficient to enable it to take full advantage of these opportunities.

Again, as purely illustrative, the F–27 on Bonanza's system is already generating more than twice the revenue per plane-mile operated than is the DC–3. Yet its direct operating costs per plane-mile are only about one-third greater. It should again be emphasized that further experience with the aircraft and engines, and emergence from the difficult and costly period in which the manufacturer, the vendors, and the operators are individually and collectively seeking out improved and more efficient techniques in such areas as supply, maintenance, and overhaul, will lead to still more pronounced operating cost advantages for the F–27 over the DC–3.

Even in a measure of productivity that is cast in terms of available seat-miles the F–27 on Bonanza's system is already far outstripping the DC–3. During the past 12 months ending March 31, 1960, the DC–3 barely managed to make a contribution toward indirect costs, whereas by contrast the F–27 not only covered its direct operating costs but contributed very substantially toward overhead. This is shown by the following table:

12 months ending Mar. 31, 1960

[Cents per available seat-mile]

	Total direct expense	Total operating revenue (exclusive of subsidy)	Available for contribution to indirect expense
F–27	2.387	3.504	1.117
DC–3	2.680	2.739	.059

Again it must be stressed that we are in the early stages of this program and that this situation can be expected to improve radically in favor of the F–27.

Having now completed a year during which period bonanza has accomplished a partial transition into an all-turboprop operation, and having reviewed the results of that year with intense interest and great analytical care, we can now say that we are eminently pleased with those results. So pleased, in fact, that we now firmly believe a total transition into the jet age to be essential to the future welfare of the local service industry and to the public which it does and will continue to serve so beneficially.

THE FUTURE

In preparing and submitting a report of progress you must inevitably reach that juncture where you ask the question, "To where will this progress to date lead this industry in the future?" The objectives in their simplest form call for the provision by the local carriers of a very fine, high-grade public service in the interests of the commerce, the postal service, and the national defense. Moreover, they call for the provision of this service ultimately on a self-sustaining basis. We fully recognize that the attainment of these objectives is the joint responsibility of the carriers, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Congress of the United States. The Congress has taken a deep and abiding interest in this segment of the industry, as reflected by its passage of legislation providing for permanent certification of local air carriers and, subsequently, legislation providing for the Government guaranty of repayment of private loans for the financing of an equipment modernization program for this industry. In both of these matters the Congress has made it unmistakably clear that the public interest calls for the perpetuation, future development, and continued strengthening of this segment of the industry; and it is, of course, to Congress that we must turn for the public service support money necessary during the interim period when the Civil Aeronautics Board and the carriers are building a foundation on which a structure of self-sufficiency can finally be erected.

We must admit that in our pursuit of these objectives the way is fraught with many and serious problems. There are conflicts within the airline industry itself which, if not properly resolved, can readily destroy this program. For example, there are a few carriers within the trunkline industry that believe that the local airlines must be per-

manently relegated to a subsidy status. Stripped of any artifice or embellishment, this philosophy very bluntly calls for a policy from the Civil Aeronautics Board which would require that any air transportation authorization that is profitable be granted to and reserved exclusively for the trunk airlines; if it is a loss operation, it belongs to a local service carrier. It calls for permanent and mounting subsidization of the local service industry, regardless of the character and quality of the equipment and service that can be provided to the public by the local carriers. Such a thought must be regarded as abhorrent to the fundamental principles of this Nation, unless in the national interest there can be no other answer.

The enhancement and realization of this permanent subsidy concept is being pursued by a few trunk airlines in route case proceedings before the Civil Aeronautics Board. It boils down in essence to a position that local airline applications for self-sustaining or profitable operations in short-haul, high-density markets should not even be heard by the Civil Aeronautics Board. These trunk carriers make no attempt to defend such a position on any public interest grounds, for a position such as this cannot stand public exposure. So they launch their attack on procedural grounds in local service area route case proceedings, contending that the very consideration of short-haul, high-density route awards to local carriers in such route cases would make the proceedings far too big and too complex.

They would have the Board reserve consideration of service in short-haul, high-density markets for those cases in which only trunkline applications are to be acted upon. They would have the Board continue to envision the local service carriers as puddle-jumping DC-3 operators for whom any form of profitable operation or authority is unthinkable, thus wholly ignoring the local airline industry's technological advancement into the modern day jet age, and the public benefits that can accrue from such advancement. This DC-3 image which they persist in attempting to perpetuate is indeed obsolete in view of the fact that many of the local carriers have progressed very far into the jet age. Bonanza, in fact, is today carrying well over 90 percent of its total system traffic in the ultra-modern F-27.

From a public interest standpoint, these proceedings must be so cast as to present the Board with an opportunity to determine which carrier will do the better job—a trunk or a local service carrier—in the short-haul, high-density markets. Many of the local service carriers are today financed, jet equipped, and ready, willing, and able to serve these short-haul, high-density markets—and to do so even better than the trunks. To give them access to those markets will serve well the public needs in such markets and capitalize fully upon the very great interest, ability, and incentive of these carriers. This, in conjunction with the industry's fleet modernization program, provides the only hope for the elimination or any substantial reduction of the dependence of these carriers on Government support.

It ought also to be recognized that the Civil Aeronautics Board itself is quite properly beset with many conflicts in connection with this problem. Oversimplification cannot solve the problem; the answer is not necessarily either black or white, good or bad; it is not a problem susceptible of resolution by formula. Each case must be examined individually within the framework of a basic developmental and forward-looking policy. Certainly the Civil Aeronautics Board cannot mutilate the trunk airlines of the Nation by divesting them of segments and markets essential to their well-being and economic stability. Nor can the Board jeopardize the trunk airlines' enviable and self-sufficient route structure by saturating them with competitive influences on route segments and in markets vital to their survival on a self-sustaining basis. These are factors which the Board must carefully evaluate.

It is apparently not yet recognized that the proper development of these short-haul markets by local carriers, adequately equipped and intensely interested, will inevitably mean that the services will be especially geared to the local and connecting needs. Service of this type will lead to increasing frequencies of service and increasing volumes of traffic, of which the connecting trunk carriers will be a major beneficiary. The real air travel potential has as yet but scarcely been tapped. It is through this kind of joint airline participation that jet travel can be brought to all areas of the Nation. Then, and only then, will the vast air travel potential of the American public be fully realized.

Freedom Monument

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, the recent revival of the plan to build a Freedom Monument in Arlington, Va., has raised a storm of almost universal opposition in the neighborhood most closely affected. I think it may be well if Members of Congress from other areas have the opportunity to know how deep and how widespread the opposition is. Accordingly, I should like to offer for insertion in the RECORD the attached resolution from the Kiwanis Club of Old Dominion, and also several selected editorials that bear on this subject:

OPPOSITION TO FREEDOM WALL PROPOSAL

(Resolution by Kiwanis Club of Old Dominion)

Whereas it is the policy of the Kiwanis Club of Old Dominion and Kiwanis International to support maximum economy in Government and judicious use of tax dollars in Government operations, and

Whereas there has been introduced in the Congress of the United States legislation for expenditure of $12 million by the Federal Government to erect a marble and granite edifice on the Nevius tract adjoining Arlington National Cemetery, said structure being sometimes referred to as a Freedom Wall; and

Whereas the overall initial cost of this monument would be approximately $24 million, of which the Federal Government would defray one-half by an outright appropriation of $12 million of taxpayers' money and authorize the raising of an additional $12 million through public subscription. Said subscription could include tax-exempt funds. Thus, in one form or another, the cost of this monument would be borne by the taxpayers, including questionable expenditures of tax or tax-exempt funds for advertising, fund-raising activities, and payments to private promoters; and

Whereas after the initial $24 million cost, the taxpayers would be required to maintain this monument indefinitely at a substantial additional cost each year; and

Whereas in the opinion of many outstanding individuals and authorities, the size of this proposed massive monument, approximately 68 feet high by 204 feet wide, by 327 feet long, and its location, would reduce in stature the truly great impressive national shrines commemorating our country's history and ideals located in that immediate vicinity, including the Iwo Jima Marine Memorial, the Lincoln Memorial, the Jefferson Memorial, and the Washington Monument; and

Whereas, the Nevius tract adjoining Arlington National Cemetery, on which this structure would be located, has been requested by several national veterans organizations to enlarge Arlington National Cemetery; and

Whereas, proposals to place said monument in New York City in the 1930's and on a mountain top in the State of Georgia at a later date both failed; and

Whereas after the failure in Georgia, the substantial public funds solicited by private promoters of said monument were never returned to donors, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 27, 1958, on pages 5027 and 5031, which is the record of the debate of the previous monument proposal when it was considered by the House of Representatives; and

Whereas the monument proposal has been branded as extravagant, unnecessary and undesirable by such outstanding newspapers as the Washington Evening Star, the Washington Post, the New York Times, the Washington Daily News and Northern Virginia Sun, all of which have been highly critical of the proposal; and

Whereas the Arlington County Board, civic associations, and others in Arlington County, Va., where this monument is proposed to be located, have gone on record many times, as recently as May, 1960, formally opposing location of this monument within their area because of its excessive size, costs to taxpayers, and lack of historical merit, and

Whereas the Congress of the United States studied and formally rejected a similar proposal in 1958; and

Whereas the Old Dominion Kiwanis Club and the Kiwanis International favor the establishment of living memorials such as citizenship programs, scholarships, Kid's Day, boys and girls work, vocational guidance programs, instead of monolithic inanimate memorial structures: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Kiwanis Club of Old Dominion, after due deliberation by its officers, board of directors, and assembled membership, hereby this the 13th day of June, 1960, do formally oppose the Freedom Wall monument proposal and direct the club president and the chairman of the public affairs committee to exert every effort to defeat this measure in the U.S. Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the Kiwanis Club of Old Dominion concurs with veterans organizations in the recommended use of the Nevius tract as an addition to Arlington National Cemetery and believes it should be consecrated for future burial of the Nation's hero dead; and be it further

Resolved, That in these times of international tension, which will require considerable expenditure of defense funds, and in view of the need to combat inflation and conserve our fiscal resources, the Kiwanis Club of the Old Dominion recommends that this monument proposal be shelved as a needless, wasteful expenditure not in accord with our Nation's present needs; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be instructed to inform the Kiwanians in Congress and all Members of the Virginia congressional delegation of this action by the Kiwanis Club of Old Dominion, and further that this matter be brought to the attention of all other Kiwanis clubs in the 10th division requesting them to join with the Old Dominion Kiwanis Club in opposing this monument proposal.

[From the Washington Post, May 28, 1960]

MILLIONS FOR MARBLE?

Sponsors of the proposed Freedom Monument seem to have met objections of the Commission of Fine Arts by reducing the height of the memorial which they want to build on the Nevius tract near Arlington Cemetery. Under terms of the new bill endorsed by President Eisenhower, the monument would stand only 68 feet high instead of 90. Moreover the National Capital Planning Commission has endorsed the location.

Even though the project now has the blessing of these agencies, we think Congress ought to consider carefully whether $12 million of public funds ought to be spent on such a venture, despite the willingness of the sponsors to raise an equal sum privately. As a rule, we think memorials ought to honor persons or historic events, not abstract concepts.

Moreover, with the many and varied opportunities for useful memorials that abound here and throughout the Nation, we question whether another purely decorative mass of marble and granite ought to command public support. The $12 million of private money would make a much-needed contribution to the proposed National Cultural Center here. The same amount of Federal funds would provide the aditional land and roads needed for the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Park. Such projects as these would not only be fitting memorials, they would also provide useful recreational and cultural opportunities for thousands of people.

[From the Evening Star, June 4, 1960]

NIT PICKING

Harry T. Thompson, who wears two hats with respect to the so-called Freedom Wall project—one as Superintendent of National Capital Parks and another as secretary of the National Monument Commission—has referred to criticism of the controversial proposal as nit picking. This sort of thing, he told reporters at a press conference in Nyack, N.Y. (Madison Avenue style), can be expected whenever such a project is launched in Washington.

Was it nit picking when the Fine Arts Commission objected to the original 90-foot height of the roofless wall in the location specified by Congress (without prior consultation with the commission, incidentally)? This site, adjacent to Arlington National Cemetery, long had been reserved by the Fine Arts Commission and the National Capital Planning Commission for a sylvan setting to mark the Virginia end of the Mall axis.

Was it nit picking for the Fine Arts Commission to request the right to pass on the final design for the freedom shrine? (At last reports, the Commission still was awaiting the final drawings.)

Was it nit picking for the Arlington County Board to oppose such a huge masonry structure on the very land which the Federal Government had bought as a safeguard, it was explained at the time, against tall private construction so close to Arlington Cemetery?

Is the county board still indulging in nit picking when it continues to oppose the monument, even though the height has been reduced, successively, to 80 feet and now to 63 feet?

Is it nit picking for the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other patriotic groups to object to the erection of the wall on land which they and other groups contend should be held for future expansion of crowded Arlington Cemetery?

Is it nit picking to criticize sponsors of the undertaking for reneging on their past promises to Congress that not one cent of Federal money would be asked for the project? (Congress recently was asked to pay $12 million of the $24 million cost.)

The fact is that the Freedom Wall project is a monstrosity. It ought not to be jammed down the throat of a protesting community by the likes of Harry Thompson. And if nit pickers can prevent this, we are happy to be counted among them.

[From the Washington Post, June 6, 1960]

A BARRAGE AIMED AT FREEDOM WALL

A monument to Freedom?
I didn't know it died.
I knew that it had suffered
Some damage to its pride;
I knew humiliation
Had lately been its lot
But surely Freedom is not dead—
Oh say that it is not!

A monument to Freedom?
How fit—if need there be
To have it put beside the men
Who died to keep us free,
The heroes of Antietam
And Gettysburg and such
Who never once were heard to say
That Freedom cost too much.

Of monuments to Freedom
We surely stand in need,
But build them not of marble
But of noble act and deed,
Of purpose high and courage,
Of ends for which men strive,
No monuments to Freedom dead—
To Freedom—much alive.

J. W. RUSSELL.

WASHINGTON.

A monument to freedom.

Shrines commemorate the origins and accomplishments of living men and forces. Freedom's shrines are in Boston, Concord, Willamsburg and Philadelphia. But monuments honor the not-to-be-forgotten dead. Let us not erect a gravestone to freedom, not just now.

JAMES HODGSON.

ARLINGTON.

The concept of the proposed "Freedom Wall" eludes me as I believe it does others equally loyal and patriotic. Somehow I cannot equate the idea of a wall with freedom.

Freedom, in the dictionary I have at hand, is defined in 17 different ways having nothing with walls. Freedom is an open matter. Freedom allows charitable intercourse with all humanity.

Instead of providing cash for a pile of marble at a spot in Virginia where it is undesired, why not channel the funds to the Chilean Government for badly needed relief and redevelopment?

LYMAN D. LYNN.

ARLINGTON.

Our President insists that we should by
A "Freedom Wall," some sixty-eight feet high:
A wall of granite, open at both ends,
Like a taxpayer's pocket, as he spends
His meager income. He can use it all
For more important matters than a wall;
A wall, encroaching on the hallowed space
Which is the Nation's final resting place
For those who died that there should never be
A wall between my fellow men and me

I ask you, would it not make better sense
To spend two dozen millions on defense?

CLARK KINCAID.

ARLINGTON.

In your timely editorial, "Millions for Marble?" you say "Congress ought to consider carefully whether $12 million of public funds ought to be spent on such a venture."

Your clearcut, factual editorial also says the sponsors "are willing to raise the rest privately." That's mighty big of them. Why don't they admit that tax-exempt private contributions are borne by the rest of us to make up for the taxes exempted?

Think of the millions more to pay for the "carving which will go on for 75 years," the forever unending cost of permanent maintenance, grandiose landscaping another reflecting pool, everything down to earphones. No matter what they admit will be in there, nor forget to mention, there is only one source of revenue and no matter how it is collected, that source is you and me. Holding the bag when we would like rather to donate to worthwhile living memorials such as the National Cultural Center.

If this monument craze isn't stopped now the taxpayers should start a Boston tea party, but instead of dumping tea, let's dump the swelledhead renegade commissions and the mealymouthed Congress into the polluted Potomac.

It is easier to replace a Congressman than a good cup of tea.

M. E. JOHNSON.

WASHINGTON.

[From the Evening Star, May 20, 1960]

HARDY PERENNIAL

It's spring again and hence it is not too surprising that the hardy perennial, the so-called freedom wall, is struggling once again to see the light of day. This time, however, something new has been added. President Eisenhower has given his endorsement to a proposal that the Federal Government put up half the cost of the $24 million walled inclosure adjacent to Arlington Cemetery. Originally, sponsors of the controversial project promised that no Federal funds would be asked—that all the money would be collected privately, chiefly in pennies from the Nation's schoolchildren. In view of this we don't see why the taxpayers should put up the money, and we still are opposed to erection of such a huge structure on ground that ought to be reserved for the expansion of Arlington Cemetery. We hope Congress once more refuses to approve erection of this wall on the site proposed.

It is understandable that the President again has informed Congress that he favors the idea of an imposing memorial to the freedoms enjoyed by all Americans. Everybody outside of the Iron Curtain ought to indorse that idea. The Star repeatedly has said it thinks the concept is a good one—but that the Nevius tract near Arlington Cemetery is the wrong place for it. Furthermore, Congress should also consider most carefully the vigorous objections of Arlington County, veterans groups and others who object to the building of the shrine in the location planned.

In any event, Congress now is being presented with an entirely new shrine proposal. Bills previously considered by Congress and one passed by the Senate several years ago specifically barred the use of any Federal funds for the undertaking. In fact, Representative ASPINALL, of Colorado, a leading advocate of the monument, told the House Rules Committee in 1958 that if Congress ever were asked to pay for any part of the memorial he would oppose it himself. We trust that Mr. ASPINALL will cary out this pledge, now that the Government is being asked to pay half the cost, and that Congress will back him up.

[From the Evening Star, May 24, 1960]

DECENT BURIAL ADVISED

Since the so-called freedom wall has become more controversial than ever, Congress ought to inter permanently the revived and revised proposal for the on-again-off-again project. It does not seem reasonable to give serious consideration to the new plan for burdening the taxpayers with half the cost of a $24 million monument at a time when world conditions indicate that more money

may be needed for national defense. The $12 million could be used to far better advantage in protecting our freedoms, rather than commemorating them.

There was reason enough to oppose the plans for the walled enclosure in their original form, for the site proposed would deprive Arlington National Cemetery of land for future expansion. Furthermore, such a large structure would be out of place at the Arlington end of the Mall axis. Now, however, the proposal is more objectionable than ever, in that the original pledge that no Federal funds would be involved has been scrapped by the sponsors.

Representative ASPINALL, of Colorado, who once said he would fight any suggestion that Federal funds be used for the wall, has the chance now to carry out his promise. He is in a strategic position to kill the new proposal, for he is chairman of the House Interior Committee which must pass on any such legislation. We hope the committee will give the measure a decent, permanent burial.

[From the Washington Post, June 4, 1960]

TWELVE MILLION DOLLAR NIT

Harry T. Thompson, the superintendent of National Capital Parks and secretary of the National Monument Commission, says that "the nit picking of a few with a personal ax to grind" won't prevent eventual construction of that monstrous marble "Freedom Shrine" in Arlington County. President Eisenhower "loves this project dearly," he says, as if this should sweep away all opposition.

Well, our ax isn't a personal one, but we intend to go on picking some nits with it (if we may pursue Mr. Thompson's mixed metaphor a bit). One of them is the arrogance of Federal administrators who view local concern as "flea bites." Another is the effrontery of comparing the Freedom Wall with the Lincoln Memorial. But the biggest of the nits is that the sponsors of this monumental nonsense want the Federal Treasury to put up $12 million, or half the cost. Who is the wit of this nit, anyhow?

Mr. Thompson, of all people, ought to be conscious of the Washington area's urgent need for more parks and recreational facilities. If he thinks he can persuade Congress to give $12 million for a useless, ill-conceived and poorly sited wall of stone, why doesn't he turn so formidable a talent to the rescue of the parks program?

Nit or not, $12 million of public funds for a monument has a priority rating somewhere close to zero when Congress will not even continue the Capper-Cramton park program or approve plans for the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal Park. We hope that Arlington County, the American Legion and Amvets will continue to fight this silly project and that the next President will refrain conspicuously from giving it his support.

Think What Is True, Do What Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, we have been discussing the problems we face with Cuba and as a result of the U–2 incident. A number of Members discuss the moral aspects of these problems and we must at all times keep in our minds the necessity of doing what is right based upon the truth. A constituent of mine has sent me a statement on this very subject matter and asked me to put it in the RECORD so others might study it. It is as follows:

If some great power would agree to make me think what is true and do what is right, on condition of being turned into a sort of clock and wound up every morning, I should instantly close with the offer.

Those are the words of Thomas Huxley.

Thus being a sermon by Henry Drummond. The theme intrigues and challenges. Why? Because we all recognize that the good life would be lived by every person thus controlled, even as Jesus lived it.

Let us change the figure of speech and find a workable formula.

If any man tried to make you his rubberstamp you would rebel. You would not copy his lies and wrongs, and thus invite trouble. But you can safely copy God's truths and become right. Thus you avoid trouble.

There is a formula: Make yourself a rubberstamp for God.

Live by that formula and you will be startled. You will discover the truth that will make you free. You will prepare to inherit heaven and earth. You will learn to solve every one of your problems.

You will live by the promises of all true religion.

Believe those promises and improve your life. Recognize the basis on which they rest. Always think what is true, and do what is right.

Sacrifice personal motives to the will of God.

Think of God as a spiritual power seeking expression in our material world through human beings. Be consciously available. Be a willing helper. Never invite confusion by trying to take over and run things.

Give yourself rules to help you be right.

Refuse to commit a wrong act. Do not lie, cheat, steal, slander, or hurt. Never speak in anger. Wage a permanent campaign for absolute honesty. Make every decision as you believe God would make it.

When that displeases man, content yourself with pleasing God.

Purge your conversation and your thinking. Police your conduct. Stop supposing that you must be practical instead of right. Face truth, however disagreeable. Admit that you have deluded yourself.

Undelude yourself. Restore truth wherever you have lost it.

Recapture the exact words of lies by which you deluded yourself. Escape from the curse of believing them. Undistort your logic. Break your bonds. Unshackle your mind. Relieve yourself of affliction.

Share the formula as widely as you can.

Fair Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, on the 9th day of June 1959, after hearing many witnesses, pro and con, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which I am a member, reported and recommended the enactment of the fair trade bill, H.R. 1253. This bill is still pending in the Rules Committee. Since that time, our able and distinguished committee chairman, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS], has submitted a comparative print of proposed changes if the Committee on Rules grants a rule for consideration of the fair trade bill.

Mr. Speaker, most of the big publishers of this country are opposed to a fair trade bill. They are wrong because every attack on fair trade legislation I have read assumes that fair trade will reduce competition and drive up consumer prices. Any prudent man who will dig deeply and objectively into the Nation's experience under fair trade and who will study the kind of fair trade legislation that is being proposed in Congress this year may come to a precisely opposite conclusion. In fact fair trade would preserve and protect competition by keeping the independent average retailer alive in his unequal struggle against powerful chains, and in doing this provide a longrun protection for the consumer against local retail monopolies. The following publication in the Cincinnati Enquirer is an excellent editorial in support of fair trade legislation:

THE CASE FOR FAIR TRADE

Few subjects in our modern economic life have been discussed as vehemently—and with less real comprehension of the underlying principle—as fair trade.

The popular concept is that fair trade laws are enacted to keep people from getting bargains, or to prevent healthful competition, or to make the public pay more for manufactured goods than they are worth.

To see what fair trade really means, and how it operates, let's suppose you organize a company. You're going to manufacture electric irons—good electric irons, the best that can be made. You pay for research to obtain the latest features in your product. You buy expensive machinery, hire skilled craftsmen, organize a merchandising and advertising campaign to create a popular demand for your irons.

Your electric iron is not cheap, but you are convinced that the public will pay a fair price for a really good iron.

First, though, you must sell them to appliance dealers throughout the country—unless you intend to operate thousands of retail stores yourself, which would be uneconomical if not impossible.

The think that the appliance dealer wants to know is—can he sell them; or will he get stuck with them?

In your case, it being a good iron and properly promoted, he can be convinced of its salability. But he might be stuck with them in another way. Suppose, after he's purchased a good inventory and sold some to his best customers, a discount house or the like around the corner starts selling them at wholesale?

His best customers will accuse the dealer of having gypped them. And if the retailer tries to meet the wholesale price, he is soon out of business. After all, he is renting his store, paying his help and keeping going on the usual traditional spread between wholesale and retail prices.

This doesn't have to happen too often, or too long, before you and your good iron manufacturing company are caught in a deadly vise. Once your products has gone the round of the discount houses and the special sales, how many retailers are going to stock up on your iron? And when you lose the promotion and merchandising support of the ethical retailers, even the discount houses and special sellers will lose interest in you. Or they'll demand special

price concessions that would make it impossible for you to continue manufacturing a good iron.

Fair trade, in essence, requires all dealers in your product to observe the suggested price. It is a protection for the independent retailer as well as the manufacturer of trade name wares.

It does not end competition. Non-fair-traded products are subject to any price manipulation. And there always is the compelling factor of rivalry between manufacturers in the various fields.

What is so heinous about permitting a man—you, in the electric iron business—to suggest a retail price that will be adequate to keep you and your retailers in business?

The issue is being threshed out in Congress and the State legislatures. The public, we think, would do well to look at the broad principle involved. The bargains available when fair trade breaks down may be very illusory.

Mr. Speaker, I supported and voted for the fair trade bill in committee. It is a good bill for the protection of our independent merchants and American way of life. I hope the Committee on Rules will grant a rule on our bill and give Members of Congress the opportunity to pass on this important legislation.

Importation of Surplus Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. SLACK, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. SLACK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to go on record in vigorous opposition to the measure before the House, H.R. 9996, which is titled as "A bill to prescribe procedures to insure that foreign excess property which is disposed of overseas will not be imported into the United States to the injury of the economy of this country."

A great deal of confusion seems to have arisen about the objectives of this proposal. The proponents contend that the bill will simply devise a framework within which the administrators in the Department of Commerce may issue sound and equitable regulations governing the importation of foreign surplus property. By registering opposition, I do not imply that the Committee on Government Operations merits criticism for suggesting this means to that particular end. The fact is, however, that any rearrangement of existing regulations, in conformance with a new statute adopted in this body, must inevitably lead to the importation from abroad of more Government-owned surplus property to compete with goods produced for our domestic market, and I am unalterably opposed to that end result.

This fact is beyond question by anyone who has read the committee report on H.R. 9996. The report states that the Department of Commerce has maintained tight controls over the importation of excess property, and as a result the importers of such property have complained in consquence that the Department "had become so strict in its application of the law and so few authorizations were issued that a virtual moratorium was being placed on the importation of foreign excess property." Now, I submit, if a virtual moratorium exists today, then the passage of this bill can have only one effect—the opening of some new channel permitting the entry of such property in volume.

All of us, I am sure, favor orderly and equitable administrative processes in the Federal departments, but we must think of this issue within the framework of contemporary economics. Most of this surplus property consists of manufactured goods, produced in this country and shipped overseas. If it can be bought from the Federal Government, shipped back, and sold at a profit, then it has considerable utility. But, if so, it has not less than that amount of utility in less developed countries. Let it be channeled to those areas of the world whose friendship and support we seek.

This is not the time to return vast quantities of surplus property as a threat to domestic market stability. Our first responsibility is to the maintenance and advancement of our domestic production and employment structure. In that connection, we read in the daily press that there are an estimated 130,000 steelworkers idle, and the black word "recession" begins to crop up again in the writings of our economists.

As to the importers—no strong case has been made in behalf of their claims. It has not been established that they merit any special dispensation to enable them to compete with the established dealers and jobbers of this country who bear much of the burden of taxation and supply the bedrock on which so many American payrolls are based.

In view of these considerations, I am opposed to H.R. 9996 or any similar efforts to legitimatize increased imports of foreign excess property. I am confident that my opposition will find favor with an overwhelming majority of my constituents and equally confident that rejection of this bill will be approved by the great majority of all Americans.

Prayer for Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, Captive Nations Week, 1960, falls between the national conventions of our two political parties, and should serve to underscore for all of us how fortunate we are to live in a nation where men govern themselves.

During this week, July 17–23, I hope that all of us will turn our hearts and our minds to the millions who have been denied the right of self-government.

The captive nations committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, has published "Prayers for Captive Nations," which I would commend to all Americans. I include the prayers as part of my remarks:

PRAYERS FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS

PREPARED, MAY 1960 BY GESHE WANGYAL, GRADUATE OF BUDDHIST SEMINARY, TIBET

O, Lord, The Blessed One, through Thy blessings and Thy unique compassions, succor all the human beings who are suffering under the oppression of the tyrannic and brutal acts of imperialist totalitarianism.

May they have the opportunity to enjoy their Freedom and Liberty, for they were equally created: may we, with courage, and strength, always work to magnify this opportunity.

PREPARED, MAY 1960 BY DR. FREDERICK BROWN HARRIS, CHAPLAIN, U.S. SENATE

Our Father God, Author of liberty, grateful for our own freedom we lift our prayer for the millions of God fearing people—Thy children, who look up to Thee crying "how long, O Lord, how long," even as they are bound with the chords of a temporary tyranny.

In this desperate hour when the world's hope for a brighter tomorrow is so largely committed to our frail hands, strengthen us in Thy Name to challenge all evil forces which deal in fetters of the body and mind and which seek to degrade human personality.

Without ceasing we would remember the captive nations in their cruel bondage—proud peoples with their precious traditions stamped into the dust while alien Caesars exercise their ruthless sway over them. Above all the tumult and shouting of these volcanic days we hear the summons of Thy voice as in centuries past, "Let my people go."

May we play our full part in the restoration of human rights everywhere. May no denial of human freedom by those who would crush the liberties of others contaminate our souls with the blight of expediency. Strengthen us with Thy might that the arrogant boasts of entrenched tyranny may but put steel into our purpose to break their grip upon the governments and lives they now enslave.

We thank Thee for the inner shrine in human hearts which no dictator can desecrate, and where blaze the candles of faith which no iron fists can snuff out.

Give us to see that to acquiesce in the crucifixion of freedom anywhere is ultimately to nail our own liberty on the same cross, knowing that with what measure we mete, it shall be measured to us again.

We ask it in the Name of the Redeemer who came to proclaim liberty to the captives and deliverance to those who are bound. Amen.

PREPARED MAY 1960 BY RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN B. ROEDER, VICE CHANCELLOR, ARCHDIOCESE OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

O Almighty Creator, who hast endowed every human being with the power of free choice, hear the cries of Thy children from whom this precious birthright has been stolen. In this day when whole nations groan under the yoke of godless oppression, let those countless martyrs who have willingly shed their blood for Thee give testimony of their desire for the blessings of liberty.

O God of our Fathers, once Thy chosen people begged Thee for deliverance from captivity in the land of Egypt, and Thou didst take pity on them. Show forth Thy power today and lead from bondage the millions of Thy people enslaved by men who revile Thy very name.

O God of wisdom, whose beloved Son has said, "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," let the light of Thy divine truth penetrate the hearts of those who hate and persecute Thy people. Only Thy truth can bring that peace which

the human race has ever sought—not merely the absence of armed conflict, but peace based on justice and freedom for every human creature.

O God of mercy, regard not our unworthiness, for we do not pray for ourselves—but for the unknown millions who are suffering in silence for love of Thee. For their sake, O Lord, we earnestly beg Thee to hasten the coming of Thy reign of peace. Amen.

PREPARED MAY 1960 BY DR. NORMAN GERSTENFELD, RABBI, WASHINGTON, D.C., CONGREGATION

O Thou who art the peace of the world: Save our generation from the terror that cometh by night and the arrow that flieth by day; from the pestilence that walketh in darkness and its destruction that wasteth at noonday:

O Thou who hast led us across the Red Seas and the wilderness of the yesteryears in a vision of a divine covenant; quicken that vision in our minds so that with renewed faith we shall be its living witness and inspire freemen toward a rebirth of freedom to face the promise of a new age:

O Thou who has been our refuge and our fortress through the ages, our altar of devotion, light our lives with Thy sacred fire and our hearts with Thy flame so that with strength of spirit and courage of purpose we will strive toward a world bringing Thy light and Thy peace unto the children of men.

Bless Thou the men who raise the standards of Thy law in our own time; the men who are not neutral in time of evil nor turn their face when the wicked would barter the birthright of freedom for a mess of red pottage; the men who would rise to new sacrifice so that the captives will be freed and the age of a free church in a free state shall come for all Thy children;

Guide us and guard us and lead us forward so that through our labors in this moment of history we shall be the witness of Thy covenant and the time will soon come when the world shall be filled with the knowledge of a righteous God even as the waters cover the seas.

Catholics on the Fourth of July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an address which I delivered recently at an Independence Day celebration of the Long Island general assembly of the Knights of Columbus at Prospect Park, Brooklyn, N.Y.:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN VICTOR L. ANFUSO, INDEPENDENCE DAY CELEBRATION, LONG ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS, PROSPECT PARK, BROOKLYN, N.Y.

Mr. Chairman, reverend clergy, my fellow members of the Knights of Columbus, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a real pleasure for me to be here today and to participate in this celebration. At a time when our Nation is on the defensive in many areas of the world, it is good to see proud and patriotic citizens get together on this occasion to celebrate our Nation's Independence Day.

May I first express my appreciation to the Knights of Columbus and to its capable and patriotic leaders for sponsoring this annual celebration. I am proud to be associated with such an organization. I wish many others would follow your fine example on this day.

From its earliest beginnings, America has been a land of immigrants of various national origins and religious faiths. All of us take pride in the fact that these people brought with them to this country the rich heritage of their national culture and religious beliefs, along with their passionate love for freedom and human dignity. They have helped build America, physically and spiritually, to its present greatness.

For Catholics, this Independence Day should be an occasion for joy and celebration. Up until the time of the Revolution of 1776, Catholics were prohibited from voting and holding office in every one of the Thirteen Colonies. They were forbidden to worship publicly, except in Pennsylvania. They were often the target of the most insulting epithets hurled in their direction. And yet, when the struggle for America's independence began, they were not only loyal to the cause of freedom, but were among the first to rally almost as a unit to the patriotic cause.

The names of many Catholics associated with that struggle are too numerous to mention at this time. Let me but add that, according to authentic records, about 38 percent of the men in Washington's armies were of the Catholic faith. Furthermore, Catholic France came to the aid of the patriots by sending money, supplies and arms, as well as a substantial part of her military and naval forces under the leadership of LaFayette, Rochambeau, and De Grasse. From Catholic Poland came two great military leaders: Pulaski and Kosciusko, while from Catholic Spain came money and arms. Without all this aid, victory would have been impossible and freedom would have been delayed in this country perhaps for many decades.

Let us remember these facts on this great day. Let us recall the role played by Catholics in helping to win our independence, in founding our Nation, and in defending its unity.

George Washington was aware of this aid throughout the Revolution. In fact, in years later as President Washington, he wrote to American Catholics:

"I presume that your fellow citizens of all denominations will not forget the patriotic part which you took in the accomplishment of our Revolution and the establishment of our Government, or the important assistance which they received from a Nation in which the Roman Catholic faith is professed."

One of the cherished historic relics of those historic days is the Liberty Bell, which can still be seen in Independence Hall in Philadelphia. It was that bell that proclaimed the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776—just 184 years ago today. On that bell is inscribed a very famous passage from the Holy Scriptures, which is still very clear and readable today: "Proclaim liberty throughout all the land unto all the inhabitants thereof."

That inscription shows the close relationship that existed in those days between freedom and moral responsibility, and the concern they had then for religious duty and public virtue. They understood that God gave them their freedom, and they cherished this freedom.

There is no incompatibility between the teachings of the Catholic Church and the concepts of liberty and responsibility as expressed in the Declaration of Independence, or the Constitution of the United States. In our catechism, which is used as the basis for religious instruction of Catholic children in this country, we find this statement:

"A citizen must love his country, be sincerely interested in its welfare, and respect and obey its lawful authority."

In this way, the church expresses its views on the obligations of citizenship, the concern for the country's welfare, and the citizen's obedience of lawful authority which comes from God—the source of all authority.

As we look upon American today, we see that its face is that of a land which enjoys vast material blessings, a land of plenty, of tremendous agricultural and industrial productivity, of great scientific achievements. It is a land which has reached the greatest peak not only in economic progress, but also in political liberty and religious freedom. In the long and turbulent history of mankind there has been no equal to it.

But the face of America, as we know it today, was made possible only by its people, by its own human resources, by the labor they put into it, by their sweat, toil, and tears, by their confidence in themselves—but, most important of all, by their confidence in America and in its future. We and our children do not want the face of America marred or overshadowed by any other concepts or foreign ideologies.

There is a very interesting story told about Leonardo da Vinci, the famous Italian painter, sculptor, and scientist of the 15th and early 16th century. When Da Vinci decided to paint the "Last Supper," he threw all his energies into the work. He labored day and night. He studied the pages of the New Testament where the sacramental feast is described, in order to fully grasp and reproduce the memorable scene. At last his work was finished and Da Vinci invited a few close friends to see it. They gazed attentively at the painting, and then one of them spoke up with great admiration of a golden chalice shown on the table where the Lord and his disciples sat.

"The shape, the color, and the size of this chalice are perfect," he said. "It is the most beautiful object in the picture."

When Leonardo da Vinci heard what he said, he took a brush, dipped it in black paint, and smeared it over the whole canvas. He then said to his astonished friend: "If what you tell me is true, that the chalice is the most beautiful object, then my painting it a failure. I meant my Master's face to be the chief and most beautiful object.

In a way, each of us is painting a picture of life, sometimes good and sometimes not so good. In painting this picture of our life, some of us will often make the trifles, the petty things, the most conspicuous objects on the canvas. The great majority of the people, however, are able to distinguish between the trifles and the important things in life.

If our country is richer and stronger today, if the face of America is that of a land enjoying many blessings, it is due in great measure to the efforts and the hard labor on the part of all these people who preceded us. It is due also to the infusion of their ideals, their culture, and their religious traditions. All of these have been blended with American democratic life, to give it greater substance, harmony, and unity of purpose.

America owes a great debt of gratitude to these religious groups, who have joined their destinies with those of America in order to make it truly a land of freedom and a leader among nations. I ask you, my friends, where but in a land such as ours could people of various national origins and religious beliefs get together at a public meeting like this?

The Scriptures tell us that "as a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." This Biblical admonition reminds us that we cannot think in terms of failure, and then hope to succeed; we cannot think in terms of weakness, and hope to be strong—any more than we can think in terms of doubt, and then have faith. We must think in terms of faith in God, faith in our fellow men, and faith in America. We must think in terms of a strong America, an America that has suc-

ceeded in the past and will succeed also in the future.

This is a time of responsibility which finds us at the crossroads of human affairs—where one road leads to higher destiny, the other to horrible destruction. This is also an heroic period in the annals of human history which requires heroic efforts, just as July 4, 1776, was in the early days of our Republic. We have the opportunity to help lift the impoverished and undernourished nations to a better life. But, in addition to the great hunger for food and sustenance, there is an even greater hunger in the world today for freedom and equality.

Here, in the United States, we fought a revolution to attain freedom and independence. Yet, we cannot understand the surge for freedom in other nations. We call it Communist-inspired. We are wrong. It may be encouraged by the Communists, but the inspiration and surge for freedom and independence exists in all peoples—whether black, yellow, or white. When we understand this, we will have these peoples as our friends and prevent the influence of communism—and only then.

Let the world learn from the Catholic faith because it has been this faith, more than anything else, which has thwarted the efforts of Communist leaders to gain world domination.

May God give us the strength of faith to carry on our crusade for peace and religious freedom throughout the world.

Appreciation of J. Edgar Hoover and Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Association of Chiefs of Police meeting in their annual conference at Chelan, Wash., June 9, 10, and 11, 1960, passed a resolution which expresses the appreciation that law enforcement officials of my State feel for the help they get from the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Members of Congress recognize, of course, that the Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, and the members of his fine organization, have done an excellent job in training professional law enforcement career officials through their courses. This has not only served to upgrade the local career men but also has been an important factor in upgrading the work of combating crime.

The following resolution expresses the sentiment of Washington State's chiefs of police:

Whereas the Washington Association of Chiefs of Police are assembled in conference in Chelan, Wash.; and

Whereas members of the Washington Association of Chiefs of Police are most appreciative to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the assistance and all the facilities which have been most generously provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National Police Academy, the Identification Bureau, the Crime Laboratory, and including the outstanding leadership and effort which has made police training in the State of Washington a most successful program: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association express in writing their appreciation to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Mr. J. Earl Milnes, special agent in charge by forwarding to them a copy of this resolution.

Charles A. McCarthy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Sunday, June 12, 1960, edition of the Cincinnati Enquirer relative to Mr. Charles McCarthy, national commander of the Veterans of World War I, Inc. Commander McCarthy and I have enjoyed a friendly and understanding relationship with respect to the objectives of his organization. He is a devoted individual and human in every respect. I am glad to be in a position to have inserted in the RECORD this short biographical sketch of him.

THE CONSTITUTION IS A PASSION WITH HIM—CHARLES A. MCCARTHY, EX-MARINE, RETIRED POSTAL WORKER AND VETERANS LEADER, IS AGAINST ANY WAVERING FROM THE ORIGINAL

(By James E. Powers)

Some would say he's a fanatic, but to Charles A. McCarthy his passion for the Constitution of the United States is a natural love that should be shared by many more Americans.

It's been a long romance, starting with an awakened interest in a civics class at Fayetteville, Ohio, High School around 1910. But the real clincher came through an understanding, friendly officer in the ordinarily rigid caste system of the Marine Corps.

Commander McCarthy—he's national chief of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A., Inc.—doesn't remember many names from that period of his life but that of Lt. Loyld Williams shines like a beacon.

"He was almost a fanatic on the Constitution."

Their association began one day in 1916 in a tent on Santo Domingo where the Marines were calming one of the many uprisings. One of the men drew a horselaugh from his buddies when he told the lieutenant during a discussion of something the marine had done that he had "his constitutional rights." Lieutenant Williams quaffed the ribbing and said, "That's right, son, you have."

The officer asked if anyone could recite the preamble. None but Private McCarthy could. With this beginning he came to know Lieutenant Williams "as well as a buck private could know any officer" and from him broadened his knowledge and deepened his interest in the Constitution.

Mr. McCarthy grew up outside Fayetteville where his father ran a bicycle shop which he later converted to automobile repair—one of, if not the first garage in southwestern Ohio. One of seven children, the younger McCarthy was born in 1894. After high school he attended Xavier for a spell before joining the Marines in 1915.

His service ended in 1920—after surviving a shipwreck off Cuba and doing World War I patrol duty abroad the U.S.S. *Arkansas*. He was sent to Cincinnati to wind up his tour as a recruiter. It was here also that he became acquainted with another line of McCarthys while on a furlough and married one named Sue.

Sergeant McCarthy was not very enthusiastic about recruiting nor very effective. "I just didn't have the heart to ship them to the marines." He knew from experience what they would be getting into.

"I shudder to think how many guys I cost the Marine Corps. * * * Young boys not out of high school—nice, husky kids—would come to me and I'd tell them to go back and finish high school, then give the marines a try if they wanted to."

He landed a civilian job with the railway mail service, rising from clerk to supervisor ("glorified clerk") in the 37 years that ended with his retirement in 1957.

In the meantime, he became quite an expert on the U.S. Constitution and constitutional government. Attendance at civic meetings where the topic was government led to opportunities to present his views and these appearances in turn led to invitations to appear before various and sundry groups.

Also in the meantime, he and his wife were busy with the tribulations of bringing up a family of 10 children—7 boys and 3 girls. All seven boys have done their turn in military service, five of them in the Marine Corps. The "baby," Barry (Butch) McCarthy, is currently a marine.

Mr. McCarthy has the bushy eyebrows and bulldog appearance of John L. Lewis, but his warmth and eagerness to please soon set you at ease—he is obviously a man with a mission seeking converts.

His missionary zeal for the Constitution reached its highest pitch after 1955 when he addressed a group in Columbus which called itself the Constitution Club. They and he were of kindred spirits. Mr. McCarthy convinced them that their purpose could be served only by becoming nationwide in scope. This they affirmed and it was only natural that he should be chosen the president of the proposed national movement.

He made progress until a meeting in Washington some time ago at which leaders of what was to become known as the Constitution Party tried to divert the movement from its nonpartisan approach. Though the group stayed intact, it is obvious that its chances of success were dimmed.

Always active in veterans groups, Mr. McCarthy last year was chosen national commander of Veterans of World War I, a group that came into being in 1953 primarily because the older vets had been rooted out of control of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars by the younger members from the Korean war and World War II.

The job, with headquarters in Washington, is full time and keeps him on the go, but he has by no means neglected his interest in the Constitution, carrying his message everywhere he appears.

Speaking of himself, Mr. McCarthy said, "I don't think I am a fanatic, but I admit I'm almost 'screwy' on the subject."

For Thompson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. MORRISON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, July 1, 1960

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the July 25, 1956, edition of the Lake Charles American Press, Lake Charles, La., which

was called to my attention a few days ago. Even though the editorial was written 4 years ago when my good friend and colleague, the Hon. T. A. THOMPSON, was a candidate for reelection to his third term in the Congress, I feel the statements about the job Congressman THOMPSON has done in representing the Seventh District of Louisiana are as true today as they were in 1956. He has 4 addition years of working with the Members of this body and increased seniority on the Public Works, and Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committees; he has greater experience in assisting his constituents in their problems and a record of many more accomplishments for the Seventh District and the State of Louisiana since 1956. I was so impressed by this statement regarding Congressman THOMPSON'S qualifications for reelection that I wish to bring it to the attention of the membership of the Congress. The editorial follows:

FOR THOMPSON

On numerous occasions during recent weeks we have been asked our opinion in regard to the Seventh District congressional race.

This is written in answer to those questions. It is not an attempt to dictate to our readers, but merely a statement of our stand and why we have taken it.

We believe the incumbent, United States Representative T. A. THOMPSON, should be returned to Congress.

While he was not our choice when he first sought the office, we believe T. A. THOMPSON has done a fine job representing the Seventh District in Washington during the past 4 years.

We also think his voting record on matters affecting the Nation and the world has been, by and large, a good record. He has received a great deal of praise and commendation from his fellow legislators, and it is obvious that his conduct in the Nation's Capital has reflected considerable credit on his home district.

There is no doubt that T. A. has been a workhorse on the job. That line about the sun never setting on unanswered mail on his desk is almost literally true. We have talked to hundreds of his constituents, including farmers, laborers, businessmen, fishermen, oilmen and others. The story is always the same. When they have contacted the Congressman on any problem, no matter how small, the response has been immediate. And whatever work had to be done in the matter was done promptly.

Further, we are convinced that Representative THOMPSON has worked for all of the people in his district—and not just those who supported him in one or both of his previous campaigns. We have seen him in Washington greeting various delegations and individuals from the Seventh District, and if there was a difference in the cooperation he gave those who had supported his opponents and those who had supported him, it was not evident.

It takes a big man to do that.

Most of his record is well known. It varies from wholehearted support of such projects as obtaining permanency for the Lake Charles Air Force Base to being the prime mover in obtaining a new postoffice and Federal court building for this city. It has affected individuals in almost every known walk of life in the district. It is not by accident that Representative THOMPSON has received endorsements from rice farmers, oilmen, businessmen, labor leaders, contractors, professional men, cattlemen, shippers, fishermen and newspapermen.

The simple fact is that he has worked hard for the people of this district and done a good job for them.

Another point which influenced our decision is that Representative THOMPSON now has 4 years' seniority on a number of major committees in Congress—and it is no secret that the critical stage for any legislation lies in the committee room. Were someone else to replace the incumbent in Washington, this district would lose that vital committee seniority—as well as the 4 years of experience which goes with it.

Now to look at the other side of the coin:

With all due respect to Representative THOMPSON'S three opponents, we see nothing in the qualifications, experience, or political record of any one of them to indicate that he would do a better job than the incumbent has done. In fact, considering all things, including their lack of experience, we find good reason to doubt that any could do as well.

Under the circumstances, it would seem foolish to exchange an experienced Congressman of proven ability for an unknown quantity.

There is one thing which the other three have and Representative THOMPSON does not have—the backing and support of Gov. Earl K. Long. Even Long, however, has said he does not care which one of the three wins. He just wants to see THOMPSON defeated.

We believe the people of the Seventh Congressional District have more at stake in this election than the mere settling of the Governor's personal spats. But there is a point in that situation which is deserving of attention:

T. A. THOMPSON was first elected to Congress over the opposition of the anti-Long forces. If he is reelected this time over the opposition of Long himself, he will be in the position to be the most independent Congressman the Seventh District has ever had.

That strikes us as a pretty healthy thing in a democracy.

"The Value of Life"—An Address by the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President of the University of Notre Dame, at the University of Rhode Island, June 13, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of an excellent address delivered by the distinguished president of the University of Notre Dame, the Reverend Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., at the commencement exercises at the University of Rhode Island, on June 13, 1960.

Father Hesburgh's address follows:

THE VALUE OF LIFE

One of the most popular endeavors today is the quest for goals, personal, national, international, and, even to some extent, interplanetary. As indoor sports go, this is a difficult one. In an affluent society, advertising tries to simplify, or should I say, vulgarize the quest for personal goals. The political parties are in the usual frenzied quadrennial quest for national goals: to be all things to all men, at least to those of voting age. The current most pressing international goal seems to be survival in its most elemental sense. This gives urgency to the astronautical quest to get off the earth while it is still here and unradioactive.

For all of you who graduate today, some of this goal searching may seem a little unreal. Getting yourself phased into this cosmic picture may seem unnecessary, or at least unprofitable with so many more immediate concerns facing you. Allow me to nudge you into this broader framework with a reasonably serious thought.

Did you ever stop to think that a hundred years ago you were nothing, if not a thought in the infinite mind of God of someone who could be and would be some day. A hundred years hence you will, I believe, still be someone, somewhere, although for all that, only a statistic or a memory here on earth. Between these two focal points you live, well or badly. You affect the world and some few or many of the people in it, well or badly. You spend your days, these future days left to you, doing significant or trivial things. And when it is all summed up, one might say, as on television, this is your life.

All of life is a kind of looking ahead, almost always to greener pastures, more exciting days, the fulfillment of dreams, security, and I suppose the satisfaction of having lived well. A larger part of our lifelong hope assumes that all of this will come true, if not inevitably, at least in due time. All of you who graduate today have earned your share of hopes. I can say in all sincerity that I hope your best hopes come true in the days ahead. But I must say something else: that nothing really worthwhile in life comes true automatically, and very little of real value comes true by chance. All of our lives are just about what we, with the grace of God, make them, and what we make of our lives reflects the goals or the values that we cherish and seek and establish throughout our days.

NEED FOR CONSCIOUS GOALS

The important consideration at this juncture of your lives is, I believe, to have some conscious goals that will govern your days ahead. That they be conscious goals is the least that might be asked of your education. Woodrow Wilson once wrote that "the educated man is to be discovered by his point of view, by the temper of his mind, by his attitude toward life and his fair way of thinking. He can see; he can discriminate; he can combine ideas and see where they lead; he has insight and comprehension. His mind is a practiced instrument of appreciation. He has the knowledge of the world which no one can have who knows only his own world or only his own task" (Woodrow Wilson on Education, Harper & Bros., 1958).

What is the alternative to this picture of a conscious, intelligent, discriminating view of your life with all its opportunities, challenges, and possibilities? The alternative is an uneducated, unconscious, passive point of view that is at the mercy of every wind of passing fancy—the ship without a rudder, the unquestioning, uncommitted person who drifts through life.

A WORLD OF INEQUITIES

On other days, this latter attitude might have survived more easily in a world less full of tensions, less competitive, more stable, and less changing. But today we face a situation that demands education and the fruits of the educated point of view, not just to get along, but to survive. In easier days, you could be born a peasant, live a peasant life, and die a peasant death. We have the picture of the Incas who were born in an unchanging stratified society on the high plains of the Andes. Or of the Africans who for centuries were born, lived, and died within

the radius of a few miles of jungle. We even have periods of slower social change within the history of our own Western culture: A Renaissance that took a few centuries, an industrial revolution that took a few more. But now within a lifetime there can be witnessed the coming of electricity, automobiles, airplanes, telephones, radio, television, electronics, atomic power, fusion and fission, jets and rockets, satellites and deep space probes. There can also be witnessed a world whose outermost parts now are only split seconds apart by modern communicative devices, and yet a world where millions of people refuse to communicate with each other, and even threaten daily to destroy each other. And you live in a world of great inequity which will give rise to even greater tensions. Ten percent of the world's population living on the North American Continent have 75 percent of the world's income. And if you want to change the figures around 75 percent of the world's population receives no more than 10 percent of the world's income. Many of these people work longer and harder than we do. The 20 largest underdeveloped countries produce over half of the free world's industrial raw materials; but they themselves consume less than 5 percent of what they produce. Do not think of this as mere money or wealth, but of the things that wealth makes possible: food, clothing, shelter, medicine, education—or in a broader context—the reasonable material situation in which basic human dignity can be a reality and not a tragic fiction or an unfulfilled dream. Recall that half of the world's population goes to bed hungry every night; that half of the world's children never see milk or medicine, that half of the people on the South American Continent have never slept in a bed.

This then is the world that the educated person, the person with comprehension and insight must face: a world of explosive technological change, a world of gross, even inhuman inequity and rising tensions, a world, that to compound the complications, has had more net increase of population in the last 50 years than there were people existing on earth in the 18th century, a world that has used more natural resources in the past 30 years than in the whole history of the world before that.

Do you wonder then that I say to you that the least one might expect of your years of education is that you face the remaining years of your life in such a world with conscious goals that will give a dimension of significance, meaning, and depth to your life. When I say goals, you might substitute other equally valid words: ideals, convictions, or values. I care not what words you choose, but I am sincerely concerned that you consciously and conscientiously subscribe to some deepset and intelligent convictions regarding direction of your life in the years to come.

MATERIAL GOALS UNSATISFACTORY

While it may sound selfish at first glance, I think you might begin by asking yourself what you want out of life. At least this defines a goal. There are no dearth of goals presented to you today. Most of the visible goals, however, are hardly worth more than a passing glance, if what Woodrow Wilson wrote of the educated man has any validity in your life. Take a quick look at the goals that emanate from Madison Avenue—they are pleasant to the touch, the taste, the eye—but by any ultimate standard they lack substance. You would not be alone in our country if you made them your total life goal: The ranch house, the sleek sports car, the Ivy look, the sophisticated vacation spots—in a word, the easy, comfortable life of security. Other nations have gone this way before us, and in Arnold Toynbee's sense, gone is the word. They exist no longer.

Am I saying here that there is something wrong in comfort, pleasure, sense satisfaction, material security, ease? No, nothing wrong per se, by themselves, as the philosophers say, but something terribly wrong if this Madison Avenue picture of life becomes your total goal in the days ahead. If you think that these things alone can satisfy you and totally motivate your days tomorrow, then you cannot truly discriminate, you do not really see where this motivation is leading you, your knowledge of life and of the human situation today is naive, and your insight is tantamount to blindness. Let me add something else which is not really original: You can, in fact, choose material goals as the end-all of life, and you can achieve them in small or large measure, but you will not be really happy, for man does not, indeed cannot, live by bread alone. We can ignore the spiritual dimension of our lives, but we ignore this at our own risk, and at the price of bartering the best for that which may be good, but infinitely less important and even less satisfying in the total picture of a human life.

A HIGHER WAY OF LIFE

At this point, I may most aptly refer you to the enigmatic and paradoxical words of Christ, our Lord: "A man must lose his life to gain it," or again, "It is better to give than to receive." May I suggest that the spiritual goals of life fall within these categories: They involve giving rather than receiving, they seem often to mean losing one's life, whereas in fact they fill a man with happiness and satisfaction beyond the capacity of any food or drink or material pleasure. Do you think that Albert Sweitzer is unhappy at Lambarene, in French Equatorial Africa, because he might have been a professor at a great German university? Do you think that Dr. Thomas Dooley is unhappy caring for the abandoned sick in Laos because he might have had a lucrative practice on Park Avenue? Do you think that your professors are unhappy here at the university because they might be making more money in industry? No, these people, and all people who have dedicated themselves to a higher cause have in a true sense gained their lives by losing them, have found more joy in giving than in receiving, have lifted themselves to the height of that to which they have devoted themselves.

All of you cannot give in equal measure, but wherever you go, whatever you do, there are unchanging facts of human nature that will inevitably bear upon the meaning, significance, and importance of your lives in the days that lie ahead. To repeat what Woodrow Wilson said of the educated man: "He can see, he can discriminate, he can combine ideas and see where they lead; he has insight and comprehension."

Here then is your basic problem: the world is changing rapidly and will change even more explosively within your lifetime. The tensions will heighten throughout the world and, especially, in our country, endowed as it is with the mantle of world leadership at this time. What insight and comprehension will your life reflect—what impact will it have—what goals will consciously give your life meaning and direction in the days to come?

I need not say that my vote is for giving, for dedication, for ideals, values, and goals that transcend the quest for your own exclusive comfort, pleasure and personal security. What are some of the values and ideals that the present condition of man, the state of the world, and the whole historical moment seem to demand of educated people?

I would first commend to you the values that characterize the academic community in which you have been living: the high and continuing quest for truth, on every level, by every legitimate means. Commitment to this value has given us our universities, indeed our whole educational system. Here is the basic value of the scholars who have enlightened the minds of men and led them in the paths of wisdom. Here is the continual struggle of truth against error, the war against the blind forces of ignorance, prejudice, passion. No one of us is fully educated until we die. Only by lifelong commitment to truth, as we can daily learn truth, embrace it, and love it, do we rise above the vast army of those who feel instead of think, the great mass of those who accept all of their opinions and ideas, tailormade from the columnists, commentators, and even from the funny papers and cartoonists, unthinkingly, uncritically and blindly. Lifelong commitment to the pursuit of truth—who can hope to live a reasonable life in any measure without this value of the mind and of things intellectual as the very base of living.

Then there is the love of beauty in all its truest forms: commitment to this value has given us all the artists who have brightened our days with music, our dwellings with sculptury and painting, who have illumined our human situation with poetry, drama, and literature. The world is full of man-made ugliness and only a sense of discrimination can recognize the multiform beauty, God-made and man-made, that like sunlight brings bright flowers to blossom in the swamps and deserts of this world. The truest instinct of this value is to shun habitually that which cheapens human life, human love, and the rich tapestry of a world that mirror's God's perfection.

COMMITMENT TO MORAL VALUES

Then there are the great moral values that badly need commitment today: the passion for justice, for example, that engenders respect for law and order, basic human rights, all of the blessings of civilization that are made possible by intelligent freedom under the law, by personal integrity of life. Utter commitment to this value has given us our great lawyers, jurists, legislators—those who have given our world a dimension of order and rule that reflects the eternal law of God by way of natural law, divine and human ordinance. There are many today who want rights exclusively for themselves, but only obligations and inhuman servitude for others. There are those who want to be a law to themselves, in whose lives justice to others and respect for basic human rights are nothing but a mockery or a special prerogative of those who happen to have been born with a white skin. Passion for justice will or will not be a value in your life. If it is, it will enable you and others, if it is not, injustice will degrade other and you, too.

I cannot refrain at this point from emphasizing that you graduates of the University of Rhode Island have a special contribution to make—because of the founder of this State and the tradition he first instilled here. Roger Williams was not popular in New England. He was in fact expelled from the center of it. Because of him and what he made of this little Commonwealth, his place of exile, this State was for more than 200 years called Rogues Island and the State of Confusion. But America owes much to him and to your State, much that it could well ponder and practice today in our most serious present domestic crisis of civil rights.

Listen to what a great scholar has said of Roger Williams:

He was "certainly the most generous, most openminded, most lovable of the Puritan emigrants—the truest Christian among many who sincerely desired to be Christian. He believed in men and in their native justice, and he spent his life freely in the cause of humanity. Neither race nor creed sundered him from his fellows; the Indian was his brother equally with the Englishman. He was a leveler because he was convinced that

society with its caste institutions dealt unjustly with the common man; he was a Democrat because he believed that the end and object of the political state was the common well-being; he was an iconoclast because he was convinced that the time had come when a new social order must be erected on the decay of the old" (V. L. Parrington, "Main Currents of American Thought," vol. I, pp. 74–75).

We are still fighting that battle, and none of you can disengage yourselves from taking a stand on this national blight that makes one tenth of the American people second class citizens, without truly equal opportunity in voting, education, housing, employment, or even in the administration of justice. We have had enough of compromise, of gentlemen's agreements, restrictive covenants of the myth of white superiority, of white citizens' councils. Roger Williams said: "I have not hid within my breast my soul's belief." In a world whose uncommitted peoples, one-third of all humanity, are almost entirely colored, let us who believe in freedom and justice for all not hide that belief within our breasts or deny it by our practices here at home. The cost of following Roger Williams' lead today is not exile, just courage. The whole world looks anxiously to America and expects a passion for justice that will make the promise of our Constitution and Bill of Rights come true for all, here and elsewhere. This much we can say: Without a burning commitment to justice on the part of every American, in every section of America and in every walk of life, the American dream will not come true tomorrow or any day thereafter.

NEED FOR DEDICATION

I have thus far spoken of some personal values that should characterize the life of the educated person: the quest for truth, the love of beauty, the passion for justice. We might now pass from these values that give deeper meaning to your personal life to other social values that somehow enhance the quality and style of our life as a nation, while also giving your own life a richer dimension of significance.

Something that is of dire need in the world today is a capacity for dedication, sacrifice, and hard work geared to excellence of performance. These values are in direct opposition to the current spirit of our age that panders to security, ease, and mediocrity. Try to think for a moment of any single advance that was made in our history by indolence, by the safe rather than the adventurous way, by the shoddy, undemanding performance. Whatever you do in the days to come, you may be sure of this one basic fact of life: your life will be as significant as those things to which you dedicate your days. To high dedication one must also join high performance worthy of this dedication. Without high dedication and excellent performance in every age, there would have been no great religious or educational leaders, no outstanding scholars, artists, statesmen, scientists, doctors, lawyers, businessmen or engineers, no, not even any good husbands or wives, fathers or mothers. There is no substitute for dedication, sacrifice, and excellence of performance. There is no easy way to achieve that which is worthwhile and first rate.

SPIRITUAL VALUES

You will note that all of these values or goals that I have been commending to you are of a spiritual order: the undying quest for truth, the appreciation of beauty, the passion for justice, the capacity for dedication, sacrifice, and a personal commitment to that which is excellent. Consequently, I would at long last commend to you a final value: respect for that which is spiritual, that which transcends the body, its pleasures and its comforts. It is in the spiritual order of our mind and will that we are made in the image and likeness of God, and it is in respecting and using these higher qualities to their utmost that we best serve God, and man too.

In respecting God and the order which He has made, we are truest to ourselves and to our common mankind. I might add that in commitment to these spiritual values we are most likely to fill our days tomorrow with the kind of activity that makes for true human happiness, satisfaction, and significance, both in time and in eternity.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

When one lists the monumental challenges that face us today—personally, nationally, and internationally—it may seem unrealistic, purely academic, or unduly idealistic to speak, as I have, of spiritual values and ideals. But, may I ask you, if you will glance backward on the thrilling history of our country what stands out in greater relief than the faith of Washington on his knees in the snow at Valley Forge, the hope of Jefferson in hammering out the great ideals of liberty and justice in the ringing sentences of our Declaration of Independence, the love of all mankind that kindled the heart of Lincoln in making his Emancipation Proclamation. Strip our past history of its heroic human values and its noble ideals and you have nothing of the greatness that we have inherited today.

The fundamental challenge to America and to each of you who graduate today is to advance this American dream—by intelligence and wisdom, by integrity and courage, by faith and works—and to enable this dream to become more true in our day, for the millions of people here and abroad for whom America is the great white hope for an end to injustice, ignorance, hunger, disease, and the multiform kinds of more subtle human indignity that reduce a man to a beast and this world to a monstrous zoo.

This hope in America will be an empty illusion if young educated Americans of our day lose their taste for adventure, dedication, hard work, excellence, and the will to stand above the fat, unthinking amorphous crowd. If passion attracts you more than compassion, security more than sacrifice, convenience more than consecration—then the tensions will continue to rise, inequities will multiply, the ruthless will enlarge their rule, and all unconscious and uncaring, we will witness the demise of mankind's hopes and humanity's honor—which are also our own. With half a world hungry for bread, we will rant against spending $2 billion of our precious money on foreign nonmilitary aid while we continue to spend $6 billion annually on tobacco, $9 billion on alcohol, and $20 billion on gambling.

At long last one must ask: What are you going to do about it? Even global problems must ultimately find solutions in the intelligent decisions and the moral convictions of individuals. If only you decide that you are going to think about these great burning issues of our times—and not leave their solutions entirely out of your dreams for the future—that is a beginning. If justice somehow plucks at your heart the next time you have the opportunity to help or hurt a Negro—even in the secret of your thoughts and judgments—America will be that much richer. If you are determined to achieve excellence in whatever you do, despite the hard work and sacrifices it will demand; if you steel yourself to be honest despite all the cheap examples of cheating all around you; if you can find within you some good aspirations that transcend your own personal pleasure and indulgence, some call to dedication, some faint glimmer of heroism, something that will stretch your mind, and heart, and soul, in a word, that will enlarge your humanity, then thank God and give it a chance to grow and pray God that you are equal to the call and worthy of our great heritage.

I sincerely believe that there are great days ahead. You can coast with the crowd or be a part of that greatness.

Supplemental Appropriations, 1961

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALBERT THOMAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. In connection with this $205,000 miscellaneous item, can the gentleman give us a little hint about what this is in view of some of the speeches made by some of the Members of the other body, notably the senior Senator from Ohio, about the terrible people in the House? I just wondered whether this was a little attempt to conceal some of their expenditures.

Mr. THOMAS. May I say to our distinguished friend from Ohio, we follow the rule of comity between the two bodies.

Mr. HAYS. Oh, we do, but they do not.

Mr. THOMAS. Let us follow it here, and if the other body sees fit to violate it, why, that will be on their shoulders.

Mr. HAYS. Can you give me any explanation about what this is for?

Mr. THOMAS. The answer is "No."

Mr. HAYS. And we have to take it on faith?

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. HAYS. Well, my faith is pretty weak.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is there something classified about this? Is this a military secret?

Mr. THOMAS. This is for housekeeping items made up of 10 or 12 things, and we do not question those things. There is nothing secret about it. It is a matter of public record over there. They held debate on it, and I am sure it is carried in the Journal.

Mr. GROSS. And the gentleman cannot tell us what the substantial amounts are?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I have not the slightest idea of the details.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is this item similar to what we had in the For-and bill?

Mr. THOMAS. In what?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, the appropriation to help people, to take care of them in some way.

Mr. THOMAS. I understand those gentlemen take care of themselves fairly well over there.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Is this an assist?

Mr. THOMAS. This is what they call miscellaneous. The real big items do not come under miscellaneous.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. This says for an additional amount for fiscal 1960 for miscelleaneous items, $205,640. Can the gentleman tell us what that will make the total for the year?

Mr. THOMAS. No; I cannot.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell us why this increase from $225,000 to $5,256,000?

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the gentleman it is by virtue of two items. The first item was an international item involving one of the cities of southern California and Mexico. The House reduced the item by 10 percent for a construction project. The other body restored the 10-percent cut. We are trying to insist on the 10-percent cut. The $5 million item is by virtue of a treaty with Mexico for the construction of a dam.

Mr. GROSS. I thought that when the bill went through the House it was stated that the $225,000 was adequate, was all that they needed at this time.

Mr. THOMAS. The other body just restored the budget estimate; I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. So it is upped $5 million.

Mr. THOMAS. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Just a slight increase.

Supplemental Appropriations, 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is reminiscent of last September 15, in the early hours, about 2 o'clock in the morning, when we got the annual giveaway bill back to the House as an omnibus appropriation bill, with some 65 amendments, 35 of which were completely ungermane to the bill.

Here we are today with another one of those deals. It seems to me the leadership ought to be able to do better than this. I hope we do not come up to another September adjournment under the same circumstances insofar as a foreign handout or any other bill is concerned.

What is the reason for rushing into consideration of this conference report? The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING] told us that there is an aggregation of foreigners waiting hat in hand at a meeting to be held soon, and our representatives at the meeting must have cash in their pockets when they go. Some of our bureaucrats downtown are palpitating and panting; they cannot wait to get this $73 million downpayment and go to this meeting. At least there was the decency in behalf of the taxpayers when the inter-American bank bill was enacted last year to write in a provision that the United States would not put up any money until other nations came in on a date certain.

I had some contact with that situation last December, and I know it was a mad scramble to get even their small contributions from participating foreign nations before the expiration date.

But there is to be an international meeting and the gentleman from Missouri tells us that the Secretary of the Treasury, who can scream long and loudly about budgetbusting if the spending involves the people here at home, apparently wields some kind of mysterious influence in making Congress jump through the hoop to rush through this $73 million to benefit foreigners. I do not know whether it is because of banking interests, or what, but it is obvious the Secretary of the Treasury put the pressure on for this appropriation and the speed with which it has been considered. I am sick and tired of hearing this administration demanding economy and denouncing budgetbusting, yet demanding the rush act on this kind of spending.

It was only yesterday I asked the distinguished Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if it was necessary that we consider any further appropriation bills in this session, or conference reports relating to appropriation bills. You will find his answer in the RECORD on page 14308. Let me read it to you.

Mr. GROSS. With the adoption of this resolution, it will not be necessary to drive conference reports through the House under forced draft.

Mr. CANNON. It will not be necessary to perfect them now before we adjourn.

So what are we doing with this resolution before us now?

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time that we have publicly admitted by this action that we have no standing in the world today; that the nations will believe that this country will come up with its commitments after the Congress of the United States has said that it will join the IDA. If we are to believe the administration spokesmen, they will not believe we will go along unless we come there with the money in our pockets and in our hands. We have to bring the money to the able before any of those countries will believe that the action of this Congress is official, that we have said that we will participate in the fund. These countries, most of them better countries to us a few years ago, say they will not believe us unless we bring the money and put it on the table and say: "Look, we have brought our share, you put yours in."

Mr. PILLION. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. PILLION. Who can commit this country to an appropriation except this Congress itself? Who can do that? Can anyone commit this country except Congress?

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is right. The Congress of the United States has made the commitment, but I, for one, am not going to jump through this kind of hoop. Consideration of this appropriation bill ought to be stopped, and dealt with when the House reconvenes in August.

Transportation of Mail by Air

SPEECH
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12595) to clarify the law with respect to transportation of airmail, and for other purposes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I want to say first off that I am very appreciative to the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] and the ranking minority Member, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], because without their cooperation this legislation would not be before us today. I also want to express my appreciation to the subcommittee chairmaned by my very dear friend, the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania [Mrs. GRANAHAN], and the full committee which brought this legislation out; also to the Committee on Rules, who gave us every consideration, and to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] for allowing it to be scheduled.

I might say, to begin with, that this legislation has been introduced by several Members of this body. I might name them in order: the gentlman from Idaho [Mr. BUDGE], the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CARNAHAN], the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PORTER], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA], and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WIER].

Testimony in behalf of this legislation was offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS], and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMSON]. We had 3 full days of hearings on this legislation, and the subcommittee voted it out with only one dissenting vote. The full committee voted it out with three dissenting votes, a total of 14 to 3.

There are many interested groups and organizations throughout these United States that have supported this legislation, and I will just name a few: The American Association of Railroads; the Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees; Railway Labor Executive Association; National Association of Railroad and Utility Commissioners;

National Postal Transport Association; Midwest Association of Railroad and Utility Commissioners; Mountain Pacific State Conference of Public Utility Commissioners; Southeast Shippers Advisory Board; Central Western Shippers Advisory Board; Southern Railway; Joint Conference of Affiliated Postal Employees of Greater New York and northern New Jersey.

And, there have been many newspaper editorials favoring this particular legislation. I am sorry to say that a paper or two here in the District of Columbia saw fit to disagree with this bill, but I can understand their position. After all, the Postmaster General, I am sure, has a great deal of influence with these newspapers because of the tremendous mail subsidies that they receive, and I am sorry that they did not understand the bill and took the position that they did.

Mr. Chairman, I might say now that there has been a traditional spread, and the Congress has passed legislation to provide that there shall be a 4-cent letter rate for surface transportation and a 7-cent rate for air mail. This spread is in very great jeopardy as the result of the Postmaster's unauthorized and illegal program of airlifting 4-cent letter mail by air. He started this out in 1953 as an experiment. Many of us were not too concerned at that time, because an experiment is an experiment, and we perhaps closed our eyes to it, even though there was no authorization that he should do this. But, he has never from that day had legislative authority to undertake this experiment, and, now this year, he has expanded the airlift in tremendous proportions.

I might tell you, if you are not familiar with the way this operates, that this so-called experimental airlift operates in this manner: The Postmaster General takes a 4-cent letter, which belongs to surface transportation, and sends it by air on what he calls a space-available basis. Under his regulations the airline people must take the mail once it is delivered to them within a 12-hour period. If he trucks the mail from the post office here in Washington to the airport on its way to New York, it may wait down there at the airport for 10 or 12 hours before it is moved by air. When it reaches New York, if it ever does, it is then taken from the airport in New York back to the post office in New York where it is sorted and worked and distributed.

Now, this airlift proposition is definitely more expensive. This was brought out in the testimony we had before the committee. There is no question that, any position to the contrary. There is no question but what this is a more expensive way of moving mail than by surface transportation.

Furthermore, the airlift does not speed up the mail as the Postmaster General claims. There is a very good reason why it does not.

When you ship this mail on this airlift basis, it has to wait at our airport for up to 12 hours, for example, and then goes to New York. Then it has to be sorted and worked; whereas, if this mail leaves the Washington railroad terminal, the moment that train leaves, that mail is being worked en route by the postal employees in a railway mail car. So that when it gets to New York it is ready for distribution.

It seems to some people that, surely, you can send this mail faster by air than by rail. But the point is that under this airlift program, with the possible 12-hour delay and the fact that it has to be sorted and worked after it reaches its destination, it has not speeded up the the service. So I want to make it very, very clear that there is no substitution for en route distribution.

One of the most amazing things that came out in our hearings—and this is something that concerns all of us, because the Post Office Department operates at a deficit—is this: It is clear that the airlift is going to increase the deficit. First of all, this airlift is more expensive than surface transportation, but there is another financial problem. We found that between 1955 and 1960 the volume of airmail letters, those carrying a 7-cent stamp, had decreased by 356,300,000 pieces. That means that a large percentage of the regular airmail is no longer being used. It has fallen off that much in the few short years between 1955 and 1960. What is the answer? The answer is simply this, that people have heard that the airlift is in operation; they are familiar with it, so instead of putting a 7-cent stamp on their letter, they put a 4-cent stamp on it, thinking that this is going to go by air anyway. So that is going to have a very serious financial impact upon our postal rate structure deficitwise. That is something that ought to be borne in mind by every single member of this committee, because it could lead to this situation: that as the airlift is expanded, it could mean that everybody will be sending their mail at a 4-cent rate. That is going to have very serious consequences.

Mr. Chairman, let me tell you something about the economic effect that this airlift has upon our Nation's railroads. Between 1953 and the middle of 1958, 115 trains have been discontinued, after the Post Office Department had withdrawn the railway post office cars. I would like to quote from page 25 of the committee hearings, from the testimony before our committee of a representative of the railroads, when he stated:

> Nor should there be any secret that if the plans of the Post Office Department to divert large portions of first-class mail from the railroads are carried out the decline in railroad passenger facilities will be accelerated at a rate which has never before been seen in this country.

And never before have truer words been spoken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am sorry I cannot complete my statement in 2 minutes, but I will say this.

The Postmaster states that X number of trains have been taken off. In fact, he says 1,215 mail-carrying trains have been taken off since the airlift began. That is certainly proof that when he started airlifting this mail, a great number of passenger trains have been taken off. Where the airlift is used, it is used for transporting mail between major cities, usually on a hop of 500 miles or more. Most of these trains that have been taken off were short run trains, branch lines, because the statistics are that 83 percent of the trains that have been discontinued have operated less than 200 miles.

They are using that as an excuse for the airlift of mail. In those situations the airlift is of no use because when these short runs are discontinued the mail will move by truck.

During the snowstorms of February and March it was necessary for the Post Office Department to divert over 205,000 pounds of regular airmail to the railroads because the planes were grounded. If this airlift program continues and all the passenger trains are taken off, it simply means that in another emergency such as weather the railroads are not going to be there to move this mail. Further in times of national emergency, where the National Government would take over all or almost all of our passenger trains, and this airlift program continues, there are going to be no trains left to move the mail. That is certainly a very, very serious situation that confronts us.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me if I get him more time?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Yes. I would be delighted to yield to my friend and able colleague from Iowa.

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska, at the request of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WOLF. I want to congratulate the gentleman. I intended to speak on this, but he is doing such an excellent job that I think anything I might say might be superfluous.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman. He is an excellent legislator and I appreciate his remarks.

What is the opposition to this? I have been working hard and diligently with other members of the committee since January on this matter. I have never received one letter urging that this program be continued except the letter from the Postmaster General. There are some people who are interested in this, of course; the Postmaster General and the airplane lobby, and they have been quite busy these last few days.

It is not quite enough that we build runways for the airplane people, we build them terminal facilities, we give them weather guidance, radar, and control towers; we give them 7-cent mail, which gives a very lucrative return to them. They are not satisfied with that. Now they want to take the little that is left, the 4-cent mail which rightfully belongs to the railroads, away from them. I think they have certainly gone too far, and certainly a stop should be put to this. There is no justification for this. There is a legal way to do this. If the Postmaster General wanted to, he could come to Congress and ask for it. There is a legal way to do this. I will not go into it because I do not have time, but there is a way he can do it.

To get back to the airplanes, with all of the subsidies we give them and have given them, I do not think we should subsidize them any further by giving them this 4-cent mail. We cannot take this away from the railroads, which is rightfully theirs. This has nothing to do with a subsidy to the railroads. The railroads do not want a subsidy, they do not ask for a subsidy. But if we take this mail away from them and give it to the airlines we are giving the airlines an additional subsidy.

Transportation of Mail by Air

SPEECH
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12595) to clarify the law with respect to transportation of airmail, and for other purposes.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I carry no torch for the railroads, the airlines, the Postmaster General, or anyone else except the public. I think that all first-class letter mail that can be transported overnight and made available for delivery the next morning ought to be carried on surface transportation. But I am unwilling through this bill to meat ax all of what is presently being done to expedite delivery through the use of aircraft. I do not believe that is the proper way to legislate in the interest of the public.

I am pleased to see Mr. GARY, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Post Office Appropriations, on the floor, because I take my cue in offering this amendment from the report of that committee in connection with the 1961 appropriation. This is what the committee said:

Accordingly the committee recommends that there be no extension of the airlift until the Congress has taken legislative action on the question.

I think that is reasonable, and my amendment would validate the tonnage of airlift of 4-cent mail in effect up to June 1 of this year, removing the expansion that has taken place since. Then let the legislative committee meet early next year and go to the basic law that gives the Postmaster General authority to transport mail, and write a formula for the Postmaster General telling him what Congress wants him to do.

Let us not use a meataxe on the present transportation of mail.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I gladly yield to my friend.

Mr. GARY. I would say to the gentleman that our committee acted because it had been brought to our attention that the Postmaster General was expanding his service. We did not think there should be any expansion. The authority granted to him in the first instance was to experiment with it. We thought that before he left the experimental stage and expanded the program the Congress should give him further authority.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask the gentleman this question: In view of what you said in your report do you not think my amendment is fair and in the best interest of the orderly transportation of the mails? Does not the gentleman think it is a fair amendment?

Mr. GARY. I think so, I will say to the gentleman that our purpose was to stop the expansion. The gentleman's amendment will do that and at the same time permit the Postmaster General to do what he has been doing in the past.

Mr. GROSS. Up to June 1.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. CANFIELD. I agree with the statement just made by the chairman of the subcommittee handling appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments. I think it only fair to say, though, that the Senate subcommittee handling these funds did not agree with the position indicated in our report, but I support the amendment, as does our committee chairman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. BARRY. I am sure the gentleman knows that $325 million of rail revenues, the largest amount the railroads have ever received, they received last year, and the prognostication is that next year they will receive the largest revenue from mail ever in history. So the gentleman's amendment would in no way cut into the mail revenue that the rails have received in the past.

Mr. GROSS. Let me add just this: That there is no guarantee, if you approve this bill ending the airlift of 4-cent mail, that it would go back to the railroads. It may go to other forms of surface transportation.

Mr. BARRY. The gentleman's amendment would not hurt the railroads one iota because they are going to receive $25 million mail revenue more than they received last year according to the present estimates that have been made.

Mr. GROSS. As a friend of the railroads, as a friend of the airlines, I want this situation handled as nearly right as possible. That is the only purpose of my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(On request of Mr. REES of Kansas, and by unanimous consent Mr. GROSS was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Does the gentleman's amendment continue the present contracts?

Mr. GROSS. Those contracts in existence on June 1. There has been some extension since.

Mr. REES of Kansas. You do not want to cancel any of them out. I think the gentleman's approach is fair.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN. Is it not true that the committee had 3 days of hearings and they reported out this bill by a vote of 14 to 3?

Mr. GROSS. I do not remember the vote.

Mr. ALLEN. The gentleman will find that is correct. Here we come in with an amendment the effect of which we do not understand. Just the other day on the wage-hour bill we accepted an amendment offered, I think, by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. SMITH] under conditions of severe limitation and we finally found ourselves in a jam.

Mr. GROSS. Just a minute. I hope the gentleman is not attempting to say that I have offered an amendment in an attempt to deceive the House in any way.

Mr. ALLEN. I do not think it was intended to deceive the Members the other day, but I think we should support the committee on a bill which they reported out by a vote of 14 to 3.

Mr. GROSS. I may say to the gentleman that I do not want my amendment to be compared to any amendment that has ever been offered before in the House. I have offered this amendment in good faith.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Did not the ranking minority member of the committee accept your amendment just now?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; and the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee said he thought it was a good amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. That is what I thought.

Transportation of Mail by Air

SPEECH
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12595) to clarify the law with respect to transportation of airmail, and for other purposes.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this is an excellent amendment. Contrary to what the gentleman from Illinois just said, this does the very opposite of causing confusion. The amendment was considered in committee. It was pleaded for by the Postmaster General in charge of transportation, and it boils down to this very simple matter.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSEN of Minnesota. Personally, it has been my observation that

the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. GROSS, usually knows what he is doing.

Mr. CORBETT. I am sure the gentleman from Iowa appreciates that remark, and I will associate myself with it.

Referring back to the amendment, what it tries to do is to say that all contracts entered into by the Post Office Department prior to June 1, 1960, shall be valid. Therefore, it puts a prohibition on all contracts that might be entered into in the future.

The effect of this will be, if the amendment is adopted, all of the schemes which presently are carried through in connection with the distribution of mail can be continued. But if this legislation should pass without the amendment, then we would have to tear up all of our contracts, all of our scheme examinations, and it would result in utter confusion and chaos in the Department's transportation system.

We have a simple situation wherein we validate existing contracts, as the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Post Office Appropriations agreed and the committee agreed, so what we are pleading for is a continuation of orderly progress in the Post Office Department. We are trying at the same time to say "speed up."

Mr. Chairman, I recognize it is rather difficult to establish reason at this time of day, but I repeat again, this is a good amendment. It would allow the Post Office to continue to improve its service, it would permit all the present transportation schemes to be continued, but without this amendment I would say this is very, very detrimental legislation. Therefore, the amendment should be agreed to, then we can all support the legislation.

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. FOLEY. I would like to pose a question of the gentleman. This is an experiment, it is 7 years old. The question is this: Has not this experiment proved everything it set out to prove? Has is not supported everything it was supposed to prove? If it has not, has it not proved nothing, if I may use a double negative? In either case it is time to put an end to the experiment.

Mr. CORBETT. I may say to the gentleman very definitely in attempts to improve the mail service of these United States, this experiment has proved it to be successful to the point where that which has been proved good should be continued.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming. How long would this prohibition continue on the Postmaster General to enter into these contracts?

Mr. CORBETT. Under the bill, after January 1, 1961, no new contracts could be entered into under the terms of this amendment for carrying first-class mail by the airlift, after that date, January 1, 1961.

Supplemental Appropriations, 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. ALBERT THOMAS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. This million and a half dollars was not in the House bill as I understand it.

Mr. THOMAS. That is my understanding, too.

Mr. GROSS. Where is this money to be expended?

Mr. THOMAS. I understand it is proposed to be expended in a little town in the southwestern part of Texas about 600 miles from where I live. It is a loan, and it will not cost the taxpayers one 5-cent piece.

Mr. GROSS. That helps a little.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4501 Conn. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio.*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio.*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio.*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho.*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 5708 Nevada Ave.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.* 1440 Rock Creek Ford Road
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.* 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.* Apt. 201, 2418 Menokin Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.* The Congressional
George, Newell A., *Kans.* The Congressional
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N. Y.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.* 3842 Macomb St.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* Alban Towers
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Kyl, John, *Iowa.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*

Appendix

Text of Byrnes' Speech on Red Subversion in Dixie

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on June 30, one of South Carolina's most distinguished and outstanding citizens of all times, the Honorable James F. Byrnes, delivered a very able address before the Texas Bar Association on Communist attempts to stir up racial agitation and strife in the South. I commend this excellent address to the attention of the Nation and ask unanimous consent that the address be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD for others to read.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF BYRNES' SPEECH ON RED SUBVERSION IN DIXIE

Next week the people of this country will celebrate Independence Day. I wish that in addition to making it a day of recreation, it might be made a day for rededication. It would be heartening if even for a few hours, we should meditate upon the wisdom and the courage of those who were responsible for the establishment of our Government.

The problems that confronted those patriots undoubtedly were serious, but not as complex as those now confronting us. In the early days of the Republic there was no effort to change the relationship between the national and State governments. Then our geographical position made it possible for us to view with regret and sympathy—but not with alarm—the quarrels of the Old World. We followed the warning of George Washington in his Farewell Address against entangling alliances. With the two oceans serving as moats for the defense of our homeland, we developed friendly relations with Canada and Mexico and for all practical purposes, let the rest of the world go by.

This Independence Day is another day. The revolutionary changes in communication and transportation, plus the influence of atomic weapons, and bombs, of missiles and rockets, have destroyed much of the protection afforded us by the oceans. We cannot live alone, and we live in a world where a dictatorship with great power, bent on world conquest, is a threat to world peace.

The Soviet Government has infiltrated one country after another. It has sent its agents into the departments of our Government, our industries, and more serious, into our educational institutions. Part of Soviet strategy in attempting to attain world domination, is by directing and controlling the thinking of the youth of the world.

They believe it is easier to destroy a government by subversion from within than by attacks from without. To do this they first incite internal dissension and encourage civil strife. In Eastern Europe this strategy was successful. Because of the secrecy of their methods, it is difficult to secure positive proof of their acts, but circumstantial evidence convinces me the recent lunch counter demonstrations were inspired and directed by Soviet Russia.

Let us look at some of the circumstances. Never before have Negro students engaged in such demonstrations to influence governmental action. Suddenly, on February 1 Negro students staged the first demonstration in North Carolina. These demonstrations were of the same pattern in nine States, extending from Virginia to Texas, and from Memphis to Miami.

Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, noting the uniform pattern, made inquiries, as a result of which he declared in a notable speech in the Senate that the demonstrations which resulted in acts of violence in two or three places and threatened serious race riots in nine States, were directed by the Congress on Race Equality (called CORE), a well-financed group with headquarters in New York.

This organization conducts schools to train organizers for the demonstrations. The literature sent out soliciting recruits and money, tells how they will be taught to secure publicity in the press and on television. The director admitted to the press he had sent organizers into the South to train Negro students. He failed to say by whom and where he had been trained. However, detailed information published about the demonstrations by the New York Daily Worker, the official organ of the Communists, disclosed the close connection with CORE.

To understand why these demonstrations should have been started at that particular time, we have to look at the world situation, for it was world affairs, not local problems, that prompted the demonstrations.

For several years Khrushchev had urged a meeting at the summit. The President was not impressed, but our British ally continued to clamor for it and other allies urged our agreement. We have military bases in those countries and must consider their views. They urged that as we were battling for the minds of the free peoples, we could not refuse even to confer with the Soviets in the hope of lessening war tensions. Looking back, one may say the President should have anticipated trouble. That is Monday morning quarterbacking—interesting, but fruitless.

Khrushchev was interested in the summit because of Germany. The primary objective of the Soviets in their struggle for world domination is to control all of Germany. Khrushchev hoped at the summit to get at least an agreement for the withdrawal of troops from Berlin and to establish a free city. President Eisenhower and our allies knew it would mean that within a short time the Soviets would control all of Germany. He and his associates of the free world reached an agreement that they would stand firm against withdrawal from Berlin. Shortly before the meeting Khrushchev learned of this firm agreement. Allied unity surprised and disappointed him. In an effort to secure an agreement on Germany he had stopped jamming broadcasts of the Voice of America in Russian. Our programs had interested the Russian people. A dictatorship cannot exist without complete censorship. Khrushchev began to have trouble at home while Red China charged him with being too friendly to us. He decided he would not be able to explain a failure at the summit, and determined to sabotage the meeting.

Before the U–2 flight, at Baku, mid the oil fields near the Iranian border, Khrushchev made a bitter speech denouncing Secretary of State Herter and Under Secretary Dillon. It was the first time in 6 months that he had attacked us. His purpose we should have recognized, but did not.

Following Soviet strategy, Khrushchev proceeded to increase tensions throughout the world. He threatened to make war on every country where we had a military base. Suddenly in Turkey and Korea there were student demonstrations. Communist agents knew the time was ripe in both countries to attack the governments. The student demonstrators were joined by professional Communists, and forced changes in both governments. Khrushchev hoped by these disturbances in allied governments to impair the prestige of the Western governments at the summit.

At the same time Khrushchev determined to give aid and comfort politically and financially to Castro, who has become a Soviet stooge. Most important of all, he hoped that by inspiring the lunch counter demonstrations in nine Southern States, race riots would result, troops be called out, lives lost and the United States be placed in a hopelessly weak position at the conference table.

In a cold war, as in a hot war, a leader has breaks for and against him. The U–2 plane incident was a "gift" for Khrushchev. The only thing wrong about the fight was that Powers was caught. Last week in Rumania Khrushchev boasted he knew of pictures taken by our U–2's 3 years ago proving his cries of anguish at Paris were only an excuse for sabotaging the meeting.

In Japan the breaks were also with Khrushchev. The United States-Japanese treaty was pending in the Diet. There was opposition not only from those with strong nationalist feelings, against another government having bases in Japan, but determined opposition by the Communists. They staged the customary student demonstrations, augmented by Communists, and forced Kishi to ask the President to postpone his visit. In Moscow, Khrushchev announced it as a great victory. It was. But race riots here in the South is the victory he wanted, and had it not been for the wise action of the law enforcement officers of nine Southern States in handling the Negro students, he would have had that victory too.

Khrushchev, in addressing the Rumanian Communists, referred joyfully to the student demonstrations in Turkey, Korea, and Japan. He did not mention the Negro student demonstrations in the South. But while these demonstrations were on, the Russian press daily published lurid stories. Khrushchev's silence indicates he was disappointed that there was no serious rioting here.

Not for a moment do I think these Negro students were aware that they were being used as cat's paws by Communist leaders. I can see how they could be misled. The southern Negro is religious and is emotional. When this New York director sent his trained workers south to train the demonstrators, he placed Bibles in their hands. That impressed young Negroes that theirs was a holy cause. Law officers recognized the trick and though under great provocation at times, they were tolerant and even gentle.

Of course, these students were not reading the Bibles they carried, and the people who inspired and trained them for the demonstrations were not Christians—they were

Communists. They alone have the world-wide organization to stage the same pattern of demonstrations by students in Turkey and Tokyo and in Tennessee and Texas.

But the Communists overplayed their hands when they asked us to believe that over the world in five countries, without Soviet direction, students spontaneously attempted to direct the policies of their governments, whereas in no Communist-controlled country was there a student demonstration.

What is the result of the lunch counter demonstrations, other than arousing bitter feeling between the races?

The New York Times of March 20 quoted the chief counsel of the NAACP as saying that he and 60 legal associates had agreed that in every case where a student demonstrator was fined, his organization would appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court. He said that while the 14th amendment had been held to apply only to State action, that "the use of public funds either in the form of arrest by the police or conviction by the courts, is in truth State enforcement of private discrimination and is in violation of the 14th amendment." He admitted the common law and the decisions heretofore had been against his position but said he believes now there is a different trend. He expressed the opinion of the Court might make a distinction between small and large business establishments, but he was not very clear as to just how large must be your business before your acts become the acts of the State.

The Supreme Court decisions to date offer no support for his contention. Seventy-six years ago, in *U.S.* v. *Nichols* (109 U.S. 3), the Court held the 14th amendment did not deny to a citizen the right to select the persons with whom he wants to deal, even when it is supported by an act of Congress.

As late as 1947, in *Shelley* v. *Kraemer* (334 U.S. 1), the Court held the action inhibited by the 14th amendment "is only such action as may fairly be said to be that of the States. That amendment erects no shield against merely private conduct, however discriminating or wrongful."

In Williams (Howard Johnson Restaurant) decided July 16, 1959, by the Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, the court held that the owner and operator of a restaurant is at liberty to deal with such persons as he may select, and the fact that his business was licensed by the State did not make his act the act of the State.

Practically all issues suggested by counsel for the NAACP were raised in that case and rejected by the court in an opinion written by Chief Judge Sobeloff, who, as Solicitor General, argued the school segregation cases for the U.S. Government.

Since then, in February 1960, in *Stack* v. *Tower System*, a restaurant case from Maryland, the Howard Johnson decision was followed by a U.S. district court.

Under all decisions of the Supreme Court and the courts of appeal to date, the lunch counter demonstrations are unlawful. Have you heard any integrationist criticize these demonstrators for deliberately flouting the decisions of the Court? Is it possible they believe a Court decision is the law of the land only when it is approved by the NAACP?

Senator RUSSELL suggested that all candidates for the Presidency be asked if they approve the lunch-counter sitdowns. It is relevant because two Justices of the Supreme Court are now eligible for retirement and the next President probably will appoint their successors.

If we criticize the school segregation decision of the Court, it is attributed to prejudice against Negroes. That is not true. We criticize those decisions because of our respect for the Constitution of the United States.

On the morning of May 17, 1954, statutes providing for separate but equal facilities for the races in public schools existed in 17 States, the Supreme Court having held in at least 6 cases that it did not violate the 14th amendment. That afternoon the Court declared the 58-year-old doctrine was inhibited by the Constitution.

Who changed the Constitution? The Court did.

The Justices of the Supreme Court can change their views but they cannot change the Constitution without violating their oaths to uphold it.

However, criticism of the Court is not confined to that case nor to residents of Southern States. The Court has aroused fears of many by expanding the doctrine of preemption and invalidating the Constitution and statutes of many States where Communists and Communist sympathizers were involved.

In the Nelson case (1956) the Court struck down a Pennsylvania law providing punishment for criminal conspiracy to overthrow the Government by force, holding that the Federal Smith Act superseded the law of Pennsylvania. Many other States had similar statutes.

There were other disturbing cases. In Slochower, the Court decided that New York, by law, could not prescribe qualifications for teachers. California and New Mexico were told they could not regulate the licensing of persons to practice law.

As we watched the trend we wondered whether local governments could survive. In the Congress several bills were introduced to regulate the appellate jurisdiction of the Court. In 1958 a bill introduced by Congressman SMITH of Virginia, limited the interpretation of the preemption doctrine, overwhelmingly passed the House and in the Senate was defeated by only one vote. The public was aroused, and the Court realized it. In 1959, in Uphaus, another 5-to-4 decision, the Court apparently reversed its 1956 Nelson decision, making a feeble effort to distinguish Uphaus from the Nelson case.

The Watkins decision, where the Court restricted the power of Congress to investigate, resulted in additional efforts to have Congress curb the Court.

Apparently the Court had begun to read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. In 1959, by another 5-to-4 decision, it took a different view of congressional investigations and declared, "The judiciary lacks authority to intervene on the basis of motives which spurred the exercise of that power."

Justice Frankfurter voted with the new majority. A vigorous dissent by Justice Black was concurred in by his usual associates, the Chief Justice, Douglas, and Brennan. The dissent charged that "exposure and punishment is the aim of the committee and the reason for its existence." Further, it said that the Un-American Activities Committee's inquiries "amount to an encroachment on the judiciary which bodes ill for the peoples of this land."

Of course, it is for the people to decide which bodes the greater ill, the encroachment of the House Un-American Activities Committee on the Judiciary or the attempted encroachment of the four Justices upon the power of the Congress.

During the recent session, the Court has been more conservative. Certainly the threatened legislation has done no harm, but for the improvement I shall always give credit to the 36 chief justices of the State supreme courts and the members of the American Bar Association who dared speak out against the trend of the Court to make of itself a third legislature.

In an effort to brainwash the South, it is argued that discrimination against Negroes is used by the Soviets to arouse prejudice against us. Well it has been 6 years since the Court decided the school cases. Do you think our relations with the Communists have improved?

If the Communists use such propaganda, the northern press, instead of furnishing them ammunition, should answer these falsehoods. They can show the superior living standards enjoyed by Negroes in the South as compared with the Soviet population. They can show that Negroes are engaged in all the professions; that in the large cities some are wealthy; that a large percentage of them own their farms and their homes; that those homes are equipped with modern conveniences and comforts; and, for instance, even in the small State of South Carolina, Negroes own more automobiles than the people of all Russia, excluding officials of government and the Communist Party.

We must let it be known that we will not change our way of life in the United States in the hope that it will lessen false Russian propaganda. Our liberty was not secured by a referendum among the rulers of other nations of the world, nor will it be preserved by slavish truckling to a Gallup Poll of the uninformed masses, literate or illiterate, throughout the world. Had we in 1776 submitted the issue of our form of government to a referendum, we doubtless would have established a monarchy and we would now have no excuse for the celebration of Independence Day.

We should have the courage to regulate for ourselves our domestic policies. We cannot let either the Asians or the Russians control the education of our children.

Our views about the wisdom of separating the races to promote peace and order are not provincial. It was a realization of the wisdom of separating the races that prompted 46 governments, including the United States, to agree in the Geneva Convention of 1929, that "belligerents, shall so far as possible, avoid assemblying in a single camp prisoners of different races or nationalities."

Of course, among our white citizens there are people of different views. Some few say they favor segregation in schools but are not opposed to token integration. They call themselves "moderates." That word has a new connotation. Now a moderate means an integrationist who lacks the courage to admit.

If the southern integrationist is a journalist and publicizes his views in some northern newspapers and magazines, he will be called a man of vision and courage. He may even be awarded a Pulitzer Prize.

If he is a member of the clergy, he will receive great publicity and possibly some compensation for magazine articles. If he uses the pulpit to preach politics instead of the Gospel, he may profit, but his church will suffer.

I respectfully disagree with those ministers who, in or out of the pulpit, now declare segregation laws to be un-Christian.

For more than a century in churches, North and South, the clergy led their flocks in segregated congregations. The people have looked to the church for theological guidance. If a minister honestly believed segregation un-Christian, it was his duty to make known his views, but I do not recall ever hearing this un-Christian charge until after the decision of the Supreme Court on May 17, 1954.

If any minister bases his theological views upon the decision of the Supreme Court, he ought to be reminded that the Court based its decision on the writings of radical sociologists and that no Justice made claim to having received divine guidance in reaching a decision in that case.

But you ask, What of the future? In the field of National and State relationships the new 5 to 4 majority on the Supreme Court gives hope of greater regard for the rights of the States and less judicial legislation.

In the field of segregation, only a reckless man would predict a reversal of the 1954 decision. However, we must not forget that for 58 years the doctrine of separate but equal facilities was repeatedly upheld by the Supreme Court, and yet it was reversed.

Now there is no evidence of a change of attitude in the Court or a change of sentiment in the political field, but I recall when our lawyers and politicians believed it would be impossible ever to repeal the 18th amendment. They said it couldn't be done. But it was repealed.

We must avoid a defeatist attitude. Our representatives in public office must not compromise principle for political support. What will it profit them if they gain public office and lose their own self-respect?

We must have courage. We must resist in every lawful way what we believe to be wrong, remembering the words of Abraham Lincoln, "To sin by silence when we should protest, makes cowards out of men."

Eau Claire Press Calls for Greater Opportunity for Small Business To Secure Government Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Marshall Atkinson, the editor of the Eau Claire, Wis., Press, has written an unusually persuasive editorial calling for greater opportunity for small business to take part in Government procurement.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

PROXMIRE BILL WOULD AID SMALL BUSINESSES

Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE'S latest bill to be introduced in the Senate makes sense to small manufacturers, but it may not to the Department of Defense.

The purpose of the measure is to give small businesses a greater opportunity to secure competitive Government contracts. Senator PROXMIRE points out that for the first 9 months of fiscal 1960, small businesses received only 15.7 percent of the total defense procurement as compared to 16.6 during fiscal 1959. In 1954 small businesses received 25.3 percent, the Senator reported.

The total defense procurement program in fiscal 1949 was $22,744 million, and 86 percent of the amount was negotiated. The small business share of this was about 11.8 percent. On the other hand, Senator PROXMIRE said, of the competitive contracts, only 14 percent of the total, was competitive, but of this amount small business' share was 47.5.

There is no question but what the Senator and the others who contributed to his bill have grounds to protest at the lack of competitive bidding for defense procurement. The bill, being introduced very late in the session, would require the Department of Defense to refer contracts of any substantial size to the Small Business Administration, so it can set up a screening process to see that small business is given the greatest opportunity.

Undoubtedly, a small number of very large corporations have been given the benefit of negotiated contracts. The reason given by the Department of Defense is that the complexity of new weapons and the exigencies of time make negotiated contracts preferable.

This, Senator PROXMIRE disputes, saying that he cannot believe competition would lengthen the time of delivery of needed weapons. He believes the bill would add incentive to competing companies to provide better products.

The chances of the bill passing this session of Congress appear, at this distance, to be dim. The lateness of its introduction and the probable opposition of the Department of Defense are two strikes against it. Nevertheless it is worthy of serious study and consideration, if not at this session then at the next.

Brooklyn Polish-American Home of Cleveland Celebrates 25th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, June 12, 1960, the Brooklyn Polish-American Home of Cleveland celebrated its 25th anniversary. On that occasion a silver anniversary banquet was held at the home, under the chairmanship of Mr. J. E. Szukalski, president of the Brooklyn Polish-American Home, Inc.

It was my pleasure to speak at this banquet and to pay tribute to the great work that has been accomplished through this organization for the civic, cultural, and religious advancement of the city of Cleveland.

By leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD my address on the 25th anniversary of the Brooklyn Polish-American Home:

I am very happy to participate in the 25th anniversary observance of the Brooklyn Polish-American Home. This home is a landmark in Greater Cleveland and a beacon light for many of the finest citizens in my district. It serves as a landmark for all to observe that here stands a tribute to those who came to our country and to our city from Poland to build a new life in freedom and to help us build this great country. It also serves as a beacon light for the rich culture, traditions, and religious dedication which mark the life and times of the Polish Nation throughout 1,000 years of history. The brick and mortar as well as the decorative features of this building would be meaningless without the spirit these thoughts convey. This, then, is the spirit in which we meet here today.

How comforting it is to reflect on the manner in which Americans of Polish origin have prospered and climbed the ladders of success in these United States. In all walks of life—the professions, the religious, the business world, our scientific and industrial life, in the arts and in government—we see the positive contributions of the American of Polish extraction. All this was accompanied by hard work and personal sacrifices. Nor must you see these results as a destiny fulfilled because the success story must be repeated in each generation. This is part of the story of America in which each of us are players and in which all of us carry responsibilities.

With this, the beauties and inspirations of Polish culture have been preserved and passed on to the coming generation. This, too, is part of the American story. It has always been the diversity of our people which has given the inner strength to our country. We are not a one-culture nation, nor are we a monolythic people who look alike, think alike, and act alike. We are a nation of many cultures, a nation in which native cultures from many distant lands have taken roots and have flourished. This, in turn, has given our Nation a treasure chest of values unequaled among the nations of the world. But with all this diversity, we are a people who are bound together in a common cause which takes its purpose from those great moral values and political ideals which have been the inspiration in all generations of Western civilization. These bonds of unity reach into the heart and mind of all our people. This, too, is part of the American story, that part which forms the hub around which the hopes and high expectations of our Founding Fathers have taken form and substance.

But there is another part to the American story which makes up the contemporary chapter. In our times, all that we hold to be dear as life itself is being challenged by a crude, noisy, but determined tyranny on the march. That tyranny is Russian communism, which today holds the land of your forefathers in a pitiless grip, which seeks to destroy 1,000 years of Polish heritage and to replace it with a soulless ideology. The chains of imperial Russian communism have been dropped over more than a score of once free and independent nations. And the appetite of conquest has not been satisfied. The Russians boast they are going to make the entire world their empire. Every still free nation is marked, but for conquest. No nation, no people, are exempt from the master plan the Muscovites are now attempting to impose upon the world.

It is fitting, therefore, on this occasion that we should turn our thoughts to captive Poland. By so doing we can catch a glimpse of what the Russians have in store for us and thereby we shall find the course of action our Nation must pursue in the immediate years ahead. For those who may doubt the true Russian intentions toward the United States, let me quote no less an authority on this subject than Tzar Khrushchev. Last September Khrushchev visited the United States on the invitation of the present administration in Washington. Within 1 week after departing our shores he visited Communist China to take part in the 10th anniversary of the Communist seizure of power in that country. Arriving at the airport in Peiping, he made this public statement: "We Communists believe in just wars, that is, wars of liberation through which we liberate people from capitalism." There can be no doubt of the meaning of this declaration. It means the Russians offer us peaceful surrender or a hot war. They allow for no other alternative in their global plans. It would appear that Khrushchev's visit to the United States and the reception given him by those who should know better only made him bolder in his claims.

The Congress of the United States, on the other hand, was not deluded by the Russian call for peaceful coexistence. Only a few weeks before President Eisenhower announced his invitation to Khrushchev to visit our country, Congress enacted the Captive Nations Week resolution. This is now Public Law 86-90. As you know, this law designates the third week of July as Captive Nations Week, a time for the American people to recall the sad plight of the people in these Russian occupied nations and to rededicate ourselves to the support of their just aspirations for liberty and independence. This law made the dictator Khrushchev furious—almost as frightened as he was over the U-2 incident. Vice President NIXON was in Moscow as the guest of Khrushchev one day after Congress passed the

law. Khrushchev asked him: "How could you do this to us." Apparently he expected much better treatment from the Vice President. I have wondered many times since whether the invitation to Khrushchev to visit our country was recommended by Vice President NIXON as a means of demonstrating that he knew how to deal with the Russians when they became angry. The Vice President has never disclaimed his connection with this political blunder of the century so I continue to wonder how important a part he played in this farce on the American people.

Neither Khrushchev's blustering nor his official visit to our country can remove or weaken the determination by Congress to keep alive the hopes for liberty and independence in Poland and the other captive countries. That law remains on the books until all the countries behind the Russian Iron Curtain are free.

It was my privilege to introduce this resolution in the House of Representatives. I worked to the limit of my abilities to cause its enactment. I remain dedicated to its high purposes.

The language and spirit of that law points the way for a new foreign policy under a new administration in Washington next January. I say this for two basic reasons. The first is that the law makes a finding that the desire for liberty and independence by the people of the captive nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace. So long as our allies behind the Iron Curtain, the captive non-Russian people, remain united with us in the spirit of human freedom, the Russian imperialists will not dare to launch a hot war. If they do, the Poles and other captive peoples will seize upon this opportunity to fall upon their Russian tormentors and destroy them. Thus, the Russians are certain to end up in total destruction of their empire. The only salvation for the Russians is for them to give up their empire of fear and to retreat behind their ethnographical frontiers—as did the Golden Hordes of the Mongols many centuries ago.

My second reason is that the American people have become fed up with the threats, boasts, and insults of the Russian tyrants. They are demanding a realistic policy toward the Russians, a policy which gives practical promise of peace with justice. We can no longer stand by while the captive people call out for their emancipation. The time has arrived when we must exert a relentless political, economic, and diplomatic pressure on the Russians to get out of all the captive nations or face the wrath of a thoroughly aroused free world. We have the military strength to back up such a policy and we had better act before it is too late.

Only last week the world was reminded of the endless struggles of the Polish nation to regain its freedom. Riots broke out there again over the denial of religious freedom to those devout people. Not one word of protest against the Russian-inspired action to destroy the historic faith of the Poles was made by official Washington. This is but another example of inert government, of government by absentee leaders, of government that must be changed if we as a nation are to measure up to the challenge which faces us.

The Brooklyn Polish-American home has been a beacon light these past 25 years for a people who know the meaning of faith in the future. I urge you to share this light with all your fellow Americans, to lead the way in calling out for justice for the long suffering people of Poland. In so doing you will be acting in the finest American traditions because we are a people dedicated to justice for all nations and all people.

Legislative Record of 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the 86th Congress adjourns sine die this fall, it will have, I am sure, written an impressive legislative record for the betterment of our Nation and its citizens. As we recess at this time, I believe it would be well to review some of our actions thus far and to look at the work remaining to be done. After the elections this fall, I am confident that we who will be reelected to the 87th Congress can look forward to receiving cooperation from a friendly administration in the enactment of progressive and enlightened legislation to secure and enhance America's future.

I have been pleased and gratified by a number of actions which have been taken in fields in which I have been especially interested.

I was particularly pleased to see both Houses of Congress produce programs to extend Federal aid for school construction purposes. Having made close and careful study of the classroom shortage problem in my own district, I realized that Federal aid was necessary to help not only my area but also the other States and local school districts. As you know, I have introduced a number of bills on the subject, and one of my suggestions on a loan program was adopted in part by the administration. I have maintained that one of the greatest investments we can make today to insure continuation of our way of life is in the boys and girls of America who will grow up to be the future citizens of this great Nation. If we are to triumph over the ideologies that seek to destroy our way of life and form of government, we must see that these future citizens are trained and ready to meet the challenges of the future. To do this, we must start by providing facilities within which to educate them. I look forward to completing action on this legislation when Congress reconvenes this fall and to formulating new programs to meet new needs in the education of our children.

Another area in which I have been seeking legislative action is on the problems which confront the economically distressed areas throughout the Nation. Automation, changes in the consumer market, an ever-increasing population rate are all making their impact on the labor market and causing pockets of unemployment and depression in our country. Such conditions are to the detriment of the entire country. Coming from one such area, which suffers one of the highest rates of unemployment, I have introduced and sought action on a program to extend Federal assistance in the rehabilitation of these areas and to provide jobs for the jobless. It was heartening to see the Congress pass this vitally important legislation, but it was extremely disappointing to see the President veto the measure. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that when we return, this matter will be again brought up and favorable action secured on a program to meet the needs of these depressed areas.

With approval of the rivers and harbors bill, I saw the realization of a project on which I have been working for several years, the improvement of the Trenton Channel in the Detroit River. This is one aspect of my program to enhance the economic welfare of my own area, which, of course, will ultimately benefit the State of Michigan and the Nation as a whole. I was pleased to secure the cooperation of my colleagues in the House and in the Senate in obtaining approval and funds for the implementation of this project this year. And I look forward to securing similar approval in the succeeding Congress on projects which I have in varying stages of completion and others which I will initiate to improve the economic climate in my area, by making available the deep-water channel and port facilities that industry is always seeking for their expansion programs.

As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have been actively working on the problems of the postal and civil service employees. We have been successful in having granted to these worthy citizens a much needed cost-of-living pay increase which puts their salaries more in line with those in private industry. The committee has reported for favorable action a number of other measures important to the welfare and well-being of our civil servants. Among them are three of my bills, one to provide a health and hospitalization benefits program for retired civil service employees, another to protect postal employees from sudden and unjustified salary cuts, and another to establish a more equitable salary schedule for employees promoted from one grade to another to provide for an incentive for the promotion of the better qualified people. I shall actively seek final approval of these measures when we reconvene in August.

It was my pleasure to support and see passage of the civil rights bill this year to insure that every citizen in the United States will be allowed to exercise his constitutionally guaranteed right to vote for the people he wishes to have represent him in public office.

I had hoped for favorable action on my proposals to revise the Federal income tax structure so as to give the individual taxpayer and small businessman relief and to eliminate excise taxes which had been imposed during emergency periods. You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that my bills were drafted to provide this tax relief without any loss of revenue which the Federal Government needs to provide the services that our citizens need and demand. By closing some of the loopholes and special concessions in the tax laws, this purpose can be accomplished. However, in the absence of such revision and realizing that the Federal Government must have revenue to continue functioning, I reluctantly

joined in the passage of another year's extension of the excise tax laws. I strongly feel that serious consideration must be given to the tax situation and I shall continue my efforts to have action taken.

All of us are very much concerned with the plight of our older citizens who must live on fixed incomes while the cost of living spirals ever upward. The passage by the House of Representatives of a bill to provide for increased benefits under the existing social security programs and to authorize a new program to help the retired folks meet the high costs of hospitalization and medical care is, I believe, a clear indication that we are aware of and responsive to their needs.

Mr. Speaker, much remains to be done in the months ahead, not only on the subjects which I have mentioned here briefly but on numerous measures for the welfare of our Nation and our citizens. When the final session of the 86th Congress comes to a close this fall, our record, individually and collectively, will demonstrate to the American people that we have acted wisely, judiciously, and in their, and the Nation's best interests.

Support Growing for Lorenzo de Zavala Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, upon the resolution of the Harris County Commissioners Court and after expressions of interest and support by several other individuals and organizations, I recently introduced a bill providing for the Federal Government to transfer portions of the surplus San Jacinto Ordnance Depot land to the State of Texas for establishment of a State park.

This property consists of 281 acres adjacent to the family homestead and cemetery of Lorenzo de Zavala, a great Texas patriot who was the first Vice President of the Republic of Texas, and one of the signers of the Texas Declaration of Independence.

Since I introduced the proposal, four more organizations—the Harris County Historical Society, the Sons of the Republic of Texas, Sons of Confederate Veterans, and the Sons of the American Revolution—have passed resolutions asking the preservation of this property as a Texas shrine.

In addition, the Houston Post, one of Texas' finest daily newspapers, published an editorial supporting the bill which I filed. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the editorial from the Houston Post of July 3, 1960, entitled, "Ordnance Depot Land Sought for Park."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORDNANCE DEPOT LAND SOUGHT FOR PARK

Across the Houston Ship Channel from San Jacinto Battleground lie 10 acres which include the homestead of Lorenzo de Zavala a signer of the Texas Declaration of Independence and the republic's first Vice President. Within the acreage is the Zavala Cemetery, containing remains of members of this remarkable family. The cemetery and the homestead are included in San Jacinto Park, which includes the famous battleground, although the two areas are separated by the channel. The Zavala site itself is surrounded by land belonging to the San Jacinto Ordnance Depot.

There has been a growing feeling that the historic land which once belonged to this important early Texas family should have a stronger connection with the popular San Jacinto Battleground. Certainly, the historical connection between two is strong enough. After the battle which won for Texas her independence from Mexico, the Zavalla home across the San Jacinto River was used as a hospital.

The danger that the separation of the two historical sites may be a permanent one and even result in complete isolation of the Zavala site lies in action by the Government's General Services Administration, which has put the ordnance depot property up for bids. If this land should be sold, Zavala site would be completely isolated from the rest of the park and its historical significance confined to the pages of history books, since it would no longer be accessible to the public.

In an effort to prevent this from happening, the commissioner's court of Harris County has passed a resolution asking the Federal Government to refrain from disposing of the land immediately adjacent to the homestead and cemetery, and asking for necessary legislation to give the land to Texas as part of San Jacinto Battleground Park. Now Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH of Texas has made a similar request of the Federal Government, which gives some hope to those interested that this important historical site will take its rightful place alongside the battleground with which it shares historical importance.

There is every merit to the request that the Federal Government release the ordnance depot land adjacent to the Zavala site. Citizens of Houston and Harris County should put their sentiments in the matter on record in support of the county commissioners' resolution and Senator YARBOROUGH's request, and send them to him in Washington before the August 1 deadline. With sufficient local backing, the Senator may succeed in his effort.

A Reminder by Francis Walter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, FRANCIS WALTER, chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities, delivered an outstanding and memorable address at the Wyoming Monument commemorative exercises, Wyoming, Pa., which should be read by every American in these days of Communist aggression. Mr. Speaker, his timely warning to all of us follows:

Come with me as we walk back through the corridors of time a century and a half and more. We find ourselves right here in this beautiful valley which is the favorite gathering place of Indian tribes who come from miles around. Here we see the Six Nations of the Iroquois in their tribal conferences, and here we see an area which the white man covets. Then we see the Indians, over the strong opposition of King Hedrick, greatest of the Mohawk chiefs, deeding this very land to the white man.

As we linger in this valley, the shot heard around the world pierces the quiet of this very air. The Revolutionary War begins. Practically all of the able-bodied men leave here to serve in Washington's army to fight for freedom from British rule. The attraction of this valley does not go unheeded, for now we are in June of 1778, and we witness a combined force of Indians, British troops, and Tories under General Butler, who have set out from the village of Queen Esther, then the Iroquois monarch in New York. They have traveled by canoe down the Susquehanna. By July 1 they have captured the northern half of the valley and have reached Mount Lookout, leaving behind them a trail of blood and death. Their progress through the valley is marked by methodical massacre of everyone who falls into their hands—men, women, and children. We now behold them as they stand astride Mount Lookout, where they map their plans to pillage and sack the remaining villages.

In the valley, besides the women and children, there are only old men, boys too young to serve in Washington's army, and men of military age too sick to serve. Under the leadership of Cols. Zebulon Butler and Nathan Denison, they organize a force some 300 strong. Though outnumbered 3 to 1, they march out of Forty Fort on the morning of July 3, 1778, to meet an enemy they know they have no chance of defeating.

The British troops wait in their concealed positions until the Americans are within 300 feet—and then open fire. The Indians attack and fold the left flank of the American force. The battle itself lasts scarcely 30 minutes. The American ranks are decimated. The survivors surrender or try to flee.

The end of the battle, however, does not mean that the bloodletting is to end. Instead, it marks the beginning of the Wyoming massacre which lasts until at least the following morning. On the battlefield and around the Indian campfires that night, we see Americans who had surrendered honorably on the field of battle and other inhabitants of the valley who had been captured, being put to death by savage torture. Some have their bodies pierced by spears. Others are burned at the stake.

We grimace as we look toward Bloody Rock and see over a dozen Americans executed by Queen Esther herself. We shudder as the Indians hold them—one by one—singing the Indian death chant, while Queen Esther crushes their skulls with a huge maul.

Slowly you and I plod back again to the 20th century, and we find ourselves today with certain questions which we must ask. Why did this feeble band not flee as soon as word of the advancing enemy forces reached them? Did they not realize the futility of engaging in mortal combat an enemy that outnumbered them; that was fresh from victory after victory; that was infinitely better equipped and trained?

My friends, the answer to these questions rings through the ages until today. It is this—that there are certain causes for which men are willing to give their lives.

"Give me liberty or give me death"—"I regret that I have but one life to give for my country." Where are these voices today?

Instead, we hear: "I would rather crawl on my knees to Moscow, than die under an atom bomb." Or—"It would be better to live un-

der communism than to risk death and destruction in a thermonuclear war."

If we could bring to this scene today, here on July 4, 1960, those brave men and boys who were massacred here 182 years ago, I am confident they would utter these words: "We would rather that our bodies be blown to bits by all the destructive physical force of the international Communist empire, than to succumb to communism which destroys the soul and the mind, as well as the body."

Was the Battle of Wyoming—and the Wyoming Massacre—a needless waste of American lives? An 1837 petition to the Congress from the people of this valley made the following statement:

"The blood and tears shed at Wyoming were not shed in vain. Perhaps few incidents during the war provoked stronger sensations of horror and pity, throughout Europe, than the Wyoming Massacre. Perhaps few circumstances had so powerful a tendency to discredit, in public estimation, the arms and efforts of the enemy or had a stronger influence in arousing the people of the whole civilized world in behalf of the American cause."

Yes, hundreds of people died in this valley on July 3, 1778. But they did not die in vain. Their blood, their sacrifice, not only strengthened the resolve of the American armies, but were vital factors in rallying world support to the cause of the Colonies. In this sense, it was a defeat for the enemy. In death, the people of this valley achieved a victory.

A little over 3 years ago, the people of Hungary rose up against their Communist oppressors in what was deemed a completely hopeless cause. To the amazement of the world, they utterly defeated the Red occupation armies and won a complete initial victory. Then the Soviet Union threw in new massive forces. The Hungarians begged the free world, in God's name, to help them. But the most powerful free nations on earth responded with nothing but pious words and phrases, and, since that time, have welcomed the "Butcher of Budapest" everywhere within their borders. And so the people of Hungary were slaughtered by the tens of thousands. Many thousands more were shipped off to slave labor camps in Siberia—and Hungary today still lives under Communist tyranny.

Did the Hungarian freedom fighters die in vain? Like the Wyoming Valley Army, will they win a victory in defeat? To paraphrase the petition of the people of this valley to Congress in 1837, few incidents "provoked stronger sensations of horror and pity" than the Hungarian massacre and few circumstances "had so powerful a tendency to discredit * * * the arms and efforts of the enemy or had a stronger influence in rousing the people of the whole civilized world" in behalf of the Hungarian and the whole anti-Communist cause.

May I again ask: Did the Hungarian freedom fighters die in vain? The answer to that question will not be known until history records the last battle in the struggle between communism and the forces of freedom. In the ascendancy of the Communist conspiracy, it is reliably estimated that at least 40 million human souls have been murdered. In Red China alone, the most conservative estimates are that 20 million human souls have been crushed by this human meat grinder. It is almost impossible for us, as we stand in this peaceful valley, to comprehend just what these statistics impart. All the wars in history have not taken anything like this number of human lives. Let me give you at least a faint idea of what these statistics mean.

Let us suppose that when this ceremony is ended we were to embark on a tour that took us to every corner of our native State, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and that, after we had covered every inch of its territory from north to south and east to west, we went into the neighboring State of New Jersey and did the same thing there; then we traveled south to Delaware; west again through every mile of the State of Maryland; then into the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital; and finally all through the State of Virginia.

Let us suppose that on this tour we saw not a living soul, but that everywhere we went in each one of these six formerly populous States we saw nothing but corpses—thousands, hundreds of thousands, millions of them. We would then have some idea of what, according to the most conservative estimates, the Communists have done to the people of China alone.

West Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio would be added to the list if I were to use the higher estimates of the human slaughter committed by the Chinese Reds. It would be beyond our ability to imagine, even in a gruesome nightmare, each one of these millions of deaths taking place one by one—many of them as a result of fiendish torture.

This is an appalling picture, a picture painted by a monstrously inhuman regime—a regime which some people in this country and some of our allies say should be recognized by the United States and admitted to the United Nations as a peace loving nation.

Today, we hope that, with God's grace, nothing like what has happened in Russia, Hungary, in China, Tibet, and Eastern Europe will ever take place in this country. But we must not think that it cannot possibly take place here. Our enemy is rapidly extending his power throughout the world. His agents are growing in strength in every nation that has so far been spared Red bloodletting. To date, we have failed to stop him. Today, he is not only entrenched 90 miles from our shores, but has thousands of agents within our borders. They are in our schools, our PTA's, our churches, civic groups, our entertainment media—in every phase of our national life—and are growing in strength. This I know from incontrovertible evidence and testimony presented before the Committee on Un-American Activities. The enemy is working day and night to destroy our freedoms and our Government, just as surely and with as deadly a purpose as that of the British, Indians, and Tories in the Revolution.

What can we do now to assure that it will not happen here?

My friends, the hour is late. We must begin today to do everything in our power to see that the enemy forces entrenched in our society are eliminated, beginning on the local community level and going on up through the highest levels of our political, economic, and social structure.

We must insist that our Government do everything in its power to destroy the international forces of communism which threaten not only our lives and our freedom, but every advance wrought by thousands of years of human civilization in every part of the globe.

Today we know the enemy is at hand. He himself has told us so over and over again. And he has told us, too, just what he intends to do with us. "We will bury you," he says.

Today, unlike our Wyoming Valley forebears, we have all the tools, the weapons, the strength, needed to defeat our foe. But we have refused—and are still refusing—to make full use of them. We lack the will. We seem to lack the devotion to freedom that all men must have if they are to remain free.

The Great Wall of China was designed and built centuries ago to be impregnable. Its massive strength was tested time and time again by direct physical assault. But three times within a single generation enemy forces pierced this barrier, not by reason of physical strength, but by bribing the guards. In this hour we know that the military might of the free world is such that we can destroy in a matter of hours any aggregation which might unleash physical attack upon us. Like the walls of ancient China, our armed might appears to keep us invulnerable. How about the guards? At this very moment, while I am speaking to you, hundreds of Communists and other subversives who at one time were denied security clearances to serve on merchant vessels have now gained Coast Guard documentation to serve on the merchant vessels which are vital conduits for our defense—all because of strained constructions by the courts which fail to recognize the conspiratorial nature of the Communist operation.

While I am speaking to you at this very hour, there are over 100 employees of the Federal Government who were dismissed as security risks, but who have since gained reemployment in the Government, because of still other decisions by the courts which have all but destroyed our loyalty security program.

While I am speaking to you now, the tie-lines and lease-lines carrying security information out of the Pentagon itself, and the North Atlantic Cable, are serviced by the American Communications Association, which is controlled, lock, stock and barrel, by the Communist Party.

While I am speaking to you now, traitorous American citizens who are international Communist agents, are coming and going around the world with U.S. passports issued to them because of the breakdown in our passport control system.

Yes, my friends, our freedom is at this instant imperiled, not by lack of military might, but by lack of the spirit, vision and courage which prompted our Wyoming Valley forebears to challenge with their all, that force which threatened them.

These are things we must think about today as we remember and honor the spirit and the deeds of the early settlers of this valley and the way many of them died. They have given you and me, each one of us, the most precious thing of life—freedom and honor.

We leave this brief ceremony then with this question which each must answer to himself: Will I be true to the memory of our Wyoming Valley forebears who gave their all for the cause of freedom?

Highlights of National Affairs Platform of American Veterans Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the American Veterans Committee has distinguished itself as an organization dedicated not to the interest of veterans alone but to the welfare of all Americans and to the growth and well-being of our great Nation.

Recently, at its national convention at Atlantic City, N.J., which I had the pleasure of addressing, the AVC adopted a farsighted and praiseworthy national affairs platform, giving its views on the needs and goals of the United States

during the age of change and challenge of the 1960's.

I ask unanimous consent that highlights of this platform be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS OF NATIONAL AFFAIRS PLATFORM OF THE AMERICAN VETERANS COMMITTEE, ADOPTED AT THEIR 1960 CONVENTION, JUNE 10–12, AT ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.

GOVERNMENT AND LIBERTY

I. The Nation's freedom—The Bill of Rights

1. We reaffirm the basic right of all Americans to due process of law, the right to counsel and to freedom from unlawful search and seizure. We oppose all efforts to suppress freedom to believe, speak, write, assemble, criticize, and dissent.

2. A. We urge the passage and enforcement of Federal legislation and regulations which will insure the equal protection of the laws, regardless of race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, or sex.

B. In furtherance of the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court calling upon the States to integrate their school systems "with all deliberate speed" we urge the passage of Federal legislation which will—

(1) Direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to give technical assistance to communities engaged in integration—as well as draw up plans for any community which has failed to initiate such integration plans of its own.

(2) Give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the duty of seeking assistance from the Attorney General to enforce the above through all legal means at hand.

(3) Provide Federal funds to help support school systems deprived of State financing because of State or local laws designed to hinder or evade integration.

(4) Empower the Attorney General to seek injunctions or proceed under law on behalf of persons claiming deprivation of civil rights or liberties.

C. We urge the enactment of Federal, State, and local legislation to prevent discrimination in—

(1) Voting.
(2) Housing.
(3) Employment.
(4) The use of facilities and accommodations open to the public.

D. We urge inclusion in all Federal legislation of a provision requiring loans or grants to be used without discrimination (recognizing, however, the right of any institution to limit its religious services to the members of a particular religious denomination or to limit its services to the members of one sex).

E. We urge protection by Federal law of all members of the Armed Forces from physical violence, because of race, color, ancestry, national origin or religion.

F. We urge making lynching a Federal crime.

G. We favor Federal legislation making it a crime to bomb or to conspire to bomb school, church and other public and quasi-public property.

H. We believe in the principal of church-state separation and are therefore opposed to the use of public funds for church-administered schools.

I. We favor freedom from censorship of newspapers, magazines, radio, television, motion pictures and other media.

J. We oppose wire-tapping and electronic eavesdropping.

3. A. The right against self-incrimination should not be diluted or impaired.

B. The right of an American citizen to travel abroad should not be arbitrarily abridged by the Federal Government.

C. We urge revision of the immigration and naturalization laws to eliminate racial and religious discrimination, to eliminate the outdated national origins quota system and to do away with distinction in the treatment of native born and naturalized citizens.

We urge that all hearings on immigration and naturalization matters be subject to the safeguards of the Administrative Procedure Act.

We urge a revision of the statutes and practices governing deportation (a) to provide a reasonable statute of limitations; (b) to preclude deportation of those charged with activities which were legal when undertaken; (c) to preclude deportation of those who arrived in the United States as children and who have spent the major portion of their lives in the United States.

II. The Nation's Government

1. The right of the people to full knowledge of Governmental affairs must not be abridged, except where disclosure would imperil the national security.

2. We urge proper changes in the rules of the Congress of the United States which will make it possible for the majority of the Members to vote cloture or close debate on legislation after a reasonable period, and which will make merit, not tenure alone the standard to be used in the selection of committee chairmen.

3. Federal payments to the States for aid to schools in federally impacted areas, for assistance to the blind, disabled, dependent children, and the aged, for slum clearance, waste treatment facilities, vocational education, and hospital construction must be continued.

4. We urge reapportionment within the States based on current population distribution.

5. The Federal civil service:

A. Apart from discharges based on reorganization of Government activities or reductions in force, Government employees should be discharged only for cause and through due process of law.

B. The rights granted to veterans in the Veterans Preference Act in regard to discharge procedures and appeals should be extended to all Government employees except those in probationary status.

6. We urge that the District of Columbia receive (a) the right to full local self-government; (b) the right to vote in presidential elections in proportion to its population; (c) the right to elect one nonvoting Commissioner to the House of Representatives; (d) a fixed annual contribution in lieu of property taxes on federally owned property within the District.

ECONOMIC SECURITY

III. Basic economic policy

1. We continue to support the Employment Act of 1946 which states it is the policy of the Government to create and maintain "conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking to work and to promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power."

2. We urge Congress to establish a Department of the Consumer, to be headed by a Secretary of Cabinet rank.

3. Maximum prosperity, without inflation, can only be attained and maintained so long as the national economy continues to expand at a rate equal to our population growth, plus rising productivity per man-hour. National policies and programs to insure this rate of national economic growth should be established.

IV. Monetary and tax policy

1. Monetary policy:

A. We urge the increase of and additional appropriations for much-needed social, welfare, and economic measures as sound investments in the well-being of our Nation.

B. We urge easier credit for small business, homebuilding, and the family farm.

C. We urge the establishment of a Federal capital budget for reimbursable public-works projects with a life in excess of 5 years.

II. Tax policy:

Increased economic activity, together with stricter enforcement of our tax laws, should produce much of the income needed to finance the Government programs which we support.

We urge the elimination of special provisions in the internal revenue laws which are discriminatory in nature.

We also call for an end to the abuse of the deductibility of business expenses.

V. Housing and urban renewal

AVC is vitally aware of how closely the country's economy and well-being are dependent upon the building and housing industries and of the continued need for additional housing at reasonable rents. With this in mind, we offer the following housing program:

1. That the FHA and VA insure mortgages for a term up to 40 years with low down-payments, and that the Federal Government make said mortgages attractive investments to lending institutions.

2. An enlarged and vigorous middle-income program, both publicly owned and privately sponsored, including consumer cooperative housing.

3. That the Government (municipal, State, Federal) pursue a vigorous program of urban renewal planning and make provisions for the smaller builder-owner and individual owner to participate actively.

4. Vigorous enforcements of present Government antidiscrimination clauses in FHA and VA loan provisions and a Federal law insuring open occupancy in all sales and rentals.

5. Continued and expanded publicly owned housing for low income groups, together with a government stimulated, privately sponsored program to provide housing for said groups.

6. That the Government (Federal, State, and municipal) make allowance in the form of subsidized additional mortgage guarantees and real estate tax abatement to builders and owners who make special provisions for the disabled and the aged.

VI. Conservation and development of natural resources

We view the development and conversation of our natural resources as a vital part of the Government's role and policymaking function in the economy.

1. We suggest the reorganization of the Department of Interior as a Department of Natural Resources to promote effective application of the principles of conservation and development to all segments of our national life concerned with natural resources, and to center Federal responsibility in this field clearly within a single agency.

2. We urge the Department of Interior and Agriculture to continue and expand their programs of education and control designed to encourage wise conservation practices. We further request the appropriate committees of Congress to remain constantly vigilant to prevent by any unnecessary destruction or loss of the truly irreplaceable resources of soil and forest.

3. We recognize that, if water use continues to increase at its present rate, we shall be faced within a century with the necessity of using and reusing every gallon of water available from natural sources within our country.

A. We, therefore, reaffirm our strong support of the comprehensive river basin development (one river—one plan) principle.

B. We urge the accelerated application of this principle to our great river basins and

condemn the abandonment of this principle by the present administration in the Hells Canyon conflict and the violation of the comprehensive plan for the Columbia River Basin.

C. We favor enactment of legislation to establish a coordinated Great Plains Administration and the coordination of separate regional developments of this type, both with respect to river valley considerations and to national economic policies.

D. We urge the Federal Government to undertake the planning and construction of multipurpose water and power projects similar to the one provided for in the Tennessee Valley.

E. With the limitations of fresh water from natural sources clearly in view, we ask for development and conservation of all our water resources for maximum domestic, agricultural, industrial, and recreational uses.

F. We urge the Department of the Interior to expedite the program to develop economic means of converting brackish and saline waters into usable fresh waters at economic cost.

4. We call for the establishment of a rational, comprehensive national policy to guide the development and use of our energy resources, especially:

A. The maximum feasible development of our only perpetually renewable energy resource, the hydroelectric power of our great river systems, including Federal construction of such multipurpose power dams.

B. A continuation and acceleration of the Federal programs to develop and stimulate development of effective processes for the utilization of our immense reserves of oil, shale, and coal.

C. The speedy development of atomic energy (both fission and fusion type) for power and other peaceful purposes.

D. We urge the establishment of a rational and coherent national policy to maximize the benefits available from the great strides technology has made in high-capacity, high-voltage generation and transmission of electric energy.

5. We urge an increasing expansion of our national park system and national forests for recreation of the people of the United States and for preservation of wildlife and the conservation of the few remaining wilderness areas in our country in their natural state.

6. We strongly recommend enactment of laws making it mandatory for the executive branch to submit to Congress for prior approval any proposal to sell or grant proprietary privileges in Federal-owned land or resources to private interests. We oppose revocation of Federal commitments entered into by treaty between the U.S. Government and various Indian tribes.

VII. Agriculture

We believe that the land, water, and other natural resources should be used and conserved by owners and operators in such a manner as to pass on these irreplaceable natural resources undiminished to future generations.

We are convinced that families on family farms can best conserve these priceless national assets.

We believe that these aims can be attained through combined individual and cooperative private action with and under programs of democratic government.

Industrialized agriculture, in competing unfairly with family-type farming, must be brought into compliance with all labor and welfare legislation which now protects nonfarm industrial workers. Only as these long overdue extensions of coverage are made can more than 2 million migrant farmworkers be given first-class citizenship in our economy; only as this is done can family farm operators be assured of the fair competition needed for their survival.

VIII. Labor and social policy

We urge:

1. An increase in the Federal minimum wage to $1.25 and extension of Federal minimum wage legislation to cover employees now excluded.

2. Federal standards to increase unemployment insurance benefits, more realistic eligibility standards, and lengthening of the period for which benefits are paid.

3. Improved social security benefits.

4. Amendment of the Taft-Hartley Act to outlaw State right-to-work laws, to compel the NLRB to accept jurisdiction whenever an employer is actually engaged in interstate commerce, to grant strikers the right to vote in certification elections, and generally to establish labor's equality with management in labor's own sphere.

5. Enactment of laws for the full disclosure of the administration of pension and health and welfare plans, whether administered by unions or management or jointly by both.

6. The recently disclosed abuses in labor union management call for labor vigorously to clean its own house with the aid of Federal remedial legislation. Caution should be exercised in regard to legislation dealing with internal union management so that it will strengthen, not weaken, an independent democratic labor movement. In particular, we oppose proposals to bring the labor union under the sway of the antitrust laws.

7. Legislation requiring unions to admit to membership qualified applicants without regard to race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, or sex.

8. Legislation granting official recognition to Federal employee unions.

IX. Education

We call for active governmental leadership and support:

1. To promote widespread recognition of the fact that "in the quality of education lies the fate of freedom itself," to provide educational opportunity for every American to the limits of his capacity, and to identify the talented among us and challenge them to their highest achievement.

2. To insure the availability of adequate funds for public school construction and raising teachers' salaries, and for necessary expansion of the physical plant in tax-supported institutions of higher learning.

3. To improve and extend existing scholarship and loan programs for college and university students.

4. To extend scholarship and exchange programs for study by Americans abroad and by nationals of other countries in the United States.

5. To appropriate adequate Federal aid to communities impacted by Federal programs.

X. Public health

We urge:

1. Increased Federal expenditures for research in the prevention and cure of illness.

2. Expansion of medical insurance and group medical care plans, including a plan for national health insurance.

3. Expansion of public health facilities and services, hospitals and nursing homes, and facilities for the rehabilitation of the aged and disabled.

4. Access by patients to all health facilities and services, hospitals and nursing homes without regard to race, color, ancestry, national origin, religion, or sex.

XI. Civil defense

Aware of the importance of a vigorous civil defense effort to the very survival of the United States and its people, AVC favors effective action at all levels of governmental and individual effort in order to secure the maximum degree of protection.

The Two Tasks of Conservatism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted, I would like to include in the RECORD the following address delivered by Robert F. Croll at a Youth for Goldwater Rally, held in Chicago, Ill., June 22, 1960:

There is a saying that nothing is so powerful as an idea whose time has come. In trying to foresee what ideas will grow to power in the future, Americans often consult the trends of thought among young people. The ideas which stir them, which move them to action, are the ideas which, in years to come, will rule the Nation.

The burden of my talk here tonight is that collectivism, so long considered the movement of the future, is fading; that a new idea is surging through the young people of this country, and that its day is coming soon.

The new idea is the idea of conservatism.

Exactly how soon its time will come is hard to say, for this is not a normal period of history. It is a period of continual crisis, which imposes a twofold task on the conservative: to deal with the crisis that is upon us, and to build for the time when the new idea will move to dominance.

It used to be that standing for principle, on the one hand, and riding "the wave of the future," on the other, were considered as separate and mutually exclusive activities. You could not believe in time-honored traditions and still be in league with tomorrow. Thus collectivism, driven by its will to power, moved into political control in most of the countries of the world—and to a large degree in the United States. But statism contains the seeds of its own destruction, both in terms of working economics, and in terms of fundamental value.

Because it is not rooted in anything permanent, collectivism could not last. Like all things which are essentially frivolous, it became stale and empty with a little use.

So, I believe, we are now in the down-cycle of collectivism. At college campuses across the Nation, young people are turning away from the dogmas of the left, and taking up what to them are the new ideas of limited government, the free economy, and a firm regard for the sovereignty of the United States. They have had their fill of Government intervention, swollen bureaucracy, and the variety of internationalism which holds that America can do no right, and her enemies can do no wrong.

As the pendulum swings, conservatism is resurgent. As an idea whose time is coming, it is comparable to collectivism in its own hey-day. But there is this crucial difference: whereas the collectivist movement was based solely on the urge for novelty, and on adolescent denial of the moral order, the conservative revival combines the appeal of the new and the different with the lasting power of transcendent value.

America's young conservatives today, as I have seen them, are united both by their enthusiasm in a common fight, and by their deep belief in the traditions and values of this Nation. Thus, as its time approaches, as it is toughened and refined in the fires of crisis, conservatism grows always stronger, and must inevitably triumph.

But that, as I say, is the long-range objective, and so only part of the conservative's task. While the process of change is taking

place, the young conservative realizes that the political framework of the struggle can itself be destroyed—and that the struggle can therefore be rendered meaningless.

His worry is that the current orthodoxies of statism at home and weakness abroad may either wreck our country from within or deliver it inadvertently into the hands of the foreign enemy.

He knows that with the swing of the pendulum his side will triumph, but his first concern must be to preserve the existence of the clock.

For these reasons, today's young conservative must be a tactician; he must have a good working knowledge of the political alternatives available to him and choose those which offer the best chance of holding the line in the contemporary political arena while the dynamic forces of change are doing their work.

Thus, America's youth is today gathering beneath the political banner of Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, the statesman who, in our opinion, speaks most clearly in behalf of the policies which can preserve our freedoms at home and sovereignty abroad.

For those who are not fully acquainted with Senator GOLDWATER's views on current issues, I highly recommend his book, "The Conscience of a Conservative." It is, I think, the most straightforward confrontation of the problems we face that has ever appeared under the byline of a public official.

I will not go into all the particulars of the Senator's views now, or the particulars of the conservative position as a whole, but will offer instead this paraphrase: "The practical conservative begins, first of all, by acknowledging that these are not normal times; that this is, indeed, a time of crisis, which demands extraordinary effort. Until we recognize that unusual effort is called for, we cannot hope to achieve practical results."

The most serious aspect of the crisis, I believe, is presented by the threat of Soviet communism and its designs on the sovereignty of the United States. It is the most serious because it is the problem we have shown the least ability to understand, and so have dealt with least effectively.

It is now routine, of course, to say we have dealt improperly with the Communist menace, to decry the vast strides the Communists have made, and to demand greater effort in the struggle with the Kremlin. The trouble is that most of these demands themselves betray the very misconceptions which have brought us to our present impasse.

For example, the recent statements by a member of my own party, Governor Rockefeller, of New York. Rockefeller recently issued a statement criticising the Eisenhower administration and Vice President NIXON for, among other things, not having spent enough on defense, and in general alleging that the administration had not properly handled national policy relative to communism.

So that there will be no misunderstanding of my own position, I would like to take this opportunity to repudiate, as forcefully as I can, the stand taken by Governor Rockefeller. As a Republican, I believe I am more than willing to give my first loyalty to principle, rather than to considerations of partisan advantage. And I would be among the first to agree that a political party thrives on the free discussion of issues.

But I think Rockefeller has done a grave disservice not only to his party—and to Vice President NIXON, his party's acknowledged candidate for President—he has done a disservice to the country as a whole, by clouding issues and giving aid and comfort to the very forces of weakness and confusion which have contributed so much to our series of retreats at the hands of the world Communist empire.

I think I second the sentiments of Senator GOLDWATER, and of all other conservatives, when I repudiate utterly the kind of criticism that Rockefeller has directed at the administration, and express my solidarity with Vice President NIXON in the face of it.

I note with interest that the Rockefeller stand has been endorsed by one of the Democratic candidates for President, STUART SYMINGTON, who says: "I thought his proposals were all right." SYMINGTON added that "our only differences were in degree"—meaning that Rockefeller proposed about 10 times as much additional defense spending as did SYMINGTON.

All of this, in my view, represents a complete misunderstanding of what is happening in the world, and of what the United States must do to cope with it.

To the Rockefellers and Symingtons, greater effort against communism means simply spending more money. Reacting in terms of the mistaken assumptions which have put us where we are, they believe that a satisfactory response to communism can be purchased out of the Federal Treasury—that a challenge at the level of fundamental value can be met with dollars.

But the point about our present crisis, as the conservative sees it, is precisely that the challenge cannot be answered in these terms. And we have stumbled into our present dilemma precisely because we have consistently let them control our thinking about the Communist onslaught.

The crisis is not a crisis of dollars or of military hardware. It is a crisis of mind and will.

It is a crisis of mind because we have not properly measured the intentions of the Communist leaders, and so have not created a policy that can counteract them.

It is a crisis of will because, even when we have glimpsed what the Communists are up to, we have not had the firmness to stand up to them.

If anyone thinks that the answer to Communist techniques of aggression is simply to manufacture more arms, he is sadly mistaken. Let him consider the fact that in the decade immediately following World War II, the United States was unquestionably the preeminent military power of the world. Yet in that same decade, world communism pushed forward its offensive in every sector of the world—without satisfactory response from the United States.

We had the physical means of stopping the Communists; but, not understanding their techniques of aggression, we did not know how to apply the means. And even when the application was clear, we did not have the will to act.

This lack of understanding and lack of will are aggravated, rather than helped, by statements such as that issued by Governor Rockefeller.

By suggesting that the problem is a mechanical one, to be met with increased dollar outlays, Rockefeller sustains the country's confusion as to what the Communist challenge consists of.

By picturing the United States a second-class power, and building up an image of a Soviet colossus ready to obliterate us, he further weakens our national will to resist.

Contrary to Rockefeller's statements, the objective facts show that the Eisenhower administration has not beeen at all derelict in providing the physical means for national defense; the United States is today, by every known test, the paramount military power of the world; and while continued efforts to keep her so are desirable, those efforts themselves can do little to stop Communist advances around the world.

The conservative believes that America's performance can be improved, first and foremost, by clearing away the delusions shared by many people in both parties—the delusion that we can get along with communism, or coexist with it, if only we try hard enough.

The conservative believes that the first step toward wisdom in foreign policy is to realize that the free world is already at war with communism, and that our choice is therefore simple: to win the war, or to lose it. This means that no foreign policy can succeed which simply stipulates peace as its guiding objective.

Senator GOLDWATER puts the matter this way in his book: "We want a peace in which freedom and justice will prevail, and that—given the nature of communism—is a peace in which Soviet power will no longer be in a position to threaten us and the rest of the world. A tolerable peace, in other words, must follow victory over communism. We have been 14 years trying to bury that unpleasant fact. It cannot be buried and any foreign policy that ignores it will lead to our extinction as a nation."

The conservative believes, then, that an improved foreign policy has little to do with Governor Rockefeller's pleas for greater spending.

What is needed, instead, is to transform the basis for our strategic thinking—to move away from the defensive goal of coexisting with communism and toward the goal of destroying communism as a world force. We must arm ourselves in the determination necessary to win the war we are in.

Does this mean that we start shooting? On the contrary. As Senator GOLDWATER observes, it means that we must adopt a realistic course which can save us from being pushed into a corner where shooting alone can get us out.

Detailed prescriptions for such a course are set forward in the final chapter of Senator GOLDWATER's book, entitled "The Soviet Menace." Without enumerating them, I will note that they have to do with stopping all activities aimed at conciliating the Communists and with seizing the initiative from Moscow. The object of our policy should be to confront the Communists with the continual problem of whether to yield to our demands rather than the reverse.

This means, in particular, a strategy which no longer considers Communist-held territory as an immutable status quo, never to be disturbed by our policy. It means a strategy directed at the liberation of the nations now held captive by the Soviet Union, using all conceivable means at our disposal.

Such is the counsel of conservatism in the crucial area of preserving America's national existence against Communist aggression. It is counsel that calls up and depends upon the system of value which collectivism has sought to extinguish—commitment to freedom and to national sovereignty and honor.

It is counsel which, we think, will secure the continued existence of an arena of free thought and free political activity in the United States. It is the first task of practical conservatism which makes the second task possible.

Bishop A. Frank Smith, One of the Great Leaders of Methodist Church, Is Honored in Houston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a short time ago Bishop A. Frank Smith, of Houston, one of the Nation's best

known and loved Methodist leaders, retired after 43 years of dedicated ministry.

In honor of his outstanding and devoted work, Houstonians recently joined Methodists and many others from across the Southwest in observance of Bishop Smith's unstinting service.

In an editorial marking the occasion, the Houston Post observed:

No minister in Texas was ever held in deeper affection by his fellow clergymen or the church membership, which fact is a tribute to his own high character, his brotherly love, and his sincere interest in his fellow men. His retirement will be a distinct loss to the church, but all its members will hope and pray that he will continue his association unofficially for many years to come.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the excellent editorial on Bishop Smith's work as it appeared in the Houston Post of June 1, 1960, under the heading, "Bishop Smith One of Methodism's Greatest."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BISHOP SMITH ONE OF METHODISM'S GREATEST

Methodists of Texas will honor one of Houston's most revered and admired churchmen Wednesday evening in the Sam Houston Coliseum. He is Bishop A. Frank Smith, and he is retiring after 43 years of dedicated ministry. For 30 years of that time he has been a bishop—one of the few in Southern Methodist history to fill a bishopric for that long.

The annual meeting of the Methodist Church's Texas Annual Conference, in session in Houston this week, will be the 26th and last at which he will preside.

He came to Houston as a young minister, 32 years old, in 1922, to be pastor of the First Methodist Church, the largest in southern Methodism. He came here with a bright record of 8 years' ministerial experience, at Alto, Detroit, Dallas, Austin, San Antonio, and, during World War I, as an Army chaplain.

Beginning as bishop of the Oklahoma, Missouri, and Indian Conferences in 1930–31, one of the youngest ever elected a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, he has since presided over the St. Louis, southwest Missouri, Missouri, Illinois, Indian Mission, Texas, north Texas, Oklahoma, west Texas, Louisiana, southwest Mexican, and Rio Grande conferences. Among various other high offices he has held in Methodism was the presidency of the council of bishops.

At Wednesday evening's special service, some of the leading figures in Methodism will pay tributes to Bishop Smith; and everyone present, from all parts of the Texas Conference, who know and love him, will sincerely share the plaudits.

No minister in Texas was ever held in deeper affection by his fellow clergymen or the church membership, which fact is a tribute to his own high character, his brotherly love, and his sincere interest in his fellow men. His retirement will be a distinct loss to the church, but all its members will hope and pray that he will continue his association unofficially for many years to come.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. And, Mr. President, the story from the Houston Post of June 2, 1960, concerning the meeting honoring Bishop Smith, which was entitled "Four Thousand Methodists Salute Retiring Bishop Smith."

There being no objection, the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOUR THOUSAND METHODISTS SALUTE RETIRING BISHOP SMITH

(By Kent Demaret)

Approximately 4,000 Methodists gathered in the Sam Houston Coliseum Wednesday night to say goodby to retiring Bishop A. Frank Smith.

Bishop Smith, one of the two Methodist bishops assigned to Texas, has served the Methodist religion for 46 years, the last 30 years as a bishop, the last 27 years as a bishop of the Houston area.

He is 70 years old and the spiritual leader of 400,000 Methodists.

The ceremony to honor Bishop Smith was one of the highlights of the 22d annual meeting of the Methodist Church's Texas Annual Conference which will continue through Friday in Houston. It will be the last conference over which Bishop Smith will preside.

His retirement becomes official June 26 at the South Central Jurisdictional Conference in San Antonio when the Methodist Churches of Texas will elect his successor and five additional bishops to serve the seven-State area taken in by the jurisdictional conference.

Bishop Smith and his wife Bess were presented with a new automobile and an undisclosed amount of cash as a token of esteem by Texas Methodists. Mayor Lewis Cutrer officially proclaimed June 1 as "Bishop Smith Day" in Houston.

Bishop Smith and his wife also received telegrams from statesmen, businessmen, university presidents and ministers of all faiths who expressed regret at his retirement and gave thanks for his past services to the community.

Bishop W. C. Martin of the Dallas-Fort Worth area represented the Council of Bishops and Texas Methodism at the farewell ceremonies.

Bishop Martin praised the abilities of Bishop Smith. "We thank God that He's given you to us," Bishop Martin said.

Dr. Ralph W. Sockman of Christ Church, Methodist, New York City, delivered the sermon. He hailed Bishop Smith as both a "prince and a pioneer." Dr. Sockman said Bishop Smith had maintained his contacts with all that was good in the past and still looked ahead.

Dr. Sockman said Bishop Smith's influence in the church at large has been tremendous, and marveled at his abilities to maintain a personal touch with lay members of the church despite his many administrative duties.

Bishop Smith also received tribute from representatives of the ministers and laymen of his conferences.

Dr. Monroe Vivion, representing the ministers, cited Bishop Smith's "devotion to duty * * * devotion to God, his good will and kindly, patient and thoughtful personality" as outstanding traits.

John S. Redditt, representing the laymen, said, "Bishop Smith has been applied Christianity."

Bishop Smith, obviously touched by the display of devotion by the Methodists, spoke to the audience for a few minutes along with his wife.

"It is impossible to transfer the thoughts and emotions of this hour into words," Bishop Smith said. "I can't say anything tonight except thank God for all of you. If everything you have given me tonight was gone but the memories I could ask for nothing more."

Mrs. Smith told the audience she would use their cash gift to buy a home, the only one they have ever had besides the parsonages.

Bishop and Mrs. Smith have three grown children and several grandchildren. They live at 1049 Kirby Drive.

SBA Renders Disservice to Vermont Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. MEYER
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, early in February of this year my office was contacted by persons interested in the disposition of a furniture company in Brattleboro, Vt., which was facing bankruptcy, and thereupon began a story of disservice and disregard by the Small Business Administration which I believe should be made a matter of record. This account is from the point of view of efforts made by me and others to obtain cooperation and assistance from SBA for local business leaders who were trying to save a small industry. Their efforts were thwarted, and the manner in which the affair was handled by the Small Business Administration deserves to be recounted.

Templeton Furniture Co. of Brattleboro was the industry in question. Small Business Administration carried a mortgage of some $149,000 on its property, and parenthetically, this in itself is an item which should have an explanation when one considers that the total amount for which the assets were finally sold was only $84,000.

The problem for Brattleboro early in February was what steps could be taken to save this manufacturing plant as a going concern to provide income and jobs for the community. Original contact was made with my office by W. Robert Johnson, Sr., on behalf of the Industrial Development Committee of the Brattleboro Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Johnson asked that I contact Small Business Administration to see what disposition would be made of the plant, and especially what could be done in cooperation with local business interests to make it possible for another local furniture manufacturer, who needed it, to acquire the space and equipment.

My first discussions on the matter were with the staff of the House Small Business Committee, and it became apparent from their inquiries that SBA would dispose of the property by auction. It was my understanding that SBA probably had discretionary powers as to the manner of resale, but apparently it is their policy in such cases not to negotiate directly with buyers. Rather they go for the top dollar, and this they seek at an auction.

Later in February, Mr. Johnson was passing through Washington, and this afforded opportunity for him to talk directly with responsible officials at SBA to see what could be done to help interested local parties acquire the Templeton plant. A meeting was arranged, and this

took place on February 25 with Mr. Frederick C. Stoddard, Director of the Office of Loan Administration at SBA. Mr. Stoddard was joined by Mr. William A. Chadwell, Chief of the Liquidation Division, and both Mr. Anthony Buraczynski of Brattleboro and Mr. John Carnahan of my staff were with Mr. Johnson. It was reported that they discussed the whole range of problems in disposing of the Brattleboro property, and Mr. Stoddard was most cordial in assuring that SBA was interested in helping the community retain the plant as a going concern. In particular, it was the understanding of the Vermonters present that final approval of any sale would have to be given here in Washington, although arrangements would be handled by the SBA office in Boston. In the meantime, other representatives of the chamber of commerce, including Manager George Vakalis, and Mr. Leon Sandman, president of Alpine Wood Products Co., which wanted to acquire the plant, had talked at length with Mr. Albert O'Shea of the Boston office. From both sources, the understanding clearly was that final approval of any sale would be given by Washington.

This matter of final approval has importance to the outcome of the story, because all through the events that followed it was the definite understanding of the Brattleboro people that there would be top level review following the auction. It was hoped that in this way final consideration could be given to the community's efforts to save the property intact as a going concern, and that the needs of the community and small business could and would be taken into account in the final disposition of the property.

Community concern was indicated by local activity to make arrangements for helping to finance a buyer such as Alpine Wood Products, and it was expressed in various statements, including the following petition by the selectmen of the town of Brattleboro:

TOWN OF BRATTLEBORO,
Brattleboro, Vt., April 20, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM MEYER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEYER: It has been brought to our attention by the Industrial Development Committee of the Greater Brattleboro Chamber of Commerce that it would be very much in the best economic interest of the town of Brattleboro if the forthcoming sale of the Templeton property could be held as soon as possible and sold as a package so that it can be maintained as a productive manufacturing plant.

There is, at the present time, at least one local manufacturer extremely interested in acquiring the property. This party needs additional space desperately in order to meet increased production schedules this summer. The present employment of this manufacturer is 35 to 40 and would increase to 50 to 60 as soon as they could move. They have the potential of employing 90 to 100 production workers within 90 days.

We are also informed that there are other industrial prospects who are interested in acquiring the property as a unit and feel certain that there would be several bidding.

In view of these facts, we respectfully petition the referee and the Small Business Administration:

1. That the arrangements be made to hold the sale at the earliest possible date.
2. That the property be offered and sold as a package which would include the land, buildings, machinery and equipment.

Very truly yours,

W. H. MOORE,
ERIC G. W. BARRADALE,
WILLIAM R. CAMPBELL,
HENRY ANGELL,
L. R. WHITMAN,
Selectmen, Town of Brattleboro, Vt.

A letter similar to that from the selectmen was also received from Mr. Leslie E. Snow, president of the Brattleboro Chamber of Commerce, and he reiterated the importance of selling the Templeton property intact so that it could continue to function as a local industry. Jobs for Brattleboro workers were a principal concern of all involved, and the Brattleboro Daily Reformer on May 18 called editorially for an outcome to assure that "the building and machinery could be put to work again providing jobs and incomes for Brattleboro families."

The petition of the selectmen was forwarded to the Small Business Administration with my letter urging action along the lines sought by the Brattleboro leaders, and a reply was received as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1960.

Hon. WILLIAM H. MEYER,
House of Respresentatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MEYER: This is in reply to your letter dated April 22, 1960, to Mr. Frederic C. Stoddard, Director, Office of Loan Administration, concerning the interest of the selectmen of the town of Brattleboro, Vt., in Templeton Furniture Co., Inc.

We have received a letter from the selectmen and have assured them that we will be glad to cooperate with them in any way we can, consistent with the laws of Vermont and the regulations under which this agency operates.

As you may know the company filed a petition in bankruptcy in August 1959 and the trustee attempted without success to sell the property over a period of approximately 7 months. He abandoned the plant about the middle of March, at which time the U.S. attorney, representing this agency, instituted foreclosure. We are advised that under the laws of Vermont a period of approximately 3 months will be required to complete the foreclosure.

The foreclosure sale will be under the jurisdiction of the court in which the action was filed and the property will be sold to the highest bidder.

We have requested the selectmen to advise our Boston regional office of any plans they may develop for purchasing the property and have asked our Boston office to keep the selectmen informed of the progress of the foreclosure action so that all interested parties may make arrangements to bid at the sale.

Your interest in the matter is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP MCCALLUM,
Administrator.

Again, we were assured of cooperation, and also there was written assurance that the foreclosure sale would be under the jurisdiction of the court. This, together with our understanding that Washington would give final approval to SBA's sale, had the effect of misleading Brattleboro leaders as to how final disposition would be made. Contacts had been made with the Boston SBA office as recommended, and negotiations locally to help finance an industry to take Templeton's place were progressing satisfactorily.

The next report was on the day of the sale itself, June 9, 1960. Procedure at the auction called for the property to be offered first as an entirety, and on this there was some bidding in which Mr. Sandman, the local manufacturer with local backing, was successful at $80,000. The real estate was then offered as a separate lot, and taken by a Mr. Denerstein, for $40,000. Sandman did not bid on this as the only financing arrangement offered by SBA of which he was aware was on the land and equipment as an entirety. Machinery and equipment were then offered as a separate lot, and this also was taken by Mr. Denerstein, after raising his own bids to $44,000. Denerstein, listed as an auctioneer and machinery dealer, is reported to have been at the sale representing several interests, including his own, a woodworking machinery company, and a machine and motor company, all in New York. To many who were there he was a speculator.

To complete the auction the machinery and equipment were then offered piecemeal, and for this the total bid was $43,935—or $65 less than Mr. Denerstein had bid for the machinery in a lot. A conference followed between Mr. Denerstein and Mr. O'Shea, the Boston SBA representative, and through some understanding which has never been adequately explained, Mr. Denerstein waived his right to the machinery and Mr. O'Shea announced that the piecemeal bids would be accepted. In fact, he announced also that the sale had been completed, and buyers began carrying out pieces of equipment.

At this point the question was raised immediately about final review of the terms of sale by higher officials in SBA, and contrary to all previous understandings from Boston and from Washington, it was finally learned that Mr. O'Shea had gone to Brattleboro with full delegated authority to complete the sale, provided the total price exceeded $80,000. This fact came out for the first time in conversations here in Washington with Mr. Chadwell on June 10, the day after the auction began, when he stated that authorization had been given the Boston office 2 weeks earlier to go ahead to sell on terms set under SBA regulations. Despite all of our understandings and our entreaties of concern about the manner in which the sale would be handled, this delegation of authority had been settled and approved 2 weeks earlier here in Washington, and not one word about it had been given to any of the interested parties. Not only that, but Chadwell assured us that there was no further court responsibility in the sale, despite Administrator McCallum's written assurance on May 3 that the "foreclosure sale will be under the jurisdiction of the court."

There was also a question raised immediately about the terms on which the sale had been completed. The Brattle-

boro understanding was that SBA would offer terms on the property only when sold in the entirety. At the sale, terms were given to Denerstein on the real estate alone. In reply to questions from my office, SBA states it was announced that terms would be given on the real estate and machinery separately, provided the successful bidder on both was the same person. Possibly this was announced verbally at the opening of the auction, but it certainly is not to be found anywhere in the written brochure for the auction. Furthermore, the Brattleboro business people who had talked with Mr. O'Shea and others at length, were never aware of the possibility of such an arrangement. From all appearances Denerstein was the only one of the interested bidders who knew of this possibility, and furthermore, in his agreement to waive his right to the higher bid on the machinery as a lot, he apparently made a deal with Mr. O'Shea by which the financing terms would still be available to him on the real estate alone. Thus, not only was he allowed to withdraw his top dollar bid to which SBA was so firmly committed in holding the auction, but also a special, unannounced ,and unexplained arrangement was made by which his purchase was financed by SBA.

No such consideration was ever shown to the Brattleboro community. In fact, in retrospect it clearly appears that the town was thwarted in all its efforts to work out an arrangement for keeping the industry. For one thing, the procedure of offering the property intact first, and then by lots, puts those wanting to hold the industry together at a disadvantage. Although this is evidently standard practice for such auctions, the Brattleboro experience raises serious questions as to whether this best serves the purpose of keeping the plant together.

SBA told my office on June 10 that all Alpine Wood Products needed to do was to make a higher bid on the entirety than Denerstein did on the lot bids. How was Alpine or anyone to be sure of doing that when the bidding on the lots followed the entirety? And more important, why should not the order have been just the other way so as to let the man who wanted to buy the whole plant see if he could outbid the lot buyers? Set up as it was, the burden was all against the man who wanted the whole plant, and the advantages were all in favor of the speculator or lot buyer who wanted to clean the business out. Does this procedure serve the purposes for which Small Business Administration was established?

There were many unanswered questions in Brattleboro as a result of the way the auction was conducted. The Reformer described it as "a strange piece of business," and the matter has even been referred to the U.S. attorney for investigation as to possible irregularities or illegalities. So far no report has been made as to whether technically such was the case. Regardless of technicalities, it is clear that the SBA rendered a disservice to this Vermont community, and certainly broke faith on every count with the civic groups that tried so hard to work out something to keep the property intact so that it could be maintained as a productive manufacturing plant. Indignation has been expressed on every side in the community, and this editorial from the Brattleboro Daily Reformer for June 24 expresses local sentiment:

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

When U.S. Attorney Louis G. Whitcomb was asked by the chamber's industrial committee to come to Brattleboro last week to discuss the public auction conducted by the Small Business Administration on the former Templeton property, the local businessmen were seeking information and advice on what had appeared to them to be "highhanded" methods of operation by the SBA. It had been hoped, prior to the auction, that the Templeton building and equipment could be acquired by a local furniture manufacturer who was seeking means of expanding a successful business and that by this means many of the former Templeton employees could again find jobs in their trade.

But a Federal auction proved to be a strange piece of business, leaving many unanswered questions in local minds. There was the question of why the SBA should have shown so little interest in helping put this property back to work creating jobs; why the local manufacturer seeking to acquire it should have been denied a Federal mortgage on the building when the successful bidder was granted one; why the building and machinery as a package were put up for auction first and then auctioned separately, rather than in opposite order; why—especially—a successful bidder on the machinery as a whole was permitted to be relieved of his bid and his suggestion followed that the machinery go in separate units at a lower "take" for the Government and the taxpayers. To be sure, the lower figure was only $65 less than the high bid for the whole lot; but even if it was only 65 cents lower the question of why a lower bid was accepted would be legitimate.

As taxpayers and as a group of citizens working for Brattleboro's industrial growth, the chamber committee turned to the U.S. attorney to shed light on a Federal procedure. They still don't have the answers. They have, rather, the feeling that they got the "brush off" from Mr. Whitcomb, in the process of which they were told by the U.S. attorney "not to say anything to the newspaper about anything discussed at this meeting." Since Mr. Whitcomb refused to say anything to "this newspaper" himself, we also are unable to report whether the auction procedure of the SBA was proper.

We can say, however, that the more we see of Federal officials who profess to work for the best interest of "the Government" we wonder at just what point they began to forget that the Government is "the people."

A small business has been dismantled, and the manufacturer who wanted to operate it is now reported to be looking elsewhere for a plant. A community effort to reopen a small industry was thwarted. The moral of this apparently lies in the policies and attitudes of the Small Business Administration, and certainly this experience raises serious doubts as to the agency's real concern for small business. SBA cannot point to a single concrete way in which it helped small business in this Brattleboro episode. Possibly by relating this experience others can be forewarned of the pitfalls in such negotiations.

There may even be some poetic justice, too, in the report lately received that the boilers at the plant in question have been condemned and thus the speculator may have paid considerably more than its worth.

America as Seen by Its Presidents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as Congress began its recess on July 3, This Week magazine published its Fourth of July issue. In keeping with the spirit of the day, as well as the spirit of the era, this well known weekly reprinted words uttered by each of our Presidents to show that each had confidence in the American system and that each predicted great expansion and greater strength for our Nation.

I believe that this compilation of quotations should be of interest to all Americans. It is something that many will want to keep, to reread, and to remember.

I ask that this article, entitled "America as Seen by Its Presidents," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA AS SEEN BY ITS PRESIDENTS

George Washington, 1789–97: "The name of American * * * must always exalt the just pride of patriotism. * * * The independence and liberty you possess are the work of join councils and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes."

John Adams, 1797–1801: "I must study politics and war, that my sons may have liberty to study mathematics and philosophy * * * in order to give their children the right to study painting, poetry, music."

Thomas Jefferson, 1801–09: "The new circumstances under which we are placed call for new words, new phrases, and for the transfer of old words to new objects. An American dialect will therefore be formed."

James Madison, 1809–17: "The face of our country everywhere presents the evidence of laudable enterprise. * * * In the extension of manufactures * * * we behold a rapid diminution of our dependence on foreign supplies."

James Monroe, 1817–25: "The emigrants * * * although of different political parties and of different religious sects * * * all flow from persecution, in pursuit of liberty, and they inculcated that sentiment on their descendants."

John Quincy Adams, 1825–29: "America, in the assembly of nations * * * has invariably * * * held forth the hand of honest friendship. * * * She has uniformly spoken among them * * * the language of equal liberty, equal justice, and equal rights."

Andrew Jackson, 1829–37: "As long as our government is administered for the good of the people, and is regulated by their will * * * it will be worth defending."

Martin Van Buren, 1837–41: "The effects of distance have been averted by the inventive genius of our people, developed and fostered by the spirit of our institutions."

William Henry Harrison, 1841: "Of all the great interests that appertain to our country, that of union * * * is by far the most important, since it is the only true and sure guaranty of all others."

John Tyler, 1841–45: "Let it, then, be henceforth proclaimed to the world, that man's conscience was created free; that he is no longer accountable to his fellow man for his religious opinions, being responsible therefor only to his God."

James K. Polk, 1845–49: "While the people of other countries are struggling to establish free institutions, under which man may govern himself, we are in the actual enjoyment of them—a rich inheritance from our fathers."

Zachary Taylor, 1849–50: "Sixty years have elapsed since the establishment of this Government * * * and the United States presents to the world the most stable and permanent government on earth."

Millard Fillmore, 1850–53: "The ability to produce every necessary of life renders us independent in war as well as in peace."

Franklin Pierce, 1853–57: "While men inhabiting different parts of this vast continent cannot be expected to hold the same opinions * * * they can unite in a common object and sustain common principles."

James Buchanan, 1857–61: "We shall best promote the prosperity of the new States and Territories by furnishing them with a hardy and independent race of honest and industrious citizens."

Abraham Lincoln, 1861–65: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We * * * will be remembered in spite of ourselves. * * * The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation."

Andrew Johnson, 1865–69: "It is the only government suited to our condition; but we have never sought to impose it on others, and we have consistently followed the advice of Washington to recommend it only by its careful preservation."

Ulysses S. Grant, 1869–77: "Our republican institutions were regarded as experiments up to the breaking out of the rebellion. * * * Now our people have proven themselves to be the most formidable in war of any nationality."

Rutherford B. Hayes, 1877–81: "It is vain to hope for the success of a free government without the means of insuring the intelligence of those who are the source of power."

James A. Garfield, 1881: "To all our means of culture is added the powerful incentive to personal ambition. * * * No post of honor is so high but the poorest may hope to reach it."

Chester A. Arthur, 1881–85: "No higher proof could exist of the strength of popular government than the fact that, though the chosen of the people be struck down, his constitutional successor is peacefully installed without shock or strain."

Grover Cleveland, 1885–89, 1893–97: "Our Nation * * * lives in us—in our hearts and minds and consciences. * * * The land we live in seems to be strong and active. But how fares the land that lives in us?"

Benjamin Harrison, 1889–93: "Our growth has not been limited to territory, population, and aggregate wealth. * * * The facilities for popular education have been vastly enlarged and more greatly diffused."

William McKinley, 1897–1901: "The mission of the United States is one of benevolent assimilation, substituting the mild sway of justice and right for arbitrary rule."

Theodore Roosevelt, 1901–9: "Like all Americans, I like big things: big prairies, big forests and mountains, big wheatfields, railroads * * * and everything else. But no people ever yet benefited by riches if their prosperity corrupted their virtue."

William Howard Taft, 1909–13: "We have taken millions of foreigners into our civilization, but we have amalgamated them, and * * * we have made them all Americans. We have bred to a type."

Woodrow Wilson, 1913–21: "America * * * consists of all of us; and it can consist of all of us only as our spirits are banded together in a common enterprise. That common enterprise is the enterprise of liberty and justice and right."

Warren G. Harding, 1921–23: "The motor car has become an indispensable instrument in our political, social and industrial life. There is begun a new era."

Calvin Coolidge, 1923–29: "It would be folly to argue that the people cannot make political mistakes. They can and do make grave mistakes. But compared with the mistakes which have been made by every kind of autocracy they are unimportant."

Herbert Hoover, 1929–33: "We believe in equal opportunity for all, but we know that this includes the opportunity to rise to leadership, to be uncommon. The great human advances have not been brought about by mediocre men and women."

Franklin D. Roosevelt, 1933–45: "This great Nation will endure as it has endured, will revive and will prosper. * * * The only thing we have to fear is fear itself—which paralyzes needed efforts to convert retreat into advance."

Harry S. Truman, 1945–53: "We want to * * * do the things in peace that we have been able to do in war. If we can put this tremendous machine of ours * * * to work for peace, we can look forward to the greatest age in the history of mankind."

Dwight D. Eisenhower, 1953——: "What we call foreign affairs is no longer foreign affairs. It's a local affair. Whatever happens in Indonesia is important to Indiana. * * * The world must learn to work together—or finally it will not work at all."

Armenia Commemorates 42d Anniversary of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on June 4, 1960, a rally was held in New York City to commemorate the 42d anniversary of the national independence of Armenia. This was a significant occasion because the Armenian nation and people were among the first to declare their national independence and complete separation from the Russian empire during the period 1917–18. At that time many other nations declared their national independence and separation from the Russian empire. This was an era in which the spirit of freedom and national independence dominated the lives of the people between the Baltic and Caspian Seas and signaled the beginning of a new order among the nations of this vast area based upon the promises of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This great hope was snuffed out by the Russian Bolsheviks who, by the use of terror, infiltration, and armed aggression, destroyed the national independence of Armenia and many other newly independent countries.

The flame of freedom, the hope for a return of national independence, burns brightly in the hearts and minds of the people of Armenia. They are not satisfied with the dismal and oppressive way of life imposed upon them by Moscow. Armenians in the free world and their friends commemorate this anniversary each year as a means of strengthening the bond of friendship which exists between these subjugated people and the American people.

Under unanimous consent I include my address in the Appendix of the RECORD.

ARMENIA WILL BE FREE AND INDEPENDENT

Forty-two years ago a series of inspiring events took place in many distant lands which gave promise of bringing to war-weary mankind a long era of peace with justice.

This inspiring series of events were the declaration of national independence by the many nations submerged by the tyranny and despotism of Russian imperialism. The stimulating air of freedom, liberty, and personal dignity was everywhere as the chains of imperial slavery were smashed by the will of millions of people who determined to be masters of their destinies. In a real sense, history records that period as the golden age of national independence.

Today we commemorate the 42d anniversary of the establishment of the Armenian Independent Republic. May 28, 1918, marks the official date of the rebirth of the national independence of that ancient and honored nation. This is a day which will never be forgotten by Armenians everywhere and anywhere in the world. It is a day cherished by all people who love freedom, and particularly by Americans because our basic political belief is that all men are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights—that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our Founding Fathers determined that the pursuit of happiness required the national independence of the Thirteen Original Colonies, that life and liberty for the colonists would not be secure until that independence was won. Each generation of Americans has been dedicated to this great ideal. We in this generation want nothing more for ourselves and we seek nothing less in our national purposes for all the people of the world. That is why Americans in all walks of life pay tribute to the freedom-loving people of Armenia on this anniversary of their national independence.

This year 1960 marks the 42d anniversary of National Independence for many other nations. On this day we are mindful that the people of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, White Ruthenia, Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Cossackia, Turkestan and Idel-Ural marched arm in arm with the people of Armenia in the common fight for a better world, a world order based upon the right of all nations and people to self-determination. Nor do we forget that the people of Poland, Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria were allies in this great struggle. Our memory of this golden era of national independence is not dimmed by the present tragic plight of all these nations. We remain convinced that it is the destiny of all mankind to be free, that the divine order of the world moves steadily in this direction and that we are on the threshold of a new and brighter era.

The Congress of the United States gave official voice to this conviction in the passage last year of the Captive Nations Week resolution, now known as Public Law 86–90. This law now stands as the basic framework for a positive and realistic foreign policy for the American people.

Events of the recent past expose both the fallacy and the dangers of attempting to resolve world tensions by dealing with the jailers of the Russian Communist prison of nations. The Russian leaders have demonstrated beyond any doubt that this meaning of peaceful coexistence is the road to war or peaceful surrender. They leave us no other alternative once we accept the mirage of this high-sounding slogan. The Eisenhower administration must be credited with providing all the evidence necessary to awak-

en the American people to this reality. No one can, in honesty, argue that the present administration did not go the full distance on the theme of peaceful coexistence with the Russian Communists, nor can it be said that the visit of Tzar Khrushchev to the United States was not a part of this dangerous game. Vice President NIXON deserves and should be given credit for the part he played in this international drama which ended up with a Russian villain, but no American hero.

It is time that the debris and offensive odor resulting from the collapse of the peaceful coexistence drama was cleared from the national political arena. It is time that the American people were presented with a foreign policy which corresponds with the hopes and aspirations of the common man the world over. It is time that we turned our attention to the oppressed and away from the oppressors. It is time that we recognized the worldwide struggle, for the minds and hearts of the common man cannot be won with dollars and will be surely lost unless we unshackle the power of our American moral and political ideals. It is time that we recognize wars have never been averted by timid men or halfway measures and that the winning of a just peace entails risks which free people must accept if they are to remain free.

These are fundamentals which we, as a united people, must face now and in the foreseeable future. I am convinced the vast majority of our people have awakened fully to this need. The bursted balloon of peaceful coexistence has awakened them from the sleep of a Disneyland world into which they were led by the slogans of the Madison Avenue soap salesmen. As a nation, we are back on the hard and rough road to a just and lasting peace and the road markers are found in the convictions and moral principles set forth in Public Law 86-90.

These thoughts, I believe, are both fitting and proper on this day when we commemorate the 42d anniversary of Armenian national independence. The valiant struggles by the Armenian people to win their national independence and the terrible sacrifices they have made in these past 40 years to preserve their national heritage demand that we who are free, speak with candor. We must be honest in the analysis of our national affairs, unafraid to accept the responsibilities which our nation, as the citadel of human freedom, inherits from the march of world events, and responsive to the aspirations for freedom held by the people of Armenia and all other captive nations. These things we must do if we are to pass through the threshold to that new and brighter era when peace with justice and freedom shall prevail for all nations and all people.

Tribute to Richard W. Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve with a very distinguished Congressman from Illinois, Richard W. Hoffman, who represented the 10th Illinois District and who voluntarily retired in 1956.

In addition to his public service in the Congress, he was deeply interested in education and for a number of years served as president of the board of education for the J. Sterling Morton High School in that area. Under his guidance this great school became one of the top 10 educational institutions in its class in the entire country, and has made magnificent progress in the field of scholarships, efficient administration, and in returning to the taxpayers of that area a full dollar's worth of value for every tax dollar spent.

I believe the tribute carried in the Life paper, published in the 10th Congressional District, is a fitting tribute to one who served with such distinction in the Congress and who has served his community so well.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial accolade be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Like a substitute who is sent into a game in the closing minutes to lead a last desperate rally, Hoffman literally and figuratively pulled up Morton by its own bootstraps in the depths of the depression in 1933 when he started his first term on the high school board.

From his wealth of experience as a successful businessman, Hoffman eliminated some 135 payrollers. With the school district's credit exhausted, Hoffman showed his resourcefulness by going emptyhanded to the Western Electric Co., where he obtained a sizable and unsecured loan so that the high school could remain open and its teachers could be paid.

He won respect for himself and the school by his obvious sincerity and his responsibility, plunging into the complex problems and emerging with winning solutions at great personal financial sacrifice to himself and to his own expanding business.

At the end of his first term in 1936, Hoffman found it necessary to devote more time to his personal business affairs—but he never lost his interest in Morton High School.

When 1939 rolled around, Morton's affairs had degenerated into even worse shape than was the case in 1933. Our community was embarrassed by nationwide unfavorable publicity from school strikes, and low teacher and student morale.

Teachers and other employees were being paid in scrip, which was being discounted as much as 50 percent by insiders in the high school picture.

The sad state of affairs at Morton was documented in a bill of particulars drawn up and approved by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, the accrediting agency responsible for approval of high school and college educational standards.

Only strong protestations prevented Morton from being ousted by the association. A year's probation, however, was voted with a provision for reinstatement if Morton cleaned up its mess within a year.

Urged by scores of true Morton friends, Hoffman agreed to be a candidate. The rest is history. During the next three terms, until he was elected to Congress as the 10th District's first Representative, Hoffman gave unsparingly of his time, his efforts, and his resourcefulness to make Morton the outstanding institution it is today—free of political domination, respected by educators everywhere, a leader in the educational field and in sound financial condition.

What better tribute could there be for a man—and who would be more deserving than for the Morton High School Board of Education to name the stadium for Richard W. Hoffman, whose ever-increasing majorities at the school election polls demonstrated the feelings of the people in the district for his efforts on their behalf.

Minimum Wage Bill: Completing the Record

SPEECH

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 30, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12677) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to provide coverage for employees of large enterprises engaged in retail trade or service and of other employers engaged in activities affecting commerce, to increase the minimum wage under the act to $1.25 an hour, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, in order for me to give my full support to this bill, I feel that I must offer the three following amendments:

SERVICE STATION OPERATORS

On page 18, line 2, delete the word "or" and add the following "and any enterprise primarily engaged in the retail sale of gasoline and lubricating oils."

HOTELS

On page 19, strike out lines 11 through 19 up to the semicolon on line 19, and insert the following:

"(16) any employee of an employer engaged primarily in the preparation and offering of food or beverages for human consumption either on the premises of the establishment where such employee is employed or by such services as catering, banquet, box lunch or curb or counter service, to the public, to employees or to members or guests of members of clubs; and services in connection therewith; or any employee of a hotel employed in connection with the preparation or offering of food or beverages for human consumption and services in connection therewith."

RESTAURANTS

On page 5, line 23, after "merger" insert the following:

": *Provided further*, That in determining the aggregate annual dollar volume of sales of a hotel for the purposes of this definition, sales by restaurants and other eating places operated in connection with such hotel shall not be considered."

In private discussions with the gentleman from California, Congressman ROOSEVELT, the author of the bill, I have his assurance that we will accept these three amendments. I will state further that if some other Member gets recognition ahead of me and offers amendments similar to these, I shall support them. The gentleman from California, Congressman ROOSEVELT, substantiated my discussions with him when he stated on the floor:

There are two or three other things about which some of the Members seem to be quite concerned. One is in connection with the restaurant business of hotels. It was our intention to try to clear this up in the best possible way we could by exempting the tipped employees of hotels. We did this in order that they might be put on a fair com-

petitive basis with other restaurants that are exempted under the bill.

There is some feeling that this bill has not gone far enough and that an amendment will be offered which would go somewhat further in this line. While I would not ordinarily be happy about this amendment, rather than take this so-called substitute if the gentleman is going to offer it I will not resist it too extensively because I believe that it might make it possible for some of the Members here to answer the problems which are clear to them or problems in their districts.

I have already indicated also, of course, that we will take care of the problem of the retail gasoline dealer, although again in this instance I think we have done it, because we have said that any franchise dealer shall be exempt; in other words, the individual who is running the risk of gain or loss in his business shall be exempt from the bill. That would take in all of the gasoline retailers with the exception of those dealers who are actually working for the big owner-operated oil company stations. They come up to about 2 percent of all stations. In order to be clear on what we mean, I would be willing to accept the amendment. I think it would be proper to do so.

The other great problem seems to be with the escalator clauses, the $1.15 and then two jumps to $1.25, and then the $1.15 and up to $1.25 for those new people. I think a fair compromise should be worked out on this. I must submit that if you are going to raise it to $1.15 you certainly over a period of years should also provide that the newly covered people should get that same $1.15. If an amendment is offered on that basis I would seriously consider accepting it because I think it is a reasonable compromise under the circumstances. So we have tried, then, to meet the honest efforts here. I think we have tried. I think we have proven this is a constitutional bill. I think the questions of economics have been answered, and I hope with all my heart that the substitute will be defeated.

The Choice Is Ours

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in the July 1 issue of the Selma Times-Journal, a well-known daily newspaper, there is a most sensible editorial relating to Khrushchev and our presidential election this fall.

I commend the editorial to you all and request unanimous consent that it be placed in the RECORD following these brief comments.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHOICE IS OURS

Adlai Stevenson's advice that both 1960 presidential nominees act quickly to toss Soviet Premier Khrushchev out of the campaign is well considered.

Khrushchev has been extremely free with comment on the American election. Both parties naturally fear that he could have some effect by endorsing one or the other nominee. It could be the kiss of death.

Yet it should not be. For this would be to give Khrushchev, a hostile totalitarian, influence in the free elective process of which we are so proud.

That process should and must be carried forward without intervention from any outside quarter, free or otherwise.

Our nominees should state at the outset that the American voter should be guided entirely by what is said and done within the confines of the United States. No word from Khrushchev either in praise or derogation of any presidential candidate should be given the slightest heed.

This injunction should be earnestly supported and enforced by all men of both parties. The man who dares to offer a serious campaign argument that Khrushchev wants the Democratic nominee or Khrushchev wants the Republican should be discredited instantly by his fellow Americans.

Concern over this matter is necessary. In the 1940 campaign, at least one prominent Democrat descended to the level of saying Hitler wants Willkie.

We had no sound reason to care then who Hitler wanted, and we have no reason to be interested in Khrushchev's recommendation.

The choice is ours, and ours alone. When it ceases to be, then our vaunted elective system will have lost its most prized element: Its total freedom.

The tariff on entry of Khrushchev's comments into the American political scene ought to be 100 percent. Not for a single day do they deserve to be allowed in competition with the real substance of our own political debate.

Marshfield News-Herald Urges Greater Opportunity for Small Business To Secure Government Contracts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, an excellent editorial recently appeared in the Marshfield (Wis.) News-Herald urging Congress to liberalize both legislation and administration of the laws to encourage a greater participation in Government procurement by small and independent business.

This is not only a thoughtful and logical editorial, it is enriched by personal experience of the editor with Marshfield people who have been both successful and unsuccessful in securing Government contracts, and by realization that in Marshfield, Wis., as is true throughout America, too few small businessmen have had this opportunity.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS

Senator PROXMIRE has introduced a bill in the Senate to amend the Small Business Act in such a way as to enable small business to participate in some of the contracts huge corporations are negotiating with the Federal Government.

The Senator cites figures to show how small the percentage of business going to small corporations and how much is handed to a few large corporations. At the same time, he reminds his colleagues that many contracts are negotiated without advertising for bids. He complains that competition is lost, and as a result the Government—the taxpayer—is the real loser.

Certainly, those communities throughout the Nation—and Marshfield is one of them—that have no big industry in their midst and do not participate indirectly through employment of labor and the garnering of profits are interested in the Senator's proposed legislation. Incidentally, he is joined in the bill by Senators CAPEHART and SPARKMAN.

In discussing the need for the legislation before the Senate, PROXMIRE told of one small business which furnished supplies to the Government because the owner's father happened to be a member of the President's Cabinet. He remarked: "Unless a small businessman has a good and generous friend in Government, his chances of getting a negotiated contract are mighty small."

This is probably true; and undoubtedly the chances for small business getting Government contracts are becoming fewer all the time. Yet we know some are successful. We heard some time ago about a Marshfield man who entered into a contract during World War II with the Government to furnish caskets to be used in shipping bodies of American dead from foreign battlefields and cemeteries to their hometowns in this country. Yet he made "a killing," to quote the friend who told us of the transaction. And, having learned the ropes, he went on to get more contracts with private business until today he is classified as a millionaire. No, it didn't happen in Marshfield. The young man in question left here for California where success all but overwhelmed him.

We have often wondered why more area "live wires" have not attempted to break into Uncle Sam's purchasing system in favor of local enterprise—factories, and such. In these days and in this great country of ours, an idea that works is worth lots of money, especially if it is hooked up with initiative, vision, finance, and integrity. We think of our mobile homes' industry in central Wisconsin which originally was an idea and now is an important segment of our economic life.

We wonder if the good Senators could develop an idea to make it easier for "live-wires" to approach Government purchasing agents. After all, laws are pretty cold, as one attempts to read and understand them, but something that will open the doors of these Federal purchasing agents to small enterprise is really what is needed.

There isn't a doubt but that the experience of the former Marshfield youth can be repeated by present day citizens seeking a place in Marshfield's industrial world. But he must have an idea, and initiative, and integrity.

We hope Senator PROXMIRE can tie all these "musts" together.

Rural Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Butler County, Ky., are convinced that the rural development program is the soundest approach yet devised to gaining long-range economic development and growth in our rural towns and communities. Under leave to ex-

tend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article entitled "Butler County Shows Blueprint," by Avery T. Jenkins:

BUTLER COUNTY SHOWS BLUEPRINT—SUCCESS IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(By Avery T. Jenkins)

A demand for action several years ago to bolster the sagging economy in many low-income counties across the Nation brought about establishment of the rural development program under the auspices of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

State and National leaders recognized the need for a program that would introduce small industry to rural areas to supplement income to farm families. Along with the program came Federal aid which helped establish rural development programs in 30 States and Puerto Rico.

Three counties were selected as demonstration or pilot counties to launch the program in Kentucky. These were Butler, Metcalfe, and Elliott.

Butler County is rated as the top county in the Nation for improvements made under the program.

Four years ago an attitude of "passing the time of day" had engulfed many sections of Butler County. Farm income was at a low ebb and many merchants in Morgantown—the county seat—saw no reason to spend money to improve the appearance of their stores. Commerce in the town of 1,200 persons had slowed to a trickle.

Perhaps it was this dismal atmosphere that brought out the determination by nearly all of the county's residents to do something about their plight.

The stage for the amazing success story of Butler County was set when University of Kentucky Extension Service representatives met with local leaders in the county's general stores.

Eight persons showed up at the first meeting in the Reedyville section. Now, only 4 years later, it is not uncommon for 100 persons to attend the meeting in a new community building.

The people in each community showed a growing interest in improving their farms and homes. Each person was encouraged to take part in the discussions and introduce his ideas.

As each project was completed, the participants took pride in their work and increased their efforts. Soon the news of what was happening in Butler County had spread across the Nation. Testimony that the achievements are outstanding is the fact that more than 150 visitors in delegations from a dozen States and 30 foreign countries have been visibly impressed by the work that has been done.

Nine communities now participate in community improvement contests. Cash awards totaling more than $500 are placed into a fund and each community is presented a prize for its outstanding project. The money is in turn placed in reserve for use on future projects. The first award money was donated by the Keeneland Foundation, an agency of Keeneland Race Track at Lexington.

Here is a list of the improvements made in Butler County since the rural development program moved from the organization stage to the work stage, 2½ years ago:

A $46,700 health center was built.

A new post office has been erected.

Purchase of 20 acres of land for development of a recreation center, fairground, and park.

Two new community centers have been built and four others established by remodeling older buildings.

A county fair was held for the first time in 2½ years.

An artificial breeding association has been organized.

The dairy cattle of the county were tested for Bangs disease.

Work is being done to eliminate a small slum section and replace it with a public housing project.

Five industrial sites have been located.

The rural development county committee has sponsored two dairy shows.

A vegetable and fruit growers' cooperative was organized.

The communications committee has succeeded in establishing a better telephone system for several communities and telephones have increased as a result.

All agencies are cooperating and are being coordinated under the rural development program to do more effective work.

Town-county relationships have improved considerably. Farm-City Week has been observed for the past 2 years.

Loans are easier to obtain as a result of changed attitudes.

Grade A and grade C dairy routes have been started.

The foregoing list of accomplishments were noted by True D. Morse, Under Secretary of Agriculture, and chairman of the committee for rural development program, in an address in which he dedicated the new Sharer Community Center.

"Through your community improvement contest, with $1,950 in prizes and eight communities participating," Morse continued, "you have brought about such improvements as the following: Many homes remodeled, huge increases in running water being installed in houses, several new houses being built, hundreds of additional head of livestock added, roadside and fence rows cleaned out, mail boxes renovated, a new blacktop road in two communities, a drainage program costing $15,000 or more which involves 13 people in one community, thousands of acres of improved pasture, strengthening of several existing 4–H Clubs and new ones added, cemeteries have beeen cleaned off and are being kept neat, and signs to identify communities have been erected."

The Central Committee for Butler County is composed of the following persons: J. C. Spradlin, chairman; Guy Cook, vice chairman; Billy Clark, secretary-treasurer. The board of directors includes Arthur Ingram, Paul Cohron, Raburn Hood, Edwin Wilson, plus Spradlin, Cook, and Clark.

Each of the nine participating communities are also directed by a similar committee organization.

"We don't put any pressure on the committees, they make their own decisions," Spradlin emphasized.

"They do their own thinking on what projects they undertake in the annual contest," he added.

Other persons who helped set up the program in Butler were U.S. Representative William H. Natcher, Democrat, Bowling Green, Dean Frank J. Welch, College of Agriculture, University of Kentucky, and Associate Director of Extension Ernest J. Nesius, and George M. Nelson, Jr., who is the associate agent for the extension service in Butler County. All have noted that credit for the success of the program must be given to each and every individual in Butler who took part in the development program.

Agency committees contributing to the rural development are: Farm Home Administration, extension service, department of forestry, vocational agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the superintendent of schools.

Evidence of the community spirit that has made the program a success can be found in nearly all sections of the county. New homes are being built and others remodeled. When the sheet steel for Reedyville Community Center arrived by truck from Dayton, Ohio, a large number of the community's residents were on hand and ready to work. The concrete floor had been poured in advance and the workers put up the walls and roof, installed the windows and doors in 36 hours.

Western State College Vocational School representatives taught courses in upholstery, electrical wiring, plumbing, bookkeeping and typing.

Reedyville and Sharer Community Centers serve as a meeting place for many rural organizations and activities such as the 4–H Club, farmers meetings, homemakers, and rural development, educational and recreational meetings.

On Saturday night the buildings are used by teenagers for chaperoned parties and dances. The young people bring their own record player.

Land for the center was donated by the late Cliff Childress, whose son, Al Childress, served as president of the Reedyville program for 4 years. Business commitments forced him to resign from his post several weeks ago.

Land for the Sharer Community Center was donated by Chess Johnson. This center is furnished with a large fireplace, an electric range, refrigerator, serving counters, sinks, and highly polished picnic-type tables and bench of pine lumber.

Some additional work is planned for the Reedyville building. A farm pond is being dug nearby and will be a source of water after a filter system is installed. Some plumbing work must be completed and insulation of the ceiling and walls is included in the plans.

In addition to the other improvements in Reedyville section, more than 1,800 acres of grassland were sowed in 1959.

A sawmill located north of Morgantown has supplied a source of additional income for farm residents—logging is one of the county's industries to be stepped up since the development program was started.

Butler Countians completed their Clean-Up—Paint-Up Week on July 2 and are now devoting a lot of time and planning for their sesquicentennial celebration which will be held in conjunction with the county fair in September.

Thus, Butler County has made many improvements since the program was begun 4 years ago. Leaders in the program have stated that it was the satisfaction of a job well done, of working with the neighbors and the nationwide recognition for their work that has given the people incentive to carry on in their efforts to make the entire county a better place to live.

Letter Carriers Aid Victims of New Hampshire Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS COTTON

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, on May 6 a disastrous fire swept through parts of Derry, N.H., leaving that small community with its worst disaster in history. The fire left 53 families homeless and destroyed the town's largest industry.

A disaster such as the one which struck Derry brings out the full spirit of helpfulness and generosity of the American people. One of the groups which responded magnificently to the needs of its community was the letter carriers of

the U.S. post office. These men voluntarily covered their regular routes on a Sunday to canvass the entire community in behalf of the victims of the fire. They collected over $2,000 in relief funds, compiled a list of vacant apartments and houses, and secured extensive donations of things like refrigerators, stoves, and furniture.

I believe the efforts of this group of letter carriers are a remarkable example of the spirit of good neighborliness which should be an inspiration to all of us.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the New Hampshire Labor News describing this volunteer labor by the letter carriers of Derry, N.H.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POSTAL EMPLOYEES AID DURING DERRY FIRE

DERRY, N.H.—Postal employees throughout the Nation can be justifiably proud of a small group of letter carriers in Derry, N.H., who responded magnificently when an estimated million-dollar fire swept the Chelmsford Shoe Co.'s buildings in Derry in the afternoon of Friday, May 6, leaving this small fire-ravaged Rockingham County community in less than 2 hours with its worst disaster in its history and one of the worst in New Hampshire.

Under the direction of Michael Cassidy, president of Branch 1198, National Association of Letter Carriers, AFL–CIO, and Leander Burdick, former president of the New Hampshire State Association of Letter Carriers, AFL–CIO, letter carriers in Derry conducted a house to house canvass on Sunday to raise funds for their less fortunate neighbors. And when darkness had set in Sunday evening Derry's carriers had walked most of their "appointed rounds" and had collected $1,800, compiled a list of vacant apartments, and had material donations of refrigerators, washing machines, stoves, sewing machines, furniture, TV sets and an automobile. Returning to their routes the following Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday evenings after work, they increased the total to $2,088.

The Merrimack County Labor Council, AFL–CIO, in Concord teamed up with the First National Bank of Derry to aid the letter carriers by supplying printing and postage in order that rural patrons could be afforded the opportunity to also donate to the fire stricken citizens. To date the carriers' effort has raised over $2,500.

Burdick described the response for his townspeople as the most gratifying experience of his life. "We all owe a debt of thanks," said Burdick, "to the radio, TV and newspaper coverage for our success, particularly to the Manchester Union-Leader, Lawrence Tribune, Haverhill Journal and the Boston papers."

As a result of the spontaneous effort of the small group of postal workers in Derry, a Derry Relief Fund has been established with Frederick Manning, vice president of the First National Bank of Derry, serving as its treasurer.

Derry's worst fire left 53 families homeless, completely destroyed its largest industry, and left 360 members of Local 230, United Shoe Workers of America, AFL–CIO, without their normal livelihood. It was estimated that 4 percent of the community's population was made jobless. Tax valuation of the destroyed building was set at $200,000.

With the Derry community being declared a disaster area by Governor Powell, aid in the form of surplus food from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, assistance from the Small Business Administration and the Department of Employment Security was furnished the needy citizens.

Individual heroes were numerous, however, special praise was given President Michael Cassidy for donating a week of his vacation leave to work with the American Red Cross in securing low-cost housing in Manchester for the homeless families. And to Henry Dion, president of Local 230, United Shoe Workers of America, AFL–CIO, who diligently worked around the clock to secure employment for his union members.

From the Washington headquarters of the United Shoe Workers of America and National President George Fecteau a donation of $1,000 has been presented to the Local 230 Relief Fund. And an urgent appeal has been sent by Thomas J. Pitarys, president of the New Hampshire State Labor Council, AFL–CIO, to all affiliated locals for financial assistance.

What Is Our Heritage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the magnificent address by the Honorable Ross R. Barnett, Governor of the State of Mississippi, before the conference of presidents and other officers of State medical associations in Miami Beach, Fla., on June 9–11, 1960:

WHAT IS OUR HERITAGE?

(Address by the Honorable Ross R. Barnett, Governor of the State of Mississippi, before the conference of presidents and other officers of State medical associations, Miami Beach, Fla., June 9–11, 1960)

The rights of the individual and the rights of the several States, as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, have been marked for total destruction by power-mad and greedy politicians in Washington. Both of our major political parties—the Democratic and the Republican—are guilty of this offense against the people and the sovereign States. Neither can offer proof to the contrary.

The freedoms and liberties of individuals and the rights of the States have become almost nonexistent, so effective has been the work of those who, for their own greedy purposes, have steadily chopped away at these basic rights.

What are you, as an individual and as a citizen of your community, doing to prevent this trespassing upon your rights?

What are you, as one of this Nation's most powerful organizations, doing to stop and reverse this fatal trend?

The medical profession, of which you are a part, is a noble one. There is no way to measure the services that you have in the past and are now rendering to mankind. The entire world owes a deep debt of gratitude to you for the work you are doing in medical care and research. You are more than meeting the responsibilities imposed upon you by the profession which you chose to pursue.

Yet, all of us—physicians, lawyers, clergymen, businessmen, and so forth—have obligations or responsibilities beyond the scope of our chosen profession. Too many of us have failed to face up to the responsibilities that are ours in maintaining the liberties and freedoms established by our forefathers and protected on the battlefields of the world by generation after generation of young Americans. We have been complacent and self-satisfied and allowed ruthless politicians to reshape our lives. We are now paying the price for this negligence and will continue to pay more and more until we, the people, have the courage to stand up and fight for our rights.

Soon it will be too late to salvage this Government from the hands of those who would dictate our every action from bureaucratic Washington. It may be that we have already waited too long.

You, the officers of the State medical association and the American Medical Association and leaders of medicine, and your colleagues in the medical profession throughout this great Nation, are leaders in your respective communities, or you should be. If you are not, you had better reexamine yourself and find out why you are not.

In this position of community leadership, you are in an excellent position to counsel with your neighbors and friends concerning the unhealthy state of this Nation and the strong tendency of our leaders in government to rush blindly and without forethought toward a socialistic state. You of the medical profession have experienced in recent years the efforts of governmental leaders to impose socialized medicine upon your profession and upon the people of the United States.

I make no secret of my strong opposition to socialized medicine and all other socialistic ideas that are hatched in Washington by the politicians. In Mississippi, we will take care of our own. I'll pick my own doctor and my own hospital and let them prescribe my treatment and medicine. I don't want a sewing-machine salesman to dictate my medical treatment, no more than you would want one to represent you in a court of law. I assure you that I am supported in my position on socialized medicine by a vast majority of the people of the great State of Mississippi and I feel certain this attitude prevails strongly throughout the Nation. Only a handful of opportunists are promoting what would be a tragedy to the people of this country.

For some months now, many people have had many things to say about the aging. We have had Mr. FORAND'S proposal for care of the aging under social security. We have had the so-called administration proposal which wrongfully assumed that everyone over age 65 was automatically sick and in urgent need of health care. More recently, we have been told that a compromise proposal will be advanced by the House Committee on Ways and Means would extend public assistance to certain categories of the aging. As we see this in Mississippi, the measure is unnecessary and extravagant.

None of us needs to be reminded of the fallacies of the Forand bill. You in medicine have spoken most effectively and eloquently in this connection. As a matter of fact, I tried to explain this fallacy to the people of Mississippi during my campaign last year. I am convinced—totally apart from any and all political considerations—that Federal medicine is totally unnecessary for the growing segments of our population who are now arbitrarily called the aging.

We know that monetary income is not in itself a sufficient measure of true economic means. But, wherever a person is genuinely indigent—regardless of age—he is eligible for the assistance which we in Mississippi give without Federal means.

We believe that health maintenance is an individual responsibility. We further believe that this responsibility properly succeeds from the individual, to his family, to locally sponsored assistance which in no case goes beyond the State level.

Our doctors in Mississippi furnish almost 300,000 patient days of in-hospital care each year. This is done through a meaningful liaison between our State government and the medical profession in Mississippi without any Federal funds.

On many occasions, I have affirmed that we will take care of our own and I am happy to

make this statement again today. We want no Federal program which claim to be a cure-all for the real and fancied ills of our aging. We know that we can take care of our own. We have done so and will continue to do so.

A few days ago, I was reading some American history in my study at the Executive Mansion in Jackson, when I ran across an item penned by Abraham Lincoln in 1847. I feel that it is appropriate that I bring this to your attention. I quote now from Mr. Lincoln:

"Inasmuch as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things of right belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened, in all ages of the world, that some have labored, and others without labor enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any good government."

Those words written by Abraham Lincoln were true then and they are just as true today. I agree 100 percent with his statement.

However, my objection to the current trend of the Federal Government away from local self-government and the rights of individuals and of the sovereign States is not based upon what one person or another has had to say about the way this Government should be run. I stand firmly upon article X of the Constitution of the United States and I shall not waver from the wording contained therein.

Article X reads as follows:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

These 28 words, written originally into the Constitution of the United States, mean exactly what they say. Most any normal school child could tell you the meaning of that simple sentence, even though the black-robed Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States in Washington have at times had difficulty in interpreting the words to fit the purposes of present-day politicians. The Nation's highest Court, for some strange reason, has turned its back upon the Constitution and previous decisions of the Court over a period of many years and flipped open foreign-authored sociology books in search of fancy words for use in court decisions. It is a sad day, indeed, when such as this occurs in our country, but it has happened and, no doubt, will happen again unless some restraint is placed upon them by the people through the Congress.

Many people have a mistaken idea as to the powers of the Federal Government as provided by the Constitution. The United States is a creature of the several States. In the beginning of this Nation, the then existing States met to form a union of States. They very carefully delegated certain powers—and no more—to the central Government; the States retained other powers and rights for themselves; and still other rights were retained by the States for the people themselves. The Constitution draws clear lines between the rights of the Federal Government, the rights of the States, and the rights of the individual.

The situation in which we find ourselves at the present is this: The Federal Government, through the hands of greedy politicians, is usurping the rights of the States and the rights of the people without constitutional authority to do so. The people have become the tragic victims of the creature to which we gave birth.

If America is to remain free, her people must never submit to any candidate or public officeholder undertaking to barter away any part of our Constitution for political advantages. We must resist this shameful betrayal of our national charter. We must stand beside the Constitution of the United States with drawn sword. We must be ready to stand, even at the expense of life itself, for individual liberty and freedom, for the right of the people to govern themselves. The rights of the States and local self-government are older than the Constitution. They existed before the Union was formed and were recognized and protected by Thomas Jefferson and the other Founding Fathers when they wrote the Constitution itself.

The preservation of the prerogatives of the people of a sovereign state, their right to deal exclusively with domestic problems, and the absolute and unqualified denial of a totalitarian State in the United States, are vital and intimately affect the welfare of every man, woman, and child in America.

If we lose the rights of the States, which safeguard the most precious of all human rights—the right to control and govern ourselves at home, the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—then we may ask:

"For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own soul?"

My friends, if this Nation—the Nation to which the world is looking for leadership—abandons the principles of government that have given us the capacity to lead; if we throw overboard the compass that has guided us to the port of greatness; then we are headed for the rocks of totalitarianism and the persecution and cruelties of a totaritarian state.

This is no sectional nor regional matter. It is just as important to the people of New York and Ohio as it is to the people of Mississippi and Texas. It is just as important to people yet unborn as it is to you and me here today.

We must establish to the satisfaction of the world, as well as to politicians of little faith at home, that the basic fundamental rights of the people of the several sovereign states are not for sale and cannot be sold or exchanged, even for the Presidency itself. I was not elected Governor of Mississippi to preside over the liquidation of personal freedom. Eevery section of this Nation, your section and my section, favors human rights. But it is a fraud on the American people to pretend that human rights can long endure without constitutional restraint on the power of government.

The proposals to take from you your right to deal with your local problems in a way that is satisfactory to you, and to invest the right to deal with those problems in Washington in a way that is wholly unsatisfactory to you, is so antagonistic to our form of government and so contrary to everything that we have stood for since 1775, that it is obliged to be totally foreign in concept, un-American in principle, and un-Democratic in execution. The moment that government becomes remote, distant, mysterious, and beyond the comprehension of the people themselves, danger arises and we subject ourselves to the possibility of abuse of power and utlimate dictatorship.

Government essentially is a dangerous thing. There is no truth more fundamental than that power seeks always to increase. Human nature is a compound of many things. Its sole, continuously recurring characteristic is the desire deep in the hearts of all for power. Government is a dangerous thing, and the great leaders of the past (except the military men who have been despots), the great leaders since there came into existence the theory of the rights of men, have with universal tongue cautioned the people against the danger of power in the hands of the Government. This was completely understood by the great founders of this Nation.

I hope that you will weigh seriously and prayerfully the observations which I have made in regard to the preservation of the rights of the States and the rights of the individual. You, in your respective communities, can be the powerful instruments that will guarantee the survival of this Nation as a nation of freedoms and liberties as was the intent of those who founded it.

Veterans' Insurance Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD a letter which I have written to the Honorable EDITH NOURSE ROGERS regarding her erroneous remarks which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 5, 1960, on page 14706. I trust this letter will serve to correct the misinformation which is being disseminated. The letter follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,
COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., July 6, 1960.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am writing regarding the erroneous statements which you made on the floor of the House on July 5, 1960, which appear on page 14706 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I was not in error when I stated that the Subcommittee on Insurance voted unanimously against favorable consideration of bills to reopen the national service life insurance program. The Subcommittee on Insurance considered this matter on two occasions. On March 30, 1960, with 4 out of 5 members present it considered all of the insurance bills before it, reported four bills and passed over the remainder, including the national service life insurance bills, without action. On April 27, 1960, the subcommittee met with all members present for the specific purpose of reconsidering the bills to provide for reopening the national service life insurance program. At that time the subcommittee voted unanimously to defer action on the national service life insurance bills. The subcommittee made no plans for subsequent reconsideration at that meeting. There have been no subsequent meetings by the Subcommittee on Insurance and there has been no discussion by the subcommittee regarding reconsideration of these bills.

You state that the subcommittee never turned down these proposals. This is contrary to the facts. The subcommittee had these proposals before it on two separate occasions and passed over or deferred action. In your remarks you expressed the hope that I would ask the Committee on Rules to grant a rule for the consideration of this legislation. You are advised that I took such action immediately following my attempt to secure a vote on this legislation.

Both you and the minority clerk received notices of all committee and subcommittee meetings. Minutes of the committee reflect that you did not attend either of the subcommittee meetings where the action described above occurred. Since you did not attend the meetings and did not consult the minutes of the committee, it seems to me you should have at least shown me the courtesy of checking these points with me before making these incorrect statements for publication in the RECORD.

I expect to place this letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to correct your erroneous inference of July 5.

Sincerely yours,

OLIN E. TEAGUE,
Chairman.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 15, 1960, a large rally was held in Carpatina Hall, Cleveland, to commemorate Rumanian Independence Day. It was 15 years ago last March 6 that the Russian Communists destroyed the free government of that old and honored nation and imposed upon the Rumanian people a form of tyranny which is completely alien to their rich culture, traditions, and love for human freedom. Despite these years of occupation and despoiling of their heritage, the people of Rumania stand as stanch allies of the West. It is fitting, therefore, that this Rumanian national independence observance should be held in Cleveland, Ohio, in order that the people of Rumania would be reassured that the American people have not forgotten them, and that we look forward to a restoration of their freedom and national independence.

I was privileged to address this rally and to reassure Rumanians living in the free world and those in the homeland that we have not and shall not forget their fight for freedom. Under unanimous consent I insert my address in the RECORD:

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

May 10 is a day of great importance to Rumanian people everywhere in the world because it is Rumanian Independence Day. In these days it has special significance because the people of Rumania have been robbed of their national independence by the Russian imperialists. It was 15 years last March 6 that the Russians destroyed the free government of that old and honored nation and imposed upon the Rumanian people a form of government which is completely alien to their rich culture, traditions, and love for human freedom. In the darkness of those 15 years the people of Rumania have never lost faith in the destiny of their nation. They remain convinced that justice will triumph throughout the world—that the cause of freemen will prevail in the affairs of nations and that Rumania will rise once again in all the splendor and beauty of her ancient civilization. It is this dedication, this unwavering conviction, which holds the people of Rumania in an unbreakable alliance with the people of the United States and all other free countries.

The people of Rumania will be prohibited from celebrating this memorable day by the alien government which has been imposed upon them by the masters of the new imperialism in Moscow. No public observance of this day will be allowed because the Russians are dedicated to destroying all hope for a return of national independence and because such public manifestations carry the possibility of getting out of hand so far as the occupiers are concerned. However, the Rumanian people will find ways to observe this historic day, despite the efforts to prevent them from doing so. What rests firmly in the hearts of men cannot be wiped out by the order of a dictator.

Rumanians in the free world will properly celebrate this day. I am happy and proud that in my district one of the most significant of these celebrations is taking place today. Free Rumanians will carry high the hopes of the captive people of Rumania. They will, as in the past, remind all those who love freedom that these past 15 years of darkness have strengthened the determination of the Rumanian people to regain their national independence. In this they will be performing a service for their adopted country, the United States, because the cause of peace with justice requires the dedication of all our citizens.

Tomorrow the second summit conference will open in Paris. There a contest will take place between men who represent the cause of human freedom and those who lead the cause of slavery for all mankind. This will be a test of justice as the foundation for a lasting peace; that is, justice for all nations and all people. The one paramount issue, the issue which rises above all others at the Paris Conference, is that of political status quo. The spotlight of public attention has been focused upon such issues as disarmament, a ban on nuclear weapons, the future status of Berlin and a free and united Germany. Important as these issues are, they avoid the critical question of human rights, the rights of nations, and the unnatural division of humanity by the Russian Communists.

It is clear beyond any reasonable doubt that the Russians are going to Paris with but one objective in mind. That objective is to force the free-world leaders to accept a political status quo; that is, to put a stamp of finality upon their empire of captive nations. Nor can there be any doubt that the Russian leaders desperately need this recognition. A serious internal crisis grips the vast empire of the Russian Communists. It is not an economic crisis, even though there is a critical shortage of food and consumer goods throughout the empire. It is not a crisis at the top, resulting from the constant struggle for total power which is the common characteristic of the regime. It is a political crisis brought on by the failure of the Communist regime to win the confidence and support of the people and the corresponding demand by the non-Russian peoples of the empire for a complete change in the order of things. The old order of Russian imperial communism is bankrupt. It is centuries behind the needs and aspirations of the common man. Its failures are well known to those who are its captives. The need for drastic change to avoid total collapse is evident to all who are confined behind the Iron Curtain, including Khrushchev and his crowd. It is beyond the ability of Russian imperial communism to grant the changes necessary to avoid the great human explosion which is in the making. If the Communist leaders grant the changes demanded by the realities of life they will open the floodgates to their own destruction. They cannot possibly accommodate their system to the changes needed to preserve the empire. The leaders in Moscow recognize these hard facts of life and are accordingly going to use the Paris Conference as a temporary remedy for their internal crisis.

They seek to cause the nations of the free world to associate with them in efforts to preserve the empire. The Russians insist that the captive peoples must be made to realize that there is a finality to their unhappy state of life, that there is no hope for their future, that they must make their peace with communism and adjust to the imposed peace of Moscow.

The Russian leaders also need a legal license to employ whatever methods become necessary to hold the empire together. They feel they must neutralize the conscience of the West so that there can be no public protest or legal proceedings in the United Nations against such future actions as they may find necessary, including genocide and the other crimes against humanity. This is the insurance policy they want the leaders of the free world to underwrite at Paris.

So, to secure these objectives the Russians propose a status quo and Khrushchev has announced that this will be his goal at the Paris meeting.

Now the question is how will the leaders of the free world meet this challenge? Up to this moment there is no evidence available to the public which would indicate what we might do or not do to prevent a Russian victory on this critical issue. However, it is clear to all that if President Eisenhower fails to raise in principle the right of all nations to self-determination, to self-government, in the context of the Captive Nations Week resolution as defined in Public Law 86-90, the Russians will win their point by default. Khrushchev has made it clear in public statements that he considers the basic question of the Paris meeting to be status quo. By so doing he has established the issue as pertinent to all the discussions which will take place. If our leaders fail to raise the issue and state our position on it, silence will be taken as assent to the demands made by Khrushchev. This is a fundamental law of international diplomacy.

It is entirely possible that the Russians can leave the Paris meeting with sound precedent to believe that the United States has accepted a status quo. Nor is it necessary for the three Western Powers to have unanimity on this issue in order for our President to speak out. Rumors are rampant in Europe that the British are actively pushing for a status quo, even to the point of a permanently divided Germany. It is unlikely that France could make herself party to such a deal. In any case, it is imperative that the United States make its position clear on this issue regardless what Great Britain and France elect to do about it.

The future of Rumania and all the other captive non-Russian nations hangs in the balance at the Paris summit. While Rumania as a nation will not be an agenda item, the future of Rumania is involved in the issue of status quo which has been created by Khrushchev. Nor is status quo likely to become an agenda item but it will hang over all the proceedings and discussions at Paris. It is the unavoidable issue. It is in fact the reason why Khrushchev forced the leaders of the free world into a second summit meeting.

These are fitting thoughts for this Rumania Independence Day commemoration. Those of us who have fought for the rights of the Rumanian Nation, for justice for all the nations of the world, do not give lip service to this cause. More than words are needed. Political action must be given to this cause. I, therefore, have urged President Eisenhower to seize the initiative at Paris, to flush out into the open the issue of status quo, to disclaim any degree of acceptance of status quo for the American people, and to rekindle the hopes of suffering millions behind the Iron Curtain by a firm advocacy of the rights of all nations to self-government, to freedom, and to national independence.

Let us pray that President Eisenhower will lead all free nations of the world in a successful fight for the right of self-determination for all nations and people. Such positive, affirmative, political action will enable the great nation of Rumania to determine its down destiny and to take its proper place among the free nations of the world.

Summary of Poll Results

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I have recently conducted an opinion poll among my constituents of the Seventh District of Indiana. I believe the tabulation of the responses will be of interest and significance to my colleagues.

Continued stiff opposition to communism is supported by Seventh District voters. Despite recent threats of Russia and the attempts of some Americans to belittle our own strength, voters show no inclination to back down to the Russians. Many say such a retreat would lead to our eventual collapse.

One of the questions asked if the United States should retreat from its position in West Berlin, where the free world forces show the day-to-day living contrasts with life under communism in East Berlin. Despite Khrushchev's ultimatums, 95 percent of those responding said the United States should not abandon West Berlin. Less than 2 percent said we should withdraw and 3 percent declined to give an opinion.

On the subject of recognizing the Communist government of China, only 8 percent advised such recognition and an overwhelming 85 percent said we should not; 7 percent were undecided.

Opinion is sharply divided on the adequacy of our defense spending—42 percent believe the United States should spend more money for national defense; 43 percent said no more should be spent and 15 percent ventured no opinion.

About three-fourths of those responding favor reduced funds for foreign aid projects. Of the 19 percent who do not favor a cut, many commented that our aid programs should be better directed and administered.

Dissatisfaction with the Cuban regime of Fidel Castro has grown daily. This was evidenced in answers to a question as to whether the United States should continue to pledge to buy about one-third of our sugar requirements from Cuba at prices above the world level. The percent of people favoring our withdrawal from such agreements has grown steadily to an average of 88 percent; 7 percent believe we should continue to try to work with the Cubans through such agreements, and 5 percent had no opinion.

There is increasing awareness of the problems created for domestic industry by the imports from countries where labor rates are much lower than those in the United States: 73 percent of those replying favor import controls to protect local industries from foreign competition; 18 percent are opposed to such quotas; and 9 percent did not respond.

As a further indication of public sentiment in the defense and foreign affairs field, I asked if we should retain the Connally amendment which allows this country to reject the jurisdiction of the World Court. This issue is apparently not well understood by a large segment of the general public, for 26 percent said they had no opinion on this question; 61 percent favor retention of the Connally amendment; 13 percent favor its repeal.

Seventh District voters have strongly endorsed a proposal I put forth concerning the possibility of supporting schools by returning to each State a part of the Federal cigarette tax collected in that State—85 percent of those responding to a question about this said they favor such a program; 8 percent are opposed, and 7 percent have no opinion.

This was one of the most clear-cut responses on the questions affecting certain aspects of our domestic policies, and quite frankly the response surprised me. For years there have been insistent claims that our school systems required more financial support than could be maintained by local real estate taxes. Yet there has been strong opposition to Federal support on the grounds that it would lead to control and regimentation of our schools. This alternative, which would merely refund the money to the States and require that it be spent for education, guarantees that local school authorities would remain free and autonomous. In addition, questions as to whether such money should go for classroom construction only or should be used for teachers' salaries, whether it should be restricted to public schools or shared with parochial and private schools, could be left to the discretion of the States. The Federal Government would only insist that it be spent in the educational system of the State according to its programs.

Opinion was not so decided on the subject of Government-sponsored medical care for social security retirees. This referred to the Forand bill, which has been rejected on two occasions, and by a large margin, in the House Committee on Ways and Means: 36 percent favor some such program; 57 percent are opposed; and 7 percent indicate no opinion.

The much-discussed soil bank was also the subject of a wide difference of opinion. Among those who checked that they are engaged in farming, 45 percent favor expansion of the soil bank to about 60 million acres, which experts say would reduce production sufficiently to meet consumption and thus avoid the problems of surplus production; 45 percent of those in farming oppose this; and 10 percent express no opinion.

Among those not in farming, 25 percent gave no comment; 21 percent favor the expanded program, and 54 percent are opposed.

Deficit financing is frowned upon by a majority of Seventh District voters: 81 percent say we should limit national expenditures to balance the budget; 12 percent say we should not be bound to stay within income; and 7 percent are without a firm opinion.

The question of the loyalty oath which is required of students requesting aid under the National Defense Education Act elicited much interest. The repeal of the loyalty oath requirement is favored by 17 percent; 76 percent oppose its repeal.

In addition to the thousands of letters, telegrams, and phone calls I receive and the many personal visits I make throughout the district, I have found these polls of great value in assessing voter sentiment. I am encouraged by the wide and favorable response to this questionnaire and I am gratified by the careful attention given to the answers.

The results of the poll follow:

Final summary of opinion poll conducted by Congressman William G. Bray, 7th District, Indiana

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Government-sponsored medical care for social security retirees?	36	57	7
2. Limiting national expenditures to balance the budget?	81	12	7
3. Use of import quotas to protect local industries from foreign competition?	73	18	9
4. Increased spending for national defense?	42	43	15
5. U.S. recognition of Red China?	8	85	7
6. Reduced funds for foreign aid?	74	19	7
7. Returning to each State ½ of the cigarette tax collected from its residents for educational uses without Federal direction?	85	8	7
8. Giving in to the Russians by abandoning West Berlin?	2	95	3
9. Withdrawing from pledge to buy sugar from Cuba at above the world price?	88	7	5
10. Repeal of loyalty oath requirement of students receiving aid under the National Defense Education Act?	17	76	7
11. Retention of the Connally amendment which allows the United States to reject the jurisdiction of the World Court?	61	13	26
12. Increasing the conservation reserve—soil bank—from 28,000,000 acres to 60,000,000 acres?:			
Those engaged in farming replied	45	45	10
All others replied	21	54	25

Address by Robert H. Eagle Before Organization Meeting of the Federal Supply Management Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently it was my privilege to hear a discussion by Robert H. Eagle, a comparatively young man who is in the employ of our Government, on the subject of a need for "Federal supply management." The field covered in the discussion involved the fields of procurement, distribution, utilization of supplies and equipment, and the storage thereof.

I was much encouraged to note that a number of employees of the Government were interested in this matter, thinking that they could save a great deal of money for the Government in the respective fields mentioned above. This, of course, coincided with the conclusion recently disclosed by the Senate Subcommittee on Military Procurement.

Among the ideas that struck me particularly was that the whole supply management field in the Federal Government could be revolutionized and in so doing there would be a resulting constructive impact on the national economy, as the U.S. Government is the largest procurer of supplies and equipment in the world. We know that the Commission found that there is a failure in keeping records and that in many instances the Government has bought too much of the wrong thing.

Now, after this discussion I was given a copy of the talk which Robert H. Eagle gave before the organization meeting of the Federal Supply Management Association. I think his ideas are worthy of consideration by all Members of the Congress. Therefore, I ask that they be printed following my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BEFORE ORGANIZATION MEETING OF THE FEDERAL SUPPLY MANAGEMENT ASSOCIATION, JUNE 28, 1960

(By Robert H. Eagle)

We in this room have it in our power to set into motion a chain of events which could revolutionize the whole field of supply management in the Federal Government—the procurement, distribution, and utilization of supplies and equipment. The fact that supply management in the Federal Government needs professionalizing lies not only in the fact that the Federal Government too often spends too much for what it buys, although this is a part of the story (as recently disclosed by the Senate Subcommittee on Military Procurement); or that the Federal Government buys too much of the wrong thing and not enough of the right thing, although this is also a part of the story; or that too often decisions are based not on need but on irrelevant or noneconomic considerations. Again, this is not the whole story, but another part of it. The management of property and supplies is an integrated problem requiring an integrated approach.

People all too often are prone to be merely critical and faultfinding. It is more difficult to help bring about improvements. However, our attitude is not one of mere faultfinding. We are in a position to do something constructive and effective about an admittedly unfortunate situation. And if we were to revolutionize supply management in the Federal Government, this profound change would have an appreciable impact on the whole economy, because the U.S. Government is the largest procurer of supplies and equipment in the world. Not only are the quantity and value of the physical assets presently held by the Federal Government not completely recorded anywhere, but they are beyond calculation, as has been reported by factfinding commissions established for this purpose.

SUPPLY MANAGEMENT AND ENGINEERING

Perhaps we can throw light on the supply management situation by comparing it with another profession—engineering. People believe, and rightfully so, that bridges must be built in such a way that the likelihood of collapse under specified strains is minimized. We expect engineers to give competent consideration to such pertinent factors as stresses and strains, relative strength and economy of materials, and the like. We think office buildings, machinery, and equipment should be constructed solidly and precisely, according to engineering principles. We would not think of throwing together in a hapharzard manner these physical things that serve important human purposes without carefully planned and engineered blueprints and specifications, without tests and analyses of a complex and intricate nature and character.

The products, buildings, machinery, and technological devices of all kinds which are basic to our present culture would be impossible without knowledge and application of scientific and technological principles; yet is not the economy, upon which all these physical phenomena rest, more fundamental, though perhaps less tangible? Simply because the technical complexity of the procurement, distribution, and utilization of resources and supplies is not apparent to the layman, this is no reason for us engaged in these activities to be ignorant of the scientific nature of our functions or to ignore them.

The nature and characteristics of supply management are as complex and technical as those involved in the production and construction of equipment and machinery, transportation facilities, and the like. The allocation of resources and the management of materials should not be considered separately from the uses to which these resources are put. The means and ends are interrelated.

IMPACT OF SUPPLY MANAGEMENT DECISIONS

The impact of the decisions of supply managers on the economy is such that the wellbeing of our country is involved. What can we have in the way of machinery, equipment, defense, schools, and all that makes our modern civilization worthwhile—what can we have if the decisions of those who allocate the basic resources that comprise these physical assets result in a continuous waste and misuse of these resources?

In view of the constant search for sufficient funds for defense and education, for example, the need for the best possible allocation of resources is apparent. You and I and our colleagues collectively constitute the largest group making the biggest number and dollar value of decisions determining the use and distribution of resources.

NO CRASH PROGRAM

Now we all know that we cannot return immediately to our individual places of employment and change the thinking of our colleagues, our supervisors, and our management overnight. But what we can do is to professionalize ourselves, gaining a more exact and more comprehensive understanding of the problems we are dealing with. Then as a recognized group of professionals in the same category as engineers, the significance of whose professional advice and decisions is not questioned by laymen, we can reasonably expect to have our decisions and our professional advice more respectfully considered by those whom we serve, and not casually cast aside.

IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION

Basically our program is a long-range education program—education of all kinds—a program of educating ourselves and educating others. It is also a long-range research program of accumulating and evaluating the existing literature of all kinds on the various branches and techniques of supply management, as well as developing and pooling our own ideas, discussing and publishing them. These activities have already been undertaken in other management fields—accounting, industrial engineering, marketing, and even general management.

In this way, we bring to bear on our problems the best resources at our command. Knowing our problems personally and intimately, we can act in effect as management consultants without the disadvantages often accruing to the use of outsiders who sometimes do not have the time to acquire an understanding of our problems in the context of our actual day-to-day operations. We can operate as only insiders can, but we can gain a broader viewpoint than insiders generally possess and exercise.

SCIENTIFIC APPROACH NECESSARY

Your organizing committee believes that the scientific approach applies to the problems of supply management.

What do we mean by the scientific approach? Is it limited to people with Ph. D.'s, goatees, or math degrees? All kinds of people are scientists and scientists are all kinds of people. Scientists have their foibles and their idiosyncracies, like each one of us, but in their professional work they must adhere to certain basic fundamentals—truth, reason, logic, evidence, as opposed to mere opinion or prejudice. This does not mean that scientists are not often prejudiced or opinionated. Far from it; but they succeed in their work only to the degree they subordinate their personal prejudices to an objective approach. The key word here is succeed, and we can succeed only on the same basis, by ever striving toward the goals of objectivity, clear thinking, factual analysis, and experimentation—in short, professionalism.

Scientists are concerned about the caliber and quality of arguments advanced for or against a given proposition. They are not concerned about rank or personality. To the extent that science would get bogged down in personality considerations or personal opinion it would become lost and meaningless. It would disappear.

That we should all embrace and endorse the scientific approach in this association does not mean that the same level of education and experience is required of each member. Far from it. What it does mean is that each member within his individual capacity strive to live up to these aims and ideals in his professional life. Actually no one is expected to meet these standards absolutely and no human being can—not even the world's greatest scientist. Human beings in our present stage of development just aren't

made that way. But there is all the difference in the world between establishing such goals and standards, and striving to live up to them, and testing our relative progress in meeting these goals—there's all the difference between that approach and just drifting along from day to day in a haphazard fashion.

NEED FOR PROFESSIONAL SOCIETY

Why is it necessary and important for supply management people to have a professional society? Without the cooperation and stimulus gained through associating with our colleagues in other agencies, it is difficult, if not impossible, to maintain a clear perspective of our daily activities. An association such as this enables us to compare and contrast our methods with others, to see alternative ways of doing our jobs, and to determine whether our present procedures can be improved. Different approaches to our problems and new solutions come to light as a result of the forums provided by a professional society. Can we afford not to have this kind of collaboration?

We have many skeptics to convince, and we must convince them on the basis of facts, logic and evidence. To do this, we must constitute ourselves an information bureau as well as a fact-finding commission. Only in this way can we hope to revolutionize supply management in the Federal Government.

PROFESSIONAL DISCUSSIONS

Freedom of speech is essential to a scientific approach, and a professional society provides a kind of freedom of expression that is not generally available to us in our everyday activities. In a professional society, dissenters from a majority position are not ostracized or put into a deepfreeze. Why is this freedom of expression so important? Its importance is exemplified by the difference between a pointless, aimless "bull session" and a professional discussion. The kind and quality of the discussion is the key.

There is a big difference between merely asserting a personal belief, and defending one's position on the basis of logic and evidence. There is a big difference between saying, for example, "Supply management is an art and not a science", and saying, "I believe that supply management is largely a matter of intuition and experience because of the nature of the case. I believe that principles and theories do not apply, because the characteristics of supply management being chaotic, haphazard, uncertain, the problems that arise from such a situation do not lend themselves to logical analysis."

The last statement is at least subject to intelligent discussion and objective evaluation, simply because the premises on which the statement is based are laid bare, and the reasons for the speaker's position explicitly stated. Then the participants can go ahead and consider each piece of the argument and test it against known facts and specific situations and thus arrive at a more enlightened viewpoint.

I, for one, would argue with the position just stated, but since the reasons for that position are clearly given and the alleged facts itemized, one has something concrete and tangible to discuss, instead of a mere personal prejudice or opinion.

IS SUPPLY MANAGEMENT A SCIENTIFIC FIELD?

Supply managers are beginning to realize that the movement of supplies and equipment from their primary sources to ultimate destinations involves many interrelated numerical values. These quantities, prices, costs, and distances must be considered collectively in order to provide maximum service at minimum cost.

In discussing the scientific nature of supply management one could, for example, point out that in the realm of inventory management, replenishable stock levels fluctuate up and down, and that in order to exercise some control, certain maximums and minimums are established based on specific considerations, including procurement costs, holding costs, lead times, and availability objectives. Further analysis reveals functional interrelationships among all elements of supply. A change in any one of these factors may affect all or most of the others. This kind of a reply would be pertinent to a statement that supply management is not susceptible to analysis. This kind of discussion, rather than a mere airing of prejudices and opinions, illustrates the objective approach.

It is expected of any kind of scientist or professional that he support his position with logic and evidence; that his resistance to a proposal be not mere resistance to change, but be directed to the foundations on which a proposition rests, as to its soundness or realism or importance, or to the alleged facts and the evaluation of them, or to gaps or inconsistencies in the chain of reasoning.

In other words, this scientific approach means putting all the cards on the table and not concealing important considerations for personal or political expedience. In a professional society, a soundly considered and clearly presented minority position is welcome.

ORDERLY CHANGE

The scientific approach has brought into being the technological and scientific age we know today. This is the environment in which we have to operate, and what we are proposing is to carry this very same approach, this spirit of inquiry, testing, comparison, discussion, into our complex fields of supply and property management. The scientific approach recognizes the ever-present relationship between cause and consequences as the context within which all progressive changes have been made and must be made.

We must recognize the inevitability of change in technology, production, and taste, but in order to work most effectively with the changeable, we must also recognize those things that never change. Changes that ignore basic principles are not feasible because they eventually result in chaos and turmoil. Operating in accordance with the laws and values that are changeless enables change to be progress, brought about rationally, based on principle, and consciously directed toward the enduring goals of mankind. What we want is purposeful change in contrast to purposeless drifting, a meaningless ebbing and flowing.

The task we have assigned ourselves is big and important. If we do not succeed, we have only ourselves to blame. The purpose of this association is to better enable ourselves to shoulder our own responsibilities.

We are confronted with only three fundamental choices: Changes for the better, the status quo, or retrogression. Which shall it be?

Statement of Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller at Governors' Conference, June 29, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on June 29, 1960, the Governor of New York, Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, participated in a discussion at the Governors' conference in Glacier National Park, Mont., dealing with the issue of health benefits for the aged. In his statement, Governor Rockefeller presented a detailed outline of the kind of legislation which would best meet this serious problem. Despite some differences in details, the Rockefeller position is basically the same as that taken by the McNamara bill which I have been very happy to cosponsor. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the text of Governor Rockefeller's statement.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY GOV. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER PREPARED FOR DISCUSSION AT THE GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE, MANY GLACIER HOTEL, GLACIER NATIONAL PARK, MONT., WEDNESDAY, JUNE 29, 1960

The provision and equitable financing of adequate medical care for our senior citizens is one of the great unsolved problems of our Nation.

Those over 65 years of age constitute a substantial, steadily growing and predominantly low-income segment of the population.

By 1975, there will be 22 million Americans over 65 years of age, or more than 10 percent of the then population. Yet, while the elderly are increasing in number, their ability to be economically self-sufficient through employment is decreasing. The proportion of older workers in the labor force has decreased from nearly 75 percent of those over 65 in 1890 to about 35 percent in 1958.

The net result is that, according to Government estimates for the year 1957, only about 20 percent of our senior citizens have incomes of more than $2,000 a year—and 60 percent of them receive less than $1,000 a year. These figures include social security payments received.

These senior citizens require, on the average, two to three times more medical care than the rest of the population. Many have special need for long-term institutional care. Estimates for 1958 indicated that 78 percent of those over 65 were afflicted with one or more chronic diseases. In spite of the great need of the aged for health insurance protection, nearly 60 percent of them have no health insurance at all, and of the remaining 40 percent who do, the coverage is frequently inadequate to meet the demands of chronic illness.

These facts constitute a human problem of major proportions. A substantial portion of the burden of providing necessary health services falls upon dwindling savings, upon relatives, and upon public welfare, or upon hospitals, and the medical profession through charity treatment.

The magnitude of the problem is underscored by the fact that in New York State alone there are some 83,000 persons aged 65 or over receiving care in hospitals or nursing homes at State expense.

All too often, a lack of funds may discourage the elderly from seeking the early care and preventive treatment so essential to mitigating the effects of illness and prolonging life. Many of those living on small social security payments or pensions or annuities may face—or feel that they face—a choice between paying the rent or seeking health care—often with tragic results.

There is substantial reason to doubt that commercial insurance carriers or voluntary health insurance organizations can ever hope to meet the total health insurance needs of the aged as matters now stand.

From the standpoint of the older persons themselves, such insurance is often too expensive for their limited incomes or is unavailable because of existing illness or for

other reasons. Recognizing this, the New York Legislature recently passed a law at my request mandating the conversion of group health insurance policies to individual policies upon retirement at premium levels not exceeding 120 percent of prior payments. This measure represents a major advance, but not a complete solution. No one State can solve this problem alone. It is essentially a national problem.

From the carrier standpoint, health insurance for the aged is likely to be a most unprofitable type of business unless premium costs can be spread over all age groups. The latter is difficult in the competitive, experience-rating conditions which exist in the insurance industry.

For voluntary plans, there are serious financial problems in providing such coverage. In 1958, for example, I am advised that the Philadelphia Blue Cross collected $3.5 million in premiums from its 65-and-over subscribers and paid out $9.7 million to meet their hospital bills. Had the Blue Cross not spread this loss among all its subscribers, the premiums of the older subscribers would have been prohibitively high. At the same time, the increasing numbers of such high-cost subscribers not only raise costs for everyone, but threaten the very existence of the Blue Cross system.

It is now clear that some type of Federal Government action is needed to solve this problem—a fact recognized in the wide variety of plans now under consideration in the Congress. In 1954, as Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, I participated in developing an administration proposal for limited Government involvement through a Federal reinsurance system to assist voluntary health plans in undertaking broadened protection, including improved protection of the aged. The proposal was not adopted by Congress. Since then, the problem has become no less acute.

The issue has ceased to be whether to do anything at all. The issue is how best to do what so obviously needs to be done.

And the issue is immediate. Last Thursday, the House of Representatives passed a bill contemplating some medical care benefits, through Federal grants sharing costs with States, provided on a basis of need. This is an extremely limited measure—seemingly in the nature of an election-year stopgap. There is substantial evidence that the Senate during the coming week will begin serious consideration of expanding this measure into a comprehensive effort to meet the problem. I sincerely hope that this is the case.

Of the various proposed programs of health insurance for the aged, the best known are the Forand bill and the administration bill. There are many differences between these two bills, but the fundamental difference is in the two approaches to financing the proposed benefits. The Forand bill would increase the social security payroll tax to encompass health insurance for those over 65, while the administration bill proposes a Federal-State program of health insurance for older persons, paid for primarily by general tax revenues of the Federal and State governments, but with the older persons themselves (other than those of public assistance) paying an enrollment fee of $24 a year.

As a businessman concerned with employee welfare, as Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and as Governor of New York, I have been concerned with the health insurance question for many years. It seems to me that there are four grave weaknesses in the Forand measure.

1. The Forand bill would not provide health insurance coverage for any of the 4 million persons now over 65 years of age who are not included in the social security system.

2. It lacks any element of choice and would therefore tend to stifle further development of voluntary health insurance for the aged in this country.

3. Administration of the Forand bill program would be under centralized Federal control with no flexibility for accommodation to varying conditions in the different States.

4. It fails to provide the standards needed to maintain the quality essential to good medical care.

In the administration bill, the basic flaw is the method of financing, which I regard as fiscally unsound. Instead of extending a proven contributory system of insurance—the administration bill provides subsidies from the general revenues, shared by the States and the Federal Government under an equalization formula.

Under a contributory system a definite percentage of the cost is born by those who ultimately receive the benefits. This provides a built-in safeguard against the constant pressure for irresponsible and extravagant additions to the scheme which is politically difficult to resist. The administration plan would be particularly vulnerable to such pressure, based as it is on the concept of subsidy.

The financing of the administration plan also would represent a serious financial drain on the States; New York, for example, would have to allocate to the program nearly 10 percent of its current State purposes budget if it participated. It is likely that a number of States would decide not to participate at all, as would be their right.

In addition, the administration bill has "means test," deductible and coinsurance features unrealistically limiting benefits and requiring cumbersome and costly administrative mechanisms in all 50 States. It does, however, provide for minimum standards of care and its benefits would come closer to meeting the medical care needs of the aged than do those of the Forand bill.

What, then, are the elements of a workable approach? In my judgment, we must begin with the principle that our basic reliance for health insurance protection for the population as a whole should be voluntary health insurance. But, recognizing the special problem of insuring the health of the aged, I believe Congress should enact a program based on the principles I shall set forth.

In considering these principles, we should keep in mind that taxes levied by the Government to support a health insurance system are equally compulsory, whether they are in the form of general revenue taxes or earmarked payroll taxes. Hence, the alleged distinction between plans on the basis of "voluntary" versus "compulsory" is, in my opinion, both illusory and irrelevant insofar as financing is concerned. As to the voluntary or compulsory nature of the receipt of benefits, I shall comment further.

The principles I advocate are these:

1. Health insurance should be provided for as many as possible over 65 without reference to a means test.

The concept of an "earned benefit" resulting from a contributory system is an important one to retain—one which stresses individual initiative and dignity in our society.

2. The basic mechanism for achieving this should be the contributory social insurance system, supported by payroll taxes, which exists in the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system. A separate "health benefit trust fund" should be established in this system to account for the taxes received and benefits paid.

This well-administered system has proved to be effective and economical. Its contributory nature has been completely accepted and is, indeed, strongly supported by employees as well as their employers.

3. The full payroll-tax increase required to finance the additional health benefits should be enacted at the same time as the new benefits.

The maximum additional tax needed for the benefits I propose would be one-half of 1 percent for employees and the same amount for employers.

4. Some 4 million persons over age 65 are not covered by OASDI insurance. Nearly half of these are recipients of old-age assistance payments, paid from Federal, State, and local general revenues. A second group among these 4 million are receiving retirement benefits from the civil service, railroad retirement, or other programs. A third group receive their support from other personal resources or are dependent on others for their support.

Those older persons not eligible for benefits under the OASDI system must, nevertheless, have comparable health insurance protection available to them.

I believe that the Federal program should permit payments into the separate health benefit trust fund for the purchase of the same health protection for these persons as would be available to retired OASDI beneficiaries. The Federal Government should match according to a formula any payments which an individual State wishes to provide to assist its older persons not eligible for OASDI in purchasing the OASDI health benefits. The Federal Government would also, of course, continue to provide Federal matching grants for old-age assistance payments, including those for medical care purposes.

5. Each OASDI beneficiary eligible for the statutory health benefits should be given an option to forgo those benefits in favor of receiving a special monthly cash benefit added to his regular social security check, provided he presented proof that he carried a health insurance policy at least equivalent to the protection afforded by the statutory benefits.

This option would give the benefit phase of the program, as distinct from the financing phase, a truly voluntary nature. It would encourage commercial carriers and voluntary health insurance organizations to continue their efforts to develop sound coverage plans for the senior population. Furthermore, individuals covered during employment by outstanding health insurance plans would thus be encouraged to continue such plans after retirement.

6. The program should provide at its outset for hospitalization, nursing home care and visiting nurse services, with additional benefits to be added as experience may indicate their desirability and feasibility.

A benefit schedule offering more total days of care according to the proportion spent in nursing home care and visiting nurse services would encourage beneficaries to use less costly facilities as soon as their medical condition permitted.

Early diagnostic services should be added to the benefits as soon as possible, to help minimize instances of hospitalization. Subsequently, it should be found possible to cover broader forms of organized home-care services, the costs of certain drugs, surgery, and possibly other physician services.

7. A State agency should be chosen or established to maintain standards set by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This agency would make reimbursement to hospitals, nursing homes, and visiting nurse services on the basis of actual costs. The agency would review and certify rates for payment based on actual cost as determined by uniform cost accounting methods. It would certify expenditures under the program and maintain a continuing review of operations within the State.

This program should be regarded as only one part—though a major part—of a larger overall effort to make better provision for our senior citizens who have already made their great contribution to our way of life.

For example, improved housing for the aged ranks as an important aspect of their well-being. But a sound health insurance

program is the most urgent immediate need—to the end that the retirement years shall be made as free as possible from the crushing cost burdens and anxieties attendant upon illness.

In the achievement of these objectives, our elder citizens deserve decisive and prompt action.

The Legislative Representative of the WCTU Reports to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent approved by the House, I am including herewith "The Washington Letter," by Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, representative, bureau of legislation, Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Her report is interesting and is worth the serious consideration of those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Mrs. Hays is doing outstanding service on behalf of her organization. She has our commendation. Her article follows:

THE WASHINGTON LETTER

(By Mrs. Glenn G. Hays, representative, bureau of legislation)

THE AIRLINE BILLS

Congress will be closing its present session when this issue of the Union Signal comes to you, so you will have a later report on S. 1432 and H.R. 1075. The latter is still on the agenda of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee of the House of Representatives. Since the House acted favorably on similar legislation in 1957, it is assumed tht the bill will pass if it can receive the attention of the entire House of Representatives.

On May 18 the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee recommended S. 1432 favorably to the full committee. On May 25 the full committee discussed the bill, but did not act on it. Instead, a hearing was scheduled for June 16 for the purpose of hearing General Quesada, administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, explain why his agency feels that its new ruling is a sufficient safeguard.

During the 2-hour hearing, representatives of two airlines, National and Continental, were heard in opposition to the bill in addition to Mr. Quesada. Representatives of the Airline Pilots' Association and Senator ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL, of Kansas, spoke and placed in the record statements in support of S. 1432. Senator STROM THURMOND, of South Carolina; Senator E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska; and Senator SCHOEPPEL brought out evidence in support of S. 1432 by their searching questions during the course of the hearing. Senators Moss, of Utah, and CARLSON, of Kansas, filed statements in support of S. 1432. Senators ENGLE, of California, and SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, members of the committee, participated in the discussion and questioning.

Presumably, S. 1432 will again be placed on the agenda of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee for consideration when the report of the June 16 hearing has been printed for their study. Letters from homefolk will be an important and possibly a deciding factor. If you have followed directives in previous issues of the Union Signal, your own Senators and Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON have heard your opinion that action on S. 1432 is vital during this session.

MORE LIQUOR TO DRINK

The distillers of this country apparently produced almost 145 million gallons of whisky in 1959, and they are looking forward with confidence to 1960 and the years throughout the "fabulous sixties." One commentator in a liquor publication gave an optimistic forecast, "All grains, including corn, rye, and barley malt are in excellent supply and at reasonably low prices. Water is plentiful, labor is plentiful and the spring of 1960 looks favorable to whisky making, at a reasonable cost."

Spirits magazine believes that 1960 will be the greatest year yet for the hard liquor interests, "greatest in sales, greatest in production, greatest in favor as a normal part of American life." They see the decade of the sixties as "prosperity, secure and growing in richness."

Spirits regards the American families with an annual income between $4,000 and $8,000 as the "shank of the liquor market, the bread-and-butter part of the population for the majority of distillers, importers, package stores, and bars." The number of purchases made by this salary group will not be much less than those made by higher salaried families in the over $8,000 salary level. Nor will the proportion of money spent for liquor be much less according to Spirits.

The ascending wage scale enters into the distillers' rosy prophecy for 1960, the year that will probably be the biggest since repeal. Women and younger people are an encouraging factor. Vodka's fantastic rise is largely a young people's boom. The urban Negro and the Puerto Rican are counted upon to help the liquor industry open a golden door in 1960.

While envisioning a consumption of liquor exceeding even the historic year of 1946, Spirits still insists that drinkers are drinking less liquor. It was the spread of consumption over many customers, not the amount each consumed, that made 1959 a big year. Thomas J. Donovan, president of Licensed Beverage Industries, said per capita consumption was only 1.24 gallons, against the post-repeal average of 1.26. And that figure is 35 percent of the prohibition average, he said.

Mr. Donovan's figures do not tally with those recorded in the statistical abstract of the United States. His source of information has not been indicated. Nor has the U.S. Government made public any statistics as to the per capita consumption of illegal liquor either during prohibition or since. It would be interesting to consult the crystal ball which enables Mr. Donovan to refer to the "prohibition average."

Reprinted here are the records on per capita consumption prepared by the U.S. Government and printed annually in Statistical Abstract of the United States.

Distilled spirits—Apparent average annual per capita consumption in the continental United States, 1850–1958

[In tax gallons]

1850	2.24
1860	2.86
1870	2.07
1871–80	1.39
1881–90	1.35
1891–95	1.37
1896–1900	1.12
1901–05	1.39
1906–10	1.43
1911	1.46
1912	1.45
1913	1.51
1914	1.44
1915	1.26
1916	1.37

Distilled spirits—Apparent average annual per capita consumption in the continental United States, 1850–1958—Continued

1917	1.62
1918	.87
1919	.79
1920	.22
1921	.32
1922	.18
1923	.11
1924	.10
1925	.09
1926	.09
1927	.08
1928	.09
1929	.09
1930	.08
1931	.07
1932	.06
1933	.05
1934	.33
1935	.70
1936	.81
1937	1.03
1938	1.00
1939	.93
1940	1.02
1941	1.04
1942	1.13
1943	1.11
1944	1.03
1945	1.22
1946	1.39
1947	1.28
1948	1.06
1949	1.02
1950	1.02
1951	1.23
1952	1.00
1953	1.10
1954	1.12
1955	1.07
1956	1.13
1957	1.17
1958	1.12

(NOTE.—1922–34, inclusive, include quantities withdrawn for certain manufacturing, compounding, medicinal, and sacramental uses.)

The "prohibition average" would presumably be the per capita average for the years 1920–33, inclusive, or approximately 0.12 which does not support Mr. Donovan's contention.

The Communist Conspiracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit a speech which I gave before the United Veterans Council in San Jose, Calif., on Memorial Day, entitled "The Communist Conspiracy":

THE COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

(By the Honorable CHARLES S. GUBSER)

We meet today to honor those who have given their lives in the defense of our country.

We meet under another great cloud of international tension and view shattered hopes which fell when a shameless ruler in the Kremlin used the U–2 as a readymade excuse for a decision he had already made—to torpedo the summit conference and with it the hopes of the world for peace.

There is only one way in which we can truly honor our war dead and that is to

rededicate ourselves today to the preservation of the things for which they died.

They died to preserve liberty. Today we must rededicate ourselves to the same purpose.

Preservation of liberty requires strength—the strength to meet and conquer military aggression.

The much discussed U–2 plane flight to a depth of 1,300 miles over Russia clearly shows that our military strength has been underestimated in many circles. Our Strategic Air Command has been telling us for years that they have the ability to penetrate and destroy Russia. This ability has been described in detail to those of us who have access to classified material because of our membership on certain committees and it has also been given to the general public. But for some reason or other some have chosen to disregard the facts.

The U–2 incident shows that Russia can be penetrated and can be destroyed.

It is important to mention here that most criticism about our military defense system has been of the so-called missile gap. While it is true that Russia does possess more ICBM's than do our forces, it is also true that when everything is taken into consideration—all missiles, all planes, all ships, and all ability to retaliate, the United States is now, and will remain a superior force to that of the Soviet Union.

But there is another strength far less dramatic and far more difficult to achieve which we need if we are to preserve the liberty which the men we honor today fought for and earned. This is the strength to resist subversion.

I am sorry to say that I have serious doubts about our ability to resist Communist subversion. I never fear the ability of the American people to resist aggression when they expect it. This is the reason our people have willingly voted $40 billion defense budgets; because we know of the danger from Russian armament. But where the U–2 flights have given us the intelligence and the information necessary to build military strength, we have no reconnaissance flights to show us the strength and the danger of internal subversion. What small effort has been directed to alerting the American people of this danger from a Communist conspiracy has, I am sorry to say, been shot down by our own people.

In the book, "A Night to Remember," the story is told of the five iceberg warnings sent by wireless to the steamship *Titanic*. When the sixth message, "Look out for the icebergs," came in, the *Titanic's* wireless operator wired back, "Shut up, I'm busy." Thirty-five minutes later the ship, whose captain had said, "God himself could not sink it," was sinking.

The phrase "Remember Pearl Harbor" should remind us that we were cocksure and complacent before the afternoon of December 7, 1941. The much-maligned Dies committee reports of Japanese espionage by fishing vessels had been ridiculed as headline hunting—much as some of the effort of today to alert the public to the Communist conspiracy is also ridiculed. We even ignored the messages we intercepted in the broken Japanese code.

I well remember the famous commentator, Fulton Lewis, Jr., speaking in the San Jose Civic Auditorium in November of 1941. Asked about the possibility of a war with Japan he replied, "I can best answer that with a bit of blank verse. 'That noise you hear in the Orient, them ain't sabers, neighbor, them's knees'."

Since the close of World War II distinguished Americans have been warning us and one cannot help but wonder on this Memorial Day of 1960 if we shall heed these warnings.

In his speech to the 1957 national convention of the American Legion, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, chief of the FBI, said, "To dismiss lightly the existence of the subversive threat in the United States is to deliberately commit national suicide. In some quarters we are surely doing just that."

Communist doctrine is known to be founded upon conspiracy. It has not changed.

The Communist master plan for world conquest was stated by Lenin in these words, "First we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia, then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

On another occasion Lenin added, "As long as capitalism remains, we cannot live in peace. In the end one or the other will triumph."

In a speech to the Lenin School of Political Warfare in 1931 Dmitri Manuilski, at one time presiding officer of the United Nations Security Council, said, "War to the hilt between communism and capitalism is inevitable. Today of course we are not strong enough to attack. * * * So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record. * * * The capitalistic countries, stupid and decadent * * * will leap at another chance to be friends. As soon as their guard is down we shall smash them with our clenched fist."

Georgi Dimitrov advised the Lenin School of Political Warfare how to make use of innocents and dupes as he called them. "As Soviet power grows there will be a greater aversion to Communist parties everywhere. So we must practice the techniques of withdrawal. Never appear in the foreground; let our friends do the work. * * * A university professor, who without being a party member, lends himself to the interest of the Soviet Union, is worth more than a hundred men with party cards. A writer of reputation, or a retired general, are worth more than 500 poor devils who don't know any better than to get themselves beaten up by the police."

Have these views so long held by Communists changed in recent years?

As late as September 17, 1955, Nikita Khrushchev warned us: "If anyone thinks that our smiles mean abandonment of the teachings of Marx, Engels, Lenin, he is deceiving himself cruelly. Those who expect this to happen might just as well wait for a shrimp to learn how to whistle."

On November 18, 1956, the same Khrushchev said, "Whether you like it or not history is on our side. We will bury you."

And just a few weeks ago in Paris, Khrushchev heaped insults upon our President and the American people as he dashed the hopes of peace-loving people before the summit conference even commenced.

I don't believe anyone in his right mind can say that Communist intentions have changed—nor have Communist techniques.

There is a Communist conspiracy. And it is well protected by our own law.

It is ironic that the very liberties, which the men we honor on this Memorial Day died to preserve, have been twisted and perverted to protect and shelter subversives and Communists who would destroy that liberty. I speak of the new interpretation of the commonly used phrase "civil liberties."

Traditionally our interpretation of an individual's rights was to consider them sacred except when they were in conflict with the rights of the Nation or the rights of other people. Under this concept of individual liberty we are prohibited from dumping garbage on our neighbor's front lawn because such an act would endanger the health of others. The same concept prohibits us from driving too fast because in so doing we place others in jeopardy. But the new concept of individual rights and civil liberties seems to be that they are supreme even above the rights and the best interest of the Nation. Even our courts have held that the individual has the right to engage in subversion against his government. Look at some of our recent court decisions.

Our Supreme Court has denied the right of States to enforce their own sedition laws.

It has turned Communists loose who have taught the forcible overthrow of our Government with evil intent.

The Court has held that the State Department could not discharge a Government employee who had given secret military plans to the editor of a Communist magazine.

Our courts now say that a State attorney general does not have the right to ask a lecturer in a State university if he believed in communism.

It has said that the U.S. Attorney General did not have the right to ask an alien if he had recently attended Communist meetings.

The Court has ruled that Communists seeking the right to practice law need not answer questions about Communist affiliation.

It has questioned the right of Congress to investigate communism and suggested that it is broad scale intrusion into the lives and affairs of private citizens.

And to cap the climax the Court has ruled that the State Department must give a passport to Communists including one who was involved in the spy ring of Julius Rosenberg and was going to India to live with a Communist who had renounced his American citizenship.

With the greater strength that comes from this weakening of our laws, the Communists and their fellow travelers are hard at work at this very moment to achieve their objectives.

First of these objectives is the elimination of Federal and State security programs. Everyone admits that Government employment is not a right but a privilege. Yet the effect of many of the aforementioned Supreme Court decisions is to prevent the Federal and State Governments from withdrawing this privilege from those who associate with Communists and who are security risks. We are even required to give the dignity and protection of a U.S. passport to a Communist who leaves this country for the purpose of harming the country which issues the passport.

Many well meaning groups in this country whose loyalty is not in question, have swallowed the Communist propaganda campaign that security programs both Federal and State, smack of fascism and nazism. This genuine fear of a police state has been seized upon by Communist conspirators. Well meaning persons have, without knowing it, been fighting the Communist battle for them.

Another Communist objective is the recognition of Red China. The Communist espionage apparatus needs the diplomatic immunity of its embassies and consulates to set up spy centers. It needs the unbroken seal of the diplomatic pouch to transmit orders to its spies and couriers and to receive back their reports and microfilm documents.

Many well meaning individuals have swallowed the Communist line, hook, line and sinker and have said in effect, "The Chinese Communist nation exists, why must we refuse to admit it? Wouldn't it be better to meet them face to face and gain access to their country? As long as they exist we cannot continue to refuse to recognize their existence." To these people I say, the greatest mistake this Nation ever made was the recognition of the Soviet Union. Four American Presidents refused to recognize the Communist government of Russia and it remained weak and ineffective so long as it was unrecognized. Communism began to spread through the world as soon as the United States extended diplomatic recognition in 1933, because, in violation of all international morality and even of the execu-

tive agreement by which recognition was extended, Soviet Russia used her embassies and consulates as centers of espionage, subversion, and propaganda. In spite of this some Americans say that we were morally wrong in sending a U–2 plane 60,000 feet over Russia into air which, to my knowledge, no international lawyer has said belongs to Russia. And we do it for the purpose of learning the facts which are necessary to prevent the world from being plunged into another war.

Another objective is to halt nuclear tests, and well meaning and sincere individuals in this country support the same objective. In so doing they do not feel that they are supporting Russia but merely supporting what is good for mankind.

Obviously nuclear tests should be halted; but can they be halted without some assurance that the Russians will actually live up to agreements? Look at the record of Russian violation of their solemn commitments.

During the last 25 years the United States has had 3,400 meetings with the Communists. All this talk led to 52 major agreements and Soviet Russia has broken 50 of them.

The Communists have followed Lenin's dictum about treaties and agreements: "Promises are like piecrusts—made to be broken."

In the 3 years prior to 1958 the United States met 73 times at Geneva with the Chinese Reds to negotiate a release of 450 American prisoners. How many American servicemen have been accounted for or released?

In light of such a record, how can anyone plead for limiting our military potential by refusing to develop weapons through nuclear testing when we have no assurance that Russia will do the same? Suspending of nuclear tests unilaterally without guarantees that Russia will adhere to her agreement is exactly what Russia wants.

Some counter this argument and say, "Well, we are the peace-loving country, we should prove to the world that we are sincere by taking the first step to relieve tensions."

I am truly concerned about the attitude in some circles that the United States must take a succession of first steps. If we do and it is a step backward and Russia doesn't take a similar step, then we have a new and compromised position which isn't as good as the position we occupied before. Then there will be a new status quo and after a time you can expect these same people to urge a new and bold first step from the new position. Can't they see that such a policy means nothing in the world but a gradual retreat toward slavery?

Understand that I do not say for 1 minute that anyone who advocates unilateral suspension of nuclear testing is knowingly serving the Communist cause. But whether he knows it or not, and I am sure he does not in most cases, he is truly giving the Communists what they want.

Another Communist objective which is inadvertantly served by many innocent Americans is that of propaganda. Communists are spending $3 billion a year on propaganda which is reaching every city and hamlet in our Nation. In one day the Communist propaganda coming through New York City alone fills three large warehouses and not a single piece is labeled "Communist propaganda" as required by the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

In viewing my daily congressional mail it is amazing to me to see the same words crop up in the letters from sincere and unsuspecting constituents that one sees in this type of Communist propaganda. Reference to the FBI as "a Nazi-like gestapo," to the House Un-American Activities Committee members as Fascists and witch hunters are repeated each day by people who haven't the slightest idea how those phrases were planted in their minds. If they were to know, they would realize that this is the product of the Soviet propaganda machine operating on $3 billion per year.

Another objective of the Communist conspiracy is to humiliate the United States.

It is well known that Communists masterminded the insulting demonstration against Vice President NIXON which included spitting on him and the throwing of rocks and garbage.

Some may doubt, but I do not, that the deeds of Fidel Castro in Cuba are masterminded by the international Communist conspiracy.

Recently in our city of San Francisco, known Communist agitators were seen in the crowd whipping young college students into a frenzy to demonstrate against the House Un-American Activities Committee. It strikes me as something more than coincidence that these demonstrations were organized on the weekend which preceded the ill-fated summit conference and were prominently played up in the Russian press as a demonstration by the American people against their Government and one of its congressional committees. I doubt seriously that these young students demonstrating before the San Francisco city hall, some of them not ready to shave and some who refuse to as all good beatniks should, none of them dry behind the ears, actually knew that they were being used as tools of trained Communist organizers.

In the crowd of students and beatniks at San Francisco, were known Communist agitators who were passing out literature that had been mailed directly from the Congress of the United States.

Though it may be undignified I can only say that had one of the students been my child there would have been a very urgent date between me and that child in the woodshed.

Another objective of the Communist conspiracy is to stimulate a peace offensive. Let me quote once again the words of Dmitri Manuilski, "the bourgeoisie will have to be put to sleep. So we shall begin by launching the most spectacular peace movement on record."

Remember the Palo Alto Peace Club, now officially listed by the Attorney General of the United States as subversive? And there are many other organizations which fall for the Communist peace offensive and by no stretch of the imagination can be considered as disloyal or subversive. But disloyal or loyal they are still influenced and taken in by the Communist peace offensive. These people urge us to take bold first steps on the presumption that Khrushchev and other Kremlin leaders will negotiate in good faith and will keep their agreement. This belief is held in spite of the long record of Soviet violations of their solemn promises.

My words are not those of a warmonger. I sincerely do believe in peace and sincerely believe we should do everything reasonable to achieve it. But I repeat that a succession of unilateral first steps can mean nothing but a gradual retreat toward slavery. It is time the American people were alerted to what a Communist peace offensive really means and stopped serving it in their wishful thinking.

Another of the major Communist objectives is to nullify all anti-Communist legislation. On January 16, 1958, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, testified that 49 of the top 108 Communists convicted by Federal juries under the Smith Act have been set free by Supreme Court decisions. The Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 has been nullified by decisions of our own courts, and so have the antisedition laws of 44 States. This is not preservation of civil liberties, this is giving it away.

And the last Communist objective which I will discuss is muzzling the FBI and congressional investigations. For years the Communist Party has poured out its most hysterical language against what the Reds call the gestapo-like FBI.

During the month of May 1959, high school seniors applying for admission to the University of California took an examination in which they were required to write a 500-word essay on 1 of 12 topics. The seventh topic of the 12 contained the following language: "What are the dangers to a democracy of a national policelike organization, like the FBI, which operates secretly and is unresponsive to public criticism?" This statement is absolutely untrue. In the first place the FBI is not a national police organization, but works with State and local police authorities. Secondly, it is responsive to public opinion because the Director of the FBI reports to the Attorney General who in turn reports to the President and who in turn is responsible to the people. It gets its funds from a Congress which certainly is responsive to public opinion.

The university has since disavowed the question and apologized to the FBI.

I shall not make the assertion that this question was deliberate service to the Communist conspiracy. But whether it was deliberate or not, the fact still remains that one of our great universities imprinted the fact upon young minds that the FBI was a sinister organization. This is the Communist line and whether it was intentionally planted or not is immaterial. The fact still remains that the Communist cause was served.

It is well known that card-carrying, identified Communists are registered as lobbyists in the Congress of the United States. Is it wrong for a congressional committee to expose this fact to the public and tell them about it?

Let me quote from a speech made in the House of Representatives on May 5 by my colleague from Ohio, the Honorable GORDON SCHERER, a member of the House Un-American Activities Committee. He says:

"To accomplish its objective of destroying the Committee on Un-American Activities, this Communist-controlled group (the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee) has sent its cohorts into cities throughout the United States in advance of committee hearings. Its paid agents have done everything possible in advance of, and even during, such hearings to stir up animosity, contempt, and hatred for the committee. Its agents have circulated petitions; appeared on radio programs; arranged meetings, rallies, and picket lines; issued press releases; and placed ads in newspapers."

Mind you this speech was made on May 5, which is exactly 1 week before the recent hearings of the Committee on Un-American Activities in the city hall at San Francisco. Wouldn't you say from hearing that quotation that my colleague from Ohio was a prophet? Certainly there were petitions, there were radio programs, meetings arranged, there were rallies and picket lines, there were ads in newspapers.

Unfortunately these ads and these petitions told outright lies. What is more unfortunate is that those lies came from a speech by a Member of the House on the floor of the House of Representatives. This speech said, "that the committee had subpenaed 110 public schoolteachers in early June 1959. Most of the subpenas were served on the teachers at school at 9 in the morning on June 5."

Ladies and gentlemen, this is not the truth. Upon checking the files of the committee it is found that of 101 subpenas served, 97 teachers were actually served in their homes. Only four were served at their schools, and it is my understanding from unofficial resources that these four were not served in their classrooms.

Recall for a moment the recent San Francisco hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee. What fact enters your mind first? The rioting. Who stirred up the rioting? Known Communists.

What would have happened without the demonstrations? The hearing would have been orderly and brief newspaper reports would have been written instead of glaring headlines.

If reputations were damaged, the rioting and the resulting headlines did it. And who incited the riots? Known Communists. It necessarily follows that the object of the demonstrations, whether participants knew it or not, was not to preserve civil liberties, but to discredit the committee.

Forget for a moment the Communists who participated and the gory details of the San Francisco incident. Ask this question: What is the justification for this committee?

Here it is in simple terms: The security of the United States is the business of Congress. Most Congressmen feel that the Communist conspiracy is a threat to our security. Therefore, Congress should have a committee to investigate communism to alert the public to its danger and to revise our laws to cope with that danger.

This objective and this tactic of the Communist Party of discrediting the committee which seeks to expose the Communist conspiracy is to me the most serious threat to our efforts to resist internal subversion.

It was Pope Pius XI in 1937 who said, in response to a searching question about communism, "How is it possible that such a system long since rejected scientifically and now proved erroneous by experience, how is it, we ask, that such a system could spread so rapidly in all parts of the world?" He answered his own question in these words: "The explanation lies in the fact that too few have been able to grasp the nature of communism."

When our enemy was Nazi Germany our Government and military leaders studied every detail of the enemy and his strategies. One of our great generals was George S. Patton. Early in World War II when the Germans were advancing, General Patton was asked one day if he wasn't discouraged. His answer was precise: "I have studied the German for 40 years. I have read the memoirs of his great men. I have studied every detail of all his military campaigns. I have attended some of his staff courses. I know exactly how he will react under any given set of circumstances. He does not know what I will do. For this reason when the time comes I shall beat the hell out of him."

And this he did.

We can no more save our Republic from communism merely by saying we are against communism than we can cure a cancer by saying we are against cancer. To conquer the cancer we must kill it or it must kill us.

But to cure cancer, to cure any disease, or to defeat communism we must know how serious it is. Knowing how serious it is, we will not fall prey to the overgeneralization that civil liberties must not be restricted even when they are against the interest of the entire Nation. We will continue the Un-American Activities and other congressional committees and give them freedom to investigate Communists and pro-Communists. We will keep present anti-Communists laws and we will strengthen them. We will strengthen security provisions and the laws which keep Communists out of our government. We will restore to the executive branch the right to question aliens awaiting deportation and give it the right to deny passports for those who refuse to sign non-Communist affidavits. We will say to ourselves that no man, regardless of his occupation, is immune from investigation when there is reasonable cause to believe that his actions are aiding the Communist conspiracy.

If we do these things we will act positively against communism and repudiate our past policy of reacting too late with too little.

With such an attitude, and only with such an attitude, can we lick the Communist conspiracy and keep faith with those we honor today—the men who have given their lives in order that we might live as free men and women.

I recall the story of the lost child on a Kansas prairie on one of the coldest nights the prairie had known in years. After hours of searching the neighbors of the frightened family decided they would all join hands and walk across the prairie in an effort to find the little boy. In so doing they covered every square inch of the prairie. After a short time they found the boy but unfortunately he had succumbed to the cold and was dead. The bereaved father gathered the boy into his arms and through his sobs and tears said, "God, why didn't we join hands sooner?"

Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, this year, the Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association, of Oakdale, Wis., celebrates its 25th anniversary.

During its 25 years of service, this fine co-op has written a commendable record of service; in addition, it has played an important role in the economy of the community. For such a record of constructive work, the members, officers, and employees deserve congratulations.

At the 25th annual meeting, the members of the co-op adopted a number of resolutions, many relating to legislation pending before Congress.

Recently, these resolutions were forwarded to me by Manager Lloyd McCaskey. I request unanimous consent to have the resolutions printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 1—OAKDALE 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Whereas the Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association in 1960 is entering into its 25th year of existence; and

Whereas tremendous progress has been made by the association in the years of its existence toward the providing of service to its members now totaling 4,293; and

Whereas the splendid cooperation of members, officers, employees, past and present have been entirely responsible for the growth and success of the association: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association extend to all former and present officers, employees and members its grateful thanks.

RESOLUTION NO. 2—REA LOAN SOURCE AND INTEREST RATES

Whereas the Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association by virtue of its operating in predominately rural communities faces inherent handicaps in providing adequate and full service to all its consumers, not faced by its competitive privately owned utilities with more consumers per mile than Oakdale; and

Whereas this and other handicaps prevent Oakdale from being strictly competitive with private investor owned utilities operating in metropolitan areas with high density of population and high industrial loads; and

Whereas the need for an adequate source of low interest rate capital to finance expansion and new construction to serve growing needs, continues; and

Whereas certain groups are urging legislation to force rural electrical systems into the private money market which would result in increased interest rates on its capital needs: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association, That our congressional representatives be urged to oppose any and all legislation which would remove the Rural Electrification Administration from being our source of capital loan funds and which would in any way increase the prevailing interest rate.

RESOLUTION NO. 3—HEADWATER STORAGE BILL

Whereas bill H.R. 7201 known variously as the upstream benefit bill, the downstream benefit bill and the headwater storage bill is due to come up for consideration before the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas said bill if passed will tend to confer unearned, windfall benefits upon private power companies owning a dam upstream from a Federal dam at the ultimate expense of rural electric systems which purchase all or part of their power from Federal hydro projects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this 25th annual meeting of the Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association go on record as opposing unrestricted headwater benefit payments on Federal hydroelectric developments and its opposition to bill H.R. 7201.

J. C. CURTIS,
ALBERT REMINGTON,
WILLARD BURKEPILE,
Resolutions Committee.

True Feeling of the Japanese People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the following letter from a Japanese trade association describes the feelings of one group of people for the United States.

This letter was written to a former mayor of Seattle who has visited Japan in the interest of good will on several occasions.

I am confident the majority of the Japanese people entertain a friendly feeling for the United States in spite of recent Communist-stimulated activities and understandable but misguided pacifist manifestations.

The letter follows:

DEAR MR. DEVIN: It is with deepest regret that we had to face the stark reality of our Government being compelled to solicit postponement of the much anticipated visit of President Eisenhower to our country, on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the sign-

ing of Treaty of Amity between the United States and Japan. Agitation manifested at Haneda Airport of Tokyo, upon the arrival of White House Secretary James Hagerty to arrange for the President's visit, had grown to undreamt of proportion, culminating in the necessity of our Government's most reluctant decision of June 16.

The decision was greatest disappointment to the largest majority of our people who were all looking forward to welcome one of the greatest and most honorable guests to our country we ever had the honor to welcome. It would have afforded them that much desired opportunity for them to manifest their utmost gratitude for the President's inestimable contribution to the promotion of friendly relationship between our two countries.

We sincerely hope that this most unfortunate circumstances will not be misunderstood by Americans at large. Manifestations of violence shown by a very small minority in Tokyo, certainly do not represent feeling of the Japanese people. We are all aiming and striving for everlasting friendship between our two countries.

We are taking the liberty of addressing you these few lines to ask you for your sympathetic understanding on the matter and for your kind cooperation in explaining our true sentiment on this occasion to your friends and associates.

Renewing our regret for this most unexpected and unfortunate turn of events and soliciting your valuable assistance in conveying the true feeling of our people to your colleagues, we are

Yours very truly,

KOBE FOREIGN TRADE ASSOCIATION,
TORAMITSU YASUDA, *President*.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my newsletter of July 2, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

The battle over adjournment was won by the Democrats. Instead of finishing all work and adjourning "sine die" (until the new Congress), the Democrat leadership decided to recess and to convene again in August. We could have easily finished our work. This leaves unanswered the question, "Why?" The reason will become evident later—but only to those people who concern themselves in learning what Congress is doing.

I summarized my views during consideration of the sugar bill in this way: "Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that action against Cuba is long overdue. Why subsidize your enemy? Why delay responsible action as we have done up to this point? Why has the House Democrat leadership delayed so long in programing this bill before committee and Congress? As we face a recess adjournment instead of adjournment sine die, I am reminded once again of the failure of Democrat leadership to provide leadership. Obviously something must be done, and done now, to stop this expensive subsidy to Cuba. Meanwhile, we can let our domestic producers provide the sugar, and also buy from friendly allies." While the sugar bill is a good example of the failure of Democrat leadership, there are many others.

The minimum-wage battle wasn't over whether or not to hike the amount and increase the number of people covered, but over how much of an increase would be made in each instance. The radical and far-reaching bill brought to the floor by the Education and Labor Committee and supported by an overwhelming majority of Democrats was amended into a moderate measure by the bipartisan effort of almost all the Republicans, including me, and a goodly number of southern Democrats. The vote on the "moderating" amendment was close, 211 to 203. My own view was stated bluntly and succinctly to the House: "Mr. Chairman, I believe that the Federal Government has no constitutional authority to set wages. Therefore, I oppose minimum-wage laws." That view was supported by only 71 others in the vote on final passage. The count, 341 to 72.

All Federal employees, including postal workers, received a substantial pay raise when both Houses of Congress voted to override President Eisenhower's veto of the something-for-everybody election-year package Congress had passed earlier. Thus, we kicked another three-quarters-of-a-billion-dollar hole in the administration budget. My views on this sort of politicking were stated at the time of the vote in the House:

"Mr. Speaker, in overriding the President's veto of this pay increase we have capitulated to the political pressure of lobbyists, in this case representing the postal workers' unions. We are guilty of permitting legislative dictation. If one pressure group can do it, so can others. Then in the aggregate total our representative government will fail. No longer will we have judicious study of legislation, but roughshod political dictation. This course can only result in the disintegration of our form of government and our society of free people.

"I condemn this pay raise as factually wrong and financially unsound, though politically expedient. Therefore, I voted to uphold the veto. The President's statement contains the facts, including his recommendation that the temporary 2.5 percent raise already in effect be made permanent, and indicating his willingness to go along with a further reasonable hike commensurate with increased living costs.

"That this bill goes far beyond those reasonable norms is manifest. To the extent that it does, we are simply rewarding one group—well organized Federal employees—at the expense of all other taxpayers. At this time, as much as ever, we legislators need to exercise self-discipline, letting November's votes fall where they may."

Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, is the guest of my final television program of the current series. Senator GOLDWATER, a frequent visitor to Dallas, discussed his new book, "The Conscience of a Conservative," with me, going into the true definitions of the terms "conservative," "liberal," and "radical." This program will be shown Sunday morning, July 10, over WFAA–TV.

Cairo and the Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to an important article appearing in the current issue—No. 56, summer 1960—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. I refer to the article Cairo and the Panama Canal, an original analysis of activities by President Nasser's agents in Panama.

This article states that the Cairo regime in association with the Castro government, has been endeavoring to undermine the U.S. position at the Panama Canal and incites Panamanians against the United States while receiving tens of millions of dollars from the U.S. Treasury.

I submit, Mr. President, that this is a most unhappy situation and certainly deserves the closest attention of Congress. I ask unanimous consent to include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAIRO AND THE PANAMA CANAL

Testifying before a subcommittee of the House of Representatives in April of this year, Mr. G. Lewis Jones, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, assured Members of Congress that there was "progress in normalization of our relations with the United Arab Republic." It would seem to us that in the lexicon of international diplomacy "normalization of relations" between countries implies that each side has agreed by deed as well as word to respect the rights and interest of the other. Moreover, it would also seem to mean that each side has taken upon itself the obligation not to commit any acts which would seriously damage and/or discredit the interests of the other country. If we judge "normalization of relations" by these standards, then we must frankly express our astonishment at Mr. Jones' optimism.

SOUTH OF THE BORDER

Certainly, Cairo's blacklisting of U.S.-owned ships and harassment of American seamen by Egyptian officials and their minions cannot be regarded as proof that the U.A.R. has at last begun to respect the interests of the United States. However, nowhere do we find a more meaningful example of Nasser's deliberate aim to undermine the position of the United States than in Latin America. Comparatively little has been written about this subject, but this does not mean that it is of no significance. On the contrary, recent developments clearly indicate that the U.A.R. is steadily building up its apparatus of subversion south of our borders and is employing all of the tricks it has learned in its drive to damage the standing of the West in Africa and in Asia.

It is true, of course, that Egypt is still a very poor country and certainly does not possess the resources, let us say, of the Soviets, in probing Latin America. Nevertheless, given this disadvantage, the Cairo regime is making the best out of it. The move is not a massive one as yet. On the contrary, it appears to be primarily concentrated on Cuba and Panama. The reason for this concentration is not only due to the lack of resources but is also related to the fact that in both of these countries there are enormous opportunities for inflicting grave harm on the security interests of the United States.

CAIRO AND CUBA

Cuba is in the throes of a highly emotionally charged anti-American campaign sponsored by the Castro government. Consequently, Cuba has become the focal point of all sorts of anti-American intrigue and

activities. It is, therefore, a most suitable headquarters for alien forces, not only of the Soviet variety but also of the kind fostered by Mr. Nasser and company. Thus, collaboration between Cuba and Egypt has been strengthened over the past few months by mutual visits of leading figures in both regimes. Cuba's Foreign Minister paid a special call on Nasser in the earlier part of this year. In this connection Newsweek magazine (Apr. 4, 1960), revealed that Nasser's Deputy Foreign Minister Hussein Sabry, promised Castro help in the event of "Yankee aggression." As reported by Newsweek, Sabry boasted, "We have lots of arms and ammunition, some we no longer need, we are ready to ship them to you free."

The collaboration between the United Arab Republic and Cuba has found expression in their joint activities in Panama against the United States. Panama has enormous strategic significance, in view of the fact that the Panama Canal runs through its territory. American strategists know very well that even in this day of the jet plane and the ICBM the usefulness of the Panama Canal, both for military and commercial purposes, is beyond question. If someone were to lay hands on that canal, it would do a great deal of harm to the United States and the democratic cause throughout the world. Yet it is precisely here that Castro and Nasser have teamed up. Writing from Panama (Mar. 12, 1960), the New York Times noted military commentator, Hanson W. Baldwin, had this to say: "The Ambassadors of the United Arab Republic and Cuba have established cordial relationships with anti-U.S. elements in Panama.

"The envoys are promoting the idea of pan-Arab-Latin American cooperation with the Nasser revolution in Egypt on the one hand and the Castro revolution in Cuba on the other."

Mr. Baldwin further revealed that the U.A.R. Legation in Panama, headed by its Minister, Mohammed el Tabei, is very active and is, indeed, disproportionally large compared to the number of Arabs living there. Moreover, there are virtually no Arab commercial interests which could justify such a large staff of Arabs in the legation.

Mr. Baldwin noted that Mr. el Tabei had made numerous contacts with key Panamanian officials, including Aquilino Boyd and Prof. Ernesto Castillero, "whose acts helped to lead to anti-U.S. riots on the Canal Zone borders last fall." Of course, Mr. el Tabei, according to Mr. Baldwin, rejected the charge that the Cairo government was intervening in Panamanian-United States relations. He discounted the idea that anti-Semitic outbreaks in the Canal Zone had anything to do with the appearance of U.A.R. agents in Panama. "Our policy is to expand our relations with all Latin American countries," Mr. el Tabei said.

It goes without saying that there is nothing wrong for countries to expand their mutual relations, provided that they do not serve as a coverup for subversion and other provocative activities. However, the Cuban-Cairo duet is anything but a harmless exercise in spreading good will and cheer. As noted in the London Daily Express (Mar. 14, 1960), U.S. authorities are convinced that Nasser's chief agent in Panama has joined hands with the Castro forces to destroy the American position at the Panama Canal. "Both U.A.R.'s Ambassador Mohammed el Tabei and Cuban Ambassador José Antonio Carbrera Villa are busy behind the diplomatic scenes making friends and influencing people."

It appears that leading Panamanian officials have joined the Mutual Admiration Society which has been established by Nasser and Castro. Thus, the Panamanian Foreign Minister Miguel Moreno made a trip to Cairo in March of this year. During his stay there, Senor Moreno made a series of statements sharply castigating the United States "which could suggest that Panama is considering taking a leaf out of Egypt's Suez book as regards the Panama Canal" (London Times, Mar. 18, 1960). Indeed, Senor Moreno did not hesitate to state that his mission was to study the administration of the Suez Canal. As a matter of fact, he subsequently remarked that there was a close parallel between Egypt and Panama. In this connection, it is interesting to note that on the very same day that Senor Moreno was vilifying the United States in Cairo, the Cuban newspaper Revolucion, Castro's mouthpiece, published a scathing attack against alleged mistreatment of Cuban labor at the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo. Apparently, there seems to be some kind of coordination of tactics and propaganda between the Castro forces and the Cairo regime vis-a-vis the United States.

TARGET PANAMA

For the time being, Panama seems to have been chosen as one of the chief targets for Nasser's probing operations in Latin America. Undoubtedly, U.S. policy with respect to Panama could stand improvement. Certain conditions require rectification and the State Department has indicated an awareness of this fact. In this connection, the President recently announced a new series of grants, including a 10-percent wage increase for Panamanians employed in the Canal Zone. However, it does not appear that U.S. concessions alone will do the trick. Living conditions for the average Panamanian are very bad in contrast to the opulence of a handful of aristocratic families controlling most of the country's leading industries. In order to divert attention from these sharp and embarrassing contrasts, Panamanian politicians find the canal issue to be a handy weapon for whipping up anti-American sentiments. As a result, the United States is made a scapegoat. This is where the Egyptians and their agents come in. They have taken advantage of this situation to steam up the emotions of the Panamanians by making it appear as though the United States is responsible for all of the ills besetting that country. It should be noted that Nasser has employed this very same tactic in his own country.

The United States controls the Panama Canal in perpetuity under the Hay-Bunau Varilla Treaty of 1903. U.S. equity in the canal is estimated to be in the neighborhood of $460 million. Moreover, the United States pumps more than $60 million a year into Panama's economy. This total includes an annual rent of close to $2 million, wages for some of the 10,000 Panamanians employed in the zone and payments to Panamanian concerns for supplies and services.

It must be recognized, however, that U.S. aid, and more which will undoubtedly be forthcoming, will not suffice, because the issue is no longer one of legitimate grievances as such. Instead, the United States is now confronted by unscrupulos demagogic politicians who use the canal issue as a battle cry while they are egged on by agents of Nasser and Castro. All expert observers agree that nothing will satisfy these politicians except complete surrender on the part of the United States. These were the terms expressed by Senor Moreno when he declared on November 29, 1959, that the time has come for Panama to break "the chains of servility."

It was precisely during November of last year that violent riots took place in the Canal Zone. The U.S. News & World Report (Dec. 14, 1959) stated: "Agents of Egypt's Nasser have been in Panama advising the politicians of that country on the moves to make to get eventual control over the Panama Canal away from the United States. Nasser is able to pose as an expert, having taken the Suez Canal from its owners." The activities of these agents were spurred on by Cairo propaganda inciting Panamanians against the United States. In this connection, the New York Times (Dec. 2, 1959) reported: "Two broadcasts are beamed nightly from Cairo to Panama, dedicated almost wholly to the alleged unfair treatment the nation is receiving from the United States in respect to the canal."

The activities of Nasser's agents have been confirmed by American journalists who have been on the scene. Thus, the Washington Star's correspondent, Richard Fryklund, referred to the Egyptian, Communist and Cuban rabblerousers, who boasted that the demonstrations against the United States "have paid off and urge more of the same" (Mar. 30, 1960). Members of Congress, including Congressman DANIEL FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, have also expressed alarm over this situation.

CAIRO'S "DIPLOMACY"

Meanwhile, diplomatic activities between Panama and the U.A.R. have accelerated. On March 14, 1960, the first agreement was signed between the U.A.R. and Panama providing "for cooperation between the cultural and educational institutions of the two countries." Shortly before the agreement was signed, Cairo announced that Egypt's Deputy Foreign Minister Sabry would undertake a good-will mission to Latin America including Panama. As regards Mr. Sabry's activities in Panama, it is noteworthy that he participated in the University of Panama's seminar on "political ideas." The Panama radio reported that Mr. Sabry was "invited to reply to several questions regarding the nationalization of the Suez Canal by the Egyptian people. The topic is of particular significance to the Panamanians, due to the analogous situations of the two canals."

Mr. Sabry's missionary work in Latin America has been reported with enthusiasm in Cairo. One Cairo newspaper reported that the Egyptian Deputy Foreign Minister had declared that "imperialist domination in the past separated the Arab countries and the states of Latin America. But now we have acquired our independence and we must bolster our relations because of our common [sic] cultural heritage." Mr. Sabry further expressed the hope that the U.A.R. mission to the Latin American States would realize "something good and beneficial." A week later the Cairo radio returned to that theme, praising Sabry's good will mission to Latin American countries "whose circumstances are similar to those of the African and Asian countries" (Mar. 13, 1960). According to Cairo (Apr. 5, 1960), Sabry presided "over a conference of U.A.R. ambassadors to the Latin American States." Presumably, this is intended to further tighten and coordinate Cairo's "diplomatic" campaign.

Needless to say, Nasser's diplomacy in Latin America has been receiving ample assistance from Egypt's propaganda mills. From time to time, Cairo propagandists will dwell on alleged exploitation in South America at the hands of "Yankee imperialists." When Vice President NIXON was stoned by mobs during his South American tour, Cairo propagandists could hardly conceal their joy. When differences broke out in Bolivia last year, the Cairo newspaper Ash-Shab declared (Mar. 5, 1959): "The people of Bolivia revolt in order to get rid of slavery, domination and American exploitation. In fact, the revolution of the Bolivian people is a part of the comprehensive revolution of all the states of Latin America, aimed at ridding themselves of the domination and exploitation of the United States. The Bolivian people will undoubtedly attain their aim. Neither America's military base nor its monopolizing domination will be of use to it."

NASSER RAGES AGAINST UNITED STATES

Anti-U.S. propaganda is the stock in trade of the Cairo regime. Admittedly, it fluctu-

ates depending upon Nasser's estimation of how determined the United States will act on one issue or another. Sometimes, of course, Nasser will conceal this anti-U.S. bias by hypocritical denial that his regime aims to injure the United States. On March 22, 1960, he told a delegation of American journalists, in discussing relations with the United States, "we do not harbor any hostilities toward any country." Yet, on this very day when he avowed his peaceful and friendly intentions, he received the credentials of the first Panamanian Ambassador to the U.A.R. In February of this year, Nasser accused the United States, Britain, and France of interfering in Arab affairs and threatened to block the shipment of oil to the West. During that very same month, Nasser accused the "imperialist powers—the United States, to be exact" of inciting anti-Egyptian forces in Syria. The New York Herald Tribune correspondent noted that this was Nasser's "first attack on the United States in months" (Feb. 19, 1960). Apparently, some people who should know better but who prefer to indulge in wishful thinking, were taken aback by Nasser's anti-U.S. tirade. The fact is that even when Nasser is quiet, his intrigues against the United States never cease. Cairo's propaganda, on the other hand, is like a faucet that can be turned on or off depending upon the time and circumstances.

In March, Nasser resumed his attacks against the United States, this time calling the leaders of Jordan stooges of imperialism. The Cairo strong man shouted: "The rulers at Amman have dedicated themselves to British and American domination in their work against Arab nationalism" (New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 8, 1960).

In May of this year, Nasser delivered an incendiary speech describing Members of the U.S. Senate as thieves. He heaped scorn on American aid and in words reminiscent of Hitler, described American assistance as "the methods of Cohen." In the very same speech he defended his piratical policies at the Suez Canal declaring that it was "an Arab canal" while implying that the United States had no right to the Panama Canal.

AND THE UNITED STATES PAYS

Nevertheless, the United States continues to pour tens of millions of dollars into Egypt. A few months ago, the World Bank with the blessings of our State Department, agreed to turn over $56 million to the Cairo regime for improving the Suez Canal. This was done without insisting that Nasser respect the principles of international law and permit all nations access to the Suez Canal as an international waterway. About $120 million worth of U.S. agricultural commodities have been turned over to Egypt. Millions of dollars' worth of gifts, grants, and other forms of American assistance are going to Cairo. Needless to say, this does not deter the Egyptians from accepting substantial contributions from the Soviets.

Nasser has been playing this game for some time. It is the old strategy of pitting one side against the other to extract a maximum advantage from both. Of course, he will publicly deny his anti-Americanism and proclaim his passionate love for peace. But what does it all mean? El Amal, the Government newspaper of Tunis, supplied the answer: "Colonel Nasser's 'words of peace' can by no means be reconciled with the arrogance, incitement, and plotting published daily over the Cairo radio and the U.A.R. press. Nasser's words of peace have one aim and one aim alone; to get more dollars from the United States" (Dec. 16, 1959). The Tunis newspaper has hit the bull's eye. Members of the House subcommittee who listened to the testimony of Under Secretary Jones should ponder this evaluation of Nasser's "peaceful" intentions toward the United States.

UNHOLY ALLIANCE

Double trouble for the United States. In Panama, the Cuban and Egyptian Ambassadors get together to encourage the Panamanians to take over the U.S.-owned Panama Canal.

Ever since Nasser seized the Suez Canal the Americans have feared for their property in Panama. With good reason.

For if one nation can get away with robbery, why not another? If Egypt, why not Panama? (Daily Express, London, Mar. 5, 1960.)

A New Outlook on American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, June 19, marked the 10th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian American Youth Association. To mark this occasion a mass rally was held in Cleveland.

In recent weeks the American people witnessed the role that youth can play in support of Communist objectives when led and stimulated by agents of Moscow. The riots of Japan which made it necessary to cancel President Eisenhower's visit to Tokyo were the actions of misguided youth. This lesson will long remain in the memory of the American people and should stand as a warning sign of the importance of youth in the domestic affairs of any nation.

It is therefore refreshing to find youth groups in the United States who are motivated by love of liberty and freedom and the desire to assist in removing the threat of imperial Russian communism from the face of the earth. The Ukrainian American Youth Association is such a group. The young men and women who comprise this organization know full well the meaning of communism, the tyranny of Russian imperialism, and the consolidation of these two evils as the source of the dangerous tensions which now grip the world. They take pride in the traditions which are the American way of life; they support, without reservation, the moral and political ideals which form the foundation of our American democracy. They are determined that these same moral and political ideals shall be the birthright of all nations and people because thereby they know the Ukrainian nation, the land of their forefathers, will be free and independent.

Under unanimous consent I insert my address given before the Ukrainian American Youth Association in the RECORD:

A NEW OUTLOOK ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. Ciszkewycz, officers, and members of the association and friends, I am happy to play a part in this 10th anniversary celebration of the Ukrainian American Youth Association. This is an important milestone in the affairs of your organization, and I am confident it marks a period of progress toward the high goals which you have set for your association and for its members. For all of you it is a time to look back at your beginnings, a time to examine your purposes in terms of the realities of this hour, and, a time to plan your future activities in the light of these realities. You are much better qualified than I to evaluate your accomplishments of these past 10 years, but I believe I have something to offer you in your examination of the realities of the present and some suggestions you might consider as you chart your future course.

This moment in history reflects deep and far reaching changes in the social and political order of the world. On all sides of us we see these changes taking place and we are alert to the great changes in the offing, changes which correspond to the aspirations of almost one-third of enslaved humanity for freedom, liberty, and national independence. We are entering the climatic period of the revolutionary era. This will be the period of crucial trial and test for the political and moral ideals of freemen. At issue is the question whether our free, open society; the democratic way of life; has the inner strength and external driving power to survive the organized onslaught of Russian imperial communism and to extend the frontiers of freedom until all nations and all men are self-governing. It will not be enough for us to hold back the wave of red totalitarianism, we cannot survive through defensive efforts alone. We are now faced with the immediate challenge to hold and strengthen the areas of freedom and to launch a political, economic, and diplomatic offensive against the enemy of all mankind.

The task before us is, therefore, twofold. We must have a defensive capability which openly warns the Russian imperialists that we have the military power to render them helpless and that we will not hesitate to use it if they instigate circumstances which would make such action inescapable. This defensive capability must be attained by us and our associated allies without 1 month, or 1 week, or 1 day of delay. Then we must launch an offensive against the Russians with the assurance that we have the power to back up the political, economic, and diplomatic actions which the reality of the present danger demand. Nor should we back off from any risks involved by taking such political, economic, or diplomatic actions The responsibility for risks should be placed firmly on the backs of the Russian tyrants; if they choose to interfere with the orderly progress of all nations toward freedom and national independence, the responsibility will be theirs and not ours.

Looking to the urgent need for a program of positive actions in the cause of peace with justice, a scale of values must be set if the program is to measure up to the challenge. There are those who call for diplomacy as the major arm of this offensive. These are the people who advocate summit conference after summit conference and personal diplomacy such as the infamous visit of Tzar Khrushchev to the United States. These same people are calling out for a new President who has had personal experience in dealing with the Russian Communists, a man who by experience would be qualified to drag our Nation into more summit conferences, a man whose experience would make him a senior operator in personal diplomacy with Khrushchev and company. The candidate they have in mind is, of course, Vice President NIXON, because he meets all these qualifications.

I have often wondered how Americans of Ukrainian origin felt after Vice President NIXON, during his visit to Moscow last year, referred to Ukraine as the Texas of Russia. This was the startling statement he made after stopping a young lady on the streets of Moscow and saying, "What a pretty Rus-

sian girl," and receiving her pointed reply, "I am no Russian, I am a Ukrainian." All of us know that George Kennan is the one who launched this false idea about the Ukraine being the Texas of Russia, but we could hardly expect Vice President NIXON to be so badly informed on this basic matter. Perhaps Mr. Kennan is one of Mr. NIXON's many silent advisers.

Then there are those who are calling out for an economic offensive against the Russian Communists, including the proviso of trade with Red China, economic assistance to the so-called satellites and a variety of other strange formulas for victory. They are fundamentally economic determinists, people who see life as nothing more than the material advancement of the individual regardless of the system under which it is attained. I do not make any reference in this connection to the need for our country to have a sound, realistic program to assist the newly independent nations and the newly emerging nations in the economic development of their countries. The case for these nations is clear, we must help them by means of development loan funds, technical assistance, friendly advice and at all times extending the hand of genuine friendship. But this formula must not be extended to Communist regimes imposed upon the people of once free nations by force, intrigue, and violence. Nor should this program be extended to those who prefer to sit on the fence between the free world and the camp of the Russian Communists in the belief they can blackmail us into supporting their economic development schemes. This is no time for fence straddlers—either they get down off the fence or suffer the tragedy of Humpty Dumpty.

Then there are those who see the challenge of our times as political, the struggle of ideals and ideas, a conflict of two political systems which can not be reconciled one with another. Either one or the other must triumph, there can be only one winner and the loser is doomed to extinction from the face of the earth. I belong to this school of thought. Cold reason and long experience prohibits my being otherwise. Now, what are my thoughts on the scale of values in the program of positive actions against the Russian Communists?

To begin with, we, as a nation, must set our political goals and make them known to all the people of the world. These political goals must dominate all our thinking. All other aspects of the program must be subservient to them. That which does not support our international political objectives must be put aside. All actions in the field of economic assistance and diplomatic contact must be measured by this compelling rule. These things we have not done. These things we must do. This is the real task which will confront the new President and his administration come January 1961. This is the task which has confronted the present administration for the past 7 years, and their failure to measure up is demonstrated by the fact that summit conferences, personal diplomacy, exchange of visits between NIXON and Khrushchev have been the substance of their efforts. These efforts have failed. The evidence of the failure is to be found on all sides. We cannot afford 4 more years of such failures.

Now for more pleasant things. Let us look to the future, what are the elements of a political action program against the Russian Communists? I see these as the elements:

1. Self-determination for all nations and all people. This policy must be applied to all people on all the continents, on both sides of the Iron Curtain.

2. In appying the principle of self-determination we must get rid of the Russian concocted dilemma which exists in the Department of State, popularly known as nonpredetermination. This current policy is interpreted to mean that we must not speak about self-determination for the captive non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union because to do so would prejudge the situation. Consequently, State Department interpretations of Public Law 86-90 are in violation of the spirit of the law and play right into the hands of the Russian imperialists. We must resolve this Russian dilemma in the State Department and all those who support the confusion techniques of nonpredetermination.

3. We must support the national independence movements behind the Russian Iron Curtain. In so doing we must take into official account the fact that all the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union have already exercised their right to self-determination during the period 1917-18 and elected for national independence, for the dismemberment of the Russian Empire. Having done this, all these nations had their independence robbed from them by the Russian Communists, just as happened to such nations as Poland, Hungary, and Rumania following World War II. Therefore, the question of self-determination for these nations is not pertinent. The question of restoring national independence to all these nations is the real issue.

4. We must stop doing business with the oppressors in the Russian Empire and start doing business with the oppressed in the Empire. By this I mean we should look to the majority peoples of the Soviet Union, the oppressed non-Russian peoples, for a solution to the tensions which grip the world. These people have the answer. The answer is the return of their liberties and their national independence. They are willing to fight and die for this objective. All they ask of us is our political support, the stimulation of world opinion to understand the truth of their present plight and the power of their aspirations. They will peacefully dismember the present-day Russian Empire—the real threat to all humanity—if we will but stand by them. This can be done; we can develop world opinion in support of the aspirations of these captive nations, and by so doing we can put the responsibility on the Russian masters to accept the will of the people or face the wrath of a thoroughly aroused free-world community. But we cannot do this while playing footsie with Khrushchev and company, by forcing our people against their conscience to be courteous and considerate of the bloody-handed Khrushchev during his unwelcome visit to the United States.

5. We can begin to use the United Nations as a platform for such a political campaign. As a first step, we should take action to cause the Russians to live up to the United Nations resolution on Hungary or be expelled from membership in that body. As a second step, we should declare the non-Russian nations of the Soviet Union and the so-called satellites of Central Europe as non-self-governing territorics and demand that they be treated as such in the Council, the Assembly, and the work of the various organs of the United Nations. This will be sufficient as a starter. Such action will pry the lid off the fakery barrel which has been imposed upon the people of the world and open the door to a just and lasting peace.

This program I commend to your consideration as you plan your program for the immediate years ahead. It is a program worthy of your support, a program which I believe you could support with vigor and confidence. Having known the Russians and their Empire of fear from firsthand knowledge, many of you are in a position to speak with authority about the aspirations of the good people of Ukraine. By making these aspirations known to all the American people, you will strike a powerful blow for peace with justice, which is and will remain our goal.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Wisconsin Radio Stations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Congress—when it reconvenes in August—will have a sizable workload to handle—if it is to write a real record for the year.

Recently, I delivered an address over Wisconsin radio stations viewing some of the major legislation yet to be acted upon in the final days.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY OVER WISCONSIN RADIO STATIONS

Friends, as you know, Congress has now recessed—the House of Representatives until August 15 and the Senate, until August 8. Why? The legislative workload has piled higher and higher in recent weeks.

As a result, the majority leadership decided to adjourn—rather than attempt to push through all the pending legislation.

Question. Will this mean a long session in August, Senator WILEY?

Answer. Well, that depends upon many things. It will depend upon whether Congress is ready and willing to "roll up its sleeves" and get to work; or whether an effort will be made to "play politics" with the issues.

For myself—as prior to recess—I am prepared to stay as long as necessary to get the whole job done when Congress reconvenes in August.

Question. Senator WILEY, how large a workload remains in August?

Answer. A big one.

WILEY-SPONSORED LEGISLATION PENDING AFTER RECESS

Briefly, now, I'd like to review some of the proposals—which I have sponsored—that I believe are of major interest to Wisconsin. These include:

1. S. 910, to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and special assessments with respect to certain Federal real property.

2. S.J. Res. 208, to establish a commission to study and report on the impact of foreign trade on business and new industrial expansion in the United States. As a cosponsor of this measure, I feel we need to take a "hard look" at the effect—the adverse effect—which the increased flood of imports, for example, is having on our domestic industry.

3. Expansion of agricultural research through enactment of S. 690 now in conference. The purpose of this legislation would be to expand research of utilization of agricultural products for commercial purposes.

Incidentally, still pending also is my bill for establishing a dairy research laboratory—with similar objectives—at Madison, Wis.

Question. What are other measures of particular interest to Wisconsin?

Answer. Although there are many more, a number of additional areas include:

4. S. 2917, to provide an increase in price supports for dairy products to provide a

brighter outlook for the dairy farmer in America. Currently, the measure is pending before the Senate.

5. S. 894, to establish an ice-age national park, encompassing the glacially formed moraines in Wisconsin. Unfortunately, the long-delayed studies by the Department of Interior had held up action on this legislation.

6. S.J. Res. 186, to establish a National Voters Day. Prior to the recess, this resolution—for encouraging greater voter participation in elections—passed the Senate. Currently, it is pending before the Judiciary Committee in the House of Representatives.

7. S. Con. Res. 96, to provide for an updated Internal Security Manual—a useful guidebook to strengthen the internal security of the country. This measure has also passed the Senate and is pending before the Administration Committee in the House of Representatives.

8. Legislation to extend the termination date for the Menominee Indian Tribe, as well as to provide exemptions from Federal documentary stamp tax on transfer of property from Federal control to the tribe. To accommodate the change in status, the Wisconsin State Legislature has created a 72d county. Unless additional time is provided to put the tribal affairs in order, serious economic and social problems may arise for the Menominee Indians. Unless these are resolved, it will handicap their ability to integrate properly into the political and economic life of Wisconsin.

OTHER MAJOR LEGISLATION PENDING BEFORE CONGRESS

Question. Now, Senator WILEY, what are some of the other major issues which would be a matter of priority—or major controversy—when Congress reconvenes?

Answer. When the "closing gong" of the recess came, the unfinished business included the following:

Consideration of the proposals for increasing the minimum wage and extending it to more workers.

Proposals for providing medical and hospital care for the aging citizen.

What to do about Federal aid to schools.

Expanding the housing program.

Carrying forward the mutual security program.

Public works bill—including funds for flood control and port and harbor development and additional planning, manitenance, and surveys for projects including: Eau Galle River, Menominee Harbor, Milwaukee Harbor, Sheboygan Harbor, Cornucopia Harbor, Duluth-Superior, Pecatonica.

A great many of these major programs are highly controversial. Consequently, they could touch off real battles after Congress reconvenes in August.

UPCOMING NATIONAL CONVENTIONS

Question. What about the upcoming Democratic and Republican Conventions, Senator WILEY?

Answer. As we are aware, the conventions are scheduled as follows:

The Democratic meeting in Los Angeles on July 11.

The Republican meeting in Chicago on July 25.

The nominations of candidates for the Presidency and Vice Presidency—as well as adoption of platforms—by the respective parties, of course, is a significant—and essential—step in our two-party system toward filling the highest public offices in our country.

Because of the breakup of the normally continuing sessions of Congress, however, we must be careful not to allow politicking to unduly influence the outcome of action on the pending legislation.

Politics—in its best sense—can, and does, effectively serve the interests of our people—locally, statewide, and nationally.

At the same time, irresponsible efforts to make political football out of issues for "personal or party" gains can work against the public interest.

Consequently, we must—in these challenging times—encourage adherence to the highest standards of conduct by candidates and parties in electioneering.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FUTURE GOALS BY STATES AND COMMUNITIES

Question. Senator WILEY, today—inside and outside of politics—we are hearing, and reading a great deal about "goal setting" for our country.

Answer. Yes.

Currently, the Nation and its leaders are attempting to establish—and "shoot for" goals to meet the Nation's future needs for economic progress and security.

Personally, I think this is a good idea. Highlighting this effort has been the appointment of a National Goals Commission by President Eisenhower. Among its purposes are the establishment of objectives and assuring a good "forward pace" by channeling human and natural resources into programs that best serve the interests of the country.

To obtain maximum progress, however, I believe we need a coordinated effort also to assure a top-to-bottom voluntary mobilization of the Nation's people and resources.

Question. How can this be accomplished, Senator? What goals shall we be shooting for?

Answer. We recognize, of course, that—if this is to be done—each State and community can helpfully contribute by establishing such goals in relation to its potential. This involves such steps as:

Surveying manpower, natural, financial, commercial, and other resources.

Reviewing needs for services, products, transportation, housing, education and other needs, together with recommendations for fulfilling such needs.

Following a realistic survey of a community or State's potential, then the task is to establish—and attempt to reach—high-achievement goals within the range of their human and natural resources.

To accomplish such a program, however, certain additional requirements need to be fulfilled. These include:

1. A thorough analysis of its potential by a State or community—and then realistic efforts to "set its sights" on promising objectives in such fields as agriculture; housing; education; social progress; trade; expansion of industrial and business activity to create more jobs; and other purposes.

2. Encourage citizens to support—and invest in—local and State projects, to further provide much-needed—and sometimes scarce—finances for projects;

3. Assure local and State tax systems favorable to industrial and business development.

4. Look for new markets for local—or State—produced products or services to provide greater business and industrial activities—which means more jobs—and economic health.

5. Improve our "human resources" development program;

6. Create a spirit of cooperation between management and labor to minimize costly strife that jeopardizes progress.

7. Improve and expand air, rail, road and water transportation systems to better meet present and future needs of the economy and the people;

8. Carry on unexplored opportunities for development of mineral, timber or other natural resources; expansion of tourism; participation in trade; locating new markets for communities' products or services; and other opportunities.

Each State and each community can, of course, best determine its requirements,. potentials and objectives, and set up the machinery for mobilizing its human and natural resources to attain its goals. If such a grassroots program can be effectively established, I believe it will go a long way toward successfully paving the way for an ever-brighter future for the State and the Nation.

The overall objectives, of course, is to stimulate a greater, communitywide effort to make each hometown or community the "best place" to live in America.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is a brief, between session review of the legislative and other tasks that remain ahead of us.

As in the past, I shall look forward to hearing from you folks, from time to time, as issues of public interest arise in the days ahead.

Now, again, this is your senior Senator, ALEX WILEY, saying: Thanks for taking time out of your busy days to "tune in" to this program.

The Enemy Is No Amateur

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I offer for the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Tampa Tribune, Tampa, Fla., on Sunday, June 19, 1960. It is a great statement in behalf of my Freedom Commission bill, laying down the battlelines in clear and uncompromising terms:

THE ENEMY IS NO AMATEUR

There was once a statesman who sought to arouse his people to more vigorous action against an enemy who was encroaching, bite by bite, upon the edges of their domain.

"You have never framed any plan of campaign for yourselves," he said. "You take your marching orders from him. You have never foreseen any event until you learned that something has happened or is happening. All this was once permissible. Now things have come to a crisis."

The statesman was Demosthenes, warning the citizens of Athens against the threat posed by Philip of Macedonia. The complacent Athenians, enjoying the world's richest civilization, paid little heed. So Athens fell and its power and glory survive only in the history books.

Demosthenes' words seem peculiarly fitted to the United States and its allies today.

In the struggle with communism we seem habitually to wait for the Communist attack before we devise a defense. All too often we are caught by surprise—as in the Communist takeover in Cuba and the Communist-led riots which forced President Eisenhower to cancel his visit to Japan.

And we still console oursleves with the thought that if we just spend enough money on guns and missiles and foreign aid we can make the free world secure against communism.

The recent disasters in Japan and Cuba should help us to realize that we can outgun communism and outspend communism and still lose the cold war.

It has been said, in tiresome repetition, that what we are fighting is a new kind of war—a war not for physical objectives, but for the minds of men. No truer evaluation of today's struggle could possibly be made—yet America is failing to take the measures necessary to win such a war.

Our great fault is that we fail to sell democracy with the same zeal and efficiency

with which the Russians and Chinese go about promoting communism. We have the world's finest system of government here in America and we tend to feel that the Cuban farmer or the Japanese student or the Afghanistan herdsman ought to recognize as much. But that's not necessarily so. There are millions of gullible Snow Whites in the world to whom communism's apples look irresistibly delicious; too late they discover the poison inside.

It is to these people that we must convey both the fatal fraudulence of communism and the virtues of democracy.

How?

Primarily, by a bigger, better organized, shrewder campaign employing more highly trained workers.

One plan for helping to accomplish this purpose already is before Congress. For months it has been gathering dust in committee pigeonholes.

This is the proposal offered by Representative SYD HERLONG, of Florida, and Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, for the establishment of a Freedom Academy.

The Academy, in the words of one advocate, would serve as "a West Point of political warfare." It would prepare Americans to go forth in the world as effective crusaders for democracy and against communism; it would equip foreigners to take back to their own lands an appreciation of the blessings of freedom and the evils of Marxism. It would, in short, enable the United States to do what Russia has been doing for years—train both natives and foreigners to fight its cause unceasingly on the battlefronts of the cold war.

Congressman JUDD summed up the need very well in testifying before a Senate committee. He said:

"The amateur will always lose against the professional. I want professionals on our side. We have the better cause, but we are not professional in the presentation and advancement of it."

The Freedom Academy plan has not advanced very far in Washington, apparently, because some Congressmen think it's unorthodox and some bureaucrats fear it might encroach on their own areas of authority.

Well, this country has got to use some unorthodox measures and it's got to sweep aside politics-as-usual in behalf of the national welfare. The Macedonians are on the move—and they're no amateurs.

Address by Gov. Ernest F. Hollings at Commencement Ceremonies of the Medical College of South Carolina, Charleston, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a speech delivered by the Honorable Ernest F. Hollings, Governor of the State of South Carolina, to the South Carolina Medical College, which should be of great interest to every person.

We are extremely proud of the medical college in our State as it has a national reputation of being one of the leading medical and research institutions in the United States. I hope every Member of Congress will take a few minutes to read our Governor's speech.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS AT COMMENCEMENT CEREMONIES OF THE MEDICAL COLLEGE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, CHARLESTON, S.C.

Hippocrates, the greatest of Greek physicians, warned, "Strong maladies require strong medicine." This forebear of today's medical profession also wrote, "In order to cure the human body it is necessary to have knowledge of the whole of things." With the prophetic greatness of the ancient Greeks, Hippocrates' words have special meaning today.

The transcending malady of our times is the plague of compromise. Insidiously, it eats away at American principle and the free enterprise system in America. The strong medicine we need is vigorous action to reverse this deterioration. The medical profession must play a major role in treating this malady. It will require that you be broad enough in scope, and incisive enough in insight to help diagnose and treat the ills of compromise and equivocation. You must "have a knowledge of the whole of things."

The patient today is the equivocal man—a strange creation who stalks the land in growing numbers. He bears faint resemblance to the American of earlier day who believed in human responsibilities as well as human rights, who wrung personal achievement from his own initiative, thrift and prudence; who knew that the best governed was the least governed, who believed the American Constitution meant what its noble words said as written, rather than as interpreted by psychological or sociological theory.

This patient is marked by symptoms which are distressing in their potential impact on the welfare of the Nation. His economic pulse is slowing and becoming erratic because he is finding the rewards for personal initiative are being crushed by confiscatory taxation and stifling governmental regulation. Instead of seeking the thrills of achievement and profit through his own creative ambition, he is turning to the seductive beckoning of security. His goal in life is a safe niche in some paternal organization with pensions for old age rather than the risks of building his own future through competitive effort. He finds it easier to drift in groups than to strike out on his own. His instinct for thrift is being chewed to bits by the greedy jaws of loose money and credit. He is caught in the grip of rising costs and deflated value of the dollars he earns. If he is a farmer, he is told what he may plant. If he is a businessman, he is taught that his operations and profits must conform to the dictates of a silent partner—the Government. He learns further that if his profits reach a certain level, then this partner becomes owner of the business. If he is a worker, he is often told his right to work is governed by powerful group forces rather than by his own choice. In short, he is losing his self-reliance and with it fades the vibrant spirit of free enterprise which made this Nation great.

In addition to his weakening pulse, this patient finds himself suffering from cancerous moral fiber. Integrity becomes a word of relative meanings. Things which his forebears would never have condoned come easier to rationalize and explain away. Cheating on income tax returns becomes a national pastime and codes of personal conduct become "anything goes" so long as you can get away with it. This deterioration boils out in open sores when payola schemes are brought to light, Government officials are indicted for frauds, and general crime statistics soar. The no-compromise-with-evil spirit of his forefathers grows dimmer.

The mind of the patient is becoming clouded and unsure on fundamentals of self-government. He is told that powers reserved to the States under the Constitution are really meant to be in the hands of the Federal Government—that the original Federal-State balance of power is outmoded. He knows that the strength of the American system of government lies in its three separate but equal Federal branches—legislative, judicial, and executive. But in reality he sees the judicial taking over legislative power through far-reaching political decisions and the executive branch usurping the powers of Congress through the instrument of the Executive order and the preponderant weight of bigness. Legislatively, he sees government by pressure groups. He watches the strength of local government being sapped into the massive sponge of a paternalistic central hierachy. He is told the great American passion for liberty should be subjugated to so-called equality demanded by groups which have never learned that equality is an earned dividend of liberty.

Internationally, on the basis of unconditional surrender, he wins the war to end all wars, but learns that conditions exacted by our so-called ally have put us in the role of conquered. It is for us to concede. The great victories of World War II have been dissipated by the defeats of Yalta, Teheran, Potsdam, Panmunjom, and Geneva. He sees his nation being led to the summit time and again, each time coming away with less prestige and more concessions than before. He hears his national leaders talk of disarmament agreements with a nation which has never kept its previous agreements. He dreamily plays a game of international diplomacy while the Soviet engages in hard international politics. Because it is polite to do so, he sings the song of peaceful coexistence while he knows, and the Soviets know, that there can never be morally or politically peaceful coexistence between god-fearing democracy and atheistic communism. Because he plays the part of stupid one so well, he is treated in kind. From one unarmed reconnaissance flight, the Soviet accuses him of being an "aggressor" and derides him as "liar," "cheat," and "the one who never keeps his agreements." Immediately he responds with an investigation to make sure that there will never be a recurrence of conditions that will cause a summit failure, again pleading guilty as if he caused the conditions, as if he could control the conditions. Again playing the part of stupid one, what concessions he can't give at a summit he concedes at home to make sure the world knows that he has conceded. Even his best sellers at home carry this line. He reads in a current Pulitzer Prize winning novel that an American Senator "brought down the house" by telling an American audience "he would rather crawl to Moscow than die under a bomb." He wonders what can be the end result of it all.

The very heartbeat of this equivocal man is being slowed by the strictures of conflicting philosophies, haziness of principle and gray shadows of compromise which surround him. His history books tell him that America has always nobly risen to conquer whatever obstacle beset her, whether it be war against a foreign enemy or breaking through a domestic frontier. The national purpose has always hardened in the face of crisis and national effort has brought victory. But the great giant was brought to its knees in the Korean conflict. Unconquerable America would settle for less than victory. Today our patient is led to believe that peace is more important than victory. He is led to believe that any threat to America in her support or leadership of the free world should be met with peace. The plague of peace has immunized our national purpose. Working for freedom causes tension, and the great fetish of this decade is to ease tension. Unwilling

to preserve freedom apparently our national purpose is to consume its fruits.

Nothing could be more dangerous. Never has America faced a greater challenge, a greater need for national purpose. Never has our mission been more difficult.

The difficulty lies in failure to have knowledge of the whole of things. The equivocal man, like many medical patients, presents the frustration of improper self-diagnosis. It is no longer considered smart to feel bad and call the doctor to see what's wrong. Fashion, plus our present mania for specialization, requires that the patient know what's wrong so that he can call the right doctor in the first place. This trend, plus the disease of psychiatry, has all of us guessing the malady at the least pain, and mentally treating it. A wrong guess can become so fixed that many times a doctor must dedicate most of the treatment to dispelling fantasies, so that the patient may be conditioned to receive the proper cure. Such is the case of the equivocal man. He has sold himself the idea that changes from fundamentals or compromise of principle are desirable as "understanding." The equivocal man must first be conditioned. He must be sobered up from so-called understanding, so that he can receive the cure. Secondly, the difficulty is compounded in the equivocal man's failure to recognize he is in an epidemic—world war III. There are no high fever symptoms in this epidemic. World war III is cold. Rather than the warning of high fever or a Pearl Harbor, today we face a wily, vicious, unscrupulous foe who engages in cold warfare on the political, economic, and ideological fields. He intentionally keeps this war cool, lulling us to sleep with flights through the free world like a dove of peace, dangling before our eyes visions of sugarplums at the summit.

If we will appreciate these difficulties then we will realize that to win this war we must mobilize every resource at our command. We must close ranks. We must set our national purpose and that purpose must be to so strengthen ourselves in mind and body that we are impenetrable. Such strengthening can only begin at home and in the individual. In short, we must purge ourselves of the equivocal man by the strongest cathartic possible—a return to American fundamentals.

You must not only administer this cathartic, you must also take part of the dose yourself. The very breakdowns and weaknesses—the symptoms of equivocation—which threaten the Nation also threaten the professions. None have been exempt from their influence. In the law, courts and legal procedures are constantly employed to promote and provoke litigation, rather than dispose of it. In the teaching profession, so-called academic freedom in certain places has become so free as to make un-American a pledge of allegiance to America. In the church, many religious leaders seek inspiration and guidance from a Supreme Court rather than a supreme being. And the way for a southern journalist to obtain national acclaim is to bear false witness against his neighbor.

The equivocal man has infiltrated the medical profession. No longer is it a simple step from graduation to the treatment of the sick. Instead, the young graduate is swept into the flow of convention and conformity. Although standards have brought much progress to medical training, the tendency to conform has deprived the doctor of a vital element—his individualism. Working relationships must be established with the right hospitals. Professional referrals must be weighed in many balances. The office procedures you follow, the treatment you prescribe, the fees you charge, the office hours you keep, the clubs and civic organizations to which you belong, the neighborhood in which you live, the manner of dress, and even other more intimate details of your life will be dictated by forces which deprive you of all individuality. In short, the young graduate finds himself caught in a web of conformity and demands on his time, his talents, his energies even before he can ever get down to his basic mission—treating patients. But the great edifice of medicine has been built upon pillars of individual achievement—by the Halsteads, the Oslers, the Bialocks, and other illustrious men who were not afraid to stand alone rather than follow the line of least resistance.

I believe the best advice any young medical graduate today may receive is this: Remember the patient. Keep all other demands in perspective. Don't allow financial rewards or social status to cloud your sense of mission or your service to mankind. Work actively in your professional organizations toward individual and group progress rather than as drones seeking prestige. Never stop improving yourselves professionally. You must pursue perfection in medicine and mold your lives after the magnificent men you follow and the Great Physician which all men follow. While research has brought us miracle drugs and remarkable recoveries, there will be no discovery which will eliminate the hard work of a doctor. Of all professions, the medical profession still calls for the hardest work. You hold the highest of public trust. You also hold the greatest of opportunities as a profession to help the Nation rid itself of the equivocal man.

Your profession stands as a symbol of the finest achievements of American free enterprise. The American medical profession has brought this Nation the world's foremost record in medical care and progress. This has been accomplished by the personal efforts of devoted men and women such as you and by private and State educational facilities, always doggedly resisting pressures to bring this dynamic system under the deadening anesthesia of Federal control. Our State may well be proud of how she has met her responsibilities in this field, reflected here in this splendid Medical College of South Carolina. You as individuals may render no greater service than to devote yourselves to maintaining and strengthening the standards of your profession, providing the very best in care, and holding fast to the integrity of your profession as a profession.

The French historian de Tocqueville found in 19th century America, "There are men of integrity in almost all parties, but there is no party of integrity." I am sure he would say today that in its medical profession America has achieved both men of integrity in the profession as well as a profession of integrity. Our enemies would like nothing more than to see this noble profession, this symbol of American achievement, compromised by mediocrity.

To you of the high calling of medicine, there is no higher mission today than to help America cleanse itself of its greatest ill—the equivocal man. The malady is strong. The medicine must be stronger. Nothing less than a complete and swift return to American fundamentals can cure the patient.

Chiefs Praise FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK WESTLAND
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. WESTLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Bureau of Investigation under the leadership of Mr. J. Edgar Hoover has worldwide reputation for efficiency and fine work. The FBI has provided through the years many services to State and local law enforcement agencies and has been responsible to a great extent to the continuous improvement of law enforcement in the various States and cities.

Recently, the Washington Association of Chiefs of Police expressed its appreciation for the many services provided by the FBI in Washington State. This expression was in the form of a resolution which I wish to insert in the RECORD following my remarks. I also join the chiefs of police from my State in paying tribute to Mr. Hoover and Special Agent J. Earl Milnes.

The resolution follows:

Whereas the Washington Association of Chiefs of Police are assembled in conference in Chelan, Wash.; and

Whereas members of the Washington Association of Chiefs of Police are most appreciative to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the assistance and all the facilities which have been most generously provided by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the National Police Academy, the Identification Bureau, the Crime Laboratory and including the outstanding leadership and effort which has made police training in the State of Washington a most successful program: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this association express in writing their appreciation to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and Mr. J. Earl Milnes, Special Agent in Charge by forwarding to them a copy of this resolution.

WM. E. BJORK,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CHELAN, WASH., *June 10, 1960.*

Promote the Rule of Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee for Collective Security has written a cogent letter to the New York Herald Tribune of April 7, 1960, concerning the self-serving restrictions to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Under unanimous consent I include a copy of that letter in the RECORD:

PROMOTE THE RULE OF LAW

To the New York Herald Tribune:

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently tabled a resolution calling for repeal of the Connally reservation to acceptance by the United States of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. This reservation permits us to decide whether a dispute is within our domestic jurisdiction.

The American Society of International Law and the Institute of International Law have declared that it makes acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction illusory and urge its repeal. The President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, and leaders of the American Bar Association have also urged its repeal.

Two issues are involved: (1) Does the United States seek to promote the rule of

law in international relations? If so, it should be willing to accept the jurisdiction of an impartial tribune to decide legal disputes with other nations. A law which each party to a dispute can interpret and apply in its discretion is hardly effective. (2) Does the International Court of Justice inspire confidence in its competence and impartiality? The record of the Court has commanded approval both by governments and eminent legal authorities.

The Court has made it clear that it will regard any dispute as domestic unless it involves the interpretation of obligations established by international law or treaties binding the parties. The powers of the Security Council, where the United States may exercise a veto, would have to be invoked to enforce an unacceptable decision. This fact provides us ultimately with full protection against interference in our domestic affairs.

The Connally reservation not only prevents other nations from filing a suit against us in the Court, but it prevents us from similar action against other nations because it is applied reciprocally. The Court has been therefore unable to function either in the settlement of disputes or the clarification of international law as it was intended at the San Francisco Conference.

The United States can hardly assume leadership in developing the rule of law among nations while the stultifying Connally reservation creates the impression that our country does not mean what it professes. The Senate should repeal it now with the proviso that our waiver of the right to determine jurisdiction applies only in cases of disputes with nations also accepting the right of the Court to determine jurisdiction.

GOODHUE LIVINGSTON, Jr.,
Chairman, Committee for Collective Security.
NEW YORK.

Keeping Our Military Men at Peak Fighting Trim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, how to sustain interest in international problems is a subject that is challenging us all. An important appraisal of the need of keeping our military men at peak fighting trim has been written by Hal Miller, staff writer of the Baltimore News-Post, which deserves wide study. Mr. Miller has reviewed a volume on the subject by a Canadian author and has contributed comments based on his personal knowledge of military affairs. The review follows:

A SOLDIER NEEDS FIGHTING SPIRIT

("The Soldier in Our Time," by G. M. C. Sprung, 167 pages. Dorrance & Co., reviewed by Hal Miller)

An Army major general, and former associate of this writer in World War II days, facetiously described a raw rookie lieutenant as "the lowest form of human life."

This old ranker gripe was unique only in that it was repeated by a senior military officer, obviously not a West Pointer. More loyalty to his own species would be expected from a "ring-knocker," a wearer of the academy ring with the supersized emblem.

It has, however, been a job well done by an officer, a colonel in Canada's distinguished Regiment of the Canadian Guards, to write a significant commentary in "The Soldier in Our Time," on the need for combating civilization's tendency to soften fighting men.

His message comes at a time in world history when soldiers for freedom should be the toughest in the world.

Readers will recall that when Russia was our ally against Hitler, encomiums were heaped upon the Red troops and people for their bravery. Without adequate weapons, food, or transportation, they defeated elite Nazi forces.

Russian peasants, men, women, and children, it was said, joined the soldiery and together they virtually fought "with their hands" to repel German invaders.

We have heard the question debated whether luxury-accustomed young men of other nations could fight like that. The answer has, of course, been given in combat by American, Canadian, British, Greek, and other allied fighting men. Their courage is battle-proved.

Colonel Sprung deals with the question on two themes:

The spirit of the modern fighting man.

The relevance of this spirit to the wider crises of our time.

The suggestion is raised that Americans and Canadians are moving toward a critical era when their ways of living could make them militarily too feeble to survive in combat.

Colonel Sprung believes this a problem of epochal importance and that the highest priority should be given to toughening our moral, mental, physical, and military fiber.

Personal courage as the soldier's most vital weapon has been reemphasized by Brig. Gen. S. L. A. "Slam" Marshall, one of the few effective interpreters of the military to their real bosses, the American people.

From a physical standpoint, peacetime soldiers, assigned to office and administrative duties, are deprived of opportunities to keep physically fit. Lack of fighting missions and objectives, marching, field work, takes the toughening edge off military service.

Written compactly, "The Soldier in Our Time" is a publication of significance. Its message should be studied.

Rocketdyne Division of North American Aviation Plays Important Part in Our Outer Space Explorations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud that the Rocketdyne Division of North American Aviation, Inc., is located in the district that I represent in Congress.

The story of Rocketdyne is an example of American free enterprise and our Government working together to keep America strong militarily.

The folks who work at Rocketdyne are also hard working and good citizens of our community who contribute much to keep America strong on the homefront morally, spiritually, and economically.

At the end of World War II a small group of engineers at North American Aviation, Inc., were asked to study the propulsion system of a captured German V–2, the rocket which revolutionized warfare and which almost changed the outcome of the last war.

These studies have led to one of the Nation's most outstanding technical achievements.

In a very short time the North American engineers decided they could build a much more efficient engine, more powerful, and lighter. How well they succeeded is known throughout the world.

This small group became the Rocketdyne Division, headed by S. K. Hoffman. It now employs more than 12,000 people in its headquarters, Canoga Park, Calif., and its production plants at Neosho, Mo., and McGregor, Tex.

Rocketdyne engines are used in the Redstone, one of the most reliable missiles ever flown; in the Army's Jupiter, intermediate range ballistic missile; the Air Force Thor, an IRBM on defensive duty in England; in the Army Force's Atlas, the interconitnental ballistic missile which has had phenomenal accuracy in its test programs and which is now operational.

The first man to circle the earth in the awesome blackness of outer space will be put into orbit by a Rocketdyne engine. When man begins interplanetary flight it is most likely that he will be in a space vehicle powered again by Rocketdyne engines.

The division now is producing the clustered H–1 engines for the Saturn, which will have more than 1.5 million pounds of thrust for takeoff.

Rocketdyne is also developing a single-barreled engine with 1.5 million pounds of thrust which has been suggested as the power package for the Nova program and which would put Venus within reach of man.

Recently Rocketdyne was awarded a contract by NASA to develop a 200,000-pound rocket engine using liquid hydrogen which will have an efficiency approximately 1½ times that of any other engine of comparable size.

Because of the tremendous success of the Rocketdyne program, fortunately in time for this country, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following articles from the Los Angeles Times:

TWENTY OF TWENTY-THREE SUCCESSFUL SPACE SHOTS LIFTED BY ROCKETDYNE—POWERED WEATHER SATELLITE

(By Marvin Miles)

Rocketdyne engines built in Canoga Park have boosted 20 of the 23 successful satellite and space probe vehicles launched to date by the United States and furnished power for 234 missile, satellite and space firings since August 1953.

This impressive record was noted yesterday in a recapitulation of the Nation's ballistic missile program that began almost 7 years ago with first flights of the Army's Redstone tactical weapon.

In the 234 launchings, which included Atlas, Thor, Jupiter, and Redstone missiles and 34 satellite and space probe vehicles, Rocketdyne engines achieved a satisfactory performance rating of 94.1 percent.

Outstanding among these is the record achieved by the Redstone missile—56 successful firings out of 59 attempts—while only 1 of the 3 unsuccessful launches was attributed to engine malfunction.

RECORD OF LAUNCHINGS

The company's engines have launched a series of the country's most spectacular vehicles.

It was an A-series Redstone engine that hurled America's first satellite, Explorer I, into orbit on January 31, 1958, followed by Explorer III and IV using the same booster.

In October 1958, the first of the Pioneer series boosted by Thor engines accomplished the first of two successive lunar probes, followed early in December by a 63,580-mile space probe with Pioneer III boosted by a third Rocketdyne engine, the S3D Jupiter powerplant.

The Nation's 1958 space achievements were climaxed just before the end of the year with the launching of Score, the talking earth satellite that carried President Eisenhower's Christmas peace message into orbit.

SUCCESSFUL SHOTS

Score was an Atlas intercontinental ballistic missile powered with a fourth (MA series) Rocketdyne engine.

The company's rockets boosted nine successful space probe and satellite vehicles in 1959, including six Discoverer polar orbit satellites with payloads ranging from 1,300 to 1,700 pounds and the Pioneer IV probe that put a 13.4-pound artificial planet into orbit around the sun.

So far this year Rocketdyne engines have boosted four successful space shots, the Pioneer V solar probe, the Tiros I meteorological satellite, the Transit 1B navigational satellite and the Discoverer XI satellite for reentry nose-cone recovery. The latter vehicle went into orbit, although no recovery was made of the payload.

The frequency of ballistic missile and space launchings has shown steady progress in the last 28 months. In 1958, Rocketdyne boosters launched 56 vehicles, an average of just under 5 per month. Last year the total was 96, an average of 8 per month. So far this year the average has been seven per month.

ONLY ONE IN 1953

By comparison, there was only one launching in 1953, a Redstone. In 1954 there were four Redstone launchings and in the following 2 years, six and nine, respectively. In 1957 all 4 of the Nation's ballistic missiles were launched—13 Redstones, 9 Thors, 7 Jupiters, and 3 Atlases.

America's space vehicles (the three not boosted by Rocketdyne engines were Vanguard satellites) have returned a great wealth of data to scientists, more information by far than that received from Russian space efforts.

Wide variation of high altitude densities with time of day, season and geographic position has been observed.

From radio signals, propagation characteristics of the ionosphere and electron density distribution have been obtained.

Very low frequency propagation data were obtained from Explorer VI and that satellite and Pioneer I provided additional data on the earth's magnetic field.

Cosmic ray count was obtained above the atmosphere with counters in Explorer satellites and Pioneer probes.

The first elementary communication satellite was achieved in the Score vehicle.

Explorer cosmic ray counts brought discovery of the Van Allen radiation belt, with later Explorer vehicles and Pioneer probes showing the belt to consist of at least two zones.

A fairly low count of micrometeors corresponding to a total influx of 1,000 to 10,000 tons of material per day was recorded from Explorer and Pioneer observations.

METEOR EROSION

Meteor erosion and puncture problems were shown in general to be not particularly serious.

Pioneer V, launched March 10 and now millions of miles from Earth on its way to a Venus-like orbit of the Sun, has achieved a major success in long-range communications and continues to transmit data to Earth.

U.S. satellites have shown that moderate temperatures can be achieved in orbiting vehicles and that radiological hazard to space crews traversing the radiation belt may be relatively low, but the hazard high to those in a satellite orbiting through the belt.

Low resolution pictures of cloud formations were obtained from Explorer VI while the Tiros I meteorological satellite is transmitting television cloud pictures of a much higher order.

LOOKING INTO FUTURE

Rocketdyne (a division of North American Aviation) will remain in the rocket-engine field for a long time to come, it appears.

Not only is the company developing the H-1 engine for the giant Saturn vehicle, a 1.5 million pound thrust powerplant clustering eight Thor-type engines.

It is also developing for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration a single chamber (F-1) engine of 1.5 million pounds that can be clustered for thrust up to 9 million pounds in the awesome Nova vehicle of the future.

Nor is the company confining itself to liquid propellant engines, for it is expected to make a major announcement on solid fuel development in the near future.

Eloy Alfaro Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to insert highlights of the proceedings of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, on the occasion of the decoration ceremony and luncheon, at the Carlyle Hotel, New York City, in honor of Dr. Herbert Holt. Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost of the foundation, bestowed the Eloy Alfaro grand cross and diploma on Dr. Holt in recognition of his many years of devoted public service and more especially his work in the domain of psychiatry and psychoanalytic research.

Col. Emanuel Targum, past commander of the New York Jewish War Veterans, read a message from the Honorable Olmedo Alfaro, secretary-general of the foundation, authorizing the ceremony and conveying his personal greetings to all those assembled.

In conferring the Eloy Alfaro grand cross and diploma Dr. Bayern said:

I am delighted to confer on you, by direction of the board of dignitaries of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, the Eloy Alfaro grand cross and diploma. This foundation recognizes your many contributions to the common good, both in war and peace, by awarding you its highest honor. Your unselfish services to mankind, especially your dynamic leadership in the domain of psychiatry and psychonanalytic research, surely merit the widest appreciation.

Dr. Holt replied:

I am deeply touched and very proud to be included among the distinguished personages who have received the Grand Cross and Diploma of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. As a physician who treats the ills of the body, mind, and soul of people, I have always tried to live up to the high principles of my professions. I have especially tried to extend the knowledge of psychiatry to fields beyond the treatment of mentally ill people, feeling that the knowledge of the workings of the mind have greater implication than the treatment of the emotionally ill.

Since I believed that truer knowledge about the personality of man would be useful in the field of religion I have, for the last 7 years, worked to help priests, ministers, and rabbis to gain deeper understanding of the minds and emotions of man. I also believed that psychoanalysis could make a contribution to the understanding of the psychology of managers and the decision-making process. I therefore have taught managerial psychology to executives and especially administrators on city and State levels.

I have never thought that I have done anything unusual—just living my life in this fashion, but I am deeply touched and happily surprised to find recognition and honor bestowed on me. Thank you, Dr. Bayern, and the board of dignitaries, for granting me the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross.

The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation was organized to perpetuate and further the political and moral values of the Americas by General Alfaro, for whom the organization was named, and who, from 1895 to 1901 and from 1906 to 1911, was President of Ecuador. The philosophy of General Alfaro, known as the Lincoln of South America, was based principally on service to his fellow human beings and to the cause of international peace. The unselfish services of Dr. Holt to mankind by virtue of his leadership in the domain of psychistry and psychonalytic research comes within the framework of this kind of service to humanity.

Others who have been similarly honored in the past include President Eisenhower, former Presidents Herbert Hoover and Harry S. Truman, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, Generals MacArthur, Crittenberger, Devers, and Governors Harriman and Rockefeller.

Sharp Turns Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an address given by Mr. A. D. Davis, president of Winn-Dixie Stores, with headquarters in Jacksonville, Fla., to the 1960 graduating class at Stetson University, DeLand, Fla.

The address follows:

SPEED UP—SHARP TURNS AHEAD

When President Edmunds tapped J. E. Davis and me for these honors that have been bestowed upon us today, he also asked that one of us make a talk for commencement. J. E. pushed the talk part of the ceremony off on me. I immediately told President Edmunds that the exertion of receiving

a doctor's degree was about all I felt I could take in 1 day. Then he approached me in that "tears in his voice" persuasive way of his to which there is no such thing as saying no, and I ended up having to assume this responsibility. He assured me that I was the only person in the world who could make this talk and, of course, modestly I had to accept.

I assume this is the first time that you have graduated from college and listened to a commencement speech. Well, it's the first time I have made a commencement speech. Reminds me of the time we had a newcomer out at the ranch and he wanted to learn to ride horseback. He said he had never ridden a horse before. We told him that was just fine—that we had a horse that had never been ridden before so they should get along well learning together. The horse came out best.

You're hearing your first commencement talk and I am making the first one I ever made, so please be kind. Tonight I am like the boy riding his first horse—I may lose the bout.

It is surely a great day for you students, or ex-students as case may be. You have accomplished one of your most important objectives in life. You are privileged to attain this objective which many, many people never reach. You are fortunate. Your good health, your good intellect, your determination, and your good character has enabled you to finish college in a very great school. Stetson is not a big school, but it still has quality education which is very desirable. In some of our larger State schools students may have a feeeling they become numbers. I know of an engineering student who finished in 5 years without meeting the dean of his school. I am sure this doesn't happen at Stetson.

I would like to say something here tonight that would inspire you men and women to make a greater success of your future life. Let's catalog that word "success" now. I dont' say that success is measured in dollars and cents or in honors. It is happiness and contentment at the position in which you wish to find yourself that means the most. In whatever field of endeavor you may engage, if you are unhappy doing the task before you, then you are in the wrong field or in the wrong organization. Your niche in life may not be gold plated or studded with diamonds or encased in platinum, but if you are willing to forgo many of the easier and nicer things of life, to endure hardships and sacrifice in order to give just a little bit more of yourself and to carry the cross of hardship nobly, courageously, and faithfully, your life will have a warm place in the hearts of those who know you and that is the real measure of success.

I say to you, in building for success you have to make some plans, you have to find yourself, you have to decide which way you are going—and then tabulate the methods you are going to use, the person that you are—up to this stage of your life is pretty well going to set your character for the rest of your life. If you are industrious, ambitious, honest, reliable, sincere, and trustworthy now, you probably will be that way the rest of your life. If you are lacking in any of these departments, if you are lazy, unstable, insincere, dishonest, or undependable, you will have quite a job to change these fundamentals. Wherever you go and whatever line of endeavor you go into you will find that basically the seeds were sown in the past to influence your degree of success. A good mother and father have much to do with this. Looking back, I have found this to be so with myself.

Understand, I do think it's important for everyone to inventory their shortcomings—we all have them—and they can be improved greatly by determined efforts, but only by determined efforts.

I remember well something Bob Wodruff of Florida said in one of his talks to some football boosters. Bob was not an outstanding public speaker, but he said something that night that impressed me deeply. It was at the time that Haywood Sullivan was a big star on the Florida team and one of the country's greatest passers. Bob said, "Of course, Haywood Sullivan is one of the greatest passers in the country today, but I, Bob Woodruff, did not make him a great passer. He was a great passer when he was 11 years old in Dothan, Ala., playing sandlot football. We merely could take this basic ability and refine it and train him in improved timing and methods to make him even a greater passer. The ability had to be there—we only had a chance to bring it out."

In trying to find the field you want, inventory yourself honestly, What are you good at? What do you like to do? If you select something you have a natural ability for and something you like, the wind will be with you. You need to analyze the things you think about. If you study about business, corporations, stocks, etc., you probably will find your best ability in a business field. If you wonder about growing things, agriculture, animals, etc., you probably need to be in ranching or farming. If you study about how buildings are erected or bridges are constructed, you lean to engineering. If you dislike working for someone and if you handle your money well, maybe you should run your own business. Then you won't be working for someone, you'll be working for everybody. If you study about forcing people to make talks such as I am doing here tonight, you probably will make a college president.

I can't describe all of the various examples existing, but what I am trying to say is that you need to get into something that you like and something you like to think about and something that can consume you and possess you. There has never been a very big success made by anyone who didn't love their work, who didn't enjoy doing it, and whose job didn't grab them, hold them, and thrill them. If you can't find something like this, your success is apt to be mediocre, and this is pretty bad. To me, being mediocre as a businessman, a teacher, a lawyer, a mother, a truckdriver, a father, yes, even a politician, to me mediocrity is not success. Whatever you do, do well.

A man I admired greatly wrote a slogan that impressed me very much. It's on my desk now. It is called "Design for Success":

"I can say to any person, whether he is able or disabled, that if he expects to make a success in business through governmental paternalism, he is doomed to disappointment. First, the person must decide definitely and quickly what business he wishes to follow. Then, forgetting obstacles and ailments, he must apply his mind to learning every detail of that business, in and out, backward and forward. He must not let his love of golf or tennis, or card playing, or liquor, or gambling, or even his wife, take his eye from his objective. He must be devoted day and night to the task of finding out what makes his business tick, or what is needed to make it grow.

"In so applying himself, the person even with physical or mental handicaps will have no time for worrying or fretting about his lot. He will become so engrossed in his job that the handicaps will be forgotten. I have found it so, and I have been happy."

It's a great philosophy.

This was said by Elit Witt, who was almost an invalid with tuberculosis, yet he founded and built up the Hav-A-Tampa Cigar Co. with national distribution.

Opportunities today are very great. You don't have to be born to wealth. But you do have to learn how to handle money, how to deserve and use credit, and how to accumulate capital. Business today, both big and small, is paying more personal attention to the type of men or women who will represent that business. Business today recognizes that human relations are fundamental to all business, and that all men, regardless of their station in life, or the part they play in the business, are interdependent and are individually important. Business must have a personality of its own. This personality can only emanate from the people who operate that business.

I do want to say how much my own family appreciates the opportunities that exist in this great country under our system of free enterprise. Our own attainments, starting out with one little grocery store, is proof of oportunity. I am sure that there are other young fellows today in the same state of development as we were 35 years ago who will have as much or more success than we have had.

Florida and the South have been good to us, and I hope that we have demonstrated our worthiness. Everyone must keep in mind when they attain a degree of success that they are the stewards of some of worldly goods and that as stewards of these goods they have quite a responsibility to be good stewards.

Character is as important in any job as it is in your home life. What you do must inspire confidence and admiration and devotion from those with whom you come in contact. It is what people think of you that builds your reputation. It's the mistakes that you make—and correct—along the way that enable you, in time, to have what's known as good judgment.

A good personality helps. You must be cooperative and helpful and you must understand the weakness and strength of your fellow workers. No one wants a "yes" man around. You should have the courage to venture an opinion if you think you are right. If you develop these traits you will find them most helpful. Every successful businessman or professional man has more or less a different style of his own, as a great ballplayer may have a different stance at the plate. Remember, as you go down the pathway of life that every other person in life is equally important, whether the individual is above or below you in business or social life. Be human. Be a real person. Be mindful of the old Dutch saying, "the wooden shoes going up the hill often pass the patent leathers coming down." It is equally important that you remember the definition of a big man which is "a man who is big enough to be little enough to be big." And that tells a story in itself.

In closing my talk, let me ask a question that came out of Newsweek magazine:

"WHERE ARE THE YOUNG TURKS?

"Where is that traditional young American who takes the 'Boy Wanted' sign out of the window and says to the boss, "I'm your boy'? You know the lad I mean. The bellringer, up with the sun, last to leave, sweep the floors, learn the line, get to know the territories, up off the canvas, shoot for the moon, watch my dust. We've had our bellies full of the play-it-safe boys. Where is that enterprising youth who's willing to stick his skinny neck out and make decisions?

"The kind of man who parachutes into darkest Africa and opens a chain of supermarkets in 60 days. 'He only has to be right 51 percent of the time to be a success,' says Bruce Barton. America needs more young Turks. (And more old Turks who know how to recognize the young ones.)"

Well, I'm afraid I didn't quite fit the bill for the young Turk and perhaps you won't, but it is the right kind of positive thinking. It's an inspiration I wanted to pass along to you.

Now you're at a turning point.

You are on your own from here on out. Many people will help you. Many won't.

Regardless of that, you have to get along well with others. Competition is keen in everything. Select your course. Plan and chart your approach. Do every little step in your career the very best you can do it. Do it well, do it thoroughly and you will win.

Best of luck and God bless you.

H.R. 12311

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 12311) to extend for 1 year the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is to me a matter of regret that both in Cuba and in our own country provocative words of anger that make no contribution to mutual respect and understanding have been too frequent. They do not add, whether spoken here in this Chamber or in the beautiful island so close to our shores and historically imbedded in our affection, to the spirit of hemispheric solidarity. Nor do they reflect the frienship that has existed in all the years of the past, that is evident today and that will endure forever between the people of the United States and the people of Cuba. That is a friendship I confess very dear to me because of the circumstances of my youth and my association with both American and Cuban soldiers in the common cause of freedom.

We are living in a world of change with peoples everywhere reaching for higher plateaus of dignity, human welfare, and spiritual contentment. These cannot be gained, and the higher plateaus once ascended thereafter held as the bases for ascent to still higher plateaus, unless there are orderly governments, sound and expanding economies and the working together in cooperation of nations of goodwill.

I hope and pray that in this world of change, even though sometimes accompanied with a violence we would not wish, something as eruptions of a volcano, our country will continue in tolerance, understanding, and true friendship to fulfill its mission as the exemplar of government under God and of, for, and by the people. It is not for us to interfere in the internal affairs of another nation. It is inevitable that we will lose good will even by the appearance of interference with that which is in the sole determination of the people of another nation. Good neighbors do not invade their neighbors' homes to set things right according to their concepts and their own standards. Rather they content themselves with setting a good example, knowing that one well-ordered and happy home can change the entire tone of a community far beyond the possibility of scoldings and angry words.

I would have wished that the matter of the sugar quotas, with their repercussions upon the economies of a number of countries, including Cuba as well as that of our own, but sugar areas, could have been marked out by the able Committee on Agriculture in a less emotional climate. I trust that the power the President has asked will be administered without punitive design and in sole consideration of what in his judgment is just, wise, and necessary for the nations of the American hemisphere, including our own.

Eugene, Oreg., One of the Nation's Top 100 Industrial Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, my hometown, Eugene, Oreg., has been rated among the top 100 industrial markets in the Nation by a business-management publication of Dun & Bradstreet. As the Eugene Register-Guard aptly points out in a recent editorial:

> This indication of Eugene's economic importance, when coupled with metropolitan status achieved in the Federal census, makes growth predictions for our area seem even more realistic.
>
> The challenge for all of us, and, yes, the chamber [of commerce], too, will be to see that we plan properly for orderly development in the midst of industrial and commercial expansion which could engulf us if we choose to ignore it.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the full text of the editorial, "Among Top 100." I should like to add, too, that industries seeking area for expansion can well consider Oregon, a State where growth is a fact, not simply a promise.

The full text of the editorial follows:

AMONG TOP 100

People connected with the Eugene Chamber of Commerce, and particularly affable Fred Brenne, chamber manager, are elated. And they have a right to be.

Dun's Review, a business management publication of Dun & Bradstreet, lists Eugene among the top 100 industrial markets in the Nation. Eugene, says Dun's, is the central city of an industrial area that includes several surrounding counties.

The chamber people are excited because they feel that this recognition of the economic importance of this area will be a spur to further industrial expansion and growth. It probably will.

The publication, which will be perused by many top management people throughout the country, conducted a survey based on the U.S. Census of Manufacturers. The study comes up with the top 100 industrial markets based on the "value added by manufacturing," a term which is claimed to be the "best indicator of relative economic importance."

Eugene ranks 74th in the list, just behind Knoxville, Tenn., and just ahead of Omaha, Nebr. Of course, the main reason we appear in the select group is the lumber industry. It also reveals the relative importance of the lumber industry to the Nation's economy.

This indication of Eugene's economic importance when coupled with metropolitan status achieved in the Federal census makes growth predictions for our area seem even more realistic.

The challenge for all of us, and yes the chamber, too, will be to see that we plan properly for orderly development in the midst of industrial and commercial expansion which could engulf us if we choose to ignore it.

We'll need more expressways, arterials, parks and playgrounds, adequate power and water supplies and many other municipal projects if we are to retain the qualities of "good living" we enjoy now.

Captive Nations Week—July 17–23

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, the great American tradition of freedom, democracy and fair play are well known throughout the whole world. From the Declaration of Independence to the Wilsonian self-determination of nations to the present-day encouragement and assistance of newly emerging free nations, this country has stood before the world as the beacon of personal freedom and the sovereign integrity of nations. Sadly enough, Mr. Speaker, all nations have not been as fortunate as the United States in enjoying this status or in preserving it. The world power designs of certain imperialistic nations or ideologies have led to the overwhelming, by force, intrigue and subversion, of many of the smaller and weaker nations of the world. These nations and their courageous peoples still love freedom—for freedom is an overriding right natural to all men. While nationalities, languages, dress, and habits differ throughout the world, the human spirit differs but little as between all men. Thus we free Americans are substantially one in spirit with our fellow men throughout the world who have had their freedom taken from them.

The proclamation of the Captive Nations Week by the President, in pursuance of a joint resolution enacted by Congress on July 17, 1959, is a clear reaffirmation of our wholehearted dedication to justice and freedom. Of course none of us are naive enough to expect the freeing of these nations merely by the observance in this country of the Captive Nations Week. But we do believe that this observance will serve notice to oppressors and tyrants, indicating that the downtrodden and the underprivileged have our full sympathy, and that they have not been forgotten in their struggle for freedom. It will also hearten those tens of millions who are captives of Communist totalitarianism behind the Iron Curtain, knowing that their cause is in our mind and that it has champions in this great Republic. We shall continue to observe the Captive Nations Week until these nations have regained their freedom, and I am glad,

indeed, to join in the observance of this annual event. The week of July 17 of this and of every year shall tender the sympathy and support of every American to the freedom loving, though temporarily captive peoples of the world. We can only look forward to the day, Mr. Speaker, when there will be no such thing as a captive nation, when all human beings—indeed, the whole world—may live without fear in the personal and national freedom to which everyone has an inherent right.

A Survey of Business Climate in South Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN L. McMILLAN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a survey of business climate in the State of South Carolina.

I hope every Member of Congress will take a few minutes of his valuable time to read this item which shows that South Carolina is on the march.

The survey follows:

A SURVEY OF BUSINESS CLIMATE IN SOUTH CAROLINA

(Based upon thoughtful opinions expressed by 285 executives of manufacturing firms in the State. Prepared by South Carolina State Chamber of Commerce, Columbia, July 1960)

FOREWORD

Taking stock: This survey by the State chamber was made among manufacturers in South Carolina in order to find out what they think about the State's business climate. Their answers to individual questions provide an appraisal of key factors which must be considered significant to our present and future economic progress.

Who replied: A 4-page questionnaire detailing 67 topics was mailed to 500 industrial firms—of various types and in all geographical areas of the State—employing 50 or more people. The response was most gratifying; a total of 285 usable replies was received, for a return of 57 percent.

Of the respondents, 47 said that they had been operating in their South Carolina location less than 5 years, 34 from 5 to 9 years, 41 from 10 to 14 years, and 156 for 15 years or longer. Half of them have manufacturing operations in other States, and half are purely domestic enterprises.

For their individual plants they reported the following number of employees:

83	under 100
78	100 to 249
52	250 to 499
39	500 to 999
26	1,000 or more

Their manufacturing operations are in these broad categories: 11 chemical and rubber products; 20 stone, clay, glass, and concrete; 20 machinery and metal products; 25 food and other edible products; 27 forest products and paper; 28 apparel and related products; 96 textile manufacturing; 58 miscellaneous.

Value of analysis: While replies reflected the opinions of the executives who were queried, and may not agree with the actual facts in some instances, it must be recognized that opinion has the full weight of fact in the minds of many individuals. It thus must be considered important.

The information received, due to the geographical dispersion of the respondents and the variety of their manufacturing operations, would seem to reflect fairly what long-established, as well as relatively new, industries think about South Carolina as a place to do business. In other words, this is their opinion of South Carolina's business climate.

Of not inconsequential significance are answers to questions about plant expansion by respondents' firms. This is the proof in South Carolina's good business climate "pudding." During the past 5 years 43 percent of them have substantially expanded their South Carolina manufacturing operations. Slight expansion is reported by 35 percent, no expansion by 22 percent.

Looking ahead, 22 percent say that their firms will expand substantially in South Carolina during the next 5 years, and 42 percent will expand to some extent. One percent of the respondents predict that their operations will contract to some extent, and 10 percent did not answer. The remaining 25 percent expect operations to remain at the present level.

The results and their use: Results of the survey indicate that South Carolina has a good economic climate in which to do business. Our strong points can be utilized in industrial development promotion, and individual communities can compare and analyze their own standings with how the State is rated generally.

On the other hand, there is a fairly obvious indication that certain weak points warrant correction—not only from the standpoint of attracting new enterprises, but also that of making more comfortable the businesses already established in our midst.

Now for a summary of answers to our questionnaire.

THE COMMUNITY

Utilities and transportation

From the viewpoint of one locating a new factory in their communities, these percentages of respondents gave the following ratings:

[In percent]

	Adequate	Rather inadequate	Very inadequate	No answer
Sewers	53	22	17	8
Water	78	11	8	3
Electricity	96	2	1	1
Gas	72	9	8	11
Railroads	84	9	4	3
Trucking	95	3	1	1
Air service	47	29	21	3
Roads	96	3	1	-------

(For their own company operations now, 79 percent of the respondents deemed the above services adequate, 21 percent inadequate. Most frequently mentioned as inadequate were air service, sewers, gas, and water.)

Social and commercial services

[In percent]

	Adequate	Rather inadequate	Very inadequate	No answer
Hospitals	70	22	7	1
Medical	82	15	2	1
Churches	98	1	-------	1
Schools	75	19	5	1
Recreation	52	40	6	2
Shopping	74	23	2	1
Banking	93	6	-------	1

General community ratings

[In percent]

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	No answer
Long-range industrial development planning	22	39	21	11	7
Long-range overall community planning	15	39	26	12	8
General appearance	21	54	20	5	-------

(Local zoning regulations were rated by 53 percent as satisfactory, 12 percent as too liberal, 1 percent as too stringent; 16 percent said their communities had no zoning regulations.)

Local attitudes

Assuming the prospective location of a new plant in a community, these reactions are predicted:

[In percent]

	Good	Fair	Poor	Very poor	No answer
Acceptance by citizens in general	78	17	1	1	3
Cooperation by local government officials	72	17	7	1	3

Industries responding rate the general attitudes of local governments toward business as:

	Percent
Excellent	49
Good	38
Fair	9
Poor	3
No answer	1

RATING THE STATE GOVERNMENT

Those responding to the questionnaire had the following opinions in regard to various aspects of the government of the State of South Carolina:

[In percent]

	Excellent	Good	Poor	No answer
Its attitude toward industry generally	76	19	3	2
Its financial condition	55	33	3	9
Its efficiency (cost of operation, personnel practices, etc.)	28	49	9	14
Its planning for industrial development	34	58	1	7
Its promotion of industrial development	46	49	2	3

When asked the question, "How fairly do you think South Carolina State taxes are administered?" the replies were:

	Percent
Very fair	28
Reasonably fair	52
Somewhat unfair	3
Very unfair	4
No answer	13

THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

The individuals responding rated the attitudes toward industry of their county delegates to the South Carolina General Assembly as:

[In percent]

	Friendly	Neutral	Unfriendly	No answer
Senators	85	5	3	7
Representatives	86	4	3	7

HOW LABOR IS VIEWED

Respondents consider the educational level of the local labor supply, in regard to adequacy required by their own type of industry, as follows:

	Percent
Adequate	72
Somewhat inadequate	27
Very inadequate	1

Industries rated the attitude of their workers toward their companies as follows:

	Percent
Loyal	94
Indifferent	5
Antagonistic	1

(Of the respondents, 12 percent have labor unions, 88 percent do not.)

Productivity of workers in plants was rated as:

	Percent
Very high	26
Fairly high	46
Average	26
Fairly low	2
Very low	---

The general attitude of local business people toward organized labor was rated as:

	Percent
Antagonistic	69
Indifferent	17
Friendly	9
No answer	5

EMPLOYEE SECURITY PROGRAMS

The South Carolina workmen's compensation law was given some thought. From industry's viewpoint, 13 percent of our respondents believe it is being administered in a very favorable manner, 39 percent see its administration as fairly favorable, 23 percent fairly unfavorable, 15 percent as very unfavorable, 10 percent had no opinion. Specifically, they see—

[In percent]

	Too high	About right	Too low	No answer
Claims allowed	43	45	1	11
Benefits provided by law	5	78	5	12
Medical costs	25	60	1	14
Disfigurement claims	33	43	1	23

Respondents indicated a better reaction toward the administration of the South Carolina unemployment compensation law. Nineteen percent view the administration of this law as very favorable to industry, 53 percent as fairly favorable; 17 percent think that the law's administration is fairly unfavorable to industry; 5 percent see it as very unfavorable; 6 percent did not answer. In particular, they stated:

[In percent]

	Too high	About right	Too low	No answer
Maximum benefit ($26 a week)	7	77	10	6
Maximum duration of payments (22 weeks)	22	70	2	6
Qualifying provisions to draw benefits	37	57	1	5

THE STATE CHAMBER'S CONCLUSIONS

In reviewing responses to the foregoing specific questions, it is obvious that certain factors can be capitalized upon in promoting South Carolina's industrial development.

Industrialists now operating in South Carolina believe that they enjoy an environment of healthy attitudes. They think well of our people and of our government. They generally describe as adequate our water, electricity, railroads, trucking, and highways. They give good ratings to our climate conditions, medical services, churches, and banking facilities, to the labor supply and the productivity as well as loyalty of workers.

On the other hand, the opinions expressed point to the need for certain improvements. A large percentage of the respondents notes some inadequacy in sewage and airplane services, in hospitals and public schools, in shopping and reacreational facilities, and in the administration of our workmen's compensation law.

Paraphrasing what was pointed out in the foreword to this report, business climate factors which fall into the approved area are those which can be utilized as selling tools in industrial development. Conversely, weaknesses which show up in the survey most certainly deserve attention by those who can do something about improving them.

(Results of the questionnaires were compiled, as a courtesy to the State chamber, by the School of Business Administration of the University of South Carolina, Columbia.)

Self-Employed Individuals' Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the House may soon again consider a worthy bill to help millions of self-employed persons—the small businessmen, doctors, dentists, lawyers, and other professionals—provide for themselves a sound, convenient, and orderly plan for retirement income.

Late in the last Congress this bill was approved by the House but unfortunately it died at adjournment before it could be considered in the other House and included with the other small business legislation which the 85th Congress passed because of able and vigorous Democratic leadership. This series of measures, incidentally, if properly financed and sympathetically administered could well initiate the renaissance of American small business.

H.R. 10 when enacted will round out the basic structure in this system to help men and women who are gifted with ideas and energy but short of other resources to invigorate and put meaning and substance in the idea of free enterprise.

Our economy is in dire trouble because the giant corporations since World War II have through consolidation, purchase, or a variety of other dubious methods crushed out of existence much of their competition. Our country is now paying the terrible price for the monopolization of our economy with inflation, underproduction, and unemployment. Negative weapons of antimonopoly legislation have failed—the promising, positive program of encouraging small business is an inspired effort to keep the American economy democratic and dynamic. I am proud of the leading part that the Democratic Party, both nationally and in my State of Minnesota, has had in reinvigorating small business. Some considerable tribute has to be paid too to those fearless members of the minority party who have voted with the Democrats despite the formidable disapproval of the Republican administration and the big business elements who guide the GOP.

This administration has fought tooth and nail against any really effective program for small business and when it has been forced to accept, reluctantly, Democratic-sponsored measures it has practiced cold, deliberate sabotage against small business as our distinguished and venerable colleague WRIGHT PATMAN has revealed.

The administration has now grudgingly accepted H.R. 10 after considerable revision in the Senate Finance Committee. It has conceded the justice of giving the millions of self-employed persons a fraction of the tax consideration received by high-salaried corporation executives, those exalted employees with their bonuses in stock, stock options, company-contributed pensions, and other fancy emoluments—not including that ultimate in tax evasion devices, expense-account living.

Republicans in the administration have at long last stopped wrapping the flag of patriotism around them and saying that to enact H.R. 10 would throw the President's budget into deficit and would be doing Karl Marx's work of destroying capitalism.

I hope that H.R. 10 will be enacted into law and thus spur the millions of America's self-employed persons to do better democracy's work of invigorating free enterprise by helping themselves provide for their golden years.

I urge the passage of H.R. 10.

GOP Rewrites History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the New Era, of Reading, Pa.:

GOP REWRITES HISTORY

Black is white.

Who said so?

Why the Republican propagandists who are trying to say that the summit collapse and the Japanese riots and the U-2 episode were really favorable master strokes of foreign policy inspired by a genius.

Now along comes a vice chairman of the Republican State committee who had to dig back into the mire almost 20 years to blame the Democrats for Pearl Harbor.

This GOP pseudo-historian addressed local Republicans last week and offered such witty comments as: "I don't care what happened to the summit conference, our skirts are clean."

She then proceeded to rehash the old wheeze that the Democrats provoked the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. Maybe a week from now she'll be trying to pin the Tokyo riots on Democrats on the grounds

they were fomented to embarrass Eisenhower.

Fortunately, the people are alert. They know that the Republican administration permitted the U–2 episode to occur simply by failing to take necessary precautions.

The people know that summitry has always been dangerous business and they recall that John Foster Dulles repeatedly engaged in brinkmanship diplomacy—pushing the country to the very brink of catastrophe.

The people are no fools. They are aware that our relations in the world have deteriorated greatly in the past 8 years—under the leadership of a wartime hero whose regime is turning out to be a flop.

Not only is the cold war colder, but we have lost friends in the Far East, lost ground in Latin America, permitted the Communists to set up a regime in neighboring Cuba, lost NATO friends by disclosure of bases from which the U–2 operated, lagged in the missile race, and generally failed to provide the leadership for free peoples the world over.

Now, as another presidential election approaches we are told that these things aren't really blots but are assets which will turn out to be good—if we just wait long enough.

Like we said, the brainwashers are trying to make out like black is white. But then, a man named Hitler once said if you tell one big enough it might be believed.

Address of Hon. John F. Shelley, Knights of Columbus Dinner, Hotel Claremont, May 29, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a splendid address made by our distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. SHELLEY], at a Knights of Columbus dinner held in Claremont, Calif., on May 29, 1960.

As our distinguished colleague well said:

On the international scene, there is challenge of the cold war, with its unpredictable twists and turns. The quick-change artists of the Kremlin juggle the hopes of peace and the threat of warlike oldtime vaudeville performers. We as Americans cannot afford to be taken in by any Communist trickery. We must not become the world's largest bouncing ball in the hands of Communist manipulators and jugglers.

As Congressman SHELLEY also well said:

But the cold war is, in fact, the grim contest between those who are dedicated to freedom—human freedom and its whole brilliant range—religious, political, personal—opposing those who seek to destroy it.

The splendid address of Congressman SHELLEY is appropriate to the world of today. His address should be as widely read as possible:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY, KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS DINNER, HOTEL CLAREMONT, MAY 29, 1960

Mr. Toastmaster, right reverend monsignori, reverend fathers, past and present grand and worthy knights, sir knights, and your lovely ladies, no words of mine could adequately express the gratitude and the humility I feel for the signal honor you have conferred upon me today and this evening. We have been friends, most of us, for many years, and you will understand without my telling you, that this day will be for me an abiding source of gratitude and inspiration, and I say that on behalf of today's fourth-degree class.

I'm particularly happy to have this opportunity to speak with you as one American Catholic to another in this turbulent year of grace 1960.

If ever we, as Catholics, were called upon to demonstrate the qualities of good citizenship in our beloved country, that time is now.

On the international scene, there is challenge of the cold war, with its unpredictable twists and turns. The quick-change artists of the Kremlin juggle the hopes of peace and the threat of war like oldtime vaudeville performers. We as Americans cannot afford to be taken in by any Communist trickery. We must not become the world's largest bouncing ball in the hands of Communist manipulators and jugglers.

To the everlasting credit of the Catholic Church, she has never once taken her eyes from the central fact that communism is a religion: The religion of no God: The religion of an all-powerful tyranny from whose decisions there is no appeal, even in the moral order.

And remember this: When communism destroys the divinity of God, it destroys, at the same stroke the humanity of man. It makes of man nothing but a creature without a soul, totally dependent on the whim of the state.

If the sometimes smiling confidence men of the Kremlin have blurred that harsh fact for some of our fellow Americans, the Chinese Communists, with merciless determination, restored the image by their shattering of families, their relentless persecution of all religion; their implacable hostility to the United States.

We have the honor to be singled out as enemy No. 1—and, therefore, as the supreme objective of Communist scheming—not so much because of our power or wealth, but, I suspect, for another reason.

With all our faults—and we are not yet perfect, as a people—but with all our faults, we remain as a nation dedicated to this proposition: That free men can govern themselves with justice and dignity and honor. As Woodrow Wilson once phrased it: "Free-men need no guardians."

Within the very cornerstone of this Nation, there is written this eternal defiance of tyranny, Communist or other: "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." How could communism or any other tyranny stomach that principle?

If the cold war today were simply a matter of two differing forms of government at odds with each other, that would be one thing.

But the cold war is, in fact, the grim contest between those who are dedicated to freedom—human freedom and its whole brilliant range—religious, political, personal—opposing those who seek to destroy it.

You and I as mature Americans recognize how deep is the challenge to our convictions. The challenge to remain levelheaded through every twist and turn of the devious strategy of the Communists.

We know what an appalling catastrophe nuclear warfare would be. But we also know what an unspeakable disaster it would be for us to be either deceived or intimidated into surrendering our heritage of freedom.

Tomorrow, you and I joint with all our fellow Americans to pause for a moment and hear the high clear notes of "Taps" sounding out in living salute to American fighting men of every generation and race and faith who gave their lives to keep that heritage intact.

Memorial Day, I believe, speaks to us this year with greater urgency than ever before.

The Colonials who abandoned their plows and reached for their rifles to fight the bitter war of Independence knew perfectly well what they were up against. There they were, living practically at the ocean edge of a vast wilderness, defying the might of the British Empire. Washington knew, and Hamilton, and Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin and the other leaders, that their own lives were forfeit if this Revolution failed.

They knew the odds against them.

But they knew also that here in America men walked upright, self-reliant, refusing to be exploited by the absentee government.

It was freedom they fought for, from Lexington on through the cruel days and nights of Valley Forge to final victory at Yorktown.

Our infant Nation was scarcely out of its cradle when war struck again, and again Americans had to fight to preserve what they had won. Andrew Jackson's men at New Orleans included just about every kind of American imaginable, and maybe even a philosopher or two. They knew what they were fighting for—their own freedom; their own right to govern themselves as Americans, not as subjects of any crown or any imported bureaucracy.

As our Nation grew, as self-reliant pioneers thrust back the wilderness, so too did the confident heritage of freedom become stronger.

Under the heartbreaking tragedy of the Civil War, when brother fought against brother, and our Nation seemed on the verge of disruption, the resolute but deeply compassionate Abraham Lincoln held our country together.

Americans had their first call to oversea battle in the Spanish-American War.

Since that time, our sons have given their lives in battle on the continents of the earth; on the islands of all the seas, in the skies and oceans of the world.

Thanks to their heroism, their sacrifice, we gather here tonight as free men.

Think for a moment—how many nations are there now wherein a meeting like this would be impossible?

Tomorrow, as Catholics and as Americans, every one of us will pray for the eternal repose of the souls of those who died for us, whatever their generation, their race, their faith.

And as we remember with deep gratitude their sacrifice for us, I hope we shall ponder the meaning of their sacrifice.

For these honored dead must not have died in vain.

It remains, as Lincoln said, for us, the living, to advance their work.

The heritage of freedom is in our hands, new, enriched by their heroism.

The question remains: Do we appreciate, do we really understand what it means to be citizens in a democracy?

I often think of the words of Pope Pius XII, discussing the contract between dictatorship and democracy: "If the possibility of controlling and correcting the action of those in power had not been lacking, the world would not have been dragged into the hurricane of war."

And again, discussing the citizen in a democracy, Pius XII said: "To express his own opinion concerning the duties and sacrifices which are imposed on him; not to be forced to obey without having been listened to; there are two of the citizen's rights, which have their expression in democracy."

What happens, then, when a citizen ignores the great political questions of the day?

What happens when here in America, only a few sometimes bother even to vote?

We hear of voter apathy, voter indifference, and it reminds me of the cynical old saying that the grandfathers die on the barricades to win the rights that the grandsons don't even bother to exercise.

How many people like you and like me would give their right arm for the chance to vote in a free and open election? Think now of the people of China, of Hungary, of Poland, of East Germany, of Czechoslovakia, and the whole sad company of captive satellite nations.

Why else did Hungarian youth, in a glorious and unforgettable blaze of heroism, make their barehanded attack upon the armor of their Communist masters?

They and others like them were trying to win what we in America have: The right to control their own affairs; a voice in the shaping of their national policy.

It seems to be that of all people, we American Catholics should most appreciate the rights and privileges of our citizenship.

In this year, confronted as we are with the complex problems of the cold war, we have the solemn obligation of voting for a President.

It so happens that one of the candidates is a Catholic and thus, whether you and I like it or not, we become the objects of the critical scrutiny of our fellow Americans.

I firmly believe that no one should vote for a candidate because he is a Catholic.

The Catholic Church embraces Americans of both political parties, and Catholics have made significant contributions to both parties at every level.

I hope, as you do, that religious intolerance will not manifest itself in the months ahead.

And I most sincerely hope that Catholics will not lay themselves open to the charge of injecting the religious issue into the campaign.

We have come far, in this country, from the days when Catholics were a puzzle, a mystery, something to be feared, avoided or thrust aside.

I need not remind you tonight of the recent campaign on proposition 16.

Many regrettable things were said, many false charges were made, and a few attempts to arouse bigotry were undertaken.

But the great majority of Californians understood what the issue was and resisted, to a gratifying degree, the blandishments of bigotry.

I accept this as a compliment to Catholics generally.

I believe that as people not of our faith had a chance, over the years, to size us up, to rub elbows with us, to associate ever more closely with us, they realized that we are not a group apart.

We are accepted as other Americans and we are judged by the kind of people we show ourselves to be.

Are we good citizens?

Do we try to pull our oar in the boat, to do our part as good citizens in our community?

Do we give our time and effort to help worthwhile community projects?

Do we make it easy and comfortable for our fellows not of our faith to know us and associate with us?

We are not a special interest group in this country and I'd like to give you just one example of that from my own experience and personal knowledge.

When the Federal aid to education bill came before the Congress, the position of the church regarding parochial schools' inclusion in the bill was sent to various Members of Congress.

It was a reasonable position, and some felt that parochial schools should be included in the list of beneficiaries.

It became clear, however, that if such an attempt were made—that is, an attempt to include parochial schools—the whole Federal aid program would be defeated.

Catholic spokesmen pointed out that, rather than deprive any American youngster of the benefits of this program, the church would not press its own position in the matter.

This was mature, completely patriotic and generous action, whereby the church subordinated its own interest for the benefit of others.

As American Catholics, we have, I believe, a special contribution to make to our communities and our country.

First and foremost, of course, our position regarding communism is fixed. Regardless of what twists the party line may take, Catholics have had this evil and monstrous thing dissected for them time and again, and they know its evil.

I urge those of you who may not have done so recently to pick up and read again Pope Pius XI's letter on atheistic communism.

Read it carefully, read it thoughtfully, and you will observe certain prophetic aspects about the heartbreak and tragedy communism would bring into the world.

Catholics also have an enlightened sense of the need for helping the distressed of the world.

We, of all people, can never forget the plight of those across the world from us.

Where men and women and children are trapped in grinding and almost hopeless poverty, they may very easily, from their own despair, turn to the deceits of communism as a way out.

Technical assistance programs and programs of aid are not simply matters of good policy on the political level. They are an expression of the charity that lies deep in the heart of the American people.

Never forget this: While the enemies of our country ridicule and mock us as ignorant materialists, selfish exploiters, interested in nothing but money, the foreign aid programs brand such propaganda as a pack of contemptible lies.

In our thinking about the Communist threat and the plight of underprivileged nations, we must remember the story of Fatima.

The Russian people are the first captives, the first victims of the Communists, and in our thinking and our prayers, we must distinguish between the decent and good people of Russia and their ruthless masters.

The message of Fatima gives to Catholics throughout the world a new dimension and, indeed, a new weapon for combating this atheistic monstrosity: We see it not simply as a political or social or economic theory, but as a moral evil to be fought with the weapons of the spirit: prayer and meaningful penance.

In addition to our view of the world situation, I believe that our background as a sometimes unwelcome minority in certain areas gives us added insight into the problems of other minority groups.

Certainly we know what the denial of civil rights can mean to a people.

We knew once what it meant to be regarded as second class citizens.

Those days have come pretty much to an end, now.

But the task remains for us to see that such days are ended for all times for all Americans.

Most of us in this room have lived to see the sweep and tempo of American history speed up tremendously.

We have seen the concept of social justice expanded beyond anything one might have dreamed of 50 years ago.

We have seen legislation passed which, at the beginning of the century, would have seemed impossible.

While much remains to be done, let us not forget that much has already been done to make life better for all Americans.

We shall never create, here on earth, the conditions of Paradise.

But we have always before us the vision of an ever finer and greater nation; a people moving always forward, sometimes swiftly, sometimes slowly, but always forward to a realization of the American dream.

Progress is not achieved without the clash of judgment and opinion, and that is as it should be in a democratic society.

Let us hear every man's opinion, for no one has an exclusive monopoly on intelligence.

This year, above all, let us, as Catholics, conduct ourselves before the eyes of our countrymen with intelligence, self-respect, balance, and charity.

It is not for us to impute motives to those who may not agree with our position in one or another field of national interest now.

But it is our duty, and it devolves upon every one of us without exception, to remember that if the turn of the wheel touches off questions about the church and state; if at times we are made to answer questions about our faith, let us answer such questions from an informed mind and an understanding heart.

The Holy Father has said that in times like these it is permitted to no one to be mediocre.

For us, I believe, that means many a long and thoughtful meditation on the blessings God has given us in this blessed land of ours.

It means pondering deeply the silent but eloquent message of Memorial Day: that others had died for us—to give us the chance to make their sacrifice meaningful by our conduct as citizens of this great Nation.

Let nothing narrow or petty or mean emanate from us this year, even under the most exasperating provocation.

For our fellow Americans have a tremendous sense of fair play, and they will not mistake forbearance for timidity or cowardice.

There are members of both political parties in the ranks of our order.

In this year and the years to come, let us act according to our best intelligence and conscience as citizens, doing our utmost in however great or humble a way to make this blessed Nation an ever greater expression of freedom; a mighty beacon in the turbulent world showing forth clearly and steadily that free men indeed can govern themselves with dignity and justice and honor; that free men need no guardians; that, with God's blessing, government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth.

Captive Nations Week, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to the fact that Captive Nations Week will be observed July 17–23, 1960.

During the 1st session of the 86th Congress, Public Law 86–90 was enacted expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should proclaim the third week in July as Captive Nations Week and that similar proclamation should be made each year until such time as freedom and independence from Communist imperialism shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of

the world. Therefore this year's observance will be the second Captive Nations Week.

Mr. Speaker, I know I reflect the opinion of my colleagues when I state that I hope the reason for observing Captive Nations Week will not exist for many more years. However, so long as these nations remain under the domination of international communism, we of the United States will remind them annually that our hearts are with them and our prayers as well.

I am proud to be an honorary member of the National Committee on Captive Nations Week and I commend the committee, its chairman, Dr. Dobriansky, its executive director, Mr. Connor, its secretary-treasurer, Mr. Skubik for their excellent activities in stimulating the formation of local committees throughout the Nation to organize proper ceremonies and observances of Captive Nations Week, 1960.

The Congressional Investigating Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting article which appeared in the Suffolk Law Reporter:

THE CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE

(By Jordan L. Ring, 1960)

(Senior Jordan Ring, author of this article, is top student in the law school and plans to do graduate law work at Harvard next year, under scholarship.)

Power and the constitutional right to exercise a particular power are two distinct considerations in the philosophical concept of governmental scope and function. One endeavoring to categorize contemporary congressional investigatory practices in one of two categories can find persuasive arguments in mass for his favored position thereon. But it shall not be the purpose of this particular analysis to pursue the justification of either abstraction. Rather, the ultimate consideration herein focuses narrowly upon the jurisdiction aspect that confronts one who must deal defensively with an investigating committee's asserted authority on the plane of jurisdiction over the person and the matters closely related thereto.

Basic generalities of constitutional law have no little importance in this regard Fundamentally, our National Government, in dealing with the internal aspects of their particular functions, is one of delegated powers, which power is either specifically enumerated within the four corners of the Constitution or found to be a necessary and proper power implied therein. Therefore, every function of our Congress is directly dependent for its constitutional legality upon the adherence to the aforesaid principle. It is axiomatic that a Federal investigating committee has no greater authority over a person or persons than the sum total of its creators' authority—Congress. If, therefore, Congress has exceeded its authority in the establishment of a given committee, then we have an ultra vires body—a nullity. In a related sense, the jurisdiction of a particular committee to compel the appearance of an individual before it is directly dependent upon congressional authorization in the main, which congressional authorization is directly dependent by way of justification upon the Constitution. Hence, initially, at least, the basic and logical challenge of a committee's jurisdiction over a person can be leveled at its very right to constitutionally exist, although it may be submitted at the very outset that his fundamenal challenge is broader in theory than in practical application in the light of contemporary legislative and judicial liberalism in this particular field of thought.

The general power of Congress to create and vest a committee with capacity to compel obedience to its jurisdiction is a firmly established concept. *McGrain* v. *Daugherty*, 273 U.S. 135; 71 L. Ed. 580; 47 Sup. Ct. 319; 50 ALR 1. It is vitally important, however, to consider carefully the general authority of Congress in order to analyze whether in any particular instance a given committee is beyond the borders of constitutional concern. [Thus, the question to be carefully considered is where does the general authority come from and what are the reasons for its basic justification.]

McGrain v. *Daugherty*, supra, precisely points out that nowhere in the framework of the Constitution is there specifically enumerated authority giving to Congress the power to create legislative investigating committees. Nevertheless, from the standpoint both of English and colonial history and from the view of practicality, the Court held such authority to be a necessary and implied power of congressional function. Specifically, in order that any type of intelligent legislation may result from the sessions of Congress, there is an obvious need for specific information relating to any particular matter under consideration by either House. Obviously, it would be sheer fallacy to assume Congress, broad as it may be in membership, could possibly have within itself at all times such a fund of information as would permit it to judge the particular merits of every act, nor to understand the need for certain legislation in matters over which it must protect and regulate. Hence, the need for factual information from without. [Congress, in order to effectuate fruitful results, delegates to a relatively small group of its membership the authority it possesses as a whole to investigate. And from this reason found by the Court to necessitate the existence of such implied authority, we find therein the crux of the limitation of its power to investigate and therefrom the right to compel obedience to its jurisdiction.]

Because of the breadth of the congressional powers * * * (the power to legislate, to judge the qualifications of its Members, the obligation to maintain within the States a republican form of government, to provide for the common defense, to perpetuate its very existence, etc.), it may seem that it would be practically impossible for Congress to select a field for investigation which would not be related to some proper area of congressional concern. Actually, however, there has been one occasion when the Supreme Court failed to find such relevance. That was in the 1880 case of *Kilbourn* v. *Thompson* (103 U.S. 168; 26 L. ed. 377), testing the legitimacy of a House investigation into the bankrupt firm of Jay Cooke & Co. and its interest in a District of Columbia real estate pool. The Supreme Court ruled that this was not a subject on which Congress could legislate and therefore had no authority to investigate. This case represents the only restrictive decision upon the power to investigate. Mr. Justice Miller said, "We are sure that no person can be punished for contumacy as a witness before either House, unless his testimony is required in a matter into which that House has jurisdiction to inquire, and we feel equally sure that neither of these bodies possesses the general power of making inquiry into the private affairs of the citizen." The matter under investigation did not come within the range of congressional legislation. While the facts of this particular case are of a minimum of importance, since a similar inquiry today under the Supreme Court's broad concept of the congressional function would certainly be authorized, the principle expounded from that case, nevertheless, clearly sets forth the proposition that Congress has no authority to investigate per se. It cannot launch an investigation from the standpoint of constitutional power merely to expose for the sake of exposure or to delve into the private affairs of citizens merely to bring to light undesired, although legal, courses of conduct and pursuances over which it has no power to legislate or is prohibited by the Constitution to abridge. For an analysis of the Kilbourn case and the implications thereof see Congressional Investigation, 37 Cal. L. Rev. 556 (1949); 40 Hvd. L. R. 153 (1926). In order therefore for a congressional investigating committee to have authority over a person the purpose of the investigating committee is of a prime concern; for the purpose of the committee must have some connection with prospective legislation or congressional function or else have no jurisdiction over the person. But how close must the purpose be connected with prospective legislation? As will be hereinafter indicated, very little actual connection seems necessary.

All recent cases dealing with this subject matter have had some relation to security investigations, and while it can never be doubted that these security cases have to a large degree been pressured by the emotional complection of the Nation, nevertheless, they do outline the basis of judicial philosophy regarding the general topic under consideration. So far as the issue of the Un-American Investigating Committe is concerned, obviously no matter is of a greater importance to Congress than the internal security of the Nation and the protection of its independence and integrity against conspiratorial or subversive attacks. For these clearly proper congressional concerns it is scarcely necessary to cite such expressly stated legislative functions as to "provide for the common defense," "to raise and support armies," and the like. But this security committee seems to have dissipated somewhat the strong constitutional support by being so largely uninterested in making legislative recommendations to Congress. The mere fact that the House had stated in setting up the committee that it was for a "legislative purpose" was generally regarded as binding on the Court. Mr. Justice Clark dissenting in the case of *U.S.* v. *Josephson* (165 F. 2d 82, 333 U.S. 858), said that upholding the committee's power over the person on this basis made the congressional investigative power limitless for "the dram of good must always sanctify the dubious remainder." As a simply stated proposition, the language of the majority seems to lay down the rule that if Congress claims a particular investigation to be for a legislative purpose the Court will not say that that is not so.

There seems little reason to doubt that Clark's conclusion is actually the correct one to draw from these appellate court decisions, for all the grounds on which limits might have been based were rejected in the Josephson case. Justices Douglas and Black took essentially the same position in their concurring opinion in *U.S.* v. *Rumely* (73 S.C. at 547). "Inquiry into the personal and private affairs is precluded and so is any matter in respect to which no valid legislation could be had. Since Congress could not by law require of respondent what the House de-

manded, it may not take the first step in an inquiry ending in fine and imprisonment." In *Barsky* v. *U.S.* (167 F. 2d 241), it was said by the Court that the fact constitutional legislation might ensue from the information derived by an inquiry upon the subject described in the House resolution is sufficient to sustain the committee's jurisdiction. "The potentiality is the measure of the power of inquiry" and this be so even though the legislation that might ensue from such an investigation has a strong possibility of being found unconstitutional, and the mere fact that very little legislation has resulted from a given inquiry is immaterial in considering the committee's constitutional justification. But what if we discharge syllogisms and advance judgments and concentrate rather on the charge that the committee had actually and deliberately sought to get, by publicity and exposure, results which could not constitutionally be secured by legislation. Judge Edgerton in the Barsky case, supra, said that the committee had intentionally inflicted punishment on certain witnesses by bringing about their dismissal from employment and subjecting them to notorious publicity and held that this met the bill of attainder test in *U.S.* v. *Lovett* (328 U.S. 303). The majority felt otherwise and completely disregarded substance, looking merely to form. Justice Clark dissenting in the Josephson case, supra, concluded that the committee was merely investigating for exposure's sake, and this had been proved by the committee's questioning of the witnesses appearing before that body. But the majority of the Court rejected the Clark position by again looking solely to the purpose for which the committee was established and not into the objective mannerisms. Clark went beyond this point and contended the committee's persistent questioning of witnesses as to whether they were members of the Communist Party violated a right to privacy and to freedom from inquiry about political beliefs established by the first amendment and upon which Congress had no right to exact prohibitive legislation, let alone inquire. But both in the Josephson and Barsky cases the Court disposed of these points by reminding that Congress can curtail freedom if justified by the clear and present danger test and that Congress need not wait until there is a clear and present danger before it can inquire into these matters. All that is required is a possibility of a clear and present danger and that the Court cannot assume in advance that Congress will pass unconstitutional legislation. From what has been set forth above it may well be that legislative investigating committees will have an area of sanctioned inquiry as broad as Congress deems necessary by merely asserting within the enabling act of the committee that the purpose of the said committee is to inquire for proposed legislation and have some broad basis upon which to rest thereon. For it now appears that the Court will not look beyond this point. Thus the original concept of legislative investigation under our system of government appears to have become an obsolete limitation or at least a limitation in form only.

Now, assuming in any given instance the constitutionality of a committee, what is the immediate power over the person to compel compliance with its request to appear? For a contempt of Congress there is no doubt that either House has the inherent power to punish through its own processes outside of the courts. *Marshall* v. *Gorda* (243 U.S. 521); *Anderson* v. *Dunn* (6 U.S. 204). In *McGrain* v. *Daugherty*, supra, it was clearly stated that either House, through its own process has power to compel a private individual to appear before it or one of its committees and give testimony needed to enable it effectively to exercise the legislative function belonging to it under the Constitution. However, the power of Congress to punish for contempt of its own process is limited to imprisonment and the duration to the time of the adjournment of Congress. See 50 ALR 21. Not only may Congress itself punish for the failure to answer a proper question when appearing but in *Jurney* v. *MacCracken* (294 U.S. 125), the Supreme Court upheld the right of Congress to punish for a past and completed action. In this case the defendant had destroyed records which the committee requested to be brought before it. Thus the fact that the obstruction to the legislation function is removed or is impossible to be removed is completely immaterial in considering the authority to punish. Such a power to punish for past and completed obstructions was exerted by Congress as early as 1795 and is a well settled principle of legislative power. Today, by statute (2 U.S.C. sec. 192; F.C.A. 192) Congress has supplemented the inherent power to punish for contempt. It is to be noted that this statute does not exclude Congress from still rendering punishment through its own process. The constitutionality of this statute was upheld in *In Re Chapman* (166 U.S. 661). Section 192 makes it a misdemeanor for one properly summoned before a committee of either House as a witness to refuse to appear or to appear and refuse to answer or produce material papers or records. It now seems entirely possible, based upon the language in In Re Chapman, supra, that a party in contempt could be punished both under the statutory procedure and in addition by either House. Of course, a summary refusal of one duly called by a committee to appear before a committee could legally result in the physical removal of a witness to the situs of that committee. Therefore, any attack on a committee's jurisdiction, as a practical matter of concern, should be made at an appearance before the committee. The question of remedies is somewhat dubious and leaves in doubt the question of injunctive relief in a Federal court. However, one wrongfully taken into custody has a right of recourse against the officer but not against the membership of the committee, due, of course, to a congressional Members immunity under article 1, section 6, clause 1.

On the issue of what a witness before a committee must answer and what he need not reply to, both section 192, the fifth amendment and the committee's authority are the direct essentials to be considered. The most basic defense here is the fifth amendment—the right to refrain from answering a question amounting to compulsory self-incrimination. As to this particular civil right of the individual, the Court has been liberal in the application of it and conservative to narrow its boarders of protection. This amendment is one of such vast scope that it could not be adequately dealt with in this paper in total. But of interesting note here is the recent Supreme Court decision of *Blau* v. *United States* (340 U.S. 159), which stated in substance that one may refuse to testify if his testimony will "furnish a link in the chain of evidence against himself" and the answer need not be of such a nature as to amount to a crime itself. However, in order to invoke the privilege, the issue of statutory immunity must be considered. In the past Congress has from time to time provided for immunity or protective clauses thereby rendering testimony given before a committee as inadmissible in subsequent trials of a witness by either the Federal or State courts. Such a blanket of protection extended to a witness is binding upon the States as well as the Federal Government. *Adams* v. *Maryland* (347 U.S. 179). In *Ullmann* v. *United States* (350 U.S. 422), the Supreme Court held in dealing with an immunity clause passed by Congress, that once the reason for the privilege ceases, the privilege itself ceases. Thus the Court has laid down the proposition that one may not rightfully refuse to answer a material question without the danger of punishment if Congress has rendered testimony coming within the definition of the statute inadmissible in evidence against the witness at a subsequent trial by Federal or State authorities. For the individual is not then bearing witness against himself. However, it is now incumbent for the witness to determine whether or not he is within the statutes protection, for it is only when you come within the language of the statute that the immunity prevails.

Also a prime importance is the principle that one before a committee need not answer any and all questions directed to him by the committee. It is well established by both judicial decision and expressly set out in section 192 that a witness need answer only those questions pertinent to the question under inquiry by the committee. In order to judge whether a particular question directed by the committee to the witness is pertinent to the question under inquiry, the witness has a constitutional right to know the purpose under investigation. Either House in creating a particular committee must set forth with reasonable certainty the purposes that the committee is to inquire into. Hence, the uncertainty of the committee's scope may well be a ground of attack on the basis of unconstitutionality. The witness may also inquire as of right, from time to time, while before the committee of the relation that a particular question has to the purpose under inquiry by that committee. *U.S.* v. *Rumely* (345 U.S. 41). In the Rumely case the Supreme Court asserted that a committee may not ask a question outside the scope of the resolution creating that committee. There the committee created to investigate lobbying activities asked of the witness a question regarding the publication of books. The Court found no relevancy; thus the question was held to be improper and the conviction for failure to answer was overturned. And in 136 F. 2d 791, the Court said in substance that if the committee has no authority to ask the question because it is outside the scope of the committee's purpose, even if Congress subsequently tries to cure the defect by amendment, one who refused to answer a question before Congress amended the purpose of the committee would be guilty of nothing. If the scope is enlarged, the question must be asked again at another committee session. The crux—has the committee authority when the question is asked? In addition to the aforesaid, section 192 provides that the fact an answer to a committee question would tend to disgrace a witness or render him infamous is not a proper ground for the refusal to answer.

The preceding pages give some slight indication as to both the wide breath of congressional power and the heavy burden placed upon counsel for a witness before a committee. Counsel involved with an appearance before one of the many committees of our National Government must give careful and concise attention to the variety of matters discussed. Not only should he consider whether a committee has the constitutional right to exist but he must of necessity become extremely well versed in the scope and purpose of a committee, as well as any immunity clause that may be relevant or become relevant during an appearance before the committee. For if an individual's rights are to be protected against this vast authority of Congress no amount of consideration can be deemed too great. And while the philosophers of governmental authority may find valid criticism for this new form of national power, nevertheless, it does exist and must be dealt with in its existing form.

Barratt O'Hara's Answers to a Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in little more than 4 months every Member of this body who has been nominated and is seeking reelection will have passed upon him the verdict of his constituents. It is the short 2-year term that keeps the House very close to the people, as it was intended by the wise men who made our Constitution.

In recent years there has been a growing advocacy of changing the term of tenure from 2 to 4 years. I hope that this change never will be accomplished. The short term is a personal hardship on the Members of the House, and the expense of even a modest campaign every 2 years is not inconsiderable tax on their resources. But this is no valid argument why there should be a gulf of 4 years between the people and their Representatives. I firmly believe that one of the great strengths of our Constitution is the provision that subjects all Members of the House every 2 years to the acid test of the ballot box. The observations and experiences of my 10 years in Congress have confirmed me in this conviction.

The interest of the electorate, always a healthy sign that our representative democracy is functioning through an enlightened citizenry that wishes to be informed, is reflected in the questionnaires Members of Congress and nominees of opposing parties now are receiving. I am extending my remarks to include the questions of the independent voters of Illinois and my answer thereto. The first five questions and answers I have omitted since they relate only to name, residence, and similar statistical matters:

QUESTION 6

(a) Do you agree with the general proposition that Federal income taxes, in addition to supplying the major part of Federal revenue, should be used as a positive instrument of economic policy? Explain.

(b) Would you give a tax-cut priority over expansion of Federal support for education, housing, health and welfare services at this time?

ANSWER

(a) The Federal income tax serves the double purpose of (1) raising needed money, and (2) by percentage increases graduated to higher incomes minimizes the danger inherent in the accumulation of a nation's wealth in a relatively few hands. Furthermore, as the income rises the large percentage taken by the Government is kept by current Federal spendings in circulation and thus contributes to the sustained buying power.

On revisions of the tax rate it is inevitable that there should be conflict between the two schools of economic planning. I am of the school that believes relief first should be given where it is most needed since I conceive national strength to be measured by the position of the lowest in the economic scale, not that of the highest. On the other hand, those who think contrarywise argue that more incentive and capital should be given to those on top to encourage more expansion, more industries. It seems the old question going back to the days of Jefferson and Hamilton of whether you build from the top or the bottom. I would say that the proper approach, in the pattern of democratic thinking that what is good for one segment is good for all, is that consideration should be given to the reasonable and realistic need of both top and bottom.

In a sense I presume you can consider Federal income taxes as an instrument of economic policy. Certainly in a broad way there is a relationship. But it is difficult to make a clear-cut "Yes" or "No" answer to your question. However, if by your question you are in effect asking "Should the income tax be used exclusively for revenue purposes with no attention to economic consequences?" My answer must be negative. On the other hand, there may be economic objectives which may seem desirable to some who would use the income tax as a tool for their accomplishment, to which I would not subscribe.

For example, I would not approve use of the income tax to establish complete equality of income or to work a redistribution of the wealth. Yet I do believe in a progressive income tax and taxation in accordance with ability to pay. In any event, rates should meet the test of providing incentives for economic growth.

I may cite at least two occasions when I have supported tax legislation designed to have effects whose purposes were primarily economic. The first of these was in 1958 during the recession when I sponsored a residential rehabilitation program. To make the program attractive, I proposed to allow property owners, in computing their taxable income, to deduct expenditures for residential rehabilitation that conformed with prescribed standards. This was a deliberate tax incentive. In that sense then, I did favor the use of the income tax to promote an economic objective.

During the present session, I have also supported legislation to promote the expansion of American business abroad. I have long been impressed with the importance of implementing President Truman's point 4 program. Related to this has been the effort to make it easier for American businessmen to compete abroad. Many of us felt that the tax laws impeded the full development of their efforts. I therefore spoke in favor of, and voted for, H.R. 5 which provides a measure of tax relief designed to encourage foreign business development. In that sense then, I favored the use of the income tax to promote economic objectives.

I have answered this question at some length because I know of no short answer that would cover what I think you have in mind. I would refer those further interested in the subject to the various papers in the Ways and Means "Tax Revision Compendium" (November 1959, pp. 107, 118, 169, 180, 181, 192), not necessarily as representing my views, but as a research source on a complex subject.

(b) Decidedly no.

QUESTION 7

Which, if any, of the following proposed revisions in the Federal tax structure do you support? Give reasons.

(a) Reduction of taxes on middle and lower income families?

(b) Repeal of preferential tax treatment of dividend income?

(c) Reduction of benefits in tax treatment of capital gains?

(d) Limitation of depletion and writeoff tax allowances for oil and mining industries?

(e) Reduction of corporate taxes?

(f) Reduction of excise taxes on other than luxury items?

ANSWER

I have a sense of impotency in replying to this question since in every Congress of which I have been a Member tax items have come out of the Ways and Means Committee in package bills, not open to amendment, and a sense of fiscal responsibility (raising money for worthy things for which I have voted) compels me to vote for them despite there are items in which I am not in agreement. This year I wrote several hundred constituents of my opposition to the excise tax on local telephone calls. I did manage to save some face by voting against the closed rule (barring amendments) but when the rule was adopted I could not be irresponsible enough to vote against the bill. Some Members did vote nay in a sort of protest, but I doubt if any Member would have done so if his were the determining vote.

In revision of the Federal tax structure I would give favorable consideration to your (d), (f), and (a) because they are in fields wherein I am informed to some extent. I could not honestly answer as to the other matters without the study and evaluation of complex tax problems which under the legislative situation in which I have found myself I have not undertaken.

The Ways and Means Committee has the hardest job in the Congress, that of raising money to meet the large and growing expenses of the Federal Government. Taxes never are popular with those upon whom they are saddled. The Ways and Means Committee holds months of public hearings, at which Members of Congress may and do appear as well as other witnesses representing varying views. The committee then studies the problem as a whole. The reason advanced for package bills is that otherwise there would be endless amendments and the consequences that come when important and complex legislation is written on the floor of the House. As it is, the House must take the bitter with the sweet, according to varying viewpoints and interests, and the Federal Government ends with getting the money necessary for its functioning.

QUESTION 8

(a) What kind of program—legislative or otherwise—do you support to provide assistance to workers and businesses in "distressed areas"?

(b) Do you consider that the Federal Government has a responsibility in the distressed area problem? Why?

ANSWER

I am combining your (a) and (b) questions, and first answering (b) because if the answer to (a) were "no" it would be illogical to suggest a legislative program where there was no responsibility.

(b) I do believe strongly that the Federal Government has a responsibility in the distressed area problem. I regard it as one of our most serious problems, and one of which there is not sufficient awareness. Depletion of natural resources, as coal, lessened demand for an old product supplanted by a superior product, removal of factories and automation are only a few of the factors that more and more will occasion the drying up of the employment to which the workers of a community have been accustomed. This happened in my young manhood when the old heating stove went the way of progress and the area around East St. Louis, which had been the center of the stove industry, went through a period of readjustment and resultant keen unemployment. In the fast-moving change and expansion of the present, and the expected freer exchange of goods by the nations of the world, and certainly as a logical result of automation, developments in this direction will be rapidly accelerated.

It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to encourage, to aid and in reason-

able measure to finance on a matching basis the job of industrial readjustment to the end that all sections and all communities of our common country may share in the benefits of progress and none be penalized. The same line of reasoning governs here as that which gives justification to our program of help to the less developed nations of the free world.

(a) My thinking on the kind of a legislative program was reflected in the Douglas bill, for which I worked and voted in the 86th Congress, and which passed the Senate and House only to be vetoed by the President. I do not believe the President's veto can or will be defended by anyone aware of the seriousness of the situation and its challenge to the national welfare. Nor do I think that the administration bill, cutting assistance to a gesture and ignoring the vital need of vocational education to prepare workers for new employment in which they have had no training, can be defended. This is a subject on which I feel strongly and on which my convictions have been reached after much study.

QUESTION 9

How would you vote on the question of Federal price regulation of natural gas as proposed in the Harris bill during the 85th Congress?

ANSWER

The Harris bill in the 85th Congress was reported out by the Rules Committee 7 to 5, but never reached the floor of the House. In previous Congresses I had voted against bills which I thought gave an unwarranted advantage to the oil interests at the expense of millions of dollars in increased prices to the consumers of Chicago.

QUESTION 10

Do you think the minimum wage should be increased and expanded to include more workers? Be specific.

ANSWER

In 1913 the first State minimum wage laws were enacted largely as the result of the conscience of the American stirred by the revelations brought out by a commission of which I was privileged to be chairman. Naturally, I have a deep interest in minimum wage. I always have thought that the humblest of the Nation's workers was entitled in return for his time and toil at least the means of subsistence. In the 81st Congress I participated in the debate and voted for an increase in the Federal minimum wage and an extension of the coverage. Its passage furnished one of my great thrills of the first Congress of which I was a Member. In the 86th Congress I voted for the bill raising the minimum wage, with some increases in coverage, after first voting in Committee of the Whole for the stronger bill and greater coverage reported by the Committee on Education and Labor.

QUESTION 11

Do you support the "partnership" theory of water resource development whereby private industry has the primary responsibility for river development with only supplemental non-revenue-producing participation by the Federal Government, or do you favor direct Federal responsibility for multipurpose development of water resources? Explain.

ANSWER

Our Constitution as interpreted by the Supreme Court wisely gives jurisdiction over navigable interstate rivers to the Federal Government to preserve them in the national interest and for the use of all the people. Certainly the Federal Government has the responsibility of developing the power generated by these rivers and for multipurposes, all of which contribute to the national welfare and the benefits of which should go to all the people.

QUESTION 12

Do you believe the Federal Government should establish yardstick operation for the development of atomic energy comparable to the TVA?

ANSWER

Yes.

QUESTION 13

What Federal legislation, if any, do you favor to provide effective civil and criminal penalties for depriving any citizens of his constitutional rights to vote, and to enjoy equal opportunities for employment?

ANSWER

I think the Civil Rights Act of 1960 marked decided progress. It has provisions, I think, will prove effective, but they need strengthening. I sponsored in the House the much stronger and more inclusive bill introduced in the Senate by Senator DOUGLAS, and I hope it will receive favorable consideration in the 87th Congress. In the event of my reelection this will be high on my agenda, as will legislation assuring equal opportunity for employment. In the 81st Congress I remained on the floor of the House all night aiding in fighting off a southern filibuster and seeking to pass a Fair Employment Act with teeth. A law without strong enforcement provisions and penalties, sufficiently severe to serve as deterrents, would be a meaningless gesture.

QUESTION 14

Numerous proposals for Federal aid to education have been made. Which, if any, do you support? Why?

ANSWER

In the 86th Congress I voted for the only Federal aid to education bill that reached the floor of the House. It was trimmed to include only construction. I hope that the elections in November will return a Congress more sensitive to the Nation's educational needs and adequate salaries for teachers. The plain fact is that, in the changed world of the present, and with an increasing number of migrating families, the old concept of popular education supported solely by local taxpayers is outmoded. The Federal Government cannot escape its responsibility. If our representative democracy is to continue functioning in the highly competitive period ahead every American child must have the advantage of a good school and a good teacher, paid on a scale comparable with that of other workers with similar professional preparation.

QUESTION 15

The Supreme Court has already held that the Federal Government employee security program is limited to security-sensitive jobs. Prior to this Court finding, the programs was applied to all Government employees. Would you support legislative proposals to set aside the Supreme Court decision and reapply the security program on an across-the-board basis?

ANSWER

No.

QUESTION 16

Do you think congressional committee investigations should be unlimited or restricted to the finding of facts for legislative purposes? Explain.

ANSWER

It is the province of the Congress to make the laws, not to administer or to enforce them. Its investigations, therefore, should be confined (1) to the subject matter of pending or proposed legislation, (2) to the operation of existent laws when there is a legislative purpose, as repeal, amendment or codification, and, (3) to a limited extent and always governed by a definite and immediate legislative objective, to the need for legislation and its nature and scope.

QUESTION 17

Are you in favor of any plan to limit nuclear testing? Under what conditions, if any?

ANSWER

Nuclear testing is attendant with risks, of which menace to health is not the least. I believe there should be such definite limitations as in the judgment of our scientists would minimize these risks to a negligible margin and in the judgment of those responsible for the national defense would not unreasonably jeopardize our security. I believe that Adlai E. Stevenson rendered a large service to his country and to mankind in focusing attention to the danger in nuclear testing in his last campaign, even though what he said largely went unheeded.

QUESTION 18

Are you in favor of any of the proposed plans for world disarmament? Explain.

ANSWER

I always have been fearful that history would repeat itself and the present race of armaments would end as did that of France and Germany in the period prior to World War I. I hope and fervently pray that before it is too late world disarmament will be accomplished. If there is sincere desire on both sides, this should not be difficult. I am not sure that even such a simple plan as periodical observations by U–2 planes, operated by the United Nations or in any event internationally manned, might have possibilities. But I doubt if I, or any other member of or candidate for Congress, would wish to take the responsibility of mapping the program for observation and inspection to assure complete compliance by all nations with the disarmament agreement. That is a task and a responsibility that must be left to others with greater and specified knowledge in the field and familiarity with all the factors, both personal and physical.

QUESTION 19

Explain your views on the present U.S. program of international assistance and development.

ANSWER

My approach to foreign policy in its economic relationship is: (1) On the world front, the foundation of permanent peace is in the worldwide elimination of poverty insofar as human effort under wise and cooperating democratic governments can accomplish that end; (2) on the domestic front, the opening of new foreign markets in countries now less developed for the products of our factories furnishes protection from the danger of wide domestic unemployment resulting from automation which increases output and decreases the number of jobs for workers.

QUESTION 20

Do you support congressional approval of U.S. participation in the Organization for Trade Cooperation, the international body to administer the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade?

ANSWER

Yes.

QUESTION 21

Would you support legislation to assist workers, communities, and industries that may be directly injured by reduced tariffs?

ANSWER

Yes. I realize that some workers, communities, and industries have been injured by that which has brought benefit to the Nation as a whole. During the period of readjustment, and in their present distress, it is only fair and in the national interest that

they should be helped by reasonable subsidies and otherwise.

QUESTION 22

What is your attitude on continued U.S. participation in specialized agencies of the U.N., such as the International Labor Organization, the World Health Organization, UNESCO, and the Food and Agriculture Organization?

ANSWER

It would be the height of folly to terminate that participation. I think the entire membership of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, which is closest to the situation, would agree. It is an index to my thinking that in the closing weeks of the recent session I gave strong support to the International Development Agency as an instrumentality in which the resources of many participating nations could be pooled in the common effort to help the less developed nations.

QUESTION 23

To what extent should the Federal Government be active in the field of housing?

ANSWER

I came to Congress in 1949, when the housing problem was desperate, and in three Congresses served on the Banking and Currency Committee, which has jurisdiction in housing. I always have thought that it was the responsibility of the Congress to assure a decent roof over every American family. That objective has not been attained, but until it is the challenge will be on the Congress to meet its responsibility. As long as my constituents return me to Congress I shall work toward that end.

QUESTION 24

What important legislative proposals, other than those referred to above, would you like to see enacted by Congress?

ANSWER

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa I am keenly conscious of the importance to us and to the free world of the establishment of lasting bonds of friendship, of understanding, and of cooperation with the nations of that continent. By the end of this year there will be a total of 24 sovereign nations in Africa, all of which it is expected will have votes in the United Nations. If I am returned to Congress, it is my hope that I can make some contribution in this field of challenge.

I also am the ranking majority member of the Subcommittee on Latin America anti a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, and to these tasks I shall if reelected give my best effort, but with no cessation of my interest and activities in legislative approaches to the solution of our many domestic problems with which the experiences of the 10 years my constituents graciously have kept me in the Congress have given me familiarity.

U–2 and United States: A Look Backward So We May See More Clearly Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the RECORD an article by Henry Roemer, chairman of the executive committee of Sharon Steel Corp., entitled "U–2 and United States: A Look Backward So We May See More Clearly Ahead." This article appeared in the Sharonsteel Record of June 1960.

In my opinion, Mr. Roemer has given an excellent review of recent history and charted the proper course for our country to follow in these critical days.

The article follows:

U–2 AND UNITED STATES: A LOOK BACKWARD SO WE MAY SEE MORE CLEARLY AHEAD

(By Henry Roemer)

As this is written on June 6, it is the 16th anniversary of D-day and the historical landing on Normandy Beach, we the people of these United States find ourselves in a state of confusion.

The fact that a reconnaissance plane with the designation U–2 was grounded through engine failure, pilot blackout or for some other known or unknown reason and captured by the Russians seems to have started a hornets nest in national and international affairs. At this time and on this date we should be giving our respect, our support and paying high tribute to that great general who was in supreme command of the Allied armies on D-day. He directed one of the most remarkable military accomplishments in all of history.

This great general, now President of the United States, is the subject of criticism and is being annoyed by sniping politicians who, in an effort to promote their own selfish interests, have demanded that President Eisenhower apologize to Khrushchev for what has taken place in the U–2 incident and also as to what happened at the summit. This demand is not only ridiculous in itself, but would be a reflection on every American and a degrading influence in the international situation.

Dwight Eisenhower is a courageous man, one of deep religious conviction, thoroughly honest and one of the greatest men who ever occupied the Presidential chair in our National Capitol. He, being the head of our Government, the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and our accredited representative in every phase and feature of international affairs, deserves the unqualified, undivided support of the American people. President Eisenhower is not one to dodge responsibility or pass the buck to subordinates in a critical situation such as this. Those in this country who advise appeasement, urge the soft touch and a bow-the-head, bend-the-knee attitude to the despot and dictator of Russia and satellite countries are not really true Americans.

Is memory so short that we have forgotten Chamberlain with his umbrella in those pitiful attempts to appease and placate Adolph Hitler? We saw Hitler and his armies move quietly into Austria, then Czechoslovakia and later declare war and march boldly into Poland on September 1, 1939. Have we forgotten the many attempts of President Roosevelt and his advisers to deal with Stalin in their meetings at Teheran, Yalta, and later at Potsdam? Are there folks in this country who have forgotten the recall of our own troops back across the Elbe and the withholding of the Allied troops outside of Prague, in order to permit the Russians to move triumphantly into Berlin and Prague? Then, at the Treaty of Potsdam we acceded to the demands of the Reds and conceded the division of Germany and the partition of Berlin, leaving that great capital city entirely surrounded by the military forces of the Soviet Union. In each and every one of these cases it would seem that we were out-generaled, outmaneuvered, out-smarted, and out-traded by the Russians. Now, with all of this experience, why has there been or should there be a demand for summit conferences when the record proves so conclusively that we have gained nothing through such attempts in the past? Russia gave no help to the Allies during the war with Germany except perhaps at the battle of Stalingrad, which was fought entirely for their own safety and salvation.

It is a matter of record as to what happened to General Chennault, General Wedemeyer, and later Gen. Douglas MacArthur when Chiang Kai-shek was deposed and China, together with a large portion of Asia was turned over to the Reds.

As to the matter of spying—every informed person knows that this has been a practice throughout history from early biblical times. It is common knowledge that the Russians have been spying on this country long before—during and throughout World War II—and are still continuing those practices up to D-day 1960.

As I have written on other occasions—if France is beaten to her knees, the British Empire broken up and dismembered—we may see the Red hordes of Russia sweeping over a devastated Europe, to be followed later by waves of yellows and browns and a new civilization rolls westward, in which case the United States will find itself standing, facing, and fighting the rest of the world alone.

This is a time when we Americans should stand stanchly, steadfastely, and bravely behind our President in what may be one of the darkest and most dangerous periods of our existence as a nation—particularly in view of the Communists moving into Cuba and other Central and South American countries.

What We Believe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE L. HAYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include eight of the recommendations contained in the report of the board of world peace adopted by the northeast Ohio conference of the Methodist Church in its annual session held at Lakeside, Ohio, on June 21 through 26, 1960. The conference consisted of 517 ministers and 517 laymen, representing 250,000 Methodists. I heartily concur in the aims of these recommendations and am happy to place them in the RECORD for all to see. The resolutions were forwarded to me by the Reverend Charles M. Dailey, of Toronto, Ohio.

The recommendations follow:

WHAT WE BELIEVE

1. We believe that the United Nations is a working center of international cooperation which provides our most hopeful avenue leading to peace and world order. We believe that the United Nations, with its related agencies, should be sustained, upheld, undergirded, and strengthened by all informed and conscientious churchmen.

We support Senate Concurrent Resolution 52 and House Concurrent Resolution 208 for review and study of the United Nations Charter with a view of increasing its effectiveness as an instrument for world peace.

2. We believe in greater use of the International Court of Justice and urge the United States to lead the way in removing restrictions which impair the Court's effectiveness.

We support passage and adoption of U.S. Senate Resolution 94 (designed solely to remove so-called Connally reservation from U.S. declaration), thereby enabling the United States to participate more effectively in the International Court of Justice.

3. We believe that all nuclear tests by all nuclear powers, present and future, should cease in order that present and future generations may be protected from the dangers of nuclear radiation and that the nuclear arms race might end.

4. We believe that only complete disarmament, involving both nuclear and conventional weapons, down to the levels required for internal policing must be our goal. We are aware that this is no simple or easy goal, but its difficulty is exceeded only by necessity and urgency.

We repudiate all ideas of mass retaliation, the development of the means of chemical, biological, and radiological warfare. The preparation and stockpiling of nerve gases, the production of living organisms or their toxic products to cause death or disability to man, his domestic animals or crops, or any plan for the use of radioactive dust or death rays—these are unspeakably horrible to contemplate. It is time that dedicated Christians rethink prayerfully their dependence on such instruments in human relations.

5. We believe that one of the most Christian and most useful services that our country can render to the underprivileged nations of the world lies in economic aid. This can be of two kinds. On the one hand we can share our vast surpluses with nations where hunger is an ever-present reality, and on the other hand a long-range program of aid must necessarily be based on the principle of helping the distressed nation to help itself. Here is where specialized aid is important. Specialists in farming, industrial development, community betterment, community health, along with the tools to achieve these ends, will go a long way toward the development of these nations about to take their place among the family of nations.

We believe that the recognition of human equality must accompany economic aid if a world of peace and justice is to be achieved.

6. We believe that the United States should ratify the convention banning genocide. The United States has signed this treaty but has not yet ratified it. It is a conservative measure, constitutionally sound, recognizing in international law the right of life on the grounds of race, religion, nationality, or ethnic origin.

7. We believe that serious study should be made on the part of churches and Government on the problem of recognition or nonrecognition of the Chinese People's Republic (Communist China).

8. We believe that the United States should participate in the Atlantic Convention to draft an Atlantic Community constitution improving NATO beyond a military alliance to a representative federation of people and governments for strengthening democracy and the foundations of peace in the Atlantic Community. Such future development of NATO should be consistent with increasing the effectiveness of the United Nations as an instrument for world peace.

Strong Opposition Shown in Transfer of the Regional Operations Office of the Post Office Department From Portland, Oreg., to Seattle, Wash.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, on June 30 the Postmaster General announced his decision to transfer the Regional Operations Office of the Post Office Department from Portland, Oreg., to Seattle, Wash. At that time, I inserted in the RECORD a number of telegrams from persons who shared my deep concern and my strong opposition. Since then, my office has continued to receive mail on this subject. The mail, without a single exception, is critical of the Postmaster General's unwarranted and arbitrary decision. These letters point to the disruption of service, to the high costs of this unnecessary move; they speak volumes in regard to the unfortunate effect this transfer will have on the lives of the 180 career employees who will be faced with the choice of selling their homes in Portland or giving up their jobs with the Department.

One of these letters—written, incidentally by a good Republican—sums up the arguments against this transfer masterfully. Under unanimous consent I insert the letter at this point in my remarks:

PORTLAND, OREG.,
June 30, 1960.

Hon. RICHARD E. NIXON,
Vice President of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: Portland is rife with rumors concerning the reason for the order signed by Postmaster General Summerfield. The fact that post office operations will be improved is never considered as the real issue; it couldn't have been the premise on which the order was signed.

Even if Seattle and Portland offered equal opportunities for successful management, the order is ridiculous. Why move at tremendous cost from a proven location? To play politics with families and homes would seem too great a price for election to any office. In fact, Washington isn't the only State that will hold elections.

I ask that you as Postmaster General Summerfield's superior exercise your authority in the name of commonsense and stop this order.

If, by chance, the order to move is not rescinded, I hope at a future date some hopeful candidate asks for a full accounting of the whole cost of this transfer (abandonment of quarters furnished especially for Post Office Department operations here; cost of moving employees' belongings; per diem paid, perhaps for weeks, to commuters; and per diem paid to employees who cannot move but are detailed to Seattle to help set up the office; also the tremendous cost of moving equipment) and then compare that figure to the insinuated operational savings by headquartering the region in Seattle ("insinuated savings"—no facts—the real reason couldn't be given for publication). Interesting reading for the already hard-pressed taxpayer.

I write this as a Republican, not as a citizen who grabs at any issue to embarrass the administration.

Sincerely,

AGATHA SPINT.

Though the career employees of the regional office have, of course, protested this arbitrary decision, they have not been alone in their objections. Portland businessmen have also indicated their opposition in no uncertain terms. The following letters are samples of that opposition:

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am writing to protest the announced removal of the regional post office from Portland to Seattle. It would appear as though this certainly was not in the best interests of our community nor the Nation.

As I understand the situation, the present quarters occupied by the regional post office are rent free and custodial free. If the office is moved to Seattle, it would probably cost the Government about $4 per square foot or an additional rent of about $150,000 per year.

Besides this, the office would lose probably 50 percent of their trained people which in any event is tremendously expensive for the Government.

As far as the arguments that operations would be more efficiently handled, this is certainly not true. Portland has been proved over many years as the most logical distribution point for the Pacific Northwest. The operations would be less efficient rather than more efficient.

On top of all of this, it would probably cost several hundred thousand dollars to move the office from Portland to Seattle.

It would be my earnest hope that you could strenuously object to this move and would be successful in having the decision rescinded.

Yours very truly,

BRUCE-EMMETT CO.,
T. Y. EMMETT.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. Congress,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN: Please use your best effort to retain the regional post office in Portland.

Thanking you for this courtesy, I am,

Very truly yours,

J. V. RICH.

The city of Portland has spoken out, both through the voice of Mayor Schrunk, and through a city council resolution. These read as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG.,
June 29, 1960.

Representative EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Information concerning the proposed shift of the Pacific Northwest regional post office from Portland to Seattle, and how this information was released, most disconcerting. Please explore fully by committee hearings if necessary how this alleged proposal for movement came about and especially the bare facts concerning the actual need for such a shift. On the surface it would appear that Portland's continued importance as a distribution center for the entire Northwest certainly would negate any reason for the change in the office location.

TERRY D. SCHRUNK,
Mayor of Portland, Oreg.

CITY OF PORTLAND, OREG.,
June 30, 1960.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am enclosing herewith a certified copy of Resolution No. 28349, duly adopted by the Portland City Council on June 30, 1960, protesting the removal of the Pacific Northwest Regional Office of the Post Office Department from Portland, Oreg., to Seattle, Wash.

Your immediate consideration of this matter would be sincerely appreciated.

Very truly yours,

RAY SMITH,
Auditor of the City of Portland.

RESOLUTION NO. 28349

Whereas the Postmaster General of the United States, the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, has announced that the Post Office Department proposes to move the Pacific Northwest Regional Post Office from Portland, Oreg., where it was established in

1954 and since efficiently operated, to the city of Seattle, Wash.; and

Whereas it is the opinion of the council of the city of Portland that such a move is not in the public interest, as the city of Portland is the economic and geographical center from which the services of the regional office in administering post offices and postal services in the five Pacific Northwest States of Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Alaska, have been, and can continue to be most efficiently administered; and

Whereas the contemplated move envisages a waste of public moneys in that facilities in the city of Portland are presently available without additional rent or other costs to the Federal Government, whereas space in Seattle is not available and would have to be rented at an estimated annual cost to the taxpayers of some $90,000, and the move of facilities and personnel would be an additional expense to the taxpayers estimated at $500,000; and

Whereas more than 170 employees affected by the move would suffer unwarranted expense, as well as an unjustified disruption of their personal lives and affairs; and

Whereas the Post Office Department, by its recently authorized construction of additional facilities in the city of Portland, has recognized this city as the natural center for regional postal services: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the council of the city of Portland, in regular session assembled this 30th day of June, 1960, does by this resolution voice a most vigorous protest to the proposed move as announced by the Postmaster General, and calls upon the Oregon delegation in the Congress of the United States, the Governor of the State of Oregon, civic and community leaders and organizations to join in this protest by direct appeal to the Postmaster General, and particularly requests that no further action be taken upon the proposal until a public hearing has been had, at which there can be a full disclosure of the geographical and economic advantages to maintaining the regional office in the city of Portland, Oreg.; and be it further

Resolved, That the auditor of the city of Portland forward certified copies of this resolution to all Members of the Oregon Delegation in the Congress of the United States, the Honorable Arthur E. Summerfield, the Postmaster General; and to the Deputy Postmaster General, the Honorable Edson O. Sessions; and the Honorable John M. McKibbin, Assistant Postmaster General for Operations; and the Honorable Rollin D. Barnard, Assistant Postmaster General for Facilities; the Honorable Olin D. Johnston, chairman, and the Honorable A. S. Mike Monroney, the Honorable Ralph W. Yarborough, the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Jr., the Honorable B. Everett Jordan, the Honorable Jennings Randolph, the Honorable Frank Carlson, the Honorable Hiram L. Fong, the Honorable C. Norman Brunsdale, members, and the Honorable H. W. Brawley, executive director, of the Senate Standing Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; and the Honorable Tom Murray, chairman, and the Honorable James H. Morrison, the Honorable James C. Davis, the Honorable John Lesinski, the Honorable Chet Holifield, the Honorable Kathryn E. Granahan, the Honorable Charles O. Porter, the Honorable Ralph J. Scott, the Honorable Thaddeus J. Dulski, the Honorable Stanley A. Prokop, the Honorable John R. Foley, the Honorable Donald J. Irwin, the Honorable Randall S. Harmon, the Honorable Dale Alford, the Honorable James C. Oliver, the Honorable Jacob H. Gilbert, the Honorable Edward H. Rees, the Honorable Robert J. Corbett, the Honorable H. R. Gross, the Honorable Joel T. Broyhill, the Honorable August E. Johansen, the Honorable Glenn Cunningham, the Honorable George M. Wallhauser, the Honorable Robert R. Barry, and the Honorable Katharine St. George, members of the House of Representatives Standing Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and the Honorable Frederick C. Belen, chief counsel and staff director of said committee; to the Honorable Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of the State of Oregon, the Washington, D.C., office of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, Harold Say, manager, and such other persons or organization as the council may direct.

Adopted by the council, June 30, 1960.

RAY SMITH,
Auditor of the City of Portland.

Other letters from interested residents of Oregon make a compelling case against the transfer. I ask that they be printed below:

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1960.*

Mrs. EDITH GREEN,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: Today the sudden news broke in Portland—the regional office of the U.S. Post Office in Portland, is to be moved to Seattle, Wash.

This is a great shock to all of Oregon and especially to Portland, that has already suffered great losses to various moves in different fields. Over 170 families will be suddenly ordered to sell their homes and find new quarters in Seattle.

This will greatly affect Portland economically with so many leaving at once and think of the additional tax money that will be spent moving this many families.

I, as the mother of one of these employees, implore you to exert your influence and do all in your power to have this unreasonable order retracted. We do need this office right here in Portland.

Yours in all sincerity,

ELLA TRINKLEIN.

OSWEGO, OREG., *July 1, 1960.*

The VICE PRESIDENT,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: As you know the proposal has been made to relocate the regional office of the Post Office Department from Portland, Oreg., to Seattle, Wash. This proposal was made under the guise of an economic move. I know the economics of this situation very well, and I assure you that this claim is completely unjustified.

Relocation of the regional office is unjustified because Portland is the transportation center region. The five States in the region may be served more effectively by common transportation routes from this point.

Presently the regional office is adequately housed in Government-owned building. If the offices were moved to Seattle expensive commercial space would have to be rented. Currently 32 regional transportation employees work in Seattle. There is no justification for moving four floors of office equipment, electronic computers, electric accounting equipment and imposing hardships on the 180 employees and families for no good reason. It would be far more simple to relocate the 32 employees to Portland.

After examining the facts I am sure you will agree that this action is completely unjustified. I urge you to do all you can to "stop" the relocation of the Portland regional office.

Sincerely,

GEORGE H. TAFT, P.E.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1960.*

Hon. EDITH S. GREEN,
U.S. Representative,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: I am writing to request you to use every influence at your command to (1) rescind the recent order issued by Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield to move the regional post office from Portland, Oreg., to Seattle, Wash., and (2) to override President Eisenhower's veto of the postal salary increase should he veto it.

I protest moving the regional post office out of Oregon both as a regional postal employee and as a taxpayer. I cannot see any advantage to the Government in doing this, but on the contrary, it would cost considerably to move approximately 200 regional employees and their household goods, saying nothing of the inconvenience it would cause.

Such a move would result in considerable loss to the economy of the State of Oregon by moving this payroll to Washington.

Also, our pending salary increase is urgently needed.

Thanks for your support in the past and trusting that I can count on you in behalf of the above-mentioned requests.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR K. SMITH.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 28, 1960.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. GREEN: We strongly protest the removal of the regional post office of Portland, Oreg., to Seattle, Wash.

Why spend a vast sum of money for the moving of special equipment plus the rental of a new building to house this equipment when present location is satisfactory?

Why should Seattle, Wash., have this million-dollar payroll? We urge you use your powers to prevent this move.

Very truly yours,

AGATHA MOORE.
DONNA COFER.

JUNE 30, 1960.

DEAR MADAM: Please do everything in your power to stop the shift of the Pacific Northwest regional post office from Portland to Seattle. The cost to the taxpayers of the United States for rental space alone in Seattle is so unnecessary. Also the uprooting of 170 families of these employees from their church, home, and community would be most detrimental to all concerned.

This seems to be a strictly selfish political move, and in the interest of all taxpayers, should be stopped immediately.

Yours truly,

ELIZABETH FRANKLIN.

PORTLAND, OREG., *June 30, 1960.*

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
U.S. House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE MADAM: I wish to add my voice in protest of the movement of our regional headquarters, Post Office Department, from Portland, Oreg., to Seattle, Wash., as recently announced in the newspapers.

This will displace a hundred or more Oregon families with the accompanying hardships. This move appears to be a slap in the face to the progress of Portland and should be opposed in every possible way. Whatever the reasons for the movement, which appear on the face to be political, a thorough investigation should be made to be certain that the move is economically and operationally sound.

I urge you in your loyalty to Oregon's progress to apply all possible pressure to thwart this apparently unnecessary move.

Very truly yours,

F. S. BARLOW, Jr.

These letters, Mr. Speaker, make a better case than I possibly could. I again reiterate my urgent plea that the Post Office reconsider this extravagant, unjustified decision.

First 25 Public Laws of Second Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, since I have been in the Congress I regularly have reported to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois new public laws as they were enacted. Necessarily, in the digesting of the new laws I have had to put in many hours of night work, since attention to my legislative duties afforded no time during the hours of the day. I have felt, however, that the effort was well worth while since, by the inclusion of relatively minor legislation as well as that of major importance, the reports gave to my constituents at home a better understanding of their Congress and the nature and scope of its work. Furthermore, the reports served to give notice to my constituents of new laws affecting them and which otherwise might be unknown to them for a long time. Often reports of new laws were mailed my constituents within minutes after their official numbering.

For the convenience of my colleagues, and others, who wish to have for reference a digest of the laws of the 2d session of the 86th Congress, I am extending my remarks to include Public Laws 384 to 408, the first 25 public laws of the 2d session of the 86th Congress. In the 1st session of the 86th Congress there were 383 public laws enacted; hence the numbering for the 2d session starts with 384.

The digest of laws follows:

PUBLIC LAW 384

S. 2231, protection of childhood

Public Law 384 authorizes an appropriation of $100,000 for fiscal 1961 and 1962 to meet the obligation of the United States as a member of the Inter-American Children's Institute. Our country pays 40 percent of the expenses of the Institute, other countries on the American hemisphere a total of 60 percent. The organization, formerly known as the American International Institute for the Protection of Childhood (a name pretty hard to handle in these busy days, even when initialed AIIPC), appears to have done a good job during the years in a joint hemispheric undertaking. Its most recent achievement was a comparative study of family laws and the problem of abandoned children in the American countries, also a study of correctional systems in Latin America and a translation into Spanish of much helpful material previously available only in English.

As all peoples share a common interest in the welfare of children our cooperation with our American neighbors in this work probably pays richer dividends than much larger investments in winning their hearts and minds. Anyway, I do not see how we abruptly could draw out of the joint program for the welfare of all children of the hemisphere without unfriendly repercussions.

PUBLIC LAW 385

S. 623, veterans and wheat

Veterans of World Wars I and II, homesteading in the Tulelake area in California, find that Durum wheat is one of the few crops that can be grown successfully. Public Law 385 increases their acreage for crop years 1960 and 1961 provided the additional acres are planted with Durum wheat, which is in large demand by manufacturers of macaroni and spaghetti and in limited supply because it is grown in only five States.

PUBLIC LAW 386

S. 2379, Nez Perce Indians

In 1909 the United States paid $562 for 11 acres of land in Idaho as a site for a day school for the Nez Perce Tribe of Indians. Now other arrangements have been made for educating the Indians, and the land is surplus. Public Law 386 donates it to the tribe, which expects to make some money for tribal welfare from tourists. Reason: The final link of a historic highway following the route of the Lewis and Clark Expedition from St. Louis to Oregon will be completed in 1961 and the former school property will be a main tourist attraction because the Lewis and Clark Expedition spent an entire winter there. Perhaps someday when you take the family touring along this historic highway you'll contribute your bit to the welfare of the Nez Perce Indians and get the thrill of standing where the hardy pioneers spent that hard winter when the history of the Northwest was in the making.

PUBLIC LAW 387

S. 713, Zion National Park in Utah

Public Law 387 adds some 3,420 acres to the Zion National Park in Utah which the Department of the Interior describes as containing "a grandeur of colorful canyons and mesa scenery that ranks high among the superlative scenic areas of the world." The additional land will serve to preserve a notable terraced lava field and provide more grounds for campers.

Your Representative consistently has voted for legislation that makes the great out of doors available to the people and for national parks and historic shrines that dramatize for visiting tourists the story of our country and its development. He is cosponsor in the House of Senator DOUGLAS' bill to enclose the priceless scenic and geological treasures of the dunes within a national park. Although opposition is formidable, hope has not been abandoned.

PUBLIC LAW 388

H.R. 8171, San Francisco-Oakland Bridge

Public Law 388 permits the use of tolls collected on the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge for the construction and operation of a rail transit crossing across the Bay of San Francisco. Original plans contemplated use of the bridge both as a rail transit crossing and a highway crossing. But highway traffic has grown so tremendously it now needs all the space. So under the new plan the rails will go underground, crossing the bay by tunnel and leaving the bridge entirely to highway traffic. No Federal funds are involved, and the bridge will be toll free when the cost of the combined project (bridge plus tunnel) has been paid off.

PUBLIC LAW 389

H.R. 9664, stabilizing tobacco prices

Tobacco growing is the chief source of income for 800,000 American farm families. The industry has been adversely affected in competitive foreign markets by an excessive price established under the price control formula. So the growers began by voluntarily reducing their plantings, then petitioned Congress for exemption from the operation of a parity formula that would force tobacco prices more and more into an unrealistic and noncompetitive position. Public Law 389 is intended to serve this end. It stabilizes support levels against disruptive fluctuations, keeps the support level for 1960 at the same level as 1959 and thereafter ties the parity price of tobacco directly to the parity index (the cost of things farmers buy) rather than to the 10-year moving average of farm prices.

From our standpoint as urban dwellers, where much tobacco is consumed but none grown, interest in Public Law 389 is that it will keep tobacco prices stabilized and (very important to all taxpayers) substantially reduce the drain on the Commodity Credit Corporation, the high cost of which is a matter of concern.

PUBLIC LAW 390

S. 2033, placer mining

When the mining law of 1872 was enacted placer mining was a simple operation of washing gravel and separating gold. That romantic era long has passed into the story books. Today mining of gold in the United States is a lost art. Placer mining now is concerned with the production of nonmetallic minerals (gypsum, limestone, quartziti and related clay minerals and building materials) for industrial use.

Instead of the simple washbasin with which the placer miner worked in the old gold days, there is need of extensive building, complex machinery and storage facilities that run into the millions of dollars. These require space. So Public Law 390 provides for the inclusion of 5 acres of nonmineral land (adjacent to the site of the actual mining) in patents to placer claims, same as permitted in patents to lode claims. How the world has moved since 1872.

PUBLIC LAW 391

S. 2061, hunt for phosphate in public domain

At the present time there are 73 leases for phosphate in lands belonging to the United States, covering a total of 48,418 acres. The phosphate found in some of the land is of a low grade, and there is the difficult problem of getting economical electric power. Public law 391 is intended to improve the picture by encouraging prospecting for new locations of phosphate deposits.

It provides for permits to prospect and explore for phosphate in up to 2,560 acres of the public domain with the inducement that if phosphate is discovered within 2 years the permittee shall have the preferential right to a lease of the land. The 2-year period may be extended to 6 years on a proper showing of diligence and need of further exploration.

PUBLIC LAW 392

S. 2268, giving land back to Indians

In 1877 the Fort Apache Military Post in Arizona was established on 7,579 acres of land of the White Mountain Apache Indian Reservation. In 1922 the military post was abandoned and the land turned over to the Theodore Roosevelt Indian School. Today only 410 of the 7,579 acres are being used for school purposes. Public Law 392 turns back the remainder to the Indians.

PUBLIC LAW 393

S. 2431, Kansas centennial

Kansas will be 100 years old on January 29, 1961, and Public Law 393 anticipates the happy event by authorizing the Federal mint to strike out suitable medals and sell them to the Kansas Centennial Commission for not less than cost, including overhead and everything.

History of Kansas really goes back to 1541 when Francisco Vasquez de Coronado led Spanish adventurers in a hunt for gold in the fabled cities of Cibola. Lewis and Clark, Fremont, Kit Carson, passed through Kansas. In Medicine Lodge in Kansas a famous Indian treaty was signed and from Medicine Lodge later came Carry A. Nation, a lady who made her hatchet more famous than the tomahawk. Her hatchet smashed right and left at demon rum in the fight for prohibition and at least once a week made the first pages of the Nation's newspapers.

Also from Kansas came "Sockless Jerry" Simpson, a colorful Member of the Congress, Lewellan, literally taken from the plow to become Governor in the era of the Populist Party, smiling Charles Curtis who became Vice President of the United States, and Al Landon, who tried for the White House but fell by the roadside under the magic of F.D.R.

The finishing touch to the greatness of Kansas was painted by Senator SCHOEPPEL, in his day an all-American football great, in this language:

"Gunslingers and marshals known throughout the world—Wyatt Earp, Wild Bill Hickock, and Matt Dillon—tangled in the cowboy capitals of Dodge City, Abilene, and Wichita." Abilene was the boyhood home of President Dwight D. Eisenhower.

Kansas is a great and a proud State, and I am sure we all will join heartily in 1961 in celebration of her centennial. Looking back over the last century of the history of our country gives us confidence in facing the challenges of the next century.

PUBLIC LAW 394

S. 2454, pony express

Public Law 394 authorizes the mint to strike 500,000 medals for sale at cost to the National Pony Express Centennial Commission, which is cooperating with the Federal Government and eight States of the Union in commemorating the 100th anniversary of the founding of the pony express.

I found the story of the pony express, as related to us, intensely interesting. It was described as one of the most colorful episodes in the history of our country and of far greater significance than merely a life of glorious adventure to some 80 young men so often depicted in western films. It served to bind the country together, proved the superiority of the central (rather than the southern) route across the continent, and paved the way for the first railroad to span the continent 9 years later.

The pony express only existed 19 months, from April 3, 1860, when the first buckskin pouch left St. Joseph, Mo., to the completion of the first telegraph system across the Nation November 20, 1861, when the last delivery left Sacramento, Calif., eastward bound. Buchanan's farewell address and Lincoln's first inaugural address were carried by the pony express, from Missouri to California in 8 days. Usually, however, the 1,966-mile journey took much longer.

Here is how it was done:

1. There were some 80 riders, average age 20, some including the famous Buffalo Bill, barely 15; they were carefully selected, from youths of slender build weighing not over 130 pounds (one exception weighed 160) and trained for constant vigilance against Indians and bandits; risks and salaries were equally great, the riders receiving $50 to $150 a month, fabulous amounts 100 years ago.

2. Relay stations, totaling 190, were spaced 10 miles apart. Here the riders stopped a maximum of 2 minutes to change to fresh mounts and were off again with the wind. The men rode in relays, changing horses at each station. The usual day's stint was 75 miles.

3. Russell, Majors & Waddell, a private company in the express and freight business, poured into the venture an enormous outlay of men, horses, and equipment. It was reimbursed by the Government, somewhat as air companies are now, for service in carrying the mails.

This coming summer there will be a reenactment of the pony express run from St. Joseph to Sacramento. It will follow the original route through Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, Utah, Nevada, and California. I thought you would like to have this briefing in advance.

PUBLIC LAW 395

Senate Joint Resolution 115, Pan American Health Organization

Pan American Health Organization, with headquarters in Washington since 1902, when it was formed, is the oldest continuing international health organization in the world. It now is the regional office of the World Health Organization. Public Law 395 authorizes the purchase of land in Washington (estimated cost, $875,000) as the site for a new $4-million building the organization plans to erect with its own funds. This assures PAHO headquarters remaining in the United States despite attractive inducements to relocate in Mexico, Panama, and Peru.

In the 58 years of its existence PAHO has made a notable record (1) in combating disease, especially yellow fever and malaria, (2) in strengthening friendly relations between the United States and her sister Republics, and (3) in furthering the concept of hemispheric solidarity.

Money for use in conquering disease plagues and in protecting the health of people is the wisest investment we make in promoting real friendship with the peoples of the world. I am sure you will agree.

PUBLIC LAW 396

S. 1712, Motor Boat Act

In 1958 Congress strengthen the Motor Boat Act to assure greater safety in the operation of small motor boats, the number of which has multiplied many times. The law applied to "the United States, its Territories and the District of Columbia." That by inadvertance left the Virgin Islands, Guam, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico without the protection of required life preservers and fire extinguishing apparatus since they are neither States nor territories. Public Law 396 extends the act to include them.

You will be interested to know that the correct legislative language to include all the United States is: "The United States, its territories and possessions, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the District of Columbia."

As I mentioned in an earlier report, we have now run out of territories, but we do have Guam and the Virgin Islands, which are classified as unincorporated territories, in reality possessions. I am supporting legislation to give Guam and the Virgin Islands nonvoting representation in the House and also the proposal of House representation for the District of Columbia. That I think is in the tradition of our country.

PUBLIC LAW 397

S. 2483, Weather Bureau in the Arctic

Public Law 397 takes yesterday's administrative handcuffs from the Coast and Geodetic Survey and the Weather Bureau in the world of today by authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to fix the rate of pay for extra compensation for such jobs as going into the Arctic region to conduct meteorological investigations for the Weather Bureau or going to sea as bombers and fathometer readers for the Coast and Geodetic Survey. An old statute fixed a ceiling for certain work of $1 a day. Trouble was where to find qualified $1-a-day personnel.

PUBLIC LAW 398

S. 2185, Saga of the "Meredith Victory"

Public Law 398 authorizes a Gallant Ship Unit Citation and plaque to the steamship *Meredith Victory* and a citation ribbon bar to each member of her crew participating in the saga of December of 1950.

This is an heroic story of the sea that will live forever in the history of the American merchant marine. When the *Meredith Victory* reached the harbor of Hungnam in Korea on December 21, 1950, the city was under enemy gunfire, surrounded by Communist troops with the word out that all persons in the city when captured would be beheaded.

The captain of the SS *Meredith Victory* instructed the crew to load evacuees until no more could be taken aboard. The vessel was small, a 7,600-ton cargo ship with accommodations for only 12 passengers. In all, over 1,400 Korean civilians were packed aboard, goodness knows how. There was no doctor, no interpreter, very little food, very little water. The vessel sailed 3 days, part of the time over a minefield, with the ever-present danger of being blown into bits. During the trip no one died, but five babies were born. Thus when it docked at Pusan on Christmas eve it discharged five more passengers than it had taken on at Hungnam.

I was impressed by the language of Vice Admiral Will, commander of the Military Sea Transportation Service, in recommending passage of the measure:

"Few epics of the sea captured the imagination as did the saga of the *Meredith Victory*. She not only saved the actual lives of 1,400 persons on a single voyage, but even more than that, she and her gallant crew became symbols of the American attitude that human lives are more precious than ideologies."

PUBLIC LAW 399

S. 601, Bardwell Reservoir in Texas

Storms and floods in the Trinity River Basin in northeast Texas occasion an average $500,000 annual loss. Public Law 399 authorizes the construction of the $7 million Bardwell Reservoir on Waxahachie Creek in the river basin, local interests contributing some $2 million. The legislation was recommended by the Army Engineers, upon whom we depend for guidance in matters of flood control.

PUBLIC LAW 400

S. 1159, slum clearance in District

Public Law 400 repeals the provision that the District of Columbia Housing Authority cannot purchase land for slum clearance at private sale at a price exceeding 30 percent of assessed value, which is about half of market value. Reason: few owners would sell by negotiation at a price 15 percent of market value and the Authority was forced into costly and time-consuming condemnation proceedings.

PUBLIC LAW 401

H.R. 24, Indian land in Nevada

This gives back to the Fort McDermitt Paiute and Shoshone Indian Tribe in Nevada 160 acres of land used from 1905 to 1956 as the site of an Indian boarding school. The school now is closed.

PUBLIC LAW 402

This permits the entry duty free of all ground, powdered or granulated seaweed on the same basis as seaweed kelp. Principally affected is seaweed of the Irish moss variety, used by American processors in the production of a powdered extractive for jellying and thickening foods.

PUBLIC LAW 403

In 1860 the surveyor of the lands of the Lac du Flambeau Indian Reservation in Wisconsin by error omitted some 45 acres from his plat. A century later the Congress of the United States had the job of quieting title to the land the surveyor overlooked. Public Law 403 permits the tribe to sell the land to the present occupants at fair market value.

PUBLIC LAW 404

In 1951 the construction of the Platoro Dam and Reservoir in Colorado was completed, but unprecedented droughts prevented its utilization for irrigation. Hence the Conejos Water Conservancy District was unable to meet the first of its 40 annual re-

payments to the Government on the cost of the construction. Public Law 404 extends the repayment periods for 5 years. It is expected that with this help and improved conditions the debt eventually will be paid in full.

PUBLIC LAW 405

H.R. 7456, casein

Public Law 405 extends for 3 years the suspension of import duty on casein. Edible casein is made from skim milk, and since 1952 the milk price support program has discouraged the conversion of skim milk into casein. Industrial casein, which is almost entirely imported, is used in the manufacture of coated paper, coldwater paints, and mucilage.

PUBLIC LAW 406

H.R. 4483, lands for Geological Survey

I was interested to learn the Geological Survey maintains an invaluable record of ground water conditions by measuring the fluctuations of water levels in some 12,000 wells throughout the country.

Unfortunately, most of the wells are privately owned and can be closed to use by the Geological Survey at will of their owners. When this happens the Survey's work is badly jammed up. Public Law 406 sensibly authorizes the Survey to purchase the sites of the wells so that its good work can go on uninterrupted.

PUBLIC LAW 407

H.R. 5270, returning gift to the giver

In 1949 the Metropolitan Water District of Salt Lake City, Utah, gave some 8 acres of land to the Federal Government for a proposed project that never materialized. Public Law 407 returns the land to the giver.

PUBLIC LAW 408

H.R. 7889, rice-marketing quotas

Public Law 408 provides for rice-marketing quotas when the supply is normal instead of 110 percent of normal. Marketing quotas are designed to result in a normal supply, and quotas based upon a normal supply plus 10 percent in any year can result in excessive plantings and an abnormal supply the next year.

To us in urban areas the good news in Public Law 408 is that it will reduce the cost to the Commodity Credit Corporation and thus lighten the taxpayers' burden.

Foreign Policy Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on May 5 the North Side News of Atlanta, Ga., carried an editorial regarding an investigation made by the March–April grand jury of Fulton Superior Court and a presentment based upon that investigation.

This investigation and presentment dealt with a study course of the Foreign Policy Association. The North Side News editorial was as follows:

WHAT THE GRAND JURY SAID

For 3 days last weekend, both downtown daily newspapers in news stories and editorials lambasted the March-April grand jury for coming up with a presentment critical of the Foreign Policy Association.

The grand jury was said to have been critical of a Foreign Policy Association study course which has been slipped into classroom work of Atlanta and Georgia schools, and which, the jurors said, was designed by groups not too favorably known for healthy Americanism.

Nowhere in their columns did either newspaper print what the grand jury said. So the reader can better understand, the News prints here the complete text of the grand jury presentment:

"SUBVERSIVE MATERIALS IN SCHOOLS

"An extensive investigation has been made by the jury into the Foreign Policy Association of New York City and its 'great decision program,' which it is sponsoring in our area. This program includes such controversial items as (1) Communist timetable for 1960; (2) divided Europe, cooperation or crisis; (3) Red China on the march; (4) Cuba's revolution; and similar subjects.

"This matter was brought to our attention by the Americanism Committee of the Waldo M. Slaton Post, No. 140, American Legion, and several other local patriotic groups. We were informed that the 'great decision program' was being taught in our public high schools and by various well-meaning civic and religious groups who were not aware of the past records of the leaders of the Foreign Policy Association, nor of the authors of the textbooks prescribed for this 'great decision program.' Evidence was presented to us showing that some of these leaders and authors had a long record, dating back many years, in which they either belonged to or actively supported leftwing or subversive organizations.

"We further found that invitations to participate in these study groups were being mailed throughout our county under the name of one of our local universities as its 1960 sponsor. We learned that the prescribed booklets were available upon request in our local public libraries. It is this jury's opinion that these activities have been participated in by our local people in their utmost sincerity. This so-called course of study has been embraced without any knowledge of the past history and records of its leaders and authors of its texts.

"We are grateful for the cooperation of the department heads of our schools and to the officers of our local civic groups who have assisted us in this matter. All have pledged that appropriate actions will be taken to see that all education for students and adults shall be safeguarded against the subversive propaganda tactics of any organization.

"The range of the activity by this organization has reached alarming proportions in the schools and civic groups in certain other areas in Georgia. Its spread is a matter of deep concern to this jury, and we, therefore, call upon all school officials throughout the State to be particularly alert to this insidious and subversive material. We further recommend that all textbook committee members, city, county, and State, recognize the undesirable features of this material and take action to remove it from our schools.

"Finally, we urge that all grand juries throughout the State of Georgia give matters of this nature their serious consideration. Information and assistance is available to those educators, public officials, and other grand juries when needed."

On May 9, Waldo M. Slaton Post No. 140 of the American Legion adopted a resolution which recites that that post of the American Legion laid before the Fulton County grand jury certain material circulated by the Foreign Policy Association, and commended the March-April grand jury for its presentment regarding this material.

The resolution of the Waldo M. Slaton Post is as follows:

RESOLUTION OF WALDO M. SLATON POST, NO. 140, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Resolution petitioning Senators RICHARD RUSSELL and HERMAN TALMADGE and Congressman JAMES C. DAVIS to arrange for insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD presentment of the grand jury (March–April) 1960 term in respect to the great decisions program of the Foreign Policy Association and also the newspaper advertisement of the Americanism committee and the editorial and the news story published in defense of the grand jury

Whereas the grand jury (March–April 1960 term) of Fulton County, Ga., had the insight and the courage to take public note of the undesirable situation in respect to indoctrination of the school children of Atlanta and Fulton County by certain material being offered to them in the great decisions program of the Foreign Policy Association, said material having been laid before the grand jury by the Americanism committee of Waldo M. Slaton Post No. 140 of the American Legion; and

Whereas the Americanism committee of this post, in defending the grand jury from attacks made by the Foreign Policy Association did insert in the North Side News an advertisement in which it documented certain of the charges it had laid before the grand jury; and

Whereas the Americanism committee believes it to be in the public interest to give this documentation wider circulation: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Waldo M. Slaton Post No. 140 of the American Legion hereby request that Senators RICHARD B. RUSSELL and HERMAN TALMADGE and Congressman JAMES C. DAVIS use their offices to arrange for publication of the grand jury presentment, the aforesaid advertisement, editorial, and news story in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The advertisement referred to in the above resolution was carried in the North Side News on May 5, 1960, and was as follows:

U.S. RECORDS PROVE OUR GRAND JURY HAD OFFICIAL FACTS ON THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

MAY 1, 1960.

Mr. DAVE WARNER,
Foreign Policy Association,
Atlanta, Ga.

DEAR MR. WARNER: In regard to your characterization of the grand jury's presentment as "cowardly," in advance of the publication of the presentment—an action which we think is ethically dubious—we would like you to give an explicit and categorical answer to each of the following questions which are not based on rumor but on U.S. Government documents, all published and available to everybody.

1. Do you deny that there was a close working relationship and, in fact, an interorganizational coordination between the Foreign Policy Association, the Institute of Pacific Relations, and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace during the incumbency of Alger Hiss, as it was brought out by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, January–February 1952; pages 2817–2819, Institute of Pacific Relations?

2. Do you deny that Alger Hiss endorsed the Foreign Policy Association in the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1947 Yearbook, and that due note of this was taken in the hearings of the Special Committee To Investigate Tax-Exempt Foundations and Comparable Organizations, House Resolution 217, 83d Congress, 2d session, page 9217

3. Do you deny that the Reece committee report No. 2681 contains the following citation of Vera Micheles Dean, research director and editor of the Foreign Policy Association's bulletin:

"Mrs. Dean belonged among those who in 1937 signed their names in the Golden Book of American-Soviet Friendship, a memorial which appeared in the Communist front magazine Soviet Russia Today, of November 1937. According to the testimony of Walter S. Steele, before the House Un-American Activities Committee, on July 21, 1947, Mrs. Dean's writings figured in Communist propaganda kit for teachers of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship.

"Mrs. Dean cooperated with the world's toughest Communist agents, such as Tsola N. Dragiocheva, of Bulgaria, and Madame Madeleine Braun, the French Communist deputy, in helping set up the Congress of American Women, a Communist front so important in its worldwide ramifications that the House Un-American Activities Committee devoted a 114-page pamphlet to it (H.R. 2681, 83d Cong., 2d sess.)

4. Will you deny that without a single warning as to its nature, the book "The United States and China," by John K. Fairbank is offered great decisions discussion groups, as "a comprehensive treatment of United States-Chinese relations," when, as a matter of fact, John K. Fairbank has been exposed by the McCarran committee of 1952 in its official report on the Institute of Pacific Relations, as follows:

Fairbank, John K., trustee (p. 3742): Identified as a member of the Communist Party by one or more duly sworn witnesses. Denied.

Affiliated with Amerasia (exhibit 1335); American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives, also known as Indusco, Inc. (p. 3794); China Aid Council (p. 1513).

5. Will you deny that the Foreign Policy Association has placed this book, "The United States and China," by the above-cited John Fairbank, within the reach of high school children taking part in its great decisions without a single warning that within its pages are suggested, one after the other, the following authors, also cited in the McCarran report with their activities:

1. Page 324: Olga Lang, writer, who is listed in the McCarran report, page 155:

"Olga Lang, writer (p. 270), identified as a member of the Communist Party by one or more duly sworn witnesses. Made one or more trips to Communist territory. Writer for official publications of the Communist Party or the Communist International or for a Communist government or for pro-Communist press services. Out of country or otherwise unavailable for subpena. Affiliated with Amerasia (exhibit 1335); American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives also known as Indusco, Inc. (p. 2793). (See McCarran report, p. 155)."

2. Page 327: Owen Lattimore, who is cited as follows in the McCarran report, page 155:

"Lattimore, Owen, editor, Pacific Affairs (exhibit 801); trustee (p. 568); executive committee (p. 1313).

"Identified as a member of the Communist Party by one or more duly sworn witnesses. Denied.

"Collaborated with agents of the Soviet intelligence apparatus as shown by sworn testimony. Denied.

"Made one or more trips to Communist territory.

"Affiliated with Amerasia (p. 35)."

We also direct your attention to page 224 of the same Government document, in which you will find the following entry:

"Owen Lattimore was, from some time beginning in the 1930's, a conscious articulate instrument of the Soviet conspiracy."

Now we return to the enumeration of writers recommended by John K. Fairbank in "The United States and China," which is, in turn, recommended by the Foreign Policy Association and its great decisions discussions: page 334:

3. Edgar Snow, who is cited as follows in the McCarran report, page 157:

"Snow, Edgar, member and writer (p. 73, exhibit 1334):

"Made one or more trips to Communist territory.

"Affiliated with Amerasia (exhibit 1355); China Aid Council (p. 1514); Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (p. 2789)."

4. Page 334: Nym Wales, who is Mrs. Edgar Snow, and listed as follows in the McCarran report, page 157:

"Snow, Mrs. Edgar (Nym Wales), member and writer (exhibit 1334).

"Identified as a member of the Communist Party by one or more duly sworn witnesses.

"Made one or more trips to Communist territory.

"Writer for official publications of the Communist Party or the Communist International or for a Communist government or for pro-Communist press services.

"Affiliated with American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives, also known as Indusco, Inc. (p. 3793); Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (pp. 4610–4611); Friends of Chinese Democracy (p. 622)."

5. Page 334: Agnes Smedley, who is identified by the McCarran report on page 157, as follows:

"Agnes Smedley, member (p. 73).

"Identified as a member of the Communist Party by one or more duly sworn witnesses.

"Collaborated with agents of the Soviet Intelligence apparatus as shown by sworn testimony.

"Made one or more trips to Communist territory.

"Affiliated with Amerasia (exhibit 1355); Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (p. 2789). Deceased."

6. Page 335: Philip Jaffe, identified in the McCarran report on page 154:

"Jaffe, Philip R. (James W. Philips), conference participant (exhibit 1334); financial contributor (p. 71, exhibit 1383).

"Identified as a member of the Communist Party by one or more duly sworn witnesses.

"Made one or more trips into Communist territory.

"Writer for official publications of the Communist Party or the Communist International or for a Communist government or pro-Communist press services.

"Subject of action by agency of American Government or a foreign non-Communist government on grounds involving loyalty or national security.

"Affiliated with: Amerasia (p. 35); American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives, also known as Indusco, Inc. (p. 3794); American Friends of the Chinese People, official organ; China Today (p. 4170); American Russian Institute (p. 686); China Aid Council (p. 410); Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (p. 2789).

"Signer of a statement attacking the United States for 'suppressing the Chinese masses and fomenting civil wars among them.'"

7. Page 335: T. A. Bisson (Frederick Spencer): associate editor, Pacific Affairs (p. 4188); research associate (exhibit 801):

"Identified as a member of the Communist Party by one or more duly sworn witnesses.

"Made one or more trips to Communist territory.

"Subject of action by agency of American Government or a foreign non-Communist government on grounds involving loyalty or national security.

"Affiliated with: Amerasia (p. 35); Friends of Chinese Democracy (p. 622); American Committee in Aid of Chinese Industrial Cooperatives also known as Indusco, Inc. (p. 3793); American Friends of the Chinese People, official organ: China Today (p. 4272); Committee for a Democratic Far Eastern Policy (p. 2789).

"Signer of a statement attacking the United States for 'suppressing the Chinese masses and fomenting civil wars among them.'"

8. Page 335: Lawrence K. Rosinger, identified by the McCarran report on page 157:

"Rosinger, Lawrence K., research associate (exhibit 801).

"Identified as a member of the Communist Party by one or more duly sworn witnesses.

"Refused to answer on the ground of self-incrimination.

"Affiliated with: Amerasia (exhibit 1355); China Aid Council (p. 1513)."

10. Page 339: Dorothy Borg, listed in the McCarran report, page 152:

"Borg, Dorothy, staff member (p. 996); education secretary IPR (exhibit 801).

"Writer for pro-Communist press services.

"Affiliated with: Amerasia (exhibit 1355); Federated Press (p. 2634)."

6. Mr. Nason, the Foreign Policy Association's president, has made, according to the Atlanta Journal and Constitution of Sunday, May 1, 1960—also in advance of the grand jury's publication of its presentment—a statement involving the following charges:

(a) That the grand jury's allegations were made "without basis whatsoever."

(b) That no proof was offered by the grand jury, which "apparently was misled by rumor, hearsay, and actual misrepresentation of fact."

(c) That the "ultimate purpose" of this organization of the FPA is to aid in guaranteeing the security of the United States and the well-being of the American people.

Question. Is it the opinion of the Foreign Policy Association's president, Mr. Nason, or its local chairman, Mr. Warner, that it is a sound way to guarantee the security of the United States and the welfare of the American people by exposing them in widespread discussion groups to the unlabeled propaganda of those: (1) Who have been identified under oath as members of the Communist conspiracy, and/or (2) who have been identified under oath as collaborators with agents of the Soviet Intelligence, and/or (3) who have been the subjects of action by an agency of the American Government or a foreign non-Communist government, on grounds involving loyalty or national security, and/or (4) have been involved with the disgraceful Amerasia scandal?

Question. Was Mr. Nason the president of Swarthmore College? Was Swarthmore College among the institutions of higher learning that refused to permit students seeking U.S. Government funds the liberty and right to pledge allegiance to the American flag—under which public funds were offered toward their education?

Question. Does Mr. Nason think that the way to guarantee the security of the United States is to teach college students—particularly those seeking financial help from the U.S. Government—that they owe nothing—not even a simple pledge of loyalty to their flag?

7. Was your testimony before the Fulton County grand jury made under oath?

8. Will you offer to appear before the next grand jury and answer each allegation in the Church League of America's attack on the Foreign Policy Association under oath, either denying or affirming the Communist front record of Emil Lengyel, along with the other charges, which have been brought by the Church League of America's researcher, in regard to the FPA?

9. You have announced that you hold many endorsements from public figures. Beginning alphabetically, will you produce the endorsement of Senator GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont?

10. In order that you may be delivered from the imputation of resorting to innuendo—a technique with which you have

charged your Atlanta critics—will you identify the man and his organization out of Wheaton, Ill., who started the hate-mongering movement against the Foreign Policy Association, and who has a long record of smearing any study of international affairs?

11. In your retort of March 21, 1960, to the charges made in News and Views by Maj. Edgar Bundy, you brought into the record an attack on Major Bundy made by the Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake. Here are your exact words:

"A word should be said about our present accuser, Captain Bundy (Edgar C. Bundy), the editor of News and Views. Having recently inserted himself into the Air Force manual hassle, Captain Bundy drew the following comment from the Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, a former president of the National Council of Churches and at present, chief administrative officer of the United Presbyterian Church: 'despite the injuries done to Protestant churches by this type of attack, aided and abetted by persons such as Captain Bundy and other discredited superpatriots it is not the desire of Protestant Church leaders that their freedom of expression should be choked off."

Question: Is this the same National Council of the Churches of Christ that admits to the publication of the Negro American which offers 260 titles of books which the pamphlet says "are safe to recommend for children"? The Negro American lists 202 authors, among them being Langston Hughes who wrote poems entitled, "One More S in the U.S.A." (the S stands for Soviet), and "Goodby Christ", a poem which should be read in its entirety by those who wish to see how abusive and insulting Hughes can be to Christ, but which can be gaged by a few lines:

Goodby, Christ Jesus, Lord, God Jehovah,
Beat it away from here now.
Make way for a new guy with no
Religion at all—
A real guy named
Marx Communist, Lenin Peasant,
Stalin Worker, me—
I said, me!

Question: Is this the same National Council of Churches of Christ that has constituted itself a lobby for Red China, claiming the support of 39 million Protestants, despite the protests of outstanding Protestant leaders and their groups, such as Edgar Bundy, Carl McIntyre, Daniel Poling, and even Atlanta's own Methodist bishop, Arthur J. Moore, who expressed his support of Chiang Kai-shek in the Atlanta Journal on March 19, 1959?

Question: Is it in collaboration with the National Council of Churches of Christ that the Foreign Policy Association, despite its claim of "taking no position on national issues," and despite its claim of "objectivity," manages to have an array of appeals for the recognition of Red China made by those whose names are closely associated with the name, Foreign Policy Association—even though they maintain that they do not speak for the Foreign Policy Association? Have any members of the Board or the editorial staff or other figures prominently associated with the organization spoken strongly against the recognition of Red China to counterbalance the appeal made by Eustace Seligman, who was the chairman of the Foreign Policy Association, when he was reported as endorsing the recognition of Red China on September 17, 1958; or the statement made by Henry Steele Commager on January 26, 1955, that we must "reexamine the assumptions of our foreign policy—even of our present China policy." Not to mention the suggestive wording of the remark by Vera Micheles Dean, herself, in the Foreign Policy Bulletin of March 15, 1959, expressed in her customary eventoned, "calm and measured" language:

"And a question, as yet unanswered, hovers over the conference: Can any control and inspection system be established without the cooperation of Communist China, whose government is not recognized by the United States and has not been admitted to the United Nations."

12. In your attack on the Fulton County Grand Jury which appeared in Sunday's Constitution and Journal, (p. 13-D), you claim the endorsement of Senator RICHARD RUSSELL and Senator HERMAN TALMADGE. The American Legion is prepared to publish letters from both of these Senators explicity disclaiming endorsement of the Foreign Policy Association. These letters are being submitted for inspection to the editorial department of the newspapers in the metropolitan area of Atlanta.

THE AMERICANISM COMMITTEE OF WALDO M. SLATON POST NO. 140, THE AMERICAN LEGION.

Pursuant to the resolution of the Waldo M. Slaton American Legion Post, I had arranged to insert the resolution and material referred to in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately after the adoption of the resolution. However, a request was made of me that the insertion be withheld pending a further investigation by the May–June grand jury. That grand jury did give consideration to the subject, and when its final presentments were returned on June 30, they contained the following statement regarding the material circulated by the Foreign Policy Association:

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

It is our understanding that the Foreign Policy Association's "great decision" program, criticized by the March–April grand jury, Fulton County, has been removed from the Atlanta and Fulton County schools.

The merits of this program and its contents is more suitable to mature minds.

Numerous letters from all over the United States have been received by this grand jury, from individuals and associations, commending the presentment of the previous grand jury on the Foreign Policy Association. Not a single letter has been received by us criticizing these presentments.

We have investigated this program as thoroughly as the limited time would afford and feel that the subversive angle to this program, if there is one, should be subject to a thorough investigation by a National or Federal agency.

I have a wide personal acquaintance with the members of Waldo M. Slaton Post of the American Legion. The membership of this post is made up of outstanding business and civic leaders. I am glad to comply with the resolution adopted by the post to insert the material carried in these remarks. Under unanimous consent previously granted, I commend this material to the membership of the House.

Gen. Joseph Haller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor and pleasure for many years to join with the members of General Haller Post 95, American Legion, Department of Maryland, at the various patriotic ceremonies and observances this organization sponsored. The members of this post, whom I am proud to have as constituents, were deeply saddened by the death of the great Polish patriot and "iron brigade" commander, Gen. Joseph Haller, whose illustrious name they chose for their outstanding Legion post.

In tribute to the memory of this eminent military leader who, like Pulaski and Kosciuszko, will always be remembered for their contributions to the cause of freedom, the General Haller Post held a memorial service on June 17, 1960, and I include the following article from the Baltimore Guide of Thursday, June 30, 1960, which reports the memorial exercises:

GENERAL HALLER POST 95 HOLDS MEMORIAL TRIBUTE

Gen. Joseph Haller Post 95, American Legion, Department of Maryland, on Friday, June 17 held at the post home, 1746 Fleet Street, a memorial service for the late Gen. Joseph Haller, who passed away in London, England, on June 4 and was buried on June 11.

The Haller Post 95, American Legion, had special permission from the late general to use his name for its post, the oldest Legion post in southeast Baltimore, now over 40 years old.

The American and Polish people of the area remember Gen. Joseph Haller who was at the front in France in 1918, and was commander of the "iron brigade" in the war Poland had with Russia in 1920.

General Haller was in America to further the cause of freedom in 1940, during World War II, while stationed in France.

His last visit to this country was to New York, in a parade to honor Count Casimir Pulaski, the Polish patriot who fought and died for this country during the American Revolution in the siege of Savannah, Ga.

General Haller at the time of his death was 86 years old. The general's wife, whom he married in 1906, Miss Aleksandre Sala, died in 1925.

Land of Shining Mountains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, every day people are discovering the wonders of Montana's wilderness. Many are surprised to find that in this natural wilderness there is no corresponding wilderness of educational opportunity. En route to the Governors' conference at Glacier National Park, writer William H. Stringer of the Christian Science Monitor met Montana.

In a June 30, 1960, article, he described the beauties of unspoiled nature, and the remarkable record of Montana's colleges and universities. He found that 79 to 80 percent of parents in the Mountain States expect their children to go to college, compared to 60 to 65 percent in New England. He learned, too, of Montana's participation in U.S. techni-

cal assistance programs overseas. He found that this mountainous State in the midst of our Nation was young training men and women in an International Cooperation Center at Montana State College. He heard of Montanans abroad, and of foreign students in Montana. His story of Montana's natural beauty and educational achievements follows:

LAND OF THE SHINING MOUNTAINS

(By William H. Stringer)

BOZEMAN.—The tenderfoot from the east coast States who heads westward, airport by airport—Denver to Cheyenne to Billings—into the Mountain States and the Zane Grey country and the true "West," is fairly sophisticated about what he expects to find.

He knows that the Indians are now on the reservations and not on the warpath, that this is likely to be mining and grazing country, and he is not surprised when posters in the downtown stores of some town announce an intercollegiate rodeo. But he is not prepared for everything he is likely to discover.

Maybe he should have been forewarned by that Ford Foundation report which recently showed that, whereas in New England some 60 to 65 percent of parents expect to have their children go to college, in the Mountain States the percentage runs 79 to 80, quite a sprint above the national average of 69 percent.

But suppose he comes over Bozeman Pass, the plane just skimming the high evergreens, to land in Montana's wide Gallatin Valley, where the city of Bozeman sits beside the three forks which constitute the headwaters of the Missouri, and where the framework of high ranges circling all about—the Madisons, the Tobacco Roots, the Gallatins—earn for Montana State College there the title "Land-grant college of the Land of the Shining Mountains."

This is sparkling, lovely country in June. The mountains are majestic, and snow from their caps melts and runs icy-cold down canyon streams to flood the irrigation ditches with rushing, singing water. Every last forage-growing acre of this valley must be irrigated, and water rights here are more precious than most material possessions.

Handsome pheasants stalk across the country roads, gophers burrow in the fields, magpies sway on the barbed-wire fences, and in the rushing streams—well, they tell you that this is the best trout fishing in the land. And in the winter months herds of elk wander down from the high plateaus of Yellowstone Park.

But I meant to talk about 20th-century activity here in Montana. One thing I hadn't realized was how extensively these Mountain State universities are participating in the U.S. technical training programs abroad.

When President Roland Renne, of Montana State College, was on Government assignment in Ethiopia—on leaves of absence he has also served the International Cooperation Administration in the Philippines and Peru—he met up with 15 Americans who hailed from Montana. Other professors have been working in Iran, in Kenya, in Nepal. Montana State has been invited to accept a contract to develop a college of agriculture in Paraguay.

There is a new international cooperation center at Montana State which, like the school at Syracuse University, is training graduates in "overseasmanship"—how really to live and behave abroad, how to make one's mission a success. Graduates already equipped in engineering, sociology, geography learn the "practical" business of how to persuade an oversea farmer to use a better brand of wheat, or how to go about building a house or school in a native village. Some students spend months in Mexican villages or work on Indian reservations to get their "practical" training.

The Mountain State colleges are also host to many a foreign student. The present Ambassador from Iran was a few short years ago a college student at the University of Utah. At Montana State 140 students are from overseas.

One sees the exchange pattern at many colleges all over the United States. But the universities in a State like mountainous, scant-rainfall Montana are especially equipped to handle problems of irrigation, soil reclamation, mining, woolgrowing, and forage crops—the identical concerns of many a recipient of U.S. foreign aid situated in the higher and drier portions of the globe.

There's a special zest in the academic life hereabout. In one week at Montana State the college was host to the American Legion, "Girls State" (high school girls acting out State government), a session of the agricultural stabilization committeemen from all the Montana counties, and a meeting of the School for the Blind. A university here is the cultural center for the State.

But the professors, I am also glad to report, take time out to go fishing, to photograph the high canyons, and to attend barbecues and rodeos.

National Purpose Hullabaloo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Rochester, N.Y., Democrat and Chronicle of July 2 an article which deserves reading by the Members of Congress and by every thinking American.

The article was written by Sol M. Linowitz, one of the genuinely outstanding members of the Rochester community, and it deals with the subject of "National Purpose," which has been widely discussed in recent months.

The theme of Mr. Linowitz' article is that America's national purpose is, to borrow from Thomas Jefferson:

Self-evident—that all men are created equal and are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

It is his contention that what America needs today is not a redefinition of this basic purpose but rather a rededication to its fulfillment.

This is the finest article of its kind which I have read, and I commend it to the attention of every Member of this body. Under previous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

NATIONAL PURPOSE HULLABALOO

(Publicist, lawyer, past president of the Rochester Chamber of Commerce, monitor of his own television show on WHEC–TV, and president of the New York State Association for United Nations, Sol M. Linowitz feels that the Fourth of July should be looked upon as something more than the third day of a long weekend.)

From one end of the country to the other these days we seem to be swept up in a search to define and identify our national purpose. The effort has been variously labeled a "crusade," a "historic search," a "great debate," and even a "dedicated mission." Thoughtful people everywhere are being implored by magazines, newspapers, television and radio to do their own soul searching and to evolve their own definitions of "national purpose."

This is the right time, I think, to ask what all the shouting is about and whether we really need such a high-decibel campaign in order to clarify what our national purpose is and ought to be. We should really ask whether it is necessary to mobilize so much brainpower, voicepower and penpower on the issue.

I have nothing against this kind of absorption in a national search for self-identification. But I do not understand why so many people are so passionately asserting that we are embarked on an undefined mission toward an unclear objective guided by imperceptible landmarks.

It is one thing to say that we are not as imbued as we should be these days with a sense of urgency. No one has ever put it better than Michael Shipkov who was captured by the Communists several years ago, subjected to prolonged and painful questioning, then recaptured. In describing his captors he said:

"They are disciples and fervent followers of the dogma. Not much imagination, nor quick brains, nor much intelligence, nor sensitivity—but undeviating loyalty to their creed, and, above all, fanatic belief in their own cause."

We simply do not have that kind of a fanatic belief in our cause. But the reason is not because we do not have a cause. It is rather because we seem to have forgotten what the cause is and what, as a nation, we are for.

The need, in other words, is not for a redefinition of national purpose, but a recollection of national purpose. What we require is not a further articulation of the things for which we should stand, but an earnest effort to begin to stand for the things for which we have always said we do stand.

It is worth looking back to see what we are all about.

We are the kind of Nation we are because we have on our side the accumulated benefit of many centuries of groping for ways to make human rights and freedoms secure. More than anything else, this is what distinguishes us from the Russians. For measured against our own past, the Soviet Union stands coarse and naked and empty. It has never known an awakening from darkness; it has never experienced the mellowing of history; it has never achieved the unity of purpose which comes only when free men join—as they did here 184 years ago—in mutual trust and freedom to pledge to one another their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor.

It is hardly three lifetimes since this group of brave, determined men came together in this country to say certain things in which they believed. They borrowed ideas from men like Aristotle, John Locke, and Thomas Hobbes and shaped them and set them afire. They said what they had to say "out of a decent respect to the opinions of mankind." And at a time when we were but a loose group of weak and scattered colonies with less than 3 million people, they lit up the western sky with a great basic idea: That a free society must have as its fundamental, overriding purpose the preservation of human rights.

This country has known many black hours since then.

The Nation grew strong before it was struck down by civil war. We have survived two world wars, each claiming a generation of American dead. And the great idea of human freedom has been the concept which has been our greatest mark of distinction as a people. It has been and always must be our real national purpose.

There are two simple phrases which, I think, sum up this purpose. One is that "all men are created equal"; the other is Lincoln's assertion that here we have a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." The question is not whether these are, in fact, the core of our national purpose. The real problem is how to make them part of our national practice.

When we, for example, cite the Declaration of Independence and practice Little Rock, who is fooling whom? When we use the right words while we do the wrong things, who is being misled? Is it really possible to make our concept of freedom a rallying cry if millions of colored people about the world feel that we have open mouths but closed hearts—that we are apt to be more concerned with a man's skin than with his face? In short, must we not understand—and make sure that the people of the world understand—that what made sense to the pigs in George Orwell's "Animal Farm" just does not make sense to free Americans: That here we cannot announce that all are created equal and then in practice tack on the phrase "but some are created more equal than others"?

Or take Lincoln's reminder that our Government must be one "of the people, by the people, for the people." What do we do in practice to make it that kind of a government? Do we really understand that such a government "of and by the people" cannot be achieved merely through quadrennial spasms at a time of national elections; that it requires tending to—conscientiously, thoughtfully, reverently—by all of the people, and not just by politicians and office seekers?

Anyone who travels abroad appreciates the intense interest other people have in our way of life and in what we are doing with the greatest democratic experiment in history. They watch in dismay when we ignore our responsibilities as citizens and fail to exercise the precious right to vote in freedom. Or when we complain loudly about governmental waste and abuse and at the same time demand special or favored treatment for a pet project. Or when we rely upon prejudice, tubthumping or breastbeating rather than on calm and thoughtful analysis of vital issues. Or when we try to meet challenges to our Nation as world leader by assuming the posture of the ostrich.

We have a great responsibility at one of the decisive hours of world history. We shall discharge that responsibility not by building larger sputniks or faster and more destructive missiles—or even by framing new stirring statements of national purpose. We can only do it by trying to live up to the things which since July 4, 1776, have always been our national purpose: By living and acting the way freemen must live and act who truly understand the meaning of human freedom.

SOL M. LINOWITZ.

Public Laws 409–449

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a digest of Public Laws 409 to and including 449 of the 2d session of the 86th Congress as reported by me to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois:

PUBLIC LAW 409

S. 2482, exploring the oceans

Public Law 409 is important. In its projection into the future it may prove as vital to our survival and welfare as any legislation of the 86th Congress. It removes territorial limitations on the activities of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, which heretofore could conduct its scientific researches and explorations only in the United States, its territories and possessions. Now the whole world of outer space, the frozen wastes of the Arctics and the bottoms of the seas are opened to it. It is expected to play a leading part in the expanded research operations which experts in the scientific field declare to be essential in our race to overtake Russia.

National Academy of Science, the National Research Council and the Committee on Oceanography all are concerned over our Nation's deficiency in studies of the oceans. Research, explorations and studies in oceanography now getting started may open up amazing new sources of food and mineral supplies, a vast new world of riches at the bottom of the seas, as well as means of defense outmoding the missile, the battleship and the aerial bomber.

Whatever is ahead for us in the future no one knows, but most of us feel that our survival, militarily and economically, is for the present in the hands of our scientists. I hope you approve of my casting of your vote to unshackle the Geodetic Survey.

PUBLIC LAW 410

This is an old friend, a perennial in these reports. It is the annual permit for Canadian vessels to carry passengers and cargo to and from Hyder in Alaska and other American ports. Law is that only American vessels can do business between American ports. No American vessels, however, are available at Hyder. Each year Congress passes a 1-year exemption, vainly hoping that come another year Hyder will have American bottoms at her beck and call.

PUBLIC LAW 411

Public Law 411 extends to 2 years (instead of 1 year) the time in which claims can be filed against the United States for damages arising from noncombat activities of our Armed Forces in foreign countries. Naturally, accidents do happen in countries where we have troops stationed just as they happen at home, such as a distressed airplane inflicting damage on civilian persons or property, and the prompt and equitable settlement of resultant claims, when justified, makes for a friendly climate. Nothing is more helpful to us in winning hearts and minds than an image of Uncle Sam as always being fair and honorable.

PUBLIC LAW 412

H.R. 10233, District of Columbia appropriations

Public Law 412 appropriates $239,470,433 for fiscal 1961 for the District of Columbia, a decrease of $1,818,643 on the fiscal 1960 appropriations and a cut of $2,932,567 under the President's budget.

Washington was a city of 840,000 on July 1, 1959, with the same requirement for urban services and the same municipal problems as Chicago. Public Law 412 is comparable to the annual budget passed by the city council of Chicago. Municipal revenues come from much the same sources as in Chicago, and to these Uncle Sam adds a $25 million contribution for the reason that so much of the real estate here is occupied by the Federal Government.

Washington is the shrine of our country, to which millions come on patriotic pilgrimage, and we would wish it always to be kept clean and beautiful.

PUBLIC LAW 413

Public Law 413 repeals the 10-percent excise tax on aromatic cachous. If you don't know, as assuredly your Representative did not until this legislation reached the floor of the House, aromatic cachous are pellets, such as Sen Sen, that are chewed to sweeten the breath. Heretofore they were classified as toilet preparations (most of which are externally applied and subject to the excise tax). Usually they are sold at small candy stores, which do not handle toilet preparations, and the main reason for Public Law 413 was to relieve small candy merchants of the burden of collecting and keeping books on negligible amounts of tax.

PUBLIC LAW 414

If you were in the Navy after April 20, 1949, and prior to April 17, 1954, and temporarily stored your furniture under an erroneous order from the Department of the Navy, Public Law 414 is the aspirin for your headache. It relieves Navy personnel, present or retired, who in good faith acted under the erroneous order from reimbursing the Government.

PUBLIC LAW 415

S. 2220, Public Health Service

In 1798 Congress established the Marine Hospital Service, which in 162 years has grown into the Public Health Service of today, with a personnel of 25,350 persons, including 3,350 doctors, scientists, and nurses, who by direction of the Surgeon General and on an hour's notice are prepared to fly to a quarantine station in Burma, a disease ridden spot in Panama, or an isolated Indian reservation in the United States. They go wherever the Nation's health demands their presence.

Public Law 415 strengthens the commissioned corps by (1) providing improved retirement benefits, and (2) increasing the number of annual appointments to higher grades. This it is hoped will attract to and hold the required additional physicians, dentists, sanitary engineers, and other professional health personnel.

PUBLIC LAW 416

On original stock issues of corporations there is a documentary stamp tax of 10 cents per $100 of actual value while in the case of stock transfers the tax is 4 cents per $100 of actual value. Public Law 416 places the issuance tax of regulated investment companies on the 4 cent, instead of 10 cent basis, as such companies redeem stock put up for sale with issue of new securities.

PUBLIC LAW 417

There is no monument in Washington to James Madison, who was a large figure in the formulation and adoption of our Constitution, was Secretary of State under Jefferson and the fourth President of the United States. Public Law 417 creates a Commission to plan a James Madison memorial. It is probable that the historic columns recently removed from the east front of the Capitol will be part of the memorial.

PUBLIC LAW 418

Public Law 418 exempts bicycle tires and tubes from the manufacturers' excise tax. Reason: tires and tubes on new imported bicycles are not subject to such tax, hence Public Law 418 puts domestic manufacturers on a fairer competitive basis. Note: of about 3 million bicycles sold annually in the United States, 27 percent are imported.

PUBLIC LAW 419

This corrects an inadvertent omission in the wheat legislation of 1958. It prevents the loss of wheat acreage history when the farm exceeds its acreage allotment but does not produce a marketing excess.

PUBLIC LAW 420

Public Law 420 authorizes participation by the United States in parliamentary conferences with Mexico similar to those held with the legislators of Canada.

PUBLIC LAW 421

Public Law 421 conveys to the Navajo Tribe of Indians 81 acres of land, valued at $810, at Crownpoint, N. Mex., as site for a community center.

PUBLIC LAW 422

Public Law 422 reduces the excise tax on roof gardens, cabarets and similar establishments from 20 to 10 percent. The 20 percent excise tax on cabarets (twice the tax on theatres) caused a drop of 56 percent in employment of musicians.

PUBLIC LAW 423

Farm lands are taken over by the Federal Government by eminent domain, or negotiation, just as city properties are acquired for urban renewal, highways and other public developments. Public Law 423 protects the former owners in their acreage allotments during the period between acquisition by the Government and actual commencement of work on the proposed development.

PUBLIC LAW 424

H.R. 10743, 2d Supplementary Appropriations Act

Public Law 424 carries $955,300,003 in supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1960. This is a cut of $53,098,261 under the President's budget. Supplemental appropriations really are deficiency appropriations to cover current expenses (to keep things running to the end of the fiscal year on June 30) in excess of those provided in the regular appropriations acts passed the previous year. They are occasioned by the inability accurately to calculate in advance and unexpected situations that arise.

Among the larger items: $675 million for Commodity Credit Corp. to restore capital impairment; $17,500,000 additional for slum clearance and urban renewal; $1,500,000 additional for administering the public debt, due to increased interest rates; $9,700,000 additional for student loan funds under the Defense Educational Act.

PUBLIC LAW 425

House Joint Resolution 621, NASA supplemental appropriations

NASA stands for National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the newest instrumentality of the Federal Government. It carries an additional $23 million for the Project Mercury, the tracking and data collection network, and the Atlantic Missile Range for advanced launch vehicles. NASA employs over 16,000 persons, including 260 scientists in supergrade positions.

PUBLIC LAW 426

This reduces the annual number of paydays for Senate employees from 24 to 23. Senate secretaries will be paid on the 5th and 20th of each month instead of the 1st and 15th. Reason: increased time necessary to process payrolls because of deductions for health benefits. There are 40 optional plans, hence no uniform standard for deductions.

PUBLIC LAW 427

Public Law 427 extends for 3 years the exemption from import tax of certain tanning extracts, including extracts of hemlock and eucalyptus. A blight virtually wiping out the chestnut trees in the Appalachian Range played havoc with the domestic supply.

PUBLIC LAW 428

Four nonprofit corporations serve their own mutual bank or building and loan association members substantially as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation serves the banks of the Nation. Three, organized prior to 1951, enjoy the same income tax exemption as FDIC. Public Law 428 includes under the exemption the one corporation that was formed in 1957.

PUBLIC LAW 429

H.R. 529, Narcotics Manufacturers Act of 1960

Public Law 429 is major legislation in a field of vital need. It strengthens the public's fight against habit-forming drugs by establishing a system of licensing and control over the manufacture of narcotics. Since 1940 there has been a rapid development of synthetic substitutes, used as pain relievers but with the same habit-forming attributes as natural analgesic drugs in the morphine class. Public Law 429 covers the field, includes all classes of narcotics, both natural and synthetic.

PUBLIC LAW 430

This will interest members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It grants tax exemption to the building and property occupied by VFW in the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC LAW 431

Public Law 431 regulates the finance charges for retail installment sales of automobiles in the District of Columbia. This is expected to put an end to the practice of some finance companies of charging from 30 to 50 percent of the selling price of the car.

PUBLIC LAW 432

Coconut oil is used chiefly in the manufacture of soap, palm-kernel oil in edible products such as crackers and candy, and palm oil in the tin-plate industry to prevent oxidation in plating baths. Public Law 432 continues for 3 years the suspension of the processing tax.

PUBLIC LAW 433

Public Law 433 permits the sale to the State of Nevada, at fair market value, of some 15,000 acres of the public domain 90 miles southeast of Las Vegas. The State will develop the land for agriculture, homesite, and recreational purposes. Its topography ranges from mountainous to plains bordering the Colorado River. It now is undeveloped and uninhabited.

PUBLIC LAW 434

H.R. 725, Wilson's Creek battlefield

Public Law 434 establishes the Wilson's Creek Battlefield National Park near Springfield in Missouri on the site of the battle on August 10, 1861, the second major engagement of the Civil War. The Confederates, victorious at Wilson's Creek, took over a large part of Missouri, but Union reinforcements finally forcing their retreat into Arkansas, the Confederates were decisively defeated in the battle of Pea Ridge in March of 1862. In 1956 Congress authorized the Pea Ridge National Military Park. There now will be two battlefield parks commemorating the campaign that saved Missouri for the Union. U.S. Highway 60 runs near the Wilson's Creek battlefield.

PUBLIC LAW 435

Public Law 435 excludes for income tax purposes copyright royalties from the definition of personal holding companies (1) if they are at least 50 percent of gross income, and (2) if the business expense deductions incident to promotion are 50 percent or more of gross income. This reflects the change in the music publishing business, which formerly existed by sale of sheet music, now derives its principal income from sale of royalties to radio, TV, phonograph records, night club performers and others.

PUBLIC LAW 436

This eliminates the requirement that trustees of insurance companies in the District of Columbia be residents of the District. Reason: in Washington as in Chicago there is a residential trend to the suburbs. Many of the suburbs here are in Maryland and Virginia, outside the District.

PUBLIC LAW 437

Public Law 437 excludes from income tax the pension annuities paid to nonresident aliens. These mainly are persons who worked years in United States embassies and other offices of our Foreign Service. The Republic of the Philippines was among the nations protesting the imposition of the tax. State Department, therefore, joined in recommending Public Law 437 for the sake of amity.

PUBLIC LAW 438

H.R. 1805, Antietam battlefield

More men were killed at Antietam, or Sharpsburg, on September 17, 1862, than in any other battle in the Civil War. The Union lost 15.4 percent of those engaged, the Confederates 26.1 percent. Historians seem agreed that a decisive victory for Lee at Antietam might have foreshadowed the final independence of the Confederacy. When he turned back into Virginia the chance of intervention by Great Britain vanished.

Antietam National Battlefield Site was established by act of Congress in 1890. Public Law 438 authorizes the acquisition of 600 additional acres to restore the area to substantially the same condition as in 1862 and to give the oncoming generations a full and unimpeded view of the entire battlefield.

PUBLIC LAW 439

Public Law 439 authorizes the sale at market value of two acres of land to the city of Tillamook in Oregon for a marine park. For many years the land has been occupied by squatters, without consent of or payment of rent to the Federal Government.

PUBLIC LAW 440

This provides a tax of 1 cent a pound on the sale of laminated tires instead of the 8 cents a pound tax on tires used on highway vehicles and 5 cents a pound on other tires. Reason is that laminated tires are made of scraprubber tires, and because of their very great weight are under a tax disadvantage (based on poundage) with the much lighter tires.

PUBLIC LAW 441

Public Law 441 extends for 2 years the suspension of duty on alumina, bauxite, and calcined bauxite, the domestic supply of which is limited.

PUBLIC LAW 442

This is of interest to Federal civilian employees. It repeals section 1505 of the Social Security Act to put them on exactly the same footing as workers in private industry in the matter of eligibility for unemployment compensation. Accrued annual leave will be treated under State law.

PUBLIC LAW 443

In 1927 Congress established the Stones River National Military Park on the site of the battle of Bragg's Confederate Army of the Tennessee with Rosecran's Union Army of the Cumberland. Public Law 443 changes the name to Stones River National Battlefield (much more descriptive, I would say) and adds six acres (cost of $1,500) to include a view of Stones River itself, the stream for which the battle is named.

PUBLIC LAW 444

S. 2434, historic Fort Laramie

Fort Laramie in Wyoming, built in 1834, and used as a fur-trading post, then as an Army post in the era of the Pony Express riders, the overland stages, the gold rush travelers, the campaigns against the Northern Plains Indians, probably is the best preserved of the trading posts and forts when adventure was in the air and exploration and settlement of the West were the trend.

Public Law 444 changes the name of Fort Laramie National Monument to Fort Lara-

mie National Historic Site (which is more descriptive) and adds some 350 acres. A woman in Denver, who spent her girlhood in old Fort Laramie, is donating $100,000 to provide the historic old buildings with authentic furnishings of the times.

PUBLIC LAW 445

This gives to the Keweenaw Bay Indian Tribe in Michigan a third of an acre of land that the Federal Government purchased in 1935 for $1 for an Indian CCC camp. This assuredly is not major legislation, but it highlights the range of the work of the Congress. The President signed this $1 bill with the same pen he signed the authorization for $170 million for milk for schoolchildren, which follows.

PUBLIC LAW 446

H.R. 9331, school milk program

Public Law 446 authorizes additional CCC funds for the school milk program, a total of $85 million for fiscal 1960 and $95 million for fiscal 1961. Beginning in 1961 CCC will be reimbursed from the Treasury.

Some 83,300 schools and institutions, including summer camps, settlement houses, and child-care homes, are participating in the program in 1960. During the year they will use 2,380 million half pints of milk. Your vote has supported the school milk program since its inception.

PUBLIC LAW 447

Muckleshoot Indian tribe in the State of Washington showed little interest in its land consolidation program, and tribal council was hard put to scare up a quorum. So Public Law 447 authorizes the tribe to reconvey the land to individual tribal members.

PUBLIC LAW 448

This permits the continued delivery of water during 1960 and 1961 for irrigation in the Riverton project in Wyoming, pending execution of repayment contract.

PUBLIC LAW 449

H.R. 8601, Civil Rights Act of 1960

Public Law 449 is the legislation by which this session of the Congress will be remembered in history. It is not as strong as the measure introduced by your representative, as cosponsor with other members of the Senate and House, but it marks real progress in the long, hard fight to protect all American citizens in the exercise of their voting rights. The House passed the bill, 311 to 109. I cast your vote for the bill, against recommital (which was defeated 118 to 304), and against all crippling and weakening amendments.

The long and bitter filibuster in the Senate and the equally long and bitter fight with the Rules Committee in the House were highlights of the first half of the session.

I shall begin my next report with a digest, in simple language, of just what is in Public Law 449.

Nixon Over Kennedy for Presidency Says WIU Pollster

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, according to the word from Western Illinois University where Dr. Victor Hicken, professor of Illinois and American history, has conducted a poll, NIXON will be the Republican nominee and KENNEDY will be the Democratic nominee—and NIXON will be elected in November.

About 71 percent of the total sample picked NIXON to win the November election—with about 59 percent saying he is most qualified. JOHNSON was scarcely in the running.

Professor Hicken said:

In 1954 I conducted a similar poll and hit the outcome of the race between Meek and DOUGLAS for Senator on the nose. By using a WIU sample—which draws students from the solid Democrat and the solid Republican section of the State—I have always gotten extremely accurate results with polls. There's a good economic representation here too.

During the past year WIU drew students from 75 counties. Ninety-seven percent are residents of Illinois. He polled students in his history classes—including graduate students, senior, junior, sophomore, and freshman students.

Eighty-two percent picked KENNEDY as the Los Angeles nominee of the Democrats. Yet about 7 percent said KENNEDY is the most qualified. Exactly 25 percent said Stevenson is most qualified to be President. One in forty-four said JOHNSON is most qualified to be President of the United States.

Students in the poll represent 13 Illinois counties: McDonough County, Knox, Sangamon, Morgan, Fulton, Cook, Whiteside, Woodford, Carroll, Montgomery, Iroquois, Hancock, and McLean. Some students were less specific, indicating middle Illinois, central Illinois, west Illinois, north central Illinois, and midwestern Illinois.

The group—while not asked to give their names—was asked about the family background: 13 claimed a farming background; 7 said labor—and the vote was 4 to 3 in picking the Democrats to win. The white-collar families voted 8 to 3 for the Republicans to win in November.

With respect to the latter category, one family has a teaching background—and two more listed farming and teaching. Seven said middle class, two self-employed, one retired. And as to economic background of the family, one jotted down one word: Republican.

Bureau of Senior Citizens: An Immediate Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the past months we have seen national attention focused on the problem of medical care for the aged. An issue which has been too long neglected has finally received the emphasis it deserves. The scope of the problem has been thoroughly investigated, the need for a solution has been firmly established, and a number of divergent plans have been proposed and explored.

The degree of attention which this problem has received leaves us every expectation that the problem will be solved when Congress returns in August. I am personally hopeful that the legislative solution will be an effective and adequate one, which is fully cognizant of the medical needs of the senior citizen and which is soundly based in a workable financial framework.

The impending solution to this problem, however, does not permit us to ignore the complex of other problems which our elder citizens presently face. Adequate health insurance is only the first step. Financial security, housing, employment opportunities and psychological adjustment are all areas which still require direct and vigorous action.

These are problems which concern every single indvidual in the United States. Not only the 16 million people who are now over 65, but the rapidly increasing number of people who approach retirement age, as well as the increasing number of families who support and care for aging parents, are deeply and poignantly affected.

How we choose to meet the problems thus created is a primary challenge of present-day America. These problems can no longer be ignored or pushed aside.

I do not see how anyone, for example, can fail to be stirred by the following plea from a typical senior citizen who, having completed almost a half century of gainful employment, has now reached the age of 70. This individual writes:

Has the State or Federal Government any aid for indigent or about to become indigent folks, without too much embarrassment?

I would like to use myself as an example. On July 1, 1950, the General Electric Co. retired me because I became 65 years of age too soon. The Federal social security allowed me at that time has worked itself up to where I get $91.30 and my wife's allowance is $45.20. In addition to that I receive a General Electric pension of $49.80 which brings the three payments to a total sum of $186.30.

The above amount is hardly enough to pay the present rent, food, clothing, gas, electricity, telephone bills, medical care, dental and optical costs and personal tax.

The different governments have failed to take care of their old taxpayers and the rise of cost of living has been the same to them as those who are young enough to be employed and receive increase in their earnings.

One of the greatest difficulties, in my opinion, is the fact that the elder population has no official spokesman to represent them and their needs. There is at present no executive department or office which focuses full-time attention on our senior citizens. The absence of such a central agency may well be partially responsible for the fact that the problems of the elderly are still so far from solution. It may be, indeed, that the medical care situation might have resolved itself before this, had we had a permanent agency with the responsibility for stimulating interest and for undertaking positive action on a national scale.

It is for this reason that I have introduced a bill to establish a Bureau of Senior Citizens. This Bureau is to function solely with regard to the problems of the senior citizen, and with the interrelationships of their needs. It will

serve as a central clearinghouse for studies, programs and projects relating to the senior population. In addition, the Bureau shall be required to bring the needs of senior citizens to national attention, as well as to make specific recommendations by way of solution.

The primary responsibility for caring for our senior population must, of necessity, remain with the States. For this reason, my bill provides that one of the major functions of the Bureau will be to work closely with States and local communities, make available informational and technical assistance, and stimulate the development of local programs. The Bureau will also administer Federal grants, provided for in this bill, to assist the States in the planning and operation of their projects.

The return of Congress gives us an excellent opportunity to take concrete action during this session. I should like to see this bill enacted prior to the White House Conference on the Aging, which will be held in January of 1961. The studies and recommendations of the conference can provide the Bureau with an immediate base of information from which to proceed, and at the same time will insure that the results of the conference will have some measure of continuity.

The enactment of a bill to establish a central bureau of senior citizens should not, of course, preclude us from taking steps to solve those problems to which we can now supply ready solutions.

We know, for example, that the financial means of many of our senior citizens are pitifully inadequate, and that the answer lies in liberalizing the social security program. We know, too, that housing facilities to meet the economic, physical, and social requirements of elderly people are in most instances unavailable, and that the answer lies in an expanded public and private housing effort on a national scale.

As we meet these specific problems, let us at the same time give thought to the establishment of a full-time agency which will concentrate upon the "Geshtalt." We need an authoritative office which will speak out on behalf of those 16 million people who are over 65, and those 49 million over 45, whose interrelated problems cry out for prompt attention and solution.

Westmoreland Takes Helm at West Point

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor contained a story about Maj. Gen. William C. Westmoreland, new Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy.

I am proud that I served on General Westmoreland's staff when he was with the 60th Regiment of the 9th Infantry Division during World War II. Even then I looked upon him as one of the outstanding officers in the European theater.

The article follows:

WESTMORELAND TAKES HELM AT WEST POINT

(By R. Stafford Derby)

WEST POINT, N.Y.—Lean, long-legged Maj. Gen. William C. "Westy" Westmoreland has taken over the superintendency of the U.S. Military Academy here with vigor. His first "duty" day coincided with the arrival of the 803 youngsters who make up the class of 1964.

But it was more than a mere calendar coincidence. For General Westmoreland arrived fresh from the command of the 101st "Screaming Eagle" Airborne Division at Fort Campbell, Ky. This is a combat-ready outfit, an elite Army unit with battle honors to spare and a capacity to defend through offense.

He strode with ground-eating pace through the barrack areas where the plebes were starting their first of 6 "beast barracks" weeks.

The "awkward squad" of reporters and photographers were hard put to keep up with this paratrooper's tempo. But when the quick tour was over, luncheon enjoyed in the cadet mess, and the general seated comfortably in his office—the grave portraits of former Superintendents on the wall as silent but important witnesses—an inkling was given of what new things lay ahead.

RECORD UNROLLED

General Westmoreland's record bespeaks the man himself. A graduate of the class of 1936 (cadet first captain and regimental commander) his Army career runs the gamut from service with a horse-drawn 75 millimeter artillery battery through the bitter fighting of World War II in Africa and Europe as artillery and infantry commander, training as a parachute and airborne soldier (he has 115 jumps), and into Korea as commander of the 187th Airborne Regimental Combat Team in 1952–53.

His decorations are visual recognition of the bravery of himself, the determination of his command decisions and his accomplishments as a staff and field officer. In addition, however, General Westmoreland has served as Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower and, in 1954, attended the advanced management course of the Harvard Business School.

Such was the man who looked out under heavy eyebrows with clear brown eyes, tanned countenance, a firm mouth and chin, and tried to pierce the future in terms of challenges and means of meeting them.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOUR YEAR TO WATCH

The class of 1964 he pointed out, would be the first to enjoy the full 4-year program of the changed curriculum produced under the superintendency of his immediate predecessor, Lt. Gen. Garrison H. Davidson, now in command of the U.S. 7th Army in Germany.

He will lean heavily on this academic change. Although it is a complex subject, its main purpose is to allow more flexibility in the usual rigid curriculum of the Academy, allowing the individual greater exercise of his full capacities, and introducing a greater amount of liberal art and humanities education.

The general paused. Above his head on the wall hung the portrait of Capt. Sylvanus Thayer, Corps of Engineers, Superintendent of the Academy from 1817 to 1833. The basic principles introduced by Captain Thayer, which have stamped the West Point brand on its graduates, will be retained. These are: integrity of character, self-discipline, and education.

CHANGE KEENLY FELT

General Westmoreland, however, is keenly aware of the changing world as seen by the eyes of a Regular Army officer. "When I was a cadet," he pointed out, "we had forces in the Philippines and the Canal Zone. Now we have commitments all over the world, along the Bamboo and Iron Curtains."

West Point graduates will be serving in all these farflung places dealing with other nationalities, leading troops who will be armed with weapons of new and different design of which the present electronic control and missile character are but signposts. Thus the academic training must be based on a projection of what the qualifications should be in a time frame extending to 1975-85.

And what human material does the class of 1964 present for this first full run of the liberalized and enriched academic program?

"I'm much interested in this class—it is 'my class' coming in as I become superintendent. I hope to create an affinity between the class of 1964 and myself."

The general is the second youngest superintendent to take office at the Academy. A South Carolinian, his birthday is March 26 and his natal year 1914. Thus, at 46 his only rival to youth at time of appointment is General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur, who was 39 when he sat in the same office that "Westy" now enjoys.

The Day They Dropped the Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES O. PORTER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following review of "No High Ground." The book tells the story of the atomic bomb. It is written by Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey II. Factual, informative, and readable, it has a startling lesson for today. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following review by Hal Burton which appeared in Newsday June 4, 1960:

THE DAY THEY DROPPED THE BOMB

("No High Ground," by Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey II; review by Hal Burton)

The horror of Hiroshima was explored effectively and with such finality by John Hersey that no one ever need retell the story. Yet the events that led up to the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and the surrender of Japan have not previously been told with such freshness and in such detail as in this careful and dramatic study. Perhaps we all needed time to comprehend what happened. The world has now lurched forward into the missile age, and what happened at Hiroshima has now tragically enough become almost ancient history.

This is really a three-part story. The first is a scientific-cum spy thriller, the search for a means to split the atom, the construction of a plant to build it at Oak Ridge, Tenn., and then the decision to use it, so thoroughly anchored by Franklin Roosevelt and Winston Churchill that F.D.R.'s successor, Harry S. Truman, had virtually no choice other than the one he made. The second is, of course, the bombing of Hiroshima; the third, the anguish and soul searching of the Western

World when the true extent of the devastation became apparent.

"Wars cannot be won by destroying women and children," growled Adm. William D. Leahy, the President's military adviser. Many agreed with him, among them most of the scientists who brought the bomb into being.

But what is perhaps more appalling is the fact that, 15 years later, the world has passed from debate about fission bombs into an acceptance of the notion that they are as commonplace as big artillery shells; that of course the big powers must have them. A few voices cry out against all such weapons, and warn that the end result will be total ruin, but too many people—perhaps stunned again, this time by the magnitude of the missile race—are apathetic or at least silent.

This book, which illustrates that technology has no bounds, also suggests that the vision of humanity has somehow shifted from limited to limitless war, and that perhaps it is almost too late for us to turn back. It is, moral attitudes aside, an exciting and a tense book, excellently done, and first-class popular history.

Taxation of Real Estate Investment Trusts

SPEECH
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, June 29, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I urge the enactment of H.R. 12559, which I have introduced, to provide a special method of taxation of real estate investment trusts. Similar legislation was introduced by my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, Representative CURTIS of Missouri and the late Representative Simpson, of Pennsylvania.

The bill was approved by the unanimous vote of the Ways and Means Committee, and the Treasury Department has no objection to its enactment. The primary reasons for this legislation are, first, to remedy an inequity in existing law, by extending to real estate investment trusts, having at least 90 percent of their gross income from purely passive investment, the same tax treatment that has been extended since 1936 to the mutual funds which receive and distribute corporate dividends and bond interest. This equality of tax treatment is accomplished by providing that if the real estate investment trust distributes 90 percent or more of its taxable income—other than capital gains—to its shareholders the trust will not be subjected to a tax on such distributed income. As the committee's report states, not only is it desirable to have equality of tax treatment of these two forms of pooling funds for passive investment, but it is also desirable to remove taxation to the extent possible as a factor in determining the relative size of investments in stocks and securities, on the one hand, and real estate equities and mortgages on the other. This bill will furnish a medium for the small investor to put his savings into rental real estate and real estate mortgages, by pooling his funds with those of many other investors, as he may do if he desires to invest in corporate stocks and bonds through the medium of buying shares in the mutual funds. Such a method of real estate investment is not open to the small investor today, except at the unattractive return caused by the levying of a corporate tax on the income of the real estate investment trust, which cuts the net return in half.

Another cogent reason for enactment of this legislation, closely allied with the first, is to alleviate the shortage of private capital and mortgage money for individual homes, apartment houses, office buildings, and hotels. The result of existing law is to keep the savings of these small investors out of investments of this type. Opening up a new source of such funds should be of inestimable value in the urban renewal program and in assistance to economically depressed areas.

The bill has been carefully drawn to prevent its use by speculators or by those who might try to use it to get this "pass-through" treatment for income from active business operations, as contrasted with passive investment income. The statutory safeguards in this respect have been given careful study by the Treasury Department which, as I have said, indicates that it has no objection to the enactment of the bill in the form reported by our committee.

Public Laws 449–493

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include a digest of Public Laws 449 to and including 493, as given in my reports to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois:

PUBLIC LAW 449

H.R. 8601, Civil Rights Act of 1960

Public Law 449 (1) prescribes criminal penalties for obstructing the execution of school desegregation orders, (2) makes it a Federal crime, punishable by imprisonment up to 5 years, to flee across State lines to avoid prosecution for "hate bombings" of schools, churches, synagogues, (3) implements Federal investigations of denial of voting rights by requiring local election officials to retain voting records for 22 months after any Federal election and to surrender them to the Attorney General on demand, (4) strengthens the power of the Civil Rights Commission to administer oaths and take statements from witnesses, (5) permits the U.S. Commissioner of Education to provide schools for armed services children in areas where public schools have been closed to avoid compliance with desegregation orders, and (6) provides Federal machinery affirmatively to assist persons who have been denied the right to vote because of their race or color.

This is how title VI will work:

(a) Where in any area, with a large Negro population, few, if any, nonwhites are registered and participating voters, there is a presumption of "a practice pattern" of voting discrimination, accomplished by intimidation, arbitrary and discriminatory tests or by downright refusal to accept registrations. The court first must find that such "practice or pattern" exists.

(b) After the judicial finding that there is such "practice or pattern" any person of the race discriminated against may obtain on proper showing a court order permitting him to vote. Any election official then refusing to permit him to vote shall be punished for contempt of court.

(c) The court is empowered to appoint one or more persons as "voting referees" to accept the applications and determine the qualifications of Negro citizens who have been denied registration. The voting referees will receive testimony, ex parte, from any person denied the right to vote, and the applicant's statement under oath, "shall be prima facie evidence as to age, residence, and his prior efforts to register or otherwise qualify to vote."

(d) The findings of the voting referees will be reviewed by the Federal courts and voting certificates issued to qualified applicants.

Important: One of the strong provisions is that literacy "and understanding of other subjects" shall be determined solely on the basis of answers included in the report of the voting referee. This should go a long way in protecting against rigged examinations.

PUBLIC LAW 450

This gives 7 acres of land ($285 value) to the Shoshone and Arapahoe Indians in Wyoming for an extension agency.

PUBLIC LAW 451

H.R. 10234, Department of Commerce appropriation

Public Law 451 carries $645,922,375 in appropriations for the Department of Commerce and $83,702,000 for related agencies for fiscal 1961. This is a cut of $70 million under the budget.

An additional $50 million is given the revolving fund for Small Business. With the carryover this means $174 million will be available (mostly for small business loans) in fiscal 1961.

PUBLIC LAW 452

This extends to June 30, 1960, the life of the Lincoln Sesquicentennial Commission in order to complete volume III of "Abraham Lincoln: A Chronology, 1809–65."

PUBLIC LAW 453

Public Law 453 suspends for 2 years import duty on amorphous graphite or plumbago, valued at $50 a ton or less.

PUBLIC LAW 454

Bureau of Ships has the job of construction and repair of the ships of the Navy. It spends a billion or more dollars annually. Public Law 454 repeals an outmoded requirement that the Chief of the Bureau shall be an engineering expert, the Deputy Chief an architectural specialist, or visa versa. Now any qualified officer of the Navy can be assigned.

PUBLIC LAW 455

H.R. 10401, Interior appropriations

Public Law 455 appropriates $557,667,600 for the Department of the Interior for fiscal 1961. Our public lands and forests produce over $500 million in Federal revenues annually. Public Law 455 provides funds for more intensified management, also for increased research programs in forestry, fisheries and wildlife, and mine safety. It also gives the Geological Survey more money for water resources investigation. The appropriations total some $7 million over the budget.

PUBLIC LAW 456

This continues until September 1963, the suspension of duty on istle or Tampico fiber, used chiefly in the manufacture of brushes.

PUBLIC LAW 457

H.R. 11713, Atomic Energy Commission

Public Law 457 authorizes $211.4 million for fiscal 1961 for the Atomic Energy Commission, including $13 million for power reactor plants for the Antarctic and $5 million for stepped-up biomedical research into effects of radiation and radioactive fallout.

The Joint Committee disappointingly reports the failure of the Euratom program (of which so much was expected) to come up with a single project.

PUBLIC LAW 458

This is an aftermath of WPA. It disclaims any interest of the United States in land in Orange County, Calif., donated in 1936 by the American Legion for a WPA project, to give jobs to the unemployed.

PUBLIC LAW 459

Public Law 459 is especially interesting to automobile, real estate, and other dealers, and to finance companies that buy their installment notes. It provides transitional provisions for income tax treatment of dealer reserve income.

PUBLIC LAW 460

Public Law 460 designates two blocks in the District of Columbia as "Plaza of the Americas." In this area are the magnificent Pan American Union Building, statues to Simon Bolivar (South American liberator), and Jose Artegas (national hero of Uruguay), and other monuments to inter-American friendship and cooperation. A good gesture of hemispheric solidarity.

PUBLIC LAW 461

In its half century of existence the Commission of Fine Arts has enlisted the services, free of charge, of 64 noted architects, 8 painters, and 11 sculptors. Its members serve without pay, but the annual operating expenses now slightly exceed $35,00. Public Law 461 removes the authorization limitation.

PUBLIC LAW 462

Public Law 462 honors the memory of William Horatio McAlpine, dean of the civilian engineers employed by the Corps of Engineers, by giving his name to the lock and dam on the Ohio River at Louisville.

PUBLIC LAW 463

S. 1052, bank mergers

Public Law 463 is major legislation in the field of banking. It requires Federal bank mergers to have the approval of the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Purpose is to assure against monopoly and resultant absence of competition in a banking system serving the industry and commerce of an area. There has been a strong trend toward mergers in recent years. (I was interestingly reminded in the debate that the largest bank in the Nation is in California, the next four in New York, and the 8th and 10th in Chicago. Of the 50 largest banks 13 are in New York, four in Chicago.

PUBLIC LAW 464

H.R. 10550, Export Control Act

Public Law 464 extends for 2 years to June 30, 1962, the authority of the President to control exports of strategic and critical materials. The authority now, however, is little used except for security reasons with the Sino-Soviet bloc.

PUBLIC LAW 465

Public Law 465 will interest officers of the Coast and Geodetic Survey who were specially commended for gallantry in actual combat. Hereafter they can on retirement be advanced one grade the same as officers of the Navy and Marine Corps. The naval service calls these "tombstone promotions."

PUBLIC LAW 466

Living conditions of our agents enforcing the customs and immigration laws on the Mexican and Canadian borders are rugged. Public Law 466 raises to $80,000 the maximum allowance for construction of buildings on the border for combined office and living quarters.

PUBLIC LAW 467

Somebody misplaced until too late a bill of $765 rendered by a water district in Nassau County in New York for service to the Federal civil defense. So Congress enacted Public Law 467 to authorize the payment and keep Uncle Sam's honor unsullied.

PUBLIC LAW 468

Public Law 468 extends loan provisions of Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act to other soil conservation projects. This is expected to hasten completion of 11 major watersheds, work on which started some 12 years ago.

PUBLIC LAW 469

Library of Congress is one of the top research libraries of the world. At present it is housed in a main building and an annex, but with its tremendous content of books, sheet maps, phonograph records, newspapers, microfilm, and other formats it is bursting at the seams. Public Law 469 provides for preliminary plans for an additional building.

PUBLIC LAW 470

H.R. 9660, medical expenses of aged parents

Many persons past 65 either live with or are entirely provided for by their children. Because of the age factor the medical bills frequently are considerable. Public Law 470 permits a personal income tax deduction of all such medical expenses. If your or your spouse's father or mother are dependent upon you and are past 65, you can now charge off all their medical expenses (not covered by insurance) as a deduction. I know you will approve of my casting of your vote for this good legislation.

PUBLIC LAW 471

H.R. 10474, new naval craft

You will be interested in the program of our Navy to meet the challenge of the Soviet Navy, with its 450 high-powered submarines and rapidly increasing number of cruisers and destroyers. In fiscal 1961 we will construct or modernize a total of 35 ships and 22 craft, already authorized. Public Law 471 adds authorization for (1) one amphibious transport and dock which will carry 900 troops with transport helicopters and landing craft; (2) two escort vessels for locating and destroying enemy submarines, and (3) one fast combat support ship to provide continuous replenishment of fuel, ammunition, and food.

PUBLIC LAW 472

H.R. 11510, Mutual Security Act of 1960

Public Law 472 extends the Mutual Security Act for 1 year and authorizes $1.3 billion for economic assistance, technical cooperation, and special programs. This is in addition to $2 billion for military assistance and $700 million for the development loan fund already authorized. It is $136 million under the President's request, $42 million less than last year.

The act, drawn up by the Committee on Foreign Affairs after months of intensive study, tightens up the program and provides for closer supervision. It continues aid to Israel on the same measure and authorizes a special $20 million program to assist the newly emerging nations of Africa to meet the responsibilities of sovereignty. This is the program recommended by the Subcommittee on Africa, of which your Representative is chairman and Congressman WILLIAM MURPHY a member.

I was happy to be one of the sponsors in our committee of a statement of policy that puts our country squarely on record against Egypt's denial to the ships of Israel of passage through the Suez Canal. It states that "the purposes of this act are negated and the peace of the world is endangered" when nations helped by us wage economic warfare against other nations friendly to us "by boycotts, blockades, and restrictions of the use of international waterways."

Happily, this statement, originating in the committee of which your representative is a member, survived a drive by Senator FULBRIGHT to eliminate it in the Senate. Senator PAUL DOUGLAS led the successful fight to head in Senator FULBRIGHT.

The House passed the bill 243 to 130. Your vote was "aye."

PUBLIC LAW 473

H.R. 8042, ships for China

In 1948 the Republic of China purchased four cargo-passenger vessels from the United States for $4,400,000. It made a downpayment of $1,100,000, installment payments of $188,000 and spent another $1 million in American shipyards reconditioning the vessels. But before the vessels ever left the American coast for the China trade the Republic of China, driven from the mainland, was unable to meet payments and the ships were repossessed. Public Law 473 does the fair thing by permitting the payments previously made to apply on 2 of the 4 vessels. The vessels are 17 years old and at present are in mothballs.

PUBLIC LAW 474

H.R. 9449, Coast Guard

Coast Guard, as we in the Second District well know, performs a necessary and useful service in protection of lives. Its workload has been greatly increased by the rapid increase in the number of small motorboats and the enactment of the Federal Boating Act of 1958.

Public Law 474 (1) increases the limitation on enlistment from 4 to 6 years, (2) raises the number of commissioned officers from 3,000 to 3,500, (3) improves the civilian teaching staff at the Coast Guard Academy, and (4) elevates the rank of Commandant from vice admiral to admiral.

PUBLIC LAW 475

Our country has the finest transportation system in the world. Public Law 475 sets aside the third week in May every year as "National Transportation Week" as a tribute to the men and women who move goods and people throughout the United States.

PUBLIC LAW 476

Explosion and crash of an Air Force jet near Little Rock, Ark., on March 31, 1960, killed or injured many civilians, damaged 123 homes and 12 automobiles. Damage will exceed $500,000. Public Law 476 removes $5,000 limitation on settlements as some of the claims will be over that amount.

PUBLIC LAW 477

The International Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America is erecting a $5 million building on land worth $2 million bordering the Capitol grounds in Washington. Public Law 477 permits the contractor to move his materials over adjacent Capitol grounds during construction. Any use of the grounds of the Capitol requires congressional approval.

PUBLIC LAW 478

Public Law 478 amends special excise taxes in the Internal Revenue Code on short-barreled firearms and machineguns. It is expected to serve the good purpose of making it more difficult for gangsters to get the types of weapons they like best. A tax of $200 is imposed on the sale of each "gangster

weapon" and both buyer and seller are made liable.

PUBLIC LAW 479

This extends to June 30, 1963, the suspension of duty on crude chicory and reduction of duty on ground chicory. Since 1954 no chicory has been grown in the United States.

PUBLIC LAW 480

Public Law 480 authorizes the sale at market value to the State of Florida of 500 acres of land in Sumter County as site for a prison. Uncle Sam bought the land for $5 to $6 an acre, will get for it an estimated $54 an acre.

PUBLIC LAW 481

H.R. 10809, aeronautics and space

Public Law 481 authorizes $970 million for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal 1961, itemized $170,760,000 for salaries and expenses, $621,453,000 for research and development, and $122,787,000 for construction and equipment.

It increases the number of positions paying up to $21,000 a year to 13, of $19,000-a-year positions to 290. These positions are filled by scientists and other professional and technical personnel. My understanding is that they as yet have not all been filled or committed.

House report No. 1333 is an interesting and factual recital in 55 printed pages, of progress and plans in our race with the Soviet to conquer space.

PUBLIC LAW 482

Public Law 482 extends for another 5 years the loan of a small destroyer to the Republic of China. It also authorizes the loan of a submarine to Canada for training a cadre of personnel to operate Canadian submarines when they are built. At present the Canadian Navy, equipped for antisubmarine warfare, has no subs of its own.

PUBLIC LAW 483

September 13, 1960, is the 100th birthday of Gen. John J. Pershing, who symbolizes the men of the AEF who fought under him in World War I. Public Law 483 authorizes the Army and Federal agencies to join with patriotic organizations in observance of the day.

PUBLIC LAW 484

House Joint Resolution 502, Mary McLeod Bethune

Mary McLeod Bethune (1875–1955) was a prominent Negro educator (founder of Bethune-Cookman College for Negroes at Daytona Beach, Fla.), and one of the remarkable women of her times. Public Law 484 authorizes the National Council of Negro Women to erect on public grounds in the District of Columbia a memorial honoring Mary McLeod Bethune and commemorating the 100th anniversary of the signing of the Emancipation Proclamation. The council will raise the money for the memorial by popular subscription.

When I cast your vote for this resolution I remembered a tremendously moving article by the talented Ethel Payne on Mary McLeod Bethune that I had read in the Chicago Defender of May 25, 1957, and had put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 27, 1957, page A4082. You might find it in the public library.

It will interest you to know that this will be the second monument in Washington commemorating the signing of the historic proclamation. The first was dedicated on April 14, 1876, the 11th anniversary of the assassination of Abraham Lincoln. It cost $18,000, every cent of which was contributed by persons emancipated by the proclamation. It is a statue of Lincoln, his right hand holding the proclamation, his left hand held over a kneeling Negro who has been released from the shackles of slavery.

PUBLIC LAW 485

House Joint Resolution 546, flag of our country

Hawaii, as you know, is the 50th State of the Union. Public Law 485, a nice sentiment, presents to Hawaii for preservation the first 50-star flag flown over the Capitol.

Illinois was the 21st State. Question: When was the 21-star flag first flown and is it now existent? Answer: It was first flown on July 4, 1819, and I have checked here in Washington with the National Museum and Smithsonian Institute, neither of which has a 21-star flag. I am continuing my search. You can help by checking with the Chicago Historical Society.

The 21-star flag was the official flag of our country for only 1 year, from July 4, 1819, to July 4, 1820. In a sense it is Illinois' very own. It is doubtful that there was a 22-star flag, the Library of Congress informing me that the records were not too well kept. Alabama was admitted in December of 1819 and Maine in March of 1820. So it is likely that the official flag replacing Illinois' 21 stars had 23 stars.

PUBLIC LAW 486

S. 2130, money for Japanese

In view of recent events in Japan this is of timely interest. It was signed by the President only a few days before he started on his trip to the Orient.

The Bonin Islands lie 700 miles south of Tokyo. During the war its 7,000 civilians were evacuated to the Japanese home islands. They have not been permitted to return to their old homes for security reasons as the Bonin Islands now are part of the defense system of the United States. Unfortunately, many have not been integrated into the Japanese economy and are in need.

Public Law 486 authorizes a payment of $6 million in full settlement of the claims of Japanese nationals who cannot return to their farms and old employments because we have taken over the Bonins. It follows the pattern at home where farmer owners are compensated when property is taken over for public use.

I am happy to report that Shig Wakamatsu, national president of the Japanese American Citizens League, and one of our esteemed neighbors in the great Second District, came to Washington to confer with Congressman MURPHY and your representative when this measure was before the Foreign Affairs Committee. He made a large contribution to the enactment of equitable legislation removing an irritant and advancing the cause of friendship with the Japanese people.

PUBLIC LAW 487

S. 1833, Bent's Old Fort

Public Law 487 establishes a national historic site at Bent's Old Fort near La Junta, Colo., as part of our rich and rewarding system of national parks. The land acquisition will run less than $50,000.

Bent's Old Fort, on the Santa Fe Trail, was considered one of the great outposts of civilization in the vast plains area. It was erected about 1833, a trapezoid adobe building with protective walls 2 feet in thickness, a fortress against the Indians, a hostelry, a trading post, a rendezevous for trappers, a stopping place for caravans. In 1845 John Fremont made it his base of operations for his third expedition. In 1846 General Kearny and his army stopped there. It did service in the war with Mexico as military storehouse and hospital.

All the romantic past in the conquest and settlement of the West is dramatized for the present generation in the restoration and preservation of such historic spots as Bent's Old Fort. They keep afresh the spirit of our pioneers and imbed the traditions of our country.

PUBLIC LAW 488

S. 44, San Luis water supply project

Public Law 488 authorizes $500 million construction of San Luis unit of Central Valley water supply project in California. It provides for a cooperative partnership of the Federal Government and the State of California in the development of California's waterpower for irrigation, industrial and all-inclusive purposes. There was little, if any controversy, on the soundness of the project and the working together of State and Federal Governments, and the House passed the measure by voice.

But first an amendment was adopted on rollcall, 214 to 181, to delete a section that would have removed the 160-acre limitation in the basic reclamation laws. Your vote was aye. I think you will agree with me that the benefits of public works should be widely spread.

I also voted for an amendment, which carried to prohibit the delivering of water to newly irrigated lands in years when the supply of farm products was in excess of normal. Some 500,000 acres will get water for irrigation, probably to grow crops not under the support program. Nevertheless I thought it prudent to guard against the possibility of further swelling of costly CCC surpluses.

PUBLIC LAW 489

Nebraska and Kansas divide the waters of the Big Blue River and its tributaries. Public Law 489 grants the consent of Congress (required by the Constitution) to a compact of the two States to arrange an equitable apportionment.

PUBLIC LAW 490

Public Law 490 gives a break to veterans who are awarded additional compensation for dependents, based upon 50 percent or more disability rating. The additional compensation will start on the date of the increased percentage allowance instead of waiting for receipt of basic proof.

PUBLIC LAW 491

Also of interest to veterans' Public Law 491 makes uniform the marriage date requirement for service-connected death benefits to widows. Widows, otherwise eligible, who were married for 5 or more years or the mothers of children, will not be affected.

PUBLIC LAW 492

Formula for fixing the compensation of widows in service-connected cases is $112 plus 12 percent of base pay of veteran. Public Law 492 provides that the base pay may be that of the highest rank held for at least 6 months in service. This among others will benefit widows of persons who prior to June of 1948 reverted to lower ranks in order to retire from the service.

PUBLIC LAW 493

H.R. 8238, exhausts of motor vehicles

Public Law 493 directs the Surgeon General to conduct a 2-year study of the effects on the public health of exhausts from motor vehicles. With some 50 million cars on the streets and highways (by 1970 it will be 90 million) the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is genuinely alarmed. Emissions from automobiles are carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen and organic substances.

What Congress Should Do About the Renegotiation Mess

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, the magazine Missiles and Rockets has made a significant contribution to the subject of renegotiation of defense contracts by publishing an article prepared by Jacob Friedman which I include with my remarks:

WHAT CONGRESS SHOULD DO ABOUT THE RENEGOTIATION MESS

(A special House Armed Services Procurement Subcommittee has recommended that the present Renegotiation Act be enacted into permanent law. The subcommittee also has rapped Defense Department reliance on negotiated contracts and incentive contracting—holding any savings to be a fallacy. The House has urged passage of H.R. 12572 to impose new restrictions on incentive contracts. In the following critique, Mr. Jacob Friedman takes a hard look at the issues involved in renegotiation and proposes specific solutions to the dispute. Mr. Friedman is a registered professional engineer and Washington business-engineer consultant. He formerly was a Navy facilities contract negotiator and, in 1951, a Deputy Director of the National Production Authority's tax amortization division.)

(By Jacob Friedman)

Renegotiation today is the harshest word in the defense industry's vocabulary.

Scratch a missile contractor and he'll tell you the Renegotiation Board is nothing more than a band of pirates who grab hard-earned profits year after year.

But scratch almost any Congressman and he'll praise the Board as a group of sainted heroes who each year justifiably recover millions of dollars in excessive profits.

Both these viewpoints are extreme. While they portray the focal point of the dispute that has raged almost since the inception of the Renegotiation Act in 1951, neither gets down to the real issue—the law itself.

Criticism of the Renegotiation Board, insofar as the defense industry is concerned, is so much wasted motion. The Board is merely the instrument of the law.

If inequities in Renegotiation Board actions are to be corrected, then the law must be corrected. That the whole renegotiation process today stands in need of drastic correction, there can be little question. For the law—notwithstanding its objective to recapture excessive profits—is having some profoundly adverse effects on the defense industry at a critical period in the Nation's history.

To obtain the proper remedies, objective concessions are needed from both sides.

No argument is being advanced here to forget all about renegotiation and let extra profits become a form of subsidy. On the contrary, renegotiation fulfills a necessary function. It is needed particularly in the area of fixed price negotiated contracts where there are unknown factors affecting costs and profits. But renegotiation must be made to function under firmer ground rules.

Consider the case of Boeing Airplane Co. A regional renegotiation board determined that no excessive profits had been made by the company during fiscal year 1952. However, the National Board overruled this decision and made a finding of almost $10 million in excessive profits. Boeing appealed and—a full 8 years later—the case is still awaiting a final determination by the U.S. Tax Court.

Without attempting to pass on the merits, we can readily see that this case at least indicates a lack of consistency in interpreting the statutory factors.

Double standard: Much of the strife over renegotiation presently lies in conflicting values established by the Defense Department under armed services procurement regulations for certain fixed factors and those established by the Renegotiation Board in accordance with the law.

These factors—character of business, amount of Government-owned facilities, range of subcontracting, pricing risk, etc.—are known and agreed to in contract negotiations. But, when the Renegotiation Board looks over a contractor's total renegotiable business for a given year, these fixed factors may be assigned a different value—in effect overruling the Defense Department.

Testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in April 1959, pointed up this conflict in a 1954 case involving Lockheed Aircraft. The National Board told Lockheed in a letter introduced in the record:

"Notwithstanding the decrease in sales and profits from the prior year and the contractor's acknowledged efficiency and lowered costs, the Board has concluded that the contractor's renegotiable profits, accompanied as they were by substantial Government assistance and subcontracting as well as the minimal risks to which the contractor was exposed by reason of 94.9 percent of its production being either CPFF or fixed price incentive, are greater than can be considered reasonable."

It is significant that each of these factors—on which excessive profits in the amount of $6 million was determined—may have been fixed factors considered as a basis for the contractual agreement and not affected by conditions thereafter.

The profit incentive: Primarily, Congress should concern itself with reduction of overall costs in defense buying. But there is a large question whether the Renegotiation Act obtains this objective.

Profits from incentive contracts, while a small portion of total defense costs, represent the bulk of those considered excessive by the Board. In theory, the incentive contract holds out the promise of more profits as a reward for reducing overall costs. This, in turn, is intended to establish patterns for lower production costs in the future.

However, contractors frequently complain that they are not being treated fairly in the case of price reductions on incentive contracts resulting from their efficiency of operation. This introduces the question whether or not the contractor reduced costs through efficiencies not normally expected.

The Board, however, considers that jobs done for less than the target cost do not necessarily represent savings at all, since the yardstick for determining the target cost may be inaccurate. Other factors having no bearing on the contractor's efficiency also may arise.

The incentive to industry is profit. To take away any part of the target profit when the actual cost does not exceed the target cost is shortsighted. It defeats the purpose of the incentive contract. For unless the contractor can feel that the lower his costs are, the more his profit, then incentive contracts are "incentive" in name only.

Renegotiation of incentive savings depends on differences of amounts—rather than magnitude of the amounts—of actual costs and renegotiated target costs. Thus, in order to maintain the incentive for lower overall costs, the Board should tend to become more liberal in renegotiating target costs as actual costs reach lower levels. This would take coordination with the procuring agency to obtain pertinent information regarding the original negotiations. In turn, the Armed Service Procurement Act should provide for penalties when contractor withholds from contract negotiator information affecting target costs.

The actual elimination of any profits would depend upon the profit determinations relative to the remainder of the contractor's renegotiable business. However, under pending legislation (H.R. 12299) wherein contractors must prove that incentive savings are due entirely to skill, efficiency or ingenuity as a condition precedent to retention under each contract, a portion of such profits will be eliminated before consideration by the Board on an overall basis. Such a proposed law not only appears questionable as to practicality and intended purpose of an incentive contract; it also appears unfair in that losses on other renegotiable contracts will not offset such eliminated profits.

(This proposed provision has been dropped in accordance with the recent proposed provision in H.R. 12572, which calls for adjustment in target cost or price to exclude any sum found after audit resulting from inaccurate, incomplete or noncurrent data.)

It is noted that higher profits are realized on incentive contracts through lower overall costs—in contrast to higher profits through higher overall costs on cost plus percentage contracts, which are now illegal. Nevertheless, public policy dictates that excessive profits by a contractor should not be made on Government contracts. On this basis, a strong justification that the renegotiation function on a backwardlook basis should continue is a high volume of contract work accomplished under fixed price incentive contracts. When industry concedes this point it will be in a more constructive position to receive cooperation from Government that will lead to objective results.

Adm. John S. McCain, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with mixed emotions that I have just learned that Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., is leaving his assignment as Chief of Legislative Affairs for the Navy. The admiral is moving to duty as Commander Amphibious Group II in Norfolk. We on Capitol Hill are all sorry to see him go, and want to take this opportunity to wish him happiness and success in his new assignment. Members of Congress have come to know Admiral McCain as an able and enthusiastic friend and he has been a great aid to them in conducting their legislative duties. He has never been too busy to lend assistance at any time on matters pertaining to the Navy.

Admiral McCain has an outstanding war record as commanding officer of submarines during World War II, during which time he won the silver star medal and the bronze star medal and two letters of commendation for meritorious duty in both the Atlantic and Pacific. Admiral McCain has always upheld the finest traditions of the Navy as exemplified by his father who is remembered by

many as an outstanding carrier task force commander of World War II. As he leaves this assignment, we all wish him farewell and Godspeed.

Tributes Paid at the Memorial Meeting for the Late Prince Aly Khan Held at Pakistan House, May 23, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the tributes paid to the late Prince Aly Khan, permanent representative of Pakistan to the United Nations, an accomplished diplomat whose distinguished career was cut short by his death in a recent automobile accident in France.

At the 14th General Assembly session of the United Nations last year, the Prince, Aly, and I became good personal friends, shared many mutual problems, and, rather remarkably, had the same general approach to many of these problems. His death on May 13, 1960, near Paris was a deep shock to his many American friends, as well as his friends all over the world.

The memorial tributes follow:

TRIBUTES PAID AT THE MEMORIAL MEETING FOR THE LATE PRINCE ALY KHAN HELD AT PAKISTAN HOUSE, MAY 23, 1960

MR. AGHA SHAHI, ACTING PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF PAKISTAN

"This world is but a moment," so said his holy ancestor, the Prophet Muhammad. Death is a natural and necessary phenomenon. But it has never appeared so unnatural and arbitrary as in the tragic and untimely death of Aly Khan. Why it had to be thus and not otherwise will never be divined by us. The great master, Jalaluddin Rumi, the mystic poet, declares:

"Sometimes the action of God appears like this, sometimes the contrary: (true) religion is nothing but bewilderment."

We are gathered today to pay our last loving tribute to our friend and comrade, Aly Khan.

It is my saddest duty, on behalf of my Government and the Pakistan Mission to the United Nations, to thank you, Mr. Secretary General, your excellencies, and you ladies and gentlemen, the grieving friends of my late chief and comrade, for the deeply moving messages of sympathy that you have sent to us on his death. May I also express, at this memorial meeting, our profound gratitude for the demonstration of your love and reverence to his memory. In particular, I would like to thank you, Mr. Hammarskjold, and the distinguished speakers for taking time off from your preoccupations with the grave and pressing issues of peace and war to pay homage to the memory of your valiant fellow fighter in the cause of peace.

The loss to Pakistan in the death of the Prince can hardly be exaggerated. The president of Pakistan, Field Marshal Ayub Khan, has said in a message:

"While Pakistan has lost a diplomat of the highest caliber and value, it is also a great personal loss to me. His sportsmanship, his friendliness, and his personal charm will be remembered by thousands of his friends and admirers all over the world."

The Prince was linked to the Arab world, to Iran and Pakistan and the Moslem world and to India by ties of race and religion. He was also linked to Europe and the Americas by bonds of blood and culture. Therefore, while he served Pakistan in the United Nations, he was also the servant of causes which transcended the national and territorial divisions of mankind. In the best and deepest meaning of the term, he was a citizen of the world, of the one world toward which, we, the members of the United Nations, must endeavor to move if the human race is to survive.

MR. DAG HAMMARSKJOLD, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS

A few days ago the world was shocked and grieved to learn about the passing of Prince Aly Khan, a man so well liked by all and, as it seemed, so favored by destiny, at an age when he still had before him broad possibilities for continued service in the great cause to which, in recent years, he had devoted his energies.

Prince Aly was not with us at the United Nations as permanent representative of Pakistan for a long time, but in that period he had won many sincere friends and the respect of those who, never enjoying close personal contact with him, witnessed his contribution as a spokesman for his country. With seriousness and idealism he approached the problems with which he had to deal. He spoke of them with dignity and a deep sense of personal responsibility. A friend of many everywhere, he was also a friend of mankind. Generous and spontaneous, he infused also his actions as a diplomat with the warmth of his engaging personality.

He brought to his work in the field of international relations a rich and noble heritage from the world of thought of which his family for generations had been the spiritual leaders. He brought to his work also fine traditions in the field of international diplomacy in which his father had had such a distinguished role.

Prince Aly Kahn will be missed by his colleagues in the United Nations and by all of us of the Secretariat. On behalf of the organization, I express its deep regret at his untimely death and extend to all those who stood close to him our sincere condolences.

M. MONGI SLIM, AMBASSADOR OF TUNISIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS TRANSLATION

It is a very sad honor indeed to evoke today the memory of our dear colleague and friend that fate, blind and cruel, has taken away from our midst, in the prime of his life, at a time during which we were able to appreciate the full measure of his capacities and talents which were devoted to the service of his country and all humanity.

The Prince Aly Khan ardently strived here among us in the multitudinous ways toward the triumph of the high principles of liberty, justice, and peace among men. He was prepared by a childhood during which he lived in several European countries and which enabled him to derive the best of each individual culture to know, understand, and love his fellow man, The many personal friendships which he nurtured throughout the world aided him in the role of moderation and conciliation, and in this way to combat through reason the evils of tyranny, injustice, and racial discrimination. His desire to better serve his fellow man compelled him to accept great responsibilities in the United Nations, where he battled against other tyrannies, injustices, and racial discriminations. This earned him the high esteem of all his colleagues and especially among the Afro-Asian group, as well as the confidence and satisfaction of his Government, which was preparing to increase the weight of his responsibilities. Unfortunately, destiny took another turn. Aly Khan will have no more missions to accomplish. It is indeed a great loss for us all. May his example inspire similar other noble and generous vocations.

In the name of the Afro-Asian group, I defer to the memory of this great departed soul and address my sympathies and condolences to his family, to his people, and to his Government.

MR. HENRY CABOT LODGE, U.S. AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED NATIONS

The tragic and untimely death of Prince Aly Khan deeply moves many persons in many countries in many walks of life and of many races and creeds.

But I venture the opinion that in no country was there deeper feeling and shock than among us here in the United States, where he had so many friends.

Americans can be happy at the thought that Aly Khan had many ties with our country and it was my good fortune to be with him when he began his close association with the United States by means of service with the U.S. Army.

He joined us in southern France on September 16, 1944 and stayed with us until the end of hostilities. I could tell you a great deal about his excellent qualities as a soldier, but I would rather have the record speak for itself and that record is found in a citation issued on March 24, 1945 at the time that Lt. Col. Aly Khan, as he was then known, was awarded the Bronze Star Medal. I will read the citation because it was something that Aly Khan had earned and which was officially bestowed on him by the U.S. Army:

"Aly Khan, 157,269, lieutenant colonel, British Army, for meritorious service in connection with military operations as assistant liaison officer, 6th Army Group from September 15 to December 10, 1944 in France. Lieutenant Colonel Khan showed tireless energy, marked industry, and constant willingness to undertake any task, regardless either of its hazards or of its irksomeness. His knowledge of France and of the French language; his tactfulness and diplomatic sense; his willingness to undertake frequent all-night trips in the combat zone; and the imagination and initiative which he displayed in meeting unexpected tactical emergencies contributed materially to good understanding between the U.S. Army and the French Army, and won for him the loyal cooperation of those who served under him."

That is a citation of which any man can be proud.

He often told me in later life that he never was happier than during his service in the U.S. Army—and this reflected great credit on him because no more intimate system of human association has ever been devised than that which exists in the Army. There is no way of life which strips away the pretense and the sham more rudely than does the military life. And the fact, therefore, that Aly Khan was happy in the U.S. Army, shows how truly democratic he was and how much he enjoyed his fellow human beings regardless of what their walk in life might be.

His familiarity with the United States led to his brother and his two sons being educated at Harvard University and it resulted in many trips over here in the years after the war.

Therefore, we in the U.S. Government deeply grieve at his death and feel that we have lost a true friend.

Then, perhaps I can say a word as a representative of one of the member states of the United Nations, because naturally when Aly Khan arrived in New York to become the representative of Pakistan, I saw a great deal of him and in common with many of my

colleagues, I can vouch for the high quality of his work here, and for the serious way in which he discharged all of his new duties. He loved Pakistan and he was determined to make a serious contribution to Pakistan and to the world. In this he succeeded.

And so I conclude these brief remarks. I have spoken as a representative of the U.S. Government and as a member of the United Nations.

I will now close by speaking as an individual—and in this capacity Aly Khan's death strikes me with deep sorrow. I grieve with all my heart. Not only has the world lost a warm and considerate man; I have lost one of my best and dearest friends. His death takes something gay and delightful and generous and loyal out of my life which cannot be replaced.

A few years ago, accompanied by a Moslem friend, I visited the British military cemetery at Tobruk in Libya, in the desert, where men whom I knew and with whom I served are buried. In this cemetery both Christians and Moslems are buried side by side. On the Moslem tombstones I noticed a saying written in the beautiful Arab script which, alas, I cannot read. I asked my friend what the words meant and he replied:

"He has gone back to God from whence he came."

What a beautiful sentiment.

It is thus, it seems to me, on this sad occasion that we must think of Aly Khan.

AMBASSADOR MARIO AMADEO OF ARGENTINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS

It is my sad privilege to express today the sorrow of the Latin American group, of the Argentine Government, and of myself for the passing away of His Excellency Prince Aly Khan, permanent representative of Pakistan to the United Nations.

For all of us, Latin American representatives, Prince Aly Khan was a never-failing friend. He loved our countries, many of which he knew well; he understood their national character; he helped us with his wholehearted support each time this support was needed, even before it was asked.

For my country, where he was a familiar figure and where in these very days he was going to represent Pakistan, this loss has been felt as our own. Much indeed was to be expected of his action toward the establishment of closer links between two nations far apart in geographical distance but very near in their international aspirations.

As for myself, allow me to say that Prince Aly Khan's premature death has meant a hard blow in my feelings. A warm friendship grew in a short time between us, and I had full opportunity to evaluate the qualities other colleagues have just stressed. Among them, we cannot avoid referring to the gift we all, of course, have experienced; his magnetic charm. He had a way of saying "mon cher ami" which made us feel to be really his lifetime friends.

Prince Aly Khan's greatest contribution to this Organization of the United Nations rests mainly, we think, in his endeavors for harmony and understanding between the peoples of European origin and those of the Asian and African Continents. For this task, he was specially qualified. He belonged to the East by origin, by creed and by rank; he was very close to the West by education and by friendly ties.

He was essentially a man of peace. He used his manorial tact and his vast and inherited knowledge of international affairs to shorten distances, to soothe differences. In his hospitable house, the most opposite variety of people did not look incongruous. He was always able to impress his cordial style to every gathering where he was the host.

Now this fair Prince is gone from the world he decorated with his golden legend; he has tragically departed from this life which he loved and where he was loved so much. His country, his children, his spiritual brothers, the international organization whose aims he loyally served, his countless friends throughout the world will mourn him. They will remember that he was always for the good and positive things of life. His absence has dimmed a little the lights under which we must go on with our task.

AMBASSADOR ARMAND BERARD OF FRANCE TO THE UNITED NATIONS

For all of us who have gathered here to bid him a last farewell, Prince Aly Khan was not merely a colleague; he was truly a friend. There is not one among us who, when stunned by the shocking and dreadfully sudden news, did not feel as though he had lost someone very close to him, so great was the place that Aly Khan had held among us.

When he became head of the Pakistani mission, 18 months ago, he was taking his first steps in the diplomatic field and in the life of our Organization. With astonishing rapidity, he came to play one of the foremost roles, one of the most effective, one of the most useful, not only for his country but for the United Nations. If he absented himself from New York on one of the numerous trips demanded of him by his very active life, it seemed that something was missing from our U.N. circle. When he returned, he brought back with him gaity, optimism, the joy of action and enterprise.

To Pakistan, his country, Prince Aly Khan rendered outstanding service here. He gave Pakistan an influence that went far beyond the framework of his mission. He won for it not only an esteem, but a sympathy, that were unanimous. Thus he occupied, in our debates, in our activities, a place in the front rank.

Indeed he brought to his mission, an unrivaled experience of the world and of men; to this he added a simplicity which meant that, no matter to whom he spoke, he put the person on an equal footing with himself and knew how to draw his friendship. With a lively intelligence, he combined an equal amount of intuition, an equal talent for awakening immediately a confidence that no one ever placed in him in vain. He possessed to the highest degree that spirit of conciliation which ought to be the prime quality in our Organization. A feeling of good will, a feeling of brotherhood inspired him. He considered himself the brother of all men, and he treated them all as equals.

Perhaps his long sojourns in France from the time of his childhood, when he attended the local school at Deauville, helped to develop these tendencies. Not only did he speak our language as can only one of our compatriots, but he was also filled with French thought, which was also his own.

It was in the French army that he enlisted during the war, in order to defend the principles that are basic to our democracies and that inspire the United Nations. In this France which does not know discrimination of nationality, of race or of religion, he felt himself to be at home. Of all his residences, the Chateau de l'Horizon was doubtless the most dear to him. He was happy each time that he was able to aid my country, and France wholeheartedly reciprocated. Few men have been given such a welcome and such affection by my countrymen. And it so happens that a cruel fate has willed it to be in that very France that he came to so premature, so ruthless, so cruel an end.

May this spirit of comprehension, of conciliation and understanding, this liberalism, this feeling of brotherhood that were his prevail in our relations, in the solution of the problems which are submitted to us and in the life of our Organization. It is in this way that we shall honor him and that we can best make his memory live. Thus, the French soil which temporarily received him, and later the soil of the East, where he will rest under the same sun, will be particularly kind to him.

SIR PIERSON DIXON, AMBASSADOR OF THE UNITED KINGDOM TO THE UNITED NATIONS

When we heard the news of Prince Aly Khan's sudden and tragic death, all of us knew that we had lost more than an honored and wise colleague: we had lost a friend.

It is not often that such a wide variety of talents are blended in so balanced and attractive a personality as they were in Aly Khan. Prince, soldier, sportsman, statesman, diplomat—he excelled as all of these, but he was much more than merely the sum of them, and those of us who knew him have been enriched by his presence among us. He represented his country in the United Nations with devotion, distinction, and wisdom. Though rightly jealous of Pakistan's interests, he never took a narrowly national or sectional view. Indeed, I would say that his exceptionally varied international background and experience made him uniquely suitable to represent, in this place dedicated to international peace and understanding, a country whose own influence has been used to further those very aims.

In that other association of peace-loving free nations, the Commonwealth, we knew Prince Aly Khan as a wise counselor and as one who conspicuously practiced that civilized international intercourse which is the special mark of the Commonwealth relationship.

And so it is, for me, a sad but honorable duty to add my word to these last tributes to a very dear friend and colleague, for whose loss we and the world are the poorer; and on behalf of myself and the United Kingdom Mission, to offer my sincerest sympathy to his colleagues in the Pakistan mission, the Government of Pakistan and the Aga Khan (IV).

Bastille Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 14, 171 years ago in Paris, an outraged citizenry stormed the citadel called the Bastille, the dread prison that for them represented the denial of basic human rights by the regime under which they lived.

The anniversary of that occasion has since been celebrated by the French nation as the symbol of its dedication to the principles of liberty, justice, and equality for all.

It is most fitting for us to join the people of France in recognition of this anniversary. And it is fitting that the key to the bastille should today hang in Mount Vernon. For the charter of our liberties, the Declaration of Independence, owes much of its essence to France. The enlightened French philosophers of the 18th century largely fathered the concept of society as one in which individuals have rights and do not exist merely as objects for the whims of arbitrary rulers. The American Revolution was the earliest concrete expression of that concept. And from it the French people perhaps drew renewed inspiration for their struggle to establish a demo-

cratic society. Much of the history of the world since that time has been the history of peoples throughout the world inspired by the ideals of the French and American revolutions and struggling to realize them.

Today when new and more insidious forms of tyranny than monarchic despotism threaten to overwhelm the world, it is more than ever important to pay tribute to a people whose devotion to individual liberties has long been paramount, and to join with them in rededicating ourselves to renewed efforts to maintain them.

Public Laws 553 to and Including 591

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks to include Public Laws 553 to and including 591, as reported by me to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois. My reports have covered all legislation enacted at the 2d session of the 86th Congress with the exception of a few awaiting the President's signature. I hope that this digest of the laws of the second session will prove of interest to my colleagues, and others, at least as a source of convenient reference and reminder. I do not know of the availability to the general public elsewhere of a digest of all the laws of the session.

The digest follows:

PUBLIC LAW 553

This is of no interest to the second district, where we grow no cotton. But it is of interest in the Cotton Belt. Sometimes the Government makes mistakes in measurement of acreage in regard to allotments. Public Law 553 places the cost of remeasurement in cotton lands on the same basis as that in lands producing wheat and and other farm products.

PUBLIC LAW 554

Public Law 554 changes the title of the second in command of the Coast and Geodetic Survey from "Assistant Director" to "Deputy Director." I do not believe much in titles, but if a public servant thinks he can do a better job with more dignity in appelation it is all right with me. Whatever you call him, anyone paid by the taxpayers to do a public job is a public servant.

PUBLIC LAW 555

St. Lawrence Seaway has greatly complicated vessels safety problems on the Great Lakes. In 1959 there were 1,033 foreign commercial vessels making round voyages in the lakes in addition to the 2,206 United States and Canadian vessels regularly in the Great Lakes trade. Public Law 555 requires that vessels entering the five lakes through the Seaway shall during passage in the lakes have pilots, experienced with the area, and drawn from a United States-Canadian pool. I, with other members of the Illinois delegation, objected to the bill as first drawn, withdrew our objections later when the bill was amended to the satisfaction of the Chicago shipping interests and pilots.

PUBLIC LAW 556

Public Law 556 authorizes a payment to the Government of Israel of $16,616 for two of its nationals injured in an automobile accident in Paris and of $3,340 to the Government of France for one of its nationals injured in another automobile accident in Paris. Reason: inquiry showed that in each instance the driver of an American Embassy car, on official business, was to blame.

PUBLIC LAW 557

Public Law 557 (1) makes permanent the suspension of import duties on coarse wools imported under bond for use in the manufacture of rugs and carpets, and (2) adds papermakers' felts to the list of wool products covered. Purpose is to place American carpet manufacturers on even footing with foreign competitors.

PUBLIC LAW 558

Officers in the naval service, please take note. Public Law 558 corrects the bull the Navy admittedly made in urging the definition of "total commissioned service" in the hump law. The Navy intended solely to protect Marine Corps majors from mandatory retirement because by promotions over the heads of their superiors in rank they had picked up too much total commissioned service time. But it turned out the hump definition would force the retirement unintentionally and prematurely of 7 worthy but passed over lieutenant commanders, 154 commanders, and 31 lieutenant colonels. Congress rights matters by restoring the old definition of total commissioned service.

PUBLIC LAW 559

H.R. 8186, Reserve commissioned officers

Public Law 559 amends the Reserve Officer Personnel Act of 1954 to equalize promotion opportunity in the various branches of the Armed Forces. The law (19 printed pages) affects and is of interest to all Reserve officers, a fact pointed up when the document room informed me that it was completely out of House Report No. 681 (120 pp.) and the Armed Services Committee loaned me its copy on my solemn promise to return it within 24 hours. Note to Reserve nurses: You now can aspire to becoming a full colonel. Former top rank for Reserve nurse or Army medical specialist was lieutenant colonel.

PUBLIC LAW 560

Public Law 560 extends to June 30, 1962, the President's authority to allocate and fix priorities for strategic materials, grant loans and subsidies under the Defense Production Act to expand industrial capacity. We were told the control powers are necessary to maintain production schedules on missiles and other defense contracts.

PUBLIC LAW 561

H.R. 10569, Treasury and Post Office appropriations

Public Law 561 carries $4,007,500,000 in appropriations for fiscal 1961 for the Post Office Department ($522.5 million under the budget), $832,849,000 for the Treasury Department, and $1,565,000 for the U.S. Tax Court.

Not included in the above amount for the Treasury is $9.6 billion permanent and indefinite appropriations for debt service, tax refunds and payment to the unemployed trust fund. Most of this goes to paying interest on the national debt, a reminder of the future price we pay when we spend borrowed money.

PUBLIC LAW 562

This continues until August 7, 1962, the suspension of duty on copying lathes used in making shoe lasts. Purpose is to make available to American manufacturers specialized lathes obtainable only from foreign sources. It also extends suspension of duty on casein.

PUBLIC LAW 563

Public Law 563 extends for 2 years the exemption from duty on personal and household effects brought into the United States by persons returning from governmental service abroad.

PUBLIC LAW 564

H.R. 12381, Excise taxes and debt limit

Public Law 564 (1) provides for a temporary limit of $293 billion on the national debt for 1 year to June 30, 1961, (2) extends to July 1, 1961, the 52 percent corporate income tax rate, and (3) continues another year the excise taxes on alcoholic beverages, cigarettes, automobiles and parts, transportation of persons, and telephone calls.

All of this was packaged in one bill, which the Rules Committee reported out under a closed rule. A closed rule means that you take it all as is, or leave it, since no amendments are in order. Your representative, opposed to an excise tax on local telephone calls, voted against the adoption of the closed rule. The closed rule, however, was adopted, 204 to 181, and the bill passed, 223 to 174. Your vote was aye. It could not have been otherwise with a proper sense of fiscal responsibility. I doubt if any Member of the House would have voted nay if his were the decisive vote.

PUBLIC LAW 565

H.R. 11001, International Development Association

Public Law 565 authorizes the United States to participate with 17 larger and 51 smaller nations in the International Development Association to help provide assistance to undeveloped countries. IDA, affiliated with the World Bank, is an international cooperative venture, furnishing financing on flexible terms but on the same sound banking principles as those of the World Bank. It will have resources of $1 billion, of which the United States will contribute about a third. The House passed the bill, 249 to 158. Your vote was aye. I believe the burden and responsibility of world rebuilding should be shared by all free nations, each contributing in increasing proportion as its own economy improves. That makes commonsense. You will find my remarks on pages 13714 and 13728 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 28, 1960.

PUBLIC LAW 566

United States produces less than half the long staple cotton it consumes. Public Law 566 prevents 50 percent reduction in acreage by establishing the same marketing quota for the 1961 crop as for the 1960 crop.

PUBLIC LAW 567

This extends for 2 years, to June 30, 1962, the authority of the Federal Reserve Board to buy securities directly from the Treasury.

PUBLIC LAW 568

H.R. 9883, Federal employees pay raise

Public Law 568 is part of the history of the 86th Congress. It raises by 8.4 percent pay of postal workers, 7.5 percent pay of classified and other Federal employees. Mainly it affects the humble Federal workers, most of whom had a hard time making both ends meet in a period of rising living costs.

But it had to go the hard way to clear the hurdles. A discharge petition, signed by 219 Members, brought it from the Rules Committee, where it was bottled up. Your Representative was the fifth Member to sign the petition, held the floor for an hour on the deadline day and until the required 219th signature (that of Congressman O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin) was affixed to the petition. (Discharge petitions can be signed only when the House is in session.)

The bill passed the House, 378 to 40, the Senate, 62 to 17. Then came the President's veto. It required a two-thirds vote in both bodies to pass over the veto. The House vote came first, 345 to 69. Later in the day came the Senate vote, 74 to 24.

Public Law 568 had cleared all the hurdles.

PUBLIC LAW 569

July 1 was the beginning of fiscal year 1961. As some of the 1961 apropriations had not been voted, Public Law 569 provided temporary appropriations on the basis of fiscal 1960, pending later enactments. It is the usual resolution on such occasions. Otherwise the Federal departments affected would have to shut down at midnight of June 30.

PUBLIC LAW 570

Public Law 570 directs the transfer by the Postmaster General and General Services of needed books and personal property to State and county agencies engaged in cooperative agricultural extension work.

PUBLIC LAW 571

Impoverished Americans becoming insane while in foreign countries are cared for and their return to the United States arranged. Public Law 571 provides for their hospitalization after their arrival in America and while en route to the State of residence.

PUBLIC LAW 572

Demand for warm-water fish to stock ponds, lakes, dams and wildlife refuges in the Southeast is growing. Public Law 572 authorizes a fish hatchery in Orangeburg County in South Carolina.

PUBLIC LAW 573

This gives owners of five lots on the Indian River in Florida another year to perfect their claims jeopardized by a surveyor's error. The error all added up to more work for the Congress.

PUBLIC LAW 574

When a country school at Stella, Mo., burned down, the Army met the emergency with the loan of a former officers' quarters at Fort Crowder, unneeded and no longer in use. Public Law 574 permits its continued use without payment of rent. Just another proof that Uncle Sam is the kind of person we like.

PUBLIC LAW 575

Public Law 575 helps out unsubsidized operators of American vessels in the coastwise and foreign tramp trade. It permits them to trade in their old vessels as part payment for benefit ships from the Government's reserve fleet.

PUBLIC LAW 576

United States owns 2.6 million acres in Texas for which it paid $151 million. Public Law 576 would permit exploration for and development of oil and gas deposits.

PUBLIC LAW 577

Public Law 577 makes mortgage insurance on fishing vessels more effective, puts it on the same footing as that on ship construction.

PUBLIC LAW 578

This provides housing for essential civilian employees of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

PUBLIC LAW 579

Washington is the headquarters of many trade and other associations. Public Law 579 amends the District of Columbia Life Insurance Act to permit writing of group life insurance to cover their employees.

PUBLIC LAW 580

Castillo de San Marcos, now a national monument in Florida, was built by the Spanish in 1672, was the outpost of the Spanish Caribbean empire in defense against the English and French, in the 1800's served as a military prison. It was visited by over 450,000 tourists in 1959. Public Law 580 authorizes addition to the monument of land containing part of the historic moat still in evidence.

PUBLIC LAW 581

This gives back to the Cheyenne River Sioux Indian tribe in South Dakota, 16 acres of land for which the Government has no further use.

PUBLIC LAW 582

Here is good news for service personnel who were awarded decorations, such as the Distinguished Service Cross or medal, and never received them, due to inadvertence or loss of the recommendations. Public Law 582 in such cases permits their delivery despite the time limitation has run.

PUBLIC LAW 583

Vessels of foreign construction are not permitted to operate in the coastwise trade of the United States. Public Law 583 closes a loophole by requiring that when American vessels in the trade are rebuilt the work all must be done in the United States.

PUBLIC LAW 584

Public Law 584 relates only to the District of Columbia. It adopts for the District the uniform law of many States for the transfer of securities to and by fiduciaries.

PUBLIC LAW 585

Public Law 585 gives return rights to career civilian employees of the Defense Department assigned to oversea posts. On return they will get their old jobs back with no reduction in seniority, status or tenure. Purpose is to encourags rotation between positions overseas and positions at home.

PUBLIC LAW 586

Enlisted men on 85 vessels of the Coast Guard, small patrol boats, were overpaid from January of 1955 to April of 1956, according to the belated finding of the Comptroller General. Congress properly saved the enlisted men from digging up the money erroneously paid them 5 years ago. Public Law 586 validates the payments as made.

PUBLIC LAW 587

Public Law 587 broadens the coverage of existing law relative to payment of travel and transportation costs to attract needed scientists and engineers to the Federal service.

PUBLIC LAW 588

Most cotton grown in the United States is classed under the Smith-Doxey Act. Public Law 588 prohibits improper practices in cotton sampling and provides penalties.

PUBLIC LAW 589

Public Law 589 authorizes judge advocates, adjutants, and commanding officers of the Armed Forces in foreign service to act as notaries and administer oaths to civilian employees and dependents as well as to those in the services. This protects absentee ballots from the danger of being thrown out.

PUBLIC LAW 590

Public Law 590 allows reimbursement for ferry fares, bridge, road, and tunnel tolls (in addition to 5 cents a mile travel allowance) to VA beneficiaries and their attendants. Commonsense. I never heard of a nickel toll.

PUBLIC LAW 591

Small business especially is interested in having products tested to determine whether they meet Government requirements. Public Law 591 authorizes the General Services Administration to accept funds for such testing.

European Economic Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, the following article sent to me by Mr. Curtis J. Hoxter, of New York City, on the subject of European economic integration is inserted for my colleagues' consideration:

Europe, formerly the leading continent in the world without which America would not have become what she is today, has for many years been in danger of seeing her former strength change to weakness and being overrun politically and economically by the rising forces of young nations. However, Europe is now about to make a new beginning, to overcome her divisions, and to become conscious of her unity. Successes have been achieved, but much remains to be done. It would appear that Europe will first have to discard antiquated notions which may have suited the idyllic conditions of the 18th century, but which are no foundation for the reconstruction of the Europe of tomorrow.

Let us have a closer look at what is happening in Europe today. After 1945 Europe realized that new impulses were necessary to increase production, productivity, consumption and the standard of living in peaceful competition with the other large economic areas. The United States became the great teacher who not only subsidized the devastated continent to the tune of billions of dollars, but who above all was the shining example of the forces which a large market can develop. This example was all the more convincing as Europe with 166 million consumers presents practically the same conditions for the establishment of a Common Market as the United States with a population of 175 million. As to labor potential, free Europe with 74 million usefully employed persons is even superior to the United States with 71 million. No less important for Europe than the dollars was the recognition of the "law of increasing returns" and the realization that the law cannot apply to an area which is divided every hundred miles, but that it presupposes a large market.

The first step on this road was inaugurated by Robert Schuman's idea to create a common market for the German and French coal and steel industries. Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, and Italy followed suit and declared their willingness to join the combination. In 1953 the national frontiers were abolished between these six European countries for the important basic commodities, coal, iron ore, scrap, iron, and steel. Since then the flow of these commodities is no longer hampered by customs duties and import quotas.

As a second step, the six countries decided to extend the Common Market to all other sectors of the economy. The European Economic Community, which became effective on January 1, 1958, and which has been supplemented by the European Atomic Community, is intended to be a further step on the road to a united Europe. For the time being, this is only a "little Europe," but the eventual aim is to include in that Community, by some kind of association, all other free countries of the old continent and thus to bring about a common market of 320 million consumers. The present differences of opinion between the European Economic Community and the "Seven" of the European Free Trade Area may be regarded as the labor pains of such a greater Europe.

As far as the treaty establishing the European Coal and Steel Community is concerned, it is its declared purpose to guarantee all consumers within the Community free and equal access to production and to offer the enterprises a stimulant to produce more, better, and cheaper, contributing thereby to the improvement of the general standard of living.

The Common European Coal and Steel Market was started in the period of a worldwide economic boom. Since that time substantial rates of increase of production and trade have been recorded within the Coal and Steel Community. From 1953 to 1959

the crude steel production of the Community rose by 60 percent, exports and imports between the member countries of the Community increased even by 80 percent, steel consumption by 35 percent.

However, as compared with the United States, Europe still lags far behind in all important sectors affecting the national wealth. All production statistics still show considerable disparities between the European Community and the United States. Here Europe is confronted with a task which may be decisive for the future of the free world. The question is what use the governing supranational bodies in Europe which are supposed to promote forced economic expansion will make of the instruments which have been placed in their hands. On the interpretation, broad or narrow, of certain treaty provisions—in other words, on the spirit of interpretation, it will depend whether further progress can be made or whether the European treaties will eventually prove merely to be the means of perfectionist "administration of poverty" inspired by traditional sentiments and resentments. There is no doubt that the governing bodies of the communities will have to grow in their task, but it seems as though even supranational bodies and agencies are at times afraid of their own courage. A prime example of this attitude is furnished by the European disputes—hardly understandable to Americans—on the "permissible" size of steel enterprises. It is a commonplace to say that the "economies of scale," or the advantages of mass production, will only make themselves felt if works and enterprises reach a certain size. Europe will have to adapt its production potential to this economic law if she is to reap the fruits of her endeavors. What is required are efficient and crisisproof industrial concerns.

As to the size of its works and enterprises the European steel industry lags far behind the United States. From 1953 to 1959 it invested about $4 billion, the major part of which went into the expansion and modernization of existing plants. Mergers and other concentrations have frequently occurred during the last years by which two enterprises harmonized their production and achieved more favorable cost relationships. This has resulted in the formation of groups of coal and steel enterprises with annual capacities of 3 to 6 million tons of crude steel, which do not measure up with the size of non-European steel enterprises, but which are more in line with the new market requirements.

The treaty rules governing competition within the coal and steel community, taken literally, meet these requirements of a developing economy. The very important provision contained in article 66(2) of the treaty allows the merger or concentration of enterprises, provided they do not attain thereby a size which enables them "in an important part of the market of their products to determine prices, to control or restrict production or distribution, or to restrain true competition." The high authority insures the observance of these provisions by approving or disapproving concentration plans which must be submitted for approval before execution. Without approval, no merger or concentration. Of late, the high authority even asserts the right to judge and forecast, one might say by crystal gazing, the development of the competitive position in which an enterprise and its competitors will find themselves in future years.

In that respect the law governing the European Coal and Steel Community differs fundamentally from the American antitrust law as well as from the law of the European Economic Community. Neither the Clayton Act nor the Rome Treaty subjects mergers and other forms of concentration to approval and lengthy approval proceedings.

It goes without saying that the mere necessity to obtain approval as prescribed by the law of the Coal and Steel Community constitutes a serious handicap for the initiative of free enterprise which may easily lead to severe economic disadvantages. Moreover, the high authority has recently shown the tendency in proceedings of concentration approval to go beyond the specific language of the treaty by usurping the right, contrary to the treaty, to make its approval of mergers and other concentrations of enterprises over and above a certain size dependent on the acceptance by such enterprises of a control of their future investments. The combination of two German steel enterprises has only recently been frustrated for the very reason that they declared themselves unable as a matter of principle to accept such control. Although no objection was raised to the size of the group of enterprises in question, the high authority was influenced by the fear that the group might in future achieve a dominant position in the market by further investments. It may be legitimate to ask whether Europe is already afraid of her own future growth.

The competitive situation in the European steel industry certainly does not justify any apprehension of excessive concentration. As shown in the following table, the degree of concentration in the Coal and Steel Community is far below that in the United States. In the community approximately 80 percent of the total crude steel production is distributed among 21 enterprises while this percentage is represented in the United States by 9 enterprises. As to the scale of competition within the member countries of the Coal and Steel Community, the figures demonstrate that competition is keenest in Germany.

Degree of concentration of steel enterprises

	Number of crude steel producers	Percentage of crude steel production
United States	9	80.7
Coal and Steel Community	21	79.6
Federal Republic of Germany	12	80.0
France	6	75.2
Belgium	3	79.5
Luxembourg	2	89.5
Italy	3	70.0
Netherlands	1	85.0

The most recent development in Europe clearly shows the obstacles which result if the will to overcome outmoded economic forms is put in the strait-jacket of superperfectionist paragraphs. It also shows that the overlapping of different principles of law, such as govern the Coal and Steel Community on the one hand and the European Economic Community on the other, cannot but obstruct economic development. For that reason, harmonization of the European Communities is the essential concern of the hour. If Europe wants to achieve its aim of overcoming her past weakness and of becoming the equal of the great economic powers in West and East, she must jettison the ballast of the past and adapt her imaginative powers to the new realities.

Dry Times—Southwest Needs Water Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Denver Post, July 1, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRY TIMES—SOUTHWEST NEEDS WATER CONFERENCE

(By Roscoe Fleming)

The missing ingredients in the southwestern water picture so far are, first, to think as big as the problem, and, second, to learn to act unitedly on the basis of what we think.

This is as to the program for national water development recently reported in the Post as outlined by Edward A. Ackerman and other technical specialists, for Senator ROBERT S. KERR's special Senate committee.

The Ackerman group suggests that the American Southwest, including Colorado, could well be turned into one huge laboratory for finding ways to develop every possible drop of water and use it without waste.

They suggest hammering out an effective national water-supply program, by proving what will work in this most water-short of all regions.

This is vital as to progress or stagnation for the Southwest, facing a doubling of population in 40 years—if the sheer lack of water doesn't bring its material progress to a grinding, dusty halt.

Ackerman and associates say that the technical means already exist—and that others may be discovered—to enhance the effective water supply once we are forced to do it.

But the water history of the Southwest is one long process of isolated expedients devised in the face of imperative need, of communities grabbing for the supply like children grabbing for the highest piled plate at supper, of jealousy and mistrust.

Even our most famous attempt at development and equitable division, the Colorado Basin compact, merely became a sort of set of rules for quarreling. Ditto with the many other smaller compacts that dot the region. Instead of acting like sensible neighbors confronted by a common problem, we have staged a sort of slow cold war based on the assumption that if each State, or region within States, doesn't keep its legal shootin' irons ready, its future is likely to be massacred at any time.

The inevitable step, as the Ackerman group suggests, is that in some way a regional body must be created to work for the common cause of enhancing everyone's water supply by all the devices of modern technology.

In 60 years, the United States has actually spent about $15 billion on Federal water development and control, or one-third of 1 year's spending on defense.

If you think we're going to get by with a national water program for any such sum, or even for the $40 billion projected for highways, there's another think coming.

Secondly, we ought to start thinking now. Concretely Governor McNichols might well get the southwestern Governors together and talk over joint plans. If he doesn't, someone else will.

If all the June commencement addresses were laid end to end, they'd reach half across the Atlantic. And maybe a good thing too.

For the theme of about 99 percent is that America both needs and demands rugged individualists who "like insecurity and will take chances"; who will wear no man's (or corporation's) collar; who will refuse to conform, who won't follow the crowd but will stand on their own feet, etc. etc.

The ironies are first, that the speakers are usually organization men who got sufficiently prominent to be invited to make commencement addresses by, to put it delicately, not following their own advice.

Secondly, no speakers added, as they ought:

"But if you take our advice, prepare to get clobbered; for on this matter as in so many

others, America is suffering from a national schizophrenia of saying one thing while doing another."

There's the youngster on Long Island—perhaps inspired by a commencement address advising him to be ruggedly individualistic and never to be pushed into conformity—who suddenly interrupted the exercises to refuse an award from the local American Legion post, because he "doesn't respect Legion policies."

Did he get clobbered.

The school officials immediately apologized to the Americanism chairman of the Legion post, who sternly declared the boy had "made a mistake that would haunt him the rest of his life"; i.e., a sort of threat of eternal excommunication from decent society.

You go around being ruggedly independent and wearing no man's collar, and you're going to be guilty of poor taste and bad manners many times, in the eyes of the majority.

To my mind the treatment of the youth was worse taste and worse manners than his. Especially as it was by people three or four times his age of 17.

Hon. James E. Murray, of Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by me on the retirement from the Senate of the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS ON THE RETIREMENT OF HON. JAMES E. MURRAY, OF MONTANA

Many of our colleagues have expressed their regrets over the decision by JIM MURRAY not to run for reelection but to retire from the Senate at the end of this Congress. Each one who spoke undertook a most difficult task for it is impossible to put into words what it means to serve in the Senate with a man of JIM MURRAY'S stature. Each of us has learned to look to JIM time and time again for direction.

I have been most fortunate to serve with him on the Democratic policy committee where his wise counsel and experience has been invaluable to us all. In the remaining days of this Congress we will all be looking to JIM MURRAY for continued leadership.

I should like to say a few words about my own firsthand knowledge and experience in working closely with JIM MURRAY—an experience which I shall always cherish. Within a very few months after I became a Member of the Senate, a devastating flood swept over the land in the Missouri River Basin. I urged President Harry S. Truman to establish a commission to survey the basin with respect to the preservation and development of its water and land resources. The President established the Missouri Basin Survey Commission consisting of three Members of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representatives, and six lay members. JIM MURRAY was asked to serve on the Commission and even though at that time he was older in years than most Members of the Senate, he never hesitated one instant to give up the many months of the recess period which as we know is normally at the disposition of a Senator to use as he may, to take part in this survey.

The Commission with its headquarters at Lincoln, Nebr., held 60 public and executive sessions. The public hearings were held all along the Missouri River. JIM MURRAY'S service to the Commission was indefatigable and faithful as we worked to solve the problems of water and land resources for one-sixth of our Nation.

During those days together on the Commission, I came to know him not only as a warm and friendly man of highest character and devotion to public service but also a man of keen intellect who very quickly grasp the many technical and difficult agricultural, economic, and engineering problems with which the Commission had to deal. Since that time I have always felt very close to JIM MURRAY.

We will miss JIM MURRAY, but we will never forget him nor will the American people. In his 25 years in the Senate, he has left us a rich legacy of accomplishment. His name is a hallmark in the legislative annals, in the fields of health, of education, of labor, of conservation, and of natural resource development. In fact, I cannot think of a field in which over the years JIM MURRAY'S vision and dedication has not guided and enriched us.

I want to wish JIM MURRAY Godspeed and many years ahead of health and happiness which he so richly deserves in his retirement from public life.

Exit Summitry at Last

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Press-Scimitar of June 23, 1960. Perhaps President Eisenhower made one mistake on the summit matter: He tried to get along with Communist enemies abroad and political opponents and critics at home instead of following his own judgment and that of most of his best advisers by refusing to get into an exposed position where the enemies then turn on him for doing what they urged him to do.

The editorial follows:

EXIT PERSONAL DIPLOMACY

Secretary of State Herter says there should be a return to traditional channels and procedures of international contact—meaning no more personal diplomacy, so far as the United States is concerned.

He went further—in a Senate subcommittee session—saying President Eisenhower plans no more good-will trips to foreign countries during his remaining half year in office. Back of the decision is the rude treatment Ike got at Paris and the riots in Tokyo.

At the moment, President Eisenhower is bearing the brunt of a lot of second-guessing on his foreign trips.

That is not fair, because the clear implication is that it was Ike's idea in the first place to make the five trips he has made within the past 10 months. It wasn't.

The pressures on him to carry out this program of pageantry and personal talks were many. A pattern had been set up by Soviet Premier Khrushchev, and he was getting apparent results. From our allies came persuasive invitations and pleas that a show of the President was even better than a show of the flag for increasing solidarity.

But most of all there was implicit and uttered pressure from the political opposition within our own country—Democratic leaders and spokesmen who all along have cherished the idea that all the East-West tensions could be eased if Ike and Khrushchev would only get together.

Adlai Stevenson, among them, was sure that the Khrushchev visit here was a hopeful omen for peace and he continually advocated informal talks between the two heads of state. And only a few months back, Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, Senate Foreign Relations Committee head, was warmly approving of President Eisenhower's prospective visit to the Far East, saying:

"This meeting of people is one of the things the President does best. I think he should stop in as many countries of the Far East as he can."

The Democratic hind-sighters are at it now, hot and heavy. They seem to take into consideration less the circumstances that brought about the Tokyo debacle than the perfectly good intentions and abilities of Ike—and the undoubted good effects of his visits to Italy, Turkey, Pakistan, India, South America, and the Philippines. Overlooked is their own urging of the past that the President make every use of the personal diplomacy idea.

We think a little more perspective is called for, rather than a quick effort to make political hay out of an unhappy development that confronts all of us.

Public Opinion Poll, 10th District of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES RAPER JONAS
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the year I distributed 45,000 questionnaires among the residents of my district. Approximately three-fifths were sent to rural boxholders because many people in the district work in town but receive their mail on rural routes, and the remainder went to residents of the towns and cities in the district.

The response to this questionnaire was gratifying—a 10-percent return—and came from every urban and rural community in the district—from farmers, laborers, executives, storekeepers, clerks, teachers, housewives, and professional men and women.

Perhaps half of those who returned the questionnaires extended their yes or no answers by adding explanatory comments. Many others took the trouble to elaborate at length on their answers and some discussed issues not even listed on the questionnaire.

I have personally read all of these supplementary comments and appreciate the willingness of so many of my constituents to share their views with me on important issues. Although the final responsibility for votes I cast in Congress must necessarily be my own, and

is always based upon a careful consideration of all the pro and con arguments on a given bill, I believe the people of the district should have an opportunity to express their views and to know that they will receive careful consideration by me. The use of such a questionnaire is the easiest way I know to give them that opportunity and I am pleased that so many took advantage of it.

Following are the questions with answers indicated on a percentage basis:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
(1) In the recent steel strike, almost the entire steelmaking capacity of this country was closed down. In view of the impact of such a strike on our national security and economy:			
(a) Do you believe the Federal Government should be given more power to arbitrate and enforce agreements between labor and management in such cases?	67	26	7
(b) Do you favor a legal ban on industrywide bargaining?	56	29	15
(c) Do you believe unions that represent all workers in an industry should be made subject to the antitrust laws?	83	8	9
(d) Do you favor compulsory arbitration of labor-management disputes when an entire industry is affected?	72	18	10
(2) The present Federal minimum wage is $1 per hour. The North Carolina minimum wage is 75 cents per hour: (a) Do you favor increasing the Federal minimum wage above $1 per hour?	34	60	6
(3) The Forand bill provides hospital, surgical and nursing home care for social security retirees, surviving widows and children. Persons presently retired will be eligible without contribution. The program will be financed by an increase in social security taxes on employers, employees, and the self-employed: (a) Do you favor the Forand bill?	35	59	6
(4) Under present law, if a person drawing social security earns in excess of $1,200 annually he is penalized by having his social security payments reduced:			
(a) Do you favor increasing this limitation on earnings?	69	24	7
(b) Do you favor eliminating the limitation altogether?	36	52	12
(5) The 1961 Federal budget provides $565,000,000 for various aid to education programs. Several proposals are pending in Congress to increase substantially this Federal support of education. The bills range in cost from $300,000,000 to $1,100,000,000 per year:			
(a) Do you favor Federal aid to education in addition to that already being provided?	32	61	7
(b) If so, would you restrict the use of the funds to school construction or would you include teachers' salaries?	21	13	66
(c) Would you prefer a plan providing that the Federal Government should return to each State a small percentage of the income taxes collected from individuals within that State for use by the State in support of public education?	66	23	11
(6) Legislation is pending to grant a pension of $100 a month to every World War I veteran:			
(a) Do you favor this proposal?	18	79	3
(b) If your answer was "No," would you favor such pensions if they are restricted to veterans with small incomes?	40	40	20
(7) A bill is pending in Congress to inaugurate a GI educational benefits program for peacetime veterans. This bill is estimated to cost $600,000,000 a year. Do you favor such a bill?	19	75	6

	Increase	Decrease	No opinion
(8) Do you favor increasing or decreasing spending in the following areas:			
(a) Defense	41	37	22
(b) Farm subsidies	11	79	10
(c) Mutual security	27	47	26
(d) Public works, such as dredging harbors, building dams, flood control, reclamation, etc.	39	45	16
(e) Public housing, urban renewal, slum clearance, etc.	36	52	12
(f) Federal grants to States and local communities for public works such as sewage disposal works	27	60	13

	Yes	No	No opinion
(9) If you favor increased spending, where would you propose getting the money?			
(a) Increasing existing taxes?	16	46	38
(b) Deficit financing (borrowing)?	5	42	53
(c) New taxes, such as a manufacturers' sales tax?	27	25	48
(10) Interest on the national debt is now $9,600,000,000 a year. It takes 11 cents out of every tax dollar just to pay this interest bill. If we go on as we have been, in just about 30 years we will have paid out, in interest alone, an amount equal to the national debt ($290,000,000,000) but will still owe every cent of the principal. In an effort to force the Federal Government to begin reducing the national debt, I have introduced a bill providing that at least 1 percent shall be paid on it each year. Do you favor this proposal?	93	3	4
(11) Do you favor taxing cooperatives on the same basis as private enterprises?	83	9	8
(12) Do you favor a national fair trade law?	29	55	16
(13) Do you agree with the administration that disarmament must be accompanied by a foolproof inspection system?	89	5	6
(14) Do you believe that the exchange of visits by heads of state is in the interest of world peace?	78	12	10
(15) Do you favor continuing our current missile and space programs on about the present level or do you favor a "crash" program to speed them up regardless of the additional cost?			
(a) Continue on present level?	70	9	21
(b) Starting a "crash" program?	17	36	47

The Story Behind Hiroshima

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, nuclear physicist, Dr. Ralph E. Lapp, is a knowledgeable, readable expert in his field. His review of the recently written "No High Ground" by Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey II, notes "'No High Ground' should produce a shock wave impacting upon our conscience." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following review of the book by Dr. Lapp which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald, June 5, 1960:

THE STORY BEHIND HIROSHIMA

("No High Ground," by Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey II; reviewed by Ralph E. Lapp, a nuclear physicist who was assigned to the Manhattan project in 1943–45 and whose books about atomic energy include the recent "Roads to Discovery")

"Repose ye in peace, for the error shall never be repeated."

These are the words inscribed on a stone chest in Hiroshima. Most Americans do not believe that it was a mistake to drop the bomb. They have been led to believe that the use of the bomb saved the lives of a multitude of our fighting men. They are in for a real shock when they read "No High Ground."

The authors—two experienced newsmen—have dug assiduously into the past and have uncovered plenty of evidence that Japan was on its last legs in the early summer of 1945. Denied access to the files of the Manhattan A-Bomb Project (Gen. Leslie Groves refused to unlock them), the authors tunneled into other records. They have done a resourceful job of reconstructing events of 15 years ago. As a result, their book is flooded with a wealth of detail and previously undisclosed information.

To be sure, old ground is covered, but it is done in such a lively way, with such a

crispness of language and local color, that the book takes on a throbbing character.

In quick succession, the authors trace the events leading up to the decision to use the bomb. U.S. air intelligence and code cracking showed that Japan was on her knees in the cataclysmic summer of 1945. Yet this vital information fails to percolate through to the decisionmakers.

Scientists called in as top advisers quite obviously do not learn of Japan's supine posture. They seem to accept rather docilely the necessity for a November invasion of Japan—come hell or high water. Unless—the A-bomb ended the war that summer.

In their first critical interaction with public policy, the scientists played the role of technical experts advising on weapons effects. Some scientists argued against the use of the bomb and recommended a "demonstration" of the bomb's might—a proposal quickly overruled on military grounds.

We see in fine detail the hectic chain of events connecting the shipment of bomb material from Oak Ridge and its final insertion in the 10,000-pound bomb at Tinian in the far Pacific. A general is allowed to hold the vital bomb parts and is mystified by their gentle warmth. The bomb—nicknamed "Little Boy"—is readied for its entry into history.

The bomb was dropped on an unsuspecting and unwarned Hiroshima. Told of the successful bombing, President Truman is reported to have said to an aide: "Captain Graham, this is the greatest thing in history."

Admiral Leahy was bitter about the bomb, maintaining: "The use of this barbarous weapon at Hiroshima and Nagasaki was of no material assistance in our war against Japan. The Japanese were already defeated and ready to surrender."

The world is again on the brink of a great decision—an agreement to end nuclear tests.

"No High Ground" should produce a shock wave impacting upon our conscience. There is an acute parallel between Hiroshima-1945 and Geneva-1960, but there is also a great and good difference. Then the decisionmakers were few and insulated by secrecy; now the issue is in the open and we are all decisionmakers.

Public Laws 494–552

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include my report to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois on Public Laws 494 to and including 552 of the 2d session of the 86th Congress:

PUBLIC LAW 494

Public Law 494 grants gratuitous national service life insurance up to $10,000 to enlisted personnel who died in aviation accidents while undergoing flight training in Army or Navy from October 7, 1940, to August 4, 1942. This puts them on the same basis as those serving in capacity of aviation cadets, which seems to me only fair. Money will be paid in monthly installments only to (1) widow or widower, (2) children, or otherwise (3) to parents.

PUBLIC LAW 495

Public Law 495 is aimed at halting a windfall when a widow of one veteran marries another veteran and on his death collects for her children twice the benefits, such as compensation or pension. It prohibits duplicate benefits. Most extreme case was that of a widow who married three times, each husband a veteran, and her children drew three allowances, based upon the deaths of three individuals.

PUBLIC LAW 496

Public Law 496 revises the method for treatment of railroad corporation income resulting from discharge of indebtedness in receivership or bankruptcy.

PUBLIC LAW 497

Public Law 497 waives payment of premiums on national life insurance policies for veterans who become totally disabled in line of duty after applying for insurance and prior to its effective date. It applies only to World War II and Korean veterans.

PUBLIC LAW 498

This extends for 2 years payments in lieu of taxes on real property transferred by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to other Government departments.

PUBLIC LAW 499

Veterans with total (service-connected) disabilities get additional compensation for one to three children. Public Law 499 grants additional compensation of $12 monthly for each child of totally disabled veteran in excess of three and of partially disabled veteran in lesser amount. Some 1,275,000 veterans will be benefited at estimated annual cost of $12 million. VA said no, Congress with one voice said yes.

PUBLIC LAW 500

H.R. 10777, military construction

Public Law 500 authorizes $1.1 billion of construction projects for fiscal 1961 at Army, Navy and Air Force installations in this country and abroad. Fifth Army (headquarters of which are in our district) gets $13,977,000, the greater part for housing and facilities at Fort Leonard Wood in Missouri. Authorization of over a billion dollars in 1 year for military construction alone emphasizes the high cost of defense.

PUBLIC LAW 501

H.R. 113, veterans

Public Law 501, urged by all veteran organizations, prohibits the severance after January 1, 1962 of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except when based on fraud. Since 1954 VA has been conducting a comprehensive review of all service-connected cases, has severed 21,500, increased ratings in 9,551 cases, decreased in 71,125 instances. Review will be completed next year. After that Public Law 501 takes over and if veteran has gone 10 years and there is no fraud he is permanently set.

PUBLIC LAW 502

S. 2611, Small Business Investment Act

In 1958 Congress passed the Small Business Investment Act to bring equity-type capital and long-term credit within easier reach of small businesses through the formation of small business investment companies. Since that time 95 of such investment companies, including 2 in Metropolitan Chicago, have been licensed. Public Law 502 advisedly amends the act to remove obstacles that have prevented the formation of many more companies. Anything to strengthen the credit position of small business in its tough fight to survive is in the public interest, I think you will agree.

PUBLIC LAW 503

S. 2977, Central Bank for Cooperatives

Public Law 503 increases from 7 to 13 the directors of the Central Bank for Cooperatives. This will give representation each of the 12 regional banks, the 13th director being appointed by the Governor of the Farm Credit Administration with the approval of the Federal Farm Credit Board.

PUBLIC LAW 504

Inflation has hit even bankruptcy. Public Law 504 increases the closing fee of a trustee in bankruptcy from $5 to $10 and the cost of filing a reorganization petition from $100 to $120.

PUBLIC LAW 505

Navajo and Hopi Indian tribes in Arizona seem to be riding on the crest. Public Law 505 gives consent to the tribes for sale of 100,000 acres, recently acquired, and to make 99-year leases, looking forward to a $7-million sawmill, a $150-million powerplant, byproducts industries, and home construction project.

PUBLIC LAW 506

Public Law 506 authorizes the lease of lands in the Colorado River Indian Reservation in Arizona pending a judicial determination of just what tribes own the land.

PUBLIC LAW 507

H.R. 10996, certified mail

Some 3,600,000 pieces of Government mail annually are sent by registered mail. Public Law 507 gives Federal Departments option of using either registered mail or certified mail, which costs about 36 percent less. Annual saving of $774,000 is anticipated.

PUBLIC LAW 508

West Virginia, which the Civil War brought into the Union, is planning a whooping centennial celebration in 1963. Public Law 508 directs the cooperation of the Federal Government.

PUBLIC LAW 509

H.R. 7681, Hoover reorganization plan

Public Law 509, fathered by Congressman DAWSON, embodies the substance of Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1959 of the Hoover Commission on economy and efficiency in Government. It transfers certain duties relative to forest land mineral rights from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of Agriculture.

PUBLIC LAW 510

This amends an old law, enacted in 1876, to permit streets in the Palace of Fine Arts area in San Francisco to be used for park, recreational, and cultural purposes. Time brings changes and when Uncle Sam is concerned the demand for another public law.

PUBLIC LAW 511

Public Law 511 gives the Secretary of the Navy the same authority exercised by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Air Force in meritorious cases to cancel an enlisted member's indebtedness to the United States on his honorable discharge. Fair enough. Sailors should have the same treatment as soldiers and flyers, they all serve in the Armed Forces.

PUBLIC LAW 512

Surveyors made a mistake in mapping major highways in Alaska, so Congress had to pass Public Law 512 to right things. Strips of land totaling 14 or 15 acres are all that is involved.

PUBLIC LAW 513

Public Law 513 requires publishers of magazines enjoying second-class mail privileges to file sworn statements of average number of copies going to paid subscribers. This always has been required of publishers of newspapers.

PUBLIC LAW 514

This authorizes the sale of 22 acres of land to Port Hueneme in California to help out in its harbor development program. Uncle Sam acquired the entire waterfront in World War II.

PUBLIC LAW 515

Water pollution in the historic Potomac River here in Washington is, as elsewhere,

a hazard and a problem. Public Law 515 authorizes a sanitary sewer from Dulles International Airport to District of Columbia system.

PUBLIC LAW 516

New England fishing industry is in dire straits due to imports of frozen fish and aged trawlers needing replacement. Public Law 516 provides a $2.5 million program, part in subsidies to meet foreign ocmpetition, part in loans for construction of new and modern trawlers.

PUBLIC LAW 517

Our national forests are a valuable asset. Public Law 517 directs an administration of them on the basis of multiple use (recreation, range, timber, watershed, wildlife, and fish) so that they best will meet the needs of all the American people. It also provides for sustained yield of products.

PUBLIC LAW 518

H.R. 10646, $2.5 billion in new ships

American merchant marine has started on a replacement program calling for construction of 275 new vessels at cost of $2.5 billion under operating-differential subsidy contracts. Public Law 518 increases life expectancy of vessels from 20 to 25 years. Reason: increased costs and depressed freight rates (due to worldwide excess of ocean tonnage over demand) make amortization of construction loans under 25 years all but impossible.

PUBLIC LAW 519

Public Law 519(1) eliminates the requirement that bankruptcy claims be filed under oath, and (2) makes a false claim not under oath a crime.

PUBLIC LAW 520

This relates only to insurance companies operating in the District of Columbia. It regulates the issuance of variable annuity contracts, a recent insurance innovation.

PUBLIC LAW 521

Headquarters of Mount Rainier National Park is at Longmire, Wash., where average snow depth is 53 inches. Public Law 521 changes the location to Ashford, near the Nisqually entrance. Reason: less snow, Ashford seldom having as much as 4 inches.

PUBLIC LAW 522

Alien employees of international organizations are exempt from paying Federal income tax. In New York, headquarters of the United Nations, they are exempt from paying State income tax by a State law. Public Law 522 extends the immunity (from the District of Columbia income tax) to alien employees of the Organization of American States, and other international organizations, resident in Washington.

PUBLIC LAW 523

Public Law 523 reflects a growing public awareness to the loss of important prehistoric sites in the construction of dams and other large public works. It provides for the salvage of historical and archeological data in advance of construction in order to preserve the Nation's heritage.

PUBLIC LAW 524

Registration of births in the District of Columbia is pretty much a mess, as it was in Chicago until the Bureau of Vital Statistics of Cook County bent to it. Public Law 524 gives parents in the District 3 months in which to report name of newborn child for official recording.

PUBLIC LAWS 525, 526, 527, 528

These (as Public Law 524) apply only to the District of Columbia. Congress, as you know, serves Washington and the District both as city council and State legislature.

PUBLIC LAW 529

Public Law 529 authorizes the construction of a reservoir on Little River near Norman in Oklahoma to furnish water for municipal, domestic, and industrial purposes. Fourth of the population of Oklahoma lives within 50 miles of reservoir site and Tinker Air Force Base is in the area. Plans for the project include fish, wildlife, and recreational benefits.

PUBLIC LAW 530

Public Law 530 relates only to the District of Columbia and is another illustration of how the Congress serves the District of Columbia as a State legislature. It (1) provides for use of modern tables of mortality in connection with life insurance, and (2) allows policies on females to make allowances for the 3-year greater life expectancy. Many State legislatures already have similarly adopted recommendations of the National Association of Insurance Commissioners.

PUBLIC LAW 531

This establishes a Legal Aid Agency (annual cost $75,000) to provide lawyers for indigents in the courts of the District of Columbia. With 7,500 poor persons annually without adequate representation, situation was so bad House Report No. 1372 termed it "intolerable." Cook County for many years has had a public defender and staff.

PUBLIC LAW 532

H.R. 12117, Department of Agriculture appropriations

Public Law 532 carries the appropriations for fiscal 1961 for the Department of Agriculture. The appropriations total $1,323,963,600, $17,557,590 less than the budget.

This is for the regular activities of the Department only. The act also carries $1,226,500,000 capital funds for the Commodity Credit Corporation, and $1,443,634,000 for reimbursement for its special activities, including about $107 million for famine relief to friendly peoples and $881 million for sale of surplus products for foreign currencies. Thus the total appropriations for fiscal 1961 for agriculture are $3,994,075,600, some $141 million under the budget.

PUBLIC LAW 533

Public Law 533 saves Uncle Sam some money by eliminating 40 or 50 annual reports various departments of the Federal Government were required to make to Congress but which no longer served any useful purpose and often were duplications. They took time, personnel, and money to prepare. A good job of housecleaning, I would say.

PUBLIC LAW 534

Public Law 534 designates September of 1960 as "National Wool Month." Wool is grown in every State of the Union, including Alaska and Hawaii. The American wool industry, we were told, represents $5 billion a year measured by retail value of its products.

PUBLIC LAW 535

Public Law 535 makes a supplemental appropriation of $6 million for unemployment compensation for veterans and Federal employees for fiscal 1960. The demand was greater than anticipated—not a healthy economic sign.

PUBLIC LAW 536

In 1880 Congress authorized a harbor at Waukegan, 38 miles from Chicago. With the advent of the St. Lawrence Waterway the Waukegan Port Authority has ambitious plans for further development. Public Law 536 helps out. It permits Federal land conditionally ceded to the city to be transferred to the authority.

PUBLIC LAW 537

Pesticide chemicals are widely used on fresh fruits and vegetables to cut down staggering losses due to decay in marketing. Public Law 537 requires the shipping container to declare the presence of pesticide chemicals, but removes the requirement that the declaration shall be posted when the fruit and vegetables are out of the container and on display for retail sale. Food and Drug Administration, tried and true guardian of the public health, approved.

PUBLIC LAW 538

In 1897 Ford City in Pennsylvania built a sewer system into the Allegheny River. In 1928 a Federal dam on the Allegheny all but put the sewer system out of business. Public Law 538 waives the statute of limitations and permits Ford City to sue.

PUBLIC LAW 539

In 1958 Congress awarded members of the Lower Brule Sioux Indians $977,000 for 8,000 acres of tribal lands, taken for construction of a dam. Public Law 539 protects individual Indians from liens for money owed the Government when such would result in hardships.

PUBLIC LAW 540

This relieves minor members of the Otoe and Missouria Indian Tribes of having legal guardians appointed so that they can share in the million dollar judgment against the United States. Per capita share is only $581. Cost of guardian appointment is $250.

PUBLIC LAW 541

Highland Falls in New York needs a new cemetery to bury its dead. Public Law 541 accommodates by permitting sale to the village of 8 acres of land of the Military Academy at West Point and across the street from the tank firing range used by the cadets.

PUBLIC LAW 542

This is stopgap legislation extending for another year the operation of steamship conferences with dual-rate exclusive patronage contracts, pending the completion of exhaustive inquiries by two committees of the House.

PUBLIC LAW 543

In 1958 the Standing Rock Sioux Indian Tribe was awarded $5,252,000 for land taken over for a dam. Public Law 543 protects needy individual Indians from liens for money owing the Government. Similar to Public Law 539.

PUBLIC LAW 544

This relates to the Crow Creek Sioux Tribe, which received $1,395,800 for land taken for dam construction, and is similar to Public Laws 539 and 543.

PUBLIC LAW 545

Crowded court dockets are delaying Federal watershed projects for months and sometimes years. Public Law 545 permits work to start on issue of court's order without waiting for final adjudication and transfer of property.

PUBLIC LAW 546

Public Law 546 brings the judicial review provisions of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 and the Food Additives Amendment of 1958 under the uniform provisions of Public Law 85–791 relating to the record on review of agency orders.

PUBLIC LAW 547

Public Law 547 extends from June 30, 1960, to August 1960, the effective date of the Humane Slaughter Act. Reason: delay in delivery of needed equipment ordered by packinghouses.

PUBLIC LAW 548

This authorizes the Kickapoo Indians of Oklahoma to use some $1,600 to their credit with the Government to rebuild their tribal community house.

PUBLIC LAW 549

Public Law 549 gives to the Zia and Jemez Pueblo Indians, in trust, 640 acres of land no longer needed by the Government to add to their 78,371 acres in New Mexico for cattle operations.

PUBLIC LAW 550

I think this will be of interest to you, as it was to me. Inhabitants of the territory of

American Samoa are the only Americans who are not citizens. They are legally classified as American nationals. Hence they were not eligible for the scholarships and graduate fellowships of the National Science Foundation. Public Law 550 amends the Science Foundation Act to read: "Persons shall be selected for such scholarships and fellowships from among citizens or nationals of the United States."

PUBLIC LAW 551

In 1958 Congress directed the Administrator of General Services to sell to Wisconsin the property at La Crosse formerly used as a rifle range. But Wisconsin doesn't want to buy. So Public Law 551 repeals what Congress did in 1958. The property now probably will be sold to the higher bidder.

PUBLIC LAW 552

Public Law 552 extends for 3 years the time for holders of desert land entries on public lands in the Lower Palo Verde Mesa in California to complete reclamation and cultivation as required by the Desert Land Act.

Vast Southwest Water Plan Recommended by U.S. Experts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the Denver Post of June 26, 1960, entitled "Vast Southwest Water Plan Recommended by U.S. Experts."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VAST SOUTHWEST WATER PLAN RECOMMENDED BY U.S. EXPERTS

(By Roscoe Fleming)

Why not constitute the entire Southwest, the dryest corner of the Nation, as a sort of gigantic national laboratory to try out every means of increasing and of saving its water supply for its oncoming rush of people and general development?

The suggestion has been made by experts retained by the Senate Committee on National Water Resources headed by Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma.

Heading the group is Edward A. Ackerman, who with George O. G. Lof, of Denver, wrote the valuable book, "Technology in American Water Development."

Tomorrow's water shortages will be upon us before we know it, and it's time to start really massive preparations to overcome them.

The Southwest needs water worst and first, beginning now. What can be learned there, will help both in building a great Southwestern future, and in providing invaluable experience and guides for the rest of the Nation, so this group says.

By the year 2000—only 40 years from now—the United States must find water to supply twice as many people as now, people living on a scale that will demand much more than twice as much water.

And water is the one indispensable resource to support such a civilization. Where is ours to come from?

The authors say that the Southwest, as conceived by them, will in 40 years have a fourth of the Nation's population in about 38 percent of the area of the 48 original States; but that its basic water supply is only 14 percent of the national supply.

If its hopes of development are to be realized, it's got to find more somewhere, or explore every way to save this priceless resource, perhaps both.

Their Southwest consists of nine States from California on the west to Texas, Oklahoma, and Kansas on the east. It includes the Colorado Basin States, save for Wyoming.

By the 1960 census this group has 34.6 million people or 19 percent of the national total. In 40 years it will have perhaps 80 million. Where is the water to come from?

The writers say that the national task of supplying and saving water will constitute the most complex and gigantic task of internal improvement that the Nation has ever faced.

It will dwarf such undertakings as the present $40 billion national highway program.

And incidentally, they point out that water development is at least as vital as road development, although it has received much less national attention.

Providing water for the long future will require such an immense body of advance planning and programing, that we ought to get started now.

One big job will be to determine what we want water to do, and what are the national and regional priorities as between uses?

In other words, we need the national water policy which everyone has declared imperative for years, but which we've never even approached, because "we never miss the water until the well runs dry."

One early goal ought to be to determine what land we shall need now for future reservoirs, and to set it aside now so that when we need it, it won't be covered with billions of dollars worth of improvements, and so out of reach.

All this comes under the head of planning. Next will come development, which the authors don't see as a Federal task alone.

They see the Federal Government as a coordinator and catalyzer, but not as the sole builder. They suggest participation by regional and local people, public and private; and think the Federal Government might well induce action by offering loans and grants-in-aid for federally approved projects.

They point to the present antipollution program as a model, by which Federal grants are given communities to build sewage works.

Every local sewage facility helps purify the water supply of a whole basin, they note; and every local supply project would help with the water supply of a region.

Finally, when it comes to operation, they envisage computer-operated control systems to see that every drop of water goes where most needed.

This would be like the water-control systems inaugurated in the TVA, but so complex that any present system would be a baby beside them.

If the Southwest with its pressing water needs were to be chosen as the first area for such complete water development and control, the first step would be to ask the States to set up water models of their prospective need right up to A.D. 2000.

Second, "prognostic hydrology" would be put to work to ascertain the total possible supply from all sources.

These patterns would then be matched and from the matching could be planned further development such as the design of new facilities, and future construction big enough to provide "scale economy."

One vital suggestion is that the program be authorized far enough in advance, with Federal and State appropriations, so that work could proceed by decades rather than years.

In managing water, the authors say we must come to the "three-dimensional concept" in which all water in the atmosphere, on the surface or in the ground is to be treated as one whole supply.

We are, to put it mildly, far from this today. Irrigation experts concede that much waste is unavoidable in present Western priority systems; and there's little uniform legal treatment of groundwater and atmospheric water.

Specifically the southwestern program would:

Estimate future water supply by better long-range forecasting based on powerful new methods now just developing, such as satellite observation.

Locate ground waters, which in many areas total more than all surface supplies.

Seed the clouds consistently and region-wide. The authors figure this might possibly increase Western precipitation by 40 million acre-feet yearly, runoff by 15 millions.

Other means of enhancing supply would include:

Forest planning to keep more snow on the ground.

Desalting brackish water.

Averting pollution.

Cleansing and reusing polluted water.

Suppressing waste, as by recycling, cutting down evaporation—which alone costs the Southwest 10 million acre-feet yearly—by eliminating water-wasting weeds, by lining canals against seepage, by thriftier irrigation practice, and by applying water to its highest uses.

Dr. Donald Patton, who aided in this study, suggests that atomic energy can play a part in rapid and cheap development of water facilities as yet undreamed of, such as digging reservoirs with one gigantic blast, fracturing underground strata to form artificial acquifiers for storage; and even blowing the silt out of silted-up reservoirs, making them useful for many more years.

"My True Security—The American Way"—Essay by Miss Sunny Ustrich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE HOLT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the achievements of a 17-year-old girl, Miss Sunny Ustrich from Hollywood High School of Hollywood, Calif., who was awarded second place in a nationwide essay contest sponsored by the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co.

Her essay on "My True Security—The American Way" was selected as first-place winner in the State of California, thereby entitling her to enter the national competition. As one of the three national winners, Miss Ustrich received a scholarship to the college of her choice.

I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues this prize-winning and timely essay, as I know it will be a rewarding experience for them to share the sober thoughts of this outstanding young citizen.

Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this excellent essay which Miss Ustrich has written in the Appendix of the RECORD.

MY TRUE SECURITY—THE AMERICAN WAY

(By Sunny Ustrich)

As Mr. Average American looks about the dinner table, he smiles with satisfaction. He is proud that he can provide his lovely wife and rosy children with nourishing food and can shelter them in a comfortable home. The satisfaction that he derives is from the security that he feels. This material wealth is not the root of his security but a mere symbol of it. If tomorrow Mr. A. American were to lose his job, he might lose all those possessions. Yet his security stems from the fact that as long as he uses his own initiative, he has the chance to regain all he has lost and more. Failure simply means that he must try harder, not that his life is at an end because of one misfortune.

In this country, and in many others, the state attempts to aid people whom misfortune has robbed of security. Yet, no one is secure who depends on others. True security lies not in the hands of a national government but in the hands of the individual himself. In a nation governed under a Communist system, people need not worry what jobs they will hold, where they will live, what way of life they will lead. Everything is planned for them by their government. This is termed "security." Yet the moment that government is weakened, their so-called security is weakened also. They are a flock of sheep without a shepherd; their lives are without meaning, purpose, or direction. They search for guidance in others, for they have never had occasion to make their own decisions. If no leader is found, existing order crumbles, and chaos reigns. Was this group ever really secure?

In this land of freedom, man is taught to look for guidance and counsel in our Government, but never to be dependent upon it. The function of the Government is to formulate rules and maintain order to protect man from his neighbors in his legitimate search for fulfillment of his aspirations. Ours is a government by the people; therefore the people, not the Government provide their own security. One's job, one's home, one's way of life are his own to choose. Our system of economics, capitalism, provides the incentive, but man himself must provide the initiative. Opportunity is offered to all those willing to take advantage of it. If our Government were destroyed, man could rebuild it, for he knows how to work, to get ahead, to live. He has developed a faith in himself. He knows that dependency upon others is the opposite of security. The key to security is self-reliance.

Numerous wars have been fought to preserve man's freedoms—his right to be independent, to make decisions for himself, to be able to take advantage of opportunities. Would people now lose their integrity for this false security which would make them dependents and slaves of another's whims? Security would then mean submission. Man must continue to strive for better things, or this world will become a beehive with a queen who rules a mass of workers, who are born, perform their functions, and die. There is more to life than that. No matter how kindly the shepherd, man is not a sheep to be herded from pasture to pasture, but an individual in whom burns the spirit of adventure. His destiny must be his own. As was stated by William Hazlitt, the early 19th century English essayist and critic, "Even in common affairs of life, in love, friendship, and marriage, how little security have we when we trust our happiness in the hands of others?" You alone can provide your security, for your true security is yourself.

Hon. Joseph C. O'Mahoney, of Wyoming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by me on the retirement from the Senate of the Honorable JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS ON THE RETIREMENT OF HON. JOSEPH O'MAHONEY, OF WYOMING

I wish to join the great number of friends of Senator O'MAHONEY in expressing sentiments of regret that he is leaving the Senate. As one of its ablest members, his rugged individualism, initiative, and perseverance have made him outstanding. Outspoken in his dedication to the Constitution, in his alinement with proponents of economic freedom, and devotion to the development of the West, he is most highly respected by his fellow Senators. His eloquence and great independence in all fields from antitrust to military affairs, from matters effecting the Department of Interior to atomic energy have added to his prestige.

JOE O'MAHONEY is a leader, advocate, and originator. He is a realist.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming made an indelible impression on me in early 1937 when I, as a Member of the House, would come to the Senate to listen to the debate on the Supreme Court "packing" plan. He was a bulwark of strength and principle in the great fight to maintain our Court as an independent judicial body.

It is through our common interest in the field of constitutional law and antitrust legislation that I have gotten to know Mr. O'MAHONEY very well. It has been a privilege to be with him on the Judiciary Committee. During our close association on that committee, I have observed his keen insight into constitutional problems, his dauntless courage and determination to prevent any threat to constitutional rights, and his courage of conviction. His opposition to the drafting of labor in World War II, and assertion of the constitutional principles at stake in the Strauss nomination are indications of his deep conviction and courageous vigor in defense of the Constitution.

Guided by patriotism and welfare of the country, he has done all in his power to protect the American system. He believes in fairplay and competition. He has been forceful in attacking monopolies and concentrations of economic power. He has been outspoken against the power of monopoly in controlling the economic lives of working people, white-collar people, and small business people. He has been an ardent supporter of antitrust legislation.

He has been industrious in his endeavors to help the West. He has been successful in his battle for the development of the West's natural resources. In conservation he has worked to aid mining, water development, and land reclamation.

Although he comes from a State with a small population, through his talent, integrity, and keen intelligence, his reputation has spread beyond the boundaries of his State, beyond the boundaries of the West, and over the entire country. His grasp of national problems and relentless efforts to solve them have made America a stronger and better place to live.

I regret to see him leave the Senate. I realize, though, that he is taking the right road. He knows in his own heart what is best or he would not have made the decision. As a great students of history, he himself will now go down in history as one of the outstanding Senators of our time. I wish for him and for his loved ones many more years of good health, great happiness, and success.

Governor Rockefeller Suggests Means To Promote Freedom at Home and Abroad

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to commend to the attention of every thoughtful American citizen a recent address by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller, of New York. He is deeply concerned over the present state and strength of freedom in the world and has made a number of specific proposals in this field.

To increase the efficiency of our own Government, Governor Rockefeller recommends a thought-provoking scheme of government and military reorganization. To strengthen the forces and resources of the whole free world, Governor Rockefeller suggests regional confederations that can multiply national potentialities.

The Governor of New York State is, as he points out himself, "an elected official responsible for the safety and well-being of more than 16.5 million citizens of the greatest State in the Union." He has served the Federal Government under Democratic and Republican administrations, in Washington and abroad. As Chairman of President Eisenhower's Committee on Government Organization, he has had unrivaled opportunity to observe any weaknesses in U.S. policy-making. I believe that his bold, imaginative, and far-sighted proposals merit serious consideration all over the country. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the text of his address before the Rotary Club of Binghamton, N.Y., be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR ROCKEFELLER PREPARED FOR DELIVERY AT LUNCHEON SPONSORED BY BINGHAMTON ROTARY CLUB, ARLINGTON HOTEL, BINGHAMTON, N.Y., TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 1960

I thank you warmly for the privilege of this occasion. I wish to try to repay your kindness and hospitality with more than casual acknowledgment. And I hope to do so by speaking to you of some of the things most seriously upon my mind in these most serious times—in the Nation, through the world, and for the future.

I am deeply disturbed by the present state and strength of freedom in the world, as well as the security of our own country. I know these matters and their true appraisal must

concern you, as individual citizens and thoughtful Americans, and as members of a great international organization dedicated to fostering world understanding in no less than 116 nations. I personally feel this deep concern as a father and a grandfather who cares, like each of you, about the kind of world our children and their children will inherit and inhabit. I also happen to be an elected official responsible for the safety and well-being of more than 16.5 million citizens of the greatest State of the Union. My concern, therefore, is official as well as personal.

The facts before us permit no one to be either serene or complacent. For the fate of our freedom—yours and mine and America's—is decisively affected by the fate of freedom in the world at large.

Everywhere we look across this world in which we live, the forces of freedom are under siege and in danger.

It is so in Cuba, just 90 miles from the American mainland—and it is so in Japan, on the far side of the globe. It is so in those divided nations whose internal borders are among the most cruel scars of the cold war: Germany, Korea, Vietnam. It is so with a country whose whole conduct can bend before Communist pressure—as with Japan; or with a city whose very life must suffer Soviet threat—as with Berlin.

The forces of freedom, in short, are in historic trouble.

We, as Americans, cannot waste time merely lamenting this fact. Nor must time be wasted in confusing or exploiting the fact for partisan purposes in domestic politics. The great question is: What can we do about it?

I say that there is a great deal that we Americans can do about it—and we can do it with greatness.

We can make freedom a dynamic and irresistible force throughout the world.

Before we talk about "we," the Nation, let us talk specifically about "we," the individual citizens, such as you and I. We individual Americans are not helplessly remote from the arenas where great problems and great perils must be met. I can demonstrate this simply and concretely to you.

Only 4 days ago, the controlling majority in the U.S. House of Representatives attacked the mutual security appropriation as if wielding an ax. By the time the ax had finished its indelicate surgery, the money available in fiscal 1961 for strengthening our allies, along all the frontiers of freedom, had been slashed by $590 million.

I am pleased and proud that an even more drastic cut was prevented by the leadership of an upstate New York Congressman, JOHN TABER, at the head of a coalition largely of Republicans. We can thank him and them.

But we cannot afford the damage that was done. The mutual security appropriation is now before the Senate. I strongly urge you to wire or write your Senators immediately to support vigorously the restoration by the Senate of the House cuts—to restore the full amount requested by President Eisenhower. The restoration of these cuts is vital to the strengthening of the forces of freedom. This is a vital task in which each one of you can help.

Action in this area, however, is essentially a holding action. If freedom is really to become a dynamic and irresistible force in the world, free men and free nations must join together in a truly great design—a design to assure that our deepest spiritual and political values shall live and thrive.

Where do we begin on this great design? Very simply, it seems to me that we have to start with the problem of organization. This means political organization in the most full and creative sense. It means organization of our own Government. And it means organization of a host of free nations.

Two great and explicit challenges and needs are involved:

First, we must give to the Government of the United States a structure so cohesive, so efficient, so strong that it can both inspire and execute the policies and programs necessary in a world of revolutionary change.

Second, we must lead and encourage the free nations to develop and deepen their bonds with one another so that regional alliances can grow into working confederations.

I am speaking now of historic steps, of giant strides to be made both within our own Government and among the governments of all freedom-loving peoples. They are realistic and practical steps.

Let us look at both areas of action. There is nothing new about efforts to improve the organization of the Federal Government. Two Hoover Commissions studied aspects of this need at length, and they achieved important reforms during the Truman and Eisenhower administrations.

I was intimately concerned with the subject for 5 years as chairman of President Eisenhower's Committee on Government Organization. In addition, I participated in the last two reorganizations of the Defense Department.

Spurred by ever-changing world conditions, a Senate subcommittee under Senator JACKSON, of Washington, is now investigating the policymaking machinery of our National Government.

The significant fact today is the growing public awareness of the urgency of getting major improvements made—and made fast—in this area. For we have lately faced plain and serious evidence of the inadequacy of our Government machinery. We have seen this with the unfortunate U–2 incident. We have seen this with the unhappy fate of the President's plans to visit Japan. Both occurrences have warned us that there is something seriously wrong with the working of the decisionmaking processes of our Government.

Deeply as we may regret these facts, we can and must welcome the quickened public concern that they have provoked. This concern encourages me to believe that important reform can now be achieved—and I am confident that a great deal of such reform will have the full support of the President.

I feel deeply, therefore, that the Congress should make necessary Government reorganization its first order of business in the next session. For the blunt truth is that the present structure of the Federal Government is simply not properly geared to support the President in developing and executing policy, thoughtfully and purposefully, in the complex areas of national security and foreign affairs.

This governmental structure moves slowly, even sluggishly, to meet a world of swift-moving change. It tends to be stiff and static when it should be quick, alert, and creative.

If any citizen imagines, for example, that our Department of State exercises sole and supreme authority in the operation of our foreign policy, this citizen is very much mistaken. The defining and operating of such policy involves almost a legion of governmental departments and agencies—State, Defense, CIA, ICA, USIA, and very often Treasury, Commerce, Labor, Agriculture, along with innumerable interdepartmental agencies. To reconcile and coordinate their policies and actions, a host of committees, including the National Security Council, has been established.

The weaknesses of such a way of operating are becoming obvious. It verges on a system of government by committee. Committees, by their very nature, tend to reach the least bold or imaginative position. The result is the lowest common denominator among several varying positions, in the name of agreement.

How do we make sure that, in the making of important national decisions, the controlling consideration is the supreme interest of the United States—and not the rival interests of competing agencies?

I strongly urge that two important and practical steps be taken immediately: (1) The post of First Secretary of the Government should be created to assist the President in the exercise of his authority in the whole area of national security and international affairs. This official, with status above the level of Cabinet officers, would derive his authority from the President and act on his behalf. He would have statutory designation as Executive Chairman of the National Security Council. He would be empowered to represent the President, in international matters, on the prime ministerial level. He would be supported by a staff of his own. He would be empowered to reorganize and use the whole interdepartmental planning machinery of the Government in this area, including programs for controlled disarmament.

While the Secretary of State continued in charge of the day-to-day conduct of diplomacy (and represented the Government on the foreign ministerial level), the First Secretary would, under the President, inspire and direct the defining of long-range purposes, the policies working toward them, and the coordinated action needed to execute these policies.

2. A similar clarification of authority in the area of defense planning and organization is especially necessary. The most effective and efficient defense organization is indispensable to the whole defense of freedom. I recommend the following: (a) The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff should be designated principal adviser to the Secretary of Defense and the President, and be responsible for the development of overall strategic doctrine. (b) The staff of the Joint Chiefs should be organized on a unified basis under the direct authority of the Chairman. (c) All officers above the rank of brigadier general or the equivalent should receive any promotions from the Department of Defense and be officers of the Armed Forces of the United States—not the individual service of their earlier careers. (d) The Secretary of Defense should be given full authority over all military research, development, and procurement.

Why are such organizational steps so urgently necessary?

It is not any marginal matter of simply making governmental machinery a little more efficient, a little more coherent, as all of us would like. It is the most critical matter of making this machinery able to cope with problems and challenges emerging with swiftness upon all sides—in an age of the deadliest of weapons, on an earth deeply divided against itself.

And only as our own Government is sensibly put in order can we proceed to the greater task of applying to the world of the free nations the same modern principles and practices that alone can give strength to the forces of freedom everywhere. This is the way to start building the kind of world we want.

Let us now look at the challenge of building this larger world—and of helping bring to it, too, purpose and organization.

I have spoken of developing confederations out of regional alliances. This is

neither a dream nor an abstraction. It simply suggests the logical and inevitable next step in the history of free nations.

We must face the fact that we have reached a point in history at which the Nation-State, standing alone, is becoming as obsolete as the city-state of ancient Greece or medieval Europe. No nation today, large or small, can meet the needs of its people or insure their security from within its own borders alone. We have already seen the peril of allowing Communist imperialism to pick off, one by one, the free nations standing in its path of aggression. We can see that the pattern of relationship between America and these other free nations must be something deeper and broader than a series of military alliances and bilateral treaties. There must be more lasting and rational political structure to these relationships.

Furthermore, we know in the economic realm that we cannot indefinitely treat or support the many needy free nations as dependents upon America. Rather must we help them to evolve political and economic structures that sustain their own unity, cooperation, prosperity and strength.

Our great task, then, is to help build these structures, so that the forces of democracy throughout the world can be strong and purposeful, dynamic and confident. We must be concerned primarily with political associations. As the political structures are sound—and only thus— the strength needed for common effort and common defense will follow.

We are not and cannot be striving merely to meet crises on a sporadic basis—but striving to serve the needs and aspirations of free peoples everywhere on a continuing basis. We are not trying merely to baffle enemies of freedom. We are trying to build freedom itself—by building the structures in which it can live and thrive. These are the ideas and purposes beneath the regional concept of confederation.

The outlines of confederation are already present throughout the world. They exist in the Organization of American States, in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, in the Inner Six and Outer Seven of European trade, and other like associations. These can be starting points for the work ahead of us.

This work of moving toward confederation does not involve any superstates. Nor does it subtract from or conflict with the authority of the United Nations. Quite the contrary: Article 51 of the United Nations Charter specifically makes provision for regional associations, and the growth of these associations, would, in fact, add immeasurably to the strength of the United Nations.

The whole spirit and concept of confederation would be gradual and evolutionary. It provides occasion for firmer bonds between nations, joined in common effort on any level of national life—whether it be social, economic, or monetary; juridical, cultural, or military. Thus the principles of confederation can be applied at whatever level the parties agree to be in their mutual interest.

Let me try to put the idea of confederation into clear focus by proposing specific confederations and the great tasks they would accomplish:

(1) A North Atlantic Confederation. What would this confederation actually do? It would strive to tighten all political, economic, military, and cultural bonds linking Great Britain, Western Europe, and North America. It would offer in the economic arena a larger framework within which to work toward resolving present conflict between the Inner Six and the Outer Seven.

It would be dedicated to the ultimate achievement of free competition and free trade throughout its area. It would work toward greater unity of armed forces—a unity that, as it grew, America could recognize by placing nuclear weapons under the command of NATO.

It would share among the prosperous Western nations the burden now falling largely upon America to bring economic assistance and technical training to underdeveloped areas—and it would inspire this essential help to be given as a joint undertaking.

It would work toward a single Western plan for enforcible programs of disarmament to be negotiated with the Soviet Union—rather than allow the Soviets to confront and exploit a variety of divergent Western programs as they do today.

Finally, it would be a confederation so strong and so confident as to be ever ready to enlarge its numbers to include any of the Soviet-controlled satellites wanting to break away from the Soviet system and to join a union of free nations clearly capable of defending themselves.

(2) A Western Hemisphere Confederation. What would this confederation do? It would give hope and help to the peoples of Latin America who today are the world's most rapidly growing population. It would make possible a kind of Marshall plan for Latin America that would work toward long-range industrial development and a hemisphere free-trade area, allowing a free flow of men and goods and money from Point Barrow to Tierra del Fuego. In my opinion, only action of this scope can check antidemocratic forces, spurred on by Communist influences from abroad, as are so evident in Cuba today.

It would join efforts everywhere to make the land serve the people, by supporting land reform wherever necessary and by fostering so great a joint project as an East Andes Development Authority. Such an authority could open up the fertile soils and abundant power along this great frontier reaching from Caribbean shores 3,000 miles southward through the heart of the continent.

It would inspire progressive social action on a broad front. It would quicken the growth of universities. It would encourage scientific research and development. And it would tackle such urgent social problems as the need to finance, through a hemispheric credit mechanism akin to FHA, a massive program of low-cost housing in the fast-growing metropolitan centers of the hemisphere.

(3) An African Confederation. What would this conference actually do? To begin with, it would respect and echo the spirit of African unity already voiced by African leaders who are themselves impatient with old forms of nationalism that have no real roots in Africa.

With the cooperation of the North Atlantic Confederation, it would then begin with the most urgent task before the newly free African peoples, that of providing skills and training to millions just learning to govern themselves and to direct their own economies.

It would establish specific institutes of training in these subjects, from civil administration and auditing to telephone communication and roadbuilding. These institutes could largely be financed by the combined resources from public and private sources.

These, then, are some concrete examples of work to be done. The challenges are no less great in the Middle East and the Far East. Here, too, the rewards of working confederations can be enormous—for the cause of freedom. Ultimately, effective confederation can mean the proving that freedom can work—and that the needs and aspirations of free peoples everywhere can be met by bold and imaginative leadership of the free world.

This is a cause to challenge the greatness of America—to stir its people—to inspire its leaders.

This is a time in history when the skeptics and the cynics must not be allowed to make us shy from great endeavor, boldly conceived and bravely executed. Nor can we be turned aside by oversimplified warnings in terms of costs and expenses—warnings that, while seeming to be realistic, take little account of the facts.

We must remember the basic truth that only as the free nations of the world share in growth and strength can they share cost. Only as world productivity expands can the free peoples find a more sound and just source of help than the income of the individual American taxpayer. Only as the American economy grows in size and strength can it fulfill the opportunities of freedom and meet the challenge of communism. And this growth of ours can come only in a world whose productivity is speeding and whose economy is expanding.

The practical and the ideal are thus not at odds with one another. They are one and the same. And they must join to do what is more than desirable—they must do what is utterly and vitally necessary for the survival of freedom. We can hope to do this only with political structures in the world that can give both form and force to the principles of human dignity and individual worth.

What must be proven is that free citizens and free nations have the will and the wisdom to be as creative in this 20th century as our own American Founding Fathers were in the 18th century. Then freedom on this continent was at stake. Today it is freedom throughout the world. And the size of our designs and our purposes must match the size of the perils that challenge us.

I am confident that we can—as we must—build on this scale of greatness. I deeply believe in particular that the youth of America are ready and eager for the great adventure that can lie ahead. Let us begin this adventure by building those political structures throughout the world which will enable free peoples to live in peace and know justice. Let us begin it with the zeal and courage of our forefathers.

We have nothing to lose but our fears. We have the future of freedom to win.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, a year ago the Congress adopted a resolution calling upon the President to proclaim "Captive Nations Weeks." This was done and the proclamation has been renewed this year. In the week of July 17, 1960, we will again observe Captive Nations Week.

The Soviet Union, whose fondness for branding other nations as imperialists represents the depths of hypocrisy and deceit, has forcibly thrust its evil Communist doctrine upon more than 20 nations throughout the world. It has subjugated these nations by force and subversion and created a Communist empire of nations which are, in truth, captives. We think of the fate of Hungary, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, the Baltic States, Bulgaria, and many more.

If these captive nations could choose, they would choose independence and

freedom rather than Communist subjugation. For no nation has ever freely chosen communism. Who would prefer bondage to freedom? This evil system has gained power only by violence, subversion, deceit, and force.

We in the United States are well aware of the sentiments of these captive peoples. We understand and support their aspirations for liberty and independence. We know that so long as any nation is oppressed and subjugated, no nations can be entirely free.

The captive nations resolution last year caused great consternation in the Soviet Union for it struck an area which the Communists anxiously desire to keep submerged. They know the captive nations represent a major weakness in the Communist system. Instead of the great monolithic system which the Communists pretend exists, the Communist empire is held together by chains.

We have faith that the desire for freedom and independence will not remain suppressed indefinitely by brute force. The United States supports the cause of freedom everywhere and the right of self-determination for all peoples. We look forward with hope to the day when these noble principles will again prevail in the captive nations of the world.

Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, by resolution of this Congress, and by proclamation of the President, July 17–23 is Captive Nations Week.

This solemn occasion is a truly historic one. The value and impact of the resolution was clearly demonstrated last July, when, as we recall, its passage evoked an explosive and vituperative reaction from Nikita Khrushchev.

The forthcoming observance will poignantly portray to the Nation as well as to the world, the plight of the nations who live in Soviet captivity. These nations, let us recall, do not just exist outside of the Soviet Union, where the heavy hand of Russia systematically exploits the resources and relentlessly treads upon the liberties of the valiant peoples of central Europe. The U.S.S.R. itself is built upon the captivity of 100 million non-Russian people who endure, in secret rebellion, the excesses of the Soviet Empire.

Let us remember that, despite the tactics of the police state, and despite merciless attempts at russification, these peoples also struggle to retain the vestiges of their national identity. Brute force, which has achieved a surface unity, has at the same time only strengthened the will of the people for self-determination and freedom.

The depth of the desire for liberty was tragically demonstrated by the revolts in Poland and the bloodbath of Hungary. The people of the captive nations have never accepted the Soviet tyranny, nor have they forgotten the priceless freedom that once, however briefly, was theirs.

I anticipate that the week of July 17 will bring demonstrations, rallies, and parades throughout the Nation. By these observances Americans will give heart and courage to the peoples in captivity and will remind the world, as well as their oppressors, that we have forgotten their suffering no more than they have forgotten their precious dream of freedom.

When President Eisenhower issued the captive nations proclamation, he stated that such observances shall take place each year "until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." Let us hope and pray that, with God's help, we shall soon see the day when the need for a Captive Nations Week exists no more.

Our Region Needs Debate on Water Problems, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article from the Denver Post of June 26, 1960, entitled "Our Region Needs Debate on Water Problems, Too."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR REGION NEEDS DEBATE ON WATER PROBLEMS, TOO

The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources has not completely sifted the millions of words of expert and amateur testimony it has taken this past year.

But one fact has already become apparent, as the adjoining article indicates.

What the committee calls the "Southwest" water region of the country, which includes Colorado and the vast area served by the Colorado River, is on its way to becoming the "water crisis" area of the Nation in the next 40 years.

Here are the challenging figures:

Today this nine-State region (Arizona, California, Colorado, Kansas, Nevada, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Texas, and Utah) has a population of roughly 30 million. Its water use, including farm irrigation, averages out to about 2,475 gallons per person per day.

This current level of water use is supplied primarily from surface runoff water in our rivers and streams. The region has less of such runoff than any other in the country.

For the area as a whole this supply can be estimated at anywhere from 196 down to 120 million acre-feet per year, depending on whether you look at the best years or the poorest. The average has been as low as 120 million acre-feet in drought periods.

Now, taking the Bureau of the Census high-range population projections for the same region, we can expect about 89 million people by the year 2000. California and southern Arizona are expected to be one of the great urban areas of the Nation.

This is substantially more than our "best years" average supply, and almsot twice the average for the driest 10-year period in the region's history.

Suppose we allow a 1,600-gallon-a-day average use figure in the great Southwest of 40 years from now (and that's only two-thirds of present per capita use).

Even so, the Senate has been told, the region will have to almost double its water storage capacity at very high costs and engage intensively in every known and hoped-for method of water conservation and development to achieve that lower per capita use supply. Some of the possibilities are listed in the adjoining article.

These water figures must force the leaders of our area to ask themselves hard questions, many of them going against the grain of regional tradition and sentiment.

For example, is the day already here when we can no longer afford the use of an acre-foot of water for farm irrigation because growing cities and industries need it more, and will yield more over-all economic growth to the region?

Can we ever again afford to use a good reservoir site for a one-purpose development, say power alone, or city water supply alone?

Can western water law, based on the first-come, first-served principle of ownership, continue to be the framework for our water development when, as a region, we can see shortages that will affect great communities so clearly ahead?

Can any force except the Federal Government coordinate and push the comprehensive and extremely expensive programs of development that the experts tell us will be not just desirable but essential?

These are only a few of the tough questions beginning to emerge at meetings of regional water experts.

But they must become interesting questions to the layman, too, for 40 years is not a long time. It's probably within your lifetime and certainly within that of your children.

If we now need a great national debate on foreign policy and purpose, as our best thinkers are urging, clearly, too, within our region we must embark on serious and organized public discussion of resources problems, especially regarding water.

Otherwise our regional contribution to the great national purpose, whatever it may turn out to be, is in danger of becoming increasingly ineffective.

Hon. Tom Martin, of Iowa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS C. HENNINGS, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. HENNINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by me on the retirement from the Senate of the Honorable THOS. E. MARTIN, of Iowa.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HENNINGS ON THE RETIREMENT OF HON. TOM MARTIN, OF IOWA

I wish to join with my colleagues in the Senate and House of Representatives in expressing regret that my friend, TOM MARTIN,

is retiring from the Senate this year. Specializing in matters dealing with taxation, agriculture, and national defense, he has made many steady, significant, and lasting contributions in these areas.

He is a man of courage, integrity, and understanding. A good and solid citizen with human sympathy, he has served exceedingly well the people of America and his constituents in Iowa. The people of Iowa whom he has represented for 22 years, as well as his fellow Members of Congress, will miss his honorable and constructive service.

TOM MARTIN has left an indelible imprint on the destiny of the Nation. Modest, firm, and skillful, he has been faithful in his devotion to Congress. He typifies the public servant who comes to Congress and diligently attends to business without seeking publicity or headlines. He has worked untiringly to protect the liberties of our Nation.

As he retires to private life, he carries with him the continuing admiration and affection of his colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I fully understand and respect his desire to return to private life after so many years of dedicated public service. He has earned the best of everything. I wish for him and for his loved ones many more years of good health, great happiness and success.

Open Land for Metropolitan Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the preliminary results of the 1960 national census indicate that about 80 percent of our Nation's population growth is concentrated in metropolitan areas. And, already, nearly two-thirds of our people reside in these huge and spreading urban-suburban complexes.

Moreover, all the evidence points to an increased trend in this direction—bringing all of us inevitably closer to the day when we shall be overwhelmed by the multitude of unsolved problems arising from metropolitan living, unless immediate and well-coordinated action is taken.

Mass transportation, slum clearance, urban renewal, highways, water resources, and air pollution—these are among the better known challenges facing the governing bodies at local, county, State, and Federal levels with jurisdiction over metropolitan areas.

There is another problem, however—directly related to all the others—which is rapidly reaching the critical stage. This is the need to preserve and develop what remains of the open land in metropolitan regions, in order that present and future needs for the economic, recreational and social resources of open space may be met.

The Regional Plan Association, a private and nonprofit group which has worked effectively to alert the New York-New Jersey-Connecticut metropolitan area to the need for cooperative planning and action in many of these fields, recently published a report on the need to save our open land.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a news story from the New York Times which describes the association's report and recommendations together with an editorial from the Newark Evening News which clearly and forcefully points up the issues at stake.

The article and editorial follow:

[From the New York Times, June 30, 1960]

REGION GETS PLEA FOR UNUSED LAND—PLAN GROUP BIDS COUNTIES SAVE 220 SQUARE MILES

(By John C. Devlin)

Conservationists, alarmed by the increasing roar of bulldozers, pleaded yesterday for a campaign to set aside 220 square miles of open land in the New York metropolitan area for the good of this generation and future ones.

A report by the Regional Plan Association supported by leading conservation groups, said "unbridled metropolitan expansion" was the crux of the problem.

The report, which included 140 photographs of existing natural assets, said that proper planning and land acquisition was needed not only for the economic and emotional health of the area, but also as an aid to flood control and the protection of water resources necessary to meet the demands of an exploding population.

The specific locations of the tracts recommended for acquisition were not identified in order to prevent speculators from buying them.

However, included are 30 tracts of less than 100 acres and three with more than 5,000 acres. Most of them—104—fall in the 100-to-299-acre category. It was recommended that 20,000 more acres outside the New York region also be acquired.

The report—the third or fourth to be made by the association—is only a survey. Recommendation to municipalities, counties, the three States affected and the Federal Government, will be contained in a final report to be published later.

The survey, entitled "Nature in the Metropolis," was prepared by Dr. William A. Niering, an ecologist and associate professor of botany at Connecticut College, New London.

It was released by Griffith B. Harris, First Selectman of Greenwich, Conn., and Otto L. Nelson, vice president of the Regional Plan Association, and cochairman of its park, recreation, and open space project, which is sponsoring the series.

The association is nonprofit. Thirty years has provided leadership in the coordination of the development of the region and in the encouragement of county and municipal planning. It works in cooperation with the metropolitan regional council, an informal voluntary forum of the chief executives of the region's counties, cities, and towns.

POPULATION CREATES PROBLEM

Mr. Harris said the essence of the problem was that the 7,000 square miles in the region was only 25 percent developed today but that it faced "unprecedented" developments as the population rose. The tri-State metropolitan region, while now having a population of 16 million people, is expected to encompass 8 million more persons within the next 25 years.

This region extends roughly 50 miles from New York City and embraces 22 counties, principally in North Jersey and in the lower Hudson Valley area. It also includes Fairfield County in southwestern Connecticut.

Dr. Niering reported that "nature is more varied in the New York region than in any other metropolitan area of the country." He described it as "a natural bounty" with "fast dwindling resources."

But, he added, "Participation in such natural area activities as hiking, bird-watching, hunting, fishing, camping, and boating is outstripping population gains by far.

"This fact is borne out by the steady increases in attendance records, equipment sales, licenses issued, and by mere observation. There is a great trek to the woods, waters and wetlands because nature provides the best setting for relief from urban living."

Furthermore, he said, "these areas provide an invaluable teaching facility which is vitally needed by the region's schools, colleges, and universities."

"As outdoor laboratories," he said, "they add a true element of life and dynamism to the science curriculum and make studies really meaningful."

As an example of an economic asset, Dr. Niering cited the commercial fishing industry. More than 600 million pounds of fish and shellfish worth in excess of $20 million have been taken from the coastal waters of New York and New Jersey, he said.

"It is now well established biologically that these resources are dependent upon and are intricately associated with tidal marshes as well as the estuaries and surrounding bays," he said.

Dr. Niering's survey backs up a recent proposal of Governor Rockefeller to spend $75 million on parks and recreation. Next November the voters will have an opportunity to vote on a bond issue needed to finance this program.

"Green areas for parks and recreation purposes in our State are disappearing so rapidly that it is frightening," the Governor said.

The report also comes in the wake of recent census figures that indicate showing a growing exodus of urban people to the suburbs.

Conservation, Dr. Niering said, "is not often associated with the built-up portions of our Nation."

"Yet in this era of unbridled metropolitan expansion it has become a critical urban problem," he declared. "Conservation, after all, is for people, and in the tri-State metropolitan region—the largest concentration of people in the United States—the need to conserve open land has become a matter of urgency," he said.

The 64-page report is divided into these sections:

A description of the region's natural features, with photographs and text devoted to the shoreline, the Atlantic Ocean, beaches, and dunes, salt marshes, bays and ponds, and uplands with their woodlands, farmlands, and wetlands.

A report on the need for conservation, with sections on recreation, wildlife study, the protection of commercial fishing resources, the need to combat floods, water shortages, and air pollution.

A study of conservation practices and areas that have already been established in the region by public and private interests.

A report on the amount of land needed for conservation.

Photographs, many of them dramatic, show typical flora and fauna of the region.

Copies are available at the Regional Plan Association offices at 230 West 41st Street. The price is $3.

[From the Newark (N.J.) Evening News, July 1, 1960]

OPEN LAND

The Regional Plan Association is addressing itself to one of the great public needs of our time—the preservation of open space. All of us hope to leave something to our children and grandchildren and work hard to do so. But at the same time we are making little effort to conserve their natural heritage. If we go on letting factories, real estate developments, highways, and airports cover every inch of the metropolitan area, our descendants are going to suffer a deprivation for which they will not forgive us.

In the metropolitan area embacing New Jersey, New York, and Connecticut much

natural beauty in beaches and dunes, marshes, woodlands, and farmlands remains. But, as a Regional Plan Association report shows, they are fast being obliterated. The report urges immediate action to save 220 square miles of undeveloped land so the teeming populations of the future will have breathing space, places for recreation and contemplation, refuges from noise, polluted air and an excess of neighbors.

A half century ago municipalities and counties then experiencing rapid growth showed foresight largely lacking in today's new population centers. The magnificent Essex County park system is an example.

The regional plan report shows that Morris County leads the metropolitan area in the amount of priceless and irreplaceable land left for conservation. Although Morris recently set up a county park commission, it has made only limited progress. The threat of a jetport in the Great Swamp area has appalled the county, but Morris has not invoked the remedy of acquiring the swamp as a county park.

Preservation of open space for public use involves a costly investment, especially when land acquisition is delayed until values begin to soar. But it is an investment which will return rich dividends in public health and happiness.

Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations

SPEECH
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, June 30, 1960

The House had under consideration the conference report on the bill (H.R. 11389) making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FOUNTAIN], in expressing regrets that the conferees have recommended a reduction from $175,000 to $115,000 in the administration request for the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

It is especially disturbing because I know of no item in the entire budget where the return per dollar in terms of research and recommendations in major areas of Federal-State-local relations is so high. As a nonpaid member of the Commission, I can testify to the fact that its budget was prepared on the most conservative possible basis. If the reduction is permitted to go into effect, the work of the Commission will be seriously handicapped.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, neither the House Appropriations Committee nor the whole House has had an opportunity to consider this budget item. For this reason, I hope the committee will agree to consider a supplemental request for restoration of the $60,000.

The House has found, year after year, plenty of cases of budgetary extravagance. I cannot imagine, however, any item less extravagant than this one. This Commission is now in a position, I believe, to make a major contribution to improved intergovernmental procedures. The cost to taxpayers is remarkably small.

Area Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, on May 4 of this year the House of Representatives once again passed an Area Redevelopment Act. Two days later the Senate passed the same bill and sent it to the White House for Presidential signature. Seven days after that the efforts of Congress to assist the depressed areas of this country were rewarded with a Presidential veto of this important legislation. It is perhaps significant that this veto came on Friday the 13th because it was certainly bad news for the unemployed persons throughout the country and for those many areas where unemployment and underemployment have become a chronic tragedy. Nor was this the first time that such a bill had been vetoed. You will recall that an area redevolpment bill was passed by Congress in 1958 only to be thwarted by Presidential veto. I wonder if you also recall this 1958 veto came at a time when the unemployment in Detroit had reached 18 percent of the work force. Think of it—18 percent. When you consider that unemployment at the end of April of this year was 8.1 percent of the labor force, you must remember that depressed area legislation was more than twice as significant when it was first vetoed.

To me, one of the most significant aspects of the passage of the Area Redevelopment Act of this year is that Congress has spoken once again and has once again made clear its feeling and intent on this question. The passage this year represents favorable action on this type of legislation in three consecutive sessions of Congress. A bill was passed in 1958, the Senate passed another bill last year, the House passed this Senate bill with some changes this year, and the Senate agreed to the changes and passed the House version within 2 days. The congressional action of this year has but reechoed the previous sentiments of Congress on this matter for all the Nation to hear. Considering that Congress expresses the will of the people of these United States, I ask you how, in good conscience, can the leaders of this Nation ignore or reject this will when it has been so clearly expressed and so consistently repeated?

One of the more frequent phrases used in describing the workings of the Congress is the phrase: "the legislative process." This phrase, however, has a cold and impersonal sound to it and makes the operations of the Congress sound something like the mechanical motions of automatic machinery. This, of course, is not how Congress works. A piece of legislation can be a personal thing with the Congressman who introduces it. This is the case with respect to area redevelopment legislation as far as I am concerned. As much as any bill that I have sponsored in my 24 years in Congress, the area redevelopment bills that I have sponsored in the past several Congresses are a personal thing with me. I was born in Detroit. I have lived here all my life. This is my city, just as it is your city. I have seen it grow. I know its people. I know its problems. And when it is afflicted with problems that only Congress can do something about, it is then that I feel the greatest pride in being the elected representative of the people of my district. This is the case with the conditions of chronic unemployment and underemployment that have come to be termed "depressed areas." Detroit is one of these areas and this is a problem that only Congress can solve. This is the reason that I have introduced and reintroduced area redevelopment bills. This is the reason I have testified again and again before various committees of the Congress and spoken on the floor of the House of Representatives in support of this legislation. I recall the last time I spoke in Congress on this subject. It was on May 4, this year—the same day that the House passed the Area Redevelopment Act. I said at that time that it is always gratifying to have one's efforts in behalf of needed legislation culminate in successful passage. But I said also that this is a type of gratification that goes far beyond personal satisfaction. Allow me, if you will, to repeat myself by quoting a few of my own sentences on that occasion because they will best explain the basic point I wish to make today:

It reaches to the fundamental realization that in passing this bill we have extended the hand of assistance to millions of our fellow citizens so direly in need of help. This is the American way. We have always helped the fellow who is down. And at a time when we are doing so much to help such people in all parts of the world, there is certainly no reason why we should not help our own fellow citizens in this, their time of great need. This is the gratification of which I speak: the gratification that the American way has prevailed; that we have refused to turn our backs on the plight of our own countrymen; that we have decided to continue our great tradition of helping the down guy, instead of putting dollars above human values.

Area redevelopment legislation, as previously conceived and passed, is good legislation that answers a crying need in a sensible and realistic fashion. The Congress, in its time-tested wisdom, has recognized this fact. This recognition will take the form of action once again in the next Congress. I shall continue, in fact, I shall increase, my personal efforts in behalf of my own area redevelopment bill or any other area redevelopment bill that answers the problem in a direct and concrete manner. This is my determination and I think I can safely say that it is the determination of the Congress. The will of the people, as expressed through the Congress, cannot be ignored or discounted. We cannot, and we shall not, sacrifice the needs of millions of our fellow citizens on the altar of the balanced budget.

Good Homes for All Americans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. CARROLL
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech made by Lee F. Johnson before the Denver Monday Forum.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY LEE F. JOHNSON BEFORE THE DENVER MONDAY FORUM, DENVER, COLO., JUNE 13, 1960

It is a pleasure and privilege to meet with the Denver Monday Forum and discuss "Good Homes for All Americans." I am talking about all Americans, regardless of income, race, creed, or color. I had hoped that this group would someday devote a few minutes to this subject, and that I might be permitted my 2-cents worth. I have been back in Denver for only 2 years, endeavoring to help administer the activities of the Denver Housing Authority, which owns and operates more than 3,200 homes, in which more than 13,000 of our fellow citizens live, of whom 8,500 are children. We have 600 apartments devoted to our senior citizens. The only difference between the people living with us, and the rest of the community is that our residents have more often than not been dogged by hard luck, have previously lived under intolerable housing conditions, and continue to have incomes that are so low that it is impossible for them to achieve decent shelter provided through normal channels of private enterprise. I will return to this subject a little later on.

It was just 29 years ago this month that I joined the staff of the greatest American I have ever known, the late Senator Edward P. Costigan. Throughout his term in the Senate it was my privilege to serve as his secretary, the job that is now dignified by the title "Administrative Assistant." The depression was on in full force. The Federal Government was paralyzed. I can never forget the shock of driving up Pennsylvania Avenue to the Senate Office Building for the first time, and passing a breadline of homeless men and some women, winding its way to a soup kitchen at the foot of Capitol Hill. It was six blocks long. I passed that line twice each day, until the wheels of Government started turning once again from the very hour that Franklin Roosevelt issued his clarion call that all we have to fear is fear itself.

Those were crucial days when democracy was sorely tried. It was Costigan of Colorado who introduced the first relief measure with Bob LaFollette of Wisconsin, while President Hoover was practically barricaded in the White House. It was then that the bonus army marched on Washington, and I was one of those who witnessed the brave army of the Potomac drive these desperate men and women from Washington at bayonet point, after burning and bombing their makeshift quarters on Pennsylvania Avenue and on Anacostia Flats. Gen. Douglas MacArthur led the attack from his white charger. I know, I was there, and spent weeks trying to bring families together, families from Colorado, who had been separated by MacArthur's charge. One of the abandoned babies found in the smoking ruins of Pennsylvania Avenue was identified as belonging to a Colorado family. Its mother was driven north, its father south. They were finally united through the magnificent efforts of private relief agencies.

In 1933 the American Government struck back. Basic relief legislation was passed, banking laws were revised, work programs instituted, agricultural relief became a reality, the Social Security Act was passed, the Security and Exchange Commission was created, the concept of a decent home for every American family was first conceived, the home loan bank was created, the TVA became a reality, and a base was built under the economy of the United States that is just as firm today as it was during those sectic hours and years when it was put together. On every front that I have mentioned, Costigan of Colorado was one of the leaders. His was the great mind to whom everyone turned, including the President of the United States. The Costigan Sugar Act, creating parity payments for the first time, which saved the sugar beet growers and processors alike, was the forerunner of other basic agricultural reforms. For his pains he was vilified by part of the Colorado press, and characterized as Senor Costigan, agent of Cuba. He was the author of the first antilynching bill which was the forerunner of later civil rights legislation, and was characterized by a local cartoon as Senor Costigan, about to be lynched should he return to Colorado for having betrayed local sugar interests. Many of you will remember these attacks. Never a well man, the pressures from Colorado killed our greatest Senator. I was with him when he collapsed. When it was known that he could never recover, Mabel Costigan, the Senator's equal partner through triumphs and adversity asked me to advise the press months before his term expired, that he would not be a candidate for reelection.

I would be the last person to say that grave mistakes were not made during those years. Basic acts have had to be amended time and again to update them. But they were days of action, achievement, dynamic leadership, and a display of guts that won the admiration of the entire world. America came of age in the 1930's, and now in 1960 we are faced with a series of problems, critical to the core on the international front, and equally critical on the domestic front. I would not turn the clock back for one instant except to offer one prayer from one small individual for a return to the kind of dynamic leadership, vision, courage, and dedication that saved our country in the thirties, and must be brought to bear to save the world and humanity in the 1960's. We in Colorado have a great heritage for national and international leadership. I am confident that we will measure up in the years ahead.

With that preface, which has been very much on my heart, let's return to the subject of housing and its many component parts. This week in Washington the full Committees on Banking and Currency in both the House and the Senate will report out omnibus housing bills. Practically all of the provisions in both the proposed House and Senate bills have been vigorously opposed by the administration as being inflationary. Why do Senators SPARKMAN, CLARK, DOUGLAS, CARROLL, HUMPHREY, and many others including JAVITS, of New York, and COOPER, of Kentucky, on the Republican side, and Representative ALBERT RAINS and a majority of his colleagues on the House Banking Committee as well as the leadership of both Houses insist on the importance of housing, urban renewal, and related subjects?

All of us recognize that on the international front we are in the midst of the most awesome crisis of all time. Man has learned to control the elements before he has learned to control himself. Our very substance is being consumed in the development of weapons capable of destroying the human race, and we live in fear that some slaphappy idiot may press the button. In addition, lethargy, disinterest, and intellectual laziness are permitting a cancerous disease of bad housing and expanding slum environments to eat at the vitals of our body politic that can be just as fatal some day, as an atomic or hydrogen bomb.

The unwillingness of most of our fellow Americans to face up to the basic social demands of our exploding population is frightening. Today, more than 60 percent of the American people live in approximately 170 urban centers, of which Denver is one. The U.S. Census Bureau has recently raised its forecasts for the future population of the United States. By 1980, the population is expected to be 260 to 270 million, an increase of 85 to 100 million. Since census forecasts have generally been below the actual growth, we may conclude that our population will grow by 100 million within the next 20 to 25 years. We may expect at least 90 percent of this gigantic population increase to land in our expanding urban centers. I need not tell you what is happening in Denver. In addition, and much to the shame of this democracy there are today more than 9 million occupied substandard homes in the cities where our friends have chosen to congregate. That number is constantly increasing, in spite of all of our efforts for urban renewal, conservation, and rehabilitation. Denver has more than its share and is doing less than most of our great cities to correct the situation.

Good housing for all Americans is not the cure for all of our domestic social ills, disease, crime, juvenile delinquency, and countless other maladjustments. It does, however, mark an excellent point from which to start. Working as I am today with people who have few of this world's goods, I realize that every facility for community service must be brought to bear, to help in the rehabilitation of families that have been oppressed by slum living for so long that they have become slum minded. Such families, however, are the exception, not the rule. And let us remember that slum-minded people are not limited to the poorer areas of our cities. We can find them in every part of our community. For those, however, forced by financial circumstances to live in wornout shelter, huddled together under physical conditions that defy description, the will to fight their way out is finally destroyed.

The cancer of slums is growing in almost every American city, although the disease was diagnosed in the midthirties as one requiring national action. If you think that is not true in Denver, just visit the 26-Club and look in any direction, particularly to the north and east. You can see creeping blight in all directions, even if you can't smell it. No city and no State has the financial resources to cope with it. We have written a series of national laws into the statute books such as the U.S. Housing Act of 1937, as amended in 1949 and 1954, calling for slum clearance, low-rent housing and urban renewal. Forty-six States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have adopted enabling legislation. We have the machinery with which to do the greatest reclamation project in history, the reclamation of our cities and towns, but our performance leaves something to be desired.

Some few American cities are doing a magnificent job in measuring up to their responsibilities to the full extent of their financial ability, in their efforts to destroy blight and to build sound communities for decent living. In every instance where progress is being made, the captains of industry, not their lieutenants, top officials of labor, and fighting city governments have joined forces with the support of an informed public opinion, because they have made sure that the public was informed, to rebuild their cities, to destroy slums, and to produce good homes for all of their citizens. Pittsburgh is a prime example, where a fighting mayor,

Dave Lawrence (now Governor), Richard Mellon, the president of United States Steel, the president of Alcoa, the president of Pittsburgh Plate Glass, the president of the Steel Workers, Dave MacDonald, and others of equal stature sat down together and made plans and invested the seed capital to save their city. The same is true in New Haven, Norfolk, St. Louis, and a dozen more cities. Top management, top labor, top citizen support have been mobilized in the terms of fighting crusades. Scores of small communities are doing a fine job, but put them all together they represent but a drop in the bucket, if our Nation is not to become a maze of broken-down core cities, surrounded by ill-planned suburban chaos.

In 1954, under the direction of Dr. William L. C. Wheaton, director of urban studies at the University of Pennsylvania, the National Housing Conference conducted a study of the Nation's housing needs. His conclusions have never been challenged by a competent authority. The 1960 census will doubtless prove that they are more true and more tragic today than 6 years ago. He demonstrated a need for 2 million new homes a year for at least 20 years, if we are to keep abreast of population growth, and provide decent shelter for families now living under substandard housing conditions, and care for those people displaced through public action such as urban renewal, highway construction, and code enforcement.

This need is broken down into 1,300,000 new homes annually, built through FHA and conventional financing; 300,000 new homes for the forgotten families of moderate income provided again through private enterprise but with special financing assistance with low interest rates and long periods of amortization, which would initially necessitate direct Federal loans; 200,000 new farm and rural nonfarm homes, and 200,000 low-rent public housing units. The latter for a period of at least 10 years. In addition, Dr. Wheaton concluded that we must rehabilitate at least 400,000 existing homes a year. Even if all of that were accomplished, there will still be some 5 million families in 1975 living in shelter that was substandard in 1950.

What is more important in our national values than wiping slum blight from our national life and replacing it with good housing in sound neighborhoods for all Americans? What is more important to our economic life than building a strong home construction industry? Few people pause to realize that with its countless ramifications, a major slump in homebuilding could bring on a major economic recession. Think of the related industries for which homebuilding is their most important customer: steel, aluminum, lumber, copper, plastics, and countless others. Where would General Motors, General Electric, or United States Steel be without their vast homebuilding market. We need far greater programs than are in existence today to give a firm foundation for the production of homes, and one small, but vitally important part of that economic and social picture is low-rent public housing.

These are but some of the reasons that some of our great congressional leaders will not back away from their fight for better housing. When Senators Wagner, Ellender, and Taft led the fight for passage of the Housing Act of 1949, a fight that they began in 1945, they had written into the law a declaration of national policy stating in effect that it is the responsibility of the Federal Government to help insure a decent home in a decent living environment for every American family. While major leadership has always come from the Democratic side of the aisle, the Housing Act of 1949 would never have been adopted had it not been for Bob Taft's fighting support. While Vice President NIXON helped lead the attack on that act, JACK KENNEDY made his first major speech in Congress in behalf of housing. As Governor of New York, Nelson Rockefeller has expanded and improved the great housing program of that State, which was begun under former Governor and later Senator Herbert Lehman.

The fight for better housing, for the rebuilding of our cities through urban renewal, conservation, and rehabilitation will be carried on until the job is done, and it will not be done until we bring our housing plant up to standard, and keep it there. All of us agree that our cities should be rebuilt, and that urban renewal is a great thing. What many fail to realize is that we are dealing with a gigantic problem of human beings. When we tear out an area we're displacing human beings. Before we come in with the bulldozer we have to make certain that families living in the road to progress are able to secure decent, safe, and sanitary homes. About half of them constitute a market for low-rent public housing. If we have no low-rent housing units available to them, I say to you, categorically, that urban renewal will fall flat on its face.

Having said that I would like to spend a few moments describing the program of the Denver Housing Authority. Basically, I suppose, that is my reason for being here, and my other comments have been strictly gratuitous. I opened my remarks by giving you some idea of the size of our low-rent housing program in Denver.

Just what is public housing? It was created under the U.S. Housing Act of 1937. Basically, the program has changed little since its inception. In order for a community to participate, State enabling legislation is required. The Colorado law was passed in 1938. A local housing authority is created as a separate public corporation through action by the governing body of the city or county under the provisions of State and National law. Under the Colorado law a local housing authority composed of five commissioners is appointed by the mayor for terms of 5 years with the term of one member expiring each year. Commissioners serve without pay. They name the executive director, and he and the staff are responsible to them. Our present commissioners are J. J. "Lou" Carey, chairman; Tom McCormick, vice chairman; Joe Cohen, Willard Karcher, and Msgr. John R. Mulroy, who is the only remaining member of the original commission.

Low-rent housing is financed initially by loans from the Federal Government to the local housing authority, after it has obtained a cooperation agreement approving a specific number of units, in which the city agrees to provide normal services and the local authority agrees to pay 10 percent of shelter rent in lieu of taxes. Federal loans are used for preliminary planning. Just as soon as an authority reaches the construction stage, it sells short-term notes through private channels, repays the Federal Government's preliminary loan, and through the sale of its notes provides funds for construction purposes. Borrowings of the local housing authority are tax exempt, just as municipal bonds are tax exempt, and favorable interest rates are obtained. Permanent financing is not reached until after the initial occupancy period when the authority sells its bonds on the open market. If the bond market is excessive, the projects are held in temporary financing.

This kind of financing is made possible by a guarantee from the Federal Government of an annual contribution equal to the interest and equity payments on the capital cost of the project. Bonds are sold with a 40-year maturity. The local housing authority must pay all operating expenses from operating income, including a payment to the city of payments in lieu of taxes. Any excess income is returned to the Federal Government to reduce the annual contribution payment. In 1959, for example, the Denver Authority paid the city $108,000 in lieu of taxes, and returned $129,178 to the Federal Government after increasing our operating reserves by $83,312. Our total operating receipts from rents amounted to $1,500,000 plus. When persons charge that tenants in low-rent housing pay none of their way, and that we the taxpayers pay our neighbors' rents, they are either misinformed, or are willfully misleading. To be sure, you and I contribute something through our Federal income tax to the maintenance of low-rent housing. The average taxpayer kicks in about 50 cents a year on the present program, the cost of a shot of cheap bar whiskey. And that goes not only for housing in Denver, but for families living in programs in more than 1,000 other communities. We would pay just as much, if we had no program at all in Denver.

Our program is typical of most cities. All of our residents came to us from substandard shelter, from dangerously overcrowded conditions, or were without shelter. The average family has three or more children and exists on an earned income of $2,300. We have many with from 8 to 13 children. Under the Colorado law we charge a rent of 20 percent of net family income, which includes all utilities. Maximum incomes for initial and continued occupancy are based on family size. For the smallest family they are $2,800 at admission and $3,400 for continued occupancy. For the larger families (five or more persons) income at admission cannot exceed $3,600 and $4,350 for continued occupancy. Thirty percent of our families are on some form of public assistance, and pay a flat rent based on the apartment size. Local contributions to public housing are in the form of tax exemption and services. However, our payment in lieu of taxes return to the city approximately five times what the slum areas returned prior to our developments. Were we to be taxed on the $29-million value of our projects, we would be out of business. The cost of fire, police and health services have been substantially reduced by the creation of decent neighborhoods, a statement that I am sure will be verified by the city departments involved, and by the courts. However, the city's contribution is very real in making the low-rent housing program possible, although it represents no out-of-pocket moneys or appropriated funds.

One word about the families living in our housing projects. I have often heard them described as deadbeats, criminals, prostitutes, and bums. Nothing makes me more furious. Nothing could be further from the truth. Among more than 3,000 families we have problems, but the vast majority are fine people and good neighbors. We have self-governing tenant councils in eight projects. If you want a genuine lift you should attend one of their meetings. You would be thrilled by the countless activities that are underway for people of all ages. From Cub Scouts to senior citizens' clubs, you will find groups that would do credit to any part of our city. We may not have the best baseball league in the city, but with teams representing every project, we have one of the most enthusiastic. We have families of all races living in nonsegregated communities as good neighbors, establishing a pattern that some of the rest of us could well afford to emulate.

Families living in projects of the Denver Housing Authority take pride in their homes and their environments. Our yards and grounds are tenant maintained. I invite you to visit them. A person's yard and garden is a window to the housekeeping within. Come see for yourselves.

As to an additional low-rent public housing program in Denver, let me say that for more than 3 years we have had a reservation from the Public Housing Administration in Washington of 1,500 additional units. For

the last 2 years the authority has been engaged in a major housekeeping job. There were major areas in the development of policies covering all phases of management from maintenance, personnel, fiscal, tenant relations, and general community participation that needed immediate attention. I believe that we have a vastly improved operation, which has been achieved by a competent, dedicated staff. I also believe that we have reached the point where an additional program is imperative to the progress of Denver. The urban renewal program is just beginning to be flat in Denver. If the Supreme Court declares the State law constitutional, the urban renewal authority is prepared to move ahead rapidly.

A joint meeting has been held between the housing and urban renewal authorities. The size of the housing program to be recommended by Denver rests with the Denver Housing Authority when it requests a cooperation agreement from the city council. Under our existing program we cannot hope, through normal turnover, to care for more families than those dislocated by the Avondale project. I cannot anticipate the commissioners' decision as to the number of units they will request, but I know that they will cooperate with all agencies of the city in seeing that progress is made.

I am confident also that a new program of the Denver Housing Authority will be developed under an entirely new concept. Most people complain about the institutionalized appearance of low-rent public housing. We don't have to build massive projects, of high density, where the impact on all facilities of the larger community is sometimes intolerable. When we bring several hundred families with a thousand or more children into a restricted area of a few square blocks the impact on schools, shopping centers, community facilities, everything is enormous.

In developing a future program you will find every effort being made to rehabilitate existing homes and neighborhoods for low-rent housing use, to build new homes in existing communities on vacant sites, in conjunction with urban renewal and code enforcement programs. They may be free standing homes, duplexes, courts or small garden apartments. In that way we can help rehabilitate entire neighborhoods, and make use of but not overtax existing facilities. It is our hope, and I am confident that it will come to pass, to develop some homes that residents can buy as their economic conditions improve, and such homes can then go back on the tax rolls. As it is now we are oftentimes forced to evict the family for overincome that has worked to improve its economic stature in the community before that family's income is sufficient to permit the purchase of an adequate house on the normal private market.

Such a program has never been tried in a large city on an extensive scale. Few cities adapt themselves so well to this approach as does Denver. We are convinced that we can make it work, and that instead of following the pack, we can bring new leadership and pioneering to the entire concept of low-rent public housing. I know that it can be done with your support and that of other community leaders who are basically interested in the development of a greater Denver. One thing I promise you—there won't be any surprises. Our plans will be presented to council and to community groups so that everyone may have his say. It's the difficult way to go at it, but we think the right way.

By outlining a different concept for a new public housing program in Denver, be very sure I am not condemning what we already have. It is working, and working well. We have no apologies to make, however, we can profit from mistakes, and some dandies have been made. We will doubtless contribute to more in the future. But in this great country we can meet and conquer the enemy from within, with the same vigor that we gird ourselves for defense against real and fancied enemies from without. The slums and the ghettoes in American cities and towns represent our most killing enemies from within. I know that we can continue to count on the fighting leadership of the Democratic Party to destroy the greatest shame of our Nation, the American slum, and to counter with feasible plans that will result eventually in the provision of good homes or decent housing for all Americans.

Harold "Robbie" Robinson Tells Problems of Southwest Redevelopment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by Mr. Harold R. Robinson, chairman of Marine Equipment Dealers & Marina Proprietors whose property is located in the southwest redevelopment area, before the Senate District Committee, concerning S. 3648. The subject bill would empower the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to transfer to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency the waterfront property on Maine Avenue, SW.

The statement follows:

A STATEMENT BY HAROLD R. ROBINSON, CHAIRMAN OF A COMMITTEE OF BOATOWNERS, MARINE EQUIPMENT DEALERS, AND MARINA PROPRIETORS

Gentlemen, our reasons for objecting to the subject bill which empowers the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to transfer to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency the waterfront property on Maine Avenue SW., are as follows:

Objection No. 1: No effort has been made to provide, during reconstruction, other berthing facilities for the boats owned, operated, and berthed or stored in the area described in the subject bill.

Objection No. 2: The giving of this land to the Redevelopment Land Agency without any compensation to the District of Columbia, instead of selling these valuable rights and land to the operators of marinas, repair yards, and dealers in boat sales and marine equipment, would not be profitable to the District of Columbia; and, the money that could be derived from the sale of this land to owners of small businesses could certainly enhance the depleted treasury of the District of Columbia.

Objection No. 3: The closing of marinas, boat supply stores, and repair yards on Maine Avenue would affect the income of the District of Columbia since this would deplete the gross income of businesses that amounts to millions of dollars, and thus this money would probably be expended in the States of Virginia, Maryland, and elsewhere instead of in the District of Columbia. This would entail a loss to the District of Columbia treasury of sales taxes, gasoline tax, personal property tax, and other sundry taxes that would be applicable to the marine business. All this would be a total loss to the District.

The publicity that has been given to the turning over of waterfront property for demolition by the Redevelopment Land Agency and to be used in the future for the building of restaurants, theaters, and a wax museum, has brought on a recession in the sales of boats and boating equipment. Potential buyers are reluctant to invest their money in recreation equipment they may not be able to use because there may be no water facilities available in this area. Lack of berthing and storage space for their boats is going to cause many a boatowner to try to sell, but there'll be no market for boats, new or used, in Washington, D.C.

For many years the Washington Channel has been a joy to Washingtonians, rich and poor alike, who have found healthy recreation and relaxation in boating, and the river has always been a public domain and a source of pleasure for all. The facilities as discussed at an informal meeting with representatives of the Redevelopment Land Agency will be constructed at an estimated cost of $15 million, if completed, and this project would of course have to be financed by some multimillion-dollar foreign concern which would no doubt request a loan from a Government agency for this purpose.

The cost of such a project would necessitate the paying of prohibitive rents by operators of marinas and dealers in boats and marine equipment, and there is no question that, with such a great capital outlay, it would be impossible for a boatowner to rent berth space for less than a minimum of $2 per foot per month, this in comparison to the present 40 to 50 cents per month which allows those in the lower income group to enjoy the water as a source of recreation. The greatest number of boatowners are in this lower- or middle-income group; and, with a rate of $2 per foot per month, a man with a 16-foot rowboat that probably cost him a hundred dollars would have to pay $32 a month to keep his boat at Maine Avenue. It would not be worth it; he couldn't afford it, and he would be deprived of a pleasure he is entitled to as a taxpayer in this city.

The Redevelopment Land Agency have already demonstrated that they are not concerned with the individual boatowner, or the small businessman. They will deal only with big business, and they have a free hand in this. They appear to have no set plan for the redevelopment of the waterfront area for the benefit of small marine businesses, nor for the boatowners in the middle- or low-income groups. Little or no planning has been made for temporary location or relocation of facilities or businesses now in the waterfront area. A good example of their having no firm project in view is the vacant land in the Southwest area that has stood idle for years, some with buildings either in demolished or semi-demolished condition. In this connection, your attention is invited to the bill introduced by Senator LOUIS C. RABAUT, of Michigan, which it is understood would prevent excessive demolition until more rebuilding is done.

The sole responsibility for the condition of the waterfront on Maine Avenue is due to the fact that the leases under which we all operate have a 30 days' notice clause which absolutely prohibits anyone from investing a lot of money in major improvements. This term of lease also prohibits the financing of major improvements by a loan from any bank or loan agency.

The Washington Channel waterfront is the only logical and suitable location in the Metropolitan Washington area for boating facilities and services. The boating public benefits from the facilities and services made available at reastonable cost; the small businesses provide a means of livelihood for many, and the District of Columbia benefits from the resultant taxes. There is no objection to a well planned and realistic redevelopment of the waterfront; however, the

present proposed method involving transfer of the property to the Redevelopment Land Agency for action in the manner outlined herein is not in the best interests of the public, the Government, or the small businessman.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, as we are all aware the question of medical care for the aged citizens of our country has become one of the most controversial issues of the day. And rightly so. The position in which our elder citizens find themselves when the necessity arises to meet the cost of any sizable medical expenses is truly tragic. In the vast majority of cases they simply cannot meet such expenses. What is more, a representative cross-sampling of this above-65 group has shown that not only can these people not meet the cost but would either have to borrow the money or flatly state that they do not know where they would get it. This is a sorry situation, indeed, for our retired workers to find themselves facing. There are roughly 15 million retired people in this country. Of this 15 million just about 11 million are now drawing social security pensions. Only about 1 million of these are also covered by private pension plans. With respect to those on social security, it should be noted that the maximum Federal benefit for a retired couple is $180 per month; but the average amount actually received is close to $114. It is, of course, obvious that these figures leave no margin for heavy medical expenses, particularly when you consider that medical expenses have zoomed up higher and faster than any other single item in our economy.

The consequence of this situation is that it creates a singularly peculiar paradox within the traditional American system of employment and retirement. The traditional goal and the fond dream of the American workingman and his family has always been eventual retirement to a life of ease and complete freedom. However—and here is the paradox—this traditional goal is becoming more and more difficult—even impossible—of attainment for the retired and retiring members of our society because their continuing reliance on a set, stabilized income in the form of pensions and so forth has failed to be given due consideration as the price of living has continued to spiral. Thus these people who are required to get along on the same amount of money each month have seen their ability to do so decline progressively as the purchasing power of the few dollars they receive has grown less and less. This general principle, while it is true of all living necessities such as food and rent, is particularly and acutely true with respect to medical expenses incurred by these older citizens. For if their fixed incomes are increasingly inadequate to buy the daily needed loaf of bread, how then are they to meet unforeseen medical expenses of greatly larger proportions The answer is simple—they cannot.

But it is not enough to know this answer. It remains to seek the remedy. For what are we to do, refuse these people needed medical care because they cannot afford it? Certainly not. Here, then, is the central point on which everyone concerned is in agreement; that the need exists and that something must be done about it. Even the budget-minded administration recognizes this point. But here, also, is where the general agreement ends and the controversy begins. For here is where the question arises of how to approach the problem; of how to go about the solution.

By this time there have developed several differing approaches, all distinct in one respect or other from the original and well-known Forand bill. I do not intend to go into a detailed discussion or comparison of the different bills involved. There are now six different major bills dealing with the question of providing health care for our aged. The main differences between them lie in the manner of financing the program and in the categories of coverage to be provided. The basic alternative methods of paying for this medical care are first, through an extension of the present social security system; second, out of the general revenue funds; third, through State and Federal Government matching funds; fourth, through subscription fees to be paid by the recipients; or fifth, through some combination of these methods. For my part, I have supported the Forand bill from the very beginning and I am in favor of paying for the needed medical care through the present social security system. This would be done by increasing the present social security taxes one-fourth of 1 percent. This would mean that an individual would pay into the Social Security Fund a maximum of $12 per year more than he is paying now. This program would amount to a prepaid health care package on which today's workers can fall back when they retire. Figures from the Census Bureau show that 60 percent of retired people—60 percent of people over 65 years of age do not have as much as $1,000 income per year. This means about $20 a week for food, clothing, shelter and everything else people need to live. How are they to pay for needed medical care?

The elderly people of this country are the people who need medical care the most. More than any other segment of our population these people need this care—which, in a tragically large number of cases, they cannot afford. This older group of persons get sick more often and stay sick longer than any other population group. Further, many of them are in need of continuing care. That is they require nursing home care or medical attention on a regular basis—be it weekly, biweekly, or monthly—or they are required to take medicines regularly, often daily and often comprising not one but several different medicines—all of which are expensive these days. All of these things are necessary and they are also considerably beyond the means of most of our senior citizens. This situation has been called a "pressing social problem." I prefer to call it a "crying human need" and I pledge that I shall fight to see that something is done about it.

Captive Nations Week, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, a look at any map of the world through the eyes of political freedom will reveal an area extending eastward from East Germany, through Eastern Europe, European Russia, across the vastness of Asia, down into southeast Asia as far as North Vietnam, and across the China Sea to North Korea—a huge area of many countries and cultures and peoples.

These are the captive nations, and their many hundreds of millions of people are the captive peoples.

In the colors of political freedom, this large sector of the map is painted red—red for the color of international communism, red for the color of the blood shed in defense of lost freedoms.

Since 1917, Mr. Speaker, the process of Communist subjugation has gone on. One by one, nations have fallen to the twin weapons of communism: internal subversion and external force. In exchange for national independence, Moscow and Peiping have brought the most ruthless tyranny in history. Slavery and death have been the rewards of those who fought to preserve their freedom.

It is a grim and disheartening picture, Mr. Speaker. But it is a picture from which we must not look away. The lessons taught in the Ukraine, in Poland and Hungary, in China, Korea, and Tibet must be learned well and never forgotten.

This is the purpose of Captive Nations Week. This is the reason why the Congress authorized the designation of the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week," and why the President—acting under that authority—has proclaimed it so.

We owe it to ourselves and to our own freedom, and to our brothers who have lost their freedom, to rededicate ourselves at this time to the cause of freedom and justice throughout the world. Only by understanding what they are, how they can be lost and what can be done to strengthen them, can we be worthy of the cause.

The whole world looks to us for the leadership and the sense of direction which can bring our cause alive and rekindle in the hearts of people everywhere the hope and assurance of freedom and justice and true peace.

This is the moral of Captive Nations Week. This is the issue of our time.

Summary of Veterans' Legislation, 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman, has received many inquiries from Members of Congress with respect to legislation affecting veterans which has been enacted during the 86th Congress. In order that this material may be readily available, I insert material showing the status of veterans' legislation as of July 15, along with certain general information relative to the various veterans' programs which I believe will be helpful to Members:

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, OLIN E. TEAGUE, CHAIRMAN—SUMMARY OF VETERANS' LEGISLATION REPORTED, 86TH CONGRESS

LAWS ENACTED

Public Law 86–73 (H.R. 2256): Makes $100 million available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, upon his request, for immediate use in the direct-loan program for for the purpose of reducing existing waiting lists. Provides that the interest rate on guaranteed and direct loans may be set at a rate not to exceed 5¼ percent per annum and repeals provision of law requiring that VA interest rate be not less than one-half of 1 percent below FHA rate. Makes certified agents of Federal Housing Administrator eligible to make VA automatic loans if approved by the Veterans' Administration. Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to refuse to appraise homes for builders and lenders suspended by FHA. (Approved August 11, 1959.)

Public Law 86–103 (H.R. 5447): Extends for a period of 10 years, to June 30, 1970, the existing authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to maintain offices in the Republic of the Philippines. (Approved August 25, 1959.)

Public Law 86–109 (H.R. 5446): Requires that Veterans Canteen Service pay reasonable charges for the use of space, buildings, and structures furnished by the Veterans' Administration, the amount of charges to be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. (Approved August 25, 1959.)

Public Law 86–113 (H.R. 3269): Liberalizes statutory bar to benefits available to a veteran discharged during a period of hostilities on his own application or solicitation as an alien by presuming that he was not so discharged in the absence of affirmative evidence establishing the fact. (Approved August 25, 1959.)

Public Law 86–116 (H.R. 269): Grants to employees of the Manila, Republic of the Philippines, office of the Veterans' Administration, who are U.S. citizens, certain allowances and benefits similar to those enjoyed by Foreign Service personnel—transportation, home leave, etc. (Approved August 29, 1959.)

Public Law 86–146 (H.R. 6319): Restricts payment, upon death of an incompetent veteran, of gratuitous veterans' benefits deposited in the "personal funds of patients' trust fund" to wife, child, and dependent parent rather than paying to personal representative. Provides that an incompetent veteran receiving hospital care at public expense and having neither wife nor child shall have any gratuitous VA payments stopped when his estate reaches $1,500 and such payments shall not be resumed until the estate is reduced to $500. Payments may be made for the needs of a dependent parents or parents. Where State institutions charge for the care of a veteran patient, payment out of the benefit is permitted. (Approved September 1, 1959.)

Public Law 86–150 (S. 906): Provides that, for veterans of the Korean conflict, receiving education or training under the "Korean GI bill," a change from the pursuit of one program to the pursuit of another will not be considered a change of program if the first program is prerequisite to, or generally required for, entrance into pursuit of the second. As an example, where a veteran may have declared his educational objective to the attainment of a master's degree and he later decides that he wishes to attain a doctor's degree, this change of objective would not be considered a change of program. (Approved September 1, 1959.)

Public Law 86–152 (S. 1694): Extends authority of the Veterans' Administration to provide hospital and medical care abroad to include U.S. citizens temporarily residing abroad who require hospital care and medical treatment for peacetime service-incurred disabilities. (Approved August 11, 1959.)

Public Law 86–187 (H.R. 267): Increases the presumptive period for service connection for the disease of multiple sclerosis from the present 2-year period to 3 years. (Approved August 25, 1959.)

Public Law 86–188 (H.R. 271): Provides that Hansen's disease (leprosy) developing to a degree of 10 percent within 3 years from the date of a veteran's separation from the service shall be considered to be service-connected. (Approved August 25, 1959.)

Public Law 86–195 (H.R. 2405): Includes as a "child" for purposes of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration (except those relating to insurance and the disposition of personal property of a decedent left upon the premises of a VA facility), one who was a member of the veteran's household at the time of his death and who was adopted by the veteran's spouse within 2 years after the death, unless at the time of the veteran's death the child was receiving regular contributions toward his support from some individual other than the veteran or his spouse, or from any public or private welfare organization furnishing services or assistance to children. (Approved August 25, 1959.)

Public Law 86–211 (H.R. 7650): Modifies the pension programs for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, and their widows and children.

1. Provides a sliding scale of pensions based on the income and dependency status of the recipient. Such scale of pension rates applies to veterans, and to widows and children, as indicated below:

Veteran, no dependents

Annual income		Monthly pension
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$600	$85
$600	1,200	70
1,200	1,800	40

Veteran with dependents

Annual income		Monthly pension		
More than—	But equal to or less than—	Veteran and 1 dependent	Veteran and 2 dependents	Veteran and 3 or more dependents
	$1,000	$90	$95	$100
$1,000	2,000	75	75	75
2,000	3,000	45	45	45

Above rates increased by $70 when veteran needs regular aid and attendance. In addition, for this group the Administrator may furnish an invalid lift. (Invalid lift benefit applies to all wars.)

Widows and children

WIDOW, NO CHILD

Annual income		Monthly pension
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$600	$60
$600	1,200	45
1,200	1,800	25

WIDOW, 1 CHILD [1]

Annual income		Monthly pension
More than—	But equal to or less than—	
	$1,000	$75
$1,000	2,000	60
2,000	3,000	40

[1] Plus $15 for each additional child.

NO WIDOW, 1 OR MORE CHILDREN

Annual income equal to or less than (earned income excluded)—	Monthly pension
$1,800	$35 for 1 child and $15 for each additional child.

2. All income, regardless of source, counts except:

(a) payments of the 6 months' death gratuity;

(b) donations from public or private relief or welfare organizations;

(c) payments by VA of pension, compensation, and dependency and indemnity compensation;

(d) payments under policies of U.S. Government life insurance or national service life insurance, and payments of servicemen's indemnity;

(e) lump sum social security death payments;

(f) payments to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar plans or programs equal to his contributions thereto;

(g) amounts equal to amounts paid by a widow or child of a deceased veteran for—

(1) his just debts,

(2) the expenses of his last illness, and

(3) the expenses of his burial to the extent such expenses are not reimbursed by VA;

(h) proceeds of fire insurance policies.

3. The income of the spouse (if not estranged) may count as the veterans' income. In determining annual income, where a veteran is living with his spouse, all income of the spouse which is reasonably available to or for the veteran, except $1,200 of such income, shall be considered as the income of the veteran, unless in the judgment of the Administrator to do so would work a hardship upon the veteran.

4. All waived income counts.

5. Discretionary authority granted VA for a finding on the net worth of the veteran or the widow or child which could lead to a determination that the applicant is not eligible for pension because of net worth.

6. Places World War II and Korean conflict widows and children on same basis as widows and children of World War I for purposes of pension eligibility.

7. The pension of a veteran being furnished hospital or domiciliary care by the Veterans' Administration will be reduced to $30 a month after the expiration of 2 full

months but the Administrator may apportion to the wife or children the balance of the pension.

8. Under the savings provision, the amendments to title 38, United States Code, will not apply to pensioners on the rolls on the day before the effective date unless they seek and are granted pension under the amended title 38. Thus, no person on the pension rolls on the day before the effective date shall have his pension reduced or shall be removed from the pension rolls because of the enactment. All persons on the pension rolls on the day before the effective date will be permitted election to the higher rates if they qualify under the new program or may elect to remain on the rolls under the old law.

The rate under the old law, which may be continued if the veteran chooses, is $66.15 per month, except that where the veteran shall have been rated permanently and totally disabled and has been in receipt of pension for a continuous period of 10 years or reaches the age of 65 years and is permanently and totally disabled, the rate is $78.75 per month. A rate of $135.45 per month is authorized in the case of an otherwise eligible veteran who is helpless or blind or so nearly helpless or blind as to need or require the regular aid and attendance of another person. Such pension is not payable to any unmarried person whose annual income exceed $1,400 or to any married person or any person with minor children whose annual income exceeds $2,700.

In the case of widows and children, the rates under the old law are as follows:

Widow	Widow, 1 child	Each additional child	No widow, 1 child	No widow, 2 children	No widow, 3 children	Each additional child
$50.40	$63	$7.56	$27.30	$40.95	$54.60	$7.56

(Subject to income limitations of $1,400 per year if widow has no child and $2,700 if she does; $1,400 for each child if there is no widow.)

9. Effective July 1, 1960.

Of all single veterans now receiving pension, 278,000 or 78 percent will receive more money. Sixty percent or 262,000 of the veterans with dependents receive more while 70 percent or a total of 298,000 widows and orphans benefit by passage of this law. Eighty-seven percent of veterans receiving aid and attendance will be increased.

Of all pensioners, married and single veterans, widows and orphans, almost 70 percent, or 838,000 cases, will get a raise; 72,000 cases would be added to the rolls because of the higher income limits; 206,000 cases would be added to the rolls because of equalization of death pension eligibility. The total cases helped would be 1,116,000.

Estimate of cost of Public Law 86–211

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Total with equalization	Equalization	Total living and deceased veterans	Living veterans	Deceased veterans
1st	$309,076	$154,268	$154,808	$104,730	$50,078
2d	294,323	162,085	132,238	85,333	46,905
3d	265,599	177,719	87,880	47,320	40,560
4th	222,512	201,169	21,343	[1]9,699	31,042
5th	165,014	232,476	[1]67,372	[1]85,722	18,350
5-year total	1,256,614	927,717	328,897	141,962	186,935
Period ending:					
1970	1,698,760	1,955,594	[1]256,834	[1]353,358	96,524
1975	1,784,981	2,171,533	[1]386,552	[1]326,367	[1]60,185
1980	2,245,862	2,816,755	[1]570,893	[1]474,456	[1]96,437
1985	1,985,965	3,357,038	[1]1,371,073	[1]1,283,022	[1]88,051
1990	901,937	3,764,620	[1]2,862,683	[1]2,796,991	[1]65,692
1995	4,065	3,956,505	[1]3,952,440	[1]3,876,711	[1]75,729
2000	[1]558,984	3,792,893	[1]4,351,877	[1]4,220,747	[1]131,130
Total	9,319,200	22,742,655	[1]13,423,455	[1]13,189,690	[1]233,765

[1] Savings.

This law makes no change in requirements under the old pension program as to disability, length of service, age, and unemployability of a veteran. These requirements are as follows:

A veteran of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict is eligible for pension if he is permanently and totally disabled from nonservice-connected disability not the result of willful misconduct or vicious habits. He must either have served in the active military, naval, or air service for a period of 90 days or more during the applicable period and have been discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, or have been discharged for a service-connected disability.

The determination of permanent total disability is made on a liberal basis. Such rating is granted (where the requirement of permanence is met) when there is a single disability of 60 percent, or two or more disabilities one of which is 40 percent in degree, combined with other disability or disabilities to a total of 70 percent, and unemployability attributed thereto.

Although age alone is not a basis for entitlement to pension, it is considered in association with disability and unemployability in determining permanent and total disability. The aforementioned percentage requirements are reduced on the attainment of age 55 to a 60-percent rating for one or more disabilities, with no percentage requirements for any one disability; at age 60 to a 50-percent rating for one or more disabilities; and at age 65 to one disability ratable at 10 percent or more. When these reduced percentage requirements are met and the disability or disabilities involved are of a permanent nature, a permanent and total disability rating will be assigned, if the veteran is determined to be unable to secure and follow substantially gainful employment by reason of such disability.

A widow's age, disability, or unemployability is not considered in determining her eligibility for a pension, either under existing law or under the provisions of Public Law 86–211. Under the old law, a widow of World War I, World War II, or the Korean conflict is required to meet an annual income limitation of $1,400 if she has no dependents or $2,700 if she has dependents. In addition, the deceased husband of a widow of World War II or the Korean conflict must have had a service-connected disability, although his death was not caused by this disability. Public Law 86–211 removes this latter requirement and places the widows of World War II and the Korean conflict in the same status as widows of World War I veterans. (Approved August 29, 1959.)

Public Law 86–212 (H.R. 255): Makes applicable to a competent veteran who disappears the provisions of existing law which provide that where an incompetent veteran who is receiving compensation for a service-connected disability disappears, the Veterans' Administration may pay to his wife, children, and parents the compensation otherwise payable to such veteran, amounts payable to each not to exceed the amount payable if the veteran had died from a service-connected disability. (Approved September 1, 1959.)

Public Law 86–222 (H.R. 7106): Prior to passage of Public Law 86–222, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs had authority to forfeit the rights of veterans, widows, children, and dependent parents to all gratuitous benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. Forfeiture was authorized in two categories:

(1) Where the Administrator finds the one claiming benefits has been guilty of mutiny, treason, sabotage, or rendering assistance to an enemy;

(2) Where a false or fraudulent statement has been made concerning any claim for benefits.

The forfeiture decision of the Administrator was final and not subject to review in the courts. Forfeiture, if adjudged, forfeits all benefits and continues for the lifetime of the forfeited individual, unless pardoned by the President.

This law continues the authority of the Administrator to forfeit in all cases where the guilty person resides, or is domiciled, outside the jurisdiction of the U.S. courts.

Where the accused resides, or is domiciled, within the United States at the time of the offense, the new law eliminates the authority of the Administrator to impose a forfeiture based upon false or fraudulent statements. Forfeitures previously imposed are not affected. This law also provides for automatic forfeiture of rights to gratuitous veterans' benefits in all cases of conviction of certain specified offenses involving loyalty or security. A Presidential pardon restores the right to benefits.

Authority of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make an apportionment award disability compensation to dependents of veterans in cases of administrative forfeiture for fraud or forfeiture for offenses involving loyalty or security is terminated. (Approved Sept. 1, 1959.)

Public Law 86–236 (H.R. 2773): Provides war orphans' educational assistance to children of veterans of the Spanish-American War who die as the result of a disability incurred or aggravated during that period of war service. (Approved Sept. 8, 1959.)

Public Law 86–239 (H.R. 7373): Expands the program of assistance for severely disabled veterans in acquiring homes equipped with special facilities made necessary by the character of their service-connected disabilities. The bill brings into this program those with compensable permanent and total disabilities incurred when such disability includes (1) blindness in both eyes, having only light perception, plus (2) loss, or loss of use, of one lower extremity such as to preclude locomotion without the aid of a wheelchair. Also, it removes the limitation that where eligibility is based on loss, or loss of use, of both lower extremities that such loss must have been due to certain specified conditions. (Approved Sept. 8, 1959.)

Public Law 86–490 (H.R. 276): Authorizes payment to veterans of additional compensation for dependents (based on establishment of a disability rating of not less than 50 percent) from the effective date of the increased percentage evaluation, provided basic proof of dependents is received by Veterans'

Administration within 60 days from date of notification of rating action. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-491 (H.R. 641): Authorizes payment of service-connected death compensation to an otherwise eligible widow of a veteran if she was married to him before the expiration of 15 years after the termination of the period of service in which the injury or disease causing his death was incurred or aggravated. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-492 (H.R. 7502): The service-connected death benefit of dependency and indemnity compensation is payable to a widow at a monthly rate equal to $112 plus 12 percent of the "basic pay" of her deceased husband. Generally, such basic pay is computed by using the rank of the veteran at the time of his death in active service or last discharge therefrom. The bill would change the method of computing basic pay for dependency and indemnity compensation purposes by using a higher rank held in service than that held at the time of a veteran's death in service or his discharge therefrom, if the use of such higher rank would result in a greater benefit to the widow. It would apply to cases where the veteran had satisfactorily served on active duty for 6 months or more in such higher rank and was so serving within 120 days of death or discharge. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-494 (H.R. 9785): Grants gratuitous national service life insurance in a maximum amount of $10,000 to any enlisted person who died as the result of an aviation accident incurred in line of duty while undergoing flight training in the active service of the Army or Navy after October 7, 1940, and before August 4, 1942, if such person would have been eligible for life insurance with premiums paid by the United States had he been serving under an appointment as an aviation cadet. Upon application filed generally within 2 years, the insurance would be payable effective from the date of enactment of the bill in monthly installments to a limited class of beneficiaries, if living, and no payment would be made to the estate of any person. Liability for such payments would be borne by the national service life insurance appropriation. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-495 (H.R. 9788): Prohibits the payment or furnishing of benefits under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration to or on account of any child by reason of the death of more than one parent in the same parental line. However, it would permit a child to elect one or more times to receive benefits by reason of the death of any one parent in the same parental line, thus allowing the child to receive the greater of two or more benefits. The bill would apply only to cases where the death of a parent occurs after the date of enactment thereof. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-497 (H.R. 10703): Grants waiver of payment of national service life insurance premiums, upon application, in any case in which an insured, during World War II or the early Korean conflict, became totally disabled in line of duty after making application for insurance and prior to the effective date thereof and remained continuously totally disabled to date of death or the date of enactment, whichever is earlier. A waiver of premiums under this bill would render the insurance nonparticipating while the waiver is in effect. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-499 (H.R. 10898): Authorizes payment of additional $12 per month for each child of service-connected disabled war veterans who qualify to receive dependents' allowance (50 percent disabled or more) and 80 percent of that rate for peacetime veterans. (Approved June 8, 1960.)

Public Law 86-501 (H.R. 113): Prohibits the severance of a service-connected disability which has been in effect for 10 or more years, except when based on fraud or when military records clearly show that the individual did not have the requisite character of discharge or service. To be effective January 1, 1962. (Approved June 10, 1960.)

Public Law 86-590 (H.R. 10108): Authorizes reimbursement for ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls, in addition to the mileage allowance payable for the travel of certain Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants. (Approved July 5, 1960.)

Public Law 86-598 (H.R. 7966): Provides for the furnishing of needed services of optometrists by the Veterans' Administration to veterans having service-connected eye conditions. The Veterans' Administration today is authorized to furnish outpatient medical care for veterans with service-connected disabilities. This care is furnished primarily in Veterans' Administration clinics but is supplemented by using the services of fee-basis private physicians where it is not feasible to care for veterans at the clinics. It is expected that enactment of this legislation will cause the Veterans' Administration to materially expand its use of the services of optometrists in its outpatient fee-basis program. (Approved July 7, 1960.)

Public Law 86-625 (H.R. 10596): Reimburses State homes at the rate of $2.50 per veteran per day (or a maximum of $912.50 a year per veteran) rather than at the rate of $700 per annum, for care of veteran members who are eligible for care in Veterans' Administration hospital or domiciliary facilities. (Approved July 12, 1960.)

Public Law 86-626 (H.R. 11776): Veterans' Administration appropriations, fiscal year beginning July 1, 1960, and ending June 30, 1961. (For details, see: "Veterans' Administration Appropriations." This legislation reported from House Appropriations Committee.) (Approved July 12, 1960.)

Public Law 86-639 (H.R. 7965): Authorizes the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish medical services for a non-service-connected disability when reasonably necessary in preparation for admission of a veteran in need of hospital care. Outpatient treatment reasonably necessary to complete treatment incident to a veteran's hospital care also would be permitted. (Approved July 12, 1960.)

Public Law 86-663 (H.R. 7211): Establishes a new statutory rate of disability compensation for certain service-connected seriously disabled veterans. A monthly rate of $265 would be authorized for a veteran who has a service-connected disability rated as total and (1) has additional service-connected disability or disabilities independently ratable at 60 percent or more, or (2) by reason of his service-connected disability or disabilities is "permanently housebound." (Approved July 14, 1960.)

Public Law 86-665 (H.R. 7903): Extends the World War II loan guaranty program and the World War II and Korean conflict direct loan program for 2 years, from July 25, 1960, to July 25, 1962. It also authorizes an additional year for processing loan guaranty applications received by July 25, 1962, and permits the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to close direct loans subsequent to July 25, 1962, on the basis of commitments issued before that date. Authority for Treasury advances to the direct loan revolving fund in the aggregate amount of $150 million per fiscal year (but not more than $50 million in any one quarter) would be continued through fiscal years 1961 and 1962. Committee amendment adopted on House floor provides (1) for issuance of guarantee when veteran has in fact occupied house as his home but occupancy certifications were not completed; (2) that a veteran's deposit or downpayment be held by seller in a trust account until the loan is closed; and (3) that a revolving fund be established in the Veterans' Administration. (Approved July 14, 1960.)

Public Law 86-670 (H.R. 9786): Permits Indian war and Spanish-American War veterans to elect to receive aid-and-attendance pension at the rates and under the conditions (except service requirements) applicable to World War I veterans. (Approved July 14, 1960.)

PASSED HOUSE AND PASSED SENATE WITH AMENDMENT, RETURNED TO HOUSE FOR CONSIDERATION OF AMENDMENT

H.R. 11045: Provides a new plan of insurance for national service life insurance (NSLI) policyholders. The plan is modified life insurance which provides a level premium throughout the life of the insured but the face value of the policy will be automatically reduced by 50 percent at the end of the day preceding the insured's 65th birthday. The face value of any extended term insurance in force under the modified life policy would also be reduced by 50 percent at that time. The plan is permissive. Policyholders may elect to retain the insurance otherwise lost at age 65 by paying premiums for age 65 without medical examination. The modified life plan will provide permanent plan insurance at a lower premium rate than the existing permanent plans of insurance. This is true because the protection is cut in half at age 65 and a more realistic table is used for calculation of premiums on participating insurance. A comparison of premiums per $1,000 of participating insurance is as follows:

Age	Annual premium for the modified life plan	Annual premium, present rates		Level premium after age 65	
		5 LPT	O.L.	If 50 percent face continued	If 100 percent face continued
30	$9.83	$8.41	$18.47	$9.83	$13.22
35	11.72	9.00	21.31	11.72	45.11
40	14.09	10.06	25.10	14.09	47.48
45	17.17	11.72	30.07	17.17	50.56
50	20.84	15.04	36.94	20.84	54.23
55	25.22	20.95	46.53	25.22	58.61
65		47.00	78.97		

Senate amendment permits issuance of national service life insurance to persons eligible to apply between October 8, 1940, and December 31, 1956, both dates inclusive. Application to be submitted in writing within 1 year after January 1, 1961, with proof of good health at time of application. Veterans who served between April 26, 1951, and December 31, 1956, with service-connected disabilities may obtain a special type of policy. Administrative cost and cost of physical examination to be borne by veteran.

House Report: No. 1543; April 21, 1960.

Passed House: May 2, 1960.

Referred: Senate Finance Committee; May 3, 1960.

Senate Report: No. 1485; May 26, 1960.

Passed Senate: June 2, 1960, with amendment.

H.R. 3313: Amends the Soldiers and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 to provide that facts may be established by written unsworn statements, declarations, verifications, or certificates which are certified to be true under penalty of perjury. These statements would be in lieu of affidavits which are today required in any court action or proceeding where there is default of any appearance by the defendant. In such a case the claimant shall, prior to entering a judgment, file in the court an affidavit setting forth either (1) that the defendant is not in military service, or (2) that the defendant is in military service, or (3) that the plaintiff is unable to determine the status of the defendant insofar as military service is concerned.

Senate amendment extends vocational rehabilitation program until July 25, 1965, for service-connected disabled veterans of World War II who have been prevented from entering or completing training because: (a) they had not attained, retained, or regained medical feasibility for training because of disability; (b) they had not met the requirement of an honorable discharge but character of discharge was later changed by appropriate authority; or (c) they had not timely established the existence of a compensable service-connected disability. Program is also extended for those veterans in training on June 1, 1960, until such time as training is completed.

House Report: No. 1309; March 2, 1960.

Passed House: March 21, 1960.

Referred: Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; March 22, 1960.

Senate Report: No. 1621; June 20, 1960.

Passed Senate: June 29, 1960, with amendment.

BILLS PASSED BY HOUSE, REPORTED BY SENATE COMMITTEES

H.R. 4306. Provides educational assistance for the children of persons who die as the direct result of armed conflict or while engaged in extrahazardous service (including such service under conditions simulating war) during the period after January 31, 1955, and before the end of compulsory military service.

Senate committee amendment extends eligibility to children of persons who die as the result of disabilities incurred in the performance of duty and specifies conditions under which training by open-circuit television may be allowed.

House Report: No. 722, with amendment; July 28, 1959.

Passed House: August 17, 1959.

Referred: Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; August 18, 1959.

Senate Report: No. 1645, with amendment; June 22, 1960.

BILLS PASSED BY HOUSE, REFERRED TO SENATE COMMITTEES

H.R. 268. Adds "deafness of both ears, having absence of air and bone conduction" to the other types of service-connected disabilities specified in the law pertaining to veterans' disability compensation for which an additional award in the amount of $47 monthly is provided.

House Report: No. 411; June 2, 1959.

Passed House: August 31, 1959.

Referred: Senate Finance Committee; September 1, 1959.

Senate committee action: Tabled; April 4, 1960.

H.R. 270. Increases from $10 to $100 the monthly pension payable to holders of the Congressional Medal of Honor, permits payment at any age instead of the present requirement of attaining the age of 65 years, and pays holders of the medal whether or not they are on active duty.

House Report: No. 413; June 2, 1959.

Passed House: July 20, 1959.

Referred: Senate Finance Committee; July 21, 1959.

Senate committee action: Ordered reported, with amendments; April 4, 1960.

H.R. 283: Provides that if a veteran, as a result of service-connected disability, has suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot, or one hand, or both buttocks, or blindness of one eye, having only light perception, the rate of compensation therefor shall be $47 per month for each such loss or loss of use independent of any other compensation provided in subsections (a) to (j). At present this provision limits payment thereunder to one statutory award of $47 per month for all such losses, except where the losses are in addition to other combinations of disabilities specified in subsections (l) to (n). Under the bill as reported, the total payment in any case may not exceed $309 and the loss of more than one creative organ would, for this purpose, be considered a single "loss." In peacetime cases the rates are 80 percent of the above-mentioned rates.

House Report: No. 415, with amendments; June 2, 1959.

Passed House: August 31, 1959.

Referred: Senate Finance Committee; September 1, 1959.

Senate committee action: Tabled; April 4, 1960.

H.R. 5996: Authorizes payment in a lump sum of the total amount of compensation, representing the statutory awards of $47 monthly for the anatomical loss or loss of use of a creative organ and $67 monthly for arrested tuberculosis disease, which would have been payable for the period August 1, 1952, to date of bill's enactment had claim therefor been filed on August 1, 1952 (the effective date of Public Law 427, 82d Congress, which first provided such statutory awards for World War II and Korean conflict veterans). Applies to all cases in which the condition was determined, before August 1, 1952, as service connected, and would require reduction of the amount payable by any such statutory awards paid during that period.

House Report: No. 419; June 2, 1959.

Passed House: July 20, 1959.

Referred: Senate Finance Committee; July 21, 1959.

Senate committee action: Tabled; April 4, 1960.

H.R. 8098: Permits the combination, or tacking, of two or more separate periods of service during more than one period of war in satisfying the 90-day service requirement for payment of non-service-connected disability or death pension to veterans and their widows and their children.

House Report: No. 1536; April 21, 1960.

Passed House: May 2, 1960.

Referred: Senate Finance Committee; May 3, 1960.

H.R. 9792: Provides that the salaries of managers of Veterans' Administration hospitals, domiciliaries, and centers shall be not less than $16,500 per annum and the salaries of Directors of Professional Services shall be $16,250 per annum.

House Report: No. 1539; April 21, 1960.

Passed House: May 16, 1960.

Referred: Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service; May 17, 1960.

BILLS REFERRED TO HOUSE COMMITTEE FOLLOWING PASSAGE BY SENATE

S. 1138: Provides readjustment benefits to persons with more than 180 days of service, entering the service after January 31, 1955, and before the termination of compulsory military service (July 1, 1963), as follows:

(1) Education and vocational training;

(2) Vocational rehabilitation (for veterans with service-connected disabilities); and

(3) Guaranteed and direct-loan assistance for the purchase of a home or farmlands, livestock, machinery, etc., to be used in farming operations conducted by the veteran.

S. 1138, 86TH CONG. (AS PASSED BY THE SENATE ON JULY 21, 1959)

TABLE 1.—*Sec. 2. Education and training—Estimate of expenditures for direct benefits and monthly average trainees* [1]

Fiscal year	Expenditures for direct benefits			Monthly average trainees				
	Total	Educational loans [2]	Grants	Total	College	Below college	Job	Farm
1961	$178,000,000		$178,000,000	134,000	76,000	47,000	8,000	3,000
1962	360,000,000	$25,000,000	325,000,000	271,000	128,000	108,000	22,000	13,000
1963	379,000,000	37,000,000	342,000,000	285,000	134,000	114,000	24,000	13,000
1964	375,000,000	34,000,000	341,000,000	281,000	128,000	116,000	24,000	13,000
1965	362,000,000	39,000,000	323,000,000	272,000	124,000	112,000	23,000	13,000
1966	359,000,000	38,000,000	321,000,000	269,000	121,000	112,000	23,000	13,000
1967	322,000,000	38,000,000	284,000,000	242,000	109,000	104,000	18,000	11,000
1968	247,000,000	31,000,000	216,000,000	186,000	84,000	81,000	12,000	9,000
1969	182,000,000	24,000,000	158,000,000	137,000	62,000	61,000	8,000	6,000
1970	130,000,000	18,000,000	112,000,000	98,000	45,000	44,000	4,500	4,500
1971	90,000,000	13,000,000	77,000,000	67,000	32,000	30,000	2,000	3,000
1972	58,000,000	9,000,000	49,000,000	44,000	21,000	20,000	1,000	2,000
1973	37,000,000	6,000,000	31,000,000	27,500	13,500	12,500	500	1,000
Total [3]	3,079,000,000	312,000,000	2,767,000,000					

[1] This estimate assumes enactment early in fiscal year 1961, prior to the beginning of the school year. Amounts which might be expended because of retroactive payments for training subsequent to Sept. 1, 1959, as currently provided in the proposal, are not included in the estimate. With retroactive payments for fiscal year 1960, approximately $46,000,000 additional would be expended for grants, and approximately $10,000,000 of the total expenditures shown for fiscal year 1961 would be for loans.

[2] Assumes persons taking loans would take as much as they would have received on a grant basis.

[3] Total is through fiscal year 1973 only. Additional expenditures for direct benefits beyond fiscal year 1973 have not been estimated. The program will continue for several years beyond fiscal year 1973.

S. 1138, 86TH CONG. (AS PASSED BY THE SENATE ON JULY 21, 1959)

TABLE 2.—*Sec. 3. Vocational rehabilitation—Estimate of expenditures for direct benefits and monthly average trainees* [1]

Fiscal year	Expenditures for direct benefits	Monthly average trainees
1961	$6,000,000	3,200
1962	13,000,000	6,800
1963	18,000,000	9,000
1964	19,000,000	9,800
1965	19,000,000	9,900

[1] These estimates assume that there will be no concurrent readjustment education and training program. Participation and cost would be reduced to approximately ½ the amounts shown if there is a concurrent readjustment education and training program.

Administrative costs, including counseling and beneficiary travel, would approximate one-sixth of the direct benefits cost.

S. 1138, 86TH CONG. (AS PASSED BY THE SENATE ON JULY 21, 1959)

TABLE 3.—*Sec. 4. Home and farm loan benefits*

Participating veterans [1] 1,000,000–1,250,000
Administrative cost ..... $40,000,000–$50,000,000

[1] Assumes that the number of entries into the Armed Forces continues at approximately the present rate and that from 3,000,000 to 4,000,000 veterans will become eligible for the loan benefits.

The cost to the Government of the proposed extension of the loan guaranty benefits is not subject to precise estimate. It is quite problematical whether a one-half of 1 percent fee (the maximum permitted by the bill) would be adequate for offsetting the expenses resulting from claims under the guaranty and the subsequent expenses which might result from acquisition of properties, their management and sale. To the extent that the mortgage guaranty fund, which would be derived primarily from such fees, proved inadequate to meet these expenses, they would be paid out of appropriated funds.

No additional direct loan funds would be provided by the bill beyond those which will be available under present law for the World War II and Korean veterans. Hence, no additional direct loans would be authorized, but there would be an increased demand for the limited amount of direct loan money available.

Senate Report: No. 514; July 14, 1959.

Passed Senate: July 21, 1959, with amendment.

House committee action: Hearings; February 23, 24, 25; March 3, 4, 9, and 14, 1960.

S. 2201. Proposes to amend the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities" contained in 38 U.S.C. 601(4)(C) to include private contract facilities for veterans of any war in a State if (1) no Veterans' Administration hospital is located in the State on the effective date of the act, and (2) no Veterans' Administration hospital is located within 500 miles of the border of the State.

This would permit the use of private contract hospitals for the care of war veterans with non-service-connected disabilities in the State of Alaska. Hawaii having become a State, private hospitals there could also be used for hospitalization of veterans with non-service-connected disabilities.

Senate Report: No. 1730; June 24, 1960.

Passed Senate: June 28, 1960.

Referred: House Committee on Veterans' Affairs; June 29, 1960.

BILLS REPORTED BY HOUSE COMMITTEE

H.R. 12566: Requires that decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals shall be in writing and shall contain findings of fact and conclusions of law separately stated.

House Report: No. 2030; June 29, 1960.

H.R. 12653: Establishes a Court of Veterans' Appeals consisting of five judges to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Judges are to be appointed for 10-year terms.

The bill also authorizes the court to appoint not more than 50 commissioners. The commissioners shall perform such duties as the court may prescibe, including the conducting of hearings, the receiving of evidence, and the making of such reports as the court may perscribe.

The court is given exclusive jurisdiction to review by appeal decisions of the Board of Veterans' Appeals except in cases involving life insurance contracts housing or business loans where jurisdiction is now vested in the U.S. courts.

The decisions of the court shall be final. This, for the first time, subjects decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to review by a separate and independent agency.

House Report: No. 2031; June 29, 1960.

Summary of Veterans' Affairs Committee action

	Congress								Congress						
	80th	81st	82d	83d	84th	85th	86th [1]		80th	81st	82d	83d	84th	85th	86th [1]
Bills and resolutions referred	498	619	436	402	537	491	614	Pending in Senate committees	6	16	14	2	17	11	6
Hearings sessions	60	64	50	46	71	69	54	Bills on Senate Calendar		1	1	2			1
Hearings, printed pages	3,596	2,355	2,362	5,337	4,271	4,834	3,443	Recommitted		1	1			1	
Executive sessions	49	34	27	55	37	28	21	Bills vetoed	1	2	4			1	
Bills reported	60	44	36	36	48	44	42	Bills passed over veto		1	2				
Bills in House	16	1		14	1	5	4	Laws enacted	36	24	22	25	30	26	31

[1] Through July 15, 1960.

Veterans' Administration appropriations, fiscal years ending June 30, 1960 and 1961

	Public Law 86-255, approved Sept. 14, 1959 (fiscal year 1960)	Public Law 86-626 approved July 12, 1960 (fiscal year 1961)		Public Law 86-255, approved Sept. 14, 1959 (fiscal year 1960)	Public Law 86-626, approved July 12, 1960 (fiscal year 1961)
General operating expenses	$163,373,000	$153,500,000	Veterans' insurance and indemnities	$53,000,000	$48,800,000
Medical administration and miscellaneous operating expenses	29,349,000	34,500,000	Construction of hospitals and domiciliary facilities	31,659,000	75,000,000
Inpatient care	792,079,000	817,021,000	Grants to the Republic of the Philippines	2,000,000	1,500,000
Outpatient care	83,866,000	86,481,000	Service disabled veterans insurance fund		
Maintenance and operation of supply depots	2,218,000	2,500,000	Soldiers and sailors' civil relief		
Compensation and pensions	3,300,000,000	3,800,000,000	Total	5,042,544,000	5,363,302,000
Readjustment benefits	585,000,000	344,000,000			

Estimated distribution of compensation and pensions, fiscal years 1960 and 1961

	Fiscal year 1960			Fiscal year 1961		
	Total	Living	Deceased	Total	Living	Deceased
Compensation (service-connected), total	$2,043,731,000	$1,563,904,000	$479,827,000	$2,066,288,000	$1,581,394,000	$484,894,000
Spanish-American War	1,794,000	542,000	1,252,000	1,774,000	509,000	1,256,000
World War I	264,463,000	204,019,000	60,444,000	252,334,000	190,172,000	62,162,000
World War II	1,422,747,000	1,102,476,000	320,271,000	1,437,509,000	1,119,059,000	318,450,000
Korean conflict	227,396,000	178,070,000	49,326,000	236,698,000	186,310,000	50,388,000
Peacetime service	127,331,000	78,797,000	48,534,000	137,973,000	85,344,000	52,629,000

Estimated distribution of compensation and pensions, fiscal years 1960 and 1961—Continued

	Fiscal year 1960			Fiscal year 1961		
	Total	Living	Deceased	Total	Living	Deceased
Pensions (non-service-connected), total	$1,202,539,000	$848,676,000	$353,863,000	$1,715,807,000	$1,144,796,000	$571,011,000
Yellow fever experiments	5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000	
Mexican War	2,000		2,000	2,000		2,000
Indian Wars	615,000	83,000	532,000	574,000	63,000	511,000
Civil War	2,775,000	3,000	2,772,000	3,012,000	2,000	3,010,000
Spanish-American War	103,131,000	41,826,000	61,305,000	99,042,000	41,761,000	57,281,000
World War I	978,312,000	727,188,000	251,124,000	1,316,093,000	991,824,000	324,269,000
World War II	110,049,000	73,781,000	36,268,000	279,897,000	102,008,000	177,889,000
Korean conflict	7,579,000	5,744,000	1,835,000	17,112,000	9,090,000	8,022,000
Peacetime service (private acts)	71,000	46,000	25,000	90,000	43,000	27,000
Other, total	60,730,000	17,659,000	43,071,000	57,905,000	13,497,000	44,408,000
Emergency officer's disability retirement (World War I)	3,408,000	3,408,000		3,406,000	3,406,000	
Adjusted service and dependent's pay	1,000		1,000	1,000		1,000
Subsistence allowance for disabled veteran trainees	14,151,000	14,151,000		9,916,000	9,916,000	
Initial burial allowances	43,070,000		43,070,000	44,497,000		44,497,000
Special allowance, dependents (70 Stat. 857)	100,000	100,000		85,000	85,000	
Program total	3,307,000,000	2,430,239,000	876,761,000	3,840,000,000	2,739,597,000	1,100,403,000

VETERANS IN AMERICA

Population of veterans

America's population of living veterans is about 22,500,000.

About two-thirds, or more than 15 million served in World War II. They average 41 years of age.

More than 5,500,000—average age 31—served during the Korean conflict period. Approximately 960,000 of them are "double duty" veterans, serving both in World War II and the Korean conflict.

Less than 2,700,000—average age 66—served in World War I.

Spanish-American War veterans—average age 83—number 37,000. Only about 50 old-timers—in their 80's and 90's—served in the Indian wars.

The Nation's veterans, together with their families, make up about 45 percent of the total population of the United States.

MEDICINE

VA operates 170 hospitals for the care of ill and disabled veterans. On any average day, VA's patient load exceeds 114,000. During an average year, VA admits nearly half a million veterans in its hospital program.

Admissions are under a priority system.

First call goes to veterans with service-connected conditions. Generally, the service-connected are admitted immediately.

And next—if beds are available—come veterans with non-service-connected ailments who are unable to pay for private hospitalization. In addition to signing a statement of inability to pay, they also must submit a statement of their assets and liabilities.

INSURANCE

Approximately 6 million veterans today hold GI insurance policies valued at over $42 billion. The breakdown:

Nearly 5 million World War II veterans hold $34.7 billion of participating national service life insurance; 620,000 Korea veterans hold $5.9 billion of special nonparticipating national service life insurance; 43,000 disabled Korea and post-Korea veterans hold $380 million of special nonparticipating insurance—the only type that may now be newly issued; 275,000 World War I veterans hold $1.4 billion of participating U.S. Government life insurance.

GI LOANS

Eligibility: Any person who served in the armed services at any time on or after September 16, 1940, and prior to July 26, 1947, or on or after June 27, 1950, and prior to February 1, 1955, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable after active service of 90 days or more or because of disability incurred in line of duty is eligible. Generally loans, or applications for guarantee, must be made prior to July 26, 1960, for World War II veterans; veterans of Korea have until January 31, 1965. Widows of deceased veterans whose death was due to service may also qualify.

Amounts: Non-real-estate loans up to $2,000 and real-estate loans in certain cases up to $7,500, or a prorated portion thereof, or loans of both types or combinations thereof, may be guaranteed with interest at not more than 5¼ percent per annum, repayable in not more than 30 years, except in the case of farm realty, which may run for 40 years. (Maturity on non-real-estate loan may not exceed 10 years.) If the proceeds of the loan are to be used for the acquisition of residential property, the amount guaranteed may be 60 percent of the loan but not over $7,500. Banks or other lending institutions make the loans, with the Government guaranteeing 50 or 60 percent of the loan, but in no case to exceed the above amounts. Under certain conditions, Veterans' Administration is authorized to lend, until July 25, 1960, up to $13,500 directly to the veteran when private sources are not available.

Under this program, veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict have borrowed more than $48 billion for homes of their own. VA has guaranteed more than half of this amount, or $26 billion.

The record established by veterans in meeting their GI loan obligations is unparalleled.

So far, veterans have repaid in full nearly 1,600,000 GI loans having a total value of $10 billion.

Defaults on GI loans—for which VA has had to make good the guaranteed portions to lenders—number a mere 61,000, or slightly more than 1 percent of the total number of loans granted.

EDUCATION

More than 10½ million veterans so far have trained under the four programs. That's more than three times the total enrollments in every college and university in the United States of America.

Of the 10½ million total more than 7,800,000—one-half of all World War II veterans—trained under the World War II GI bill. Of them, 44 percent went to schools below the college level (such as trade and technical schools); 29 percent studied in college, and the rest trained on the job and on the farm.

Another 2,330,000—more than 2 out of every 5 Korean veterans—trained under the Korean GI bill. Their number will grow (the program doesn't end until 1965).

A new trend has developed under the Korean GI bill. Fewer veterans have attended schools below the college level (36 percent), and more have gone to college (more than 50 percent). Enrollments in on-the-job and on-the-farm courses account for the balance.

Another 615,000 disabled World War II veterans and 64,000 disabled Korean veterans have received vocational rehabilitation training. Some 40 percent have trained for top-level jobs in professional and managerial fields.

It has helped raise the educational level of veterans to better than 4 years of high school, whereas the level of nonveteran males, same age group, is but 2 years of high school. "Your every voter, as surely as your chief magistrate, exercises a public trust," said Grover Cleveland. Through more education, veterans have become better prepared to exercise this public trust.

It has helped build up America's reservoirs of trained manpower, so urgently needed for our Nation's strength and well-being. This country has gained immeasurably from the 478,000 engineers, 391,000 schoolteachers, 275,000 in the medical and related fields (130,000 doctors, dentists, nurses), and 140,000 scientists who learned their skills under the GI bill and the vocational rehabilitation programs.

Approximately 20,000 war orphans have trained since the war orphans educational assistance program began in the fall of 1956. Of these, 79 percent trained in college and the rest in schools below the college level. Approximately 1 in 6 had selected objectives in the scientific field. Of the 1,400 training in the medical and related fields, more than 900 were female students most of whom selected the field of nursing. Almost all of the 1,100 training to be engineers were males. More than 500 trained to be scientists. Approximately 2,300 trained to be schoolteachers.

Number of participants and deaths in service during all wars; number of living veterans, and veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls, Dec. 31, 1959

REVOLUTION (1775–83)

Participants	395,000
Deaths in service	4,000
Last veteran died Apr. 5, 1869	age 109
Last dependent died 1906	age 92

WAR OF (1812–14)

Participants	536,000
Deaths in service	2,000
Last veteran died May 13, 1905	age 105
Last dependent died 1946	age ?

MEXICAN WAR (1846–48)

Participants	130,000
Deaths in service	13,000
Last veteran died Sept. 3, 1929	age 98
Dependents on compensation and pension rolls:	
Widows	3
Children	1

CIVIL WAR (1861–65) (UNION FORCES ONLY)

Participants	2,213,000
Deaths in service	364,000
Last veteran died Aug. 2, 1956	age 109
Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls (Union and Confederate Forces):	
Widows	3,399
Children	761

INDIAN WARS (APPROXIMATELY (1860–98)

Participants	106,000
Deaths in service	1,000
Living veterans	55
Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls:	
Widows	705
Children	22
Veterans	55

SPANISH-AMERICAN WAR (1898–1902)

Participants	392,000
Deaths in service	11,000
Living veterans	40,000
Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls:	
Parents	3
Widows	76,856
Children	2,409
Veterans	36,369

WORLD WAR I (1917–18)

Particpants	4,744,000
Deaths in service	131,000
Living veterans	2,724,000
Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls:	
Parents	11,226
Widows	418,787
Children	74,583
Veterans	983,414

WORLD WAR II (SEPT. 16, 1940–JULY 25, 1947)

Participants	[1] 16,535,000
Deaths in service	409,000
Living veterans	[2] 15,220,000
Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls:	
Parents	251,385
Widows	89,597
Children	178,032
Veterans	1,641,079

KOREAN CONFLICT (JUNE 27, 1950–JAN. 31, 1955)

Participants	[1] 6,807,000
Deaths in service	54,000
Living veterans	[2] 5,466,000
Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls:	
Parents	36,466
Widows	10,395
Children	21,818
Veterans	211,624

TOTAL—ALL WARS

Participants [3]	31,858,000
Deaths in service	989,000
Living veterans	[4] 22,599,000
Veterans and dependents on compensation and pension rolls:	
Parents	[5] 316,733
Widows	[6] 615,644
Children	[7] 289,361
Veterans	[4] 2,972,069

[1] Includes 1,476,000 who served in both World War II and the Korean conflict.

[2] Includes 951,000 with service in both World War II and the Korean conflict.

[3] Persons who served in more than 1 war are counted as participants in each.

[4] Includes approximately 100,000 former members of the (peacetime) Regular Establishment who are receiving VA disability compensation.

[5] Includes 17,653 parents of deceased former members of the (peacetime) Regular Establishment.

[6] Includes 15,902 widows of deceased former members of the (peacetime) Regular Establishment.

[7] Includes 11,735 children of deceased former members of the (peacetime) Regular Establishment.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SENATE SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Through inadvertence, the following was omitted from the RECORD of July 2, 1960:

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the permanent RECORD be corrected in connection with an insertion made by the junior Senator from Colorado on June 30.

The insertion contains a profile article about Dr. Walter Orr Roberts, director of the University of Colorado High Altitude Observatory, as published in the New York Times. The title of the article, beginning in the first column of page 14045 of the RECORD, is "A Keen Eye for Weather."

In the line just below the title is a word which inadvertently found its way into the RECORD and does not belong there. Instead of simply reading "Walter Orr Roberts," it reads "By Walter Orr Roberts." The word "by" is superfluous and misleading in that it creates the impression that the article was written by Dr. Roberts. Actually it was not. It was written by a staff member of the New York Times. The word "by" preceding the name of Dr. Roberts should therefore be stricken.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the correction will be made.

SENATE BUSINESS TRANSACTED SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

The following business of the Senate was transacted subsequent to adjournment:

AMENDMENT OF HELIUM ACT OF SEPTEMBER 1, 1937, AS AMENDED—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (PT. 2 OF S. REPT. NO. 1814)

Under authority of the order of the Senate of July 1, 1960, Mr. CARROLL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, on July 7, 1960, submitted his individual views to accompany the bill (H.R. 10548) to amend the Helium Act of September 1, 1937, as amended, for the defense, security, and the general welfare of the United States, which were ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 712, agreed to July 2, 1960, the President pro tempore signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

On July 4, 1960:

H.R. 12311. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

On July 5, 1960:

S. 2535. An act for the relief of Joseph Lue Fan and Aura Joan Lue Fan;

S. 2674. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain lands for addition to Harpers Ferry National Monument, and for other purposes;

S. 2765. An act for the relief of Safia Skōlopoulos;

S. 2969. An act to authorize the award posthumously of appropriate medals to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington;

S. 3247. An act to amend the act of September 9, 1959 (73 Stat. 473), to provide that payment for the lands covered by such act may be made on a deferred basis;

S. 3319. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to release the recapture provisions contained in the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Little Rock, Ark., and for other purposes;

S. 3450. An act to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions;

S. 3616. An act to deny to the District of Columbia, in suits on claims arising out of the negligent operation of vehicles owned or controlled by it and operated by its employees in the performance of their official duties, the defense of governmental immunity, to relieve such employees of liability in such cases to third persons, and for other purposes;

H.R. 808. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to evaluate in dollars certain financial assistance loans expressed in foreign currencies arising as a result of World War II, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1422. An act for the relief of Alessandro Maraessa;

H.R. 1493. An act for the relief of Antonio Mendez Garcia and Palmira Lavin Garcia;

H.R. 1588. An act for the relief of Julius F. Steinhoff;

H.R. 1643. An act for the relief of Francesco Carozza;

H.R. 2117. An act for the relief of Ireneo B. Brodit and Antonio D. Brodit;

H.R. 2124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Teruko Teri Miyamoto (nee Ikeda);

H.R. 2705. An act for the relief of Bernardo Paternostro;

H.R. 2716. An act for the relief of Miss Elisabeth Hollander;

H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Luciano Di Franco;

H.R. 3524. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

H.R. 3804. An act for the relief of Rosolina Ciuferri;

H.R. 3900. An act to permit the admission to registry and the use in the coastwise trade of certain foreign-built hydrofoil vessels;

H.R. 4546. An act for the relief of Margaret P. Copin;

H.R. 4555. An act for the relief of Anatolijs Janitis;

H.R. 4595. An act to clarify and make uniform certain provisions of law relating to special postage rates for educational, cultural, and library materials, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4970. An act for the relief of Haralambos Groutas;

H.R. 5055. An act to amend the restriction on the use of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., by the United States;

H.R. 5436. An act to provide for a register in the Department of Commerce in which

shall be listed the names of certain persons who have had their motor vehicle operator's licenses revoked;

H.R. 5647. An act for the relief of Wong Gee Sing;

H.R. 6556. An act to amend subdivision (c) of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67c) so as to clarify time for review of orders of referees;

H.R. 6804. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Tighe Crespo;

H.R. 7004. An act to facilitate the administration of the public lands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7367. An act for the relief of Chieko Sakano and her child, Masao Sakano;

H.R. 7379. An act to amend the act of July 27, 1956, with respect to the detention of mail for temporary periods in the public interest, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7425. An act for the relief of Mrs. Humiko Ross;

H.R. 7551. An act for the relief of Hubert O. Beckles;

H.R. 7593. An act to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board may temporarily authorize certain air carriers to engage in supplemental air transportation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7634. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7895. An act for the relief of Gloria Anne Loveday;

H.R. 8229. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for supplemental unemployment benefit trusts;

H.R. 8384. An act for the relief of Otto Small;

H.R. 9042. An act for the relief of Anna Semechole Marcolina;

H.R. 9610. An act for the relief of Sister Frances Cabrini (Virginia Bilbao);

H.R. 9786. An act to amend sections 511 and 512 of title 38, United States Code, to permit Indian War and Spanish-American War veterans to elect to receive pension at the rates applicable to veterans of World War I;

H.R. 9960. An act for the relief of Doctor Tze I. Chiang;

H.R. 10002. An act for the relief of Ida Exle (nee Ida Sterio);

H.R. 10495. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10511. An act to grant additional benefit to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937;

H.R. 10793. An act for the relief of Ray C. Thompson;

H.R. 10952. An act to authorize the National Society Daughters of the American Colonists to use certain real property in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of that society;

H.R. 10997. An act to grant to the Government of Guam certain filled lands, submerged lands, and tidelands;

H.R. 11135. An act to aid in the development of a coordinated system of transportation for the National Capital region; to create a temporary National Capital Transportation Agency; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes;

H.R. 11389. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11516. An act to create a judicial officer for the Post Office Department;

H.R. 11748. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11776. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11854. An act to clarify the ownership of certain church properties located in the Virgin Islands;

H.R. 11931. An act to amend the act of March 3,1901, with respect to the time within which a caveat to a will must be filed in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 12231. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12465. An act to provide for a simpler method of determining assessments under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12584. An act to amend the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act for the District of Columbia;

H.R. 12740. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 605. Joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the 175th anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States;

H.J. Res. 672. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation with respect to the 1960 Pacific Festival, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 722. Joint resolution relating to the entry of certain aliens.

On July 6, 1960:

H.R. 11545. An act to amend the act of October 31, 1949, with respect to payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for certain Indians.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate presented to the President of the United States on July 5, 1960, the following enrolled bills:

S. 1315. An act for the incorporation of the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc.;

S. 2585. An act for the relief of Joseph Lue Fan and Aura Joan Lue Fan;

S. 2674. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain lands for addition to Harpers Ferry National Monument, and for other purposes;

S. 2765. An act for the relief of Sofia Skolopoulos;

S. 2969. An act to authorize the award posthumously of appropriate medals to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington;

S. 3076. An act for the relief of Daisy Pong Hi Tong Li;

S. 3247. An act to amend the act of September 9, 1959 (73 Stat. 473), to provide that payment for the lands covered by such act may be made on a deferred basis;

S. 3319. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to release the recapture provisions contained in the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Little Rock, Ark., and for other purposes;

S. 3450. An act to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions; and

S. 3616. An act to deny to the District of Columbia, in suits on claims arising out of the negligent operation of vehicles owned or controlled by it and operated by its employees in the performance of their official duties, the defense of governmental immunity, to relieve such employees of liability in such cases to third persons, and for other purposes.

APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that, on the following dates, he had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolution:

On July 5, 1960:

S. 1018. An act to authorize and direct the transfer of certain personal property to State and county agencies engaged in cooperative agricultural extension work;

S. 1752. An act for the relief of Stamatina Kalpaka;

S. 2053. An act to provide for the acceptance by the United States of a fish hatchery in the State of South Carolina;

S. 2174. An act to permit the filing of applications for patents to certain lands in Florida;

S. 2331. An act to provide for the hospitalization, at St. Elizabeths Hospital in the District of Columbia or elsewhere, of certain nationals of the United States adjudged insane or otherwise found mentally ill in foreign countries, and for other purposes;

S. 2443. An act for the relief of Edgar Harold Bradley;

S. 2481. An act to continue the application of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, to certain functions relating to fishing vessels transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 2618. An act to authorize the exchange of certain war-built vessels for more modern and efficient war-built vessels owned by the United States;

S. 3189. An act to further amend the shipping laws to prohibit operation in the coastwise trade of a rebuilt vessel unless the entire rebuilding is effected within the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 3226. An act to amend section 809 of the National Housing Act; and

S. 3485. An act to amend section 7 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, to provide for the payment of travel and transportation cost for persons selected for appointment to certain positions in the United States, and for other purposes.

On July 7, 1960:

S. 1886. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to certain rebroadcasting activities;

S. 2384. An act for the relief of Tommy Tadayoshi Shuto (Tadayoshi Takeda);

S. 2566. An act for the relief of Peter Leo Bahr, John Trevor Jefferies, Chairman Candy Jefferies, and Stephen Reid Jefferies; and

S. 2941. An act for the relief of Ming-Chen Hsu.

On July 12, 1960:

S. 598. An act for the relief of Anthony Di Giovanni;

S. 747. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain lands which are a part of the Des Plaines Public Hunting and Refuge Area and the Joliet Arsenal Military Reservation, located in Will County, Ill., to the State of Illinois;

S. 1283. An act to regulate the interstate distribution and sale of packages of hazardous substances intended or suitable for household use;

S. 1409. An act for the relief of Donald B. Thurston and other employees of the Fish and Wildlife Service;

S. 1454. An act for the relief of Keitha L. Baker;

S. 1502. An act to provide for adjustments in the annuities under the Foreign Service retirement and disability system;

S. 1509. An act to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, to provide "grandfather" rights for certain motor carriers and freight forwarders operating in interstate or foreign commerce within Alaska and between Alaska and the other States of the United States, and for certain water carriers operating within Alaska, to provide "grandfather" rights for certain freight forwarders operating between Hawaii and the other States of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1600. An act for the relief of Grace L. Patton;

S. 1795. An act relating to the promotion and separation of certain officers of the regular components of the Armed Forces;

S. 1965. An act to make uniform provisions of law with respect to the terms of office of the members of certain regulatory agencies;

S. 2113. An act for the relief of George K. Caldwell;

S. 2197. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act so as to authorize the use of suitable color additives in or on foods, drugs, and cosmetics, in accordance with regulations prescribing the conditions (including maximum tolerances) under which such additives may be safely used;

S. 2277. An act for the relief of the Geo. D. Emery Co.;

S. 2548. An act for the relief of Henry C. Larson;

S. 2689. An act for the relief of Hwachii Lien;

S. 2740. An act for the relief of Julia Sukkar;

S. 2744. An act to extend the term of design patent No. 21,053, dated September 22, 1891, for a badge, granted to George Brown Goode, and assigned to the National Daughters of the American Revolution;

S. 2817. An act for the relief of Joseph R. Paquette;

S. 2855. An act for the relief of Brenda Nicholson Miller;

S. 2857. An act to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for disposition of contributions in the case of annuitants whose length of service exceeds the amount necessary to provide the maximum annuity allowable under such act, and for other purposes;

S. 3105. An act for the relief of William Y. Allen, Jr., Donald Baldwin Quintero, Johann Friedrich Stapelfeld, and Kenneth Gordon Woods;

S. 3125. An act for the relief of Robert William Neal, Robert J. Naumann, Charles LeRoy Van Slyke, and Franklin Jordan;

S. 3179. An act to increase the authorization for appropriations for construction of facilities for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory;

S. 3545. An act to amend section 4 of the act of January 21, 1929 (48 U.S.C. 354a(c)), and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 41. Joint resolution to establish a National Institute for International Health and Medical Research, to provide for international cooperation in health research, research training, and research planning, and for other purposes.

On July 14, 1960:

S. 1315. An act for the incorporation of the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc.;

S. 2585. An act for the relief of Joseph Lue Fan and Aura Joan Lue Fan;

S. 2674. An act to authorize the acquisition of certain lands for addition to Harpers Ferry National Monument, and for other purposes;

S. 2765. An act for the relief of Sofia Skolopoulos;

S. 2969. An act to authorize the award posthumously of appropriate medals to Chaplain George L. Fox, Chaplain Alexander D. Goode, Chaplain Clark V. Poling, and Chaplain John P. Washington;

S. 3076. An act for the relief of Daisy Pong Hi Tong Li;

S. 3247. An act to amend the act of September 9, 1959 (73 Stat. 473), to provide that payment for the lands covered by such act may be made on a deferred basis;

S. 3319. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to release the recapture provisions contained in the conveyance of certain real property to the city of Little Rock, Ark., and for other purposes;

S. 3450. An act to amend section 22 (relating to the endowment and support of colleges of agriculture and the mechanic arts) of the act of June 29, 1935, to increase the authorized appropriation for resident teaching grants to land-grant institutions;

S. 3616. An act to deny to the District of Columbia, in suits on claims arising out of the negligent operation of vehicles owned or controlled by it and operated by its employees in the performance of their official duties, the defense of governmental immunity, to relieve such employees of liability in such cases to third persons, and for other purposes.

SENATE BILLS DISAPPROVED SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that on the following dates, he had disapproved the following bills of the Senate, together with his reasons for such action:

On July 6, 1960:

ECONOMIC REGULATION OF ALASKA RAILROAD UNDER INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

I am withholding my approval from S. 1508, a bill to provide for economic regulation of the Alaska Railroad under the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes.

I cannot approve the bill because it would (1) subordinate certain of the President's statutory powers to those of a regulatory commission, (2) allow a State to regulate a Federal agency, and (3) apply to the Alaska Railroad laws, rules, and procedures which are intended solely for application to privately owned and operated railroads and which are completely inappropriate for a Government agency established to carry out a public purpose.

The power to construct and operate the Alaska Railroad and to set the rates charged by it are vested in the President. To subject the President's exercise of these powers to the review and perhaps disapproval of the Interstate Commerce Commission would be repugnant to our constitutional system.

By allowing the State of Alaska to regulate the Railroad, which is a Federal agency, the bill violates the principle that the Federal Government's authority shall be supreme. Under S. 1508, the State could thwart public purposes declared by the President and the Congress, but it would have no responsibility for the success or for the financing of the Railroad.

The laws, rules, standards, and procedures concerning tariffs, rates, accounts, services, and employees of private railroads are not suited to a Government agency. Accounting standards established by the Interstate Commerce Commission for private railroads cannot, for example, assure the President and the Congress of adequate control over the use of Federal funds by a Federal agency. In requiring the Commission to consider the needs of Government financial agencies, and in other exceptions it makes, the bill itself recognizes that standards applied to private industry cannot be applied to the Alaska Railroad.

By extending the Employers' Liability Act to cover the Alaska Railroad's liability to its employees, who are already covered by the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the bill may give this group of Federal employees either dual compensation from the Federal Government for a single injury or the right to choose between two methods of obtaining compensation. Either result would be inconsistent with the Federal workmen's compensation policy that all employees be treated equally.

The President and the Congress have ample authority to insure that the Railroad operates in the public interest. In due course, it will be determined that the Railroad's Federal purposes have been achieved. At that time the Congress should authorize disposition of the Railroad to a non-Federal agency, and it would then automatically become subject to Interstate Commerce Commission regulation.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 6, 1960.*

On July 12, 1960:

METHOD FOR REGULATING AND FIXING WAGE RATES FOR EMPLOYEES OF PORTSMOUTH, N.H., NAVAL SHIPYARD

I am withholding my approval from S. 19, to provide a method for regulating and fixing wage rates for employees of Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard.

My reasons for disapproving an identical enactment of the 85th Congress still apply. This bill, like its predecessor, strikes at the heart of the statutory principle that rates of pay for 673,000 Federal wage board employees shall conform, as nearly as is consistent with the public interest, with private rates of pay in the immediate vicinity of the particular Federal activity.

This principle is sound. It insures Federal employees a fair wage. It insures against the payment of unwarranted hourly rates by the Government. And it insures that Federal rates of pay will not upset the economy of the community in which the Federal establishment is located.

S. 19 would disregard this principle by providing that hourly rates for Portsmouth Naval Shipyard employees should be based on those which obtain, not in Portsmouth, but rather in the Boston industrial complex, 60 miles distant. Private industrial rates are substantially higher in Boston than in Portsmouth—and therein lies the explanation of the bill.

But why should the Government pay a much higher hourly wage rate than do fair-minded private employers in the Portsmouth area? If the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard were a private establishment, there would be no question of a differential. The going rate for the area

would be paid. But because the Government is the employer, and just because it is, there is apparently an expectation that the Government should pay more than these hourly employees in fairness and equity have a right to expect. Further, it is seemingly of little or no concern that in so doing the Government would be departing from sound principle and business practice and would be unsettling the economy of the Portsmouth community.

This kind of legislation—this expectation of something-for-nothing from the Government just because it is the Government—weakens our national fabric and with each occurrence leaves it more seriously impaired. The spread of this expectation, and its reflection in an increase of such legislation, are profoundly disturbing for the future of America.

In this one instance, for example, S. 19 as a law would provide a ready precedent for the eventual dissolution of the wage board principle and system. The Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in no way presents an unusual situation. Several Federal establishments, less distant from Boston than Portsmouth, have lower pay scales than those of the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard.

By no rationale can this bill be justified. Wage disparities exist throughout the United States but under the wage board principle the Government pays the fair and equitable hourly rates of the particular area in which it finds itself—and so it should.

For these reasons I am unable to approve the bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 12, 1960.*

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOUSE SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT UNTIL AUGUST 15, 1960—BILL ENROLLED

[Omitted from the RECORD of July 5, 1960]

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that on July 4, 1960, that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title:

H.R. 2117. An act for the relief of Iranso D. Brodit and Antonio D. Brodit.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

[Omitted from the RECORD of July 5, 1960]

Pursuant to the authority granted the Speaker by House Concurrent Resolution 712, 86th Congress, he did sign an enrolled bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2117. An act for the relief of Iranso D. Brodit and Antonio D. Brodit.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, subsequent to the adjournment of the House of Representatives, reported that, on the following date, that committee had presented to the President for his approval bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On July 7, 1960:

H.R. 7593. An act to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board may temporarily authorize certain air carriers to engage in supplemental air transportation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7634. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7895. An act for the relief of Gloria Anne Loveday;

H.R. 8229. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for supplemental unemployment benefit trusts;

H.R. 8384. An act for the relief of Otto Small;

H.R. 9610. An act for the relief of Sister Frances Cabrini (Virginia Bilbao);

H.R. 9042. An act for the relief of Anna Semechole Marcolina;

H.R. 9786. An act to amend sections 511 and 512 of title 38, United States Code, to permit Indian war and Spanish-American War veterans to elect to receive pension at the rates applicable to veterans of World War I;

H.R. 9960. An act for the relief of Dr. Tze I. Chiang;

H.R. 10002. An act for the relief of Ida Exle (nee Ida Sterio);

H.R. 10495. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10511. An act to grant additional benefit to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937;

H.R. 10793. An act for the relief of Ray C. Thompson;

H.R. 10952. An act to authorize the National Society Daughters of the American Colonists to use certain real property in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of that society;

H.R.10997. An act to grant to the Government of Guam certain filled lands, submerged lands, and tidelands;

H.R. 11135. An act to aid in the development of a coordinated system of transportation for the National Capital region; to create a temporary National Capital Transportation Agency; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes;

H.R. 11389. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11516. An act to create a judicial officer for the Post Office Department;

H.R. 11545. An act to amend the act of October 31, 1949, with respect to payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for certain Indians;

H.R. 11748. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11776. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11854. An act to clarify the ownership of certain church properties located in the Virgin Islands;

H.R. 11931. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to the time within which a caveat to a will must be filed in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 12231. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12465. An act to provide for a simpler method of determining assessments under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12584. An act to amend the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act for the District of Columbia;

H.R. 12740. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 605. Joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the 175th anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States;

H.J. Res. 672. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation with respect to the 1960 Pacific Festival, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 722. Joint resolution relating to the entry of certain aliens.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS APPROVED SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the House of Representatives until August 15, 1960, notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 30, 1960:

H.R. 8186. An act to amend titles 10 and 14, United States Code, with respect to reserve commissioned officers of the Armed Forces;

H.R. 8457. An act for the relief of Richard Schoenfelder and Lidwina S. Wagner;

H.R. 9226. An act for the relief of Pietro Mela;

H.R. 9322. An act to make permanent the existing suspension of duties on certain coarse wool;

H.R. 9652. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Alonzo C. Tenney;

H.R. 9862. An act to continue for 2 years the existing suspension of duties on certain lathes used for shoe last roughing or for shoe last finishing, and to extend the suspension of duty on imports of casein;

H.R. 9881. An act to extend for 2 years the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders;

H.R. 10569. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, and the Tax Court of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes.

H.R. 10631. An act for the relief of George T. Moore, Carl D. Berry, and Dr. Harold J. Heck.

H.R. 11001. An act to provide for the participation of the United States in the International Development Association.

H.R. 12052. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, for an additional 2 years.

H.R. 12115. An act to extend the minimum national marketing quota for extra long staple cotton to the 1961 crop.

H.R. 12381. An act to increase for a 1-year period the public debt limit set forth in section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act and to extend for 1 year the existing corporate normal-tax rate and certain excise-tax rates, and for other purposes.

H.R. 12415. An act to amend section 6387 (b) of title 10, United States Code, relating

to the definition of total commissioned service of certain officers of the naval service; and

H.J. Res. 688. Joint resolution for the relief of certain aliens.

On July 1, 1960:

H.R. 12346. An act to amend section 14(b) of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, to extend for 2 years the authority of Federal Reserve banks to purchase U.S. obligations directly from the Treasury.

On July 2, 1960:

H.J. Res. 778. Joint resolution making temporary appropriations for the fiscal year 1961, and for other purposes.

On July 5, 1960:

H.R. 1600. An act for the relief of Francis M. Haischer;

H.R. 1844. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia approved June 19, 1934, as amended by the acts of July 2, 1940, and July 12, 1950;

H.R. 3122. An act directing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a homestead patent to the heirs of Frank L. Wilhelm;

H.R. 3789. An act for the relief of Preciolita V. Corliss (nee Preciolita Valera);

H.R. 3805. An act for the relief of Religiosa Luigia Frizzo, Religiosa Vittoria Garzoni, Religiosa Maria Ramus, Religiosa Ines Ferrario, and Religiosa Roberta Ciccone;

H.R. 4786. An act declaring certain lands to be held in trust for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe of Indians of South Dakota;

H.R. 4964. An act for the relief of Mrs. Betty L. Fonk;

H.R. 5033. An act for the relief of Betty Keenan;

H.R. 5569. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the award of certain medals within 2 years after a determination by the Secretary concerned that because of loss or inadvertence the recommendation was not processed;

H.R. 6081. An act for the relief of M. Sgt. Emery C. Jones;

H.R. 8226. An act to add certain lands to Castillo de San Marcos National Monument in the State of Florida;

H.R. 8315. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Army to lease a portion of Fort Crowder, Mo., to Stella Reorganized Schools R–I, Missouri;

H.R. 8740. An act to provide for the leasing of oil and gas interests in certain lands owned by the United States in the State of Texas;

H.R. 9201. An act to validate certain mining claims in California;

H.R. 9443. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ethel B. Morgan;

H.R. 9541. An act to amend section 109(g) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949;

H.R. 9921. An act to validate certain payments of additional pay for sea duty made to members and former members of the U.S. Coast Guard;

H.R. 10021. An act providing a uniform law for the transfer of securities to and by fiduciaries in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 10108. An act to authorize reimbursement of certain Veterans' Administration beneficiaries and their attendants for ferry fares, and bridge, road, and tunnel tolls;

H.R. 10695. An act to provide for the rotation in overseas assignments of civilian employees under the Defense Establishment having career-conditional and career appointments in the competitive civil service, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11646. An act to amend the act authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to collect and publish statistics of the grade and staple length of cotton, as amended, by defining certain offenses in connection with the sampling of cotton for classification and providing a penalty provision, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12265. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain persons to administer oaths and to perform notarial acts for persons serving with, employed by, or accompanying the Armed Forces outside the United States.

On July 6, 1960:

H.R. 3291. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to certain medals;

H.R. 4251. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on the deduction of exploration expenditures;

H.R. 6108. An act to provide for the establishment of the Arkansas Post National Memorial, in the State of Arkansas;

H.R. 9142. An act to provide for payment for lands heretofore conveyed to the United States as a basis for lieu selections from the public domain, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12311. An act to amend the Sugar Act of 1948, as amended.

On July 7, 1960:

H.R. 2584. An act for the relief of Courgen H. Assaturian;

H.R. 2665. An act for the relief of Briccio Garces de Castro;

H.R. 2823. An act for the relief of Fumie Yoshioka;

H.R. 3375. An act to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to contract for coal research, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3534. An act for the relief of Epifanio Trupiano;

H.R. 3923. An act to provide for the presentation of a medal to persons who have served as member of a U.S. expedition to Antarctica;

H.R. 4670. An act for the relief of Karnail Singh Mahal;

H.R. 5888. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to transfer to the Massachusetts Port Authority, an instrumentality of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, certain lands and improvements thereon comprising a portion of the so-called E Street Annex, South Boston Annex, Boston Naval Shipyard, in South Boston, Mass., in exchange for certain other lands;

H.R. 7932. An act for the relief of William E. Dulin;

H.R. 7966. An act to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the furnishing of needed services of optometrists to veterans having service-connected eye conditions;

H.R. 8212. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, with respect to the procedure for ordering certain members of the reserve components to active duty and the requirements for physical examination of members of the reserve components, and for other purposes;

H.R. 8241. An act to amend certain provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act relating to the reemployment of former members of Congress;

H.R. 8253. An act for the relief of Pierre R. DeBroux;

H.R. 10644. An act to amend title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to change the limitation of the construction differential subsidy under such title, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11522. An act to amend the act of August 26, 1935, to permit certain real property of the United States to be conveyed to States, municipalities, and other political subdivisions for highway purposes;

H.R. 11748. An act to continue until the close of June 30, 1961, the suspension of duties on metal scrap, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11787. An act to authorize a continuation of flight instruction for members of the Reserve Officers' Training Corps until August 1, 1964;

H.R. 11998. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12263. An act to authorize the conclusion of an agreement for the joint construction by the United States and Mexico of a major international storage dam on the Rio Grande in accordance with the provisions of the treaty of February 3, 1944, with Mexico, and for other purposes.

On July 12, 1960:

H.R. 1157. An act to provide for promotion of economic and social development in the Ryukyu Islands;

H.R. 2671. An act for the relief of Antonia Martinez;

H.R. 4049. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to authorize free or reduced-rate transportation for certain additional persons;

H.R. 4346. An act to amend the Bankruptcy Act to limit the use of false financial statements as a bar to discharge;

H.R. 4386. An act to amend title 18 of the United States Code to make it unlawful to destroy, deface, or remove certain boundary markers on Indian reservations, and to trespass on Indian reservations to hunt, fish, or trap;

H.R. 5040. An act to amend and clarify the reemployment provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 5098. An act to provide for the application and disposition of net revenues from the power development on the Grand Valley Federal reclamation project, Colorado;

H.R. 6179. An act to grant the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands to the city of Crawford, Nebr.;

H.R. 7726. An act to amend section 678 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 1078) relating to the transmission of petitions, notices, orders, and other papers to the Secretary of the Treasury in chapter XIII proceedings;

H.R. 7965. An act to amend section 612 of title 38, United States Code, to authorize outpatient treatment incident to authorized hospital care for certain veterans;

H.R. 8295. An act to authorize the transfer to the Navajo Tribe of irrigation project works on the Navajo Reservation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 9702. An act to amend section 2771 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain payments of deceased members' final accounts without the necessity of settlement by General Accounting Office;

H.R. 9711. An act for the relief of Robert L. Stoermer;

H.R. 9751. An act for the relief of Mrs. Icile Helen Hinman;

H.R. 10068. An act to amend section 303 of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, to authorize travel and transportation allowances, and transportation of dependents and of baggage and household effects to the homes of their selection for certain members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10500. An act to amend the Career Compensation Act of 1949 with respect to incentive pay for certain submarine service;

H.R. 10596. An act to change the method of payment of Federal aid to State or territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines of the United States;

H.R. 11389. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office of the President and sundry general Government agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11602. An act to amend certain laws of the United States in light of the admission of the State of Hawaii into the Union, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11776. An act making appropriations for sundry independent executive bureaus,

boards, commissions, corporations, agencies, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12200. An act to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize reduction in enlisted grade upon approval of certain court-martial sentences;

H.R. 12231. An act making appropriations for military construction for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12232. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12570. An act to amend section 303(c) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 by imposing certain limitations on the transportation of household effects; and

H.J. Res. 627. Joint resolution to authorize appropriations incident to U.S. participation in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property.

On July 14, 1960:

H.R. 808. An act to authorize the Secretary of State to evaluate in dollars certain financial assistance loans expressed in foreign currencies arising as a result of World War II, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1422. An act for the relief of Alassandro Maraessa;

H.R. 1493. An act for the relief of Antonio Mendez Garcia and Palmira Lavin Garcia;

H.R. 1588. An act for the relief of Julius F. Steinhoff;

H.R. 1643. An act for the relief of Francesco Carozza;

H.R. 2117. An act for the relief of Ireneo D. Brodit and Antonio D. Brodit;

H.R. 2124. An act for the relief of Mrs. Teruko Teri Miyamoto (nee Ikeda);

H.R. 2705. An act for the relief of Bernardo Paternostro;

H.R. 2716. An act for the relief of Miss Elizabeth Hollander;

H.R. 2944. An act for the relief of Luciano Di Franco;

H.R. 3524. An act for the relief of certain aliens;

H.R. 3804. An act for the relief of Rosolina Ciuferri;

H.R. 3900. An act to permit the admission to registry and the use in the coastwise trade of certain foreign-built hydrofoil vessels;

H.R. 4555. An act for the relief of Anatolijs Janitis;

H.R. 4595. An act to clarify and make uniform certain provisions of law relating to special postage rates for educational, cultural, and library materials, and for other purposes;

H.R. 4970. An act for the relief of Haralambos Groutas;

H.R. 5055. An act to amend the restriction on the use of certain real property heretofore conveyed to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., by the United States;

H.R. 5486. An act to provide for a register in the Department of Commerce in which shall be listed the names of certain persons who have had their motor vehicle operator's licenses revoked;

H.R. 5647. An act for the relief of Wong Gee Sing;

H.R. 6556. An act to amend subdivision c of section 39 of the Bankruptcy Act (11 U.S.C. 67c) so as to clarify time for review of orders of referees;

H.R. 6804. An act for the relief of Mary Elizabeth Tighe Crespo;

H.R. 7004. An act to facilitate the administration of the public lands, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7033. An act for the relief of Jack Darwin, Adolphe Herstein, and Nicholas Anthony Marcantonakis;

H.R. 7211. An act to provide additional disability compensation for certain seriously disabled veterans;

H.R. 7367. An act for the relief of Chieko Sakano and her child, Masao Sakano;

H.R. 7379. An act to amend the act of July 27, 1956, with respect to the detention of mail for temporary periods in the public interest, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7425. An act for the relief of Mrs. Humiko Ross;

H.R. 7551. An act for the relief of Hubert O. Beckles;

H.R. 7593. An act to provide that the Civil Aeronautics Board may temporarily authorize certain air carriers to engage in supplemental air transportation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7634. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7895. An act for the relief of Gloria Anne Loveday;

H.R. 7903. An act to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to extend the veterans' guaranteed and direct loan program for 2 years;

H.R. 8229. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an exemption from income tax for supplemental unemployment benefit trusts;

H.R. 8384. An act for the relief of Otto Small;

H.R. 9042. An act for the relief of Anna Semechole Marcolina;

H.R. 9610. An act for the relief of Sister Frances Cabrini (Virginia Bilbao);

H.R. 9786. An act to amend section 511 and 512 of title 38, United States Code, to permit Indian war and Spanish-American War veterans to elect to receive pension at the rates applicable to veterans of World War I;

H.R. 9960. An act for the relief of Dr. Tze I. Chiang;

H.R. 10002. An act for the relief of Ida Exle (nee Ida Sterio);

H.R. 10495. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1962 and 1963 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 10511. An act to grant an additional benefit to persons receiving cash relief under the Panama Canal Cash Relief Act of July 8, 1937;

H.R. 10793. An act for the relief of Ray C. Thompson;

H.R. 10952. An act to authorize the National Society Daughters of the American Colonists to use certain real property in the District of Columbia as the national headquarters of that society;

H.R. 10997. An act to grant to the Government of Guam certain filled lands, submerged lands, and tidelands;

H.R. 11135. An act to aid in the development of a coordinated system of transportation for the National Capital region; to create a temporary National Capital Transportation Agency; to authorize negotiation to create an interstate agency; and for other purposes;

H.R. 11516. An act to create a judicial officer for the Post Office Department;

H.R. 11854. An act to clarify the ownership of certain church properties located in the Virgin Islands;

H.R. 11931. An act to amend the act of March 3, 1901, with respect to the time within which a caveat to a will must be filed in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 12465. An act to provide for a simpler method of determining assessments under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12584. An act to amend the Uniform Narcotic Drug Act for the District of Columbia;

H.R. 12740. An act making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to enable the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 605. Joint resolution providing for the preparation and completion of plans for a comprehensive observance of the 175th anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States;

H.J. Res. 672. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue a proclamation with respect to the 1960 Pacific Festival, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 722. Joint resolution relating to the entry of certain aliens.

BILLS DISAPPROVED SUBSEQUENT TO ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the House of Representatives until August 15, 1960, transmitted to the Clerk of the House a list of House bills disapproved, together with his reasons for such actions, as follows:

On July 6, 1960:

JUAN D. QUINTOS ET AL.

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 1516, for the relief of Juan D. Quintos, Jaime Hernandez, Delfin Buencamino, Soledad Gomez, Nieves G. Argonza, Felididad G. Sarayba, Carmen Vda de Gomez, Perfecta B. Quintos, and Bienvenida San Agustin.

The bill would waive the applicable statute of limitations and confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear the claims of these individuals for losses of jewelry, coins, relics, and currency which were somehow included in one of four large wooden boxes delivered to the United States High Commissioner to the Philippines by the Philippine National Bank in response to the Commissioner's direction, in December 1941, that the bank deliver to him "all cash reserves, bullion, negotiable securities, and other negotiable papers held by your bank, or held by you in trust for others." The purpose of the directive was to prevent such items from falling into the hands of the enemy who, at that moment, was invading the islands. When the property of these claimants was discovered, it was turned over to a representative of the Philippine government, who rejected suggestions of United States Army officers that it be sent out on an American submarine. Instead, he voluntarily placed the property in a safe at Corregidor where it was confiscated by the Japanese. From these facts it is apparent that the possibility of a valid claim against the United States is very remote.

More importantly, these claimants had ample opportunity to present their claims in a timely manner. Under the applicable statute of limitations, they had until December 1947—2 years after the end of the war—to file suit in the Court of Claims. They had 5 months after the Treasury Department, on July 25, 1947, advised that there was no statute or appropriation permitting the administrative settlement of such claims. They waited, however, for 4 years, until 1951, before petitioning the Court of Claims.

Nothing in the record justifies special treatment for these claimants, particularly when it is remembered that many

others filed suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for damages arising out of incidents in the Philippines during the war years and had their cases dismissed because of the expiration of the statute of limitations.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 6, 1960.*

On July 7, 1960:

SAM J. BUZZANCA

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 6712, a bill "For the relief of Sam J. Buzzanca."

Mr. Buzzanca, at a Federal tax sale in 1954, purchased certain real estate which had an estimated market value of $21,000, but which was subject to a mortgage prior in time to the Federal tax lien. It was announced at the tax sale that principal and interest in the amount of $8,320 was due under this prior mortgage. The real estate was sold to Mr. Buzzanca for $8,100—far less than the amount of the Federal tax lien which exceeded the market value of the property.

Two months later the holder of the first mortgage, who also had acquired whatever rights the heirs of the delinquent taxpayer and former owner had in the property, successfully sued Mr. Buzzanca to obtain possession of the property. Although the United States was not a party to this action, the District Director for the area did render informal assistance to Mr. Buzzanca. On appeal, the Supreme Court of Alabama affirmed.

Mr. Buzzanca's claim for relief appears to rest on the contention that the first mortgagee obtained a judgment for possession of the property because the tax sale to Mr. Buzzanca was defective and did not convey to Mr. Buzzanca the former owner's interest.

Internal Revenue Service records reveal no defect in the seizure and sale. This being so, Mr. Buzzanca has no ground for complaint against the United States. Because the existence of the first mortgage was made known at the time, the tax sale did not purport to convey rights superior to a valid first mortgage.

The United States cannot and does not attempt to warrant or defend title to property seized and sold under the internal revenue laws. No warranty is available to a purchaser at a tax sale and a deed is not a warranty of the title conveyed. The right, title, and interest conveyed is derivative, and the purchaser acquires only the interest of the delinquent taxpayer. To compel the United States to warrant and defend the title to all property sold by it for taxes would be costly and inadvisable.

For these reasons I cannot, on the facts at hand, approve this bill for it would create a precedent that would encourage dissatisfied purchasers at Federal tax sales to ask Congress to underwrite their losses and guarantee their titles.

Were Mr. Buzzanca, however, to adduce direct evidence establishing incontrovertibly that the tax deed in question was defective, I would of course be willing to sign a similar bill subsequently enacted.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 7, 1960.*

On July 14, 1960:

MARGARET P. COPIN

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 4546, for the relief of Margaret P. Copin.

This bill would direct that its beneficiary be credited with a 20-year service period for purposes of civil service retirement annuity, payable commencing October 1, 1959.

This claimant, during three periods beginning in August 1920 and ending in June 1949, was on the employment rolls of the Treasury Department for a total time of 20 years and 29 days. This included, however, 7 months and 21 days of leave without pay in calendar year 1922. Her actual service therefore, totals only 19 years, 5 months and 8 days. Nevertheless, in computing Mrs. Copin's length of service for retirement annuity purposes, the normal rules of the law were applied; namely, free credit of 6 months of leave without pay taken in 1932 and exclusion of the excess amount.

Despite the credit of 6 months, the claimant still lacks 22 days of the 20 years of creditable service which would have given her the right to an immediate reduced annuity beginning October 1, 1958, when disability annuity payments theretofore received were terminated pursuant to a finding that she was reemployable. Instead, her status is that of a deferred annuitant, and retirement annuity will not be payable until March 1, 1964, after she has attained 62 years of age. The difference in the total value of the two annuities, based on life expectancy, is $4,200, which would be, in effect, a gratuity from the Federal Government.

The record on H.R. 4546 discloses no valid justification for the favored position the bill would accord this claimant. To confer such a preferential advantage on one individual participant in the retirement program would be highly discriminatory and contrary to the principles of fair play and equality of treatment which are basic to sound personnel administration.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 14, 1960.*

On July 14, 1960:

BERNALILLO COUNTY, N. MEX.

I am withholding my approval from H.R. 11545, to amend the act of October 31, 1949, with respect to payments to Bernalillo County, N. Mex., for furnishing hospital care for certain Indians.

A 1949 law authorized the Government to contribute $1,500,000 toward construction of a hospital in Bernalillo County upon Government donated land. In return, the county must make available, when required, at least 100 beds for the care of eligible Indians. Further, the cost of caring for Indians admitted to the hospital was to be paid by the United States and, as an experiment, the Government undertook to guarantee the county a payment at least equal to the cost of operating 80 percent of the beds reserved for Indians irrespective of the number actually hospitalized.

The minimum guaranty provision, previously twice extended and now expired as of June 30, 1960, would be extended for still another year under H.R. 11545.

Ordinarily in such cases the United States pays for Indian care on the basis of actual hospitalization. Accordingly, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in reporting to the Congress in 1957 pursuant to the original law, recommended that the experimental 80 percent minimum guaranty be permitted to expire. The Congress nevertheless extended the guaranty provision for another 3 years.

Funds for contract hospital care should be available for expenditure wherever the health needs of Indian patients so require, and no portion of them should be mandatorily tied to a single contract facility without regard to actual need or use. Moreover, because other Government service contracts for Indian care do not include a minimum payment guaranty, it would be highly inequitable to continue this provision solely for the Bernalillo County Hospital.

Finally, the completion of other facilities now under construction will in all likelihood reduce the number of Indian patients at Bernalillo Hospital and the bill would thus mean unnecessary expense to the Government and without any corresponding advantage, either to the Government or to this program.

For these reasons, I am unable to approve this bill.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *July 14, 1960.*

STATEMENTS BY THE PRESIDENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to the adjournment of the House of Representatives until August 15, 1960, transmitted to the Clerk of the House the following statements:

On July 12, 1960:

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION, 1961

I have today approved H.R. 11776, the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1961.

In enacting this law the Congress refused to provide recommended funds which would have enabled the General Services Administration, at small cost, to include fallout shelters in certain appropriate new and existing Federal buildings. In fact, by a general provision, the law actually precludes the construction of fallout shelters in Government-owned or leased buildings unless specifically authorized.

It is an aspect of the Federal Government's policy in this area to provide leadership by example. The incorporation of fallout shelters in appropriate new and existing Federal buildings is intended to stimulate State and local governments and the public to undertake shelter projects on their own initiative.

State Governors attending a recent White House meeting on civil defense unanimously agreed that providing pro-

tection from fallout was an essential requirement of national policy. Last year, in Puerto Rico, and again this year in Montana, the Governors' Conference reached the same conclusion.

The Congress accordingly should appropriate the omitted funds when it convenes again in August. Such positive action would be in the best interests of our national security.

On July 14, 1960:

RELIEF OF CERTAIN ALIENS

I have today approved House Joint Resolution 397, to enable the United States to participate in the resettlement of certain refugees, and for other purposes, because of its general merit and the urgent need to accomplish the purposes of the measure. Under this provision, the special authority of the Attorney General to parole into the United States certain refugees could be terminated upon the adoption of a simple resolution to that effect by either House of Congress. The Attorney General has advised me that there is a serious question as to whether this provision is constitutional. Nevertheless, in view of the short period for which this power is given and the improbability that the issue will arise, it is believed that it would be better to defer a determination of the effect of such possible action until it is taken.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker, Sam Rayburn

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Addonizio, Hugh J., *N. J.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* 5115 Allen Terrace
Alexander, Hugh Q., *N. C.*
Alford, Dale, *Ark.*
Alger, Bruce, *Tex.*
Allen, Leo E., *Ill.* University Club
Andersen, H. Carl, *Minn.* 4501 Conn. Ave.
Anderson, LeRoy H., *Mont.* 911 Beverly Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Anfuso, Victor L., *N. Y.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S. C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Auchincloss, James C., *N. J.* 113 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Avery, William H., *Kans.*
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Bailey, Cleveland M., *W. Va.*
Baker, Howard H., *Tenn.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Barden, Graham A., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barr, Joseph W., *Ind.* Tulip Lane and Glen Mill Rd., Rockville Md.
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Barry, Robert R., *N. Y.* 3019 Normanstone Drive
Bass, Perkins, *N. H.*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Baumhart, A. D., Jr., *Ohio*
Becker, Frank J., *N. Y.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1530 38th St. SE.
Bennett, John B., *Mich.* 3718 Cardiff Rd., Chevy Chase, Md.
Bentley, Alvin M., *Mich.*
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Blitch, Iris Faircloth, (Mrs.), *Ga.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 3409 Lowell St.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N. C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bosch, Albert H., *N. Y.*
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Bowles, Chester, *Conn.*
Boykin, Frank W., *Ala.* The Washington
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Breeding, J. Floyd, *Kans.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.*
Brock, Lawrence, *Nebr.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Brooks, Overton, *La.* 4413 46th St.
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Charles H., *Mo.* 3723 N. Oakland St., Arlington, Va.
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.* Alban Towers
Brown, Paul, *Ga.* Boston House
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buckley, Charles A., *N. Y.*
Budge, Hamer H., *Idaho*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Burke, Frank W., *Ky.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. So., Arlington, Va.
Cahill, William T., *N. J.*
Canfield, Gordon, *N. J.*
Cannon, Clarence, *Mo.*
Carnahan, A. S. J., *Mo.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Chenoweth, J. Edgar, *Colo.*
Chiperfield, Robert B., *Ill.* 1713 House Office Building
Church, Marguerite Stitt (Mrs.), *Ill.* 2122 Mass. Ave.
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 3735 Gunston Rd., Alexandria, Va.
Coad, Merwin, *Iowa.*
Coffin, Frank M., *Maine*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 5708 Nevada Ave.
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.*
Cook, Robert E., *Ohio.* 1440 Rock Creek Ford Road
Cooley, Harold D., *N. C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Laurence, *Mass.* 3314 O St.
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N. J.*
Davis, Clifford, *Tenn.* 4611 Butterworth Pl.
Davis, James C., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
Delaney, James J., *N. Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derounian, Steven B., *N. Y.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.* 800 4th St. SW.
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dixon, Henry Aldous, *Utah.* 1817 N. Quinn St., Arlington, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dooley, Edwin B., *N. Y.*
Dorn, Francis E., *N. Y.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S. C.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Doyle, Clyde, *Calif.* 3877 30th St. N., Arlington, Va.
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N. Y.* Apt. 201, 2418 Menokin Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Durham, Carl T., *N. C.* The Lee House
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N. J.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Elliott, Carl, *Ala.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N. Y.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Fenton, Ivor D., *Pa.* 3725 Macomb St.
Fino, Paul A., *N. Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynn, Gerald T., *Wis.*
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R. I.* 1133 House Office Building
Foley, John R., *Md.*
Forand, Aime J., *R. I.* 4108 Dresden St., Kensington, Md.
Ford, Gerald R., Jr., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Forrester, E. L., *Ga.*
Fountain, L. H., *N. C.* The Westchester
Frazier, James B., Jr., *Tenn.* Fairfax Hotel
Frelinghuysen, Peter, Jr., *N. J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N. J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gary, J. Vaughan, *Va.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*
Gavin, Leon H., *Pa.* The Congressional
George, Newell A., *Kans.* The Congressional
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N. Y.*
Glenn, Milton W., *N. J.* Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va.
Goodell, Charles E., *N. Y.* 3842 Macomb St.
Granahan, Kathryn E. (Mrs.), *Pa.*
Grant, George M., *Ala.* 4801 Conn. Ave.
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., Jr., *Pa.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N. Y.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Hargis, Denver D., *Kans.*
Harmon, Randall S., *Ind.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harrison, Burr P., *Va.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* 1323 Barger Drive, Falls Church, Va.
Healey, James C., *N. Y.*
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Hemphill, Robert W., *S. C.*
Henderson, John E., *Ohio*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hess, William E., *Ohio.*
Hiestand, Edgar W., *Calif.*
Hoeven, Charles B., *Iowa.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Clare E., *Mich.* 100 Maryland Ave. NE.
Hoffman, Elmer J., *Ill.*
Hogan, Earl, *Ind.* 5211 Flanders Ave., Garrett Pk., Kensington, Md.
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Holt, Joe, *Calif.*
Holtzman, Lester, *N. Y.*
Horan, Walt, *Wash.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Huddleston, George, Jr., *Ala.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Ikard, Frank, *Tex.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.* Alban Towers
Jackson, Donald L., *Calif.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Jensen, Ben F., *Iowa.* 2120 16th St.
Johansen, August E., *Mich.*
Johnson, Byron L., *Colo.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Lester R., *Wis.*
Johnson, Thomas F., *Md.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N. C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Judd, Walter H., *Minn.* 3083 Ordway St.
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kasem, George A., *Calif.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kearns, Carroll D., *Pa.*
Kee, Elizabeth (Mrs.), *W. Va.* Albemarle House, 4501 Conn. Ave.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.*
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N. Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N. Y.* The Mayflower
Kilburn, Clarence E., *N. Y.*
Kilday, Paul J., *Tex.* 3507 Albemarle St.
Kilgore, Joe M., *Tex.* 4848 Upton St.
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kitchin, A. Paul, *N. C.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Knox, Victor A., *Mich.*
Kowalski, Frank, *Conn.*
Kyl, John, *Iowa.*
Lafore, John A., Jr., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*

Appendix

Tribute to Gen. John J. Pershing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on September 13 we celebrate General of the Armies John J. Pershing Centennial Day in honor of the 100th birthday of one of America's greatest soldiers. To honor the man who commanded the American Expeditionary Force in World War I, little known incidents and statements which illustrate General Pershing's strong devotion to human rights have been recalled by the National Jewish Welfare Board, the Government-authorized agency for serving Jewish military personnel in the U.S. Armed Forces.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD the article by Bernard Postal entitled "Pershing and the Fighting Jews."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PERSHING AND THE FIGHTING JEWS—A CENTENNIAL REMINDER OF A FORGOTTEN CHAMPION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

(By Bernard Postal)

Once, at an American Legion convention in the early 1920's, the late Sam Dreben, known as the fighting Jew because of his valor in the Philippine insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion and World War I, tried to crash a banquet. Two husky marine sentries halted the Russian-born and Texas-raised soldier of fortune who had fought in Mexico, Venezuela, and Nicaragua, and informed him, none too gently, "only generals allowed."

Dreben was asking how come when a band struck up, "Hail to the Chief," as Gen. John J. Pershing, Marshal Foch, General Diaz, and Admiral Beatty entered the hotel. Dreben snapped to attention. Pershing spotted Dreben, stopped and said to Marshal Foch: "General, I'd like you to meet one of my finest soldiers." Seeing the French decorations Dreben wore (his awards also included medals from the United States, Italy, and Belgium), Foch embraced him. Then, as the sentries blinked in amazement, Pershing and Foch linked arms with Dreben and marched into the room reserved for "generals only."

Ex-Sgt. Edward Cohn, one of the American servicemen who remained in France after World War I, was Pershing's wartime orderly. Whenever Pershing came to France after the war, he and Cohn got together and fought the war all over again. Despite the difference in rank, a genuine friendship grew up between the two men. Sgt. Harry Epstein, a former New Yorker who settled in Arizona, was Pershing's wartime mess sergeant.

Up to World War II, General Pershing had under his command the largest body of Jewish soldiers of all time. Serving under him in France during World War I were more than 150,000 American Jews whose religious and morale needs brought into being the National Jewish Welfare Board in 1917.

Responding to a Rosh Hashanah greeting in 1917 from Col. Harry Cutler, then president of JWB, Pershing cabled these words: "The stirring message of greetings from the National Jewish Welfare Board is much appreciated by the American Expeditionary Forces. The contant support and cordial assistance of our brothers of the Jewish faith and the thought that all creeds are united under one banner gives courage to our Army and urges us on to victory."

At the close of World War I, in an official message to Colonel Cutler, General Pershing expressed to JWB his praise for the splendid services American Jewry had rendered through JWB, to the AEF. In that message Pershing said, "The activities of your organization in France commenced in the summer of 1918, with the opening of a clubroom in Paris to which American soldiers, irrespective of creed, were welcomed. Handicapped by lack of personnel and facilities, your representatives, during the remaining months of hostilities, did valuable work among the soldiers of the Jewish faith and others, taking advantage of the opportunities offered by the larger welfare agencies to keep our soldiers in touch with their religion and their homes.

"Since the signing of the armistice you have grasped the opportunity for increased recreational facilities, and have increased your personnel, opened additional club rooms at important centers, and shown a commendable eagerness to cooperate with the Army and the other welfare societies and to bear your full share of the responsibility for keeping up this important work until all troops can be returned to America."

Pershing's appraisal of the Jewish fighting men under his command and his vigorous support of Jewish reconstruction in post-World War I Europe were expressed in a now forgotten speech he made on December 5, 1926, before a great meeting of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews in New York's Cathedral of St. John the Divine. It was at that meeting that Pershing proposed that the Christians of America raise $25 million to match the sum being sought by American Jews under the leadership of the Joint Distribution Committee for European Jewish relief and reconstruction.

In that address, General Pershing said, among other things:

"Jews are an essential part of America. As citizens among us, they have always done their full part. When the time came to serve their country under arms, no class of people served with more patriotism or with higher motives than the young Jews who volunteered or were drafted and who went overseas with our other young Americans. I well remember, in my inspections of New York divisions, seeing so many patriotic, well-disciplined, well-behaved young Jewish soldiers, whose commanders spoke of them in the highest terms. During the war there was no such thing as race or creed—they were forgotten.

"During this campaign they also should be forgotten. It is for generous Americans, of whatever religion, to aid the Jews of America in succoring their brethren overseas. The Jews of America have always been in the forefront of charitable works. There has never been an attempt to raise a large sum of money for a public cause in which the Jews have not done more than their share. It is up to the Christians of America to show that they appreciate what the Jews have done in the past. The spirit of this occasion appeals to me tremendously. This gathering should be the beginning of an era of good will that should spread throughout America. It is not so much a question of giving as it is of showing the proper spirit. A spirit of good will is needed in America, today. It could have no better beginning than here in New York in this great cathedral.

"It is a difficult thing for us in our prosperous country to imagine just what suffering those poor people overseas are going through. This is an occasion for all Americans, whether Christians or what not, to show our Jewish friends that we have charitable instincts and that there is no such thing as race prejudice in this great country. To my mind this is one of the great lessons we can teach the people of Europe by contributing to this fund.

"I was brought up as a Methodist, and the Methodists are the greatest beggars in the world. I want to hark back to my Methodism and appeal to Christian American to give much greater contributions to the Jewish fund than they have contemplated. I feel sure that this undertaking will meet with very cordial and generous response all over the country, especially if New York City gives it the right kind of start. Christians of America ought to raise at least as much as the Jews themselves are raising. Twenty-five million dollars are not too much for the Christians to raise to help those poor people over there. The Jews will raise their $25 million all right, and if the Christians cannot duplicate it—well, I don't know, I'd like to tell them what I think about them."

Five years earlier, in another address at Madison Square Garden, called to protest postwar German propaganda, General Pershing said a few things which are still timely and pertinent. Speaking of the foreign born, he declared: "There were with me in the Philippines, in Mexico, and in France thousands of foreign-born men hardly able to speak our tongue who had in their hearts the spirit of Americanism and devotion to make the supreme sacrifice. Indeed, there was often a zeal for all that America means that put to blush many older Americans who have fallen below the obligations of their birthright."

In the same vein he defended the right of naturalized Americans to maintain a continuing interest in the culture of their birthplace. "We have no quarrel," Pershing declared, "with Americans of foreign birth or stock who cling to the music, art, folklore, and the better traditions of the old land. They would be less than human and we would be poorer if they didn't. We recognize our obligation to all these. We want all to know that America is an inspiration, that it is something spiritual, a goal toward which we aim. If we bring together people from different lands, of different creeds and varied conditions and merge them into one America, the product will be the greatest of all nations and a race that will long hold a compelling place in the world."

That was Gen. John J. Pershing, commander in chief of the American expeditionary forces in World War I, the centennial of whose birth on September 13 has been proclaimed by President Eisenhower and Congress as General of the Armies John J. Pershing Centennial Day.

Puerto Rican Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 25, 1952, the people of Puerto Rico entered into a new relationship with the United States. On that day the island became the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or, as the Puerto Ricans call it, an associated free state.

This transformation took plaee in accordance with a freely negotiated compact between the Puerto Ricans and the Federal Government. Under its terms, the islanders drafted a Constitution which was approved first by the U.S. Congress and then by an overwhelming majority of Puerto Rico's population.

Our own ANTONIO FERNÓS-ISERN, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico here in the House of Representatives, served as chairman of the convention that drafted the Constitution. Knowing and admiring Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN as we do for his very great abilities, we are not surprised that the convention he led produced a Constitution imbued with political wisdom.

This year we celebrate the eighth anniversary of that Constitution, the eighth year of a new and exciting era for our fellow citizens, the Puerto Ricans. American troops first landed on Puerto Rico 62 years ago, and in 1917 Puerto Ricans were granted American citizenship. From the day of the first landing the island's inhabitants have been moving inexorably toward that fuller understanding and experience of democracy embodied in the American ideal. They have dedicated themselves to a mastery of local autonomy that is both the root and the fruit of the American way of life.

We need look no further than the preamble of the Puerto Rican Constitution for a brilliant summary of the lofty aims of these people:

> We consider as determining factors in our life our citizenship of the United States of America and our aspiration continually to enrich our democratic heritage in the individual and collective enjoyment of its rights and privileges; our loyalty to the principles of the Federal Constitution; the coexistence in Puerto Rico of the two great cultures of the American Hemisphere; our fervor for education; our faith in justice; our devotion to the courageous, industrious, and peaceful way of life; our fidelity to individual human values above and beyond social position, racial differences, and economic interests; and our hope for a better world based on these principles.

With these words Puerto Rico proclaimed its new political status. A new sense of stability, confidence, and urgency accompanied the birth.

In its role as a Commonwealth, Puerto Rico has maintained complete control of its own internal affairs and, at the same time, has enjoyed the benefits of United States protection in foreign relations, defense, and full American citizenship.

The desire and ability for self-government on the part of the Puerto Rican people had long been evident. With the adoption of their Constitution, they assumed responsibility for that local control that has been one of the most important factors in the growth of democracy in the United States. In the operation of that Constitution, Puerto Ricans have demonstrated beyond question the political equilibrium and community enterprise that is the mark of a mature and progressive society.

This maturity is in no way better illustrated than in the choice of leaders Puerto Ricans have made. I have already mentioned the splendid work of our colleague, Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Puerto Ricans have also been fortunate to have in their midst a towering political figure.

Gov. Luis Muñoz Marín served as Puerto Rico's first elected Governor before the Commonwealth and continues in that office to this day, holding the significant distinction of governing the island for a longer period than any other current executive in Latin America. And he has maintained his tenure through the support of large majorities of his people, as exhibited in free elections.

The ideal of leadership in newly self-governing areas, Governor Munoz Marin deserves the primary credit for Puerto Rico's current stability and, more especially, for Puerto Rico's phenomenal economic and social development.

Statistics dramatically illuminate these advances. Puerto Rico's death rate decreased 62 percent between 1940 and 1957; it is now lower than that of the continental United States. Puerto Rico's per capita income has leaped so far upward that it is now the highest in the Caribbean area and second in all of Latin America only to that of oil-rich Venezuela. Family income almost quadrupled between 1940 and 1956.

Under Operation Bootstrap Puerto Rico has been setting world records in raising itself from the depths of poverty and illiteracy. This great effort, though it still leaves Puerto Rico far from being a wealthy state, nevertheless has elevated the island to a position that is the envy of underdeveloped countries all over the world. Representatives of these nations come regularly to Puerto Rico to study the methods by which this miracle of growth was accomplished, and still continues.

Puerto Rico's economic problems once seemed unsurmountable. The island was cursed, as are many Caribbean lands, with a one crop economy, a limited supply of land, and almost no industry worthy of the name. Puerto Rico's leaders recognized that the land could never become prosperous without industry. The Government exerted itself, therefore, to attract American firms to set up branch factories on the island, offering as incentives capital loans, factory buildings at low rent, the promise to train labor in the necessary skills, and 10-year tax exemptions. The net gain of more than 400 new factories since the introduction of Operation Bootstrap is testimony to the skill, initiative, and determination of the Puerto Rican people.

These qualities convince me that we need not fear for the economic future of the island. Puerto Rico can be made prosperous, and Puerto Ricans have demonstrated that they have the skill and intelligence to accomplish that metamorphosis.

The Commonwealth's political future needs more thought on our part. The exact legal nature of Puerto Rico's status has not yet been determined by our courts. But whatever that status is, we know that numerous voices have been raised for change. Some advocate independence. Others press for statemood.

We must never forget that Puerto Ricans are American citizens, living on American soil. We must never forget that they have made significant contributions to our culture, in the arts, sciences, and professions. We must never forget that thousands of Puerto Ricans served valiantly in the Armed Forces of the United States during two World Wars and the Korean conflict.

My conviction is that we must consider carefully all aspects of Puerto Rico's political relationship with the United States. If we find that Puerto Rico is ready for statehood, and if we find that the Puerto Ricans sincerely desire statehood, it is our duty to grant such status to the island.

These problems will, I am certain, be considered at the proper time, and with sympathetic attention. I want to reiterate my congratulations to the Puerto Rican people on the anniversary of their constitution and to wish them every success for the future.

Pollution of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we all know the expression "free as the air." But today, it is beginning to appear that even the air we breathe is not going to be free much longer. The problem of air pollution, which renders the air around us unclean and unfit to breathe without possibly expensive new depolluting techniques or restrictions on various activities, is becoming a matter of increasing concern to all parts of the country.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following release from the Office of Public Health Education of the State of New York. It indicates the extent of the problem in Elmira, N.Y., some of the causes, and measures that can be taken to ameliorate it.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> ALBANY, August 4.—Adequate preventive and abatement measures are needed in Greater Elmira in order to head off the possibility of a future air pollution problem in that area, it was announced today by Dr.

Herman E. Hilleboe, State health commissioner.

Dr. Hilleboe, who is chairman of the New York State Air Pollution Control Board, made the statement following receipt of "Air Pollution in Greater Elmira," a survey report prepared for the air pollution control board.

He said that at present there is no serious air pollution condition affecting the metropolitan area. He added, however, that "the significance and seriousness of air contamination in Greater Elmira will increase with the expansion of industry, accelerated growth of population, greater use of motor vehicles, and accompanying social and economic developments." There has been a 17.7-percent increase in the population of the area in the last 10 years.

The State health commissioner pointed out that Greater Elmira's basinlike topography, low wind speeds, numerous fogs, and temperature inversions indicate that the atmosphere over this portion of New York State will be unable to cleanse itself of contaminating material if sources and amounts continue to increase. "Then Greater Elmira will be faced with a serious air pollution condition," he said.

Among the highlights of the 64-page report are:

Forty percent of the 40,000 tons of solid and gaseous air contaminants emitted in the area each year are from industrial sources. Private sources contribute 33 percent, with 16 percent from public sources and 11 percent from commercial operations.

In the five towns, three villages, and one city surveyed local legislation and control activities are inadequate or totally lacking. However, municipal zoning, fire control, refuse disposal, and general ordinances do contain provisions for better air quality—but these largely are unenforced.

Air pollution control facilities including technical services, sampling equipment, and laboratory installations cannot be supported individually by the local communities. This, plus the intercommunity nature of some pollution, suggests a need for intercommunity control.

Rules and regulations based on findings and recommendations of the survey now are being written and will be submitted for discussion at a public meeting before adoption.

Capital Times' Bill Evjue Bids Farewell to Champion of Consumer, Leland Olds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, no newspaper in America has been a more consistent and fighting champion of the public interest, and particularly of the interest of the consumer, than the Capital Times, of Madison, under the command of that last of the great crusading editors, William T. Evjue.

Few men in public life have more devotedly and effectively dedicated themselves to the consumer than Leland Olds, the former battling member of the Federal Power Commission.

When Mr. Olds died a few days ago, I anticipated that the Capital Times would have words of national significance on his life and service. Bill Evjue's editorial fully met my expectation.

Mr. President, I have edited the editorial to bring it into conformity with Senate rules. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEATH OF LELAND OLDS GETS 16 LINES IN THE PRESS

A great public servant died the other day with very little attention paid in the press or by the politicians. His name was Leland Olds, a man to whom the American consumer owes a deep and lasting debt of gratitude.

Olds began his adult life as a schoolteacher, but he felt that he could be of greater service to the public in some other capacity. He quit his job and went to Washington where he began a study of the utility industry in the Library of Congress because he believed that in this field the consumer was getting a raw deal.

Word of his unusual interest reached the then Governor of the State of New York who was struggling with this problem. He called Olds to Albany and asked him to take over the job of regulating utilities in New York to get a better break for the consumer.

When the New York Governor, whose name was Franklin Delano Roosevelt, was elected President, he asked Olds to come to Washington with him to help in giving the consumers across this land the kind of a new deal he had forged in New York.

Idealistic, tireless, and devoted, Olds became one of the towering figures in the New Deal as a member of the Federal Power Commission. He looked upon the FPC as an agency set up to serve the public in contrast to regulatory agencies today which operate on the principle that they are meant to serve the industries they are supposed to regulate.

Under Roosevelt, Olds continued to be reappointed to the FPC, despite the efforts of the utility industry and natural gas interests to drive him from public life.

In 1949 President Truman appointed him to another term. * * *

The utilities and the gas and oil industry launched a vile campaign smear against him, charging him with communism, socialism * * *.

To the great credit of Harry Truman he refused to recall Olds' name. The fight went into the Senate.

* * * Olds was crushingly defeated by a vote of 53 to 15, his record of service repudiated, his name blackened from one end of the Nation to the other.

It is a sad reflection on the social values of our time that * * * the death of this great public servant was noted in a United Press International dispatch of 16 lines.

He died of a heart attack at the age of 69 shortly after attending church services. Who would have believed 11 years ago, in the whirlwind of charges against this "dangerous radical" that he ever went to church?

Recognition for Dedicated Teachers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, good education requires satisfactory buildings and equipment, but it is dependent ultimately on the quality of teaching. The "apple for the teacher" symbolizes the appreciation which the community has always felt for the dedicated, inspiring teacher. However, the financial rewards of teaching usually fall short of what they should be, with the result that the national teacher shortage as estimated by the National Education Association amounts to 135,000 teachers.

What we can do in the Nation to help fill the need for more teachers is to stimulate an appreciation of the role of the teacher in our national life and to get our people to understand, accept, and build on this appreciation. This can be done without interference with traditional local control of education.

I pointed out the importance of encouraging greater understanding and recognition of the teacher in our society when I introduced a resolution calling for National Teachers Recognition Day to be celebrated annually on the fourth Wednesday of April.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD excerpts from certain statements and news items regarding the role of the dedicated teacher.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF JUDGE JONAH J. GOLDSTEIN, PRESIDENT, GRAND STREET BOYS' ASSOCIATION, AT DEDICATED TEACHERS LUNCHEON, JANUARY 16, 1960

A kid hits a teacher, and it is front page news; but the fine things done in our schools, the day-to-day job of helping children to learn to grow and to thrive, the art exhibits, the musical festivals, the dramatic performances, the winning of scholarships, the academic achievements of our students, all the results of the efforts of dedicated teachers, are ignored.

We, of the Grand Street Boys' Association, headquarters of those who love New York, recall with profound gratitude the dedicated teachers who taught us, and so we wanted to honor the dedicated teachers of today.

We do not want our expression of approbation, our pat on the back, to be a substitute for deserved increases in the salary schedules of the teachers in our city, in recognition of the important services rendered by our teachers.

Our efforts this year do not constitute a single shot in the dark. We hope to make this an annual affair and those who were not included in the 1960 list of dedicated teachers, will have ample opportunity of being cited as dedicated teachers of 1961, and those who did not receive the $500 award this year may receive the coveted prize in 1961, 1962, or in years thereafter.

Most important, we hope this pebble in the lake has ripples that go far and wide and we hope to see our community aroused, and through them the communities in the whole Nation aroused to the importance of attracting dedicated teachers, rewarding them well, and honoring their dedicated service. For in this way lies the salvation of the America of tomorrow.

NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL, JANUARY 18, 1960

The Grand Street Boys' Association and Foundation has called fresh attention to the thousands of dedicated teachers in our New York City school system, mean and women who work far beyond the call of duty, who through wise and friendly guidance inspire their pupils and who successfully mold the character of the youngsters who will be the voting citizens of tomorrow.

A committee of 35 prominent retired and active educators carefully screened more than 1,000 nominations made by principals,

assistant superintendents, faculty councils, parent-teacher organizations, alumni associations and community leaders. One hundred were selected to receive an illuminated, dedicated-teacher scroll, and in addition 10 of these were awarded a prize of $500 each.

This expression of appreciation is a starting signal for a general campaign in which all citizens will participate in an effort to improve our schools by providing attractive salaries for our teachers. This will not only help solve the serious problems of our teacher recruitment program, but will also assure us that the effectiveness, the spirit and the morale of our 40,000 New York City instructors will bear the hallmark of the dedicated teacher.

THANK YOU, MR. CHIPS

(By Raymond Moley)

JANUARY 13, 1960.—Somehow, it seems to me, the public's image of the teachers and of the incomparably valuable profession which he or she represents has been tarnished by some of the arguments made for improving the teacher's economic and professional status. Some statements of fact embodied in those arguments are undeniably true, some are at least arguable, some require further substantiation. Some remedies proposed would not help solve such problems as exist.

Such dedicated teachers—and there are such public servants in every school system—rank with the most significant individuals in our civilization. They have labored over many years, never for glory or ostentatious honors, because they live teaching and are richly rewarded in the love of inspired pupils. They are the Mr. and Miss Chipses in our midst.

The least we can do is to pay them our respect and gratitude for what they have done to help save this generation.

LETTER BY JUDGE JONAH GOLDSTEIN

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: Thank you for your expression of interest in the dedicated teachers project carried on by the Grand Street Boys' Association and the Grand Street Boys' Foundation in New York.

Briefly stated, here is the story. Use it as a springboard—and go on and do better.

WHY WE DID IT

1. The Nation needs, and our children deserve, good schools and fine teachers.

2. We need to do more to increase community appreciation of the important contributions made by teachers, to improve their status in every respect.

3. In this way, we can attract and hold in this profession the talent we seek.

4. Our awards are tokens and symbols of a broad community drive to achieve these objectives.

5. Concrete deeds are meaningful, even if one reaches relatively few, provided the purposes are nobly inspired and clearly stated.

WHAT WE DID

Our approach achieved our objectives, but another may be as good or more appropriate for your community.

1. Judge Goldstein sought and won the support of the project by the organization he heads, and got additional private financial support for the enterprise.

2. We set up a committee of advisers—retired and respected men and women of eminence in education, public affairs, business and labor, to carry out the program.

3. We publicized the program widely in every medium, making clear the objectives, purposes, our techniques, and limitations.

4. We urged educational authorities, PTA's, teacher faculties, and alumni groups, to submit names and supporting data on candidates for awards.

5. The committee screened, sifted, considered and made the final choices.

6. We announced the names of the 100 winners, out of over 800 submitted, and invited the 100 to a luncheon at which they were to receive scrolls. Ten were each to receive a $500 prize.

SUGGESTIONS

1. Involve students, parents, and the whole community.

2. Make the gifts meaningful.

3. Citations were read for those receiving the cash prizes, outlining their dedicated service to the schools and children.

4. Make the event a tradition.

Please let us know how your efforts succeed. After all, our purpose in tossing a pebble into the lake is to cause ripples that will reach distant shores.

Best wishes in our common devotion to American democratic ideals.

EXCERPTS FROM ADDRESS BY DR. BUELL GALLAGHER, PRESIDENT, COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, JANUARY 16, 1960

It is a genuinely sound impulse which leads the Grand Street Boys to do honor to the teaching profession and symbolically to express that honor by calling special attention to the representatives who are here gathered. Accept, then, if you will, these apples of affection and appreciation I bring. My accolade goes to the teacher who continues to be a warm, alive human being in the face of every manifestation of contrary tendencies. My approval goes to the teacher who, despite the obvious expectation of peers, superiors and inferiors, refuses to show favoritism to selected friends and achieves instead a warm, friendly fairness toward all.

The greatest peril which threatens the public employee, and teachers are not excepted in this instance, is that that he may yield to corrupting temptation. Neither is it laziness or deliberate inefficiency. It is complacency.

Praise should go to the teacher who refuses to be complacent, who continually finds new and better ways of achieving new and better results, who know that healthy and stimulating controversy is the life-process of academic growth and who makes a constructive contribution to the growth process.

We who are in public service, whether in Government or in education, have rested upon us the very heavy burden of justifying the democratic process and the democratic way of life, not only through words but also in deeds. We are servants of the people, not of politicians: partisan interference in our work must be resisted like the plague. We are Catholics, Jews, Protestants, and Free Thinkers: but we are indifferent to these distinctions in the performance of our work. We are of many races and come from many nations: we cannot permit this to color our relationships or to condition our performance.

This apple, then, goes to the teacher who refuses to be the docile donkey for the administration—and who also refuses to be the gullible goat for the professional agitator and organizer. If there is anything of value, any sweetness of flavor, in the apples I have tenderly laid on the teacher's desk today, let that be ascribed to my desire to give recognition to the honest and dedicated efforts of teachers to meet the needs of school children. I bring a word of warm appreciation for being themselves, for dedicating themselves to the profession which molds the youth and builds tomorrow.

NEW YORK TIMES EDITORIAL, MAY 17, 1960

There is more honest sincere feeling of appreciation accompanying Teacher Recognition Day than on most or all other days.

In this grave time in international affairs recognition of the importance of the school, of the teacher, is almost automatic. On a radio program last night, the superintendent of New York City's schools, Dr. John J. Theobald, said: "I think the future of this entire Nation rests in the hands of our teachers. I think that what they do—what they do working with the parents and working with the community and developing each and every one of these youngsters to the maximum—I think that this, more than anything else, is going to be the payoff in terms of what we are tomorrow. And I would say to you that far from feeling that we push too much to get better salaries for teachers, honestly, as a community, we can't afford to place this responsibility in the hands of people we are not willing to pay and pay well for it. This is the kind of thing that really either spells a bright future or catastrophe."

Social Security System Best Method for Health Care for Senior Citizens

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, administration of health care for our aged citizens through the social security system would provide a sound, contributory plan of health insurance free from pauper's oath provisions.

John Beidler of the AFL–CIO legislative department in an article in the August 1960 issue of Allied Industrial Worker explains how the social security system can be used effectively to remove the threat of costly, lengthy illness and frightening financial burdens from our elderly men and women.

I ask unanimous consent that John Beidler's article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM BEST

(By John Beidler)

Insurance through the social security system, paid for by workers during their productive years, seems to be the soundest way of solving the most pressing social welfare problem of our day—the human and financial disaster that illness imposes on the aged.

That is why the AFL–CIO and other interested groups support the Forand bill and reject all substitutes, no matter how well-intentioned, which would not do the job.

This Nation has solved, or reached partial solutions for, many social problems in the United States. It has put a floor under wages through the Fair Labor Standards Act. It has provided a cushion for old age through the Social Security Act. It has established a system of unemployment compensation through the same act, and of supplemental unemployment benefits via union contracts.

But it has done almost nothing for older citizens, living on small incomes and suffering lengthy illness.

Social security pensions now go to 11 million persons. About one million of them also are covered by private pension plans.

But the primary Federal social security benefit, on which most retirees must depend exclusively, averages only $73 a month, or $16.85 a week. For a retired couple, the maximum benefit is $180 a month, $41.53 a

week, which few beneficiaries actually receive.

These amounts are small enough by today's living standards. But out of them must come rent, food, clothing, and other necessities of life. There is no margin for medical expenses brought on by a stay in a hospital.

It is true that many retired persons have some form of health insurance. But a recent Federal study showed that, of all pensioners who had medical expenses in 1957, only 14 percent of the couples and 9 percent of the single persons drew any insurance benefits whatever.

The Forand bill does not solve the entire problem of medical care for the aged, but it does guard against total disaster. The bill would:

Pay in full for 60 days of hospital care for all persons eligible for old-age and survivors' benefits. This would include the dependent children of widows.

Meet the cost of combined nursing home and hospital care up to 120 days a year, and also cover certain surgical expenses.

Social security records would be used to establish the rights of applicants to funds.

The Forand bill includes standard safeguards as to the quality of care, negotiation of rates, and freedom of cooperating institutions from Government interference.

The program would cost about $1 billion a year at the start. It would be met by a rise of one-quarter of 1 percent in social security taxes on employers and employees, and three-eighths of 1 percent on farmers and other self-employed persons. The most any worker would pay, if he makes $4,800 or more a year, would be $12 a year.

What are the alternatives to the Forand bill?

Ask for public assistance, say the doctor's organizations and the House Ways and Means Committee.

Public assistance is, the AFL–CIO says, the free care available to the poverty stricken through State and Federal funds. It is necessary, it is worthy, it should be improved. Many doctors donate their services unselfishly.

But public assistance is public relief. Those who get it must prove their poverty, often to the point of taking a pauper's oath. They must exhaust their savings and, in many States, sell their TV sets, their homes, their ancient cars, to become eligible.

Buy private, commercial insurance, say the insurance companies.

Such insurance is available for the 65-plus group. But where the cost of private insurance is within reason, the benefits are meager. Where the benefits are adequate, the cost is out of reach of the average oldster.

This is bound to be true of a plan under which the aged are insuring themselves. To be workable, any insurance plan must be broad enough to include good risks along with bad risk, the young along with the old.

Private insurance can supplement a Federal program. It cannot replace it.

Get the children and grandchildren to pay hospital and medical bills, say others.

Many emergencies have been solved in that way. But a medical catastrophe to parents is in many cases beyond the means of willing children. At best, such help is a poor bulwark for pensioners who have worked all their lives to earn their independence.

None of these alternatives seems to labor people and others to be acceptable in a society of free and independent citizens.

Under the Forand bill the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would administer the program, as he does the present social security system.

Any qualified hospital or nursing home could participate. Rates for services to the eligible sick would be set by agreement between the Government and the institution, using the kind of formulas already developed in many Government and private plans.

Why We Need a Democratic President in 1960—Prize-Winning Oration by George Flynn, St. Paul, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in Minnesota, as in all States, young men and women are attracted to the Democratic Party because it is the party for today and the future, and not the party of yesterday. Three young Minnesotans who participated in the Minnesota Young Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party oratorical contest on June 19, 1960, in Minneapolis, demonstrated the fine talent and straight thinking on major national issues that these young people bring to our party.

I ask unanimous consent that the prize-winning oration by George Flynn, third place, St. Paul, Minn., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the oration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The man who will be the next President of the United States will be a man whose decisions and actions will guide the destination of this world for the next 8 years. Therefore who that man is will be of tremendous consequence, but of more consequence will be what that man stands for. And the way in which we best know what his actions while in the White House will be is by the party to which he belongs. Since it is my firmest conviction that we need a Democratic administration during the next 8 years, let me analyze the reasons why we need a Democratic President in 1960.

Since any question can be decided from two angles it is my purpose to show the affirmative reasons for a Democratic President in 1960 as well as the negative reasons for a change in the present administration. Through the course of my speech I will show how the Democrats have done a better job in relation to the areas of labor, farming, and small business, as well as making far more significant progress in the field of foreign relations.

The Democratic Party is the party of the common man; proof of this may be seen in the Roosevelt and Truman era, when the Democratic administration brought this country from the depths of depression to the heights of prosperity. This progress was not caused by the neglect of big business but rather by the correct policy and foresight which was introduced by Roosevelt and carried out by Truman. Since the Republican administration has been in office they have cast the farmers deeper in debt as well as causing many to leave the farms and overflood the cities with an extra surplus of labor thus causing further unemployment. Through all this, however, they were able to set new profit heights for the big business monopolies while completely disregarding the small businessmen by allowing these monopolies to exist.

During the era of the sixties a plausible theory must be found once again by the Democratic Party, since the Republicans have shown they cannot by their actions through the past 8 years, and the Democrats speaking in restrospect, have proved they can by the solutions which they found during the New Deal period. Therefore from the interior point of view there is no question that we not only need but must have a Democratic President in 1960 to solve the aforementioned problems.

The Republicans have provided during their years in office nothing but an expensive, inadequate, and illogical solution to the farm problem. Meanwhile in a Democratic Congress there were continued efforts to bring about a solid solution but every answer they came up with was overruled by the Republican administration in favor of their inane plan.

In the field of labor the Democratic Congress was able to pass a useful and sensible bill, which helped the common man, without causing strife and confusion among the businesses in which they are employed. Meanwhile, the Republicans passed a harmful and sometimes disastrous bill over the Truman veto during his administration. Again it is evident that they are not qualified in this field to take the reins, so to speak, which must be taken in the sixties.

Also in the field of business they have been unable to stop the ever-rising cycle of inflation, which was nil at the time they took office. They have encouraged and supported the rise of big business while completely disregarding the smaller, insignificant businessman. Again it appears that the Republicans cannot keep the correct relation between business and labor, which was the situation when they took office.

In the field of foreign relations, again the basic philosophy of representing the common man must be employed, in direct opposition to the Republican philosophy of representing the dollar.

In the daily papers we read of demonstrations and violence against the policies and even the theory of the United States. For the past 2 years the Republican administration has used the field of foreign relations for their political gain and not for the gain of America. There was no other country at the fragment of a summit conference, which even made mention of bringing their second in charge to it. Yet the United States made a great play of bringing NIXON for no positive reason but for the gaining of political prestige. This points out the pure mockery which is evidenced in Republican handling of foreign relations.

Looking at the Democratic administrations we find that America was looked upon as the ultimate in free government, the country which was considered to use a phrase, heaven on earth. There was never a demonstration against us in the free world, yet in the past 8 years, even our own allies have been questioning our aims.

The reason for this turn of events is again the Republican philosophy of the dollar. When we give foreign aid we give it with the idea of getting that country's trade or establishing businesses there ourselves. We show no consideration for the common man or the country itself, but only for their trade and money. Another fault of the Republican administration is the practice of peace at any price. A person can only crawl back so far before he has to fight, yet daily the Communists are taking little pieces of land from our allies and we send nothing but a mere note of objection. Quemoy one of the islands we are pledged to defend is being shelled daily, yet all we do is complain. This same situation exists throughout the world yet we do nothing but deny their requests for help as we did with Hungary.

Peace is valuable and it must be preserved but not at the cost of sacrificing our ideals and prestige as is the case now. All we have to do is help arm the countries being attacked but yet we neglect to do so, or if we do we again do it with the thought of preserving the ever powerful dollar.

In this field again we see the need for a better policy and a better handling of the situation, the Republicans have showed they can't do it, and Democrats have proved they can. Therefore we see again the advantages which can be gained from a Democratic President in 1960.

In conclusion therefore we find that the situation which exists today needs a man with strong convictions and principles for the presidency. For a man to even be a candidate for the presidency he must have these convictions. However, we must look deeper into the party to which he belongs to see if the ideals are the right ones and in so doing there can be but one answer as to what party the next President of the United States can belong to, and that party is the Democratic Party of the United States, the situation of the world today needs the continued success of America; America must have it, and the people of America demand it.

Government Aid for the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, our American heritage is steeped in the arts which form an important reflection of the character of each period in our history. We have developed a rich and varied culture in many art forms, but it is largely concentrated in large metropolitan centers, leaving great areas throughout the country that are most often blacked out to professional cultural activities.

I believe that some help from the Federal Government is necessary to encourage the development of the arts and to spur their dissemination more widely than is presently possible, and as a step in this direction I have sponsored legislation calling for the establishment of a U.S. Arts Foundation.

There are four specific objectives to be gained by the participation of the Federal Government in the arts: expanded opportunity for individual arts; security in the development of artistic careers; recognition abroad as well as at home of the arts as a central expression of our Nation, and enrichment of our culture on a broad basis as a vital element in our total educational process and in our morale. Such a program could be aimed at both the professional and amateur levels, and would help private, nonprofit, theater as well as the other performing arts; it would also assist colleges and universities and State and municipally sponsored arts councils.

This stimulation, dollarwise, could accelerate to as much as 10 times the amount contributed by the proposed Arts Foundation on total performing arts performances. The good it could accomplish for the theater was discussed recently by Joseph Papp, founder and producer of the New York Shakespeare Festival which has the backing of the New York municipality and is a case history in this field,

I ask unanimous consent that his analysis, entitled "Government Aid," which appeared in the New York Times on July 24, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, July 24, 1960]

GOVERNMENT AID

(By Joseph Papp, founder and producer of the New York Shakespeare Festival)

Asking for Government subsidy of the theater was represented by Brooks Atkinson in a recent Sunday column as an invitation to control. By this token, commercial theater, the very antithesis of Government-supported theater, should be a veritable bastion of freedom, a powerhouse of provocative and unorthodox ideas.

Yet were a Government committee to select our theater of private investment as a target for censorship, it would have slim pickings indeed. Unless it were to consider deleting a subversive bump from "Gypsy" or curbing the radical enthusiasm of the magnificent dancers in "West Side Story."

Why, with all the apparent freedom of privately financed theater, are there so few plays that stretch the boundaries of freedom?

Though the commercial producer has absolute freedom of choice in the selection of plays, he instinctively turns to the one with the greatest potential gross. Is this not a significant encroachment on the freedom of the theater?

If we believe that the theater, to be worthy of its heritage, should stand in the vanguard of thought, should be an area for challenging ideas in both content and form, a place for deep and stimulating experiences, then we must also feel unsatisfied with what we have.

The invisible villian of the piece is anarchy. We have a theater without scheme or purpose, without consistent artistic leadership; a theater based on whim, subject to economic laws thoroughly at odds with creative objectives; a theater with pickup teams of talent plucked from theoverflowing pool of unemployment.

WASTING TALENT

This chaos, inspired by the "freedom" of commercial investment, restricts and, in turn, inhibits the real freedom necessary for a vital theater—the freedom that comes from the planned utilization of our now wasting talent resources—the freedom for our actors, writers, and directors to develop artistically and consistently in permanent repertory companies.

When we ask the Government to support the theater, we do so because we realize that the arts cannot operate on the profit principle. We also recognize that they are an essential part of our lives and necessary for our survival. These ingredients have motivated the Government's entry into education, science, and the postal service. The fact that these functions of society are too important to be left in private hands is the substance of my argument.

Since it is the area of ideas that concerns us most, let us take a look at education and the Government. Schools are the crucibles of our thinking. Yet we accept without reservation the necessity for Government-subsidized education. Now certainly this inherently means control. Though the danger is always great that some governmental committee or ambitious politician will try to invade the realm of education, it is no argument for the abolition of public education.

Therefore, how can we reasonably deny the theater the help we accept for our subsidized educational system in the fear of interference? The fear is real—but the conclusions unrealistic. In a democracy there is no alternative but to constantly defend the sensitive areas of thought and expression against incursions. There is only one way to guarantee freedom in the schools, the theater and elsewhere—to defend it—eternal vigilance being the price of fredeom.

THE FOUNDATION

Mr. Atkinson suggests in his article that "private subsidy as opposed to Government subsidy is, when it is given, a guarantee of freedom." He cited foundation assistance as a case in point.

For the New York Shakespeare Festival, foundations have proven to be its main source of operating income. Without it the festival would be hard put to survive. Therefore, to critically examine the role of foundations in their relationship to the theater is not to deny their necessity, at a time when the only real alternative, Government subsidy, is not in the offing.

In the long run, foundations are no answer to the problems of the theater and no guarantee of its freedom. To support this latter contention we may take the example of the Rockefeller Foundation, which rejected an appeal from the New York Shakespeare Festival on the ground that free admission destroyed incentive.

The Ford Foundation likewise turned down a request. Here it was subtly hinted and cautiously intimated that free Shakespeare smacked too much of socialism. Whatever their justifications, it appears that these giant foundations, responsible for the largest grants in the field of the arts, would not necessarily guarantee freedom of the theater.

Furthermore, decisions concerning grants are made in private. The public has no knowledge of them, nor can it expect to have. There is comparatively little public pressure that can be brought to bear on these private organizations. On the other hand, were the Government involved, one would, at least, have recourse to the system of checks and balances, to the principle that the Government is responsible to the people. Under those circumstances it would be possible to cry havoc and petition our Government for a redress of grievances. Admitting that interference is undesirable, but having the choice of private or Government interference in the theater, it would seem that the latter is preferable.

CONTINUITY NEEDED

Aside from the issue of control, the unpredictable and temporary nature of foundation giving leaves unresolved the key problem of the theater—guaranteed continuity; and it must be guaranteed to make any sense. Foundations gear their support to the understandable philosophy of a boost, to help the recipient over a hurdle. Grants are not given in perpetuity. Their purposes are varied and subject to change. Nor can they be expected to limit their commitments year after year to a single project.

The theater, like education, needs the security and comfort, if you will, of inclusion in a Government budget. It may be attacked. It may be cut. But it is there to be defended and fought for. Any discussion of freedom of the theater without considering its permanency is largely academic.

By making the theater a responsibility of Government, it makes it also a responsibility of the people. Restricting the theater to private subsidy cuts it off from the mainstream of American life and perpetuates the grow-

ing separation of the theater from its vast potential audience.

Only with Government aid can we have ticket prices within the reach of everybody, a greater number and variety of plays and a guarantee of continued existence for the theater. Private subsidy narrows the scope of the theater. Government involvement broadens its role into the larger area of education and contributes to the development of a greater, more intelligent and more responsible audience.

Health Care for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, shortly before the recess I received a message from a group of distinguished social security experts.

These experts urge us to include hospitalization and related health services under the Federal old-age, survivors, and disability contributory social insurance program.

The people who signed this message represent a tremendous accumulation of wisdom and experience in the field of social security and I believe my colleagues should give very serious attention to the views of these experts when we take up the social security bill, H.R. 12580.

I ask unanimous consent that this message and the list of signers be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 30, 1960.

MEETING THE HEALTH CARE NEEDS OF OLDER PEOPLE THROUGH SOCIAL INSURANCE

The undersigned who have long been identified with the American system of social security, having served the Government in administrative or advisory capacities, urge the incorporation in social security legislation now before the Senate of a program of contributory social insurance through which our citizens can pay for the cost of the hospital and related services they may need in old age. An extension of Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance to include hospital coverage would provide a systematic way of financing serious illness and prevent the exhaustion of the savings of aged persons and the consequent, often devastating, demands upon the resources of their children.

There is every indication of the willingness of Americans to share the cost of basic health protection for their elderly parents and later for themselves by paying for such a program through their working years. If such health protection were available for older persons, private organizations would be enabled to offer more economical protection to the younger people in our population.

We sincerely hope that the social security bill now pending before the Senate will be amended to provide for hospital and related services to older people through the social insurance system.

LIST OF SIGNATORS

Mr. Arthur Altmeyer, Madison, Wis., former chairman of Social Security Board and Commissioner for Social Security.

Mr. Joseph P. Anderson, executive director, National Association of Social Workers, member, Advisory Council, 1961 White House Conference on Aging.

Dr. Eveline M. Burns, professor of social work, New York School of Social Work, Columbia University, former consultant to Committee on Economic Security and Social Security Board, and member of Advisory Committee to Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (1954).

Mr. Wilbur J. Cohen, professor, public welfare administration, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, member of the staff of the President's Committee on Economic Security (1934-35).

Mr. Nelson Cruikshank, AFL–CIO, Washington, D.C., member, Advisory Council on Social Security (1948–49) and Advisory Council on Social Security Financing (1958–59).

Miss Loula Dunn, Chicago, Ill., member, 1959 Advisory Council on Public Assistance.

Mr. Fedele F. Fauri, dean, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, former consultant on social security to House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees.

Miss Helen Hall, National Federation of Settlements, member, Advisory Council of the President's Committee on Economic Security (1934–1935).

Mr. Seymour Harris, Littauer professor of political economy, Harvard University, consultant to President's Council on Economic Advisors.

Miss Jane M. Hoey, New York City, director, Bureau of Public Assistance, Social Security Administration (1936–54).

Mr. Raymond W. Houston, commissioner, New York State Department of Social Welfare, member, 1959 Advisory Council on Public Assistance.

Mr. John Kidneigh, director, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Minnesota, chairman, 1959 Advisory Council on Child Welfare Services.

Mr. Murray Latimer, Washington, D.C., former chairman, Railroad Retirement Board.

Mr. Richard A. Lester, professor economics, Princeton University, member, Advisory Committee to Federal Bureau of Employment Security.

Mr. Norman V. Lourie, deputy secretary, Penhsylvania department of public welfare, member of Ad Hoc Advisory Committee to Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Charles I. Schottland, dean, Florence Heller Graduate School of Social Welfare, Brandeis University, former Commissioner of Social Security (1954–58).

Mr. Karl de Schweinitz, Washington, D.C., former consultant to Social Security Board, and professor emeritus, University of California.

Mr. Herman M. Somers, chairman, Political Science Department, Haverford College, former consultant to Social Security Administration.

Mr. John W. Tramburg, commissioner, New Jersey State Department of Institutions and Agencies, former Commissioner of Social Security (1953).

Mr. George K. Wyman, executive director, Welfare Council of Metropolitan Los Angeles, former deputy Commissioner of Social Security (1959).

Mr. J. Douglas Brown, dean of faculty, Princeton University, Chairman of Advisory Council on Social Security (1937–38) and member of Advisory Council (1948–49).

Mr. John J. Corson, McKinsey & Co., Washington, D.C., former Director, Bureau of Old Age and Survivors Insurance.

Our Defense Posture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address I delivered at the annual banquet of the Virginia Court Clerks' Association, last Friday, Aug. 5, at Hotel Chamberlin, Old Point Comfort, Va., with reference to our present defense posture.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON AT THE ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE VIRGINIA COURT CLERKS' ASSOCIATION, HOTEL CHAMBERLIN, OLD POINT COMFORT, VA., AUGUST 5, 1960

Early in my congressional service, when the handling of domestic issues was not complicated, either by a tremendous national debt incurred in fighting a Second World War, or by a threat to our survival from an unscrupulous foreign dictator, I had the honor and great pleasure of addressing your annual meeting at this lovely and historic hotel. The memory of that meeting nearly a quarter of a century ago will always be a cherished one.

While I do not minimize the seriousness of the economic problems growing out of our greatest depression, they pale into insignificance when compared with the destruction of civilization in the event of another world war. How to prevent such a war is by all means the most serious issue confronting our Nation today.

Hence in this historic area of the Old Dominion which cradled and defended the infancy of our Republic, the scene of victory in our revolutionary fight for independence and freedom, the present location of the world's greatest naval base and shipbuilding facilities, and the training area for our first venture into manned exploration of space, I feel it would be both timely and appropriate to give you a brief report on the Military Establishment we are building with the hope that fear of punishing retaliation will stay the coldblooded and calculating hand of the Soviet dictator.

Most of my congressional service has been devoted to the handling of fiscal matters—10 years in the House during which I, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, helped to frame 12 tax bills, including the heavy and burdensome income and excise taxes of World War II, and 14 years in the Senate, during which I have served on the Appropriations Committee that has handled unprecedented peacetime budgets, and on the Banking and Currency Committee that has handled vital legislation relating to the congressional power to coin money and fix the value thereof.

With full knowledge of how burdensome our taxes are, with keen appreciation of the importance of a sound and stable economy in a successful fight for the preservation of our cherished democratic institutions, I have been working in recent years for an adequate defense program that could be financed within the framework of a sound fiscal policy. While fully agreeing with the able Secretaries of the Treasury of the present administration concerning the importance of a balanced budget, I have voted in recent years to cut foreign aid and domestic spend-

ing by an amount sufficient to measurably increase our defense posture. But for the inclusion a few years ago, on my insistence, of an additional $900 million for strategic bombers which Secretary of Defense Wilson said was not needed and would never be spent, we would not today have our present wings of B–52 bombers—the weapon most feared by the Communists.

Again this year, in advocating an airplane carrier to cost $293 million in the budget but not in the House bill, a start on a wing of B–70 bombers, costing $285 million which was not in either the budget or the House bill and increases for Army modernization, guided missiles and warning systems, I could point to cuts that had been made in the budget for domestic spending and to the cut I thought could and would be made in the mutual assistance or foreign aid program that would more than offset the $661 million that the Congress added to the President's defense budget. If no new spending schemes are adopted in the adjourned session that commences next Monday (and I hope none will be) the President can use all of the defense funds we have appropriated and still close his last fiscal year with one of the largest surpluses of his term.

On the basis of hundreds of pages of expert testimony presented to our Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations I do not think we need a crash program of any military activity costing two or three billion dollars of additional funds as some have proposed.

In order that you may more intelligently follow the debate that is sure to come on this issue in the next few weeks and in the next few months, I will present to you tonight a bird's-eye view of our current defense program and the additional items costing some $660 million which the Congress approved.

We must all recognize quite clearly that world domination has remained a steadfast and paramount Communist goal over the years and that this is the supreme threat to the free world and to our own way of life. Recent events have shown that this threat, exploiting all forms of power, has not lessened but on the contrary has been intensified in critical regions of the world. Indeed, we now see its manifestations at our very doorstep.

In company with this constant pressure against the West and its institutions there has been a change in the nature of the threat. This is reflected by a marked Soviet emphasis on intercontinental missiles and by the emergence of a dynamic, aggressive, and hostile Communist China. In the course of these events, and despite the talk of armament controls, both the Soviet Union and Red China have consistently improved their already large and effective military forces. Simultaneously they have stepped up their expansionist drives in important regions of the world. It is vital that we realize that these threats to our friends all over the globe are actual and direct threats to ourselves. In the long run, we in the United States can be defeated through erosion of the free world position just as well as by any overwhelming attack on our homeland. This means that we must remain strong militarily and that we must be able to successfully counter aggression wherever and in whatever form it may occur. We and our friends must be able to protect ourselves, and to do so the United States must maintain a fast striking, highly effective, modernly equipped Army.

In making its contribution to the national defense program our Army has four main tasks. It keeps forces overseas to deter aggression and to effectively resist such aggression should deterrence fail. It maintains combat-ready strategic units in the United States for rapid reinforcement of our forces in forward areas and those of our allies. Thirdly, it provides a significant share of the air defense of the United States. Lastly, it maintains a base for rapid mobilization, and this includes our civilian component forces as an essential ingredient. In addition to these primary tasks the Army has other important functions. Among these are the furnishing of military advisory groups and training missions to over 40 allied nations, the support of other armed services and governmental agencies, certain support for the atomic delivery systems which we provide other nations, and a large number of other activities which assist our national effort.

To carry out its mission in fiscal year 1961, the Army has been authorized a strength of 870,000 for its active forces and a paid drill strength of 700,000 for its Reserve components—the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard. The Active Army will include 14 divisions, eight being stationed overseas and six being located in the United States. Three of these divisions in the United States will continue to be in a high state of readiness for immediate deployment in any emergency. This is the famed Strac, "ready around the clock." During the year our Active Army forces will be increased by a battle group, a missile command, two and one-half more Nike battalions, and by 2 surface-to-surface missile battalions, even though the overall strength stays the same.

In supporting the air defense of the United States the Army's excellent surface-to-air missile units, armed with the Nike-Hercules, will expand their protection of major population centers, bases of the Strategic Air Command, and our industrial base. They will be complemented by other Nike missile units operated by the Army National Guard.

In this connection, all the Army's plans and programs will continue to place heavy dependence upon its Reserve components. Their capability to provide combat-ready units for the immediate backup of the Active Army and to furnish a training base for mobilization is at the highest level in our peacetime history. In particular, six divisions of the Army National Guard are prepared at all times for immediate mobilization and use. This overall state of readiness will continue to improve.

Several years ago it became apparent that new weapons and technology were altering the fundamentals of warfare as they had been known previously. As the result of long and extensive tests and studies, the Army has now revamped its organization and concepts to meet these changing conditions. Today, as never before, it emphasizes quality, flexibility, mobility, and the highest possible state of training and combat readiness. All of these require constant improvement in methods, in ideas, in equipment, and in the human element.

The Army considers the soldier as the basic and indispensable element for the defense of the Nation and so it is natural that it has attempted to attract and retain the best and most highly qualified people. Programs enacted by the Congress have permitted the Active Army to stabilize its personnel, a trend that also has been reflected in the Reserve Components. A large part of the Army budget for fiscal year 1961 will go toward the pay and allowances ($3.507 billion, Active Army: $234 million, Army Reserve: $230 million, Air National Guard) of these increasingly capable and highly qualified personnel.

Modernization of our Army has become urgent. The Soviet Union has made vast strides in re-equipping its land forces with the most modern weapons. This imposes upon us the absolute necessity to maintain a qualitative superiority if we are to keep our power posture in the international arena and if we are to be prepared to defend ourselves and help our allies protect themselves. Such modernization involves, first, research and development of new equipment and techniques, and then the procurement and issuance to our troops of advanced types of weapons.

The Congress has voted nearly $1½ billion for Army research and development during the new fiscal year. This sum exceeded the President's original budget request by $158,352,000. This will be devoted to a large number of projects, covering specific equipment items as well as many broad research investigations. This money will also finance contracts with educational institutions and will support extensive development and test programs by installations like the White Sands Missile Range and the Engineer Research and Development Laboratory at Fort Belvoir here in Virginia.

It would be difficult indeed to go into the hundreds of projects in this category. As examples of things that will be done, the Congress is concerned with the protection of our industrial and population centers from intercontinental ballistic missiles. The Army's Nike-Zeus is to be given full-scale testing in the near future. In these tests the Nike-Zeus will be set up in the Kwajelein area of the Pacific and will be fired against our own ballistic missiles fired from the West Coast. Many feel that the Air Force's Bomarc is a superior antimissile weapon.

To give our troops better fire support at medium ranges new solid-fueled missiles, such as the Pershing, will be pushed. These will replace older types which although reliable must be replaced by new and improved weapons. Dispersed units in the field need better defense against attack by low-flying aircraft and air-breathing missiles and this added protection will come both from missiles under procurement and from the development of a highly mobile system called the Mauler. Mobility of the Army, so essential if we are to gain the full capabilities of the Pentomic concept, will be enhanced through newer types of aircraft and helicopters, by better combat vehicles, and by more efficient means of transporting supplies. And in the area of firepower the Army is working hard on a new tank, and on better artillery with longer ranges and more lethal effects.

You may be interested in a brief description of a few of these items. There is a flying vehicle called the Avrocar which moves along above the ground on a cushion of air and which the Army hopes will go a long way toward getting some of our soldiers out of the mud. A brand new weapon is the Redeye, a hand-held guided missile that frontline troops can use to shoot down aircraft. And improvements continue on the Davy Crockett, a man-carried weapon which for the first time puts a nuclear weapon in the hands of small units. Really fantastic developments in electronics are being applied to devices for communication and for locating hostile forces and in identifying targets.

However, successful research and development is but the forerunner of procurement. As has been stressed, both are essential to modernization, and the Congress has emphasized its concern that the Army be modernized. During the forthcoming year this modernization will accrue quite largely from the replacement of wornout items by new equipment, and the Congress has made sizable funds available for this purpose—$1½ billion total for procurement.

The firepower of combat forces will be increased through the purchase of a whole family of missiles for use against ground targets. No doubt you have heard the names of some of these—Little John, Honest John, Lacrosse, and Sergeant. Even though the small nuclear weapon Davy Crockett is still being refined through research, initial quantities are going to be bought since this

weapon is needed quickly. To continue to improve our air defenses the Army is improving Nike-Hercules. This, of course, is the missile now protecting many of our most vital areas; for instance, the entire Norfolk region, but its effectiveness against a large-scale attack has been seriously questioned.

Air defense for our combat units also is being significantly improved by the purchase this year of more Hawk missiles for use against lower-flying aircraft. Conventional forms of firepower are being modernized by new and improved tanks, artillery pieces, and rifles and machineguns. These latter—the rifles and machineguns—will use ammunition made standard for all NATO countries.

To improve its mobility posture the Army is getting quite a few better types of aircraft. These will be used for such things as photography, reconnaissance, and the transportation of troops and supplies within the area of combat. Too, there will be some new helicopters which can lift up to 32 men or as much as 3 tons of equipment. While movement in the air is important, our modern Army still needs large amounts of surface transportation. For this reason, some 18,000 trucks will be bought, as well as quantities of armored personnel carriers.

The growing tempo of warfare, using all these improved weapons and faster means of getting from place to place, impose critical problems in connection with the command and control of all these diverse elements. For this purpose the Army will get new radios, teletype machines, and electronic systems to help locate enemy forces and targets.

The speed at which things take place, together with the large amounts of machines and weapons, make it essential that the flow of food, ammunition, gasoline, and all sorts of other supplies, keep pace with the battle. You may be sure that items like roadbuilding equipment, mobile bridges, generators for large amounts of electric power, are being bought.

Related closely to the modernization of the Army is the ability to move it strategically to the part of the world where it is needed. As you know, the Army depends upon its sister services for this transportation by sea and by air. The Congress has given special attention to this matter and has decided that our capability to move the Army needs strengthening. So funds ($310 million) have been given the Air Force for the particular purpose of modernizing its airlift through purchase of the most modern type of planes and the development of new types.

In addition to the operation and maintenance of installations, already mentioned, there is the need to continue certain military construction. For the active Army ($148.4 million) the Congress has approved additions to the Nike-Hercules air defense system, mainly in new radar sites. It has provided for building the necessary test facilities for the Nike-Zeus, and for airfields and helioports needed by the Army's aviation program. A limited amount of new construction is also planned for maintenance facilities, hospitals, and troop housing. We have given additional funds for new and better armories and training facilities for our Reserve Components ($16 million for the Army Reserves; $17.5 for the Army National Guard).

Of the moneys appropriated by the Congress for the Army, an appreciable amount will be devoted to activities and projects in the State of Virginia. Some of these, like armories and public works, are quite firmly planned, while others, like procurement contracts, can only be estimated at this time. However, it would appear at present that from the funds made available to the Army, expenditures during fiscal year 1961 will approximate the following amounts:

	Million
Civilian payroll	$52.1
Military payroll	71.2
National Guard (pay, operation and maintenance)	6.0
Construction, Active Army	9.2
Construction, Army Reserve	1.0
Construction, ANG	.6
Procurement contracts (over $10,000 only)	76.0
Civil works (under Army Corps of Engineers)	6.0

The overall effect of congressional action on the Navy budget was to add $258 million for procurement and ship construction and $50 million for research and development. Sixty-eight million was cut in other areas, mainly in operations and maintenance and military construction. The Navy budget approved by both Houses of Congress was $12.35 billion, an increase of about $230 million over that recommended by the President. But let me discuss these events in a little greater detail.

The funds in the budget provided for the support of 619,000 active duty personnel and 129,000 Reserve personnel, 817 ships of the active fleet and 6,800 aircraft. The Navy's budget request included funds for the support of the Navy Shore Establishment, which also was reduced in size, both in number of facilities and personnel.

The funds in the President's budget request provided for procurement of 658 aircraft and several types of guided missiles, the building of 20 new ships, 14 of which were for the purpose of antisubmarine warfare, and modernization of 15 other ships. It is interesting to note that the new ships included one attack aircraft carrier, five guided missile frigates and destroyers, two escort vessels, one nuclear powered attack submarine, three Polaris ballistic missile submarines plus long leadtime items for nine more, and six other ships.

The funds also provided for the procurement of new equipment for detection and attack of enemy submarines and aircraft and for communication equipment for ships, aircraft and supporting stations.

In the Navy's original budget request were funds for the research, development, test and evaluation of many types of equipment, stressing improvements in antisubmarine warfare equipment, attack ability of the fleet, nuclear power propulsion, and aircraft and ship missile systems. Funds were also requested for space projects. Increase in mobility and reaction speed of the striking power of the Marine Corps were provided for in the research and development funds.

After hearings and deliberations on the Navy's budget the House Appropriation Committee recommended substantial changes, the most drastic of which was deletion of the aircraft carrier.

After the House completed action on the Navy budget, hearings were held by the Senate Appropriations Committee in which the Navy programs were again reviewed. After serious consideration the Senate recommended restoration of the attack carrier in the budget, as well as other changes to the House recommendations. In so doing, the Senate reaffirmed its faith in the Navy's attack carrier striking force as a powerful and valuable weapon in wars of all kinds. I should like to state here that I have always been a firm believer in the value of the attack carrier and have supported a strong carrier program on every possible occasion. As a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee I was able to express my convictions, and, I believe, helped to convince my colleagues as to the great importance of this new carrier to the sea supremacy of the United States.

In the joint conference meeting on June 25, the House and the Senate Appropriations Committees compromised in their action on the President's appropriation bill, agreeing on restoration of funds for the attack carrier, and on five Polaris ballistic missile submarines with long lead time items for seven more. The joint conference also agreed to provide funds for four nuclear attack submarines and two destroyer escorts, a $50 million augmentation for research and development in antisubmarine warfare, and cuts in other areas amounting to $207 million. The overall increases in the Navy budget amounted to about $350 million.

The additional funds voted by the Congress will be of material assistance in improvement of the Navy's readiness for war. In strengthening procurement and research and development efforts these funds assist significantly toward giving the country an aggressive, modern Navy equipped with weapons superior to those of any possible enemy.

As you know, the 20th of July marked the advent of a new and highly effective deterrent force when the successful firing of two Polaris missiles took place from a submerged Polaris submarine, the *George Washington*. The additional funds voted by the Congress for a total of five of these ballistic missile submarines to be started this year will provide a major augmentation of this invaluable and invulnerable deterrent force. With these voted by the Congress the total authorized to be built is 14. Since each submarine holds 16 Polaris solid propellant missiles the Congress has increased by 32 the number of nuclear armed ballistic missiles which can be fired against any aggressor from virtually invulnerable platforms. Polaris missiles are capable of a range of more than 1,000 nautical miles and will be equipped with nuclear warheads. Later versions expected to be available in 1962 will be capable of about 1,500 nautical miles and by 1965 up to 2,500 nautical miles. The missiles can be fired rapidly from the Polaris submarine either submerged or on the surface. The first two Polaris submarines will be ready for operations with missiles on board later this year. Two of the five ballistic missile submarines approved by the Congress for fiscal year 1961 have already been awarded to naval shipyards. The remaining three have been awarded on competitive bids to private yards. Of these, one will be built by the Newport News Shipbuilding Co.

Aside from Polaris types the three additional nuclear attack submarines added by the Congress to the one in the Navy budget will be highly important additions to the Navy's growing fleet of these revolutionary ships. Currently there are 9 completed and 23 others authorized, most of which are building. The new attack submarines are capable of sustained high speed while submerged. They are one of the Navy's most effective means of countering enemy submarines of which the Russians have over 400. They are many times more effective than the diesel-powered types previously built, of which the Navy now has about 95. The contract for at least one of the four fiscal year 1961 submarines will be let on a competitive basis to a private yard. The construction of the other three will be determined later.

Navy offensive capabilities will be greatly improved by the antisubmarine warfare research and development funds provided by the Congress. Additional research funds of $50 million will provide for development of new equipment of all types. The funds will be used to expedite the development of present antisubmarine warfare projects

which are nearing completion, to increase effort in ocean surveillance systems, and to develop new weapon systems and methods of defeating enemy submarines. Some of these funds will augment basic research in the field of ocean surveillance by long-range acoustics.

Thus it can be seen that the addition of the funds by the Congress has given a sizable boost to Navy's defense programs for fiscal year 1961 and will have its effect on readiness of the fleet and in the deterrence of general war in the very near future.

The attack carrier funds for which were restored in the budget by Senate action, will provide a badly needed replacement for one of the remaining World War II *Essex* class, which are now becoming obsolescent and are near the end of their useful life.

The new carrier will be an improved *Forrestal* class ship. It will be about 77,000 tons, with a flight deck of about 1,025 feet, almost a fifth of a mile. Its angled deck, mirror landing system, and heavy-duty catapults and arresting gear will permit handling of modern high-performance aircraft with safety and speed. Its flight deck will be 71 percent larger in area than the World War II *Essex* class ships. It will be able to operate aircraft in rough seas which would prevent so doing in the case of *Essex* ships. The ammunition capacity will be three times, the aviation fuel capacity double that of the *Essex* class. Working space, maintenance shops, and many other features will be vastly more modern, convenient, and efficient than in previous ship types. The new carrier will add greatly to the power of the attack carrier striking force when it joins the fleet in 1965.

The attack carrier striking force, of which the fiscal year 1961 carrier will be a significant element, is essential to U.S. Navy sea supremacy. It is the most powerful tool in the world for maintaining control of the seas and for establishing control of land areas from the seas. This force will keep sea lanes open for free world nations and deny them to the enemy for many years to come. Perhaps most significant of all, it is a force which is sovereign in itself. It is not subject to the changing climates to which our other bases are subject. This means that it can be in position and prepared to project our forces when needed overseas without danger of revocation by some other authority.

Both the offensive and defensive capabilities of the Air Force were strengthened substantially through recent appropriations.

Money was provided to take the B–70 bomber program out of the prototype development stage and put this airplane into production as the most powerful manned aircraft yet devised. While the President had asked for only $75 million to build two B–70 prototypes, the Congress raised this to $265 million so the Air Force could proceed as rapidly as possible to develop this 2,000-mile-an-hour airplane as a fighting weapon. Many experts believe that this is the ultimate transitional craft between manned and unmanned offensive aerial striking power.

Moreover, the Congress appropriated another $100 million to be used either for additional fighter aircraft or for the B–70. If these funds are used entirely for the bomber, a total of $365 million can be put into the B–70 program.

On the defensive side, the Air Force and the Defense Department have revised their planning against attack of the North American Continent by manned bombers.

Careful attention was paid to the reduced number of Bomarc interceptor missiles that would be available in the near-term future, the optimum deployment of the manned fighter-interceptor force because of this, and the complex requirements for adequate ground environment systems—that is, the devices used to detect and identify attacking forces and to control the defensive weapons turned against them.

These revisions provide for the redeployment and reequipping of our manned fighter-interceptor force and a number of adjustments and improvements in our radar warning network. Still more revisions are being planned and will be announced later.

In this connection, the 48th Fighter-Interceptor Squadron at Langley Air Force Base is to be reequipped in September of this year with improved F–106 aircraft to enable it to perform its functions with greater speed, effectiveness, and power.

Today, the predominant threat is unquestionably from the Soviet strategic bomber force. The threat from this force will contiaue to exist indefinitely into the future. As time progresses, however, the threat of the growing Soviet ICBM force will rapidly become our principal concern. Air Force analysis indicated that maximum achievable effectiveness against the total threat would result from an accelerated completion of a semiautomatic defense system against the manned bomber, substantially improved over that existing today, coupled with further concentration on timely deployment of systems designed to counter the ballistic missile threat.

Specifically, the Bomarc interceptor missile program is being substantially reduced to 7 "A" and 9 "B" squadron equivalents (28 launchers per squadron) located on 10 bases, including 2 in Canada. Modernization of the manned fighter-interceptor force is expected to offset this Bomarc reduction to a degree adequate to meet the threat. Nonetheless, the decrease in total weapons available made it necessary to reposition and reequip certain units of the manned fighter-interceptor force in consonance with the reduced numbers of Bomarc to be deployed and with other existing air defense weapons.

A twofold objective guided all planning in this repositioning and reequipping of fighters. The first objective was to insure maximum defense capability along the most probable attack routes toward the most important national strategic targets. The second was to provide a rough equivalence in all areas of the United States as regards the relationship between weapons available, strategic targets to be defended, and enemy attack capabilities. This planning involves reducing the total number of weapons previously located in certain of the States and in other areas of the North American continent, as well as reequipping certain fighter-interceptor squadrons with aircraft of improved performance. The planned changes in the manned fighter-interceptor force may be summarized as follows:

REPOSITIONING

(a) Movement of three squadrons to different bases.

(b) Inactivation of six squadrons and transferring their aircraft and equipment to the Air National Guard or other Regular Air Force squadrons.

REEQUIPPING

(a) Replacing the aircraft in nine Regular Air Force and seven Air National Guard squadrons with aircraft of higher performance.

(b) Increasing the number of aircraft in four squadrons to provide greater defense capability in the areas where these squadrons are located.

One of the major portions of our air defense system is the ground environment, that is, the radar, radio and computer devices which are employed for detection and identification of hostile aircraft and for control of our defense missiles and fighter-interceptors. As you are aware, the revision of our previous air defense plan as presented to the Congress in March of this year included many changes in this ground environment. Specifically, we recommended cancellation of the SAGE supercombat center program and certain modifications in the original SAGE 1 program. This reorientation of our semiautomotic control centers made it necessary to revise our previous plans for deployment of radars. Certain radars which were required to support our SAGE supercombat centers now are either not required or contriute very little to the overall command and control system. Included among these radars which are no longer required are sites which have previously been in operation as well as those which were planned but have not yet been constructed.

The Air Force expects to shut down the radar equipment at 13 of these stations within the next 12 months, and to cancel plans for another station not yet constructed.

Let me say in conclusion that no man—in the Congress, in the White House or in the Pentagon—can tell with certainty whether our Defense Establishment is adequate at any given moment to meet and completely defeat every possible combination of assaults that might be made on us. We simply do the best we can, on the basis of the best available advise and planning, to keep the country as strong and as alert as possible within the means available for a long and continuing effort.

In this connection, I am glad to say that no authorization bill passed by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate since the start of the cold war has ever failed to get adequate funds from the Appropriations Committee on which I serve. I mentioned earlier some examples in which additional funds were made available for particular programs that seemed vital in our judgment.

I am informed that, starting next year, the Armed Services Committee will enter still more fully into the area of authorizing legislation on the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and vessels as part of its plan to oversee more closely than even before the area of military policy planning. This undoubtedly will permit the Appropriations Committee to work in still closer harmony with the Defense Establishment and the Armed Services Committee.

I can assure you that the elimination of waste and inefficiency in the procurement of items ranging from aircraft carriers to paper clips will continue to be a major concern of the Congress, but no price tag will be placed upon our security and the Congress can be depended upon to appropriate sufficient funds to maintain our present military superiority.

High Wages Not Pricing Us Out of World Markets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Sylvia Porter, in one of her recent columns, warns that the fallacy that our high wage rates are pricing American goods out of world markets is fast becoming folklore. A second fallacy also being widely circulated is that American wage rates are continuing to rise faster than Western European rates, thus putting us in a

continually worsening competitive situation.

Miss Porter, in a sharp analysis of some aspects of our world trade position, points out that our workers turn out more goods per hour and that production costs often are higher in other nations than in the United States and finally that wages in Europe are rising faster than in our country.

The solutions Miss Porter recommends lie in finding answers to our lack of real selling, our tendency to cut product service, our tough credit standards, and our indifference to planning. The answers are not to be found in cutting wage rates.

I ask unanimous consent that Miss Porter's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HIGH WAGES NOT PRICING US OUT OF WORLD MARKETS

(By Sylvia Porter)

A fallacy which shows dangerous signs of becoming folklore in our land is that our climbing wage rates are progressively pricing American products out of the world's markets—that, in short, because of our far higher wage levels, our products are less and less competitive with the goods of cheap labor nations.

Another fallacy which shows equally dangerous signs of becoming folklore is that our wage level is rising much faster than the wage levels of the major nations of Western Europe, and thus the wage spread between our country and European countries is widening and making our competitive position worse and worse.

It well may be that you believe these fallacies; they certainly are being publicized widely enough. But they cannot be supported by facts. Rather, new statistics just brought out by world-respected sources emphasize that:

Wages in Western Europe are rising faster than in the United States and the likelihood is that they will continue to rise faster, thereby closing, not widening the labor-cost gap.

Although Europe's wage levels are substantially below our levels—as they have been for generations—many factors other than wage levels decide the total cost of a product, and these other factors make it possible for a long list of products to be produced cheaper in our country despite our higher wage rates.

These facts are underlined in a new study by the French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies and are considered so important by New York's Chase Manhattan Bank that it is sending them in a report to all U.S. businessmen considering investments in Western Europe. They surely will be of interest to you too.

To begin with, the fact which is basis for the fallacies about our problems in the world's markets today is that our wage level is still so much above Europe's. Our hourly average of $2.68 compares with $1.08 in Sweden (highest in Europe) and 57 cents in the Netherlands (lowest average in Europe). These comparisons include fringe benefits or social charges which, incidentally, account for much larger part of total labor costs in Europe than here. In Italy, for instance, social benefits account for 43 percent of total labor costs.

In view of this central fact, how can it be argued that wages are not pricing us out of the world's markets? Here is how:

The hourly wage figures may often, as the Chase Manhattan Bank puts it, "understate actual labor costs." Our workers can turn out more goods per hour because they have more equipment behind them and they are more effective than equivalently skilled European workers.

Other costs beyond wages must be considered—such as the cost of fuel, power, construction, raw materials—and these other expenses frequently are higher abroad than here.

The trend is toward a more rapid rise in wages in Europe than in our country. Between 1950 and 1958, the wage rise in six European countries averaged almost 8 percent a year against about 5 percent here. And European labor unions are tightening their organizations, building their financial resources, pressing harder for more pay, shorter hours.

What is hurting us in the world markets is not our always superior wage scale. What is hurting us is our lack of real selling, our inferior if not deteriorating servicing of our products, our unnecessarily tough credit demands, our complacent indifference to topnotch planning to compete with our alert, vigorous, aggressive European competitors.

To accept the fallacy that we're being priced out of the world's markets by our wage rates is to accept defeat. We certainly are not going to slash our wage rates, and it will be a long time before Europe's level reaches ours. The answers lie in our common sense and courage, qualities American industrialists are supposed to possess in abundance.

Teachers Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, exchanges of American students and teachers with those in other countries serve our national interest, supplement our foreign policy and help disseminate the ideals of freedom and democracy in many parts of the world.

The number of Americans studying abroad, however, as well as the number of foreign students in this country is not as high as it should be. We need an exchange program which will result in the outflow of 100,000 Americans studying abroad annually compared to about 14,000 today. We are capable of enlarging our exchange program, reenforcing those which exist and instituting new ones.

One program presently functioning is the university contract system operated under International Cooperation Administration, by which American teachers help foreign governments and universities train their apprentice teachers and improve their educational standards. The success of this program so far is indicated by Dr. John H. Fischer, dean of Teachers College at Columbia University, in a letter to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, describing the experience of Teachers College. I think that Dr. Fischer's comments show how important is the university contract program and how necessary it is that we support this program and others like it, which seek to increase international exchanges of students and teachers. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a letter from Dean Fischer.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We understand that in discussion of the mutual security authorization bill (H.R. 11510) questions have risen concerning university contracts in the ICA program. Since Teachers College is now working with three such contracts, in Turkey, India, and Afghanistan, it has occurred to us that you might be interested in a brief summary of our experience.

In Afghanistan since 1954 we have been working with the Institute of Education and Kabul University. A staff of some 30 persons, headed by 1 of our senior professors, works in 3 major fields. We advise the appropriate Afghan officials and actively assist them in establishing and conducting a program of teacher education for the elementary and secondary schools. We work directly with Kabul University in training teachers of the English language. In the third branch of our program our people serve as teachers of English in Afghan secondary schools.

All of these activities are related directly to appropriate departments in Teachers College so as to focus upon the problems of education in Afghanistan the total strength of our professional resources here in the United States.

Under our Indian contract we work with the Ministry of Education of the Government of India and with the Central Institute of Education, the National Institute for Basic Education, the National Fundamental Education Centre, the Central Bureal of Textbook Research, the Central Bureau of Educational and Vocational Guidance, and the National Institute of Audio-Visual Education. The overall purpose of our activities is to assist the appropriate Indian authorities in strengthening the national program of professional education for teachers. Since February 1959, three of our most distinguished professors, each with an international reputation, have been assigned to this project. One is currently serving as our chief of party on a 2-year assignment. Each of the professors, one in social and philosophical foundations of education, one in instruction, and the third in educational administration, has contributed to the project not only his personal competence but also the benefit of his extensive professional and scholarly contacts in his field.

Our third contract has to do with the development of the Florence Nightingale School of Nursing in Istanbul. This will be the first collegiate level school of nursing in Turkey. The work began 2 years ago when a group of 10 Turkish nurses, selected as the nucleus of the faculty of the new school, came to the United States for advanced study in the Teachers College Department of Nursing Education. In their work here they became acquainted with recent developments in nursing education in this country and at the same time planned the program for the new school in Istanbul. When they returned to Turkey in the summer of 1959, they were accompanied by two members of our faculty who continued to work with the Turkish faculty and other medical and nursing agencies in Istanbul. The project is moving forward and the building for the new nursing school is under construction.

The principal value we see in the university contract system is that the Americans who serve as consultants and advisers abroad go not merely as individual technicians but as representatives of established and powerful American educational institutions, to which they may continuously turn for help.

At the same time the experience accumulated by the consultants flows back into the university to strengthen the programs by which young people, both Americans and citizens of the host countries, are trained to carry forward the work begun by the consultants. I can testify on the basis of personal conversations with officials of the countries in which we are working that they value highly the association with American universities which these contractual arrangements make possible.

From the point of view of our own institution, the oversea contract program brings a number of additional problems which certainly make our lives no easier. Every time one of our professors is assigned overseas, we must find a suitable temporary replacement for him. Maintaining sound communication between the campus and the field project is complex and difficult. Arranging to receive and properly care for foreign student participants is a time-consuming and delicate business. Setting up and administering any government contract requires many hours of the time of administrative officers and professors. Nevertheless, we are convinced that the role of education throughout the world today is so important that we would fail in our duty if we were not willing to accept a fair share of responsibility in this work.

Whether or not our own institution continues in the contract program, we trust that the special values and long-range importance of university involvement in the international relations of the United States will be carefully and objectively appraised. We are certain that the benefits to America and to our friends overseas will be found to justify the necessary investment of public funds and private effort.

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. FISCHER.

Statement by Frank N. Hoffmann, Legislative Director, United Steelworkers of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. MOSS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on July 20 of this year Mr. Frank N. Hoffmann, legislative director of the United Steelworkers of America, made a statement at the nonferrous conference of the United Steelworkers of America in Salt Lake City, Utah. Since the statement is one of policy made by a large national organization, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. FRANK N. HOFFMANN, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, AFL–CIO, AT THE NONFERROUS CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, NEWHOUSE HOTEL, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, JULY 20, 1960

Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to be here after the turmoil and tumult of the Democratic Convention last week at Los Angeles where I sincerely hope we nominated the next President of these United States.

The program of our union for the domestic nonferrous minerals industry lays down the line that the domestic minerals industry is not an island by itself. It is part and parcel of our entire economy. To the extent that the problems of the minerals industry are the problems of the economy as a whole, the solution must rest on an overall economic program.

The market for minerals is international; therefore, price is set on an international basis.

When supply becomes excessive lower prices result. This has an adverse effect on a segment of our mining industry. These are the high-cost producers whose operations are on a relatively small scale. We do not feel that tariffs and quotas offer a real solution to this problem. All that tariffs and quotas would accomplish would be windfall profits for the major producers.

1. As a general rule the big mines are low-cost producers; the small mines are high-cost producers.

2. One of the major ills of this industry is the erratic movement of prices.

3. The United States is an import nation, insofar as most minerals are concerned.

4. Many United States ore bodies are poorer in metal content than foreign ore bodies.

5. Some high-cost mines must eventually shut down.

In order to best alleviate many of the problems facing the domestic nonferrous minerals industry, the United Steelworkers proposes that Federal legislation be enacted providing for the creation of a domestic minerals agency. This agency would be empowered to—

1. Establish an economic price for minerals based upon the following standards: (A) Domestic production costs, (B) historic price of minerals, (C) prices of substitute materials, (D) defense and other domestic needs of minerals.

2. Administer a program of subsidy payments to domestic producers whenever the selling price is below the economic price. This subsidy will apply on a yearly basis only to a limited, fixed tonnage of any mine.

3. Administer a buffer stockpile of domestic minerals. The agency will buy the mineral when the market price is below the economic price. It will sell when the market price is above the economic price. As a general rule, purchases for the stockpile will increase as prices decline. The agency will not purchase more than 20 percent of any mine's output in any year. Appropriate restrictions would be set up to prohibit the use of the stockpile to break or weaken a strike.

4. Administer and exploration and development aid program. Loans will be made available for exploration and development purposes. In addition, development and exploration will be subsidized on a dollar-matching basis.

5. Administer a readjustment program. Extremely high-cost mines may well be forced to close. In these areas, technical and financial assistance will be provided to hard-pressed companies unable to meet the costs to modernize, diversify, or build new plants and businesses. In addition, special inducements will be offered to new industries to locate in the area. As a last resort, full assistance will be given for the purpose of relocating people in other areas. Such assistance must include: (a) Unemployment benefits, (b) assistance in finding another job in another area, (c) moving expenses, (d) retraining to acquire news skills.

So much for a general outline of the problems confronting us.

Now what have we been doing as a union to have this ambitious program enacted and bring some relief to this industry?

We have advocated aid for this industry since the 79th Congress. We have testified before every session of Congress since then.

During the 85th Congress, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs held a series of hearings on a long-range program for the minerals industry.

These hearings extended over a period of 4 months. They are the best and most complete hearings on the subject that have been made to date.

President McDonald laid the groundwork for the program that I have already outlined, at these hearings.

On September 22, 1958, the administration finally moved to do something when the President agreed with the unanimous finding of the U.S. Tariff Commission that escape clause relief was warranted in the case of lead and zinc.

The President's proclamation limited imports by an annual quota equivalent in amounts to 80 percent of average annual commercial imports during the 5-year period, 1953–57.

The quota was allocated among exporting countries and subdivided by calendar quarters and by tariff schedule classifications.

The President stated in his proclamation that the imposition of quotas was an unusual step. Of course any step that would help industry or labor would be an unusual step—to a Republican administration.

I would like to point out that the administration had rejected higher lead and zinc tariffs at that time and instituted a Government stockpile buying plan instead, to help the industry out of a recession, while at the same time the late Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, asked representatives of the importing countries not to take advantage of the stockpiling plan by increasing production sharply and flooding this country with metal. Canada was one of the countries that complied conscientiously with this request.

It should be mentioned that the quotas which restrict imports of lead and zinc to 80 percent of the average amount that entered this country from 1953 through 1957 could not take exclusive credit for the slight improvement. Demand for both metals already had started to pick up when the quotas were announced on September 22, 1958, to be effective on the 1st of October.

Under the quotas, imports may not exceed 354,720 tons of lead a year or 520,960 tons of zinc. These represent 80 percent of the average 1953–57 commercial imports of 443,400 tons of lead and 651,200 tons of zinc. However, import quotas have not proved a satisfactory means of curtailing imports of lead and zinc. Since 1951, imports of lead have increased from 75 percent of U.S. production to more than 90 percent; imports of zinc have zoomed from 72 percent of domestic production to more than 115 percent. At the same time, the number of domestic lead and zinc mines has declined substantially.

One of the items in testifying on S. 4036, this year before the House Committee on Interior that we fought for was a bonus or subsidy for small producers of lead and zinc.

We strongly advocated such a step and I am happy to report that the House of Representatives recently approved by a vote of 197 to 191, a bill—the Edmundson bill—to allow the Federal Government to subsidize the mining of lead and zinc by small domestic producers.

The vote was close because Republican and Southern Democrats teamed up to fight the bill.

This bill would provide subsidies to producers whose mine output amounts to less than 2,000 tons of lead and zinc a year.

Payments would be made to insure producers return of 14½ cents a pound for zinc and 17 cents a pound for lead.

Current prices for lead and zinc are 13 cents for lead and 12 cents for zinc. Under the subsidy plan, the Federal Government would make up the difference.

Just before Congress adjourned to reconvene in August the Senate Finance Committee approved a bill that would put a fixed duty on lead of 2 cents a pound plus a flexible additional tax of 1 cent a pound.

This flexible tax would apply when lead prices drop below 13½ cents and would be removed when they reached 14½ cents. The fixed duty on zinc would be 1½ cents a pound. In addition, a flexible duty of 0.7 cents would apply when zinc prices dropped below 12½ cents a pound and would be removed when they rose to 13½ cents. We do not agree with the approach of the Senate Finance Committee.

There is a good chance that the subsidy to small mine owners—the Edmundson bill—will pass the Senate. However, there is a distinct possibility that the President will veto the bill.

The Administration will probably recommend to the White House that both bills be vetoed. The White House contends that current quotas limiting lead and zinc imports are adequate protection for the industry.

We are going to do all that we can when the Congress reconvenes in August to see that this Edmundson bill is enacted into law.

This will be a step forward in helping an industry that has suffered altogether too long—and is certainly deserving of help.

I wish you success in this conference.

The Puzzle of Farm Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Puzzle of Farm Politics," published in the Wall Street Journal of August 5.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PUZZLE OF FARM POLITICS

For a generation or more the farm program has been, inevitably, an election issue; today it is a national scandal. Unfortunately neither candidate seems prepared so far to offer any useful suggestions for dealing with it. And this is strange, because practical political solutions are possible today as never before.

It is perfectly true, as the Democrats charge, that the costs of the Federal agricultural programs have skyrocketed in the years of the Republican administration; that Federal surpluses have increased enormously; and that, despite all the outpouring of money from Washington, total net farm income has not improved.

But these statements do not mean much unless it is asked why matters have turned out so disastrously. The principal reason is the continuation of the high price-support policies designed to spur maximum production as a World War II emergency measure. Secretary Benson has succeeded in getting through Congress some modifications of this, but Congress has balked at significant changes. So it is not the Republican administration but the Democratic Congresses that stand indicted for the farm chaos.

That responsibility, one might suppose, would impel the Democrats in particular to search for commonsense solutions. Instead we find in the party platform and the statements of Senator KENNEDY an appalling intellectual poverty. As though high price props were not the root of the trouble, the Democrats would make them worse by restoring them to a rigid 90 percent of parity.

Vice President NIXON, for his part, has yet to provide details of his approach to the farm problem. But he has already talked, alarmingly enough, of massive aid without regard to budgetary considerations.

There is no mystery, however, about the right approach. It is a progressive lowering of price supports to a point where domestic and foreign markets are able to absorb farm produce without these monstrous Government surpluses. Objective agricultural experts know this; farmers themselves say it over and over. The trouble is that this approach is considered politically unrealistic.

A couple of facts, it seems to us, strongly suggest that even the politics of a sound farm program is far less formidable than the politicians profess to think. One is that the bulk of price support payments goes to the growers of a very few crops which account for the worst surpluses. Some of those growers are wealthy—are, indeed, corporations. What is politically so suicidal about opposing huge Federal handouts to corporations for the purpose of piling up costly Government surpluses?

Another fact is that a large segment of the farm population embraces people who are not properly speaking farmers. These include people with other jobs or income who have taken up farming on the side to get in on the Government gravy. Politicians hardly need to shed public tears for these.

In addition, are the so-called marginal and largely unsubsidized farmers who add practically nothing to the national product and can't make a decent living at farming. Under the guise of preserving farming as a way of life or preserving the family farm, the politicians demand that these people be kept at it by subsidies which could not make them efficient producers. What is so noble about condemning them to continued and needless squalor?

That is not humanitarianism. The humanitarian thing is to encourage marginal farmers to get into productive work. Where needed during a transitional period, the Government might well spend some of the money it is wasting on farm millionaires in helping train these erstwhile marginal farmers in industrial or other work that would enable them to share in the general prosperity.

A further, and powerful, political fact is that the farm population is declining despite all the solicitations of Washington; the tremendous increases in productivity per man and acre have decreed that. It should be a source of pride rather than a cause for rebuke, as when the Democrats charge that 3 million people have been driven from the farm since 1952.

Whatever the validity of that particular statistic, the decline has been notable for decades. Its political meaning is that the farm bloc is no longer so potent in an increasingly urban America—particularly when farmers are also dissatisfied with the Democratic policies which the Republicans have perforce pursued.

Over a year ago, Mr. Benson said: "The economics of the farm dilemma is simple—it is the politics of the problem that is baffling. What farmers want and need is less Government in the farming business—less politics in agriculture."

But the politics, it seems to us, need no longer be such a hopeless hurdle, if the candidates would show the political sense to state the honest facts and draw the plain conclusions.

Why We Need a Democratic President in 1960—Prize-Winning Oration by Susan Springborg, St. Paul, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in Minnesota, as in all States, young men and women are attracted to the Democratic Party because it is the party for today and the future, and not the party of yesterday. Three young Minnesotans who participated in the Minnesota Young Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party oratorical contest on June 19, 1960, in Minneapolis, demonstrated the fine talent and straight thinking on major national issues that these young people bring to our party.

I ask unanimous consent that the prize-winning oration by Susan Springborg, St. Paul, Minn., second place, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the oration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"The Eisenhower administration is like a tranquilizer pill factory. With each speech and each public appearance, it seeks to lead us gently and expertly into an unreal, delightful, trivial world, without veracity, without dignity, without humanity, and without purpose, except, of course, the purpose of balancing the budget." This statement by Adlai Stevenson sets the tone well for the more specific inadequacies of the administration which I would like to suggest today. However, remembering that it is easy to criticize, and more difficult to solve a problem, I would like to do more than simply point out Republican failures. I'd like to suggest solutions which have been proposed by leading Democrats, solutions which I think have the potential for success.

In analyzing the specific inadequacies I referred to, I'll review the record of the present administration in two phases, at home and abroad. In doing this I realize I am committing the same blunder that the administration has, trying to separate domestic and foreign policy. But I hope you will forgive me for this error, realizing that the separation will serve an organizational purpose for my remarks.

First, then, let's look at the past 8 years here at home by evaluating our economy and the progress made toward solving domestic problems. Let's measure our economy in terms of the three comprehensive goals set forth by Economist Leon H. Keyserling. The first of these goals is, "To achieve steady and optimum growth in real terms." Our rate of growth in gross national product is about 3 percent a year, as compared to a Soviet minimum growth rate of 6 percent a year. These statistics from the New Republic of March 7, 1960, present a challenge to us, not only in terms of the Soviet threat, but also in respect to the population explosion at home. Why have we failed to meet this challenge? I believe that our failure can be attributed to Eisenhower's fiscal policies. According to the Progressive, the Republicans have acted "as if a balanced budget was the paramount means of meeting the Soviet economic offensives." Inflation has been complicated by tight money policies and high interest rates designed to slow down

our economy. Keyserling summarizes: "The repressive budgetary policy has stunted economic growth and truly aggravated price inflation."

Further, unemployment remains as an unsolved problem. Currently, about 6 percent of the working force is unemployed. In 1959, when 4,750,000 men and women were without jobs, the President did not even deign to mention them in his state of the Union message.

And finally, there is no solution to the longstanding farm problem. Mr. HUMPHREY commented, "I am particularly conscious that the farmers have suffered more than any other group in the American economy from the stubborn stupidity and dogmatic shortsightedness of the Republican administration."

Similarly, our economy has not fulfilled the second goal, which is "to apportion our total national production wisely, in accord with relative priorities of needs, so that we do not get what we need least at the expense of what we need most." We have what Galbraith has called the "social imbalance." Increased financing for education, particularly on the Federal level, is urgently needed. Mr. NIXON recently defeated a bill for such aid in the Senate. We must provide added help to the aged, for 80 percent of those 65 and over live on less than $2,000 a year, and 60 percent of them on less than $1,000. Mr. Eisenhower has opposed the Forand bill. Conservation, urban redevelopment, mental health research, water and air polution—all of these require our attention if we are to erase the "social imbalance." Yet, during the last session of Congress, Mr. Eisenhower used the veto 150 times.

Taxation must be altered to provide for these needed expenditures. The New Republic of March 7, 1960, stated, "At current levels of taxation the best rise in the GNP that the country is likely to get will not bring enough funds to do what must be done." This does not necessarily indicate an increase in the tax rate, but rather a tightening of taxing policies. Leading Democrats have suggested that $4 billion in dividend income goes unreported; if there was a dividend withholding tax, as in the case of many other sources of income, the Government would collect at least a billion dollars of the dividend-based revenues that were due it (Progressive, May 1960). The administration has also chosen to ignore the Democratic proposal to tighten up the tax-free expense allowances.

The third economic goal is to combine economic progress and efficient use of resources with economic justice. We have failed here also. The administration has not met the challenge of technological unemployment and displacement, nor of the pockets of poverty throughout the country. A recent report of the Bureau of the Census stated that slightly under 25 percent of U.S. families live on less than $3,000 a year, and 6.4 percent on less than $1,000. Yet, according to the Progressive of March 1959, "The President's messages and budget do not contemplate any direct attack on, or for that matter, show any awareness of, the needs created by the recession or the longrun problem of technological unemployment."

At home, a consuming fear of inflation has blinded the Republican administration to America's urgent economic and social needs. That is the first reason I would choose a Democratic President in 1960.

Now let's examine the Republican policy abroad, in the areas of defense and foreign relations.

"The millitary position of the United States has, in the short span of 15 years, declined from one of great security to one of great insecurity" (Washington Center of Foreign Policy of Johns Hopkins University, December 1959). Why? The reasons are numerous: lack of planning, coordination, basic research, and efficiency. But may I mention just one, inadequate financing. We are spending about $45.8 billion on major national security this year, and several independent studies, requested by the President to evaluate our defense, have concluded that these expenditures are inadequate. The Rockefeller report stated: "The overall U.S. strategic concept lags behind development in technology and in the world political situation. Systems of budgets, appropriations, and financial management are out of gear with the radically accelerating flow of military developments." The Gaither Committee, appointed by Eisenhower in 1957; concluded: "If, for the 10 years ending 1967, Russia continues to increase her military expenditures by 6.5 percent per year—while ours remains fixed at $40 billion per year—then we will obviously fall behind in relative military strength." And finally, the President's Committee to Study U.S. Military Assistance Programs, which added, "The reduction in funds for the military assistance programs in the present fiscal year involves a serious security danger for the United States and the free world."

In spite of these warnings, the President continues to sacrifice our national safety to his budget.

Although the administration has been at fault in the area of defense, it has been even more negligent in striving for disarmament. Public opinion polls indicate that the American people are most concerned with peace, not missiles. Yet, Eisenhower's administration has been more interested in "the Nation's capability to destroy the potential enemy rather than in ending the cold war. It has not taken a positive or creative approach to negotiated disarmament" (Progressive, May 1960). JOHN KENNEDY has pointed out that delegates to peace conferences have been poorly prepared, and that we have no consolidated leadership in working for peace. There are six different governmental agencies in the area. HUBERT HUMPHREY has offered his solution in the form of a national peace agency, and JOHN KENNEDY has suggested an arms control research agency. Either one of the proposals would serve to intensify research and effort toward achieving peace and disarmament by consolidating the various agencies.

In respect to our foreign policy as it affects the uncommitted world, I could mention the U–2 blunder, the Japanese fiasco, the problems created by not recognizing Red China, of the questionable success of our buy-American trade policies. But let's glance at our record in foreign aid. The administration has acted on the principle, "Buy friends and influence people." It has been more concerned with the military rather than the economic growth of underdeveloped nations. Adlai Stevenson commented, "I regret that the administration rejected the recommendation of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last winter for a $1.5 billion loan fund for about 5 years." If the recommendation had been approved, it would have allowed long-term planning, something which is badly needed.

Stagnation, not innovation, has been the keyword for the past 8 years. Arthur Schlesinger summarized the situation well: "The administration's new ideas have either been flops, like the Baghdad Pact and the Eisenhower doctrine, or else, were fortunately, never carried out, like the unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek and massive retaliation." There have been no fresh suggestions, like Mr. HUMPHREY's White Fleet, the International Educational Development Foundation, and food for peace. Creativity has been absent.

Abroad, a concern for the budget rather than our national security, a failure to progress toward negotiated disarmament, an ineptitude in dealing with the uncommitted nations, and a deficiency of new ideas, has characterized the years of Republican administration. That is the second reason I would choose a Democratic President in 1960.

Again, a concluding statement by Adlai Stevenson seems appropriate, "I believe that the United States is ready for a new awakening and the achievement of greater goals. Within it are the moral and material elements of new purpose and new policy. It is the task of leadership to marshal our will and point the way. We had better start soon for time is wasting."

May I add my own footnote. We can start—with a Democratic President in 1960.

Citizens' Platform for 1960 Political Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the major political parties—Democratic and Republican—created at their national conventions and presented to the American people party platforms for the 1960 election.

The platforms for the most part reflect what the parties propose or promise to do for the people.

We recognize, of course, that in many fields the Federal Government does have a fundamental and/or supplemental responsibility.

Naturally, each party wishes to—and, in fact, must—clarify what it proposes to do on major national issues, if it hopes for victory in November.

As citizens, however, I believe it is significant that—as provided by the Constitution—we reserve the responsibility and opportunity to do what we can for ourselves.

Among other things, this means retaining the rights, freedoms, and responsibilities, to stimulate the creative efforts and "test the mettle" of the American people.

In effect, we do not want to spoon-feed our citizens with a ladle of bureaucracy, from the cradle to the grave.

Recently, I was privileged to outline proposals for a citizens platform for the 1960 campaign, in an address over Wisconsin radio stations. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The major political parties—Republican and Democratic—have adopted platforms upon which to run in the 1960 elections. For the most part, however, these resolutions propose—or at least promise—what the parties would, if elected, do for the people.

About 100 years ago, however, Abraham Lincoln—in a now time-tested statement—said: "The legitimate object of government, is to do for a community of people, whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so do well, for them-

selves—in their separate, and individual capacities."

As citizens, I believe that it is essential that we—the people—retain the maximum rights, freedom, and responsibility—to stimulate the creative potential and "test the mettle" of our people. What we do not want is to spoon-feed our citizens by the ladle of bureaucracy from the cradle to the grave.

What, then, is the citizen's role—yours and mine—in this upcoming campaign?

BILL OF RIGHTS FOR VOTERS

Fundamentally, Mr. and Mrs. Voter have both rights and obligations.

In the campaign, we, as citizens, have a right:

1. To be presented with all the facts—not just "selected data" to prove allegations;

2. To expect candidates to "live up" to their campaign promises;

3. To a campaign debating the issues, not a mudslinging foray; and

4. Since we are living in a "glass house"—so to speak, with the world looking on—we have a right to expect responsibility by candidates in public statements. Why? Because any such statements may provide propaganda ammunition in the Communist international ideological struggle. In these times, we are no longer an island unto ourselves. Consequently, we need a new "high road" of campaigning.

Today the American people are looking more closely at the qualifications and capabilities of candidates. Also, there is a growing trend—with some exceptions—away from the hard-and-fast "party line" voting. The voter who "thinks for himself" is a growing phenomenon. Overall, I believe this is a healthy sign in U.S. political life.

VOTERS' OBLIGATIONS

Now, let's look at voter obligation: These include:

First, to roll up our sleeves and work in the party of our choice;

Second, if we can, contribute. In the words of the popular slogan: "Don't pass the buck, instead, give a buck."

Third, be informed on the candidates, their qualifications, and the issues of the day; and

Fourth, to vote.

The voting record by U.S. citizens is deplorably low—ranging from 24 percent in 1904 to 63 percent in 1952 in a national election.

By contrast, voting in other countries has reached such ranges as follows: Italy, 93 percent; Germany, 86 percent; Turkey, 87 percent; Denmark, 80 percent.

For 1960, the Nation should shoot for a minimum of 75 percent, and, if possible, a 90–100 percent voting record in the election.

Now, why is voting so necessary?

In a complex age, each of us, as citizens, faces the task of fulfilling a dual role: First, as an individual integrated into our social and economic structure; and second, as a civically responsible citizen in our political system.

Tragically, the voters of the country—historically—have demonstrated far too little interest in exercising their voices in government. Specifically, what does this really mean?

Loss of a voice in government—through negligence—for millions of people;

Rule of a minority, since the total vote at its top is barely over 50 percent of the population;

An inordinately strong voice in government for the special interests crusading for their own goals; and

A loss to the Government itself in terms of strength of support, ideas, efficiency, and organization of the nonvoting populace.

In general, the apathetic attitude toward voting results in "somebody minding our business.'" However, government is the business of each of us.

NEW LOOK AT CITIZEN'S ROLE IN ECONOMY

Over the years, the Government has assumed a larger and larger share of responsibility in a great many fields. Unless voluntary effort is undertaken by the people to handle as many programs as possible, it can be safely assumed that the long arm of Uncle Sam will reach farther into the affairs of our citizens. Again and again, it must be stressed that the success of a free society depends upon maintaining opportunity for the initiative, ingenuity, and enterprising spirit of its citizens.

Today, we live in a fast-changing world. Again, to paraphrase Lincoln: "In new times, we need to devise new programs." During this process, however, we must be careful not to forget the role of the individual and assign all new responsibilities to Uncle Sam. Instead, there needs to be every precaution taken to preserve—within an orderly society—the opoprtunity for the individual to make his unique contribution with a maximum degree of freedom.

What does this mean? Among other things:

A reevaluation of the individual versus governmental role in developing new programs.

A stronger, more active voice in Government for our citizens;

Surveying the gamut of programs to see how and where, individual effort and group, State, or county initiative can take the burden off Uncle Sam;

Adopting an "election year" resolution that candidates and parties—not just with "promises" of more Government aid, but with a "sense of responsibility," will merit—and get—our votes in November.

The lifeblood of a republic is its people—well informed, creative, thinking citizens.

To a large degree, progress in a free society depends upon the active participation of its citizens.

First, we must elect the right candidates to serve our country; and

Second, following such election, we cannot adopt the attitude of "Well, we've elected him. Now let him do the job."

Instead, in these challenging times, we need a real mobilization of our national manpower and resources—on a voluntary basis—to assure an ever-better life for our citizens and establish peace on the globe.

Commencement Address by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on the 22d of July Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development of the Department of the Army, made the commencement address to the 1960 Defense Strategy Seminar at the National War College. His message was a warning to America. He calls attention to the threat of Communist aggression and to the need of America to recognize the threat and do something about it. In hopes that more of America may become alert to the threat, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks by General Trudeau be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ACTION 1960

Remarks by Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, Chief of Research and Development, Department of the Army, Defense Strategy Seminar, 1960, the National War College, Officers' Open Mess, Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C., Friday, July 22, 1960

Thank you, General Harrold, General Armstrong, distinguished guests, graduates of the 1960 Defense Strategy Seminar, ladies and gentlemen, and fellow Americans. I deeply appreciate the opportunity to be here with you this evening. I congratulate those who have conducted and made this fine course possible. I also congratulate all the students who have had the opportunity to benefit from the splendid curriculum. You must sense new horizons. Instead of thinking of today's events as your graduation, however, I suggest you think of them as your ordination. I hope your diploma will haunt you everytime you look at it unless you embrace it as a commission and a directive to go forth and tell all those your voice or pen can reach how dire is our danger and how urgent, our need.

The need of the hour, above all else, is a dynamic awakening of American public opinion in support of worthy, clear-cut, comprehensive national goals.

I hope you all have read—and given much thought to—the splendid series of articles in Life magazine during May and June concerning this Nation's need to reexamine its pillars of national purpose. And I hope you are aware of the work of the President's National Goals Commission under Dr. Henry Wriston, the president of the American Assembly whose report is due at the end of the year.

I urge you to study and to keep abreast of these developments—they are guided by men who understand the deep and fundamental meanings of what our national purpose should be. There is no doubt in my mind that if such guidance is implemented our country can rise to meet the Communist challenge and advance the vital interests of freedom throughout the world, and here your leadership is badly needed.

As a people we must more meaningfully define our national goals and objectives and again fire the fuel that brightens the uplifted torch of liberty, but it can only come from within the heart and soul and body politics of an awakened America.

There is a growing recognition of this fact as America stands today at a critical moment in history—at the crossroads of our destiny—fighting to halt and repel the advancing growth and spread of an alien and amoral ideology relentlessly dedicated to the suppression of freedom and domination over the globe. For a half century, the challenge of communism steadily has grown in all of its ramifications—economic, social, psychological, and political as well as military—until today it is reaching the full crest of its drive.

The time is now—to strike and shatter it by force of dynamic policies and actions propelled by an awakened people.

This is where you come in. The challenge has never been so grave nor the cold war so hot. The relative power of the Sino-Soviet bloc has never been so great in the military, economic, and political-subversive fields. The free world must awaken—now.

We need to get pulled out figuratively of our campagne-filled bathtubs and thrown under in ice-cold shower.

The alternatives to such an awakening are either a nuclear hell or the continued submersion of free men beneath the enervating and lethal waves of communism.

The Red-written record is clear. And it has been starkly clear since the first unfurling of the banner raised by Marx and Engels and Lenin against God and man. Make no mistake: Since that convulsive event, Christian civilization and communism have been locked in a struggle to the finish—and wiser heads have realized it.

Like you, I view this situation with some trepidation, but I am more shaken by the fact that many—many of our people do not. They are too complacent, too beset with seeking final solutions to world problems through such hopeful policies as containment and status quo, as they are lulled and dulled by the siren of peaceful coexistence and languor in the lap of luxury and domestic prosperity.

Our people must come to the realization that the tides of history cannot be contained and that there is no such thing as maintaining the status quo. Unless we have the urge to push onward and upward, we shall be thrust back. To rest is to rust. I can find in history no periods which mankind views with real pride except those in which heroic efforts usually accompanied by great sacrifices were made to advance. There is inspiration and growth in the path of progress; there is only atrophy of the spirit in fancied security and repose. The great illusion of the invincibility of American power needs to be carefully reexamined in the cold light of a new era.

There can be no doubt in any well-informed mind that a rapidly expanding Soviet technology with all its sinister facets, poses the greatest threat of our day to the peaceful and productive evolution of mankind. With all our energy and resourcefulness we must counter this threat but it can't be done by ignoring it.

Within this context, I speak to you today.

Since last year's class graduated, the yeast of their enthusiasm has leavened thousands of other Americans. Now we look to your fertile minds to again bulge the numbers who recognize that, at our level at least, greater leadership can and must be generated. Any of you who fail to do so are not worthy of the effort or expense of bringing you here or of the uniform you wear. Tell our people the facts.

As we engage this enemy, let us be fully aware of two other fast-moving phenomena, which are part and parcel of the worldwide upheaval of this new era.

One is the rising tide of ethnic nationalism which burst forth from the agonizing struggles of World War II and from the impact of modern communication and transportation—and which is creating truly significant problems in those vital areas of Africa and Asia, known as the uncommitted world. These people—diseased, undernourished, illiterate, impoverished—call for an improved standard of living. They look to see which system—the free world's or the Communist—can best help them secure the economic necessities of life—and which system can do it more rapidly. We must find solutions to their problems and show them that economic growth and technological progress are in better harmony with our system and our type of freedom—than with Communist slavery.

Do you realize that 30 percent of the 100 nations in the U.N. by 1965 will be from Africa?

Do you know that in all of the Congo, there are only three natives who are college graduates? And 47 in Libya?

Do you know that the Congo contains half the world's uranium, 70 percent of its cobalt, 80 percent of its industrial diamonds, the world's purest copper and much of its tin?

Do you know that more central Africans are being educated and trained behind the Curtain than on this side of it?

Do you know that the Congolese are waiting for a young Congolese native to finish a course in business before he assumes the presidency of their Central Bank?

Can we define the difference between anarchy and chaos? What do the sickening events of these last weeks mean?

What about a Khrushchev who completely ignores wholesale murder, disorder, brutality and rape in calling for us to do nothing in the Congo and even to evacuate the only remaining forces of law and order.

How thin is the veneer of our civilization against the rising temperatures that scorch it from below? Can we invent and use a fire extinguisher before man's loftiest goals and noblest dreams are a charred and smoking mass of ruins?

On the international scene, our leaders must seize, retain, and exploit the initiative in all fields of human endeavor. We must unmask the false image communism is projecting to the world—the image of a winning movement inevitably riding the rising wave of history. We must use the fruits of our free enterprise technology to counter and disprove this Soviet claim.

An obvious example of this initiative is the need for greater concentration of technological effort in Asia and Africa in order to bolster fledgling and underdeveloped countries now reaching out from centuries of backwardness toward the promise of political liberty, economic freedom, and material improvement. In this uncommitted part of the world, we have some influence, and we should have; but we should not confuse our affluence at home with our influence abroad. To have luxuries is one thing; to have comforts is another; and to have the necessities of life is a third. What are luxuries to others are considered necessities by us. It is high time now for Americans to differentiate between these separate and profoundly different human requirements and possessions and reassess our values from a mature and modern viewpoint.

The populations of the Middle East and Latin America share a common awareness of the problems in Asia and Africa and a passionate conviction that they can offset the great divergence between their living standards and those of the West. If peace and stability are to be maintained in this shrinking world of ours, their aspirations must be recognized and their needs met to a greater degree. To the extent we can assist, we should, in the interest of both humanity and of international peace and progress. As I said if the threat of world communism were removed tomorrow, the problems caused by ethnic nationalism so rampant in all the underdeveloped areas of the world would still challenge our best efforts for the next century.

The other phenomenon is the explosion in science and technology which is drastically reshaping our world, bringing to our generation more changes than were faced by our forebearers in any past period of history.

In the last 100 years 2 percent of recorded time—mankind has achieved 90 percent of his technological progress. The future may be even more astounding! Of all the men who have ever been trained in science and technology, it is estimated that nine-tenths of them are alive today.

The implications of this exploding technology are truly fantastic. Not only will national security profit from this amazing surge in technology, but literally all mankind if we have but the wisdom to employ its potential.

At the taproot of this marvelous technological age is the disturbing fact that nations have at long last achieved the awesome power of mutual destruction. With the key of science and technology, mankind has freed these fearful forces which cannot be reimprisoned. Today, a single nuclear-tipped missile can equal in destructive power all the devastation created during World War II. There is worldwide concern that this terrible power will, by design or miscalculation, break loose and wreak havoc upon nations and peoples.

Now, in this life there are few certainties, but one of them is that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty—and today, even of survival—and great as our problems are, their solutions are not beyond the genius of the American people. Informed and dedicated—alive to the stark reality of our time—we can prepare to sacrifice and know it is better to give freely of our treasure and sweat now, than our blood and tears later.

Whose memory today is so short and shallow he fails to remember that less than 10 years ago, the blood of 140,000 Americans was shed on Korean hillsides as a measure of our determination to repulse aggression and to advance the cause of freedom whatever the cost, whatever the sacrifice? This was 4 times as costly as our own revolution but the price of freedom is higher today—both to gain and to retain. We were right beyond measure in meeting that challenge—and experience is a bitter teacher, but every citizen should remember the lesson to insure that next time we be more ready and better armed when the Communists charge again. I wonder how well we have done so?

Never must we forget that the Communists consider themselves perpetually at war with the non-Communist world. In their ugly, tortured logic, peace is a condition that can exist only on their terms. They cry "peaceful coexistence" when they actually mean "coaxful nonresistance." They define peace itself as a condition that can only exist in a classless or Communist world.

Consider for a moment the growing Communist drive in Latin America and the provocative Soviet remarks on the Monroe Doctrine. Our President told the Communists as well as our friends that the policy announced by his courageous predecessor over 135 years ago was a rock that the surging waves of communism could not wash away. I wonder how many recall that when the Monroe Doctrine was promulgated in 1823, it was as much directed against Russia as a leader of the Holy Alliance and a growing threat to our Pacific coast as against the nations of Western Europe. And today, as again events have come full circle in the tide of history, we can consider the menacing situation in Cuba in light of these words of Rudyard Kipling:

"Fenced by your careful fathers, ringed by your leaden seas,
Long did ye wake in quiet and long lie down at ease;
Given to strong delusion, wholly believing a lie,
Ye saw that the land lay fenceless, and yet let the months go by.

But ye say, 'It will mar our comfort.' Ye say, 'It will minish our trade.'
Do ye wait for the spattered shrapnel ere ye learn how a gun is laid
For the low, red glare to southward when the raided coast-towns burn?
(Light ye shall have on that lesson, but little time to learn.)"

Yet, the powerful material forces arrayed in this struggle, while of vital importance, are still secondary, for this worldwide battle will be won or lost primarily on the windswept crags of the spirit—in the hearts and minds of men.

True, the competition is very real in the economic and military realms because both sides possess vast power, but the best defense of all that we hold dear is to keep freedom's fire burning brightly in those three immutable pillars of our Western civiliza-

tion—the home, the church, the school—and only an awakened people can do so.

In ever-strengthening and vitalizing these institutions, we must redouble our efforts to differentiate between our standard of living and our way of life.

The American way of life, based on a belief in the dignity of man, faith in God, free enterprise, and freedom and justice for all, was clearly spelled out by our founders. To enjoy these blessings, millions of people sought, and still seek, the protective arm and guiding light of the Statue of Liberty. Today, though less than 200 years old as a nation, we stand as the patriarch of all freedom-loving peoples everywhere. This is why we must lead; this is what we have to protect! Quality is more important than quantity. If democracy is only the triumph of mediocrity, we are doomed. We must not tarry in the mirage of material comforts when there are bolder and brighter horizons worthy of our struggle.

Our standard of living is something else. Our collective talents, energized by easy access to great resources, free enterprise and advantages stemming from our creed and our system, have given us material benefits in excess of any other people in this world. But we must be on guard to assure that these blessings are disciplined—held in their perspective—that they are made to contribute to the advancement of our way of life, not permitted to command and subvert it.

We must never, never forget that the real capstone of all strength lies in firm advancement of the spiritual values that have made America the leading nation on this earth—that infatuation with things material can destroy us—that the true strength of freemen and nations everywhere comes from faith in a Supreme Being—dedication to a just cause and courage to live, or if necessary to die, for it.

Thus, the heavy mantle of free world leadership, now resting precariously on our shoulders, will drape itself more securely and more gracefully about us if we not only guard it against the ominous pressures of today but guide our Nation to an enlightened and happier tomorrow. Your job is to get out and do your part. The need for courage on the battlefield was never greater than in the mortal combat in which we are now locked to the finish.

The great days of America must not lie shrouded in past glories. We have but glimpsed the dawn of national achievement. Unlimited is our future if we have the courage to seek it. A glimpse of the coming years burns bright with promise—for those who dare. Our heritage bespeaks our greater destiny, and freemen everywhere pray that we will find the wisdom and the strength to gain it for all mankind.

The kind of national spirit, dedication, and courage that we must have today was clearly demonstrated to the Connecticut State Legislature back in the 18th century. Those were still times of deep-rooted superstitions and beliefs about all of the forces of Nature. When the sun darkened from a total eclipse of the moon, the good citizens of Hartford thought the Day of Judgment was at hand. The legislature was in session that day and the members, some of them panic stricken, began to rush about excitedly. The speaker of the house stilled the commotion and rapped for order. Then the old man raised his voice above the babble and said: "This darkness does not matter unless it means the end of the world. And if the world is indeed ending, I choose to meet my Maker while doing my duty. Therefore, I ask that candles may be brought, so that this house can continue its business."

Take your candle and light it—now.

And Godspeed and good luck to all of you.

Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, water pollution is rapidly reaching the proportions of a major problem in this country. In what may well be a precedent-setting court suit, the Federal Government has moved toward suing the city of St. Joseph, Mo., in order to compel it to stop polluting the Missouri River. A Conference on Water Pollution, arranged on the recommendation of the President, will meet in Washington this December to study the pollution question as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following account of the program and progress of the Conference to date.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. BURNEY CALLS NATIONAL CONFERENCE ON WATER POLLUTION

More than 1,000 leaders representing all walks of life throughout the United States will meet in Washington, D.C., next December to attack one of the great still-unsolved health and economic problems facing the American people.

The first federally sponsored Conference on Water Pollution ever held will be called to order on Monday, December 12, by Surg. Gen. Leroy E. Burney before an audience representing some 300 national groups and organizations. The 3-day meeting will be held at the Sheraton-Park Hotel.

The National Conference is being called at the direction of President Eisenhower and of Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Secretary Flemming will make the opening address of the Conference on December 12.

Organizations to be invited to the Conference will include a broad sampling of national groups with a special stake in maintaining adequate supplies of clean water. Among these will be municipal, State, interstate, and Federal organizations and agencies; industrial, farm, and labor groups; civic clubs and associations; fish, game, and boating associations; and organizations in the fields of recreation, conservation, engineering, public health, and scientific research.

PRESIDENT ASKS FOR MEETING

The Conference arises from a message delivered to the Congress by President Eisenhower on February 23, 1960. In his message Mr. Eisenhower wrote—

"I am requesting the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to arrange for a National Conference on Water Pollution to be held next December. This Conference will help local taxpayers and business concerns to realize the obligation they have to help prevent pollution. * * * In short (it) will provide a forum in which all concerned can confront and better appreciate their mutual responsibility for solving this pressing problem."

Aside from the President's message, professional and technical leaders in public health and water management have discussed for some time the need for setting up a national conference to study water pollution. Such a conference, these experts feel will do much to build a national program against water pollution and to mobilize public opinion behind such a program.

When delegates meet at the Conference in December it will be against a background of increasing competition of industries and municipalities for adequate supplies of clean water.

Despite the enormous advances in technical knowledge about pollution control and correction, many sanitary engineers point out, the Nation's water problems are in many respects more serious from economic and health standpoints than a generation ago. During the 1960's, they feel, the situation may become even worse in light of the Nation's population explosion and its expanding economy.

The first step in preparing for the Conference was taken a month ago with the calling together of a steering committee representing government, conservation, industry, civic, and other groups. The committee held its initial meeting in Washington in June and plans a second meeting, also in Washington, in August.

CONTROLLING WATER POLLUTION: A JOB FOR NATIONAL TEAMWORK

For nearly 50 years efforts to control water pollution in the United States have been carried on through a four-way partnership between industry, municipalities, the States, and the Federal Government. All four of these—together with the general public—will be represented next December when the National Conference on Water Pollution opens in Washington, D.C.

The need for establishing and protecting clean waters in the United States became evident in the 1880's and 1890's. Increasing urban populations and the dumping of raw sewage in rivers and streams brought about a succession of waterborne epidemics of typhoid fever during these years—in Pittsburgh and Chicago, and States as widely separated as Massachusetts and Minnesota.

As the result of the work of Pasteur, Lister, and other 19th century scientists, there was no doubt that many epidemics resulted from contaminated drinking water. Lawrence, Mass., and Louisville, Ky., were the two earliest of a number of cities which experimented with new methods of filtering and chemically treating their water. A number of States also became active in water-treatment work during this period.

At the turn of the century, the U.S. Public Health Service had the assignment—among many other assignments—of safeguarding the water supply of trains and ships, under the interstate quarantine laws. The question was raised throughout the country as to how the Service might be of additional help in stemming the steadily worsening condition of widespread water pollution, and a variety of bills were introduced in the Congress with this object from 1897 to 1909.

The act which was passed in 1912 authorized the Public Health Service to carry on investigations of pollutions of major rivers and lakes with particular attention to sewage and its effect on health. Six sanitary engineers were employed and placed on duty at the Ohio River Investigation Station at Cincinnati. The work done by that laboratory is still applied in sanitary engineering today and is the basis of much of today's knowledge of stream pollution and natural purification.

The Water Pollution Control Act, under which the Federal Government now conducts its water pollution control activities, was passed in 1948 and strengthened and amended in 1956. Under this act the Federal Government is required "to support and aid technical research relating to the prevention and control of water pollution and to provide

Federal technical services and financial aid to State and interstate agencies and to municipalities in connection with the prevention and control of water pollution."

Water problems change

During these years of legislative history the problems of water pollution have been changing. While health agencies are still concerned with the potential threat of typhoid fever, intestinal ailments, and other diseases known to be waterborne, new types of wastes and contaminants have made their appearance, particularly since World War II, and are now calling for new research.

Almost all of the new wastes and contaminants have resulted from the Nation's increase in population, its vast industrial expansion, and the new chemical technologies now used in industry and agriculture. Some of these newer contaminants are difficult to avoid and many are hard to remove. Most are in tiny amounts today but their cumulative effects on health are unknown.

The need for large supplies of clean and healthful water is increasing. Cities and suburban areas need more water; industries are dependent on water for their continued existence and expansion; and our large population needs clean and healthful water for recreation, swimming, boating, and fishing.

In seeking to build and protect a celan water resource for the United States, teamwork has been shown to be necessary among all users of water and all levels of government.

Roles described

In a report issued last year by the U.S. Public Health Service, the various roles of States, local governments, industries, and the Federal Government were described as follows:

"The State has primary responsibility for controlling pollution of intrastate waters. It sets standards and enforces its regulations, conducts surveys, collects and evaluates data, and provides technical assistance to local governments and industries. Some States conduct research and a few provide financial assistance to cities and industries.

"Local governments construct and operate sewage treatment plants, make surveys, provide assistance to local industries, and enforce local ordinances.

"Industries construct and operate treatment facilities when their wastes are not discharged to municipal sewers. They change plant operations or adopt new processes to reduce or eliminate harmful contaminants. Many industries conduct research to solve their own problems.

"The Federal Government, through the Public Health Service, supplements, and supports the work of the other team members by furnishing assistance of various kinds, such as consultation, technical services, research, and financial aid. It carries out the limited enforcement provisions of the Federal law with respect to interstate waters."

BUTRICO NAMED SECRETARY

Frank A. Butrico, career sanitary engineer in the U.S. Public Health Service, will head the staff of the forthcoming National Conference on Water Pollution in the post of Executive Secretary. His appointment was announced in May by Dr. Leroy E. Burney, Surgeon General of the Service.

Mr. Butrico is Chief of the Office of Engineering Resources in the Division of Engineering Services, and has served in both Washington and the field in all aspects of environmental health problems. He has also contributed widely to professional journals in the fields of sanitary and related engineering.

Death of McCook (Nebr.) Publisher Harry Strunk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN L. HRUSKA

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, last Friday Nebraska lost a true friend of conservation.

No single citizen was more dedicated to, more closely associated with the development and conservation of our water resources than Harry D. Strunk, of McCook. Last week, after an extended illness, he passed away.

A niche in Nebraska's history has been cut by this man. And for a good reason. Harry Strunk was a doer. Behind him stands a record of noteworthy achievements that brought great benefit to the southwestern quarter of our State. He will be warmly remembered by those conscious of, and concerned with, the promotion of reclamation.

It is deeply gratifying that Harry Strunk could have participated in the recent ground breaking ceremonies for a dam and reservoir on the Red Willow Creek, a tributary of the Republican River which flows through his home country. This project will make opportunities possible for reclamation, irrigation, and recreation in a three-State area. There could be no more fitting climax to his distinguished career.

Although the Red Willow Dam project is a genuine tribute to the long-range planning and persistent effort of the Republican Valley Conservation Association over which Harry Strunk presided since its organization in 1940, it is by no means the only recognition paid him during his lifetime. In 1952 he saw the reservoir behind Medicine Creek Dam near Cambridge, Nebr., named after him. He thus became one of very few living persons to have such an honor bestowed. Also in that same year he was the recipient of an award by the Department of Interior for his lifetime of work for conservation. His picture hangs in the Bureau of Reclamation Hall of Fame.

By profession Harry Strunk was a newspaperman. Founder and publisher of the McCook Gazette, he was well known and highly regarded as a fearless and conscientious journalist. In his later years, however, his occupation became primarily that of a conservationist. In 1953, he turned over the management of his paper to his son, Allen, while he devoted his total energies and time to that vital cause.

A colorful and imaginative personality, Harry Strunk left his community a standard for public service that will be hard to surpass. His wise counsel and leadership will be sorely missed. As a personal note, I want to add that I have lost a loyal and close friend. Mrs. Hruska and I express our deep sympathy to Mrs. Strunk, her fine children and family.

Among the tributes paid to Harry Strunk was the following by Mr. Harold Sutton, a neighbor and long time friend:

We lost probably the greatest leader and one who has done the most to develop our valley.

The work he accomplished will live many decades through enjoyment and through the addition to our economy.

He worked hard for the development of our recreational and economical possibilities along the valley.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article highlighting Harry Strunk's life from the August 6, 1960, issue of the Lincoln Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

McCOOK PUBLISHER HARRY STRUNK DIES

McCOOK.—Harry D. Strunk, 68-year-old publisher of the McCook Gazette, died Friday after an extended illness.

He was president of the Republican Valley Conservation Association since it was organized in 1940 and was active in the southwest Nebraska reclamation program.

Strunk founded the Gazette as a semiweekly in 1911 and turned to daily publication in 1926.

He was a native of Pawnee City, Nebr.

Strunk, who left school after the 8th grade, was one of two living persons to have a lake named after him. That was Lake Harry Strunk near Cambridge. The other person is former President Herbert Hoover.

Strunk was the only living person to have his picture framed in the Bureau of Reclamation Hall of Fame while living.

Funeral services are tentatively set for Monday.

Strunk, suffering from a kidney and liver ailment, had been in the hospital several times in the past 6 months.

He was a charter member of the McCook Elks Lodge.

In 1952 Strunk received the Interior Department award for his work in the field of conservation and that same year former President Harry Truman signed bills naming the reservoir behind Medicine Creek Dam as "Harry Strunk Lake."

Strunk said at the time that "to me this honor comes not as a result of my efforts but of the efforts of one of the finest organizations ever formed—the Republican Valley Conservation Association."

He was the first man in the Western States to receive the Interior Department award which cited him for a lifetime of work in behalf of the conservation and utilization of the natural resources of the Republican River Basin and the entire Missouri River basins."

In 1953 he turned over active management of the Gazette to his son, Allen.

Born on December 2, 1892, at Pawnee City, he was educated there and as a youth was apprenticed to one of the local papers.

From 1908 to 1910, he was employed by newspapers at Fairbury, Fremont, and Beatrice. He had acted as publisher of newspapers at Pawnee City, Holton, Kans., and Franklin.

In 1910 he became a printer on the McCook Tribune and in 1911, established the Red Willow County Gazette, a weekly. In 1924 he transformed it into a daily and in the following years absorbed several weeklies.

Mr. Strunk was a member of the Nebraska Press Association, the McCook Chamber of

Commerce, the Inland Daily Press, the Elks and the Congregational Church. He was also active in Boy Scout work.

In 1942, Mr. Strunk was given the annual community service award of the McCook Rotary Club because of his leadership in the southwestern Nebraska movement for flood control, irrigation, and conservation.

Why We Need a Democratic President in 1960—Prize-Winning Oration by Craig Anderson, Hopkins, Minn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, in Minnesota as in all States young men and women are attracted to the Democratic Party because it is the party for today and the future and not the party of yesterday. Three young Minnesotans who participated in the Minnesota Young Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party oratorical contest on June 19, 1960, in Minneapolis, demonstrated the fine talent and straight thinking on major national issues that these young people bring to our party.

I ask unanimous consent that the prize-winning oration by Craig Anderson, Hopkins, Minn., first place be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the oration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY WE NEED A DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENT IN 1960

(By Craig Anderson, Hopkins, Minn., first place Minnesota State winner)

"The price of liberty is eternal vigilance." These words of Thomas Jefferson, the founder of the Democratic Party, have a special significance. For again, the enemies of human dignity, tyranny abroad and selfishness at home, compel the Democratic Party to launch a crusade to strengthen democracy: to strengthen democracy, to follow the courageous example of Thomas Jefferson, who would not compromise human rights; to strengthen democracy, to reaffirm Andrew Jackson's belief in the importance of the common man; to strengthen democracy, to rededicate our Nation to the philosophy of Woodrow Wilson that freedom must be guarded everywhere; to strengthen democracy, to practice the ideals of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who had faith in time of crises to free America from want of substance and want of security.

In the next 4 years, 180 million Americans will look to their President to lead the United States through a most critical juncture in history, a juncture in history where America cannot be content merely to survive, but an hour in history where America can enable all her citizens to realize fully the opportunities that lie ahead. The next President will have to guide our Nation to meet a twofold challenge—a challenge abroad and a challenge at home, the challenge of international communism, and the challenge of social needs that are unfulfilled. How can these challenges be fulfilled? Will they be met by the worn techniques from the past? Will a return to Warren G. Harding's normalcy suffice for a spirit of dedication? Can a keep-cool-with Coolidge philosophy be substituted for enthusiasm and industry?

Should a two-chickens-in-every-pot policy be exchanged for economic justice? Must we be contented with a peace that rests precariously on the brink of war? Must we be satisfied with a prosperity that is not enjoyed by all?

When I considered these questions, I decided that I want a Democratic President in 1960. Because I want a President who can seize the initiative in foreign policy, a man who does not only anticipate crises, but a man who is willing to try new and inspiring methods in the tradition of Wilson and Roosevelt and Truman, to be willing to promote a challenging idea. Remember Woodrow Wilson; he was willing to sacrifice his life in order that some day nations might settle their differences at a conference table rather than on the battlefield. Remember Franklin Delano Roosevelt; he regained the confidence of our Latin American neighbors with a new appeal for inter-American cooperation, the good neighbor policy. Remember Harry S. Truman; he was willing to help Europe to help herself through a new expression of our dedication to freedom and justice, the Marshall plan. Again, in order to win this struggle for men's minds, we need to stress the positive. We need a liberal attitude in foreign policy. Only when America can prove in terms of better food, better health, and better shelter, will the world recognize the inherent worth of democracy. Yet, during the past 8 years our aid has not gone to the countries with greatest need, but to six countries forming a "Maginot line" around the Soviet Union. And only one-third of our aid has been to meet the daily needs of nourishment, medical care, and housing.

Yet, the present administration feels that one-fourth of 1 percent of our national income is enough to capture the creative imagination of the world. This is why I firmly believe that America must be lead by a Democratic President who can show true understanding and compassion for our friends abroad.

At the same time, the United States, long the arsenal and citadel of democracy, must remain militarily strong. Except today I cannot say with confidence that we are not vulnerable to the forces of tyranny. I cannot be sure that we are the strongest nation when responsible men admit that there is a missile gap. In order to remain strong, we must make full advantage of our talented men, and our national resources. To stay strong, our defense administrators must not be burdened with poor organization and inadequate funds. But still the GOP is unwilling to modernize the Defense Department. And with a don't-rock-the-boat attitude they are willing to pinch pennies and gamble with our very existence as a nation. This is why there is a need for a change, a change from Republican conservatism, to Democratic vision, to hope and foresight with a Democratic President—the same hope and foresight that led us through the uncertain thirties, the hope and foresight that dispelled the shadow of fascism in the tumultuous forties, the same hope and foresight that can secure a more equitable and a more certain life for us in the coming decade. But which party has had a spirit of vision, which party has worked to improve equality of opportunity, which party has had a record of devotion to public welfare? The same party which promoted a graduated income tax, social security, and workers' compensation. Yes, the Democratic Party has shown foresight. The Democratic Party, the party willing to work toward modifying the social shortcomings of society.

Now let us examine a recession in the general tide of progress, the past 8 years of a Republican administration. In 1956, the Bureau of the Census found that 13 million urban housing units were substandard. Yet, the current administration opposed more funds for adequate shelter. The Rockefeller Foundation reported that urban renewal must increase at a rate seven times the current rate. Nevertheless, the urban renewal bill was vetoed. Today, 15 million Americans over 65 have no assurance that they can afford adequate medical care. Yet, the GOP dismissed the Forand bill. Almost defying history, the farmer has improved his efficiency, but he has experienced a drop in his income at the same time. How can the farmer be given his fair share of the national income? Must he fall victim to the law of supply and demand, and to poor conservation? Might we ask: Is the Republican freedom to suffer truly an ideal? In 1952, the GOP promised 100 percent of parity, but after the election apparently Mr. Benson had a lapse of memory when he drastically reduced commodity price supports. Will such a program increase the farmer's freedom? Or will a program that has forced hundreds of thousands off the farm bring the liquidation of the family farm? I believe the answer is obvious, for a farm program—unlike the Benson program—should take into account the human element. The farmer does not want to be given a handout, but he wants a chance to earn his own living. Just as labor and industry control production to protect their workers and stockholders, the farmer must be protected from the disaster of a flooded market. Only if the next administration takes the advice of the Democratic leadership and puts excess croplands into conservation programs and turns our surplus into a blessing to the poor nations of the world; will the diligence of the American farmer be rewarded.

Another necessary area of improvement is education. Our Nation must face up to the warning of sputnik. How long can we adequately educate all our youth when New York spends a dollar for every quarter that Mississippi spends on education. Never before has there been a greater need for an increase in our support of education. The resources of the local community must be supplemented by the resources of the U.S. Government if we are to have the educated citizenry for the nuclear age. However, giving lipservice to the problems of a nation is not enough. It is not enough for the GOP heir-apparent to say: "Inadequate classrooms, underpaid teachers, and flabby standards, are weaknesses we must constantly strive to eliminate" and in the same week to kill the school construction bill. An approach that is timid, indecisive, or cheap will not satisfy the hopes of a great people. In all areas of social welfare, action, not mere words, are needed, action to move our still young country forward, action that dispels the fear of advancement, action that improves our Nation as a whole by raising the opportunities for each individual, action that enlivens our democratic traditions, the democratic traditions that have enabled the Democratic Party to write new epochs in the story of humanity. This is why I want a Democratic President to lead our Nation over the hurdles of tyranny abroad and selfishness at home to the goal of a better America for all.

Beaumont Enterprise Says No Reason for Putting Off Until Next Year Padre Island National Park Bill That Could Pass This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although there is a great deal of vitally important legislation awaiting congressional action, I want again to urge action at this session on my proposal to establish a national seashore recreation area on Padre Island.

There are those who have taken the position that despite the fact that the bill is a sound, reasonable, and needed measure to preserve America's last, great open beach for public use, the proposed action should be put off until early next year.

Hundreds of thousands of Texans and many lovers of outdoors across the Nation believe that in this case we should not put off until next year what we can achieve this year. To begin with, it would be more costly to wait, because the same property will be more expensive with each passing year.

What is more, if we do not act this year, we shall run the very real risk of losing a very substantial part of the area to private development as part of America's fenced-off, vanishing shoreline.

Within the past few weeks, private property owners, under a new ruling they have gotten from the Supreme Court of Texas, have gone onto the beach and have driven railroad ties into the sands, to keep people from driving their cars up and down the beach—the first time since Europeans first gazed upon the shores of that part of the Western Hemisphere that those beaches have been fenced off and have been removed from use by the general public.

Mr. President, at the present time this land can be acquired for moderate amounts of money.

The Secretary of the Interior has recommended that the bill be passed and that the Federal Government spend $8 million on this badly needed recreational area, which will be 88 miles long—the last long section of available seashore on either of our costs. The administration, even though it is very money conscious, and slow as it has been to develop the resources and the recreational facilities of America, has in this instance said that this situation is so critical that it will spend $8 million for this purpose, over a period of 5 years, if the Congress will take action on it this year. However negligent the administration has been and however slow and misguided its "no new starts" policy has been, we cannot complain about its policy with respect to this badly needed recreational area. So it is up to the Congress to pass the measure at this session, and thus give the American people the opportunity to have this ocean beach area—suitable for both fishing and other recreational purposes—available the year around, for the benefit of all the people of the United States.

Recently the Beaumont Enterprise, one of Texas' most straightforward and responsible daily newspapers, editorialized on this subject. It pointed out there are some obstacles to passing the measure in this session at this time, but the paper calls for passage at the present time, because, with the passage of time, land that is available now may not be available later, and the cost will increase by millions and millions of dollars.

I am hopeful the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will bring this bill up. Full hearings were held at Corpus Christi, in December of 1959. My senior colleague from Texas has written me that he was for this measure. With that combined support, this bill should become law.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial from the Wednesday, July 27, 1960, Beaumont Enterprise, entitled "Applause for Mr. YARBOROUGH," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPLAUSE FOR MR. YARBOROUGH

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH's staff says, reports the Dallas Morning News, the Senator will be pushing for passage of the Padre Island National Park bill when the Senate reconvenes on August 8.

Despite the fact that other so-called must measures are first in line, YARBOROUGH feels the bill has a good chance, the News report adds.

This is encouraging in that not only is Mr. YARBOROUGH continuing the fight for the Padre Island legislation—on which he has done a most admirable job—but also that the junior Senator continues to have confidence that Congress may pass the bill this year. Unfortunately, few Texans share Mr. YARBOROUGH's confidence at this time. However, the Senator is in a better position than most of us to judge the chances of the measure.

It is to be hoped Senator YARBOROUGH's hard work will pay off. But if it doesn't, it certainly won't be his fault. Texans can and should commend the Senator for what he has already done.

Boris Pasternak's Last Message to the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in these days of history-changing international events, we are experiencing a rapid series of crises, almost in day-to-day succession. The temperature of the cold war goes up and down upon a thermometer of time. The East-West struggle goes on—consisting of charges and countercharges, proposals, and disagreements, threats, counterthreats.

The Western nations, I believe, despite the efforts of the Kremlin to divide us, the problem of strengthening our coalition, and the job of ironing out any differences between our countries, have done an admirable job of holding back the tide of communism and of serving the interests of peace.

In the face of diverse and sometimes fast-changing tactics of the Kremlin, however, we need to continue relentlessly to be prepared to stave off outspreading problems of the conspiracy, as well as to establish—as we can—more effective ways, not only of stopping the outspread of communism, but also of turning the tide in the other direction.

In this effort, we must ask ourselves: Are we really, day by day, understanding any better the scope of, and ways to deal with, the challenge?

Our Government, I am satisfied, is attempting to carry forward a wide variety of programs—within the limitations of manpower and money available—to do what it can, on a government-to-government basis.

But the question, I believe, also should be asked: Are we, the people—individually and together—going forward rapidly enough in our understanding of the Communist mind and purpose, and also of the heart and will of the Communist-dominated people?

Personally, I am convinced that even among the enslaved peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, there is the universal will for peace, for a better life.

As it is possible, I believe that a greater effort must be made to extend our ingenuity and creativity toward finding ways in which we, the people, universally dedicated to peace, can find common grounds of understanding with those under the domination of communism.

Yesterday, This Week magazine published a thought-provoking interview by Jhan Robbons with Boris Pasternak, the late Russian poet, novelist, and Nobel Prize winner. In itself, the article is illuminating. More than that, however, it reaffirms what many of us have long believed—that is: The human will for peace, brotherhood and a better life, is universal—on both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains; the spirit of man will not be satisfied with bread alone; the propaganda of atheistic, materialistic Communists is not supplanting the desire and yearning for peace in the hearts of the people whom they dominate.

To the contrary, the dictatorial, social, and economic philosophy of communism continues to frustrate and defeat the inherent God-given will and aspirations of people of all lands subject to its totalitarian reins. Because it fails to allow the soul of man opportunity to rise to its greatest heights, I am convinced that communism ultimately must fall—either from without or from within.

As published in This Week, the interview records that even under communism—designed to enslave body, mind and soul of man—the universal will for self-expression still strives to lift its voice.

I quote from the interview with Boris Pasternak: The question is, "Can a man control his future?"

Yes. Despite the system he lives under, I believe that men everywhere have more power over the future than ever before. The important thing is that we must choose to exercise it. It is conventional to say that the future belongs to our unborn children but the fact is it belongs to us. What we do today determines how the world shall go. Tomorrow is made up of the sum total of today's experiences. No one knows what the formula is, nor how slight a change may reshape the pattern to our heart's desire. Far from feeling hopeless or helpless, we must seize every opportunity, however small, to help the world around us toward peace, productivity and human brotherhood.

Appreciating the dramatic effect of Boris Pasternak's last message to the world, I believe, however, that the message of Boris Pasternak—symbolizing the courage of a human soul in the face of only God knows what pressures to still his voice—will live long in history.

I ask unanimous consent to have the interview printed at this point in the RECORD, along with excerpts from a recent address which I was privileged to make over Radio Liberty to people behind the Iron Curtain.

The purpose of the broadcast was to counter some of the propaganda which has been spread about U.S. activities, as well as again to reassure the Russian people that despite tirades of propaganda, we and our U.S. leaders are committed, not to war, not to imperialism—which is really the characteristic of communism—but to the establishment of a just and lasting peace in the world.

There being no objection, the article and the excerpts from the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From This Week magazine]

(By Jhan Robbins)

The recent death of Boris Pasternak released me from a pledge of secrecy he did not ask me to make, but which I made to myself. When I spent an afternoon with him last September I was, I believe, one of the last representatives of the non-Communist world to speak to him at length. When I came away I had the peculiar feeling that comes from spiritual and mental contact with one of those rare human beings who are born far ahead of their time. I was aware that in our talk he had made a stirring declaration to the world.

As a journalist I could not help but be tempted to file the story while I was still trembling with the impact. Just as strongly I knew that I could not. I had not come to him as a reporter. Our 4-hour talk was the kind that occurs between two people who meet, exchange views and feel at once that they can be friends. I did not want to write anything that would make life more difficult for this man who had already suffered so much.

Now Pasternak is dead. The man who refused the Nobel Prize for Literature on pain of exile can no longer be hurt by anyone. In America and in the countries of Western Europe, the news was received with shock and grief. To many the author of "Doctor Zhivago" was clearly a martyr in the worldwide struggle which is seeking to decide whether the rights of the individual shall be recognized ahead of the needs of the state. Details of his funeral were read by millions with a mixture of reverence and indignation. In his own country it is doubtful that very many people even knew of his passing. Most newspapers in the Soviet Union virtually ignored it.

Yet he was known and loved there, too. It is said that once when he merely mentioned that he was going to read some of his poetry on a certain Wednesday night in midwinter, nearly a thousand people tramped through bitter cold to hear him. They pushed so enthusiastically into the meeting hall that they broke a grandstand.

I, myself found him unforgettable. Although he must even then have been suffering from the cancer which killed him 8 months after I saw him, he had a sturdy, hard-looking body. He wore his silver hair in a rough thatch. As we talked I watched the dark, deep-set eyes blaze with conviction, cloud with pain and then suddenly sparkle with amusement. (I had just told him that my wife, who is also a writer, finds it relaxing to scrub floors. "Ah," he said, nodding, "I shall have to try that.")

As a Quaker, I went to see Boris Pasternak because members of the Religious Society of Friends were acutely aware of his anguish and my wife and I were asked to convey a private message of comfort and support.

Once in Moscow, however, when I mentioned Peredelkino, where Pasternak lived, our interpreter shook her pretty blond head and said firmly, "It is much too distant. Besides, there is nothing to see." My wife then asked to be taken on a tour of Moscow's colorful secondhand shops and I resorted to that international source of information, a taxi driver. "Peredelkino," I asked, "daleky (far)? Or blizky (near)?"

He grinned and answered, "blizky." I gave him a fistful of rubles and off we went. The trip, 25 minutes in length, took us to a sleepy suburb choked with white birch trees. Pasternak's two-story brown frame house was at the end of a long, narrow lane. On his door was a hand-lettered sign in Russian. I knocked.

Pasternak himself answered. His eyes swept over my American clothes. In perfect English he asked exasperatedly, "Didn't you read my sign?"

I replied that I understood only a smattering of Russian. He translated: "Journalists and others, please go away, I am busy."

I was overwhelmed with a sense of my own bad manners. I blurted out my message and began to stumble back down the steps. His face softened.

"Wait," he said. "Do you like poetry?"

Taken by surprise, I answered, "Some, yes. And some, no."

"Come in," he said. "Let's talk."

Three times, as the afternoon wore on, I thanked him for his hospitality and rose to go. Each time, he waved me back to my seat beside him at the large round dining table. Between us, we consumed three pots of strong tea sweetened with beet sugar. The house was quiet. In the kitchen two servants were washing and ironing. On the walls were etchings signed by Pasternak's artist father. Books in French, German, English and Russian were piled on the floor, on chairs and tables and crammed onto shelves.

Like a modern Socrates he posed universal questions that engross the minds and hearts of all men—and eagerly answered them himself. Here is what Boris Pasternak said to me. As it turned out it was probably his last spontaneous testament to mankind:

"IS RELIGION REALLY NECESSARY?

"Yes. I think that man will always strive to find a meaningful form of worship. I was born a Jew. My family was interested in music and art and paid little attention to religious practice. Because I felt an urgent need to find a channel of communication to the Creator, I was converted to Russian Orthodox Christianity. But try as I might, I could not achieve a complete spiritual experience. Thus I am still a seeker. Some people tell me that religion won't make any progress until the world has solved its practical problems. But I believe we shall find it is the other way around.

"IS PATRIOTISM OUTDATED?

"I say no. In this era most problems cry out for international solutions. Nevertheless, love of country is one of the highest and most stirring human emotions. I know that many Russians of my generation went into exile after the Revolution, some because they were hunted and others because they could not face the changes that were coming. To me, exile would be worse than death. Patriotism, of course, must not be blind. The mother corrects her child; the son sees the weaknesses of his father. But love does not turn aside from ugliness or error. Loyalty to the land where you were born and the people from whose loins you sprang is the beginning, not the end, of internationalism.

"ARE MOST WORKERS TODAY MERE ROBOTS?

"They need not be. The industrial revolution has made plenty for all a possibility in our time.

"I have never been a farmer and, except during World War I when I worked in a factory in the Urals, I have never been a laborer. Yet I know that agricultural products are the result of a partnership of man and nature, which is uncontrollable, unpredictable and often cruel. A man who fits nuts and bolds together on an assembly line is working in partnership with his fellow men. Surely this is not less noble or less satisfying. I believe passionately in the dignity of all necessary work. At the moment I am writing a play. It is the first I've attempted. I don't know whether I'll ever finish it. But I know that when I complete a line that sounds exactly right, I am better able to love those who love me and to understand those who don't.

"CAN A MAN CONTROL HIS FUTURE?

"Yes. Despite the system he lives under, I believe that men everywhere have more power over the future than ever before. The important thing is that we must choose to exercise it. It is conventional to say that the future belongs to our unborn children but the fact is it belongs to us. What we do today determines how the world shall go. Tomorrow is made up of the sum total of today's experiences. No one knows what the formula is, nor how slight a change may reshape the pattern to our heart's desire. Far from feeling hopeless or helpless, we must seize every opportunity, however small, to help the world around us toward peace, productivity and human brotherhood."

Pasternak's inspiring conversation was still racing when darkness fell. I knew that I had to leave. I told him that I hoped one day to entertain him in my home.

"Perhaps," he said. And he pressed my hand.

The taxi was waiting on the main road. As it whirled through the dusk toward the lights of Moscow, I scribbled furiously. Pasternak certainly did not pretend to be either a lawgiver or a moralist. He was a brilliant, perceptive man who was perhaps more keenly aware of the human condition than most of us can be.

Boris Pasternak will be remembered for his poetry, for his Shakespearean translations, for the controversial novel which cost him the world's most coveted literary prize. I shall always remember him as a man who believed that love, faith, pride, and vigor are the real answers for tomorrow.

TRUTH BROADCASTS ABOUT U.S. RELATIONS WITH CUBA AND LATIN AMERICA TO PEOPLE BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN

(Excerpts from address by Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY of Wisconsin)

If nuclear-missile war is to be avoided, then the people of the world must rise up, en masse, to provide the governing light for the handling of affairs that affect the interests—yes, even the survival—of mankind.

We do not want war; we do not believe that you—the people of the Soviet Union—want war.

Instead, we believe that you—like ourselves—wish for freedom

To our deep sorrow, however, the threats and counterthreats of war; of strife; of international tensions; of fear from destruction by nuclear-missile attack will continue to threaten peace and survival of mankind.

Why?

The Communists say: It is the fault of the Americans.

The Americans say: It is the fault of the Communists.

Which is true? For the answer, let's look at the post-World War II record of history.

During World War II, the United States—fighting side by side with the Russian people—had a major role in victory against dictators. Yet, we did not take for ourselves 1 foot of territory.

Instead, let me review historically the treatment of nations and peoples once under the wing of the United States.

Philippine Islands: Granted independence in 1946.

Puerto Rico: Became a self-governing commonwealth with its own constitution in 1950.

Alaska: Previously a territory, joined the United States as a State by free election in 1959.

Hawaii: Formerly a territory. By free elections they voted to become the 50th State of the United States in 1959.

Now, let's look at the Communist record. Following World War II, Communists—by treaty breaking—obtained and maintained iron-fisted control over such countries as Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania.

Yes; and you all remember Hungary.

Moreover, you, the people of a great nanation, can best remember how, and with what bloodshed, the Communists gained control of your country.

UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

Now, looking to the present and future, apparently you are being "hit" with barrages of false propaganda about U.S. relations with our neighbors, in Latin America, particularly in Cuba.

Briefly, let me acquaint you with the truth.

Historically, we have enjoyed excellent relations with the people of Cuba. Our citizens visited friends and vacationed with our island neighbors; American industries made investments that helped improve the economy and create jobs for more workers. Our Government established special programs and policies—such as the sugar agreement—to help Cuba financially—even though it meant economic loss for the United States.

On the two-way street, a great many Cubans came to us: To become citizens; for educational opportunities; for jobs; to enrich us with the Cuban culture, particularly the unique music that is important in their heritage.

Prior to the present regime, Cuba was governed by a dictator. Although we do not approve of dictatorship, the United States—as a policy—does not interfere with the internal affairs of other countries.

Under the leadership of Castro, the dictator was overthrown. With the revolution were born new hopes—particularly in Cuba, the United States and the Western Hemisphere—that the fine people of the island could be free, independent, and self-governing.

Unfortunately, and sadly indeed, Castro is now betraying the great trust placed upon him by the Cuban people. How? In many ways: By unreasonable, unjustified, and erratic lying and distortion of facts, he is attempting to disrupt—if not destroy—good relations with the United States. Although he promised distribution of land under a so-called reform program to the Cuban people, he is failing to fulfill that promise.

Other dictator practices include: Restriction of free press, radio, and television; refusal to hold free elections; trial by firing squad instead of a court system; rubbing out in dictatorial fashion any opposition to his regime.

Regrettably, Soviet Premier Khrushchev approved Castro's dictator methods and is attempting to stick his nose in United States-Cuban relations. We, in accordance with traditional policies, have warned Mr. K. to stay out of the Western Hemisphere.

The real fact is that dictatorship—whether under the guise of communism, nazism, fascism, or similar-type isms—is really dead—killed by long centuries of failure—and should be buried.

Despite the effort to destroy freedom in Cuba, I am confident the betrayal—even with Khrushchev's help—will not succeed.

In the face of erratic tirades by Castro, the United States has demonstrated toleration and forebearance—not the killer-type policies demonstrated by the Kremlin in Hungary. The good people of Cuba—I am confident—will ultimately take matters into their own hands and redirect their fine country onto the right road of progress and freedom.

IMPROVING UNITED STATES-LATIN AMERICAN RELATIONS

To further illustrate the spirit of friendship and cooperation demonstrated by the United States, President Eisenhower recently proposed a new, broad plan of mutual cooperation with Latin America.

What is its purpose?

I quote from the statement by President Eisenhower upon announcing the program:

"In the Americas, as elsewhere, change is the law of life, and the interests of the people will be better served if that change is effected constructively and peacefully, not violently. Clearly, the aspirations and needs of the peoples of the Americas for free institutions and a better way of life must be met. Our desire is to help the American nations to meet their own responsibilities—to help them develop their institutional and human resources, to strengthen the framework of freedom, to protect individual dignity and to gain a better life for those who are underprivileged, underemployed, and undereducated."

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, I want to again assure you that the people of the United States—yes; and of the free world—want above all things, peace. The will of the world, I believe, is for peace. We, the free world, shall expect of you, the great dynamic people of the Soviet Union, help, in spirit and, as you can, in action, to create the conditions and climate of peace for the future.

America's National Goal: Freedom for All Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 8, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, Msgr. Francis J. Lally, editor of the Pilot, the weekly newspaper of the Catholic Archdiocese of Boston on June 4, 1960, delivered a baccalaureate sermon at Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis. In his sermon, Monsignor Lally, who is a member of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, pointed out that the American dream of freedom is not only our dream but the dream of all men—a part of the patrimony of all mankind.

Monsignor Lally said:

Our fathers created an island of liberty in a sea of tyrannies at a time when such islands were very rare indeed. * * * Our task now is to relate that island to the rest of the world and to spread the liberty so nobly won, and we may add so nobly used, among all other men.

I ask unanimous consent that Monsignor Lally's address as printed in the July 15, 1960, issue of the Catholic Bulletin of St. Paul, Minn., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES OF WORLD PROPOSED AS NATIONAL GOAL

At the present moment we are engaged in a debate that could be immensely consequential for the future of America. Thoughtful men of many backgrounds have begun to talk in terms of a reassessment of our national purpose. Already several observers have expressed their views publicly in order to suggest along what lines they consider it appropriate for our thoughts to run.

These men are speaking in the language of liberty, human rights, the American dream, democratic living and many other familiar terms and concepts. It might be salutary, in the reflective mood of today's exercises, to ask ourselves a bit about this new debate and its present implications for Americans.

Certainly there is some question about our ability to project ourselves as a nation in a manner calculated to catch the inspiration of other peoples.

Although men in many lands once looked here to see the torch that might light other paths to freedom, it is no longer true that America is the great vision that inspires the beginnings of new peoples and reforms the institutions of older ones.

What the Founding Fathers did so well, now, nearly 200 years later, needs to be done again, if we can expect to rally the spirits of our own citizens and give an example to the citizens of other lands. But is it enough for us merely to translate into contemporary language, so often less eloquent, the expressions of an earlier time?

Is it true that men have forgotten what we believed to be the unforgettable words of the Declaration of Independence, the preamble of the Constitution and its Bill of Rights? If our only problem is to sell the old ideas, to repackage them, as it were, this crisis comes at a providential time indeed, for American know-how has never been more slick in the area of salesmanship.

On the other hand, however, if the product itself needs some attention—and this is the clear implication of the great debate—then we must postpone our appointment with the admen, until we have had our day with the thinkers.

What has given special urgency to our present problem is the naked and ugly fact that there is another product on the market in competition to ours, and there is more than a little evidence to support the view that this product has been sold even where we thought we had a corner on the market.

Just as competition has its effects in business, so too does it affect politics; what we

could allow to happen in the days of what seemed to be our monopoly, we cannot permit now as an advantage to our competitors. When our fathers at the moment of their independence spoke of a decent respect for the opinions of mankind they were talking about something which was a desideratum, but very far from being a necessity for them.

It is so very different with us. The "opinions of mankind" is precisely the matter that is now at stake. In a divided world, men are asked to make a choice.

On the one side, there are those who claim, with a powerful logic and certain undisputed victories already won, that the future belongs to them; on the other side, there is the free world still using the old words and struggling to put new fire into them.

Unless we can articulate a new philosophy of freedom with immediate relevance, we will fail to catch men's minds and we will never inflame their imaginations.

What is there then to say about our national purpose? The opening words of our Constitution are still familiar to us: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty for ourselves and our posterity do ordain and establish this Constitution of the United States of America."

These phrases surely still ring with greatness and sing with hope, they still represent an ideal and a vision, a dream if you wish, toward which we move and for which we labor. But why do men not turn toward them from every nation, as they once did; has our revolution, in time past the model for destroying tyranny, lost its power to move men to action?

Some people will suggest that our American philosophy of men and society has need only of a new voice to interpret it in fresh tones. The bold torch can still blaze brightly, but there are no hands strong enough to raise it high for men to see again, no men of the character of our fathers who can command the assent of other men's souls.

Even after the Founding Fathers, we are told, mankind listened to the voice of our country but only at those moments when men of special stature spoke—as Abraham Lincoln or Theodore Roosevelt or Woodrow Wilson. It is suggested that what we need is the kind of personality around which men once again may rally, and in an age of strong men, one more man of strength.

This is certainly a quick and perhaps superficial response; for the greatness of our founders and of those who have followed has not been one of personal strength, but of the power of ideas—a vision that could electrify a whole people and before which the world was forced to pause in admiration.

Is it just possible in our present juncture that we have lived too long without reinvesting the legacy of our fathers? What they did with singular greatness is now nearly two centuries passed; there is even a sense in which it is many worlds away from the present—and here perhaps is the clue we are seeking.

Our contemporaries are asking for a declaration of a new national purpose, but the very phrase itself is obsolete. We simply cannot think in these terms today. What once was so uniquely our national purpose is now everyone else's national purpose and it has been for a long time.

What we need for this moment is a declaration of purpose which transcends national boundaries, which disallows distinctions between peoples, which concerns the total human family. This is the new revolution—that mankind is one; this is the new purpose—to make possible a United States of the World.

Small wonder men are no longer electrified or fascinated, small wonder that they are not aware of an ideal or a vision when it is expressed always in national terms. What our fathers—boldly and bravely, clearly and unequivocally—declared once for America, we must now in the same manner declare for the entire world.

Look back for a moment at the text of our founding—then ask ourselves if we dare to rewrite it in terms of a new order for man, not just for one nation, but for all mankind. We, the people of the United States of the World, in order to form a more perfect planet, establish justice, insure global tranquility, provide for our common defense, promote the universal welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty for all men now and in posterity, do ordain and establish a new constitution of the United States of the World.

Does this say too much, too soon? Isn't it just possible that the old vision is renewed by being enlarged, that it becomes a vision for all men just as soon as all men are given a place in it?

America has proven that a land of liberty can be a reality; now that reality must be realized everywhere good men want freedom and are willing to work for it.

The declaration of our national purpose is now in a real sense the declaration that there is no national purpose, distinct at least from the destinies of other nations and other peoples. The American dream, in all of its excitement and promise, is everyone's dream and the American reality, in all its freedom and prosperity is everyone's reality.

Now for nearly a generation Americans have spread their riches across the world—first defending the defenseless, then assisting the dispossessed, and finally aiding the less-favored peoples. We have already exported the American dream and the American reality, but we have failed to remove the labels.

It is not our dream, or our freedom. These dreams and these realities are now a part of the patrimony of all mankind. The basic pattern, the immediate design, to be sure can be ours, but the product may say "made in Africa," "made in Asia," "made in Latin America," or whatever else.

Our fathers created an island of liberty in a sea of tyrannies at a time when such islands were very rare indeed. It was a herculean labor and they worked well. Our task now is to relate that island to the rest of the world and to spread the liberty so nobly won, and we may add so nobly used, among all other men.

In this work you and I as American Catholics have a rather special role to play. Let us not accept Archibald MacLeish's suggestion that either religion or geography have made us unfriendly to freedom, either in theory or in practice. Catholics were among the signers of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States. Both of these documents look back for their inspiration to the many charters of an earlier and more catholic time when the tradition of the common law itself was established.

It may very well be that Catholics who had so much to do with the discovery and exploration of America—as the name of your university so eloquently testifies—were not numerous among the founders of the Republic. Our absence was an historical accident which the immense migrations of the 19th century and the early 20th have already managed to correct.

For all of that, our claims on liberty are ancient claims, they are indeed the very springs from which the great rivers of freedom in our days take their source. More than 7 centuries ago, it was a prince of the church, Stephen Cardinal Langton, who produced the Magna Carta for the signature of King John. And even then the struggle for liberty was an old one.

Fifty years earlier, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, cut down at Vespers by the soldiers of King Henry, was protesting in an ecclesiastical context the same arbitrary power of the monarch. Professor Carlyle, in his monumental history of the Middle Ages says that the history "of civilization during the last 2,000 years is primarily the history of the development of liberty." What is this but the story of the Christian church?

Catholics of our time too often fail to feel the continuity that reaches back from Thomas More and Nicholas of Cusa, back to Gregory and Ambrose and Gelasius, and indeed to Paul and the evangelists—to the very origins of our Christian faith.

We cannot forget that we have reached our present eminence only because we have been able to stand on the shoulders of these great men of early times. To be sure, our vision has been clouded because the impressive democratic movements of modern times have for the most part been separated from the gospel inspiration, but this does not mean that their authentic voice, where it has been heard, has not spoken in accents familiar in Christian history.

At the present time, and particularly in this land, Catholics must rediscover that stream for freedom, which here and there has been permitted to go underground, and bring it to the surface of men's attentions where its refreshing waters can again solace a suffering mankind.

As we rehearse during these years the meaning of our national purpose, Catholics can broaden the view of American freedom into that larger picture of the freedom of all mankind. For us, this is an opportunity to translate to our fellow Americans the claims of earlier times and many lands, to point out how liberty is universal or it is without meaning, how its proper object is humanity itself, "that great family," as Pope Benedict said, "extending beyond the boundaries of any country and every continent."

This is truly the contemporary extension of traditional American liberty. Once we welcomed all men to these shores who sought freedom, and this was a glorious adventure; now we must export that liberty itself for men on every shore and in every hinterland, and this is an even more challenging adventure.

The timid, the shy, and the selfish will counsel differently. For them it is enough to draw up the bridges on this island of freedom and prosperity, enough to man the towers and protect our barns and bins. Conceivably, we could survive this way, at least for a while.

But we would be unfaithful to the national purpose for which we were founded and, what is worse, faithless to those deeper spiritual traditions which urge us on, even now, to greater things. There is a purpose that transcends all national barriers and blots out the lines of division which separate one man from another, and it cannot fail to recognize those elements of unity which bind us together in a single human family. This is the purpose that America must enunciate if we wish other men to listen, this is the call that can bring all men to rally.

This, I would like to suggest, and not some mere radio broadcast, is what we should describe in those noble words, the voice of America calling all mankind to freedom, under God.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Brunsdale, Norman, *N. Dak*——
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*——5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Brunsdale.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, and Brunsdale.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Improving the Outlook for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 9, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the weeks ahead, we will be hearing a great deal about what the major political parties—both Democratic and Republican—propose to do for the American people.

Naturally, it is important that Government—guided by its administrating officials—do what is necessary to keep the wheels of progress moving forward.

At the same time, however, it is important that we vigilantly maintain a climate of maximum freedom in which the people have opportunity to do all that they can for themselves.

We recognize, of course, that maintaining a strong economy is an important part of our job. The strengthening of our job-creating, free-enterprise system, is fundamental to our economy. Today, there are more than 4.6 million businesses in the country. About 95 percent of these are small businesses.

Recently, I was privileged to discuss over Wisconsin radio stations the opportunity for further improving the small business outlook.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of my remarks printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

The Nation—to combat communism, spur progress, and promote peace—must assure a strong economy. A few of the necessary steps include: Maintaining a sound, noninflationary, money policy—neither too tight nor too loose; plugging loopholes in the tax system; finding new ways to help job-creating business—particularly small ones—to progress; brightening the trade outlook, including efforts to expand exports; and—at the same time—to protect the domestic economy from the adverse impact of imports; encourage greater cooperation between the consumer, business, labor, and government—not only to combat inflation but to promote maximum progress.

FREE ENTERPRISE UNDERGIRDS ECONOMY

We recognize, of course, that our job-creating, free-enterprise system is the foundation of our economy. Throughout the country, there are about 4.6 million firms in business. This is an alltime record; 95 percent of these are small enterprises.

In addition to turning out our "arsenal of defense," these businesses and industries provide our people with the jobs, and goods and services necessary for better living, and for economic progress.

Currently, our output of goods and services—termed the gross national product—has reached an alltime high of over $500 billion. In addition, the gross national income has zoomed to more than $400 billion annually.

Unfortunately, it is difficult to relate these gigantic figures to the economic problems in the daily lives of each of us. However, the steady upward climb of national wealth does reflect meaningfully that the economy as a whole is going forward promisingly.

The fundamental task is to provide a climate of opportunity—for each of us—to reap a proportionate share of the Nation's wealth. This is true for farmers, professionals, businessmen, and folks in all other walks of life.

ROLE OF SMALL BUSINESS IN ECONOMY

On the main streets of America, small business—including more than 110,000 in Wisconsin—in the villages, towns, and cities, are the wellsprings of our economic life. However, further efforts are needed to improve the outlook. Although there are many ways it may be done, any major program, I believe, should include:

1. Providing an opportunity for greater participation in Federal defense and defense procurement programs.

2. Establishment of local development companies to provide financing funds for small businesses—in areas where other adequate financing sources are not available.

3. Efforts by States—as well as small businesses, themselves, to cooperate in providing managerial and technical assistance to small business for resolving problems, improving efficiency, and other tasks that may be too expensive for the small business budget.

4. Further improving the patent system for protection of ideas and systems.

5. Expansion of research providing management aids through voluntary groups and—as necessary—through State and Federal assistance programs.

6. Encouraging labor—management peace, or conversely, preventing strife to minimize costs of labor-management difficulties. Fundamentally, their interests are mutual—not conflicting.

DEVELOPMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS "POOLS"

The development of small business "pools" also is helping to meet some problems that could not otherwise be resolved, such as:

Collect market and research information related to a particular industry for dissemination to participating members;

Construct, acquire, or establish laboratories and other facilities for the conduct of research;

Prosecute applications for patents and render patent services for participating members; as well as

Negotiate and grant licenses under patents held under joint programs.

TAX OUTLOOK

Taxes for individuals as well as business of course, are always a serious matter.

What is the outlook?

As things look now, the great pressures on Uncle Sam's pocketbook—particularly for defense, as well as domstic programs, threaten to increase, rather than diminish.

Consequently, the outlook for immediate, across-the-board tax cuts is dim. However, this would be a good time, I believe, to undertake what has long been needed—and that is, a top-to-bottom overhaul of the tax system.

For this purpose, I have introduced legislation to establish a Hoover-type tax commission. The purpose would be to plug loopholes, iron out inequities, eliminate unintended hardships or benefits, capture revenue that now may be escaping taxation; and make adjustments in the tax structure to reflect the changing needs of the economy, the technological revolution, shifts in the pattern of consumer and national requirements—and other purposes.

In a free enterprise system, it is absolutely essential that tax laws be formulated to encourage—not limit—economic growth and expansion. In addition, there is a need for simplifying tax reporting—particularly for businesses as well as individuals.

Despite the fact that taxes have been at a substantially high rate, ranging up to 91 percent, however, the economy has progressed in the last 8 years; for example, the gross national product, as I mentioned, has increased 35 percent.

EXPANDING FOREIGN TRADE

There are, of course, opportunities for improving the outlook for job-creating business and industry through expanding trade.

Traditionally, the U.S. market has been the major target for the products of our factories as well as farms. With further improvement of our mass production techniques—for stepping up production—however, we need to look for new horizons. Currently, for example, studies are underway by the Department of Commerce to see what new opportunity exists in the export field. As of now, only a minor portion of firms in Wisconsin—and the United States—have engaged in foreign commerce.

Around the world, however, there are many potential markets. The less-developed countries of Latin America, Africa, and Asia, particularly, offer real prospects for new business oportunity. In effect, they need everything.

How can we take advantage of the emerging opportunities?

First, we need to broaden our horizons; to attempt to find new markets.

Second, expand U.S. and Wisconsin participation in international trade fairs, offering opportunity to locate customers.

Third, utilize services of Department of Commerce—as well as cooperate with other business—to locate and attempt to supply new markets.

PROBLEMS IN EXPORTING

We recognize, of course, that there are difficulties. These include:

Financing the necessary market research.

Competing with goods produced at lower wages and operating costs from other countries.

Acquiring the financing as well as developing the know-how for entering and profiting by participation in foreign trade.

Difficulty of converting foreign currency—earnings or principal—into U.S. dollars.

Problems of complying with national laws as well as local ordinances affecting distribution of goods in other countries; and

Running the risks of expropriation or even confiscation of property in unstable countries where such investments are necessary for market outlets.

Currently, the United States is negotiating with other countries to attempt to resolve a number of these problems. This would mean not only greater health for business and industry, but more jobs for the workers in America.

IMPACT OF IMPORTS

We recognize that trade is a two-way street. Unfortunately, a number of Wiscon-

sin and U.S. firms are now suffering from the impact of imports. We cannot ignore this situation. Instead, a realistic effort must be made to protect U.S. industries—and their workers—from being too hard hit by imports—often produced by lower wage levels and operating expenses.

Recently, I joined in cosponsoring legislation to establish a special committee to study the impact of imports on domestic industries. The purpose would be—by a clear and objective study and survey by competent persons—to determine the necessary steps to provide protection for domestic industries. Also the committee would see what could be done by enterprising exploration and official negotiations to improve the opportunity for new markets in other countries.

After the recess, I believe that Congress should take speedy action to set up this committee. In the interests of the overall economy, we cannot too long endure losses by domestic firms—which affects not only firms but our workers and the overall economy.

CONCLUSION

This, then, is a brief review of a few of the problems involved in further strengthening our economy.

Again, I want to stress that, as one sector advances, the whole economy is benefited, conversely, as any segment suffers, so does the whole economy—not only in terms of loss of business and industrial activity, but in jobs for the workers of the country.

Penalties of Prejudice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 9, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, history has recorded that perhaps the most serious challenge to our democratic way of life, our incomparable system of freedom and equality for each individual, has grown from prejudice.

Recently the Beaumont Journal published an outstanding editorial column by Mr. Matthew Adams on this subject. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column from the June 21, 1960, issue of the Beaumont Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREJUDICE SAPS STRENGTH OF GOOD SOIL AND CREATES USELESS STRIFE

(By Matthew Adams)

We are going to wake up some fine day and realize how barbarous is prejudice.

The open mind is like a field over which the wind bathes the flowers and foliage in its arms.

Prejudice is made up of roots that sink into perfectly good soil, only to sap away its life and richness, and prevent useful growth from producing its natural fruit in its way.

What useless strife prejudice creates. It puts boulders across the smooth path of progress and blocks strong men from attaining their ends.

If it hadn't been for prejudice, some earlier Columbuses would have found the New World centuries sooner. All reforms are stabbed at their onsets by the hand of prejudice.

Prejudice at this very moment has its secret agents in the seats of the mighty, seeking what it may destroy.

At heart, we are all both small and great. Prejudice enters us while we sleep or while we are in careless mood, binding us to ways that it takes herculean will to break when we want them broken.

Let us have a thousand doors to our mind. Let us throw away our keys and invite the opinions of any and all to enter freely.

Let us all have at least one prayer that we have learned to utter as we enter upon every day. This it is: "God give me an open mind—to see all sides and every truth."

Progress in the Battle Against the Purveyors of Pornography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 9, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, one of the satisfying accomplishments of the 86th Congress has been the progress which has been made to strengthen the Federal laws against obscenity. Definite strides have been made to bring to book those who engage in the filthy business of printing and distributing pornography and other unwholesome material. It is my hope that while all of us applaud the enactment of certain laws thus far, we will now rededicate ourselves to placing others on the statute books.

A recent editorial in the Catholic News, which has long crusaded against the barons of obscenity, points up the progress which has been achieved and emphasizes what individuals can do in this important battle. I ask unanimous consent that the fine editorial to which I have referred be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Catholic News, Aug. 6, 1960]

PROGRESS AGAINST OBSCENITY

There is no more important problem before our people at this time than that of the obscenity flooding through our newsstands and through the mails to the homes of the Nation. Where it is not inspired by atheistic totalitarianism, it still serves its purpose, for a primary tactic of communism is to weaken the moral fiber of Americans, particularly the young.

Court decision after court decision protecting the rights of the small minority of those who are making huge sums by the printing, distributing and selling of such filth and ignoring the rights of the moral majority has hampered the fight the public authorities are making against this tide of salaciousness. Members of Congress and officials of the Post Office Department have complained that bills seeking to remedy the condition have rough going in the legislature hopper. There are indications, however, that the situation is changing for the better.

Recently Congress has approved and the President has now signed into law a bill giving Federal district court judges power to impound for as long a time as they deem necessary mail addressed to a person who is believed, on reasonable grounds, to be dealing in obscenity. This cuts such dealers off from their source of revenue. Another law, similarly approved by Congress and the President, gives statutory status to the position of Post Office judicial officers who ordinarily hand down the final departmental decision in obscenity cases.

These laws will strengthen the efforts of the Post Office and other authorities in dealing with such salaciousness. In the meantime parents and others are under civic and moral obligation to help in the battle by reporting to the proper office the receipt of unordered salacious mail sent especially to the young, and by seeing to it that neither they nor their children patronize places of business where such smut is sold.

Let Your Light Shine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 9, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, young Christopher Dearie, president of the Student Government Association of Mountain Lakes, N.J., High School, delivered an outstanding oration at his commencement June 23, 1960. Calling his address "Let Your Light Shine," Christopher compares June graduates to stars with the essential, important distinction that the young people have free wills.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET YOUR LIGHT SHINE

(Oration delivered by Christopher Dearie, president of the Student Government Association of Mountain Lakes, N.J., High School at commencement June 23, 1960)

People say the stars come out at night, but astronomers tell us that they really do not come out at all—they are there all the time. The stars cannot be seen in the daytime because the sky is too bright. It is only when the sun sets and the sky is dark that they are visible. And so it seems, just as the sun, you, our parents and teachers, have subdued your brilliant lights to allow us to glow on this commencement night.

Astronomers also tell us there are billions of stars in the sky, and yet there are no two exactly alike. Although we, the class of 1960, in our caps and gowns appear to be alike, we are, so to speak, like the stars, individual and different. We know the stars are in unchangeable order, so much so, that travelers look to them to find their way.

We, however, are unlike the stars because of our free wills. We are in a position to cooperate with the Creator in working out our own destinies.

Here we are, each with individual talents. How shall we accept them? bury them? deny them? or use them?

It is rather exciting, I think, to realize that each of us has a distinctive ability that no person before us, with us or after us, can display. With this knowledge, it is our obligation, our duty, to develop our God-given talents to the fullest. If we fail, much will be lost to man and to the world.

"You are the light of the world. Let your light shine before all men." As you know,

these words, from the Sermon on the Mount, were spoken to all generations, 2,000 years ago, and it applies to you and to me, tonight.

It is only on occasions such as this that we realize our importance as individuals, as builders of eternity—whatever our work may be.

We may not be another Joan of Arc, who saved France at the age of 16, or another Mozart who made concert tours as a boy, or indeed, another George Washington, or Abraham Lincoln. No, our purpose for existence may not be something as dramatic and noteworthy as that of these people. But we all have to make our contribution to mankind, no matter how small and unimportant it may seem to us. The poet expresses it this way:

"There is some place for you to fill
Some work for you to do
That no one can or ever will
Do quite as well as you."

When do we start? It seems to me, it is a daily task to do what we can with what we have, where we are today. Newman says it in a way easy to remember—"If a man waited until he could do something so well that no one would find fault with it, nothing would ever be accomplished." We have an excellent example today in Thomas Dooley, a young Navy doctor who went to Laos during the war. He saw great suffering there, and his future work in life unfolded before him. He felt that something should be done and he wanted to do it. Should he wait until he was rich and famous, enjoy the good things in life first? No. He started that day and stayed to establish a hospital and take care of the sick and needy. He found his purpose in life and he has truly been called the splendid American.

Let us keep the Dr. Dooley type in mind and remember that each of us is unique, with a special mission to perform that no one else can do quite as well as we. Let us develop, cultivate and use our talents to make our lives worthwhile to ourselves and to others. In this setting, on this commencement night, let us meditate for a moment on these words of a French philosopher:

"I shall pass through this world but once. If, therefore, there be any good thing I can do, or any talent I can use, let me do it now; let me not defer nor neglect it, for I shall not pass this way again."

Resolution of New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police Commending Cooperation by Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 9, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has long performed outstanding service to America on a local as well as on a national level, particularly concerning the important matter of police training. The New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police adopted, at its convention in Spring Lake, N.J., in June, a resolution commending the excellent cooperation the New Jersey police have received from the FBI, its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, its various divisions and special agent in charge in New Jersey, William W. Burke. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place this resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the members of the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police and their respective departments have continued to receive excellent cooperation and assistance from the Federal Bureau of Investigation, its Director, J. Edgar Hoover, and its various divisions; and

Whereas Director Hoover and special agent in charge in New Jersey, William W. Burke have diligently supported the aims, objectives, and ideals of this association and assisted tremendously in police training in New Jersey: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police, in convention assembled at Spring Lake, N.J., June 27, 28, and 29, 1960, extend its greetings and best wishes to Director Hoover and express its continued appreciation and thanks for the splendid cooperation and assistance received and its confidence and trust in Director Hoover and his associates in the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, to Director J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Washington, D.C., and to Special Agent in Charge William W. Burke, as well as to Gov. Robert B. Meyner and the U.S. Senators and Congressmen of New Jersey.

Chief CHAS. H. MCCOY,
Chairman, Resolutions Committee.
SPRING LAKE, N.J., *June 29, 1960.*

Bringing Foreign Market to United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 9, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, one of the great challenges facing American business today is finding new markets, especially overseas. Of course, there have been many experiments of various ways to attract new foreign markets.

One of our country's leading manufacturers, A. O. Smith Corp., of Milwaukee, Wis., has now opened the door to greater advances in foreign marketing. Under the sponsorship of A. O. Smith—a going concern of over 8,000 Wisconsin employees—68 German farmers recently came to Wisconsin and were entertained and instructed on the merits of labor-saving crop storage units called Harvestores.

The Germans paid for their own transportation, food and lodging, while A. O. Smith furnished side trips and a banquet. The result: A reported sale of 15 Harvestores. This month a similar trip is being planned for a group of Italian farmers.

Reflecting the kind of business initiative which has made our country great—and will contribute to our general prosperity and better international understanding in the future—I ask unanimous consent that an article "Bringing Foreign Market To United States" from the July 9 Business Week be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRINGING FOREIGN MARKET TO UNITED STATES

A planeload of German farmers left Milwaukee for home last week after a 2-week initiation into the ways of American farmers—and the merits of A. O. Smith Corp's glass-lined crop storage units, called Harvestores—in a European sales promotion run off in Smith's own midwestern backyard.

The visitors had been entertained and instructed on the merits of Harvestores by A. O. Smith International S. A., a subsidiary of the Milwaukee-based company, and Mannesmann-Regner GmbH, its distributor in European Economic Community countries. The working part of the trip by the 68 German farmers was climaxed by a barbecue, beerfest, and horse show and overnight stays on farms in Walworth and Rock Counties, Wis.

Sales spurt: At week's end, Smith reported sales of 15 units, which will cost the Germans about $13,750 each, less a special 5 percent discount offered during the trip. The price tag and the financing of the Harvestores are the biggest problems for Mannesmann-Regner, of Duseldorf, a subsidiary of Mannesmann AG, metal fabricator and third largest manufacturer in West Germany. However, Dr. Fritz Lehmann, chief of Mannesmann-Regner's foreign department, says the company has sold 40 Harvestore units in the past 4 months in European countries inside and outside of the Economic Community—mostly Germany, Italy, and Great Britain.

Smith says the farmers could have toured some of the 56 installations of the Continent but these have been operating less than a year and detailed records aren't yet available. Besides, none of the farmers had been to the United States.

What Harvestores do: Harvestores resemble ordinary silos, but Smith people quickly explain that they are sold as complete plants for vertical farming, designed to simplify a farmer's work and increase his income by better utilization of existing acreage.

The storage units, which also are used in the food processing, chemical, and lumberjack industries, date back to 1949 but were only a minor factor in Smith's diversified operations until 1956. In that year Smith perfected an automatic unloading mechanism that won farmer approval. Smith now says it has nearly 7,000 units in place on American farms, ranging in price from $10,000 to $13,000. The pushbutton feeding device, plus improved nutritive value of the feed and reduced spoilage, are Harvestores' principal selling points.

Germans' tour: The laborsaving feature most pleased the Germans, who say their land is expensive, labor is scarce, and more mechanization is needed. To show its visitors the wonders of the Harvestore, Smith set up a week-long tour beginning with a visit to Kankakee, Ill., home of the company's Permaglas products group which makes Harvestores and other glasslined products.

The hardy Germans, who flew over in a DC-4 and traveled in the United States by bus, also toured stockyards, packing plants, agricultural schools, and farm equipment plants. But most of all, they clambered over farms and learned about Harvestores. In all, they trundled through some 200 miles of the country's richest farmland in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, a major area where people of German descent live.

Windup: The tour wound up with a 24-hour blowout at Elkhorn, Wis., a typical farm

community of 3,600 tucked away in the southeastern corner of the State. Elkhorn laid out the Willkommen mat and the visitors drank Milwaukee beer, consumed 320 pounds of barbecued beef, and watched a horse show.

Local farmers then took two of the Germans to each of their farms. There they watched the Americans do their chores, enjoyed a home-cooked dinner and spent the night and following morning trading information.

Target: The Germans, who paid their own way, spent about $450 each for transportation, food, and lodging. Smith picked up the tab for the buses on the tour of Harvestore farms, for the Elkhorn doings, and for the banquet the previous night at which it made its only hard sell of the tour. Its bill: $1,800.

This month Smith and Mannesmann-Regner plan a similar trip for a contingent of Italian farmers. Their tactics will, they hope, increase Harvestore sales in Europe from about $500,000 this fiscal year ending July 31 to over $1 million next year.

Resolution by Polish American Congress, Central and Northern New York State District, Reaffirming Dedication to Faith in America and Her Future, and Eventual Independence of Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 9, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I commend to the attention of the Senate an important resolution recently adopted by delegates to a regional meeting of the Polish American Congress, central and nothern New York State district. At this conference, which was held in June in Utica, N.Y., members of the congress voiced their faith in America and her future, and their dedication to the heritage and the eventual independence of noble Poland.

In order that the meaningful sentiments expressed by these members of this fine organization may receive the wide readership they deserve, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, CENTRAL AND NORTHERN NEW YORK STATE DISTRICT, SCHENECTADY, N.Y.

The delegates to the Polish American Congress, central and northern New York State district, in their regional meeting assembled at the Polish American Community Club, Columbia Street, in the city of Utica, on Sunday, June 26, 1960, have unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"With faith in our belief that God created man to his own image and breathed into him the breath of divine life, we stand vigilant in the defense of our United States of America, our American way of life, and our American institutions, thereby upholding the dignity of man, the individual—all of which root and stem and sprung to life and continue to grow from that faith and belief.

"On this occasion we greet all our fellow Americans and we wholeheartedly support our Government in its efforts to seek a just and lasting peace and we have full faith in our sincere and courageous leader, the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

"We urge our Government to stand ready and always prepared to defend our country.

"We hereby express our gratitude and sincere thanks to our spiritual leader, our chaplain, the Reverend Ladislaus Guziolek, who for so many years devotedly has contributed to much to our organization by his advice, counsel and active participation.

"We note with much satisfaction, for their valued, faithful and untiring service, the raising to the dignity of Prothenetary Apostolic, the Right Reverend Monsignor Casimir S. Piejda; to the dignity of domestic prelates, the Right Reverend Monsignor Bernard A. Janczewski and the Right Reverend Monsignor John A. Kociela; and we note the 25-year anniversary of fruitful service rendered to God as a priest by the Reverend Edmund Stankiewicz, pastor of St. Stanislaus Parish. To all these right reverend and reverend fathers we send greetings and we offer our wholehearted congratulations and best wishes: Szczesc Jem Bozé.

"We call upon all our fellow citizens to support the Polish American Congress, the Alliance College, the Catholic League, the Kosciusko Foundation, the Orchard Lake Seminary, the Paderewski Foundation, the Polish Immigration Committee, the Pulaski Foundation, and all the other noteworthy charitable and humanitarian organizations.

"We call upon all Americans to act, initiate, and organize committees for the purpose of drawing up programs to appropriately observe:

"1. The 1,000-year anniversary of the acceptance of Christianity by the Polish Nation, noting its myriad contributions to Europe, Christianity civilization, and the world.

"2. The 100-year anniversary of the birth of Ignacy Jan Paderewski, champion of freedom and world-renowned maestro of the piano and musical composer.

"3. The Refugee Year in which the Nations of the world have and are participating and which is so proclaimed by our President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, whereby help and aid is given to the refugees cast and strewn all over the world and particularly those of Polish descent who are calling for our aid and help and on whose behalf our great leader, the Right Reverend Monsignor Colonel Felix F. Burant, through our Polish Immigration Committee, is appealing to us.

"4. In memory of one of the greatest fighters for freedom, that brave American Revolutionary War hero, a contemporary and colleague of our Founding Fathers and of George Washington, Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

"We call upon our brethren, the Americans of Polish descent, not to forget, but to dignify them by appropriate testimonial ceremonies for their well deserved contributions made to their Polonais, those elder statesmen, the pioneers and builders, the Seniors of our Polonais who have spent a lifetime in building those communities which include churches, schools and community homes wherein the best of Polish culture is expressed to add to the beauty of the American landscape; whereby they will be made to feel that their life's work for the community is appreciated.

"And at this time we hail Konstanty Sarnowski, one of the senior builders of the Schenectady community.

"We urge our Governor, the Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, and the honorable mayors in our district to proclaim Paderewski Day to be observed on November 7, 1960, in honor of the 100-year anniversary of the birth of that champion of freedom and to proclaim Gen. Casimir Pulaski Day on October 11, 1960, to commemorate that great patriot's memory.

"We send brotherly greetings to the people of Poland in their continuing fight for freedom and democracy and we assure them of our continued support in their efforts and in their struggle.

"We bow our heads in reverence to His Eminence, Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski, the Primate of Poland, and we assure him of our support in his cause.

"And together, as we ascend to the various summits confronting our national and international life may the blessing of the Lord be upon us.

"The Polish American Congress, Central and Northern New York State District: Rev. Ladislaus Guziolak, Chaplain; Mr. Stephen Obremski, President; Dr. W. Kotwas, Vice President; Mrs. Ann Szczepanska, Vice President; Mrs. Sophia Czachowska, Vice President; Mr. Stanley Zabek, Financial Secretary; Mrs. Violet Michalska, Secretary; Mr. Robert J. Pietruszka, Assistant to the President; Mr. Anthony Sawicki, Sergeant at Arms; Mr. Joseph Dylong, Treasurer."

Needed: New Study To Expand Trade and Commerce Through St. Lawrence Seaway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 9, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the St. Lawrence Seaway—completed in 1959—offers new, untested opportunity for expanded trade and commerce. The challenge now is to take full advantage of the great potential.

As a sponsor of the original seaway law, Public Law 358, of the 83d Congress, I am particularly concerned with assuring that (a) the seaway fulfills its full potential in terms of market opportunity for Wisconsin, and the great agricultural-industrial complex of the upper Midwest; and (b) that it pays off the costs of operation and construction—a $140 million investment by the American people.

A comprehensive review, and exploitation of, the potential is absolutely essential—if the seaway is to fulfill these objectives.

Recently, I contacted the Secretary of Commerce to urge that a comprehensive study be undertaken by the Department of Commerce aiming toward improving and expanding trade and commerce through the St. Lawrence Seaway. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my letter to Secretary Mueller urging such a study printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to respectfully urge that a comprehensive study be undertaken by the Department of Commerce, aimed toward improving and expand-

ing trade and commerce through the St. Lawrence Seaway.

As you well appreciate, the seaway, completed in 1959, offers new commercial opportunities for the agricultural-industrial complex of the upper Midwest—the greatest in the world and the whole Nation.

The challenge, now, is to take full advantage of these new opportunities.

We recognize, of course, that the search for markets, rerouting of trade, changing of trade patterns—these, and other complex innovations—cannot be done overnight.

However, I believe that a comprehensive study—covering the whole scope of possibilities for expanding trade, commerce, and tourist traffic, through the seaway, would help tremendously in benefiting the economy, providing new opportunities for the farms and factories of America to transport their products to new markets; strengthen and improve trade relations with other countries; assure that tolls from the operation of the seaway—as provided by law—will support the costs of operation, as well as pay off the debt of construction.

Naturally, you are in the best position to determine the scope of such a study. In my humble opinion, however, I believe that any such survey should cover such fields as: A review of potential markets for U.S.-produced products, transportable through the seaway; providing information on the seaway to foreign and domestic shippers; encouraging a greater flow of tourists, to, and through, the seaway; explore for new ways and means to increase interest in utilizing the seaway by shippers and producers, as well as consumers abroad and elsewhere in the United States.

As we recall, the Grace Line recently received permission from the Maritime Board to withdraw its vessels from the Great Lakes-Caribbean service route. Generally, I believe this marks a setback for seaway traffic—at a time when it should be expanding in an uninterrupted way.

In carrying out such a study, it would appear that the services of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, itself, as well as your own Department—could make invaluable contributions to providing data and information—and perhaps new trade policy recommendations—to assure maximum utilization of the potential of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

I sincerely hope, therefore, that you will find it possible to initiate such a study in the near future.

Sincerely,

ALEXANDER WILEY.

Dr. Ephraim McDowell—Pioneer Surgeon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 9, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during the recent recess of the Congress, I had the great good fortune to hear delivered in my hometown of Lexington, Va., before the Rockbridge Historical Society, a remarkable address by Mrs. Gordon Graham Heiner on Dr. Ephraim McDowell.

Born and reared in Rockbridge County, Va., Dr. McDowell is justly known as the father of abdominal surgery. The operation on which his claim to fame is based was performed in Kentucky, where he had moved for the practice of medicine and surgery, and he now represents Kentucky in Statuary Hall.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the splendid address on Dr. McDowell and his most famous patient, delivered by Mrs. Heiner before the Rockbridge Historical Society on July 25, 1960, at Lexington, Va.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF MRS. GORDON GRAHAM HEINER TO THE ROCKBRIDGE HISTORICAL SOCIETY ON JULY 25, 1960, AT LEXINGTON, VA., DURING EPHRAIM MCDOWELL-JANE TODD CRAWFORD WEEK

Members of the Rockbridge Historical Society, honored guests, tonight we have come together to remember a great surgeon and a brave patient who were born in this county—one 10 miles, and the other only 3 miles from where we are tonight.

We must go back 150 years and 6 months to see them as they approached the time of an operation full of pain and unknown danger, an operation whose influence would save the lives of thousands of patients between that time and this.

We must go back to an icy forest trail that led from Greenwood, Ky., to Danville, to see an exhausted woman clinging to a horse, supporting on its pommel a dreadful burden, as big as a child, that is a part of her body.

The way is 60 miles long, in the fearful December cold, but she presses on, attended as well as possible under those conditions by her anxious husband and a colored woman servant. It is a long way, yet short and terrifying, because she knows that each step her horse takes may be carrying her nearer to a miserable death from a surgeon's knife.

The determined woman who rides through "trackless wastes" is Mrs. Thomas Crawford, born Jane Todd, 3 miles from Lexington on route 60, and the doctor who waits to "experiment" on her, in spite of the warnings of all his colleagues, is Dr. Ephraim McDowell, also born in Rockbridge County, 10 miles from Lexington on Route 11.

In a few more days, as church bells ring out to greet the birth of Christ, Mrs. Crawford will lie down of her own choice, without the relief of anesthesia, with only her faith in God and her trust in a country doctor to soothe her pain, and allow Dr. McDowell to cut away the 22½-pound tumor that bulges before her, in what has been called the first successful abdominal operation to be recorded anywhere in the world.

"Jennie" Todd was 8 years old on November 11, 1771, when another of Samuel McDowell's 11 children was borne by his wife, Nancy McClung McDowell. The couple had been married 17 years, almost as many as the age of each had been when they had made their vows to each other.

The winter cold pressed in on the ochre-stained logs of the red house, and in the distance, wolves howled in the night, but the Indian dangers that had caused a 24-year-old colonel in the British Colonial Army named George Washington to have special fortifications built in Augusta County had subsided, and the Revolutionary War was still only a threat.

When Benjamin Borden had offered John McDowell a thousand acres of land of his own selection if he would survey and settle in the Borden Grant, John had selected a site 10 miles from Lexington near what is now Fairfield, and built his large log house immediately behind the site of the present stately mansion.

He skinned the logs, afterward staining them with red ochre paint which he made from powdered material found on a bank of his land. This caused the cabin to be called the red house, as the present red brick house, owned by Mrs. J. P. Alexander, is now called.

John McDowell was a man of importance in the community, and was made captain of the local militia. According to the historian, Waddell, visiting Indians always lived off of the country, and when they were drinking, they would make targets with their arrows of any hogs or cattle that they saw. A band of Iroquois had been camping near the red house, on their way to North Carolina to fight the Cherokees. It was the duty of Captain McDowell and his militiamen to escort them from the area.

At Balcony Downs, near the present town of Glasgow, a renegade white man shot at a lame Indian who had stepped out of the path. The chieftain, who was riding by the side of Captain McDowell, "whirled and shot him." Someone else shot the chief, and a number of whites and Indians were killed before the latter escaped to the mountains, and returned to New York.

The anger of the Indians, who felt that they had been betrayed, has been described to the Society in another paper by the able historian, Dr. George West Diehl, who found Indian records concerning the battle.

The little stream where it occurred is still called "Battle Creek," and some authorities say that it was on Christmas Day in 1743 that Captain McDowell and seven of his men were killed, 66 years before his grandson would perform his historic operation. Others give the 18th of December as the date.

John's son, Samuel McDowell, who had often carried the chain during the Borden Grant surveys, and was an important witness in the ensuing boundary disputes, was a sturdy young man of 18 in what was then Augusta County, Va., when he married Miss Nancy McClung, a daughter of John McClung and Elizabeth Alexander, on January 17, 1754. She was 1 day older than her husband.

Ephraim was the ninth of their 11 children, accustomed to frontier hardships and to war and change. His father had fought in the French and Indian wars before he was born, and had been present with George Washington's troops at Braddock's defeat.

One can imagine little Ephriam as a quiet, retiring, yet determined child, looking at his grandfather's crudely carved tombstone in the gloomy McDowell Cemetery, only a stone's throw from the red house, with its simple inscription: "HIER LYES THE BODY OF JOHN MACK DOWELL DECD DECEMBER 1743."

One can see him in the kitchen of the red house, watching, with his eyes as black as an Indian's, as chickens, geese and ducks were dissected before they were cooked, or helping the men with the slaughtering of cattle, hogs and large game, and unconsciously absorbing lessons in anatomy.

He may have absorbed other lessons in cleanliness too, in this age before germs and antiseptics were known. Nancy McClung was born of Scotsmen who had settled in Ireland, and their belief that "cleanliness is next to godliness," exemplified in the kitchen smell of homemade lye soap, may have been one reason why Ephraim later could repeatedly perform abdominal operations after which patients recovered, while the patients of surgeons who tried to emulate him often died of peritoneal infection.

In the meantime, Jane Todd was growing up only 13 miles away.

She was the second of six daughters and two sons, and according to the late Dr. E. Pendleton Tompkins, her birthplace "was almost certainly on Whistle Creek, near Beatty's Mill." (This mill is now owned by H. E. Van Der Veer.) According to land records, her father's property adjoined the land of Hall's meeting house, which was later called New Monmouth Church. The society visited the spot 3 miles from Lexington on Route 60 some years ago.

"Jennie" was described many years later, by Mary Young Ridenaugh, Ephraim's granddaughter, as having a good form, above medium height, with eyes of "that full gray kind which indicate firmness." Her features were too prominent and large to be handsome, with firmly set, curling lips, but clusters of waving brown hair softened her forehead, and her face expressed character, determination of spirit, and large patience.

With her older sister, Lydia, and the younger ones, Polly, Ella (or Alice), Sarah and Hannah, and the sons, John and Samuel, Jane must have gone to hear the long sermons at old New Monmouth Church, only a short distance from her house, which sometimes lasted intermittently for 2 or 3 days to the delight of the religion-hungry settlers, when a traveling minister was available to the Presbyterian congregation.

One can imagine her keeping her gray eyes upon her squirming charges in the pew beside her with the dignity and confidence of the older sister.

This church was without a regular pastor until 1776, when the Reverend William Graham, of Princeton College, who was head of Liberty Hall Academy, became its pastor. The Reverend Mr. Graham also preached at Timber Ridge Church, where the McDowells must have worshiped, but there is no record of a meeting between Ephraim and Jennie Todd.

After the Revolution, in 1782, Samuel McDowell was appointed one of the commissioners to settle land claims in the district of Kentucky, which was then still part of Virginia. In 1783, he took his family, including Ephraim, who was about 12 years old, over the wilderness road, first to Harrodsburg, Ky., and later to Danville, when the district court, of which he became a judge, moved there.

The red house and its lands were sold to the Trevy family, who built the present mansion in front of the cabin, which was first used as a tenant house, moved, and finally torn down. For over a hundred years, the property has belonged to the Alexanders.

On January 9, 1794, Jennie or Jane Todd was married to Thomas Crawford, whose family had lived in Rockbridge County at the junction of Buffalo and Broadneck Creeks. The Reverend Sam Houston conducted the ceremony. According to August Schachner, Samuel Todd, Jane's father, had been sheriff of Botetourt County in 1791 and 1792.

In 1805, Jane and her husband followed the McDowells, emigrating to Green County, Ky., moving with Jane's sister, Rachel, and her husband, Thomas Mitchell.

Because of Indian dangers and other difficulties in this dark and bloody ground, immigrants usually moved in groups. The Crawfords located on the Blue Spring branch of the waters of Caney Fork, 9 miles southeast of Greensburg, and about 60 miles from the McDowells in Danville.

But even before Jane's marriage, Ephraim McDowell had returned to the Shenandoah Valley to study medicine.

Dr. Alexander Humphreys, a graduate of the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, then the most famous medical institution in the world, was a prominent physician in Staunton, and in addition, was one of the first trustees of Staunton Academy, a high school for boys.

Ephraim studied in Dr. Humphreys' "shop" for 2 or 3 years. There he could be watched and counseled by his oldest sister, Magdalene, and her husband, Andrew Reid, of Lexington, and his life must have been closely associated with Mulberry Hill, where stands the beautiful old house erected by his brother-in-law.

When Ephraim was in Staunton, Dr. Humphreys' life had been darkened by the mysterious disappearance of an English friend and drinking companion named William Richardson Watson, and the discovery of a bag of bones in a cave, above the present railway station.

Two of Humphreys' students testified that the bones were those of a Negro, which they had dissected after having taken him from his grave in order to learn an insight into their business. They had then sewn him in a "crokass" bag, and placed his bones in the cave. In spite of their testimony, Humphreys was tried for murder.

Although he was acquitted, slander suits and countersuits continued for years, until Ephraim McDowell earned his teacher's gratitude by pointing out that the hair which remained on the skull was undoubtedly that of a Negro. Although this somewhat restored Dr. Humphreys' prestige, he moved to Kentucky a few years after Ephraim left his "shop."

When his father decided to allow Ephraim to go to the University of Edinburgh, Scotland, to continue his medical studies, Samuel was a judge in Kentucky, so far removed from Virginia that he left the whole management of the credits Ephraim would take with him in the hands of his son-in-law, Andrew Reid.

"You and him must do as you find it best," he wrote, "and I hope he will act prudently. If you have any doubt of his economy or prudence, pray let me know, for I would not be for his going to Scotland, if he was of an imprudent behavior in any respect whatever."

Chemistry, anatomy, and surgery were studied by Ephriam in Edinburgh after his arrival there in 1793. Part of the time he was fortunate in being under Dr. John Bell, a brilliant teacher, who Schachner says, "Doubtless, forcibly depicted the hopeless status of ovarian tumors as it then existed, and the possibility in the future of a relief through surgery."

Walking trips through Scotland, a foot race when he was chosen by his friends to compete with a boastful Irishman, in which McDowell first allowed himself to be beaten for 10 guineas, then won a longer race for a hundred, showed that his trip abroad was not all work. But in 1795, probably because of lack of funds, he turned homeward without a degree, to take up practice in and around Danville, Ky., as "Dr. McDowell," and to become "the first surgeon west of the Alleghanies."

His lack of a calfskin did not make him less careful. Until the end of his life he kept up his study of anatomy, and all his cases were prepared for surgery through preliminary treatment. He rehearsed his operations, rigorously drilled his assistants, and although there is no mention of any particular effort at cleanliness in that day before germs were recognized, his successes tell their own story.

In spite of some criticism, he often scheduled his operations on Sunday, some said so his patients could have the benefit of prayers of the church, and others because it was a quiet and restful day.

He was literally a doctor on horseback, because his practice took him through wild forests, where there was still danger from Indians and wild beasts.

Fourteen years after the start of his practice, on December 13, 1809, Dr. McDowell rode 60 miles on horseback to Motley Glen, near Greensburg, where he had been called to see Mrs. Thomas Crawford. Two physicians had requested his aid in delivering her, as she was thought to be pregnant. Her symptoms were similar to those of labor pains without relief.

Upon examining her, Dr. McDowell found her abdomen distended by a tumor of enormous size.

For a century, there had been discussion of the hopeless nature of this condition. In a paper published 7 years after the operation in the Eclectic Repertory and Analytical Review, Dr. McDowell said:

"My patient was a woman of small stature; her abdomen had become so pendulous as to reach almost to her knees. Having never seen so large a substance extracted, nor heard of an attempt or success attending any operation such as this required, I gave to the unhappy woman information of her dangerous situation.

"She appeared willing to undergo an experiment which I promised to perform if she would come to Danville (the town where I live), a distance of 60 miles from her place of residence. This appeared almost impracticable by any, even the most favorable conveyance, though she performed the journey in a few days, on horseback."

It was almost Christmas when Mrs. Crawford said goodby to her five children, was helped on the sidesaddle of a horse (Kentucky legend says it was a mule), and started her slow, perilous journey toward life or death.

There is no record of the number of days the awful journey in the depth of winter took, but it was necessary for her to rest the tumor (which was weighed after the operation, and found to be 22½ pounds), on the horn of her side saddle. A weak or timorous woman could not have undergone the trip.

Upon reaching Danville, she ignored the ominous chorus of voice, including the doctor's own assistant, which warned her of death. On Christmas morning she allowed herself to be strapped to the table, and gritting her teeth, and repeating psalms from the Bible, submitted to the knife.

Dr. McDowell "perspired profusely during his operations from intensity of his concentration," and the first part of this one took 25 minutes. Then she was stitched together, with strips of adhesive plaster applied between the stitches, and put to bed, still alive after the ordeal.

Dr. McDowell described it thus:

"My nephew, Dr. James McDowell, whom I had brought up, had graduated a few months before this time in Philadelphia, and had commenced business as my partner. Being in delicate health at the time, it was my intention to remove to the country in the spring, or so soon as I could establish my nephew in business.

"From the time of Mrs. Crawford's arrival, he had made frequent attempts to dissuade me from operating; but finding my determination fixed, he agreed to be present, but not until the morning I operated, and as my partner, to assist, for should the patient die, the responsibility was all my own; should the patient live, it would assist him in his outset in business.

"The day having arrived, and the patient being on the table, I marked with a pen the course of the incision to be made, desiring him to make the external opening, which in part, he did. I then took the knife and completed the operation, as stated in the Medical Repertory. Although the termination of this case was most flattering, yet I was more ready to attribute it to accident than to any skill or judgment of my own; but it emboldened me to undertake similar cases; and not until I had operated three times—all of which were successful—did I publish anything on the subject. I then thought it due to my own reputation, and to suffering humanity, to throw all the light which I possessed upon diseased ovaria."

There are many stories of disturbances in Danville that Christmas Day. One is that a mob threatened Dr. McDowell's life if he operated, and was only stopped by a sheriff, who persuaded the men to wait for the outcome of the operation. Another is that the husband of Mrs. Crawford pointed a loaded gun at the doctor during the operation, promising to kill him if she died. There are no records of either, but it is known that a preacher denounced the operation in his

pulpit that morning, and that many in the town had angry words to say against it.

Danville knew about the operation, and knew that only 5 days after it, Dr. McDowell had discovered Mrs. Crawford up and making her bed. But when the news finally reached the outside world, it was considered a fairy tale.

Scornful attacks even ridiculed the "backwoods doctor's" report that the tumor rested on the horn of the saddle during Mrs. Crawford's trip to Danville, on the ground that the horn of the saddle is on the right side, and the tumor was on the left.

Apparently Dr. McDowell did not realize the tremendous importance of his achievement, not only to women with ovarian troubles, but to all those who needed abdominal surgery.

His first brief report, after 7 years and success in three ovariotomies, was made after repeated urgings of his friends. Two years later, when the storm of criticism and doubt continued, he published a further report in the Eclectic Repertory. But it was hard for the great medical schools and doctors of England and other countries to believe the truth, and jealous claims were made that others than this backwoods doctor should have the credit.

Even Dr. Robert Houston, of Scotland, who tried to probe a woman's tumor in 1701, and being unable to pull out the glutinous substance, took a strong fir splinter and thrust it into the wound, and turning it around, was able to catch and draw a large amount of a substance was quoted as having preceded McDowell's operation.

Twenty-five days after the operation, Mrs. Crawford was strong enough to take the long road home in the saddle. She and her family moved to Indiana a year later, some say because of her husband's disapproval of slavery, and she lived there in excellent health almost until her death, 33 years later.

As for her doctor, he continued to operate successfully during his entire life, once upon James Polk, when he was a sick boy of 17, to remove a bladder stone. Polk's health thereafter was excellent, and he became a President of the United States.

Even in the second half of the 19th century, abdominal surgery without modern antiseptics was associated in most minds with blood and death. The "Life of Pasteur" speaks of the situation in France, which was farther behind in this operation than some other European countries as late as 1863.

Since the infected air of the hospitals was blamed for the invariably fatal results of the operation, The Assistance Publique hired an isolated house in a salubrious spot near Paris. Ten women in succession were sent to that house. The neighbors watched the 10 entering, and a short time later, watched their 10 coffins being carried away.

The sudden death of Dr. McDowell is a mystery that has never been solved. Vigorous and free from illness at 59 years of age, he suddenly became acutely ill with abdominal pain and nausea, and died on June 20 or 25, 1830, after 2 weeks of "inflammatory fever of the stomach." He became ill one evening, according to his granddaughter, after eating quantities of fresh strawberries from the vine, and was convinced that he may have eaten a poisonous insect or poisonous insect eggs. The doctors who attended him did not agree with this diagnosis. It may have been that this man, who saved so many with his knife, died from appendicitis, for lack of a knife in a brother surgeon's hand.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*—Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*—
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*—
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*—
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*—
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*—
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*—
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*—
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*—
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*—
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*—
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*—
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*—
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*—
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*—
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*—
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*—
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*—
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*—
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*—
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*—
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*—
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*—
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*—
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*—
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*—5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*—
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*—
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*—
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*—
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*—
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*—
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*—
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*—
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*—
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*—
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*—
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*—
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*—
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*—
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*—
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*—
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*—
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*—3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*—
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*—
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*—
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*—
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*—
Long, Russell B., *La.*—
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg.*—
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*—
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*—
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*—
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*—
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa.*—4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*—
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*—
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*—
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*—
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*—
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*—
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*—
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*—
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*—
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*—
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*—
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*—
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*—
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*—
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*—
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*—
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*—
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*—
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*—
Williams, John J., *Del.*—
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*—
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*—

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, ———.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, ———.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, ———.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Address of Dr. Arthur A. Schuck, Chief Boy Scout Executive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, it is heartwarming to know in the dynamic age in which we live that the ranks of adults are swelling with those who are dedicated to the Nation's youth, dedicated to the philosophy that youth replaces age and, therefore, youth must "be prepared" to assume its role as the future builder of tomorrow.

The Englishman, Lord Robert Baden-Powell, in 1908 envisioned that the will of God is to make a world of peace and happiness and that a way to creating that world is through the training of youth. He founded the Boy Scout movement in that year.

Two years later, an American named William B. Boyce founded the Boy Scouts of America. Today, there are more than 4 million Scouts in this country alone, and the number has increased each and every year since 1910.

As part of a program to commemorate the 50th anniversary of Scouting in this country, the chief Scout executive of that organization, Arthur A. Schuck, made one of the main addresses while they met in the Nation's Capital.

I ask unanimous consent to have the complete text of Mr. Schuck's remarks of June 3, 1960, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF DR. ARTHUR A. SCHUCK, CHIEF SCOUT EXECUTIVE, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, NEW BRUNSWICK, N.J.

Fifty years of scouting. Sometimes 50 years seems long, but when you think of the history of man, when you think of the contributions made by each generation to civilization's progress, when you think of the long trail of mankind ever reaching upward and onward, and seeking the day when he would have peace and happiness, then 50 years is a short time. And yet we are told that more progress has been made in the world in the last 50 years than in the 5,000 previous years.

It has been an important 50 years. How fortunate we are to have lived in this particular 50-year period. What physical and material progress we have seen. I have seen us go from the horse and buggy to the jet era. I have seen towns with local dirt roads that become four to six lane transcontinental highways. It was not long ago that I was out in a really rural part of Texas and here, about 30 miles outside of town, was a ranch and on the ranch gate, on one side it said, "The Bar XHX" or whatever it was ranch, and on the other side it said, "Telephone No. such and such." On the ranch house roof was a high arial. Just then down through the ranch road came a high-powered Cadillac car, and at the rate this man was going, he certainly would do the 30 miles from there to town in much less than an hour, probably a half of an hour. And I could not help but think of how life in America changed during my lifetime, that here in this ranch, in my lifetime, that which had been isolated now was part of a world neighborhood, through rapid transportation, telephone, and radio.

During my lifetime and that of many of you, transportation has been speeded from 5 days to cross America on a crack train to 5½ hours by jet plane. We have seen the transition from a rural America to an urban America, from an America where only 30 percent, we were told at this meeting, of the people lived in large cities to now 70 percent living in our large cities. And conversely, we have seen another change, a change from city to suburban living.

These represent great changes in American living and it is during this 50 years that Scouting has to make related readjustments. We have seen our Nation develop from a preponderance of small business enterprises to great corporations, from labor aggrandizement to dignity in labor, from backbreaking toil of a 50- to 60-hour week to machine operation and a 35-to 40-hour week. From manual to machine to electronic production, freeing man from the burden of toil and providing facilities for leisure. Providing facilities and equipment for man's leisure has become big business in America. We, in Scouting, have provided a constructive leisure time activity for man and boy in the interest of saving America.

We developed from a restricted economy with a few rich and many very poor to an expanding economy based on a high purchasing power of the common man that is the envy of the world. The average citizen has luxuries previously available to the few, and these have been the fruits of our democratic society.

Our financing of Scouting has expanded, with our economy and from being financed by a relatively few, we have now established a broad base of support.

Progress in transportation has neighborhood concepts from those that were confined to a few miles radius to a world neighborhood. From taking 8 to 10 days to go to Europe it is now 8½ hours. Thirty-three years ago the world was thrilled when Lindbergh flew to Paris in 33½ hours and we said, "This is marvelous, 3,600 miles in 33½ hours." Only a couple of weeks ago we launched a missile that went 9,000 miles in 52 minutes. With this world neighborhood realization America emerged from isolationism to twice save the freedom of the world, and now we are the world leader of the free nations, indeed, the hope of the free world.

During the 50 years came radio providing communication within the neighborhood. I can remember when as a young man I called on Olive, her mother had a crystal set. When she put those earphones on, silence descended upon the household. No one dared speak, mother was listening to the radio. And it was bringing in voices from the air and it was marvelous. Today, a rocket space explorer is launched up to 83 million miles from the earth and it sends back radio messages, and when that instrument is no longer effective, a button is pushed on earth and a directed beam starts a more powerful transmitter which can be heard on earth from up to 100 million miles away.

This is the kind of a world in which we are training youth to participate. Part of this 50-year growth, and keeping pace with this development, came Scouting. And it is, in my judgment, a God-given program to help meet the need of the day in which we live. Baden-Powell, I am sure, with all of his vision, had no concept how this movement would grow and influence the world. It was developed to contribute to the solution of what he recognized as a problem in Great Britain, namely, the need for character building and physical development of England's young men. But here was a program with the unique combination of ideas and ideals, ideas that appealed to the adventuresome and romantic minds of youth, but ideals that would develop character and good citizenship. A program involving voluntary participation but obligating the volunteer to a commitment to the principles of the Scout oath and Scout law.

Ideals have no national boundaries, and scouting came to America. In 50 years we have influenced 32 million men and boys in America. Today we have a membership, an astounding membership, of 5 million men and boys. One out of every four available boys are participants in the program, and actually at some time in their lives we reach one out of every two boys in America.

It has been my good fortune and pleasure to have been related to this movement for 47 of its 50 years, first in a lay and then in a professional capacity. During that time, one is bound to have many thrilling experiences. The fact that today our movement has nationwide endorsement and support of all the great religious, civic, business, educational, labor interest of America is gratifying to me. The fact that the American people believe in Scouting and have invested $72 million in our character and citizenship training camps is gratifying; as is the fact that they are generously contributing $38 million, as they did in 1959, for local operating expenses. The fact that a volunteer army numbering 1,360,000, including 306,000 women, give of their times to serve the boys of our Nation is gratifying, and certainly relieves us of much doubt as to the country's future.

But my friends, the mental pictures that give me the greatest satisfaction are those that relate to the influence of this program in the lives of boys.

Let me reminisce just for a moment. I was a Scoutmaster. I first organized a troop in an area where the boys of the more prosperous families lived. And then I wondered whether this program would work among poor boys, and so I went down into the underprivileged area of the city where boys were really living in poverty and most parents paid little attention to them. We organized a troop. The boys would come to this troop with wornout shoes, with torn trousers, and jackets that were pinned together with a safety pin in the winter, where mothers did not care enough to even sew a button on it. These looked like hopeless kids, and yet they were my troop.

The boys did not have enough money to buy handbooks. To instruct we had to use a blackboard. I recall one night on that blackboard I boxed the compass so they could learn it for their advancement. When I turned my back, which was a fatal thing to do with that troop, and began to write on

the blackboard, a fight started. You had to at least pretend to be as rough and tough as any of the boys, and I turned around and I said, "If there is going to be any fighting around here, I am going to do it." When the meeting was over, one boy, Mickey, stayed and I said, "What do you want?" He said, "You said if there was any fighting to be done around here you are the guy to do it." I said, "That is right." He said, "All right, I am ready."

So we went over to a corner closet where there was a set of boxing gloves and we put them on. We boxed all over the room. I finally gave him a push and set him down on a sofa, and said, "You know, you are a sucker for a left, and I can hit you in the nose any time I want." He said, "I bet you can't." I said, "Get up." I feinted and hit him in the nose, and I said, "It isn't important to me that I can hit you in the nose, but it ought to be important to you, and you should know how to block it." And I taught him how to block. I went home that night patting myself on the shoulder and said, you are a great boys' worker. Then the next week came and I was stupid enough to turn my back again, and somebody dropped a stink bomb. We were driven out of the room and after we assembled in another room, I lined them up. I said, "Now, boys, I don't care about the stink bomb; but I want to know whether there is one boy in this unit that is yellow, and I want the boy that dropped that stink bomb to step out." Who stepped out? Mickey.

When the meeting was over, he hung around again and I said, "What do you want now, do you want to fight again?" He said, "Don't you want to talk to me?" I said, "Not particularly. I'm your friend but you're not my friend. My friends don't treat me this way." And he said, "I'm sorry." The next week—to shorten the story—I made him patrol leader. He was a born leader. He came to me at the close of the meeting and I said, "What is it now?" And he said, "I don't know why you did it, but I'm going to be the damndest best patrol leader that there ever was." And he was.

Years went by and I went into Scouting professionally, and one day I received a letter from him. He had graduated from law school; he had qualified at the bar. He, in his letter, rehearsed this whole story, or I would have forgotten it. He said, "You had faith in me, you had confidence in me, you told me that if I lived the Scout oath and law and was willing to pay the price of hard work and concentrated effort I could achieve any worthy ambition. I believe you, and I have made good."

Some years later I was at a large meeting where they awarded Silver Beavers and was advised that one of the men to receive the award knew me. I did not recognize him. After the meeting that man came to me and asked, "Do you remember me?" I was terribly embarrassed, and had to say "No." He said, "Why, I was in your troop." When he mentioned the underprivileged district I identified him and said, "I remember you, and I'll prove it to you. You were the only boy in that troop that ever had a uniform, and all these years it has worried me as to where you got it."

He beamed, "You do remember me." I said, "Never mind the emotions, I have waited all these years, where did you get it?" He said, "Somebody gave it to me," and that is what I expected. Then I said, "Tell me your story, how come you received the Silver Beaver?" He said, "I remembered that you told us that if we obeyed the Scout oath and we lived according to the Scout law, if we believed in God and tried to follow after God, and if we believed that we could have anything we were willing to work for we could get it, and I believed you." He said, "Now I am manager of a large insurance company, I have a fine position. I have been for a number of years trying to pay back to Scouting what I got from Scouting, and tonight they gave me this award and now I guess I'll have to go back and work some more."

Then I went to a YMCA annual meeting and was introduced. When the meeting was over a man came to me and with pride told me practically the same story. He came from the same troop, and he had made good in life as a vocational guidance counselor.

What a thrilling thing it is to me, and one of the great dividends of my life, that from one poor troop that gave no promise, poor ragged boys, three of them made good because of the Scout oath and the Scout law.

I wish I had time to go on and tell you some other incidents that have meant so much to me in life.

What am I trying to do? It is my purpose this noon to try to lift your sights as to the great needs of our Nation and the world, and what must be Scouting's contribution to the future. Great has been our Scouting progress in the last 50 years, and then related to it historically we can trace the contributions that preceeding generation have made to civilization's status as of this day. Today, through modern science and invention, we have achieved or are in the process of developing marvels of science and engineering that place us on the verge of a breakthrough to a world of peace, abundant living for all, happiness, and indeed the existence that has been the hope of all preceding generations of man.

On the other hand, that same progress, science, invention, technology has placed within the hands of men the opportunity for extinction of civilization and our society. When we split the atom we released either utopia or we released hell, and men are going to decide which.

As each great era is closed in civilization's progress, those who achieved great heights in the era became the pioneers in the new era. Note what I say. To date with all our progress we must realize that we are a primitive society in a new era that has just been born. And great is the challenge to mankind in this new era. We must recognize that previous concepts must be revised, previous world relations and attitudes must change, previous isolation of nations is dead, previous natural defenses have vanished. The sea was our moat, the mountains our protective fortresses, but missiles have conquered distance and previous defenses.

Yes, modern science, transportation and communication facilities have taken a huge world, in my lifetime, and whittled it down to a small neighborhood, and to a vulnerable neighborhood.

If this neighborhood is to endure the world cannot be half slave and half free. We live in a time when there are the greatest number of people in slavery in the history of the world, 76 million in satellite countries behind the Iron Curtain alone. One or the other of the two conflicting ideologies must triumph.

This is our generation's challenge as we enter a new era. As pioneers in a new era, we must recognize that the cold war is a war of survival. We must recognize that we are at the crossroads, that we are determining civilization's future. The one road leads to freedom and the utopia of civilization and the other back down, retrogressively, to slavery. A free world based on the dignity of man, or a slave world with man subjugated to the will of the state. Sovietism has declared its determination to conquer the world. Their interest in coexistence, you can be assured, is limited in time until they believe they have the power to conquer the world.

Certainly, America must maintain the military might and strength as a deterrent to attack, or even a belief that we can be conquered. This requires in us a strong will to be free, to sacrifice whatever may be necessary, to pay whatever taxes may be necessary, to do whatever may be necessary to maintain our strength.

In our America we are in danger of placing personal security above freedom. We must recognize, and train our youth to recognize, that true security only comes through freedom. We must place the protection of freedom even above the seeking of security, and this is essential.

For long-range thinking and planning, we must realize that we must demonstrate to the people of the world that the fruits of a democratic society to the individual are greatly superior to the fruits of the state-dictated dominated society. In other words, our democratic society, if to be accepted, must be worthy of emulation. We must educate people to recognize that promised Soviet security ends in slavery. Merely preaching democracy to starving people in less favored lands is not a solution. We must educate people to recognize that the world has been made a small neighborhood, and that our mission as the leader of the free world is to create and maintain conditions that will help all people to a more abundant life throughout the neighborhood. We must demonstrate in a manner that can be understood by the peoples of the world that the democratic way is the way to human rights and freedom from fear of starvation, fear of persecution, fear of economic slavery.

Let us look at the human problems. There are today 2,790 million people in the world, and 1½ billion of them have inadequate food, clothing, and medical care. These people are stirring and they are seeking relief from want, and disease, and just the phrase "democracy" is not going to satisfy them. Which way shall the subjugated, underdeveloped, and uncommitted nations turn? Which way will they accept? The free way or communism, self-government, or promised benevolent dictatorship. What we demonstrate here in America will be a powerful influence.

What must we do? We must convince all people of our sincere determination to help create a world in which all people will be free, free from fear, free from hunger, disease, free from persecution, and with guaranteed human rights. We must encourage a world economy that will conquer poverty. We must have a will to better use our surpluses.

We must demonstrate to the world democracy's ability to solve fairly our problems of management and labor, not by government control, because that is the Socialist state, but by a united concept of what is right and reasonable and in the interest of our economic order, the ultimate good of our people, and our industrial growth.

Then we must recognize that the world questions the results of our democracy with our record of juvenile crime and delinquency. We know that it stems largely from broken or unstable homes, that correction lies basically in strengthening the home life of America. Here our Cub Scout program comes in and we must do more to get father, mother, and son living together, working together, playing together, stabilizing the American home.

We must utilize our revelations of science, engineering, chemistry for the good of the world, realizing that peaceful living can be achieved by world cooperation and sharing our know-how as well as our other resources. Atomic and nuclear energy must be channeled into worldwide constructive use. Our progress must be the world's progress or else there will be world chaos.

We must create a deeply spiritual world. Our Nation must be motivated by a deep spiritual resolution; intolerance must be eliminated. We must demonstrate a service

to all mankind. We must, under God, accept the injunction to be our brothers's keeper. We cannot be strong unless we are spiritually dynamic.

As I have given you this panorama of my ideas of the needs of the world, you may say it is a dream or it is a vision. I say it is the only way to exist in a world neighborhood. But if I were asked for a brief, concise statement of what is needed to achieve these things of which I speak, I would say a nation of character with citizens dedicated to freedom, under God, for all people. My friends, therein lies Scouting's challenge. We have had a glorious and successful 50 years. The next decades are the most challenging to our Nation. History of the greatest importance will be made; destiny will be determined.

We are preparing our youth today for vital participation as adult citizens in the affairs of our Nation in an era approximately 25 years from now. What do the experts predict America will be like at that time, in those things that relate to our movement?

The U.S. population will be 250 million with 6 million babies being born each year. We can look to a youthful Nation. It is believed that over 100 million of our population will be under 20 years of age. There will be 25 million boys of the ages that we serve, and if we do no better than we do now, God forbid, if we only reach 1 out of every 4 as we are doing now, we would have a membership of 6,250,000 boys alone.

Millions of people will work a 4-day week 25 years from now, 6 or 7 hours a day, and this leisure will be constructive or destructive. It will make or break America. We must challenge our people to use this leisure in training youth through Scouting. Outdoor living will thrive. A big problem will be our disappearing play space. Waterfront land along the ocean shores and lakes and rivers will be at a premium, if any is left. Here today is our challenge to plan, to acquire the facilities to meet youth needs in camping 25 years from now.

Incomes will be doubled, the dollar will be worth much less than today's dollar. Budget increases must provide for increased costs, including inflation. It is predicted there will be a trillion dollar economy, and in keeping with the trillion dollar ecenomy we must raise our sights, at least double our budgets and our staff and our program facilities in the next 25 years.

Then because we are a world neighborhood, we must recognize what we are doing today in international Scouting is but scratching the surface, and our America, with all of its resources, must do everything in its power to help the free nations of the world train their youth so that the entire free neighborhood will have an understanding of the fundamental principles that go toward making good character and toward the salvation of mankind.

What do we have to do? We need renewed dedication, certainly we must leave here recognizing the peril of the times. W must leave here recognizing that Scouting is more than a good thing, it is an essential thing. Leave here recognizing that Scouting is a game and must always be a game for boys, but it must be deadly serious business for us, training the youth of America and the world.

We must go from here determined to strengthen our district organizations and strengthen our councils, to have more adequate budgets and more adequate staff to meet this need. We must go forth determined to have our activities geared to the fundamental purpose of developing character and the kind of citizens that the world needs, who will accept the challenge of a new era.

Above all, we need a personal dedication. There is a story that I like about Babe Ruth. I used to play a little baseball when I was younger, and I have always been a baseball fan, and I admired Babe Ruth. One day Babe Ruth heard that a boy was seriously ill in the hospital and had asked to see him. So before the game he rushed to the hospital. They took him into the boy's room, and the boy was almost overcome when he saw Babe Ruth. Then after they talked a while, he said, "Son, is there anything I can do for you?" The boy answered "Yes, knock me a home run today, knock me a home run today." Babe Ruth went out to the park and each time he got up he tried and failed, and at his last time at bat, and he turned to the boys in the dugout and said, "You guys, I'm going to knock this one." And he went up there and knocked the ball clean out of the park. The person from whom I heard this story said that they never saw such a smile on Babe Ruth's face as he came in from third to home, having knocked the home run for that boy. He dedicated himself to something in the interest of a boy.

I say to you what you do for a boy you do for America. We have to see to it that they do get the program that they need.

I like parades, and I am going to close with one. Here they come, can you see them, the boys of America. Fifteen million today, each year increasing and within 25 years to 25 million. The bands are playing and the boys are marching. Where are they marching? They are marching through out adult world. Where are they going? They are going to build the America of tomorrow. What are they going to build it with? The only materials they will use in building the world of tomorrow are those that we make attractive for them to use and in which we have given them justified confidence.

You and I have a thrilling opportunity, a great responsibility. We are God's investment in the day in which we live. What we do determines life's dividends. God grant that each and every one of you will get the satisfaction that comes through achievement in doing the will of God. The will of God is to make a world of peace and happiness. A way of creating that world is through the training of youth.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Radio Station WIND, Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, apparently Soviet Premier Khrushchev is engaging in a kind of crazy, mixed-up pattern of troublemaking around the world. To paraphrase what Prime Minister Macmillan recently said in his letter to the Soviet Premier, "It's difficult to understand—or find any logic in—the capricious but dangerous way Mr. K. is meddling in world affairs."

Despite the fact that the United States is undergoing a political campaign it should be made clear—as Secretary Herter has done—that this does not create an open season for Communist troublemaking and aggression.

Recently I was privileged to review Khrushchev's seemingly schizophrenic policies in a broadcast over radio station WIND, Chicago. The program included in addition some of the major issues confronting our country. I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the address printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY OVER RADIO STATION WIND, CHICAGO

Even though there is an upcoming political campaign in the United States, we should make it clear to Mr. Khrushchev and other world Communists that:

We are alert—not asleep;

We shall continue to vigorously support those fundamental policies that will improve the outlook for peace;

We will strongly oppose Communist efforts at expansion.

We, as Americans, need to keep our heads. During the upcoming campaign, there will be charges and countercharges. However, both political parties—Republican and Democratic—and their candidates have a great responsibility for presenting the real issues; for not distorting our Nation's accomplishments or its purposes; for underwriting a strong program for world peace; and for resolutely, clearly and realistically blueprinting future plans for security, progress and a better life for our people.

Along with Lincoln—whose ascendency to the Presidency 100 years ago we now celebrate—I have great faith in the people—in their God-given intelligence and ability to find the right answers in these challenging times.

IN-BETWEEN STATE OF AFFAIRS

As American citizens, we now find ourselves in an in-between state of affairs.

The political conventions—Democratic and Republican—have just concluded.

Congress reopens in about a week for a final session that promises plenty of "hot battles."

The campaign for the elections of 1960—of which there have already been "skirmishes"—promises to mount higher in intensity, as we approach the November elections.

Abroad, too, we—and the free world—face the current cycles of unpredictable, chaotic, unprincipled actions by the Communists—as they disrupt efforts to promote peace, attempt to confuse us, distort our purposes by worldwide propaganda, and utilize any and all techniques—however reprehensible—to attempt to attain their ultimate purpose of world domination.

Despite the campaign barrages at home—and the wild, unpredictable Communist antics abroad—I am confident that you, the citizens of this great country, will be able to keep your feet on the ground. In fact, our survival depends upon it.

REVIEW OF MAJOR ISSUES OF 1960 POLITICAL CAMPAIGN

First, let's take a look at the upcoming political battles. Briefly, I would like to review some of the major challenges.

Maintaining the peace

1. The No. 1 issue is: Maintaining the peace. Among other things, this includes:

Further strengthening our defenses,

Continuing efforts to reach safeguarded agreements to reduce East-West tensions, including reducing world armaments, and cessation of nuclear tests,

A creative counterattack to the Communist ideological-propaganda offensive.

Cooperation to carry forward with our allies constructive, realistic programs for common defense and—particularly to progress and provide a better life for folks in the less developed areas of the world.

Effectively resolve problems arising out of differing economic, social, and political views among the free nations themselves—without "unsettling rifts" in our relationships.

Further strengthening our economy

2. We must maintain and further strengthen the economy at home. This involves: Encouragement of a sound money policy to stimulate growth and expansion of our free enterprise system and halt inflation; the surplus of over $1 billion for fiscal year 1960—like the dramatic "slowdown" of inflation—illustrates that it can be done. Encourage full employment—now at an alltime high of 68.6 million; also we must wipe out remaining pockets of unemployment. Further brighten the outlook for job-creating free enterprise—95 percent of which are small businesses, through appropriate modification of the tax laws; effective employment of the antitrust laws; and similar actions. Further expand our housing program—to provide new and better homes, apartments, and other types of housing for more Americans. Carry on constructive conservation of our natural resources; and other measures.

Programs for human progress

3. As our times are new, we must also adopt new programs for preservation of human rights and promoting human progress. In an economically healthy country, we should—and must—create ever greater opportunity for our people in all walks of life. This includes: Assuring opportunity for workers to engage—and succeed—in a chosen vocation; providing necessary care—as well as opportunity to continue to contribute to community and national life—for our aging folks; establishing more creative youth-development programs; expanding our educational opportunities for the increasing students of school age, as well as for adult education; assuring protection—and opportunity to exercise constitutional rights for all citizens.

These, of course, are only highlights of complex fields in which we need to keep moving forward with our fast-advancing times.

Analysis of Khrushchev's schizophrenic policies

Now, let's take a look around the world. We recognize, of course, that peace and security are necessary—in fact, essential to survival—in this nuclear-missile age. Any consideration of the outlook for peace, and threats to our security, almost magnetically focus upon the Communists—the major troublemakers and threats to peace.

Regrettably, we continue to witness sequences of erratic, contradictory, illogical action by Khrushchev and the Soviet Government. Currently, efforts are being made to analyze the motivations behind such on-and-off, hot-and-cold, alternative "missile-threats and sweet-talk" policies. For one who looks for logic, adherence to reason and principles, respect for national order and law, and desire for peace, however, the utterings and actions of Khrushchev almost defy interpretation.

Recently, Prime Minister Macmillan, of Great Britain, wrote to Premier Khrushchev, saying, "I simply do not understand what your purpose is today."

There is one theory—which, recently, has appeared to "shed some light" on Mr. Khrushchev's seemingly schizophrenic policies: A number of years ago, a Russian scientist named Pavlov—by experimentation—discovered that if one dealt consistently in an inconsistent way with animals, the result was confusion and hysteria. In practice, he would alternately "pat them"—then "kick them"—for the same thing.

Apparently, Khrushchev is adopting a similar theory in his world policy. However, I believe we should not—and must not—be fooled by his Pavlovian tactics.

SETTING THE COMMUNIST RECORD "STRAIGHT"

To better deal with these contradictory policies, we—and the world—need to do a little "skywriting"—nationally and internationally—to more clearly distinguish the great differences between the Soviets' "word and deed." Let me cite a few examples: (1) Since World War II, the Soviets—seemingly in good faith—entered into over 40 top-level agreements with the United States. As it served their purposes, however, they flagrantly have broken over 37 of these treaties. (2) Contradictorily, the Soviet Premier preaches against imperialism outside the Iron and Bamboo Curtains; meanwhile the Communist blocs are building within their orbits—and attempting to extend—a great Colonial Empire. (3) Indulging in wild—and many times refutable—accusations against the United States and the West, for espionage, the Sino-Soviet bloc has created the greatest international conspiratorial, criminal-type ring of espionage and subversion known in world history. (4) Under guise of creating a "classless society," communism—in practice—has created a new, privileged class, both in China and the Soviet Union. Although the Communists number only about 2–4 percent in Red China, and 4–6 percent of the population in the Soviet Union, they, as a new, privileged class, "get the plums," dominate and enrich themselves in power and wealth at the expense of the common people of their countries; as well, they "siphon off" the wealth, manpower and national resources of the countries they dominate. (5) Under the ruse of the oft-repeated "peaceful, or competitive coexistence," the Communists are carrying on—on a warlike schedule—espionage, sabotage, subversion and other penetrations of the free world. Among free people, the idea of coexistence, historically, has been considered an inherent right of all nations.

For the Communists, however, this does represent a deviation from the old, Leninist line—still adhered to by Red China—that there must ultimately be a war between the capitalist and Communist nations.

Fundamentally, this is one of the reasons for the recent "spat" between Moscow and Peiping. Still in the first stages of communism—Red China finds it convenient, perhaps to a large degree for internal, propaganda consumption—to advocate war, for ultimate conquest of the world by communism.

Even though Mr. K., however, professes adherence to the concept of peaceful coexistence, his alley-brawl tactics—translated into Soviet policies on the international level—include anything—right or wrong, legal or illegal—if it will forward the Communist efforts toward domination of the world.

CONCLUSION

In the days ahead, we must set Mr. K. straight. By this I mean: We should make it evident that as always we shall continuously be ready and willing—regardless of an election—to protect the ramparts of freedom.

Air-Spray Program May Help Ranchers Win Brush Battle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have been working for many years to find some means to put the unproductive brush lands of the Ozarks to profitable use. Small scale experimentation with aerial spraying in recent years has indicated that much of the land in this region now covered by scrub timber can be returned to native range grasses and support profitable cattle operations. Much of the land is also suitable for the raising of commercial timber. A research project being conducted by the Forest Service Experiment Station at Harrison, Ark., is designed to find the answers to many of the questions which remain unanswered about the possibilities and effects of brush control work. Unfortunately, this project is handicapped by lack of sufficient funds to proceed at the optimum level of research. I hope that through greater public attention to the possibilities of brush control that the Department of Agriculture can be influenced to expand this important research work.

A recent article in the Arkansas Gazette reports results of the largest aerial chemical brush control job ever carried out in the United States without assistance through the ACP program. I know that Members of Congress from States which contain large areas of scrub timber will be interested in reading this report. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR-SPRAY PROGRAM MAY HELP RANCHERS WIN BRUSH BATTLE

(By Leland DuVall)

The airplane has forced strategists to rewrite all the rules of warfare—including the rancher's battle with the brush. Any cattleman who has tried to defend his pasture against an invasion by underbrush and scrub timber knows it can be a frustrating and expensive operation.

Paul Downs, who owns 23,000 acres of scrub timber and native grassland in Sharp County, has used a wide variety of weapons against the brush. Hurlon C. Ray, of Fayetteville, range conservationist with the U.S. Soil Conservation Service said Downs was using an air-spray control program which, he hoped, would permit a return of native grasses to the land.

Chemical brush control is a controversial practice, but indications are that it is becoming more widely accepted each year. Much of the disagreement has been centered in the agricultural agencies where experts often disagree over the merits of the system.

In several States, the agricultural stabilization and conservation committees have accepted chemical brush control as an approved practice in the agricultural ocnservation program handbook. This means that farmers who use the practice can qualify for cost-sharing payments from the Government.

So far, Arkansas has steered away from general acceptance of the practice as part of the ACP schedule, but it has been approved for some counties on an experimental basis.

Downs is definitely in the big operator class. He has owned ranches in Florida, Louisiana, Texas, South Dakota, and Mexico and still has ranches in South Dakota and Mexico in addition to his Arkansas land. He also grows cotton in east Arkansas.

Downs moved one of his cattle operations in Arkansas in 1952. In common with most newcomers, he found that conditions in Arkansas were different from those in other parts of the country. Because of brush, which gradually crept into the pastureland, some of the fields lost much of their cattle-carrying capacity. He tried a variety of

brush-clearing machines, including bulldozers, and found them slow and expensive.

Last year he called in SCS technicians and Hall's Aero Spraying Service of Clarksville for a 600-acre test of the effectiveness of chemicals. The spray work was done in June and the cattle were kept off the land during the summer in order to determine the results and give the native grasses a chance to grow.

About Thanksgiving 90 head of steers were turned in on the 600 acres of treated land. The native grasses had made enough growth during the summer to enable Downs to winter the herd on the land without feeding hay, Ray said. He used only cottonseed meal, as a protein source, and salt.

Downs inspected the herd and the range in March and decided to expand the project. He and Herbert Wilson, the ranch foreman, selected an additional 6,000 acres for treatment this year. Downs bought an airplane, hired Gene Winey as pilot, and opened his attack on the brush. The operation started May 27 and was completed June 18.

The mixture included 2 pounds of 2,4,5–T acid and 4.5 gallons of diesel oil to the acre. All the work was done between 3 a.m. and 7 a.m. in order to make the most effective use of the chemicals.

The plan of operation on the ranch is developing as part of the total cattle-growing program. Downs plans to raise calves on his other ranch land then ship them to Sharp County to be finished for the market. He has estimated that the native grasses on the farm can carry 2,000 head of cattle and still leave a wide safety margin in case of drought. According to the plan, the cattle will be allowed to eat about half the grass that grows each year.

The outcome of the project should prove interesting to thousands of landowners in north Arkansas and in other parts of the State. Chemicals are being used widely for control of brush but each new project adds to the fund of knowledge.

In south Arkansas particularly, as well as in other parts of the Nation, chemicals are being used to kill hardwoods and release pine timber for more rapid growth. The chemicals are selective killers and, when used correctly, do not damage pine.

Senator FULBRIGHT has sought approval for additional research work to determine the most efficient brush control measures in the Ozark area. He estimated that about 3,500,000 acres of the forest land in north Arkansas was dense growths of stunted hardwoods that had little economic value and prevented the landowners from receiving a fair return on their investment.

Despite the fact that a considerable amount of research work has been done and chemical brush control has been used extensively on farms, on timberland owned by major lumber companies, and along railroad and utility rights of way, the practice still encounters a considerable amount of opposition.

The SCS has favored and promoted the program for many years and has sought to have it adopted as part of the ACP handbook. Recently, the University of Arkansas spokesmen have backed the method of brush control as an approved land management practice under certain conditions.

The U.S. Forest Service, on the other hand, has generally opposed wholesale spraying of brush land. The argument on this side of the question is that the practice creates a danger of erosion and could destroy the ability of the land to produce any kind of timber.

The arguments will probably continue for years but, in the end, the question will be settled by the economic success or failure of the method on farms and ranches similar to the Downs land in Sharp County.

Doing Business With the Russians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there has been a great deal of talk about increasing trade with the Soviet Union in the last year. It is a question in which some American firms have shown considerable interest. Many countries which have done business with the Soviet bloc, however, have found out, to their sorrow, that the products they thought they had profitably sold to the Russians came back home to roost; that is, the Russians have not hesitated to dump such commodities on the market to the detriment of another country's marketing arrangements, or to use machinery purchased from a foreign country to under-cut that country's own manufacturers. Pirating of goods produced under patents and trademarks in the free world is another favorite technique of Soviet businessmen.

The question of the advantages and disadvantages of trading with the Soviet Union is clearly a difficult one. Most businessmen will want to study all the possibilities very carefully before reaching any decision. One point of view is offered in the editorial "With the Kremlin Trade Is a One-Way Street," by J. Anthony Marcus, from the Saturday Evening Post. I ask unanimous consent that this piece be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH THE KREMLIN, TRADE IS A ONE-WAY STREET

(By J. Anthony Marcus)

A wholly owned branch of the Soviet foreign-trade monopoly, the Amtorg Trading Corp., has moved from "limited office space in an old loft building to the present site, where the offices occupy several floors in a new building," according to a New York Times announcement. This and several other recent events make it plain that the illusion of a profitable trade with Communist Russia is being revived. The recent announcement by the Department of Commerce that shipments to Russia of machinery and other hitherto prohibited articles are to be permitted is another symptom of the same illusion.

One of the first acts by the Soviet regime after seizing power in 1917 was the formation of the foreign-trade monopoly, which has waged economic war against the free world ever since. That war is now to be intensified. Later in the same year the Sovarkom—Council of People's Commissars—adopted a resolution signed by Lenin, Trotsky, Bunch-Bruyevich and Gorboonov, providing a special fund for Soviet representatives abroad to assist local Communists in their efforts to overthrow existing regimes—by all means, including trade.

The Department of Justice sues and prosecutes our own industrial and business corporations for antitrust violations, while Amtorg, under a New York State charter, can operate with impunity. Our corporations are forbidden by the antitrust laws to join forces to meet ruinous competition by this alien monopoly.

Unfortunately some businessmen of the free world seem eager to join the game. As Prof. Wilhelm Ropke observes in his new book, "A Humane Economy" (Regnery): "Moscow has no stancher allies in these designs than the Western businessmen * * * precisely the people who would be the first to be eliminated if communism were to win."

In a recent interview appearing in the magazine U.S.S.R., published by the Soviet embassy in Washington, Mikhail Nesterov, president of the U.S.S.R. Chamber of Commerce, strongly advocated increased trade relations with his country, pointing out that Russians are primarily interested in "industrial equipment, machinery, instruments and apparatuses which American manufacturers want to sell."

Were Mr. Nesterov speaking as representative of a free country with a genuine chamber of commerce consisting of independent businessmen, that would have been fine. But the Soviet Union respects no patent rights or trademarks. It buys samples from free countries, copies them for use in Soviet industry and exports the pirated imitations at ruinous prices to countries which have been buying from us and other nations of the free world.

Goods are sold abroad at any price where it will do the most good for world communization, and regardless of the need for them at home. Thus shiploads of Russian grain were sent to France and Italy shortly after the Second World War to bolster the local Communists in their effort to overthrow their governments, while famine was raging in many Russian areas. While offering to buy machinery and equipment from the United States, provided further credit is advanced—and the $800 million lend-lease debt presumably forgotten—the Kremlin is extending credits to Red China, neutralist India, Egypt's Nasser, Castro's Cuba and many other countries. In February Soviet chief monopolist Mikoyan agreed to ship to Cuba aluminum ingots and rolled aluminum, newsprint, sulfur, pig iron and rolled steel, fertilizer and many types of machinery. All of those items are in short supply within the Soviet Union.

The Soviet trade authorities recently granted an American automobile dealer the right to import and sell Soviet cars in the United States. While the Russian people trudge miles to and from work in subzero weather or blistering heat, their rulers are going to sell Soviet-made cars to Americans, fully supplied with motorcars. Surely our automobile manufacturers should be accorded an equal right to sell American cars in the Soviet Union. Needless to say, the Soviet monopolists would permit no such give and take.

Why shouldn't the Communist monopolists pursue an aggressive policy? They have found us a soft touch on so many occasions. In 1933 the late President Roosevelt entered into a treaty of recognition based, as all treaties are, on the principle of reciprocity. The Soviets agreed to abstain from propaganda here, but wasted no time in setting up Red cells in our very Government. During World War II we made necessary aid to the Soviet dictatorship a top priority, demanding no political conditions in return. A Red Eastern Europe is our reward. Therefore, if Mr. Khrushchev thinks he can invade our markets successfully and persuade us to send him complete textile plants, for example, to enable him to compete with our already-depressed textile industry and that of our allies, he has historical support for his great expectations.

This policy could have repercussions beyond the damage to important sections of

our economy. As C. L. Sulzberger reminded his readers in the New York Times recently, "There is no point in easing relationships with Russia at the risk of worsening relationships with our friends."

American Economic Development Without War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, many of us remember the dark days of depression in the 1930's—the long ranks of 8 million unemployed workers, the soup lines, the rock-bottom prices for our commodities. Bread sold for 5 cents a loaf—a sack of flour for 98 cents. Farm prices were so low that many farmers found it cheaper to burn their harvest of corn for fuel than to sell it for feed.

Then came World War II—and suddenly our production capacities all over the Nation were thrown into high gear. Gone were the relief measures and artificial projects created by the Government to alleviate the unemployment situation; American factories operated at top speed turning out orders for all types of goods—including armaments.

However, we all know that wars are not the way to develop the American economy. Aside from the humanitarian considerations, even though war cured the last major depression, its total effect on our country in the future would be disastrous. A thermonuclear war could literally extinguish civilization as we know it from the face of the earth. For example, not only is it estimated that the killing effect of the blast of a 20-megaton bomb dropped on one of our cities would extend for a radius of 5 miles—but, in addition, the radioactive fallout would blanket neighboring States for hundreds of miles.

Therefore, just as the solution to economic ills does not lie in war, neither can economic growth be forced through more and more inflationary Government spending, with its accompanying loose money policies. Such irresponsible fiscal methods would probably be the surest and most expeditious way of fulfilling Mr. Khrushchev's prediction that our grandchildren will live under a socialistic system.

Conversely, we know that our traditional American system of free enterprise has provided our people with the highest standard of living in the history of the world. The basis of our free enterprise system is formed by the voluntary accumulation of savings and the investment of those savings by individuals and financial institutions. Such increasing investment of savings makes us more productive, creates more jobs and paychecks, and raises the standard of living for all Americans. As has been so adequately stated:

The only effective way to accelerate economic growth is to increase the traditional strengths of our free economy—initiative and investment, productivity and efficiency.

Mr. President, recently there appeared in the August 8 issue of the U.S. News & World Report a fine editorial written by Mr. David Lawrence. Entitled "The Scare," in this article Mr. Lawrence has given a penetrating analysis of what he believes to be the underlying factors behind the uncertainty currently existing in American business. In the course of the editorial, Mr. Lawrence emphasizes how our free enterprise system has helped to make our country's economy the greatest in the world—providing our citizens with a wealth of the good things in life—and pointing out how that system must continue to be encouraged and perpetuated if we are to successfully prove to the rest of the world that our American way of granting freedom of opportunity to attain our personal goals and improve our economic status is far preferable to the Communist method of subjugation of the individual to the will of the State. I ask unanimous consent that David Lawrence's fine editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SCARE
(By David Lawrence)

Business is in an apprehensive mood. The stock market has been fluctuating widely. Profits of corporations in the second quarter have fallen sharply. Fear is in the air.

What is the cause of this psychological crisis? A turn in the economic trend is usually not due to just one factor but to the interrelation of several factors. Basically, however, the mood of the business world affects the expansion of existing plants or the halting of such programs.

For today there is great uncertainty. One reason is the deep concern over the international situation. Any day, it is felt, can bring a climax that could force wage and price controls by Government and a complete shift in our productive gears—from goods for private consumption to munitions of war.

The other factor, however, which is even more penetrating and more immediate in its impact, is domestic. Will there be a change in the national administration—a removal from office next January of all the high officials now intimately familiar with national and international affairs, and the introduction of a new set of officials who must spend precious months learning the ropes while our cold war enemies precipate crisis after crisis?

Do the people of this country, generally speaking, know what a change in administration really involves?

Businessmen already are beginning to fear a Democratic victory. They are being told that there are more Democratic than Republican voters in the country and that recent elections have been showing a tide running toward the Democrats.

Nor are businessmen wishful thinkers. They are realists. If they become convinced there is going to be a change, they will adjust accordingly. They will postpone plans for new activities which otherwise would mean the creation of more and more job opportunities. They will wait to see which way the new administration will go—toward socialism, as the New Deal did, or toward the maintenance of the private-enterprise system which has helped America to become so powerful in the economic world.

This system can be made to work only if there is a sense of responsibility on all sides. Management has been steadily giving in to demands for wage increases, not only to avoid strikes but to help sustain purchasing power. These objectives, however, have come into conflict with a tendency to let inflation go unrestrained. The Eisenhower administration has succeeded in bringing a measure of stability to the dollar. But now comes again the threat of New Dealism and socialism and more and more inflation through more and more Government spending.

Sure, inflation for a little while gives the appearance of prosperity and tends to send the stock market up. But American businessmen can see beneath the surface. They know that the coming election could mean another era of New Dealism, which was the most colossal failure, in an economic sense, the country has ever experienced. Relief measures and artificial projects were necessary, to be sure, as they always are in a depression. But the indifference exhibited for 8 long years toward the production of heavy goods kept unemployment at the 8 million mark. This condition was not relieved until World War II gave American factories orders for heavy goods. Wars are not the way to develop the American economy.

The Republican platform adopted at Chicago states the case succinctly:

"We therefore accord high priority to vigorous economic growth and recognize that its mainspring lies in the private sector of the economy. We must continue to foster a healthy climate in that sector. We reject the concept of artificial growth forced by massive new Federal spending and loose money policies. The only effective way to accelerate economic growth is to increase the traditional strengths of our free economy—initiative and investment, productivity and efficiency."

Messrs. KENNEDY and JOHNSON are committed by their platform to more and more spending of Federal funds without regard to the impact this can have on the private enterprise system.

Messrs. NIXON and Lodge are committed by their platform to the free enterprise system, with a minimum of Government intervention in the economic life of the Nation.

The American people are asked to choose between these two doctrines. Small wonder businessmen hesitate and worry over whether there is to be an epochal change in the United States from a system of private enterprise to a system of state socialism. Shall Nikita Khrushchev's prophecy that our grandchildren will live under a socialistic system be fulfilled?

We are at the crossroads this autumn as we face a choice between two fundamentally different philosophies of government. That's the reason for the scare today.

My True Security—The American Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I would like to call attention to a prize-winning essay that recently won third place in the second annual My True Security—the American Way program sponsored jointly each year by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co.,

Newark, N.J. This essay was written by a young lady from Philadelphia, Miss Jacqueline Schulgen. The purpose of the contest is to promote initiative and self-reliance among the youth of America.

In this contest, a winner is chosen from each State and then the three national winners are honored at the annual awards banquet held here in Washington, D.C. This appears to be a wonderful program for the youth of this country, and accordingly, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this prize-winning essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MY TRUE SECURITY—THE AMERICAN WAY

When God made the oyster, he guaranteed him absolute economic and social security. He built the oyster a house, a shell, to protect him from his enemies. When hungry, the oyster simply opens his shell and food rushes in to him.

But, when God made the eagle, He said, "The blue sky is the limit. Go, build your house." And the eagle built it on the highest mountain crag, where storms threaten him every day. For food, he flies through miles of rain, and snow, and wind. He, not the oyster, is the emblem of America. This narrative serves to illustrate the very basis of our American way of living. No one is given a protective shell, but everyone is given the opportunity to build his own life. What is security? To the father of a family, it may mean financial surety; to the nun, the peaceful solitude of prayer; to the child, the nearness of loved ones. Security, therefore, depends upon an inner feeling of confidence evoked by such qualities as self-reliance, in making one's way; initiative, in seeking avenues in which one may function; perspective, in seeing things in their true value. Security is achieved when one nourishes these inner feelings and develops them fully. Sometimes nature has a way of testing us to see if we possess these inner qualities. Let me tell you a true story about a 17-year-old girl who found a large measure of security.

It was a wet, cold April night. The phone in the doctor's office began to ring. His part-time assistant, Jane, hurried to answer its summons. "Doctor's office." "May I speak to Jane Jones?" "Speaking." "I am very sorry, but your mother just died of a heart attack."

Jane hung up the phone and gazed blankly at the wall in front of her. This was the loneliest moment of her life. Where could she turn? Her mother had been all she had in the world. There were no other relatives to rely upon. Now she was left entirely on her own. This was the crossroads in her life. She had two choices: to succumb to sorrow, or to build a future for herself. Because Jane wanted to graduate from high school, she had a goal, a goal which her mother had not attained, but which she had taught her daughter to cherish. After graduation, she would enter a school of nursing. She chose to fight the storms, and like the eagle, build her own house and security.

Through the aid of friends, she found a comfortable room in a girl's hotel. Her part-time job enabled her to support herself. Her chief concern was making decisions about her budget, about dating and about what was right or wrong. For the most part, she solved these problems by following the pattern and standards set by her mother. At this point in her life, she is still striving for security. Her true security lies in achieving her goal of becoming a nurse. Gradually, she is advancing toward that goal, and somehow, the long hours of study, and work at the office seem purposeful. When she takes stock of what she has accomplished, she expriences a feeling of satisfaction, and is even more eager to forge ahead toward the desired end. I know, because I am that girl.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to say that I am particularly proud of the fact that the third-place winner of this national contest comes from my own State of Pennsylvania. I also feel that both the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce and the Mutual Benefit Life Insurance Co., Newark, N.J., are to be congratulated on having the welfare and interest of the youth of this country at heart. I congratulate them both.

Celebration of Swiss Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on August 1 the citizens of that great and free friend of the United States—Switzerland—celebrate their national Day of Independence. This small country can commemorate a longer period of democracy and independence than any other nation in the world.

In the year 1291 the independence of Germanic Europe was threatened by the rise of the Hapsburg dynasty. The strength and might of this new monarchy were overpowering. Yet three small communities, the forest cantons of Uri, Shwyz, and Unterwalden all a part of present-day Switzerland, chose to fight rather than lose their freedoms. Thus, on that historic August 1 so long ago, the freemen of these valley communities took a solemn oath of brotherhood. Here was formed the "Everlasting League" that was to become the foundation for the Swiss Confederation that exists today. While barbarism still ruled most of the world, while Mongol hordes still ravaged much of Asia and Europe, these valiant men pledged mutual defense against tyranny, the peaceful arbitration of disputes, and the establishment of formal processes of law.

This is the great heritage which has never been forgotten by the Swiss people. Indeed, through the centuries since then other free and courageous men like William Tell have helped to keep this tradition ever shining and bright.

Through those centuries this small nation has demonstrated the possibility of a multinational state; for it has successfully combined under a free and democratic government three major cultural and lingual peoples—French, German, and Italian Swiss.

Here in America, we have been greatly benefited by the contributions made by the descendants of these free Swiss. Swiss-Americans have helped to insure our American freedoms from the Revolutionary War to Korea. Men like Albert Gallatin, Jean-Louis Agassiz, John Sutler, Louis Chevrolet, to name but a few, have left their indelible mark on our land.

Thus, we join wholeheartedly with the Swiss in recognition of the unquenchable beacon of freedom which they have held aloft to light the whole world.

May the mountain valleys of that beautiful land never again echo to the march of tyrants; and may the Swiss forever celebrate in their daily free lives that Day of Independence.

Salute to Port Washington, Wis., on Its 125th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, across the Nation, progress in stalwart, "solid" grassroots communities continues to provide the foundation upon which to move forward to meet the challenges of the future.

We recognize, of course, that progress—nationally, as well as in each community—depends upon our resources, the successful working of our free system, and, above all, upon creative, ingenious citizens.

At this time, I would like to pay tribute to a splendid community, Port Washington, Wis., which recently celebrated its 125th anniversary.

This historic city, in Ozaukee County, Wis., is making a significant contribution, not only to a better life for its people, but to our whole economy.

Recently, the Ozaukee Press published a salute to Port Washington, on its 125th anniversary. The special articles review the historical progress of the "City on Seven Hills."

Included in the review of progress of Port Washington, the Press printed a splendid thesis by Sister Mary Jane Frances Price, a teacher at St. Mary's School, in Port Washington.

Regrettably, it is not possible—at this time—to present the whole story. However, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts from the articles—symbolizing the struggle of growth and development of communities throughout the country—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORT WASHINGTON IN THE 20TH CENTURY

The present city of Port Washington covers an area of 908 acres, or about 1.4 square miles. The early spirit of "busy-ness" is still a characteristic of its people; they are industrious, capable, with a tenacity of purpose which pushes to a successful conclusion any enterprise they undertake. Along the lake front they have platted a Sauk Creek

recreation area and farther to the north the winding road of Lake Bluff Park entices many a tourist to stop in admiration of the glorious view of lake and hilly shoreline. Music still has its place in the lives of its people and the Port Washington band gives its weekly concerts throughout the summer months in the new shell at the foot of Lake Bluff Park.

MODERN INDUSTRY

Although this section of the country is essentially agricultural, the little city is intensely industrial for its size. The early flour and grist mills run by waterpower ranked first in production output in the eighties; lumber and timber exports superseded the flour and grist mill production in the nineties, only to make way for butter, cheese, and condensed milk in the 20th century. Fully 80 percent of Port Washington's income comes from dairy products. In the city itself factories produce chairs, office equipment, bent woodwork, rubber goods, clothing, and machinery. The Wisconsin Chair Factory employs about one-half of the town's workers and is the city's largest taxpayer. The relationship between employer and employee at the factory has always been harmonious. An incident which occurred during the rich man's panic of 1907, is indicative of the confidence with which the city regards the chair factory as a vital part of its industrial life. During the 1907 panic, specie was scarce, so the company's checks, made out in small denominations, circulated as money in the city.

Next in size, and the city's second largest taxpayer, is the Gilson Manufacturing Co.—now the Bolens Product Co.—which employs about 200 workers.

The Wisconsin Electric Power Co. maintains that its Port Washington plant is the most efficient steam powerplant in the world. Work on this project was begun May 26, 1930 and the task of removing part of a 100-foot bluff, widening the harbor, building a large coal dock, placing building foundations of concrete, erecting the buildings, constructing tunnels, and installing the equipment was done within 1 year's time at a cost of about $7,500,000.

COMMERCIAL FISHING

At dawn of each day, steel tugs and power launches sail out of the mouth of the artificial harbor and head north toward Sheboygan. In rough weather or in calm, hardy fishermen, clad in their oilskins and rubber boots, go out to gather their harvest of the deep. Six hundred pounds of trout and chubs constitute a fair day's catch. The gill nets used daily by the Port Washington fishermen would span the lake from shore to shore. Whitefish, trout, chubs, herring, carp, perch, suckers, and burbots (lawyers), are caught in the gill nets; an average day's catch totals about 800 pounds although some days the catch may be as large as 2,500 pounds.

The names of the town's financiers have gone out beyond the boundaries of city and State, carrying with them the name of the city on the lake. In the industrial markets of the country the names of O. E. Moeser, president of the Wisconsin Chair Factory; of H. W. Bolens, president of the Bolens Production Co.; of D. H. Smith, president of Smith Bros.; and of several other of the town's industrial leaders have gained not only the personal respect and recognition they have earned, but have made known the name of the city of Port Washington, Wis.

The Literary Chip Basket, the Zeitung, the See Bote have now been replaced by the Ozaukee Press, the Port Washington Pilot, and the Port Washington Herald, published weekly in the city by young, enterprising newspapermen.

The shoreline Indian trail from Milwaukee to Green Bay has developed into Federal Highway No. 141; the Dekora Road now stretches out into a well-paved State Highway No. 33, meeting a maze of other Federal, State, and county highways. The American born sons and daughters of the early settlers drive in comfort over the ghost trails and plank roads of a century ago. The Chicago, Northwestern Railroad, the Milwaukee Electric Railway & Transport Co., and a bus line furnish ample transportation facilities to Sheboygan and to Milwaukee.

SCENIC BEAUTIES

There is a quaint old worldliness about the lovely little city. The buildings of St. Mary's Catholic Church and school on North Bluff seem to dominate the entire site. To the west, another hill, separated from North Bluff by the valley of Franklin Street, is crowned by another but smaller church, the Lutheran. Old Port Washington, the business section of the city, lies in the cupped hollow formed by the bluffs. Here the courthouse—its grey stone solidity reminiscent of the old guild halls—raises its eagle-crowned spire high above the treetops. The roofs of neatly painted homes show reds, blues, and greens through the leafiness of tree-covered bluffs and hills where houses cling tightly to the steep hillsides. Behind the bluffs to the north and to the west, are the new homes, simple and beautiful, surrounded by well-kept lawns and flower beds, and shaded by lovely old trees. The new residential section is typically 20th century suburban America.

At the northwest end of the city one of the most modern and beautiful hospitals of the State has been erected. St. Alphonsus Hospital, in charge of the Sisters of the Sorrowful Mother, has a 70-bed and 12-bassinet capacity. Its 12 acres, the excavating and landscaping of the attractive boulevard approach, were contributed by the city. Port Washington had long wanted a hospital, so when, in 1941, this dream became a reality, its citizens stamped "our own and one of the best" on another of their acquisitions.

TODAY'S HARBOR

The town may not have come up to the expectations of Wooster Harrison, for its harbor has become merely a refueling stop for Great Lakes steamers and a port for a welter of fishing tugs. Seamen call it a fair weather harbor, for whenever a storm threatens, fishermen and shippers still rush the boats out into the lake to keep them from being dashed to pieces against the concrete breakwaters. If it is not the most thriving of cities, it is a city in one of the most beautiful of nature's settings. Harrison's hopes and dreams live on in a modern comprehensive city plan, which has been worked out by the city planning commission of 1939. This worthwhile study maps out possibilities that deserve the earnest consideration and cooperation of the people of Port Washington. As Rome was not built in a day so time and zealous effort may once more develop a great city built on seven hills.

Many of Port Washington's citizens may not want to see the town grow into a large industrial center; too much enterprise and bustle might rob it of its beautiful residential section or push back the homes from the rugged beauty of the shoreline. It is a home city, not an industrial center in spite of its industries; these are just enough to supply interest and employment for the nonfarming groups, and to make possible the slogan, "No city taxes."

One may turn from the smokestacks of the powerplant and the chair factory to the still wild bluffs and gullies, to the quiet pasturelands to the north, west, and south of the city, or out across the wide blue expanse of Lake Michigan—all part of the panorama viewed from the hilltops of the city of Port Washington, Wis.

Plans and Methods of the Urban Progress Association and Downtown Little Rock, Ark., Unlimited

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the progressive business leaders of Little Rock, Ark., have been making a major effort to insure that Little Rock will be in an advantageous position to meet the business needs of a metropolitan area in years to come. Two groups have been formed to insure that Little Rock will be in a position to meet the demands which will be imposed on the urban community of tomorrow. A recent article appeared in the Arkansas Gazette which discusses the plans and methods of the Urban Progress Association and Downtown Little Rock Unlimited. The efforts of these two forward-looking organizations could serve as a model for cities throughout the country which face problems similar to those in Little Rock. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, July 17, 1960]

TWO GROUPS PROMOTE PLAN TO OVERCOME DOWNTOWN APATHY

(By John L. Fletcher)

Dusk settled over the city on January 16, 1960.

The roar of traffic, which had been outshouted by the noises of actual, visible progress—the grumble of machinery, the rat-tat-tat of air hammers and the clangor of municipal construction and planned improvements—had quieted down for the night.

Tradesmen locked their doors and counted the receipts for the week ending that day. Sales for the period turned out to be 13 percent higher than for the corresponding week of 1959.

The increase was considered particularly robust since the volume for the week ending January 9, 1960, had been 20 percent less than that of a year earlier.

The occasion: The second million dollar clearance promotion in the little more than a year since a group of 160 businessmen teamed up to lead Little Rock out of the wilderness.

The first such event, conducted during the week of August 1, 1959, had resulted in sales 16 percent greater than in the similar 1958 week.

For purposes of this chronicle, it is significant to know that Little Rock's increase in department store sales during both of those periods was tops in the entire Eighth Federal Reserve District, which embraces such cities as St. Louis, Louisville, Ky., and Memphis.

These two episodes were important, of course. But they were singled out only as symbols—something new and inspiring in the wake of an era of complacency that had gripped Main Street so long.

Many other bright examples could be cited. Since these business leaders persuaded the community to shuck its timidity (time was when some merchants were self-conscious in the presence of competitors), 10 major co-

operative promotions have sent sales scooting as much as 18 percent above the like year-ago weeks.

Among these occasions: Holiday Watercade, free babysitting movies, Air Base Appreciation Day, Christmas and Easter observances, and First-Saturday-after-the-first-of-the-month sales—all in a period of 13 months.

Each proved how readily the people react to good advertising.

Behind this new deal in Little Rock is a two-pronged offensive which sort of grew up behind the scenes. The 160 businessmen can put their fingers on one prong, but the other one is an accumulation of intangibles which are of wider scope but which may not be counted immediately.

The first—an organization named Downtown Little Rock Unlimited—can be measured because its primary job is to stimulate trade and keep the traffic of people moving into the central business district. It stands or falls on results. As Raymond Rebsamen once said when asked how a man could keep track of so many business ventures without holding office in any of them, members of this group "can read a financial statement."

The second—Urban Progress Association—was formed to promote the physical redevelopment of the city before it decays into slums.

(This is a good point to mention possibilities of decay: A representative of Urban Progress just came back from Akron, Ohio, and Beaumont, Tex., neither of which is thought to be suffering from stagnancy. Yet he counted 64 vacant stores in downtown Akron. He said he was told by the chamber of commerce at Beaumont that 52 business buildings were unoccupied along seven of that city's downtown streets. In comparison, Little Rock's Main Street has only three vacancies—the former quarters of Penney's, the old Kinney Shoe Store at Third and Main and the Ritz Theater space at Second and Main.)

Urban Progress got off the ground when Metroplan began its chain of achievements in 1955. It received impetus when the Arkansas chapter of the American Institute of Architects created the Main Street, 1969, idea and thereby fired the imagination of the man in the street.

Sidetracked by the 1957 school troubles, those 160 businessmen finally chartered Urban Progress and went to work in April 1959. Another organization had been formed—Downtown Little Rock Unlimited, whose goals were of shorter range. Since both groups drew strength from the same business interests, a single membership campaign was conducted. (Downtown Little Rock Unlimited handles the budget details and screening of applicants.)

What is Urban Progress all about? The primary target was to promote a study of the downtown area, which now has resulted in the 490-acre, $14,300,000 central Little Rock urban renewal project, now in the advanced planning stage. This is the core of the city—bounded roughly by the Arkansas River on the north, Roosevelt Road on the South, the capitol on the west and the freeway on the east.

At stake are the business, industrial, residential and public uses of this big district. One main objective is to grow like such cities as Memphis, Atlanta, and Dallas, but to avoid the helter-skelter development of land wherever the builder can find it available. Urban progress leadership warns that unplanned construction of buildings could create community traffic problems requiring new streets and expressways and connectors, and new taxes to pay for them.

Urban Progress is not, in itself, the agency designed to renew Little Rock or even to plan for the renewal. For these functions, the city has Metroplan, the Little Rock housing authority, city board of directors, planning commission, Downtown Little Rock Unlimited, Pulaski County Citizens Council, chambers of commerce.

You might put it this way: The businessmen who formed Urban Progress and contribute to it are helping to make easier the jobs of these other organizations. They are trying to create understanding and support for the city's total $42 million urban renewal and rehabilitation program in eight big areas.

All of the things must stand out sharply in a community of 100,000 or so when it is in daily competition with such cities as St. Louis, Memphis, Kansas City, Dallas, New Orleans, and Oklahoma City for people, trade and industry.

Leading these two stalwart business groups are the officers—Raymond Rebsamen, Sam Strauss, Jr., Arthur Phillips, James Williamson, Dowell Naylor, Jr., Jack East, Jr., Jack Hawkins, and William McLean.

In the background, seeing that the main objectives are carried out successfully, are two capable and hard-driving former newspapermen—Jason Rouby, assistant to the president of Urban Progress, and W. A. Hawkins, managing director of Downtown Little Rock Unlimited.

Commemoration of Captive Nations Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, during the recent recess of the Congress there occurred the nationwide observance of Captive Nations Week, in the period July 17 to July 23. It was my high privilege to cosponsor in the Senate the legislation which authorized the designation of Captive Nations Week, and I find it a heart-lifting experience to note the profound significance which has been attached to this commemorative occasion.

In this regard, I should like to draw attention to the special Captive Nations Week proclamation issued by Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller of the State of New York.

Mr. President, in the light of its significance for our times, I ask unanimous consent that Governor Rockefeller's proclamation be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION
STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, N.Y.

The roll of nations held captive by Communist imperialism is one of appalling length.

As the Congress of the United States has pointed out in a joint resolution, the United States, in the eyes of the enslaved peoples, is the citadel of human freedom. They look to us for leadership in bringing about their liberation and independence and in restoring the enjoyment of their Christian, Jewish, Moslem, Buddhist, and other religious freedoms.

We Americans are proud that many refugees from the oppressed countries have found asylum in the home of the free. We have benefited from their coming. They have become valued neighbors, loyal and industrious contributors to our State and national economy.

Now, therefore, I, Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, do hereby proclaim the period of July 17–23, 1960, as Captive Nations Week in New York State, and I urge the widest possible cooperation in the observation of this week.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 7th day of July in the year of our Lord 1960.

By the Governor:

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.
WILLIAM J. RONAN,
Secretary to the Governor.

New Scout Head Was Tenderfoot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, only four persons have served as chief executive of Boy Scouts of America in a half-century of Scouting in this Nation.

The latest change occurred only last month, when Joseph A. Brunton, Jr., succeeded Dr. Arthur A. Schuck, of Short Hills, N.J.

Mr. Brunton, of course, now faces a serious responsibility, but I am sure that he will find inspiration from a study of the accomplishments of his predecessors. An editorial in the Daily Home News, New Brunswick, N.J., of August 4, 1960, describes some of those accomplishments, and it gives a welcome to Mr. Brunton and additional recognition to Mr. Schuck.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the following editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW SCOUT HEAD WAS TENDERFOOT

Joseph A. Brunton, Jr., left the National Boy Scout offices in North Brunswick about 2 weeks ago to attend the Jubilee Jamboree in Colorado Springs, as assistant chief Scout executive, and returned to the offices this week as the chief executive of this famous youth movement. On August 1 he succeeded Dr. Arthur A. Schuck, of Short Hills, and became the fourth person to have this challenging job in the 50 years of Scouting in America.

Beneath the shadows of Pikes Peak and under a midsummer Colorado sky, 56,170 Boy Scouts and Scouters marked a half-century of Scouting in this country with a giant birthday party last Thursday evening. In addition, this vast assemblage "hailed the chiefs"—the outgoing Dr. Schuck and his successor, Joe Brunton. It must have been a pleasant event for both men. Dr. Schuck felt good because so gigantic an event as this jamboree had been so sucessful and Joe Brunton knew he could rely on these leaders in Scouting to support him as this vast movement grows.

The first chief Scout executive, Dr. James E. West, a young Washington attorney when the Boy Scouts of America was founded, opened the first Scout office in New York on

January 2, 1911 with seven employees. Thirty-two years later he retired and was succeeded by Dr. Elbert K. Fretwell of Teachers College, Columbia University. Dr. Fretwell retired in 1948, the year Dr. West died, and Dr. Schuck succeeded him.

Dr. Schuck entered Scouting as a volunteer leader in 1913 and entered Scouting professionally in 1917 advancing to the top position. Joe Brunton comes to the post from the lowest ranks. He is the first chief Scout executive to start as a Tenderfoot Scout, reach Eagle Scout, and get his first leadership experience as a patrol leader. Scouters can say "he is one of us."

New Brunswick is proud of having the national offices of the Boy Scouts of America as our neighbor. And we say amen to this proclamation made last Thursday evening in Colorado Springs:

"All of us here at the Jubilee Jamboree join in thanking Dr. Schuck for the dedicated, positive leadership he has given us.

"We assure Mr. Brunton that every one of us, Scouts and Scouters, on our honor, will do our best to carry out Scouting's purposes in the years to come."

Statement Before Senate Appropriations Committee by Justice Marlin T. Phelps, of Arizona Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made before the Senate Appropriations Committee by Justice Marlin T. Phelps, of the Supreme Court of Arizona, and a member of the citizens' foreign aid committee.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, my name is Marlin T. Phelps. I was graduated from Vanderbilt University in 1909 with the degree of LL.B. I was admitted to the Arizona bar in 1913 and practiced law in Phoenix until 1923. From 1923 to 1949 I was judge of the Superior Court in Phoenix. Since 1949 I have been a Justice of the Supreme Court, State of Arizona, and have twice alternated as chief justice.

I beg leave to present this statement of my views on the proposed appropriation for foreign aid.

United States tax money today is being used, as has been brought forth in hearings, to pay the public debt of other countries. I find no constitutional or other authorization for such application of the public funds. The appropriation also provides funds for "budgetary support," which means providing money to other countries for the ordinary expenses of Government. I find no legal basis for such application of the public funds, either under the general welfare, or the national defense provisions of the Constitution. I fail to see, in any case, how the building of a magnificent crystal and steel dream of a railway station in Rome, as was done with Marshall plan funds, contributes either to the general welfare or the national defense of this country, or deters the spread of Communism in Italy.

It is not evident, for instance, how the general welfare of the American people or the national defense of the United States was advanced by the three quarters of a billion dollars we gave France to defend its colonial interests in Indochina.

It is not clear why we continue to finance the Iranian budget in view of its quarter billion dollar annual income from oil. Last year, Iran obtained through one agency or another, some $200 million additional. It is not clear how the general welfare or the national defense is promoted by the millions we are giving Communist Poland and Communist Yugoslavia.

I object to the enormous domestic propaganda and lobby machine in the hands of the State Department and the President. Congress and the public are flooded with official literature glorifying giveaway. In much of the literature the claim is made that it is our moral duty to help other countries. I find no constitutional support for such a proposition. I find no constitutional support for the expenditure of money to high pressure the citizenship into supporting foreign aid.

The foreign aid program is objectionable on the further grounds that it is in contravention of all standards of accounting and fiscal responsibility. Article I, section 9, clause 8 of the U.S. Constitution prohibits the withdrawal of money from the Treasury except in consequence of an appropriation made by law, and a regular statement and account thereof published from time to time. Has there ever been such a statement and account rendered? Does the Congress know to what purposes this money has been put? Has the State Department published such an accounting? Or has this been classified as top secret matters?

Gentlemen, I recognize that the courts defer to the judgment of the Congress as to the necessity or wisdom of legislation so long as it remains within its constitutional limitations, and the present Court in *United States* v. *City of Milwaukee* (322 U.S. 735), held that it would respect the declaration of Congress that low-cost housing is a public use and sustained the right of the Federal Government to acquire land and build low-cost homes thereon.

Gentlemen, so far as I can determine, the Supreme Court of the United States has never decided the question of the constitutionality of the foreign aid program. It appears to be wholly beyond the constitutional power of Congress to authorize the expenditure of these funds under the provisions of the Mutual Security Act. As you are aware, the power of Congress to act must be found expressly or by necessary implication in the language of the Constitution. I find not a word, a line, a clause, or a provision in the Federal Constitution that authorizes the foreign aid program as it is administered.

If Congress has such power, express or implied, it must be found in article I, section 8, clause 1 of the Constitution, which gives Congress the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, so far as here material, for the general welfare and for the common defense. The welfare of whom? The answer is clear: The welfare of the people of the United States. (*United States* v. *Butler*, 297 U.S. 1-88, 80 L. Ed. 477). The framers of the Constitution, were concerned solely with the welfare of the people of the States constituting the Union they were about to form and from the consent of whose citizens the proposed government would derive its just powers.

The decision in the Butler case, discussed at length the "general welfare clause" of the Constitution. This discussion was obiter dictum since it was not necessary to a decision of that case. Nevertheless, it represents a view of the highest court of the land. The dictum rejected Madison's interpretation of the general welfare clause, which restricted its application to the other 17 grants of power enumerated in section 8, and it adopted rather Hamilton's broader interpretation to the effect that the clause conferred upon the Congress a substantive power to tax and appropriate, limited only by the requirement that it shall be exercised to provide for the "general welfare of the United States."

The subsequent decision of the Supreme Court upholding the validity of the Social Security Act, followed the interpretation given the "general welfare" clause in the Butler case. Yet, broadly as the Court defined the term, neither of these decisions tended in the slightest degree to intimate that its operation applies to any people or to any nation other than the United States.

I am unable to see how any man can see hope for world peace through world law as long as the vast populations of Russia, Eastern Europe, China, and southeast Asia are under the rule of overlords who recognize no principle of conduct except force; who recognize no peace except as defined by them; who recognize no moral code, no God; whose treaties are observed only in their breach; whose oft-repeated threat and boast has been that they will enslave our children.

Let us cease to enact socialistic legislation at home. Let us abandon the idea that we can spend our way out of debt. Let us take an inventory of our moral assets and liabilities as a nation. Let us abandon at once the unlawful expenditure of tax money under the pretext of containing communism. Let us use these funds to establish here a center of moral, military, and economic strength that will reassure the free world and hearten the nations to their own defense.

Well-Being of Men and Women in Other Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 10, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Bergen Evening Record of Hackensack, N.J., and the Englewood, N.J., League of Women Voters recently completed an interesting venture in local journalism about international topics. For 15 weeks, in its Week-End magazine, the newspaper ran a series about Bergen County residents who have had a hand in helping peoples of free nations to understand each other better.

Mrs. Fred Thomases explained the purposes of the series in a letter to me this week. She said:

As foreign policy chairman of the League of Women Voters of Englewood, I approached the paper with the idea of printing articles, prepared by us, which would acquaint the readers with some of the fine work done by the United States in developing countries. We were ready to do all the research, interviewing, writing, in addition to supplying photos. The newspaper agreed, with the one stipulation that we hang our stories on Bergen County residents, a requirement which made our work harder but revealed the interesting fact that there actually are many local people involved in oversea assistance.

I have helped with the research but Mrs. Adele Stern, our public relations chairman, has done the major share of the work.

Mrs. Stern, the mother of two children and a former teacher, prepared articles which showed how near-neighbors in Bergen County had, at one time or another, worked somewhere on the international front to help make better lives for people in other lands. Her subjects during the 15 weeks were:

Dr. Tingfu F. Tsiang, an Englewood resident who has served as permanent Ambassador from Nationalist China to the United Nations.

Argo Thompson, manager of an Englewood firm which, through the International Cooperation Administration, has shipped disease-fighting drugs to Korea.

Miss Isabel Murray, of Cresskill, who served with the U.S. Information Agency in Indonesia and the Belgian Congo.

Robert L. Davison, of Edgewater, who came out of retirement to serve as a United Nations representative first in Colombia and now in Iceland.

Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Scarlet, of Bergenfield, who are hosts to Masanori Hashimoto, a Japanese student here under an exchange program.

Nessim Shallon, of Englewood, who spent 10 years with the United Nations, the last 4 as a member of the United Nations expanded technical assistance program.

Dr. S. M. Corey, of Tenafly, and Dr. Clarence H. Kent, of Closter, who have helped to train specialists in the universities of India.

William X. Scheinman, Tenafly, president of the African-American Students Foundation, Inc., which brings qualified African students on a scholarship basis to study in universities of this Nation.

Dr. Maurice Foreacre, of Tenafly, who, as an adviser to the American-Israeli Lighthouse for the Blind, visited Israel recently "to see what U.S. rehabilitation philosophy had done for blind persons who had been reared in depressed situations."

The Reverend C. Melvin Blake, of Dumont, who spent 10 years as a missionary in Angola—Portuguese West Africa—and the Reverend John Thompson Peters, of Ridgewood, who recently studied at firsthand a professional rehabilitation operation for 3 million refugees in West Bengal and Calcutta.

Prof. Harold McNally, of Tenafly, who had worked on technical assistance projects in Burma.

Dr. and Mrs. Gerald Dykstra, of Wyckoff, who went to Afghanistan as part of the International Cooperation Administration's contract with Teachers College of Columbia University.

The Phil Lange family of Tenafly, who were particularly concerned about recent disasters in Chile because Professor Lange had served with a UNESCO project in Latin American countries.

Miss Orrea Pye, of Englewood, who has helped other nutrition experts to improve foods and agricultural habits in the Philippine Islands.

Charles B. Fahs, of Fair Lawn, director for humanities for the Rockefeller Foundation; and Carl Burness, of Ridgewood, who was program associate for south and southeast Asia of the oversea program of the Ford Foundation.

Mr. President, the series gave readers some idea of the extent of interests which this Nation has in the well-being of men and women in other lands. It reminded Americans once more that there are no boundaries on friendly interest and mutual efforts to fight suffering and poverty.

Although the articles are too lengthy for printing in their entirety, I ask permission to include in the RECORD the last two articles in the series.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bergen (N.J.) Evening Record, June 18, 1960]

FILIPINOS PROVING SELF-HELP WORKS

(By Adele H. Stern)

Bataan, Corregidor, Mindanao—fascinating, mysterious names to most Americans until less than 20 years ago. Potent, stirring names to those who lived through World War II. Vital, living names to the Philippine Republic, once a colony of the United States.

Composed of more than 7,100 humid, tropical islands that extend some 1,150 miles in the Pacific Ocean, the Philippines are inhabited by 24 million people. Mainly of Malay stock, the people absorbed the cultures and traits of three continents to form what is now the Filipino. Asia, in thousands of years of invasions and intermingling of blood lines, contributed the basic physical chracteristics of the people and a close feeling of identity with Asian problems. About 350 years of Spanish rule (after having been discovered by Magellan in his wanderings around the world) left lighter skins and longer faces and Catholicism which is still the main religion of the islands. And at the end of the Spanish-American War, when Spain ceded the Philippines to the United States, the concepts of independence and democracy began to flourish.

When Miss Orrea Pye of Englewood landed in Manila last Christmas Day, she was greeted by a welcoming committee of some 20 people ranging in age from a 90-year-old man to a 14-month-old baby. The nucleus of the committee was formed of four former students of Miss Pye, who is professor of nutrition at Teachers College of Columbia University, and the rest of the people were the students' families. Miss Pye asserts she spent much of her time in the Philippines concerned about her own nutrition, so richly was she wined and dined.

The Filipinos, traditionally kind and hospitable, were intent upon making certain their teacher tasted every type of island dish. Moreover, they planned an extensive tour for her to introduce her to the dietary problems and nutrition projects in the islands firsthand.

Professor Pye was eager to learn about native foods and agricultural habits so that she could return to Columbia with more specific information for future Philippine students (there are any number in her classes each year). One student, who works with a governmental agency, the Food and Nutrition Center, acquired the use of a UNICEF jeep, which provided transportation to citrus orchards, to the College of Agriculture, food markets, health centers, and schools.

In return, the Englewood woman, who has traveled widely in South America, Europe, Australia, New Zealand, and the south seas, always with the view to learning more about the nutrition problems of the people of the world, lectured in Manila on trends in nutrition and recent developments in the field. Moreover, she made herself available for consultation on special problems.

Nutrition is only one field in which the new Philippine Republic is working. It is conscientiously engaged in developing its untapped forests and mineral resources and in increasing the exports of copra, sugar, logs, abaca, coconut oil, chromite ore, iron ore, and pineapple.

Particularly important has been the program of land development and resettlement through a self-help process whereby the rural people with assistance from the government and the U.S. International Cooperation Administration, work with community development personnel to better their living conditions.

A good example of this is the hundred-year-old village of Kalasungay, neglected, poor, disease ridden. With the arrival of a community development worker, changes began to occur. The first of these changes was a campaign against the rats and pests which destroyed half the crops before they could be harvested. Then a recreation center was built, a road was prepared, and vegetable gardens were modernized. Men organized to introduce piggeries to add to the family income and to dig backyard toilets, to build a schoolhouse and health center where a visiting rural doctor now holds office once a week. A community development worker says, "When the villagers realize that they themselves can improve their living conditions with a minimum of government help, their indifference gives way to eagerness and a desire to live better."

In modernizing agricultural methods, joint United States-Philippine programs have included irrigation and agricultural education. Farmers extension clubs and 4-H Clubs have been organized. Through education and new techniques, rice yields have been doubled and an estimated 3 million additional bushels of food have been produced annually as a result of these improvements.

Cornell University, through an ICA contract, has assisted in the rehabilitation of the College of Agriculture which was destroyed during World War II.

In 10 years, the Filipino (who lives in family group units called the barrio) has raised his income from $88 to $220 a year. He is learning English in the schools as well as Tagalog, the national language (many Filipinos speak Spanish as well). He may go to a vocational school after his elementary or high school education. If he is so inclined, he may go to a university or to the United States for special training.

With the Philippine Government, which contributed $5 million and the United States $4 million in equipment, the vocational education program, debilitated during the Japanese occupation, has been reorganized. United States-Philippine cooperation is shown again through the Industrial Development Center, established in 1955 to stimulate industry and business enterprises. IDC activities include industrial financing, training, consultation, and industrial information. Since 1955 a total of 176 industrial firms including textile, cement, plywood veneer, paper, logging, mining, and road construction operations companies have received a total dollar assistance amounting to more than $37 million.

[From the Bergen (N.J.) Evening Record, June 25, 1960]

PATRONS OF PROGRESS

(By Adele H. Stern)

If, as the dictionary says, a commuter is one who travels regularly between a city and his home, then any one of the briefcase-bearing gentlemen who daily board or alight from airplanes, ships, and trains in cities all around the world might be called international commuters.

Private American foundations send these men, their representatives, far and wide to investigate, approve, or oversee the spending of millions of American dollars. Last year, expenditures by the largest foundations for economic, technical, and research abroad was in the neighborhood of $40 million, and this sum is expected to rise this year. The qualified and excellently trained personnel whom the foundations employ in their home offices and in oversea outposts investigate requests for grants that come from institutions at home and abroad.

Two of these men who have made the world their offices are Charles B. Fahs, of Fair Lawn, director for humanities of the Rockefeller Foundation, and Carl Burness of Ridgewood, who was program associate for south and southeast Asia of the oversea program of the Ford Foundation.

Dr. Fahs, born in Brooklyn and a graduate of Englewood High School, has spent much of his adult life as an international traveler. He earned his Ph. D. in political science at the University of Berlin. Then followed a year at the National School of Living Oriental Languages in Paris and 3 years on fellowships of the general-education board of the Rockefeller Foundation; then to the University of Kyoto, University of Tokyo, and to the College of Chinese Studies at Peiping.

Returning to a home in Bergen County and to his work for the Rockefeller Foundation, after teaching in California and working for the State Department in Washington, Dr. Fahs screens hundreds of requests each year for funds from the Rockefeller Foundation for work in any field of the humanities—art, music, education, or literature.

When he has decided a project will be a good one for the foundation to undertake, he makes a recommendation to the board of trustees, which makes the final decision on grants.

The story of the Rockefeller Foundation is a romantic and exciting one. It has been involved with a great many of the sociologic and economic changes in the world since John D. Rockefeller, Sr., established this fund, along with several others for distributing his vast fortune, in 1913.

It has covered such projects as a $45,000 grant to the American Korean Foundation for the development of a theater in South Korea; $250,000 to the University of Sao Paulo, Brazil, for research at its faculty of medicine at Ribeirao Preto; to a grant of $714,135 to the India International Center planned in New Delhi.

Although a great deal of the foundation's funds is still spent in the United States, considerable sums have been granted abroad, for research in cardiology in Mexico City; nitrogen fixation studies at the University of Tokyo; studies in genetics at the University of Naples; and so on.

The Rockefeller Foundation originally pioneered in public-health work, and still remains heavily associated with this field. It has added agricultural research and development, social sciences, and humanities over the years. During the past 4 years, the foundation has dipped into capital to the extent of $20 million to step up the pace of its oversea work.

A commuter between Ridgewood and New York City these days, Burness has been around the world four times. He has visited, for at least 1 or 2 weeks, all of the countries in Asia, except for mainland China, Nepal, and Ceylon.

When he was with the Ford Foundation, as program associate for the south and southeast Asia program, he spent 4½ months in Indonesia, substituting for the Ford field representative to that country while the latter was on leave in the United States. This gave Burness a close view of the workings of the foundation during a period of internal strife, for Indonesia was in the midst of a revolution in 1958.

Established in 1936 by Henry and Edsel Ford, the foundation's main interests have been of an educational nature. Since 1951, the oversea development program of the Ford Foundation has been assisting underdeveloped countries to raise the living standards of their people. By the end of 1958, the foundation had appropriated or earmarked $90 million for the program. Of this sum, the foundation had approved grants and projects totaling $71 million in 19 countries in south and southeast Asia and the Near East, Africa, and Latin America.

The main objective has been helping these underdeveloped countries establish some of the educational and research institutions they need for their long-range growth, complementing other economic and technical assistance agencies that aim largely at meeting immediate economic needs and stress physical projects. The foundation helps the countries' own specialists in training and research. It finances specialized training in the United States, Western Europe, and other areas, for teachers, administrators, and technicians. It helps obtain foreign consultants and, when necessary, imports equipment.

In Burma, for example, through its oversea development program, the Ford Foundation has assisted projects in agricultural and rural development, industrial and business development, education and vocational training, public administration, and economic and social research through grants of $6 million to Burmese schools, universities, government agencies, and private organizations.

In Pakistan, where the government has placed priority on the establishment of a broad range of new institutions devoted to the advancement of individual capacity and opportunity, the foundation has committed $13 million since 1952 for furthering the spirit of self-reliance among the Pakistan people and developing a corps of trained public and business administrators, skilled technicians, teachers, and specialists in economics, agriculture, and public health.

In almost every underdeveloped country in the world, the money of some private American foundation is financing one project or another. The Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation are only two of many dedicated to uplifting the economic standards of the peoples of the emerging nations. The W. K. Kellogg Foundation, the Near East Foundation, the Asia Foundation, and the Carnegie Corporation (whose grants abroad are restricted to the British Commonwealth) are allotting sums that are being spent in highly diverse manners for a large variety of programs.

Still, the aims of the foundations are similar to each other and similar also to the aims of all the other assistance groups that have been discussed in Bergen International—helping the recipient countries develop their own bodies of technicians and building institutions in these countries to make it possible for them to exist independently.

Most of the time the individual foundations work alone, but there have been projects that have involved several agencies in joint sponsorship. In the Philippines, for example, a new International Rice Institute, to serve as a research and training center for all rice-growing countries, will be built with a $7-million grant from the Ford Foundation on land donated by the Filipino Government and staffed with technicians and advisers from the Rockefeller Foundation.

Burness says that the work of the private foundations is valuable because the money is donated with more freedom, since governmental policies and political changes are not involved. For this reason, the funds are frequently more acceptable to some governments. Moreover, emphasizes Dr. Fahs, it is our Government's policy to encourage benevolent giving through our tax laws; we encourage initiative and at the same time give people who have shown initiative an opportunity to decide where the money is going.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

REA: The Farmer's Friend

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 11, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I was privileged day before yesterday to attend the annual meeting of the Shenandoah Valley Electric Cooperative at Harrisonburg, Va., and to address the members briefly. The accomplishments of this, the largest electric cooperative in my State, are truly impressive to me and, I hope, to my colleagues in this body. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks on that occasion printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REA—THE FARMER'S FRIEND

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at annual meeting of Shenandoah Valley Electric Cooperative, Harrisonburg, Va., August 9, 1960)

In working as a boy on my grandfather's farm in Culpeper, I learned something about the problems confronting our farmers and a lot about the hard work that goes into the production of the Nation's food supply. Consequently, throughout my public service, first in the Senate of Virginia, and then in the Congress of the United States, plans to promote the welfare of the rural areas of our State and Nation have been for me major goals. Many of you will recall that as a State senator, I advocated better roads, better schools and better conservation of our natural resources. I served on the commission to lay out the State highway system; was a joint patron of the bill to create it; I was an active supporter of the Mapp bill which revised our public school system, and I helped to frame the bill that created the first game department. All of those programs have paid rich dividends. In my opinion, Virginia's highway system, and especially the secondary roads that serve rural areas, is second to none; our school system compares favorably with States of comparable per capita income and few States can surpass the recreational opportunities offered by our State parks and public hunting and fishing areas, our national forests and our marshlands and beaches in the Tidewater area.

In the Congress, two programs which I have supported from their inception, and which I feel have paid the richest dividends, have been soil conservation and rural electrification. Both of these programs have been administered at the local level, both have been voluntary porgrams, the first program being a matching one in which local farmers contributed 50 percent or more of the cost of the program and the latter being supported without cost to the Federal Government except for the loans made available to the REA co-ops, practically all of which have been met at maturity.

One of the distressing aftermaths of World War II was the fact that American farmers were encouraged to greatly expand their production to meet the needs of our allies as well as ourselves for food and fiber and after the end of that abnormal foreign demand for our farm products, no sound and workable plan has been developed under which our farmers could exchange what they produce for what they needed to buy at a fair and equitable price. However, the disparity in recent years between the farmer's share of the national income and that of either industry or organized labor would have been far greater but for the benefits which our farmers have derived from the availability on the farm of electricity. In the 50-year period prior to the rural electrification program, urban communities fully enjoyed the blessings of electric power and light but that advantage of a scientific age reached only 10 percent of our farmers. In 1935, prior to the start of the REA program, only 7.6 percent of Virginia farmers had electricity. Those of us who advocated the REA program argued that lack of modern equipment was keeping American farmers from enjoying a scale of living comparable with their city brethren and lack of modern conveniences was making farm life unattractive to young people on whom we must depend for future food and fiber production.

We said that since the Government had set up the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as a lending agency for business enterprises trying to work their way out of the great depression of the thirties, it was no more than reasonable to provide aid in the form of soundly secured loans for the 90 percent of our farmers who had been denied advantages which most city dwellers had enjoyed for 50 years. Aside from the benefits to the farmers themselves we felt that this program would benefit the Nation generally by promoting more efficient production of food and would create a better balanced economy by encouraging small industries to locate in rural sections.

The REA program has been even more successful than those of us who originally supported it could anticipate. We foresaw that electric lights would make it easier for the farmer to go about his chores and that electric power could reduce manual labor required for moving crops, grinding feed, milking and pumping water. We knew that electricity in the home would save the women from the drudgery of carrying water, standing at the washtubs and enduring the heat of the wood cookstove. We did not fully anticipate how scarce and costly farm labor would become and how essential it would be to substitute electricity and machinery which, it has been estimated, now gives every man, woman and child in our country the work equivalent of 30 hand workers. Nor were we able to imagine that a farmer would find as many as 250 productive uses for electricity, including the innovations which have helped to make the Shenandoah Valley one of the top poultry-producing areas of the Nation.

When I attended the Shenandoah Co-op meeting in 1944 I was able to report that since the start of REA electrification of rural homes in the Nation had risen from 10 to around 42 percent and in Virginia from 7.6 to 30 percent. At your meeting 2 years later I had figures showing that the national percentage was up to 45 percent and the Virginia figure to 35. It is even more pleasing to know today that the latest annual report of the REA showed Virginia had reached the national average, with 97 percent of our farms electrified. As for the Shenandoah Valley Electric Cooperative—it has become the largest in the State, with 11,465 customers to whom it furnished last year 52,083,000 kilowatt-hours of electric power.

The economic implications alone, are impressive enough to warrant considerable attention. Electricity, for its users, is simply energy in its most useable form. Once a farm is supplied with this silent, flexible, versatile means of energy, it automatically becomes a potential market for all the products that have been devised to harness it for useful work.

No amount of persuasive salesmanship on the part of any electrical appliance dealer could transform a farm family into a customer for his products without an available form of electric energy.

Once a farm is electrified, however, it becomes a potential customer for electric stoves and heaters, for lamps and washing machines, for ironers, radios, television sets, milking machines, and modern plumbing operated by electric pumps. The list of products that an electrified farm is in a position to buy is almost endless. The impact on our economy of this still-developing market is directly beneficial to thousands of stockholders and millions of our industrial workers, some of whom may never have been on a farm at all.

Benefits of the program to the farmer can appropriately be listed under the two heads: "Monetary Gain" and "Social Gain."

1. MONETARY GAIN

(a) Grinds feed for all farm stock.

(b) Ten- to twenty-percent increase in egg production by poultry house lighting.

(c) Ten-percent saving on feed by electric brooding and lighting and 2 weeks less finishing time for broilers.

(d) Marked increased efficiency in dairying through electric milking machines, sterilizers and coolers, cream separators and churns, and light in winter months in dairy barns.

(e) Saving in fences through the use of electrified fences.

(f) Electric hay driers especially valuable in curing alfalfa and pea hay.

(g) Workshop, grinding mowing blades and repairing farm machinery.

(h) Pumping water for household use, farm stock, and irrigation.

(i) Labor-saving devices in the home such as washing machines, vacuum cleaners, electric irons, churns, ranges, hot-water heaters—in a word, the full equipment of a modern city apartment designed to be operated by the housewife without servant help.

(j) The development of summer homes for city people.

2. THE SOCIAL GAIN

(a) Radio and prompt news coverage.

(b) Adequate lighting, including study lights for school children and lighting for schoolhouses and churches.

(c) Sanitary facilities made possible by pressure water systems.

(d) Deep-freeze and locker units for winter consumption of fresh fruits and vegetables as the means of a better balanced rural diet and the conservation of perishable foods.

(e) The stimulation of community pride and the accentuation of the advantages of farming as a means of life by reducing the

drudgery and inconveniences involved. The time saved to farm mothers in not having to fill oil lamps and clean lamp chimneys, churn by hand and not having to bend for hours over washboards can now be devoted to the improvement of family relations and to community enterprises.

The electrical revolution that has taken place in the rural home has been even more impressive, in many ways, than the labor-saving equipment installed elsewhere on the farm. A variety of electric kitchen equipment, freezers, refrigerators, electrically controlled heating plants and television and radio sets have all served to make the farm home a more comfortable place to live.

Estimates indicate that the average farm use of electricity has risen from 600 kilowatt-hours per year 25 years ago to nearly 4,000 kilowatt-hours at the present time. In another 15 years, this consumption is expected to rise to the challenging total of more than 10,000 kilowatt-hours annually. This is a figure both of challenge and opportunity, because it indicates that the work of the REA is far from completion.

The challenge will be to provide the necessary power to meet this anticipated need, to hold the cost to a reasonable figure and to assure that REA cooperatives will have their fair share of the giant power pools of the future.

As we meet these challenges one by one, new ones will arise, based on technological changes we cannot now fully appreciate. But we must keep pace with all these changes or else allow our Nation's agriculture, which George Washington called "the noblest occupation of man," slip into the position of a third-rate industry.

It is not agriculture, alone, that looks to the REA to assure its future. Our national security, itself, as well as the general prosperity of our population, depend on our ability to bring to the beneficial use of all our people the electric power network on which all of us depend for communications, for conveniences and for more efficient production.

The REA has made it possible for millions of nonfarmers to make their homes in rural areas and for thousands of industries, small and large, to locate their plants along rural electric lines with such profitable and pleasant results for themselves and for their workers.

But the rewarding satisfaction that I feel over the splendid results accomplished by a program which I supported at its inception 25 years ago and have continued to support ever since, is tempered by the realization of the new problems both at home and abroad which have arisen for our farmers during those years. One relates to the disparity of income, to which I already have referred. One inflation factor which has eroded one-half of the purchasing power of our money is called the wage price spiral. Industry is organized and industrial labor is organized. And over a period of years when the actual cash income of farmers was declining, to say nothing of the decline in the purchasing power of the farm dollar, industry has granted to organized labor many wage increases which were promptly followed by price increases. Our farmers have never been able to control their output in the way that industry can control its output and the always serious problem of a fair and adequate price for farm products has during recent years been greatly complicated by the accumulation of price depressing surpluses, resulting from a poorly managed farm program. One of the major undertakings of the next Congress will be the disposal of those surpluses with a view to the establishment of a freer and more competitive market for our farm products. Another recent development which is going to have a price-depressing effect, is the organization in Europe by six European nations, formerly the best customers for our cotton, tobacco, and wheat, of what is known as the Common Market. We fear that those six nations in order to stimulate their own farm production may discriminate against our farm products.

There also is another European trade organization recently formed called the Outer Seven. That is an organization led by Great Britain of seven nations that were not invited to join the Common Market group. The Outer Seven has organized for the protection of their trade and perhaps to force trade concessions from the Common Market group. All of those 13 European nations, most of whom have been the beneficiary of lavish grants and loans from us since the end of World War II, have become highly competitive with us, especially in the industrial field. But since we are normally dependent on export markets for some 40 percent of our cotton and tobacco and some 20 percent of our wheat, the problem of solving in a satisfactory way our current farm problem can be intensified by trade restrictions that may be adopted against us by these two European groups.

While I know that our farmers are concerned about their economic future, I am sure that they are likewise concerned, as are all the rest of us, over the threat to our survival posed by the rapidly developing military power of the Soviet bloc. We are now devoting, and as long as the cold war lasts, will continue to devote, at least one-half of our national revenue to the development of our Defense Establishment. While the Soviet Union may at the moment possess some slight superiority in the field of guided missiles and in the size and equipment of its land army, we still have overall military superiority. We hope that a continuation of that superiority carrying with it the implications of destructive retaliation in the event the Soviets should start another war, will be sufficient to preserve an uneasy peace. But all of us must recognize that it is an uneasy peace. All of us must recognize that in the event of another world war, the worldwide destruction by nuclear weapons will be so terrific that there can be no victor in the true sense of the word. Therefore, we should daily pray that the same God who befriended the early settlers in this valley against hostile Indians and gave them the strength and courage to overcome the hardships of a wilderness, that the same God who was the ally of the Founding Fathers during our fight for independence from Great Britain, and the same God who has enabled us to develop in a relatively brief period some 13 small and struggling Colonies to a Union of 50 States—the richest and most powerful empire in the world—will continue to be our ally in the fight we are making against the anti-God ideology of communism. For, I am convinced that we labor in vain to build a temple of peace that is not dedicated to the victory of moral force.

A Woodrow Wilson Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 11, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Senate has already passed a bill which would establish a national commission to study proposals for a Woodrow Wilson Memorial in Washington, D.C. The Commission's recommendations on the form the memorial could take would be submitted to Congress for final approval.

New Jersey, of course, has a particular interest in the proposed memorial. A recent expression of that interest and pride was given in an editorial in the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J. I believe that the editorial also expresses the deep affection felt by Americans for the man who led his Nation at a critical period in its history.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Daily Journal of Elizabeth, N.J., July 5, 1960]

A WOODROW WILSON MEMORIAL

Whether a permanent national memorial to Thomas Woodrow Wilson, who went from the governorship of New Jersey to the White House, is desirable and feasible may be determined after long years of discussion. The Senate has enacted and sent to the House a proposal for an 11-member commission to resolve that question.

The measure was introduced by Senator WILLIAMS, of Westfield. A memorial, if that is the decision, also will be evolved from commission studies.

The Washington Monument, the Jefferson and Lincoln Memorials, the Taft Monolith, are the outstanding instances of this perpetuation of the memories of illustrious Presidents. Washington is flecked with statuary and kindred tributes to greatness, and another, unless of heroic proportions, might claim a distinction less than the proponents of the World War I President desire. His tomb in the Washington Cathedral is simply, but plainly marked and a shrine to many.

Several public works, ornamental and utilitarian are under contemplation for the Federal District, and a combining of the memorial and the functional may be accepted by the commission, if the House concurs in its creation.

This is a proposal that interests the Garden State. Although Grover Cleveland was born in New Jersey, he was far less closely associated with this State than Wilson, a Virginian who was president of Princeton University prior to becoming a power in his party and then Governor. The appropriateness of the action contemplated in Senator WILLIAMS' bill is above dispute.

The Participation of the Private Citizen in the Field of Social Service—Address by Frederick M. Lange

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 11, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, a prominent citizen of my State, Mr. Fred M. Lange, executive vice president of the Dallas Community Chest Trust Fund, carried out important work as an ambassador of good will to South America during the summer.

Mr. Lange has devoted his life to welfare work. He has a truly outstanding record in the raising of funds for humanitarian causes. In the course of his visit to South America, he addressed the Brazil-United States Institute on the

subject "The Participation of the Private Citizen in the Field of Social Service."

The Brazil-United States Institute has some 15,000 students who are taught English on the basis of spending some 3 or 4 hours a week in classroom instruction. After 4 years at the Institute and 1 year at a university, the students receive sufficient credits to make them eligible for certificates permitting them to teach English in the schools of Brazil.

The importance of this work to the United States is self-evident, and it is work that is being expanded. The president of the Institute, Dr. Murilo Belchior, is a Brazilian. The U.S. director is a North American, Dr. John P. Wonder.

In giving me a report on his South American visit, Mr. Lange paid particular tribute to several staff members of the U.S. Embassy in Brazil, among them Dr. Leopold Arnaud, cultural attaché; Mr. Lafe Allen, press attaché; Mr. James Parker Lee, publications officer; Mr. James Opsata, deputy public affairs officer; Mr. Roberto Gonzaga, USIS chief editor; and Mr. Rodrigo de Miranda, USIS publications assistant.

"It is to our country's good credit," Mr. Lange writes, "that we have these fine people representing our Government in Brazil."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Lange's address before the students of the Brazil-United States Institute be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PARTICIPATION OF THE PRIVATE CITIZEN IN THE FIELD OF SOCIAL SERVICE

(By Frederick M. Lange, L.H.D., L.L.D., D.C.L., executive vice president, Dallas Community Chest Trust Fund)

Based upon the English poor law, which the English colonists brought to America, for roughly 300 years the major source of the necessities of life (food, clothing, shelter, and medical care) for needy residents in the United States, was the local government unit. This responsibility was written into the State constitutions of many U.S. States.

As the population and the welfare problem grew in the United States during the first two centuries, it became more and more difficult for the local governmental units to provide certain social services, such as institutions for the care of the feebleminded, the mentally ill, the criminal, the tuberculous, and institutions for the education of the blind and the deaf. Also, it became more difficult for the local governmental units to provide adequate health services alone. For these reasons, about 100 years ago, the State governments in the United States began to assume responsibility for these services. For many years longer, however, the National Government continued to limit its social welfare activities severely, especially in the area of financial assistance.

The business depression of the 1930's forced a change in this situation. The inability of both the States and the local units of government to provide for the needs of the millions of unemployed made it necessary for the National Government, which had taken over the taxing power with regard to many of the major tax sources, to assume responsibility for most of the financial assistance to needy U.S. citizens. This became a permanent responsibility of the National Government with the establishment of the social security program in 1935.

Early in American history voluntary agencies began to develop, some to do things not considered the responsibility of the governmental agencies, and some out of dissatisfaction with the inadequacies of some welfare services under governmental auspices. Voluntary agencies have continued to grow in numbers and importance throughout American history for these and other reasons. Many times voluntary agencies have closed down or altered their functions when the time came that their former services were no longer needed or were assumed by some level of government. It is some indication of their continuing growth that this fall community chests and united funds in 2,600 U.S. cities and towns will raise more than $480 million to help finance a major part, but only part, of the voluntary health and welfare agencies in the United States.

From the beginning of American history to this hour, there has been an important and indispensable partnership between the Government and the private citizen in welfare matters.

We now have voluntary and government agencies at all levels working side by side, one helping the other. Since 1935, the major role of our private agencies has shifted from providing primarily relief in the form of food, clothing, and shelter, to supporting and carrying on new or pioneer programs, mostly in the prevention field. As newer methods were discovered, or as new services were needed, it was usually the voluntary agencies in the 1930's which experimented and started them. As their value was proved, and as the new programs expanded, they were often incorporated into the methods and services of the large governmental programs. More recently the national governmental agencies, too, are experimenting, pioneering, and carrying on much research. In general, the governmental agencies have taken responsibility for the large mass programs directed toward providing food, shelter, clothing, and medical aid for those who cannot provide these things for themselves. The size of the National Government programs is now far larger than that of the voluntary programs.

This, however, does not mean that the partnership between National and State Government and the private citizen is weakened. Particularly at the local and State levels, the governmental agencies try to keep close to the thinking of private citizens through the establishment of advisory boards and auxiliaries. Most government agencies are anxious to know what private citizens think and go out of their way to explain their programs, invite comments, and provide for citizen participation.

The private citizens, then, not only control the private agencies, but by serving on the advisory boards and committees of the Government agencies, influence and guide them too. Many of these citizens have been active in both kinds of agencies, therefore they know intimately what each does and what each is responsible for. This helps to coordinate the whole pattern of welfare service, keeps it close to the real needs and sees that the total effort is as efficient as possible.

The participation between the Government and the private citizens in matters of welfare in the United States takes many forms. Most tax-supported welfare programs were established because private citizens active in private welfare projects knew so well the need for the programs that they became their spokesmen. After public programs are established, private citizens working in private groups keep in close touch with them, because Government and private agencies cooperate so closely on so many projects. Private groups know well the strength and weaknesses of the total effort. Private groups, through social action, through encouraging helpful welfare legislation, work for changes, expansions, or reductions in the Government effort. These efforts are based on knowledge and facts gathered as results of working together. For instance, improvements in the services of our local Dallas County Welfare Agency was brought about because voluntary agencies working with some of the same families became aware of the severe limitations of the county program. Some members of the advisory board of the county agency were also active in the voluntary agencies. Their firsthand knowledge of the facts made changes possible in the county program.

Another way in which the private citizen keeps in touch with the Government agency is by volunteering his services. Many people in America are members of auxiliaries or voluntary committees whose members visit and donate their time, doing useful work in the agency, ranging all the way from helping to care for children to helping beautify the agencies grounds. This visiting and volunteer service enables the private citizen to become acquainted with the service. Then, he can better influence not only the agency, but the Government which supports and controls it. The most outspoken and influential supporters of our Dallas Juvenile Department are the women and men who donate their time to help in certain phases of the work. In this way they know what the agency needs and can speak intelligently and forcefully to officials who control it.

We, to, have local welfare councils, which bring together all organizations, Government and private, so that local services can be planned and coordinated. Here the Government agencies and the voluntary ones map out who will do what, so that the total effort will produce most benefit. Here the partnership is very close. Some services are too broad and burdensome for voluntary agencies to carry, and Government must be encouraged to assume responsibility.

As conditions change, some new services, never tried before, may be needed. They often must be started with private funds from campaigns such as the Community Chest or United Fund Campaign, or perhaps by funds from a private foundation. America has increasing numbers of private foundations established with gifts from "well to do" persons, who wish to assure that the income from their gifts will be used for beneficial philanthropic endeavors.

In all this the total pattern of welfare services is kept in mind. As needs change, services change, and both Government and private agencies work hand in hand. Each knows what is needed. Each does his part, without duplication. This is possible because the private citizen, working in private agencies, helping to raise money for voluntary causes, donating his help in the work of private organizations, is often the same citizen who serves on an advisory board or an auxiliary, or a volunteer group in the Government agency. He is the same person, who through his activities in the local welfare council, knows who can and should do what.

This partnership with government keeps the government agency close to the people who support it and use its services. This partnership encourages efficiency. It encourages a total welfare system and provides those services which the people are convinced are really needed.

A large proportion of the U.S. giving goes to support what we call prevention programs. By this we mean social services which can help to prevent problems which may require extensive help. When, at the invitation of the Austrian Ministry of Welfare, I spoke in Vienna to welfare leaders, and also when I spoke in Stockholm to Swedish welfare leaders, there was much

interest in this. They asked why Americans support so many services such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, YMCA, YWCA, youth centers, recreation centers, day camps, overnight camps, and so forth. They questioned whether such services could be classed as necessary welfare programs. We believe they are vital welfare programs because through constructive youth activities, they help to build sounder bodies, minds, and personalities. Such youth have a better chance of growing into independent adults who can better cope with life, and therefore be less damaged by problems which require extensive aid. We look upon such programs as an investment in people, an investment which will strengthen them, not only to lessen their later dependence on welfare services, but to increase their ability to live happier, more productive lives, from which they and all people around them will benefit.

Our youth programs are largely voluntarily supported and directed. However, here again we have cooperation with government at all levels, for many of the physical facilities which these voluntary youth agencies use are provided by government. These voluntary groups use public school facilities, public playgrounds, parks, campsites leased for $1 a year from government, and so forth.

While government cooperates, we prefer to leave the direction of such programs to voluntary groups directed by private citizens. This removes the temptation which may sometimes appear, for a particular political group to influence or exploit youth programs for political ends.

We feel that a welfare program which only provides social services to remedy or repair damage after it has happened is incomplete. While we must, of course, give first emphasis to helping people who are in trouble, we must also look ahead and try to help people so that they will not get into serious trouble. Obviously, this is not always possible because of accident, misfortune, etc., but by helping to develop strong minds and bodies we can lessen their vulnerability to trouble. In this way we help to preserve human values, which in the long run, is the objective of a welfare program—to increase the well-being of our people, mental, physical, and spiritual.

Although I have said little specifically about the activities of our religious bodies, they are the backbone of our voluntary effort. Our welfare efforts have grown from religious roots, and spiritual values are the foundation of our whole program, regardless of whether the program is directed by a religious or a secular organization.

While taxes in America provide the bulk of support for welfare activities, the total of American voluntary aid is nevertheless tremendous. In addition, the role of foundations and trust funds is growing. More and more of our people with means are giving large sums of money which are used to finance needed services. Here, too, we have a partnership with Government, since our laws and tax provisions encourage this practice.

I can speak to the role of the voluntary agency and of the trust with some authority, since I now direct such a trust. Also, during my 21 years of experience in social welfare, I have directed the gathering of over $60 million in voluntary gifts for welfare purposes. This could not have been accomplished without the teamwork of the Government which believes that the dignity of every man should be upheld and preserved. Human dignity is enhanced through providing for human well-being. In this vital endeavor there is a place for government and for the private citizen. They complement each other if the job is done right.

Perhaps the most significant research in the welfare field in America in the last quarter century concerns work done by Bradley Buell & Associates in St. Paul, one of our large midwestern cities. Painstaking study indicates that the great variety of problems which plague people can generally be divided into four groups. Also, the great variety of needed services can in general be divided into four groups.

The first of the four categories relates to dependency, or the need for basic living essentials: food, shelter, and clothing. The second category relates to ill health, or the need for necessary medical care. The third category relates to social maladjustments, or the need for counseling or guidance services for personal difficulties. The fourth category relates to recreation, or the need to provide leisure time, adult education, and recreation activities, so that people can refresh themselves and maintain mental health.

I was struck in reading reports of your programs in Brazil that each one of your services could be classified under one of these categories, too. However, there was different emphasis placed on them. Most emphasis in your program seems to be placed on provision of living essentials and providing health and medical services. The other two categories, counseling and recreation, were mentioned less frequently. It is obvious that living essentials and medical services must come first, but I would predict that as needs in these two basic areas are met more adequately, you will become more increasingly aware that problems and services in all four areas are interrelated. Lack of counseling for a personal problem may lead to a more serve problem which needs medical care and basic asistance, just as inability to provide living essentials can cause a health problem, or a health problem can cause inability to provide living essentials.

Much research is being carried on concerning how best to help families who have so many problems that they require help from a large number of specialized agencies, both Government and private. Although most of this research is supported by private trusts and foundations, the results will be of greatest importance to the Government agencies, since they are now giving the most help to these families.

So, here again, we have an example of teamwork. The Government agency, which we call the public agency gets its support from taxes. It is controlled by law. It is set up by a city, county, State or the the National Government. It is administered by employees paid from taxes collected from the people. This Government agency works cooperatively at every turn with the voluntary or private agency. When private citizens join together unofficially and voluntarily to help their fellow citizens in other ways than the Government agencies provide, they do their work through voluntary or private agencies. These private agencies are administered and financed voluntarily by private citizens.

In our system, through the influence and activity of private citizens in both types of agencies, the overall program meshes smoothly, as gears in a machine. There is no competition, little duplication, or waste. We are ever alert to preserve this teamwork, and would not permit a system where the Government agencies could not readily be influenced by private citizen leaders

We believe this sensitivity and response to what our private citizens think is best, is our guarantee that our future welfare services are not exploited for political or undemocratic purposes. We believe that this is the best way to assure that these services will strengthen human dignity through increasing human well-being.

Soviets Tear Down United Nations—Statement by Senator Wiley and Editorial From the Milwaukee Journal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 11, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement I have prepared. It is entitled "Soviets Tear Down United Nations." I ask to have printed in the RECORD following my statement an editorial published in the Milwaukee Journal.

There being no objection, the statement and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOVIETS TEAR DOWN UNITED NATIONS
(By Senator WILEY)

The U.N.—serving the interests of peace, order, law, and justice—offers one of the great hopes of the 1960's for creating a world safe for freedom.

Reflecting the will of mankind, the U.N. embodies great moral force. As this can be put into action, the outlook for a global climate in which the integrity of nations shall be respected and in which more people have an opportunity for self-determination will be greatly brightened.

Only a youth 15 years old, the U.N. has taken hold of difficult situations and contributed to solutions of difficult problems which, if unresolved, might spark world war III.

In addition, it offers one of the best hopes for the newly emerging nations to get on their feet without imposition of outside forces stepping in and taking control.

We recognize, of course, that the Communists—both inside and outside the U.N.—specifically the Soviet Union and Red China, will continue their efforts to thwart ways to accomplish peace. The history of the United Nations, in fact, reveals that time after time the Soviets have attempted to block efforts by the U.N. to resolve difficulties. Instead, they have themselves stirred up greater trouble.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 9, 1960]
SOVIETS TEAR DOWN U.N.

From the beginning of the present African crisis, Soviet Russia has sought not to join in dampening fires of discord, but to add fuel to them. It has tried to set Africans against Africans, black men against white men, the Congolese against the United Nations. Even Secretary General Hammarskjold, a diplomat of cautious words, has openly criticized the Soviets for their troublemaking.

There is nothing unusual about such Russian activities, of course. From the time the U.N. came into being at San Francisco in 1945, Moscow has sought in every possible way to thwart, discredit, and defeat it.

More than any other nation, Russia used the veto power to frustrate U.N. action. Molotov, Vishinsky, Malik, and Gromyko sought to turn the world peace forum into a hall of deceit, slander, and demagoguery.

The Soviets encouraged the North Koreans to invade South Korea in defiance of the U.N., then long blocked U.N. efforts to win or end the war that resulted. They defied the U.N. in Hungary, after crushing the "freedom revolt," even refusing to let a U.N. investigating committee, or the Secretary General, enter that country. At the time of the Suez

crisis, rocket-hurling threats of Khrushchev were of no help to U.N. leaders in trying to restore peace. Most recently, when U.N. representatives went into Lebanon to help that nation maintain independence, the Russians accused the U.N. of "foreign armed intervention."

Efforts to hinder the U.N. have extended even to the subsidiary organizations, concerned not with peace and war, but with helping mankind live better. Russia has never contributed its proper shares financially to such organizations. When it has participated in activities, the purpose has usually been to confuse or propagandize.

Thus, from the start, the Soviets have tried to hamper the United Nations, even as they paid lip service to the organization and mouthed dedication to its high U.N. principles.

This is most obvious in connection with the very first purpose of the U.N., as set forth in article 1 of the charter. This purpose is "to maintain international peace and security." The Russians signed this pledge, along with all the others, at San Francisco. They constantly talk about peace, but they seem dedicated to blocking the U.N. from effectively carrying out this purpose for which it was created.

Christianity and Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, July 2, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to my bill, H.R. 870, to abolish capital punishment, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the Reverend Lester Kinsolving, rector of the Episcopal Church of Our Savior, Pasco, Wash. The original article appeared in the June 1960 issue of Pastoral Psychology:

CHRISTIANITY AND CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

(By Leser Kinsolving, rector, Episcopal Church of Our Savior, Pasco, Wash.)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Several days after this article went to the printer, Caryl Chessman was executed in the gas chamber after 12 years in San Quentin Prison death row. While the "outer" motivation for this article may seem to be the life of one individual, the issue involved is greater than the life of any one person, important as that one life may be. Caryl Chessman is dead but the issue is not.)

Dr. Joseph Goebbels missed an opportunity to score an important propaganda coup when the Nazis annihilated the entire Czechoslovakian community of Lidice. He could so easily have cited Biblical precedent for this monstrous methodology by quoting Joshua 6: 21. This passage of Holy Scripture discloses the butchery of all living creatures in Jericho (excepting one prostitute's family) after its conquest by the children of Israel.

Such utilization of Holy Writ to defend unholy brutality would by no means be unique. The Bible was used to justify the Salem witch trials. Part of the shame of practically every Christian denomination, including my own, is the pre-Civil War scriptural defense of slavery. If anyone labors under the delusion that the modern era has brought a surcease from such opprobrious Biblical reference, he need only refer to the October 12, 1959, issue of the neofundamentalist, fortnightly magazine Christianity Today.

Dr. Jacob Vallenga, who is an associate executive of the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., has authored an article entitled "Is Capital Punishment Wrong?" Almost the entire substance of his article is based on quotations from scripture. There is ample Biblical material justifying the death penalty. There is also Biblical material justifying polygamy, cuckoldry, and incest for that matter—as well as the familiar concepts of a flat world, a 7-day creation, and a pre-Copernican universe.

Most of the Old Testament proof texts for capital punishment can be discarded as deftly as our Lord disdained the bulk of musty Hebrew legalism—particularly his running roughshod over the sacrosanct Sabbath. Dr. Vallenga, however, cites the commandment "Thou shalt not kill" as an argument frequently advanced by those in favor of abolishing capital punishment. Rarely, if ever, have I heard this specific wording used by abolitionists—who under this circumstance would therefore have to be pacifists as well as vegetarians. A far more accurate translation of the commandment is "Thou shalt do no murder." This commandment applies to the State as well as the individual. Capital punishment is murder—premeditated and with malice aforethought.

Those States which practice legalized homicide usually add the word "unlawful killing with malice aforethought in a premeditated fashion." This is very similar to legalizing adultery—which like premeditated and malicious killing is evil per se—whatever the action of any State legislature. There is nothing more premeditated than an execution. Certainly no other motive than malice can be implied unless the interesting viewpoint of the judge who sentenced an 18-year-old to "hang by the neck until dead—and may this be a lesson to you."

Dr. Vallenga states that murder ("unofficial") is more horrible than an execution. As a former prison chaplain I have studied the details of many murders. Never have I ever heard of any murder which even approximates the extended, calculated and barbaric mental and physical torture as afforded those killed in cold blood by the State (in order to show how much it disapproves of killing in cold blood). I have never heard of any murderer whose crime even approximated the evil ferocity of the following:

1. The victim is confined to a 4 by 12 foot cell for 22 hours a day—365 days per year for an average of 2 years in many States—in California one notable prisoner inhabiting condemned row for 11 years. This technique in San Quentin Pirson produced no less than five suicides in 4 years.

2. While 12 States (Missouri, Maryland, North Carolina, Mississippi, Wyoming, Oklahoma, Colorado, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, Oregon, California) use the more humane method of lethal gas, the same slow and savage ceremonial, resembling an Aztec sacrifice, is still present. Victims of the gas chamber have been known to cough, gag, or vomit—before losing consciousness after an indeterminate interval. Utah offers the firing squad as one of two alternatives to be chosen by the victim. In this case, however, the same macabre ceremonial is utilized. Utah demands that its victims be tied to a special chair and covered with black hood and heart-shaped target.

3. The most gruesome and degrading method of execution is that used in my own State of Washington, as well as New Hampshire, Iowa, Kansas, Montana, Idaho, and Utah. The victim is shackled—or if a cripple, or paralyzed with fear, he is strapped to a specially designed sled. A black hood is placed over his face—in order that witnesses be spared the facial effects of hanging: popped eyes, extended tongue, exploded veins, and occasional decapitation. A transparent white sheet now protects witnesses in the Washington State Penitentiary; a large number of witnesses were recently sprayed with blood as the result of a severed jugular vein caused by a semidecapitation.

4. Only slightly less degrading (a soldier, for instance, usually prefers the firing squad to being hanged) is the electric chair, employed by 22 States and the District of Columbia. Electrocution is in reality frying the victim to death. In some cases death is swift. Other such executions have required as long as 4½ minutes. In all cases the body is frightfully mutilated. Attorney Joseph Welch in his excellent TV program on "Omnibus" cited the face mask as necessary to cover the facial effects of electrocution. Dr. Austin MacCormick, one of the world's most renowned penologists, testified to the Colorado Legislature that he had observed an autopsy 1 hour after an electrocution. The physician was obliged to remove the liver with tongs—due to the lingering and intense heat.

I have never heard of any murderer, from Jack the Ripper to Charles Starkweather, being guilty of such methodical precision in ceremonially extended atrocity. If capital punishment is either morally sound or a deterrent then we have no logical right to continue private executions. All executions should be televised—and during school hours. This would be far more "effective" than leaving our youth restricted to detailed newspaper accounts of such items as how a doomed man goes about the difficult process of holding down his last meal, and how a prison chaplain solves the problem of giving the last rites as many as three times in one morning.

Perhaps opposition to public executions might rightfully be based on history. When in last-century England they hanged pickpockets (one of more than 200 capital offenses) the other pickpockets had a field day plying their craft while everyone was looking up. While this has a sort of grim humor there is no humor at all in the hanging of one 9-year-old boy for the theft of a silver spoon. If this seems barbaric, recall the medieval practice of staging trials and execution of animals.

Dr. Vallenga states that "opposition to capital punishment is not for the common good but sides with evil; shows more regard for the criminal than the victim of the crime; weakens justice and encourages murder." It is somewhat ironic that those who sanction state killings should accuse opponents of being calloused toward murder victims. We simply don't want to add to the number of victims. Executions do not compensate the families of murder victims. Far more edifying from a Christian standpoint is the attitude of the parents of 17-year-old, only child, Deena Bonn of Palo Alto, Calif. Mr. and Mrs. Bonn confronting the parents of their daughter's murderer said: "We can't get our girl back, we want to help your boy."

There are nine States which have abolished the death penalty: Maine, Rhode Island, Delaware, Michigan (exception: treason—no cases in history), North Dakota (exception: murder by a "lifer" and treason—no cases in history), Wisconsin, Minnesota, Alaska, and Hawaii. According to the FBI National Crime Report these 9 States have a 1.5 homicide rate per 100,000 or one-fourth of the national homicide average. The State of Georgia, on the other hand, almost invariably leads all other States in the number of murders despite the fact that it almost invariably stages the largest number of executions. Washington, which once abolished the death penalty (1913) and restored it in 1919, is one of nine States which have changed statutes in this regard. Restoration came (as in the other States) not as the result of any spectacular rise in homicide but due to one celebrated murder—of a State

official. One such case can incite lynching, not to mention restoration of capital punishment by an enraged legislature. The result of restoring the gallows: in the next two decades the first-degree murder rate climbed nearly three times that of the rate of population.

If anything, the facts concerning capital punishment establish that executions, rather than deterring murder, so cheapen human life as to incite emulation by those who look to the State and church for moral guidance. Dr. Vallenga is apparently either oblivious of these homicide rates or he is unwilling to discuss them. In this matter of life and death I presume that it is the doctor's incomprehension that prompts his conclusion. It would seem that this incomprehension is not confined to the field of sociology or penology but to logic as well. Within the narrow confines of one sentence he records his conviction: (1) "From time immemorial the conviction of good society has been that life is sacred"; (2) "He who violates the sacredness of life must pay the supreme penalty." Here is a striking example of the gross contradiction of legalized homicide. Murderers are not corpses—they are human beings—until the State kills them, which is hardly a respect for the sacredness of life. Yet Dr. Vallenga opines "the law of capital punishment must stand as a silent (?) but powerful witness of the sacredness of human life." Perhaps here he forgets that criminals are also human, such as the adulterous woman, the murderous Saul of Tarsus and legions of others, categorized in "I was in prison and ye visited me."

As a matter of fact, murderers are among the best behaved of the prison population. Ohio's Governor, Mike DiSalle (who with California's Pat Brown and Michigan's Mennen Williams is strongly opposed to capital punishment) has nine first-degree murderers who staff the executive mansion in Columbus. Among 374 paroled first-degree murderers in California, only 2 committed felonies and not 1 repeated the crime of first-degree murder. Many murderers are not ever paroled—those who are, serve 12½ years average. They have an unblemished prison record and seem to deserve some manifestation of the Christian doctrine of the forgiveness of sins. The average life sentence in Washington for those few paroled is 19 years. Not once has the crime of first-degree murder been repeated. As an act of amnesty one Christmas the young Queen Victoria transferred 10 condemned men to Botany Bay in Australia. Before she died she had knighted every one of them for service to the British Empire.

Dr. Vallenga seems to imply excessive materialism to those who oppose legalized murder. "We who are supposed to be Christian make too much of physical life." May it not therefore be reasonably asked why the doctor opposes murder? "The sentence of death is more redemptive than the tendency to excuse his crime as no worse than grand larceny." This statement evinces an appalling disregard of criminal law, as well as one aspect of church history. Grand larceny in no state evokes a life sentence as does first-degree murder. The argument that capital punishment is more redemptive is almost precisely the justification cited for the terrors of the Inquisition.

Dr. Vallenga does modify his demand for executions by restricting the application: "The supreme penalty should be exacted only after the guilt is established beyond the shadow of a doubt." Such a condition is utterly impossible unless judges and juries become suddenly infallible. While a murder may have numerous eyewitnesses, California still imposes the gas chamber for perjured testimony resulting in the execution of the innocent. Eyewitnesses need not even perjure to bring about this irretrievable miscarriage of justice; they can be mistaken—disastrously so. Without the last-minute confession of a former Chicago police officer, James Fulton Foster, father of seven children, would have been executed—as a result of the sworn (but erroneous) testimony of eyewitnesses. An eyewitness named John Christy caused the 1950 hanging of Timothy Evans in England. Failing, even after Evans' death, to produce the corpus delicti, Scotland Yard acted on a tip and examined the premises of chief witness Christy. Here they discovered the body of Mrs. Timothy Evans, and seven other women. The subsequent hanging of Christy hardly compensated for the mistake in regard to Evans. It did, however, act as one of the principal stimuli to the House of Commons' vote to abolish the death penalty, almost causing England to join the 33 countries who have outlawed executions. While this was negated by the House of Lords, 11 of 13 English Lord Bishops voted for abolition—in marked contrast to the 18th century archdeacon who maintained that "the executed innocent die for their country."

The cases of "executed innocent" are by no means a rarity. Arthur Koestler's book "Reflections on Hanging" has 19 pages of such cases. Professor Borchard of Yale has written "Convicting the Innocent," a study of 146 cases. States have been known to pay a pension to the wife and children of a man executed by mistake. Even incarceration of the innocent is a tragedy. Yet after 30 or 40 years (ask any condemned man if a life sentence is more brutal than execution) delayed evidence may bring about a pardon and an indemnity. It is impossible, however, to reprieve a corpse.

(NOTE.—Since publication of this article word has reached me that this posthumous pardon was not issued—L. Kinnolums.)

I have debated the question of the death penalty with a number of district attorneys and legislators. I have never yet seen one of them that did not seek, like Dr. Vallenga, to avoid this obvious and most desperately conclusive reason why capital punishment is intolerable in a Christian society. While serious thinkers and theologians seriously question whether or not ours is actually a Christian society, it is nominally so. The tragedy of Dr. Vallenga's article in the highly subsidized and, therefore, widely circulated magazine, is that it may have some influence on those who share his views on scriptural infallibility which opposes naturalistic ideas of sociology and penology.

His article will accomplish this through an international or perverted technique in which he has resorted to the most appalling distortion since God was "recruited" by Kaiser Wilhelm. Dr. Vallenga attempts to portray our Lord as an advocate of capital punishment—this despite His being history's most famous victim. The doctor's opinion of murderers contrasts strikingly to the Sanhedrin's and its bloodthirsty mob who considered Jesus' crime worse than murderer Barrabbas'. The doctor makes no mention of Jesus' explicit and explosive views on the "eye-for-eye, tooth-for-tooth" of the lex talonis. He does, however, have the astounding temerity of defending the death penalty with "Blessed are the merciful" and "Beloved, never avenge yourselves." Such vengence-repudiating texts are legion in the New Testament which stresses a gospel of love and forgiveness.

The doctor quotes Paul's famous statement from Romans that the state "does not bear the sword in vain." This is true—if, for instance, in resisting and armed enemy bent on conquest, which would be the greater of two evils. On the other hand, the state has no right to use the sword to execute either helpless prisoners of war (the only resemblance between capital punishment and combat), or to enforce burning of incense to emperors—or to chop off the head of the author of the Epistle to the Romans.

Perhaps the arguments regarding substitutionary atonement will continue ad infinitum. Some people still feel that the cross was the desire of a God who felt the need to placate either Himself or the Devil or an inexorable legalism which demanded the torture and death of the one human guiltless. I cannot believe that the crucifixion was God's will any more than I believe he desired the cowardice of Pilate, the desertion of the disciples, the betrayal of Judas, and the brutality of the soldiers in the common hall. The Gospel according to St. John seems to provide some reasonable explanation. "For this cause came I into the world: To bear witness unto the truth." The truth here meant temple cleansing, violation of Sabbath legalism, attack on entrenched hypocrisy, and assertion of divinity. This was God's will. The result of men's will was the capital punishment on Golgotha.

I suppose that anyone capable of citing the deprecatory Psalms as a defense (as Dr. Vallenga has done) is also capable of maintaining that our Lord approved of capital punishment—because he did not rescue the repentant thief from the cross. This startling and somewhat challenging assertion is so amazingly (even if unwittingly) similar to some of those present on Calvary. They, in similar fashion, concluded that Jesus was not divine because he wouldn't come down himself.

This is still the conclusion of some—and like Dr. Vallenga's opinion as to the Christian efficacy of legalized murder—such opinion probably will remain unchanged. I can rejoice however that even within the Presbyterian Church Dr. Vallenga's opinion has been resoundingly repudiated—by resolution of the Presbyterian general synod this year. This action followed the lead of the Quakers, the Unitarians, the American Baptists, the Protestant Episcopalians, and the central conference of American rabbis. The Methodists took action against the death penalty in 1940.

With the death of Pius XII and ascendancy of John XXIII the Roman Catholic Church too has become increasingly vocal. A 1941 statement of Pius XII seemed to rule out Roman support of abolition. His statement justifying execution if it protects society is now being interpreted with the obvious amendment that it fails to protect society. The auxiliary bishop of the archdiocese of Chicago, Bernard J. Scheil, founder of the Catholic Youth Organization and opponent of Senator McCarthy, is now in charge of the Illinois Committee for the Abolition of Capital Punishment. Father Donald Campion, S.J., has written extensively on the subject and Dean Charles Sheedy of Notre Dame is a member of the American League To Abolish Capital Punishment. Wardens Lawes of Sing Sing and Duffy of San Quentin have served as officers of this organization as have Psychiatrist Karl Menninger, M.D., and Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt, who is honorary president.

Public opinion is shifting rapidly—particularly in view of such films as "I Want To Live" and "Compulsion." The psychiatric profession is almost unanimous in its opposition to execution of such as Charles Starkweather, wanton killer of 11 who was a veritable treasure house for psychiatric research. While few would question his medical insanity, he died as legally sane under the archaic McNaughton rules which were established during the early years of the reign of Queen Victoria. These rules establish the knowledge of right and wrong as the criterion for culpability. If such were applied in the case of alcoholism it could never be regarded as a disease.

THE EXPERIMENTAL NEUROSIS OF CONDEMNED ROW

There is one other aspect of this problem that requires discussion, and that is the psychological, or what one might call the

creation of an experimental neurosis of condemned row.

In 1904 Russian physiologist Ivan Pavlov was awarded the Nobel Prize for his monumental research in the physiology of digestion. Perhaps, however, posterity will assign him a niche based on later research, in a different field. No competent student of psychology is unfamiliar with Pavlov's dogs—veritably a byword in the category of the conditioned response. The experimentation whereby Dr. Pavlov was able to elicit salivation merely by introduction of stimulus associated with feeding, established an epoch in the history of psychology.

Perhaps an even more significant, if less known, byproduct of this salivary experimentation came about through the work of one of Pavlov's research assistants, a woman by the name of Krestovnikova. While almost totally obscured in the international fame of her employer-administrator, the work of this lady may some day be recognized as of unlimited importance, since she might be said to be the discoverer of experimental neurosis.

Approaching the experiment with a slightly diabolical ingenuity, Krestovnikova set out to discover the effect of confusing stimulus. This was accomplished by introducing to the dog both a circle and an ellipse, with food provided in the case of the circle; deprivation in the case of the ellipse. After developing the conditioned response to both symbols, she began to introduce a series of ellipses which were progressively similar to circles. As the experiment required more and more acute discrimination on the part of the dog, a strange reaction set in, which Krestovnikova described as a mental breakdown. The dog began to salivate not only at both the circle and ellipse, but at the sight of the experimenter as well as the testing apparatus. Perhaps even more significant than this fairly understandable reaction was the effect on the dog's temperament. He whined and barked constantly, tore at his harness and attempted to escape. The most devastating result, however, was its lasting effect upon the dog. Even after a prolonged rest, the dog, in a repetition of the experiment, was observed to have lost the ability to discriminate between ellipses and circles. Henceforth he was useless as an experimental animal.

Similar experimentation was carried out by other Russians such as Erofeeva, who added the effect of an electric shock as the punishment for a wrong choice—thus adding to the tension and producing even more marked disorganization, neurosis, and inability to recover original powers of discrimination.

As perhaps an inevitable progression, other Russian scientists such as Krasnagorski and Panferov began similar experimentation with young children. In a situation demanding increasingly excessive auditory discrimination to a metronome, Panferov reported, the children became rude, belligerent, disobedient, overly excited and often fell asleep—the reported result of emotional exhaustion. Furthermore, the children, like their animal counterparts, lost even their previous ability to discriminate. Similar conduct was reported by Siriatsky and by Shastin regarding the use of a 15-year-old. Thus we see that human beings as well as animals are liable not only to induced neurosis—but also to a sort of retroactive amnesia, with regard to the recovery of powers of discrimination.

It is beyond our scope here to explore the relation and effect of this Russian-developed experimental neurosis upon the awe-inspiring technique of "brainwashing." On the other hand, Dr. Pavlov lived until 1936. Despite his eminence in the Czarist era as director of the Psychological Section of the Russian Academy of Medicine, he was not removed from his position nor were his conditioning experiments impeded by the Soviet Government. While Professor Anrep of Cambridge has translated many of Pavlov's scientific reports, it is impossible to determine the full extent of Pavlovian influence upon the development of brainwashing. From all reports, however, brainwashing is veritably overwhelming in its effect—which is almost unprecedented in the annals of torture and well-nigh irresistible in its effect.

Our purpose here is not to analyze the Communist practice of brainwashing—but rather to cite it as an example of the devastating effects of mental torture. It is also hoped to indicate a cognitive comparison between the experimental neurosis which was intentional in Russian laboratories, and the perhaps unwittingly induced neurosis of the condemned row aspect of capital punishment.

At the time of this writing, the fate of convict author Caryl Chessman is still in doubt, having created an uproar throughout California as well as an international furor. Perhaps the most amazing aspect of Chessman's recordbreaking 11-year tenure of condemned row is that fact that he is still sane and has not committed suicide. If Chessman were to take his own life, his notoriety would create the same furor as, for instance, the 11th-hour suicide of Herman Goering at Nuremberg. On the other hand, self-destruction on California's condemned row is by no means a rarity. As mentioned earlier, San Quentin Prison death row produced no less than five suicides in 4 years.

I thank God that the church is taking a lead in the campaign to abolish capital punishment. I am also grateful that the majority of Christians and their clergy do not share the obscurantist views of Dr. Vallenga, which he admits are opposed to the prevailing ideas of sociology as well as penology.

As long as any State in this country risks the possibility of executing the innocent, following months or years of the induced neurosis of condemned row, the public conscience well merits the neurosis that should inhabit the thinking of any Christian. Any moral person can sense in the death penalty a ferocious manifestation of what Henry Wiehofen termed "The Urge To Punish."

I am grateful to this magazine for allowing me the privilege of expressing a conviction concerning a subject which I believe should be of tremendous concern to all Christians. While only 48 men were executed last year (as compared to 190 in 1935), these 48 men are children of God and especially sacred in view of His own executed son. My expressed conviction may seem unkind to Dr. Vallenga. My views seek to oppose only his opinions. His views seek to destroy human beings.

HUMAN BEHAVIOR

We should attempt to realize that murderers, and most if not all other criminals, are largely products of their culture and of their interactions with other people. This cultural and social experience determines in great part the unconscious drives of the individual's personality. If that experience is adverse, those unconscious drives are likely to result in seriously negative behavior. In this sense, we must all share in the responsibility for each crime. For we all interact with others and so help to shape them as they do us.—Stuart Palmer, "A Study of Murder," Thomas Y. Crowell Co.

Statement by Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., in Opposition to Certain Proposed Reductions in Tariffs

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 11, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on August 10, 1960, representatives of the Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., presented before the Committee for Reciprocity Information and the U.S. Tariff Commission a detailed statement in opposition to the proposed reductions in rates of duties on articles covered by paragraphs 1301, 1302, 1303, 1305, and 1312 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, at the forthcoming GATT convention in Geneva. In their statement, the representatives of the Man-Made Fiber Producers Association, Inc., summarized 22 important points which they felt should be given most serious consideration before entertaining any ideas of making any reductions in tariff rates. I concur wholeheartedly with this plea by the producers of man-made fibers in views of the adverse effect which increased imports of man-made fibers and also of cotton and wool are having on our domestic industries and our national and local economies . In fact, this is the reason why I have cosponsored with Senator KERR, of Oklahoma, and others a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that no tariff reductions whatever be made on the part of the United States at the forthcoming GATT negotiations.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary of these points be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXTRACT FROM STATEMENT FILED AUGUST 10, 1960, BY MAN-MADE FIBER PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, INC., WITH COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION AND U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION IN OPPOSITION TO REDUCTIONS IN RATES OF DUTIES ON ARTICLES COVERED BY PARAGRAPHS 1301, 1302, 1303, 1305, AND 1312 OF THE TARIFF ACT OF 1930, AS AMENDED

SUMMARY

In this statement we have shown that the estimate by the Tariff Commission of the maximum increase in annual imports, if any, which may occur without causing serious injury to the domestic industry producing like or directly competitive articles, and the decision of the Committee for Reciprocity Information on the question of listing the products of this industry for possible reductions in rates of duties must be based upon full consideration of the following:

1. The present rapidly increasing trend of imports of manmade fibers.

2. The potential production of the present and projected excess productive capacities of foreign nations, particularly Japan and the member countries of the European Economic Community and of the European Free Trade Association, as present and potential

principal supplier areas of manmade fibers to the United States—and to the world.

3. The effect of increased imports of manmade fibers on the cotton and wool industries.

4. The safeguards erected by foreign nations against market disruption caused by increasing imports from Japan and less-developed nations and the lack of comparable safeguards for the United States.

5. The position of the manmade fiber-producing industry as second only to cotton in volume of consumption in this country and as the only domestic textile industry with all its products subject to reductions in duties in the forthcoming GATT negotiations.

6. The effect on the present employees in the domestic industry by displacement of domestic manmade fibers by imports and the effect thereof on prospective employment.

7. The effect of displacement of manmade fiber production on the communities in which the producing plants of the industry are located, many of the communities being small in population and having jobseekers in excess of jobs, some with substantial labor surplus and others on the borderline of serious unemployment.

8. The low labor costs in the fiber-producing industries of foreign nations, especially Japan and Western Europe.

9. The lower prices of imported manmade fibers.

10. The decline in U.S. capacity for the production of cellulosic manmade fibers in the period from 1955 to 1959.

11. The increase in cellulosic manmade fiber-productive capacities from 1955 through 1959 in Japan, the European Economic Community and the European Free Trade Association.

12. The increasing capacities in Japan and the European Economic Community for the production of noncellulosic manmade fibers, far exceeding the rate of growth in the United States.

13. The increases in total manmade fiber productive capacities in Japan, European Economic Community, and European Free Trade Association, far exceeding the growth and rate of growth in the U.S. productive capacity.

14. The following facts relating to world productive capacities for manmade fibers, excess capacities, imports, and exports:

(a) The United States, with 29.1 percent of the world's productive capacity for manmade fibers, has 22.3 percent of the world's excess capacity; imports 24.7 percent of the world's imports (a larger volume than any other fiber-producing country); exports only 9.3 percent of the world's exports of manmade fibers and 21.2 percent of the U. S. capacity is presently idle.

(b) The European Economic Community, with 24.8 percent of the world's productive capacity for manmade fibers, supplies 52.9 percent of the world's exports; and has excess productive capacity equivalent to 19.7 percent of the U.S. productive capacity.

(c) The European Free Trade Association, with 12.8 percent of the world's productive capacity for manmade fibers, supplies 26 percent of the world's exports; and has excess productive capacity equivalent to 9.5 percent of the U.S. productive capacity.

(d) Japan, with 17.8 percent of the world's productive capacity for manmade fibers, has 46.1 percent of the world's excess capacity and has excess capacity equivalent to 32.7 percent of the U.S. productive capacity.

(e) If the European Economic Community, the European Free Trade Association, and Japan each exported to the United States the potential production of the excess capacity of each area to increase exports to the United States, the idle U.S. capacity would be increased to 40.9 percent, 30.6 percent, and 53.9 percent, respectively.

(f) If all three of the principal supplier areas exported the production of their aggregate excess capacity to the United States, the idle U.S. capacity would be increased to 83.1 percent and the domestic manmade fiber producing industry would be in liquidation.

15. The present rates of duty are no barrier to imports of manmade fibers from the European Economic Community, the European Freed Trade Association, or Japan.

16. The research of the manmade fiber producing industry is essential to national defense and can be maintained only if the industry is permitted profitable use of its present productive capacity.

17. It is admitted that Japan can flood the U.S. textile markets at will.

18. Since the domestic markets for the products of our industry can be flooded with low labor cost goods by Japan in its uncontrolled discretion, the manmade fiber producing industry is at its peril point.

19. The Congress did not intend that the determination of peril points should be based on confidence in the self-restraint of any foreign nation not to flood our markets.

20. The balance of international trade has so changed that the present and potential principal supplier areas of manmade fibers are creditors and the United States is a debtor Nation.

21. General imports into the United States from the principal present and potential supplier areas of manmade fibers have increased at rapid rates since 1955.

22. The long-term trend of trade between Europe and the United States suggests a steady shift in Europe's favor. So also in the trade with Japan.

In brief, no reductions in rates of duties on manmade fibers may be made without stimulating imports to the serious injury of (a) the domestic manmade fiber producing industry, (b) the cotton and wool industries, (c) the employees of the industries, (d) the communities in which producing plants are located, (e) the national security, and (f) the general welfare.

Politics in Action in Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 11, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, many Americans are discovering that they can help maintain high standards of government service only if they become thoroughly familiar with the actual workings of government—and that includes direct experience with political processes before, after, and during campaigns.

New Jersey is fortunate in having a unique institute which believes that practical politics is one of the bedrock institutions of American life. The Eagleton Institute for Practical Politics was created to give students of political science and government the know-how which helps to make free government work. Its seminar sessions have attracted much notice not only in New Jersey but in other States, too.

An article in a recent "Report From Rutgers" describes the work of the institute and tells how political persons are at work at Rutgers—the State university in New Brunswick, N.J.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL POLO PONIES TRAINING FOR THE FRAY

Every Monday afternoon at Wood Lawn, the stately old residence on the Douglass College campus which houses the Eagleton Institute for Practical Politics, there meets a class that probably has no counterpart anywhere.

Even its title is unusual—"A Graduate Seminar in Practical Politics."

What takes place within the softly lit room that once was the library of the Neilson's ancestral home is a far cry from conventional political science classes. The sharp questions and blunt comments come closer to the after-session discussions in a statehouse pressroom than to the peaceful atmosphere of an ordinary class.

A typical 2-hour session of the 10 students and 2 or 3 faculty members might well begin with a discussion of an assigned current political question. All are expected to take part, their comments grounded upon a substantial list of background references that might range from De Tocqueville to Thomas E. Dewey, from Philip Freneau to Walter Lippmann.

Bringing the classic political theories into present-day focus are its listed instructors, Dr. Neil A. McDonald, professor of political science at Douglass College (and an elected local political officeholder) and Donald G. Herzberg, director of the Eagleton Institute. Dr. Isadore Lubin, holder of the Arthur T. Vanderbilt University professorship in public affairs, admits his fascination with the course and sits in with it regularly.

Second and liveliest part of a typical afternoon's work is joint review of the individual projects students have before them. Right now, the task is to develop with depth and detail a complete election campaign program for a particular Member of Congress.

The students first must familiarize themselves with the election district of their Congressman, learn its political and economic makeup, voting history, current voter attitudes, the power and goals of its organized groups, its mass communication channels and their political outlook, determine the key individuals likely to be major factors in the election campaign.

Interviews with the Congressmen, their staff people and political strategists aid in gathering accurate information upon which to base campaign plans. Details such as the cost of printing and mailing, of newspaper advertising space, radio and television time all are preliminary to the design of materials, the writing of speeches and commercials for the candidate.

Most important of all is the determination of issues to be stressed, the aspects of the candidate's record to serve as campaign foundation, the attacks anticipated upon the record, and the overall strategy and timing to be embodied in waging the campaign.

The interest in the nuts-and-bolts detail of the election process might well be judged extraneous to the time-honored theoretical study of political science. But it is meat and drink to the eight men and two women who are enrolled in the seminar.

Their aim in life is to be what Director Herzberg calls political persons, individuals deeply concerned with the workings of the American bipartisan system and willing to invest their working lives in making certain that it continues to function. Their careers will take them directly into the partisan political arena, as aids to elected officials or aspirants. Some have their eyes upon eventual election to office. But all have learned, and are relearning daily, that the matter of winning elections is a combination of perspiration and inspiration, with the emphasis upon the former.

The process works. Three recent graduates are typical. Penn graduate Jim Percey serves now as assistant to the mayor of Lancaster, Pa. Miss Betty Jackson, a graduate of Douglass, is staff assistant to U.S. Senator HART, of Michigan. Carwin Williams, who came to Eagleton from Brigham Young University, is now a staff member of Governor Rockefeller's "little Hoover commission" in Albany. Other Eagleton graduates have won similar responsibilities within the machinery of political parties in government.

What sort of people does this program draw? What moves them to this career? What sort of person has the best chances for success in this field? What training can help them meet their aims?

The individuals shown on the following page and their brief biographies illustrate the variety of geographical areas and undergraduate backgrounds that contribute students to the program.

The exact ingredients that go to make up "political person" (aside from an ability to write and communicate effectively) are hard to define. Director Herzberg likes to say that he is looking for intellectual polo ponies, swift and nimble, of great endurance, steady under fire and with a highly developed competitive streak.

Involvement in the machinery of American politics as direct participants was what Mrs. Florence Peshine Eagleton had in mind when she bequeathed some $2 million to Rutgers for the establishment of a foundation for practical politics.

Aside from the production of well-trained specialists in the business of politics, she sought also to give to large numbers of Douglass and Rutgers undergraduates a basic understanding of practical politics and an inspiration to undertake a citizen's proper concern with representative government.

The Eagleton programs have won national attention. Their original approaches to problems of government and political science have brought other projects (and outside financial support for them) to Herzberg and his small and tightly knit staff.

Their broadening work has led to a change in the name of the operation from the original Eagleton Foundation to the Eagleton Institute for Practical Politics. The purpose remains the same, but the goal has broadened as increased means have made expansion possible.

No single Eagleton project, however, expresses so well the purpose of the entire program as does the graduate seminar in practical politics.

Desalting the Sea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 11, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, an informative article on one of the most pressing problems facing America—finding new fresh-water resources for our expanding population—appeared in the Wall Street Journal this morning. It deals primarily with research in salt-water conversion. But the U.S. Government and private firms are working to find economic means of converting sea water and brackish water into fresh water supplies for our cities and industries.

Mr. President, it was under the administration of a distinguished Secretary of the Interior, the Honorable Oscar Chapman, that the Government first undertook a sustained research program in salt-water conversion. A Democratic Congress in 1958 provided for five demonstration plants in various parts of the country, where enlarged programs might be put into effect. This year the Senate passed S. 3557—which I was pleased to sponsor, along with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and 19 other colleagues—in order to put our salt-water conversion program on a continuing basis, subject to annual appropriations, and to permit local communities to construct their own conversion plants with Government loan assistance.

Mr. President, we need every type of research we can get—public and private—to reach our goal of converting salt water economically into usable water supplies. This morning's Wall Street Journal article, by Robert Keatley, is an enlightening account of the state of research in salt-water conversion today, and I ask unanimous consent to have this very fine article by Robert Keatley, a staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESALTING THE SEA—RESEARCHERS HUNT WAYS TO ECONOMICALLY END FRESH WATER SHORTAGES—GOVERNMENT TO TEST A PLANT IN FREEPORT, TEX.; GE, BLAW-KNOX DEVELOP GEAR—NO TANK CARS FOR COALINGA

(By Robert Keatley)

Starting next summer, Freeport, Tex., each day will pump 1 million gallons of water from the Gulf of Mexico into its water system.

Families in tiny Coalinga and Oxnard, Calif., already are depending on brackish, mineral-laden underground pools for their cooking and drinking water.

Within 2 years, residents of San Diego, Calif.; Webster, S. Dak.; and Roswell, N. Mex., also will get water from salty sources.

These scattered communities are participating in a stepped up attack on an increasingly urgent problem: How to achieve economical conversion of salt water into pure, fresh water that can slake thirsts, sprinkle lawns and satisfy industry's prodigious water demands. Many sections of the country, threatened with future water shortages as populations and water needs grow, are following with keen interest the efforts to find practical conversion methods.

The Freeport salt water plant, along with those of San Diego, Webster, and Roswell, will be part of a federally subsidized program aimed at finding an economical conversion system. The Coalinga and Oxnard plants, with no similar subsidies, are regarded as successful—but as yet offer no solution for the Nation as a whole. Reason: They're located in areas where fresh water always has been costly. Before Coalinga's conversion plant went into operation, the town had to bring in drinking water by railroad tankcar.

Growing numbers of companies, ranging from giants such as Bethlehem Steel Corp. to much smaller firms such as Ionics, Inc., of Cambridge, Mass., are struggling with the salt water conversion problem.

STRESSING THE NEED

An official of Westinghouse Electric Corp., one of the concerns working on conversion equipment, stresses the pressing nature of water worries. "In the next 5 or 10 years, some areas are going to have to build conversion plants despite their cost if they want to have enough drinking water," he asserts.

Water shortages are already a problem for many cities. One utility association expects more than 1,000 communities to ration water this year, while another claims 20 percent of the Nation's 18,000 municipal water systems have supplies too skimpy to meet dry-year demands. Shortages in recent years have had diverse results. They have led Dallas residents to line up to buy pure water at 50 cents a gallon, inspired an Orange, N.J., ordinance providing a fine for a leaky faucet and induced Jamaica, N.Y., to assign inspectors to patrol city streets looking for illegal lawn-watering. "The water industry is the only one which urges its customers to use less of its product," observes one researcher.

Government experts sketch this picture of U.S. water resources and needs: The Nation now has about 515 billion gallons of fresh water "readily available" each day, of which 312 billion are being used. By 1980, daily needs—based on an expected 270 million population—will be 597 billion gallons. The gap between the amount of water available and future requirements will be narrowed somewhat by increased industrial and civic reuse of water. But some new sources will be needed if the increased demand is to be met. The problem will continue to be far greater in some areas than it is in others, because the Nation's available water resources are not evenly distributed. Some areas have more water than they will need in the foreseeable future; others, such as the arid Southwest and the thickly populated mid-Atlantic States, face increasingly severe shortages.

HOMES AND BUSINESSES

Pressure on water resources comes from both homes—which take an average of 150 gallons a day per resident from city systems, up 30 gallons from 1940—and from business, which accounts for nearly 40 percent of the Nation's consumption. Some chemical factories need 17 million gallons annually for each employe on the payroll, while an aluminum plant uses 22 million gallons per man. Turning out a ton of newsprint or rayon may require 240,000 gallons, while 60,000 gallons are needed for a ton of steel.

The prospect of a steady climb in demand for water from both individual and industrial users is stirring the current interest in utilizing salt water, which is available over a large part of the country. Oceans lap at the borders of 23 States, with 65 percent of the Nation's industry and 55 percent of its population, water researches note. Also, there are untapped pools of brackish water available underground in many areas.

Spending is rising for Government and private research on ways to convert water from these sources into usable form. White-haired Dr. A. L. Miller, a physician and former Congressman who heads the Interior Department's Office of Saline Waters, says, "A few years ago only a handful of companies were seriously interested in saline water conversion." Now his office figures 100 research centers and private firms are spending up to $50 million annually on this work, and the figures are rising.

PIPES, VALVES AND COMPRESSORS

The salt water purification plants now under development consist of complex mazes of pipes, valves and compressors which boil, freeze or electrically charge water to separate it from its salt. They're aimed at turning ocean water, with up to 35,000 mineral parts per million parts water (p.p.m.), or brackish water (3,000 to 10,000 p.p.m.) into fresh water with 1,000 p.p.m. or less. By the time desalted water reaches home users, it is little different in taste or appearance from ordinary city water.

Already a market for conversion equipment has sprung up. Ionics, Inc., for example, has sold more than 40 of its small conversion plants. Throughout the world, it's now estimated enough land-based equipment is operating to desalt 20 million gallons of water a day. But most existing plants, such as Ionics' unit which supplies drinking water for the Air Force station near remote Havre, Mont., fill special needs and produce water much too costly to compete where other supplies are available. The companies now getting into the conversion field have something bigger than this on their minds: They're angling for the potentially much larger municipal water system market.

A private water consultant, Louis Koenig of San Antonio, Tex., recently told an industry symposium that, figuring conversion costs at $1 per thousand gallons, some 11,000 communities in the next 15 years will find it cheaper to convert salt water than to pipe in fresh water from distant sources or otherwise boost supplies. And Gordon Leitner, vice president of Clever-Brooks Co. of Milwaukee, which has a subsidiary making conversion gear, sees a sizable market not far off. "There are some communities in the United States today which would find it economical to convert sea water for potable water," he claims.

Among the large companies besides Westinghouse Electric and Bethlehem Steel plunged into salt water conversion research and development, are Blaw-Knox Corp., Fairbanks Whitney Corp., General Electric Co., and Food Machinery & Chemical Corp. Not long ago, Scotland's G. &. J. Weir, Ltd., a veteran maker of distillation equipment, teamed with Chicago Bridge & Iron Co. to exploit the de-salting market.

NEEDED: LOWER COSTS

How successful these and other concerns are in lowering costs will determine conversion's future, industry spokesmen agree. The American Waterworks Association figures most cities now pay from 10 cents to 80 cents per thousand gallons for their water, with a typical mid-Atlantic area town now paying about 40 cents. The lowest proven de-salting cost for sea water is found on the Caribbean oil refinery island of Aruba, where a 2.7 million-gallon-a-day plant built by Weir supplies residents' needs for $1.75 per thousand gallons. Previously, water had to be brought in by barge.

But most companies, including Weir believe they can now beat this figure. The $1.3 million Freeport plant, to be built by Chicago Bridge as the first of five under a Federal demonstation program, is expected to produce one million gallons daily for $1 or less per thousand. Cleaver-Brooks executives believe they can get 90-cent water at some U.S. seacoast locations, while Blaw-Knox projections for its freezing process—based on a 10-million-gallon plant—are about 50 cents per thousand gallons. Most optimistic are claims by Fairbanks Whitney, which says it can produce water for less than 40 cents by a semi-secret method being developed in Israel.

The already-operating Oxnard, Calif., conversion plant, built by Ionics, purifies underground water for only 20 cents per thousand gallons, but this water is far less saline than sea water. Costs at the Coalinga plant, also built by Ionics, are considerably higher because it's an older, less efficient facility and the local water has a higher salt content.

CRITICS OF CONVERSION

Salt water conversion has its critics. California State water officials assert it won't be economically feasible for many years, though an industry executive suggests the State officials are merely fearful enthusiasm for conversion might undermine public support of a proposed $1.7 billion aqueduct system.

In any case, Harvey Banks, California's director of water resources, warns: "I would hate to see any misguided hopes for an early victory in the conversion battle become so widespread as to jeopardize the economically feasible plans we have underway to bring new water to the thirsty acres of the State." California's massive Feather River project would move fresh water from the upstate areas to terminal points in the southern part of the State for only 15 to 20 cents per thousand gallons, with purifying and distribution costs extra. Discussions of conversion costs don't take distribution charges into account either, but no additional chemical treatment is needed.

A wide variety of simple-sounding schemes have been devised to separate salt from water. Most are based on two facts long familiar to high school physics students: Boiling salt water gives off fresh water vapor, which can be condensed; and freezing salt water forms pure ice crystals, which can then be melted to obtain fresh water.

TRICKY PROBLEMS

Though distilling fresh water from salt water by heating sounds easy, many tricky problems are involved. The complex teakettles used need vast amounts of fuel. Another problem is that corrosive salt water eats away at water-carrying tubes, while scale often forms on surfaces exposed to heat, reducing heat transfer and fuel efficiency. New metals and plant designs have helped various companies at least partially overcome these problems.

Prof. Everett Howe, director of the University of California's $500,000-a-year conversion research program, sees this distillation process as the most important conversion method for the near future. "The general prospect seems to be that thermal distillation will continue to dominate the desalting field for the next few years and that the cost of water produced by this means will be somewhat less than $1 per thousand gallons, as compared to about $4 10 years ago," he says.

But partisans of freezing methods disagree. They claim they're overcoming design problems and will shortly take the lead. Freezing techniques have the inherent advantage of consuming less fuel than distillation, though to date plant costs have been higher.

Companies working on freezing have taken different approaches in their research. Blaw-Knox pumps a volatile liquid hydrocarbon, such as isobutane, into salt water. Rather than mix with water, it flashes off as a vapor, leaving an icy sludge behind. Carrier makes ice by flash-freezing sea water in a low temperature vacuum chamber. Each uses a different system of washing ice from brine for melting into fresh, drinkable water. By fall, both will have pilot plants in operation—Carrier's producing 15,000 gallons daily and Blaw-Knox's 35,000.

Still another experimental freezing plant will be constructed under a Government contract by Struthers Wells Corp., Warren, Pa., and Scientific Design Co., New York.

FAIRBANKS' SYSTEM

Most controversial is the freezing system of Fairbanks Whitney, developed in Israel by a Russian émigré, Dr. Alexander Zarchin. The secretive Dr. Zarchin has refused to make public details of his process, but it has prompted Fairbanks' officials to claim they can produce water for less than 40 cents at U.S. locations. The company has joined with the Government of Israel to build a 250,000-gallon plant on the Gulf of Aqaba, with equipment being made by a subsidiary, Fairbanks, Morse & Co.

Though some competitors are skeptical of Fairbanks' efforts and insist the company underestimates the capital costs of its plants, Fairbanks officials say they're ready to make good on their claims. One company official declares Fairbanks can build a 1-million-gallon-a-day plant in the United States for $700,000, including land, capital equipment, interest on loans, labor, and other charges. "We're hoping that a contract for construction of a desalting plant in the United States will be signed before the end of the year," he states.

By way of comparison, Cleaver-Brooks figures it could build a 1-million-gallon sea water distillation plant, producing 90-cent water, for $1 million. The cost of an Ionics 250,000-gallon brackish water plant is about $75,000, but these plants, which use electrically charged membranes to pick off salt ions, would have prohibitive power costs if used on sea water, with its 3½ percent mineral content.

The 8-year-old Federal Office of Saline Water has been largely responsible for cost-cutting research gains, many industry men say. The agency now has more than 40 projects farmed out to university and private laboratories. In addition to the Freeport plant, its five-plant demonstration program will provide conversion facilities for San Diego, Webster, Roswell, and an eastern city. Each plant will use a different process. The aim is to collect reliable operating data, so local water officials can decide whether they can economically build such plants.

Forward Strategy Reappraised

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 11, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday of this week the Association of the U.S. Army held its annual meeting here in the city of Washington. It was my good fortune to attend several events in connection with this meeting and I was strongly impressed with the atmosphere of forward-looking, constructive thought which pervaded the entire gathering. Particularly impressive for me were the remarks of the able Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Lyman Lemnitzer, delivered at the annual luncheon on Tuesday, August 9. This brilliant military leader gave a carefully reasoned, thoughtful, and penetrating analysis of the doctrine of forward strategy which deserves the careful attention of all individuals interested in improving our national security.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of General Lemnitzer be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORWARD STRATEGY REAPPRAISED

(Address by Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, at the annual meeting of the Association of the United States Army, Sheraton-Park Hotel, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, August 9, 1960)

The annual meeting of this association has always had special appeal for me. I view it as an Army homecoming for members of the Army, alumni of the Army, and friends of the Army. It is a time of reminiscing. It is also a time to appraise the turbulent and fast-moving events of current history which have direct impact on our present and future missions.

We live in a world of ferment and revolutionary change which has no historic counterpart. It is true that past history records periods of dynamic intellectual and economic expansion during which certain nations and cultures displayed extraordinary outbursts of creative energy. The Renaissance of Western Europe, which began in the 14th century, is only one of many examples. However, the Renaissance spanned centuries. Further, it affected only a portion of the world. By contrast, today, virtually the entire world is in the throes of a renaissance during which political, social, economic, and scientific developments evolve in years, or even months, instead of centuries. In this shifting world environment, nations are being born—and nations could die—with awesome rapidity.

In today's world, the basic conflict between free men and Communists—a conflict which emerged from the shambles of World War II—exerts a dominant influence. We recognized the massive and global menace of international communism early in the post-World War II period. To combat this menace, we joined with other free nations in adopting a policy of collective security. In light of the growing power of the Communist empire, it becomes even more compelling that we merge our strength with the strength of other free nations in a common defense against a common danger. In other words, the formula of collective security remains more important than ever.

I believe that most Americans agree on this point. Meanwhile, questions have arisen concerning the means we should employ in contributing to the collective security of the free world. For example, some have called for a reappraisal of our forward strategy, especially in light of recent disorders in some countries where we are maintaining military bases and forces. I would like to devote my remarks today to the subject of forward strategy because it is so important to the country and to the free world and because the Army plays such a key role in its implementation. Sooner or later, this strategy affects all members of the Army and their families as well. This is not to say that the other members of the U.S. Armed Forces do not participate in the implementation of forward strategy because they do. As a matter of fact, some of the best exampels of close teamwork and cooperation between the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, as well as other agencies of the U.S. Government, and with our Allies as well, are taking place daily throughout the free world in the implementation of this important facet of U.S. strategy.

In discussing forward strategy, I intend focusing primarily on the military aspects of this strategy—although I fully recognize the importance of the many nonmilitary factors involved.

Since forward strategy means different things to different people, I'd like first to define what I think it means. By forward strategy, I mean a plan to dispose our military power so that we, together with our allies, could meet and repel promptly Communist military aggression if it occurred along the periphery of the free world as well as anywhere else it might occur. Preparations to execute this strategy include, among other measures, the positioning of military forces overseas together with development of a capability to project our military power rapidly to areas beyond our borders when it becomes necessary. As I have previously indicated, since ground forces—that is, Army forces—would be a basic and essential element of military forces involved in a forward strategy, I believe the debate over this strategy has inherent interest for this audience.

Those who question the continued need for a forward strategy do so for a variety of reasons. However, I believe that the consensus of the objections, made on military grounds, rests on the thesis that a forward strategy is no longer required in light of the current strategic situation. The reasoning behind such a thesis goes like this: One of the principal means of stemming the spread of militant communism in the post-World War II period has been the U.S. capability to deliver long-range nuclear blows against the Communist empire. The establishment of U.S. bases in allied countries close to the enemy's homeland facilitates the development of that capability. However, when the Soviets also developed an ability to bring nuclear firepower to bear against distant targets, our bases immediately became vulnerable and hence—it is argued—less useful. Moreover, the thesis continues, as we developed weapons systems of intercontinental ranges, the original requirement for bases close to enemy targets disappeared, or at least greatly diminished.

It appears to me that the most striking feature of the thesis I have just described is the implicit assumption that military aggression by the Communists would necessarily take the form of long-range nuclear attack. If made at all, such an attack would undoubtedly include an attack against the United States and would precipitate general nuclear war. However, if one is to credit not only repeated statements of Soviet leaders, but also long-established Soviet military doctrine, the Soviets agree with us that neither side could escape widespread devastation in a future general nuclear war. In fact, it appears that the Soviet attitude in this regard may have irked their Chinese Communist allies. Communist China has consistently displayed less respect than the Soviets for the destructive power of nuclear weapons as she continues to threaten the use of military force in pursuit of her aims.

Thus, if we consider the attitude of the Soviets who possess a nuclear capability and the attitude of the Chinese Communists who do not, it would appear that limited war would continue to be more likely than general war.

As you know, limited war raises two major requirements. The first is for quick reaction to enemy aggression so as to limit the extent of his gains. The second requirement is for means to apply that degree of force needed to defeat the enemy without inflicting undue losses on noncombatants or risking expansion of the war into a worldwide conflagration. Versatile, dual-capable ground forces which can fight either nuclear or nonnuclear war are especially well fitted to fulfill this second requirement. This is so because they can employ a variety of types of force against an enemy appropriate to the occasion. In other words, they can exterminate the rats without destroying the neighborhood infested by the rats.

Although modern technology has afforded tremendous improvements in many aspects of our ability to wage general nuclear war, it has not provided comparable improvements in many fundamental aspects of our capability to wage limited war. For example, in general war, the intercontinental ballistic missile can deliver nuclear firepower to distant targets in a matter of minutes. However, the essence of the problem in limited war is to deliver combat forces rapidly to distant trouble areas where they can employ either nuclear or nonnuclear fire. This movement depends on air and sealift and there have been no tremendous improvements in the capabilities of these means of transport. As in the past, their speed of movement is still measured, not in minutes, but in days, or weeks, or months. In other words, the familiar limitations of time and space which we encountered in past wars would be very much with us in future limited wars.

Now I am well aware that when anyone, particularly a general makes this sort of a statement, he leaves himself open to the accusation that he is "preparing to fight the last war." However, I would prefer to regard my statement as recognition of the need to face up to old, but nonetheless real, problems which have not disappeared solely because of the passage of time or greatly improved technology.

The adoption of a forward strategy provides an obvious answer to the problem of decreasing the time lag between an enemy's limited military aggression and our response. Such a strategy provides for the positioning of combat units at or near potential trouble spots throughout the world. There is no substitute in limited war for military forces on the ground who know the ground on which they are to fight, who know the people living on that ground, and who know local allied units which would be serving alongside of them. A forward strategy also provides a means to reinforce such forces rapidly, or to move combat units to threatened areas where we have no forces. It does so by fostering the development of a strategic transport system consisting not only of long-range transport aircraft and ships but also of the forward bases and airfields which are an essential part of that system. It does so also by providing readied mobile reserves of all of the U.S. Armed Forces, like the Strategic Army Corps, which are prepared for rapid movement via the strategic transport system.

Thus, it is apparent that a forward strategy will continue to exert a dominant influence on our ability to conduct limited war—and thus to deter enemy initiation of limited war. The influence of a forward strategy in deterring or winning general war is equally important, if less apparent.

In determining what should be done to deter enemy resort to any type of war, including general war, there is always a tendency to think exclusively in terms of forces which we would need to conduct successfully the type of war which we visualize. However, it is the enemy, not ourselves, whom we are attempting to impress by our military preparations designed to discourage his attack. Hence, in making such preparations, we should consider—at least in conjunction with our own concepts of general war—the enemy's concept and the types of forces which he considers necessary to fight the war successfully. This logic assumes even greater validity in connection with general war. Because such a war completely transcends man's experience, it has inspired an extremely wide variety of opinions concerning the form it would take.

The Soviets have consistently maintained that a general nuclear war would be long and drawn out. They do not discount, for a moment, the profound influence which a nuclear exchange, or exchanges, would have on the course of such war. However, they insist that the ultimate decision would be attained by balanced air, sea, and ground forces, operating in combination.

The composition of Soviet armed forces reflects this philosophy. The Soviets are developing a growing capability to wage intercontinental nuclear warfare. At the same time, they also maintain powerful modernized ground forces and tactical air forces, designed primarily to wage offensive warfare, with or without nuclear weapons. They also maintain a potent submarine fleet. It is noteworthy that, unlike ourselves, they have not attempted to create a strategic transportation system which would permit them to move large forces, on a continuing basis, to combat areas distant from the Eurasian land mass. This would indicate that their major geographic objectives in a general nuclear war would be restricted initially to the Eurasian land mass.

If we consider the Soviet concept of general war, together with the composition of their military forces, we can determine—at least in broad outline—the strategy the

Soviets are capable of following in such a war. Elements of that strategy are:

A nuclear strike against the United States with possible strikes against other portions of the free world.

Concurrently, a massive attack by ground and tactical air forces against free nations in Eurasia. Seizure of the peoples, land, and economies of these nations would be the true objective of the Communist attack. Attainment of this objective would mark the completion of a major phase in achieving ultimate world domination.

An additional element of the Communist strategy would be initiation of a great war at sea as Communist submarines attempted to block reinforcement by the free world of combat areas in Eurasia.

Our ability to defeat this strategy provides a measure of our ability to deter Communist initiation of general nuclear war. It is evident that such an ability must include an invulnerable means to retaliate, in kind, against a nuclear attack on the United States. At the same time, we must also display an evident capability to meet and defeat Communist forces which attempted to attain the Communist objective—seizure of free Eurasia.

In developing this latter capability, the importance of a forward strategy again becomes apparent. It would appear especially important that we maintain, in conjunction with our allies, adequate military forces in Eurasia. This is so because difficulties of reinforcing them in general war would unquestionally be greater than in limited war. Ground forces should constitute a high percentage of these forces.

Earlier, I stated that I would restrict my comments principally to the military aspects of a forward strategy. However, the psychological aspects of that strategy—particularly as they relate to the cold war—are completely intertwined with the military aspects. Hence, in concluding my remarks today, I would like to discuss both aspects together.

The cold war is fought on a variety of fronts—political, economic, sociological, psychological, and military. Yet, at root, it is psychological. Throughout the cold war, the real measure of the ability of free men to withstand communism is what they, themselves, think it to be. In this regard, the power represented by free world military strength makes an indispensable contribution to the confidence of free peoples. However, the existence of this strength must not only be apparent, it must be obviously positioned for use, and there must be a clear indication of a willingness to use it if need be. I believe the contributions to allied military strength which we make, under a forward strategy, meet all of these criteria.

The diametric opposite to a forward strategy is the concept of a fortress America, involving withdrawal of our forces to the United States. We have witnessed an example of such a concept in recent history. During World War II, as Hitler's fortunes waned in Africa and then in Sicily, he began to stress the concept of an impregnable fortress Europe. Actually, this was an exercise in self-deception, if Hitler ever really believed it himself. This myth was designed to obscure the hard reality that he was losing on the fronts where his forces were in contact with his enemies.

A fortress America could prove to be as great a delusion as was Hitler's fortress Europe. That is why I feel that the American people will never accept such a concept. Nor will they permit abandonment of our current policy of forward strategy which still retains so great a military utility today.

To all of you here, I extend—on behalf of the Department of the Army—the most cordial greetings and the hope that you will enjoy the best of all annual meetings of the Association of the U.S. Army.

New Jersey Has Many Faces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 11, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey apparently has the capacity to surprise visitors who, even momentarily, leave its main traffic arteries and travel for a few miles into other regions of the State. In the Saturday Evening Post of July 16 writer Roul Tunley confesses that he had once believed that there was little more to Jersey than the landscape seen from the New Jersey Turnpike. His article also reports, however, among other things:

I might have gone on sticking to that well-trod path and feeling I knew all about the State if one day I hadn't visited a classmate who had just bought a farm near the Delaware River, a few miles above Trenton. When I saw the area I couldn't believe my eyes. Here were green, rolling hills, heavily wooded and full of game. Here were farmhouses straight out of Currier and Ives. And as I came upon an old covered bridge, six deer vaulted across the road in front of my car. That settled it. I had to have a stake in those hills. Not long afterward I built a cabin as a weekend retreat.

In time, of course, the inevitable happened. The retreat became so irresistible that I made it my permanent home. And as a full-time resident I saw the surprises really start coming. Those forests, for one thing. One tract alone—the famous Pine Barrens in central Jersey—comprise 1,250,000 acres, about 25 percent of the whole State. One can travel for miles in the Pine Barrens without seeing a house. The inhabitants, known as Pineys, are a breed apart. They are primarily of Anglo-Saxon origin, and their isolation has been so complete for centuries that even their language, like the Kentucky mountaineers', is a throwback to other days. Not long ago I was traveling in the Pines with the State forester, Alden Cottrell. We stopped at a remote general store not far from Batsto to ask the way to a certain charcoal furnace.

"Follow down the road a piece and go to the second pair of banisters," said the man. "Take the sand road to the right, but look out for the cripple or you'll get set. You'll come to the pit in a half mile."

As far as I was concerned, I might have been on the moon. However, my guide, who understands the Pineys' language, translated for me. "Banisters" are guardrails; "cripples" are low, wet places; "get set" means to get stuck, and a "pit" is a charcoal furnace. As surprising as the Jersey forests are the Jersey farms. They still comprise 35 percent of the State's land area, though you'd never know it when speeding along the corridor. From a train window or U.S. Route 1, the whole State looks urban—sleazily urban. What I learned ultimately, however, was that the corridor is, in reality, a narrow, concrete-laced strip of land only 15 miles wide. It looks the way it does because 60 percent of the State's population and the vast majority of its factories have crowded into it for convenience's sake. Actually, the slender strip is a kind of false front, like one of those western movie sets.

And behind the front are some of the stubbornest farmers in America. Stubborn because they are determined to stick to the soil and have refused as much as $25,000 an acre along the main highways. Consequently, in order to survive at all when faced with soaring taxes and the encroachment of industry and split-levels, they have been forced to become the most mechanized and efficient farmers in the Nation. And they have done just that. In 1958 they achieved the highest income per acre in the United States—$195.

No one will deny that New Jersey is highly industrial too. Although it's the fifth-smallest State, it's the fifth-largest in per-capita income. And much of this is because of its industrial virtuosity. New Jersey makes everything from girdles to electronic brains. In chemicals it leads the Nation. And in research it also holds the first position: 10 percent of all U.S. industrial research money is spent in New Jersey.

One of the secrets of the State's astonishing material success with so few natural resources is, of course, its strategic location. Its industries are within an overnight truck drive of one-third of the Nation's population.

Cameramen are also finding out about New Jersey. Brett Weston, famed photographer from California, visited Cranbury, N.J., recenty. The July 1960 issue of U.S. Camera carries his photos of idylic small town scenes—the front porch, the variety retail store, the quiet corner of an old cemetery.

Mr. President, to hasten the growing realization that New Jersey is a State rich in quiet beauty, I ask that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no obection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRANBURY BY WESTON—THOUGH JUST A SHORT WAY FROM THE WORLD'S LARGEST CITY, THIS HISTORIC VILLAGE IN NEW JERSEY SEEMS UNCHANGED BY PASSING TIME

Not many people have ever heard of Cranbury, N.J.—a village that history remembers but time forgot. Not 2 hours from Manhattan, not 2 miles from the sweep of the great turnpike down New Jersey, surrounded by lush potato, wheat, and barley fields and by an increasingly number of industrial research plants, Cranbury dozes quietly in its white houses, its dark shutters asleep against the sun.

Go through it by car and you drive along the past. Main Street was once a section of the old King George's Road, the chief link between New York and Philadelphia. There in some talk that Benjamin Franklin once walked the road. Today it is green and peaceful, lined with great elms.

Drive past the inn, or stop—it's open still. Yet it quartered Washington's troops on the eve of the Battle of Monmouth. Across the street is the First Presbyterian Church, founded in 1734 by men who, "being steadfast believers in a free church and the privileges of civil liberty, here sought a refuge from religious persecution."

Cranbury isn't far from where Washington crossed the Delaware, and Revolutionary battles raged even closer by at Princeton, only 6 miles to the west.

Yes, it's an old village, liking the old ways. And quiet. Television aerials, but no movie theater. Church socials. The undertaker's is the oldest firm in town. And prosperous enough. Just one industry—a great rose farm that ships 10,000 blooms a day. For the rest, each family knows the others, and most feel it's a good life.

And that's the way its citizens want to keep it. If you covet a plot of land or one of its houses, you'll pay New York prices—if you can find a house for sale. If you build, you'll dig your own well for water so as not to deplete the town water supply from Cranbury Brook.

A host of discouragements will hedge your notions to change the town by so much as one new house or citizen. If a building of Victorian vintage is after all razed or

altered, no modern structure will replace it: a building in Colonial style will appear—white clapboard with black trim. As one teenager put it, "We're against change, against building, and against tourists."

Address by Hon. Robert A. Lovett, Former Secretary of Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 11, 1960

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the speech of the Honorable Robert A. Lovett, former Secretary of Defense, at the George C. Marshall memorial dinner, August 10, during the annual meeting of the Association of the U.S. Army.

Mr. Lovett's speech is a stirring document, one filled with warm tribute to a great soldier-statesman, General Marshall, and one containing sound advice on vital defense matters. I commend Mr. Lovett's speech to all of my colleagues and to the American people.

Appropriately, the Association of the U.S. Army awarded to Mr. Lovett its first George Catlett Marshall medal "for selfless service to the United States of America." I know of no living American more deserving of this recognition.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. ROBERT A. LOVETT, FORMER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, AT GEORGE C. MARSHALL MEMORIAL DINNER DURING ANNUAL MEETING OF ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 10, 1960

If a man is very fortunate he may have, once in a lifetime, the opportunity to work in a cause he believes in with all his heart and soul and under the leadership of a man whom he admires, respects, and comes to love. I have had that great privilege three times: Once, with Henry L. Stimson and, twice, with General Marshall, and, until the day I die, I will be grateful to them for letting me see, at first hand, the qualities of greatness and true leadership. Both these extraordinary men had much in common. The strengths of both stem from the fundamentals of sterling character. Both had unshakable integrity. Both were fearless of the consequences of a course of action they felt in duty bound to take. Working close to them was, therefore, a stimulating and inspiring experience, in part because their own personal standards were so high that, unless you were a hopeless clod, you had to raise your own. Service with them could not fail to refine and add balance to one's sense of values.

Since October 1959 I have wanted to share with General Marshall's old comrades in arms some memories of him and to reminisce about the little-known man, behind the serious and dignified exterior, whom the world regarded with respect, admiration, and something akin to awe. The first of the memorial dinners seems to me to be the proper time and place to do so and to show you one or two vignettes of this remarkable man whom you honor tonight and to remind you of some of his characteristics which made him so inspiring a figure.

I have no words to express my own feeling of admiration, gratitude, and affection for this noble man. Perhaps it is as well, for what could my words—or indeed, any words, add to the stature of General Marshall—Chief of Staff, General of the Army, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of State, citizen and recipient of the Nobel Peace Prize.

The whole world has recognized his magnificent accomplishments in the service of his country and the civilized world has sought to honor him. His public virtues have been extolled by the great of every country who have paid him homage and, in almost unmatched eloquence, have expressed their gratitude.

Consider, for example, the moving testimony of the value of his services to his country from the two Presidents whom he served.

President Roosevelt stated simply, "I feel I could not sleep at night with you out of the country."

President Truman, whom he served twice as Cabinet officer after his brilliant service as Chief of Staff, has called him "the organizer of victory, the greatest of the great in our time," and has said "he takes his place at the head of the greatest commanders of history."

Or, hear what his British colleagues in the Combined Chiefs of Staff, said to him in a message on his retirement as Chief of Staff in November 1945. It is a document almost without parallel.

It reads, in part:

"On your retirement after 6 years as Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, we, your British colleagues in the Combined Chiefs of Staff, send you this message of farewell.

"We regret that Field Marshall Sir John Dill, and Admiral of the Fleet Sir Dudley Pound, two of your greatest friends and admirers, are not alive today to add their names to ours. As architect and builder of the finest and most powerful Army in American history, your name will be honored among those of the greatest soldiers of your own or any other country.

"Throughout your association with us, in the higher direction of the Armed Forces of America and Britain, your unfailing wisdom, high principles and breadth of view have commanded the deep respect of us all. Always you have honored us by your frankness, charmed us by your courtesy, and inspired us by your singleness of purpose and your selfless devotion to our common cause. * * *"

Few examples of simple gratitude surpass that brief and moving ceremony on May 8, 1945, in Secretary Stimson's office. Some of you here tonight may remember, as vividly as I do, that General Marshall was summoned to the office of the Secretary, where Mr. Stimson had invited 14 senior generals and his own assistants to be present. The Secretary asked General Marshall to stand beside him, facing the rest of us who were formed in an easy semicircle in front of the Secretary's desk. The Secretary, then 78 years old, took off his old-fashioned spectacles and, holding them in his hand, faced General Marshall, bowed slightly, and said:

"I want to acknowledge my great personal debt to you, sir, in common with the whole country. No one who is thinking of himself can rise to true heights. You have never thought of yourself. Seldom can a man put aside such a thing as being the commanding general of the greatest field army in our history. This decision was made by you for wholly unselfish reasons.

"But you have made your position as Chief of Staff a greater one. I have never seen a task of such magnitude performed by man.

"It is rare late in life to make new friends; at my age, it is a slow process, but there is no one for whom I have such deep respect and, I think, greater affection. I have seen a great many soldiers in my lifetime but you, sir, are the finest soldier I have ever known."

Much has been said of General Marshall as a great public figure but not nearly enough about him as a very great human being. This is not surprising since the general permitted no intrusion into his private life, except by his Government, for he treasured the brief periods of time that he had with his wife. He found solace, encouragement, and refreshment of spirit in them.

So I would like tonight to speak of the warmhearted, considerate, generous, and modest man, whom many of you knew so well, and I think the general will forgive me and realize that it is a comfort to speak of those we miss.

One of the pictures of General Marshall, that I relish, reminds me of his wry, quiet form of humor and his expertness at kidding you while he maintained a straight face and a fairly solemn air. He used to have the barber, Joe Abbate, come up to his room and cut his hair at least once a week. He found the interlude refreshing, the conversation relaxing, and the results becoming. Now, I must confess that I regarded these weekly shearings with amazement and envy, as nature had so scantily endowed me in hirsute gifts that a trip to the barber was a major occasion for me.

When we were in the Department of State, the operation was performed in a blue-tiled bathroom, with the general ensconced in a leather chair, and Joe, a trusted friend, busily engaged in snipping away with appropriate flourishes. General Marshall left strict instructions, regardless of the haircut, that I was to come in and discuss any matters with him which were not highly classified.

Time and again I would go in to clear something with the general and I began to look forward to it after a while, because I could see a plot was developing. I rather suspected that the general's aide, Jim George, was involved in it. I would customarily knock on the door and ask if I might interrupt him. He would say, "Certainly, come in, Lovett." I would ask him if he would take a look at this particular piece of paper. He would reply he didn't have his glasses; read it to him. I would do so. He would think it over; he might discuss it a bit; then he would give me my instructions, and I would gather up the papers and get ready to go.

At this point I remember seeing the general looking at me out of the corner of his eye, with his head dropped down, and the barber working on the back of it. I knew a trap was about to be sprung. He said, "Lovett, do you want Abbate to wait for you?" I said, "No, thank you, sir; I think I had better get on with this job." I started from the room and, just as I got to the outer door, the general said, "Lovett, you're an ex-banker. Why don't you try negotiating with Abbate for half price?" And I left the room with the general and Abbate looking at each other in the mirror and chuckling with delight.

Observing General Marshall at close range under all manner of difficult circumstances, it seems to me that his greatness stems from a number of traits and talents which have not been fully recognized or adequately mentioned. Some were exceptional gifts. His eminence in leadership, it seems to me, was a talent bestowed by a divine providence and heightened by use and experience, as is the case in any great talent, whatever the field.

His greatness, however, was enriched by personal traits which, like ardor, spring from the heart. He was a man of extraordinary compassion, of most sensitive and discriminating instinct, and there was an air of natural elegance about him which was unassuming and added enormously to his calm dignity. Dean Acheson, who worked closely with General Marshall over a period of years, found the precise word to describe this quality I speak of. He says, "The moment General Marshall entered a room, everyone in it felt his presence. It was a striking and communicated force."

There were two qualities which seemed to me to have had deep, perhaps even controlling, influence in lifting him to the heights of true greatness; first, his sincere concern for others; and secondly, his acceptance of change as a law of nature. Perhaps you'll permit me to explore these traits with you tonight and to draw a lesson from the second.

His concern for other people was something more than consideration or courtesy. It stemmed from a genuine interest in people and particularly those for whom he felt some responsibility. It was shown in many ways and on many occasions—some touching and a few amusing.

It comes through clear and strong and heartwarming in his attitude toward the Army which, I often thought, approximated the worried affection you see when a mother, on a street corner, with her very dear, small son beside her, sees him rather vaguely step off the curb into a street filled with speeding traffic. She reaches down, snatches him by the arm, yanks him back onto the sidewalk, hands him a resounding whack on his dumb little head and, while he howls at the top of his lungs, she bawls him out for having scared the living daylights out of her. In many things, the "Old Man," to give him that wonderful, privately used title in the Army felt compelled to do, there was definitely that attitude. And in it, I found comfort and delight.

But this quality of concern for others is most evident in his deep feeling for the individual soldier. We can hear the understanding and the blunt ring of strong conviction, when in his third biennial report in 1945 he has this to say: "It is impossible for a nation to compensate for the services of a fighting man. There is no pay scale that is high enough to buy the service of a single soldier during even a few minutes of the agony of combat; the physical miseries of the campaign, or the extreme personal inconvenience of leaving his home to go out to the most unpleasant and dangerous spots on earth to serve his nation."

There was an incident in 1948 which, I think, is not only very revealing about many of General Marshall's traits of character but also shows a most engaging quality of President Truman. I have obtained permission to tell this story in detail.

A meeting of the Organization of American States was scheduled to be held in Bogotá, Colombia, beginning April 9, 1948, a little over a year after General Marshall had taken over the difficult job of Secretary of State, to try to reorient our foreign policy in the light of new conditions in the world.

We had been forewarned that international Communists had selected the occasion as a time for a demonstration and that the United States and General Marshall might be used as symbols to attack. We felt some apprehension about having a substantial number of Americans attend in a mission headed by our Secretary of State.

Just before the mission took off, the general called me in and asked me if there were any last-minute matters that I wanted to take up with him. I said there were not. I then asked him if he had any final instructions for me and he said, "Yes," he had. Using his expressive hands to emphasize his points, he said something like this: "Lovett, I don't like the sound of that chest cold you've got. You've had it for a week and it doesn't seem to be getting any better. I want you to go to see a doctor right away, act on his advice, and be over it by the time I get back next week." I said, "Yes, sir," and bade him goodby.

Not long after the start of the meeting in Bogotá, a carefully planned and well-led major riot broke out, during which many of the city's buildings were burnt down and the radio stations and local phone exchange were seized by the mob. It was clear the situation was getting rapidly out of hand and concern for the safety of the U.S. delegation mounted. I stayed at the Department most of the night of April 10–11 and went home a little bit after 3 o'clock in the morning to get a couple hours' sleep, from which I was awakened by the watch officer calling to say that we had a message in, indicating that the roof of the section of the Embassy, which housed the communication and code room, had been set on fire and that the codes and equipment might have to be destroyed for security reasons. I went back to the Department and, as we were not able to maintain reliable contact by normal radio means, my apprehension grew.

It was clear from an earlier massage that General Marshall was staying at a villa located in a large property about a block in size. We decided to try to get through to him by a telephone circuit which was the sole remaining method of communication. After considerable delay we did reach the house which had been assigned to General Marshall. Jim George and Pat Carter answered the call. I asked how the general was and they said "fine"; I asked how the mission was, and they said that so far as they knew, "everything was OK; nobody had been hurt; some had had narrow escapes." I asked Carter if there was any particular danger. He said he thought not at the moment.

To my question as to how the general was getting along, he said—and this is a reasonably accurate quotation—"The old man is fine, he is untroubled, to tell you the truth, I think he is having more fun than he has had since he was a young lieutenant in the Philippine insurrection. A little while ago he was out in the garage instructing a young lieutenant of the Colombian Army as to how to dispose his men, telling him to bring most of them in out of the rain to shelter, where they could be warm and get some coffee, and to leave on duty only the minimum required to sound an alert if necessary, so that the others, warm and rested, could come out fighting mad and repel any attacks if needed." Carter said "the old man" wanted to talk to me and in a moment or two, the General's calm voice came on the line. To the best of my recollection, the conversation went something like this: The general said, "Can you hear me, Lovett?" I said, "Yes, sir," and started to say, "General, how are you?" when he cut in with, "Lovett, how's your cold? Are you doing what I told you to do about it?" At that point, my gaskets blew and I think, in a sanitized version, I said, "Holy smoke, General, never mind about me. How are you and the delegation?" He said, "Everything's fine at the moment. We've had a little excitement down here" but he felt the situation was beginning to stabilize, or would shortly; that the Colombian Government had tried to provide protection, which he thought was going to be adequate but that the riot was going to pretty well break up the meeting unless other delegations could be assured of being evacuated if necessary. I asked him what we could do to be helpful and told him the President had instructed me to tell him that he could have anything he wanted to insure the safety of the delegation or for any other purpose.

General Marshall said he thought that the meeting could be held together if positive assurance of air transportation could be given. He said at last report the government still held the airfield and that he felt that some troop-carrier planes of a squadron from the Panama Canal Zone would do the job if they could be held on alert in Panama subject to his call. I asked him if he needed any particular supplies, emphasizing the word "supplies" in such a manner as to make me feel sure he realized that I meant small arms or other defensive equipment. The general said, "No," all he wanted was a gross of candles, some evaporated milk, some karo syrup, and several thousand ponchos. I remember hanging onto the desk while I digested this weird list and wondering who was going to hold a taffy-pull at night in a rainstorm. I said that I would see about having them flown in at once with some emergency rations from the Canal Zone.

It was a little after 7 o'clock in the morning by now and I called the White House operator and asked her to try to locate the Secretary of the Army at his residence in Washington. She reported shortly that he was out of town on an inspection trip. I then tried the Chief of Staff of the Army, who was away on official business at some Army post. The operator was then asked to try to get hold of the Deputy Chief of Staff.

I was feeling a bit frustrated by this time and, in a rather self-pitying voice, I said to the operator, "Good gosh, isn't there anybody in Washington on this bright April morning except you and me?" The reply came promptly back, "Yes, Mr. Secretary, President Truman is here. Would you like to speak to him?" I said, "Isn't it a bit early?" and the answer was, "No, he has been up over an hour; I'll see if he's available to take the call."

In a moment President Truman's voice came on the phone and he said, "What's the news, Bob?" I gave him the reassuring report from General Marshall about our delegation and included a report on the request for supplies. The President asked what I was doing about getting them down to him promptly. I told him that I was having a little trouble digging out someone early on Sunday morning who could issue the necessary authority to the commanding general in the Panama Canal Zone to make delivery of the requested supplies. He said, "Well, Bob, you've found him." Rather startled, I said, "I beg your pardon, sir"—and heard laughter from the other end of the line, followed by the question, "Have you forgotten that the President is also the Commander in Chief?" I said I was sorry that I had for the moment, and the President said that a heck of a lot of other people around town had, too, with less excuse than I had. He then asked me to tell him what General Marshall had requested. I read him the list and said, "Mr. President, have I your authority to send a message to General Crittenberger and tell him that you have approved the shipment of these items immediately?" He said, "No, I'll call him on the phone myself and tell him that I want them shipped at once and to have those troop carriers warmed up and ready to go on General Marshall's call." The President called back in about 20 minutes and said that he had talked to General Crittenberger and that everything was being taken care of.

My embarrassment at the episode with the President was eased by two things: the President never told on me and our people got home safely. But my curiosity about the ponchos almost killed me until I got the story from Carter and George. It appears that the Colombian troops came up from the jungle heat to the high altitude of Bogotá, with the temperature about 50, in thin cotton uniforms and the general realized that standing around in the drizzle and cold would make them miserable and, therefore, not as reliable in facing a mob as if they could be dry and warm. The ponchos were issued, the troops were enthusiastic about them, and the delegations got on with the business as soon as they knew they could be airlifted out if necessary.

If you will reflect on this incident a moment, you will recognize that calm, steadfastness, instinct about a soldier's needs and concern for them, in addition to ability to inspire confidence turned something that might have been a shameful disaster into a minor, irritating event.

I mentioned earlier that one of General Marshall's most unusual attributes—and one,

I think, which added a great deal to his stature—was his recognition of the fact that Nature never stands still and that change is, indeed, one of the primary laws of life. His receptiveness to new ideas, which you have seen, for example, in the use of airpower and in the Marshall plan, was made easier by this philosophy, for he was not burdened with the attiude of mind which regards any change as a threat to the established order—or vested rights, if you choose—which must, therefore, be automatically, even blindly resisted.

About 6 months ago I testified before a Senate committee regarding policymaking machinery in the special field of the Department of Defense. I expressed the opinion that the essential military attribute of close relationship between planning and operational responsibility existed and that proved operations machinery was currently in being; and, finally, that the departments were staffed, for the most part, with competent, specially trained officers whom we were fortunate to have in good supply. I suggested, however, that it seemed to be increasingly difficult to fit new feet into old boots; that there was, I thought, excessive staff layering and, obviously, far too many committees with the resultant trend toward a reduction in the authority of the individual which I greatly deplored.

It may be that I place too much importance on men and not enough on the machine. I do not think so. But it is of no consequence anyway because events in the world are building up forces which will inevitably raise again the question of the proper organization of the services to meet the new situations which face us. The world is full of dangers, and the attitude toward change will be even more important than in the past.

Wherever you look in the world today you find one great common denominator the increasing role Government is playing in every aspect of every man's life, everywhere. We do not like to admit it, but Government is getting bigger all the time—partly because big government is necessary to deal with big labor and big business; partly because our people are asking the Government to do more for them each year; and, partly because Government by its very nature is a glandular grower.

Now, to oversimplify things a bit, this means more Government expenses. More Government expenditures mean more taxes; or more economy and efficiency; or a mixture of both. Looking at the problem of national security with such calmness as I can muster, I cannot avoid the conclusion that world change has overtaken us and that, in a relatively few years, economic pressure alone will force us to reexamine our current organization and procedures.

When that time comes, and I think it will come sooner rather than later, we will need the detached approach to the problem of what is best for national security that General Marshall exemplified and which won him universal respect. National security seems to me to be more complex than ever. I feel it is a problem we will have with us for generations to come and it is not helped in an open society by either an open mouth or a closed mind.

It will most certainly not be solved by trotting out those tired old slogans of warnings about "reduction of civilian control" and the "man on horseback" that have been used to divert attention for generations. When you hear them just remember that the chiefs of the branches of the Army used the same "man on horseback" argument against Secretary Elihu Root's reorganization plan which established the position of Chief of Staff of the Army.

Nor is the problem likely to be solved by appointing several committees of distinguished citizens from remote walks of life. Such groups normally come to Washington ignorant of the problems and ways of Government and, by dint of concentration on committee procedures, remain in that happy state. Some may even be attracted by the title "ad hoc committee" little realizing that it is merely a device used ad infinitum to obtain snap judgments ad nauseam.

The solution will be found, I suppose, when necessity or good judgment make it abundantly clear that in national security the whole is more important than its parts.

Having spoken in behalf of receptiveness to good new ideas or changes for the better, let me identify an area in which I hope you will permit no change to occur. Part of my inheritance from General Marshall is a feeling of real affection and admiration for the Army and the way it performs its manifold duties. The great traditions, which are handed down from generation to generation in the armed services, of duty, honor, loyalty, and dedication to the service of one's country are among the most admirable virtues of mankind. These have been kept alive by a dedicated and skilled group of officers who realize that self-discipline is one of the higher attributes of man. We simply cannot afford to lose these virtues. Our great schools and their standards must be nurtured and strengthened so that the code of excellence may be carried forward in a world which seems to have an increasing taste for the mediocre.

My strong conviction about this results from my experience with you, of which I am proud, and because it was these traditions, training, and discipline, which I have just mentioned, that produced the young Army officer who became one of the greatest generals and greatest men of his time.

Since I spoke at the outset of certain basic characteristics shared by General Marshall and Secretary Stimson, it is fitting and proper, I believe, that I should close my comments by letting the venerable and distinguished Secretary of War be heard again, through me, in his valedictory remarks made at a press conference in September 1945.

Hear Mr. Stimson's words: "General Marshall's devotion to the Nation he served was a vital quality which infused everything he does. During the course of a long lifetime, much of it spent in positions of public trust, I have had considerable experience of men in government. General Marshall has given me a new gage of what such service should be. The destiny of America at the critical time of its national existence has been in the hands of a great and good citizen. Let no man forget it."

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*——Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*——Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*——6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*——
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*——
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*——
Bible, Alan, *Nev*——
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*——
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak*——
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*——
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*——
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*——The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*——
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*——
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*——The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*——Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*——
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*——
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*——4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*——2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*——
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*——
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*——
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*——
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*——
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*——
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*——
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*——
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*——
Eastland, James O., *Miss*——5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*——
Engle, Clair, *Calif*——
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*——
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*——5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*——
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*——
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*——
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*——
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*——University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*——
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*——
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*——
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*——
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*——
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*——5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*——
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*——Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*——
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*——
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*——
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*——
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*——
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*——
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*——
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*——3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*——4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*——
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*——
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*——
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*——
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*——
Long, Russell B., *La*——
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg*——
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*——2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*——
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*——
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*——
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*——The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*——
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*——4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*——
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*——4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*——
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*——
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*——122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*——The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*——
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*——Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*——
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*——
Proxmire, William, *Wis*——
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*——
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*——
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*——
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*——2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*——
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*——
Smathers, George A., *Fla*——
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*——
Sparkman, John, *Ala*——4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*——
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*——
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*——
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*——
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*——2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*——
Williams, John J., *Del*——
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*——
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*——Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*——

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, ———.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, ———.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, ———.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Progress in Cleansing the Clearwater

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 12, 1960

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the people of the north central region of my State of Idaho are proud—as am I—of a remarkable river which flows westward from the Bitterroot Mountains to join the Snake River at the bustling city of Lewiston. This picturesque stream is the Clearwater, a name given it by the Nez Perce Indians; in their own language, the Kooskooskie.

Along this river was the ancestral home of the tribe. Down it in 1805 came the famous explorers, Lewis and Clark. On a tributary to one of its forks, Orofino Creek, gold was discovered in 1860. This significant strike, which drew the first population to Idaho and resulted in the creation of Idaho Territory 3 years later, is being celebrated this weekend at Pierce.

Of course, with the establishment of pioneer settlements along the river, the stream became a receptacle for waste, and as the communities grew, the river began to lose its purity. I well realize this is not an isolated problem. However, a major point is that Federal assistance, so often under attack, has provided a lever by which these communities have raised the financing for projects now building or projected to assure that this beautiful river will soon be returned to its original pure state.

This is a magnificent mountain watershed which abounds with wildlife, fish, scenery, and vast timber resources. Its contributions far exceed the boundaries of Idaho. Thus the proceeds from the decision to clean up the river are not limited to the immediate region. Perhaps most important is that the communities along the river have moved, under their own power, to end the pollution. They are to be commended.

Two significant editorials on this subject recently appeared in Idaho newspapers, one in the Lewiston Morning Tribune and the other in the Alameda Intermountain. I ask unanimous consent they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, July 31, 1960]

PROGRESS IN CLEANSING THE CLEARWATER

The approval Friday of a $122,000 loan and a $18,900 grant from the Federal Government to help Kooskia build a sewage disposal plant provides cause for celebration all along the Clearwater River.

Just 5 years ago communities adjoining the river were using this beautiful stream as a sewer line in reckless and almost unanimous disregard of the health hazards thereby created. Since then, most of them have completed or initiated sewer disposal plants. When Kooskia's projected plant is built and others now under construction are finished, Orofino will be the only major community along the river still dumping raw sewage into the stream. We are confident that Orofino will follow its neighbors in building a disposal plant as quickly as feasible.

The worst offender for many years, of course, was the city at the mouth of the Clearwater—Lewiston. A $350,000 disposal plant was finished at Lewiston 3 years ago, but it has remained a useless investment because contractors thus far have proved unable to run a sewer line to it under the Clearwater River. A third crossing attempt is under way this low-water season on a more vigorous basis (though with weekends off, apparently), and the job surely will be finished this time.

Meanwhile, Grangeville, and Cottonwood have built sewage disposal plants to stop polluting streams tributary to the Clearwater, and Kamiah has a collection system under construction. Progress toward cleaning up the Clearwater has been remarkable in the last 3 years, and the region can be proud of this achievement.

It should not be forgotten that one of the major incentives to accomplish this task came from a bit of Federal legislation which was widely denounced at the time of its introduction as another piece of Federal "encroachment." The law providing Federal matching funds and loans to help cities build sewage systems is proving to be one of the soundest of the newer Federal powers. In this region and over the Nation cities which couldn't quite bring themselves to tackle the full task of sewage disposal decided they were willing and able to do so if they could get some Federal help.

As the example of this region illustrates, stream pollution is a proper concern of the Federal Government. The sewage dumped into the Clearwater is a problem for Washington and Oregon as well as Idaho. Despite strenuous efforts in many quarters to devise interstate compacts and commissions to discourage the Federal Government from handling interstate problems, the pollution of interstate streams is clearly a proper concern of the whole Nation.

Federal assistance for community sewage disposal also has qualified to a noteworthy degree the familiar argument that cities might as well finance these projects directly and at home rather than paying the Federal taxes which supply the Federal matching funds. That conclusion is basically correct—except that financially hard-pressed cities usually just don't have the funds to handle the full chore themselves. Federal aid provides a form of equalization—providing for one community the help it needs at the time it is needed to get the job done. Taxpayers in more fortunate communities may be helping to subsidize this work through their Federal taxes, but that situation is not destined to overthrow the Republic.

Federal aid, of course, did not clean up the Clearwater River to the degree that it is being cleansed. The communities adjoining this stream had important help from their Government, but they provided the energy and impetus themselves. The region can well be proud of their efforts. A few more such performances will guarantee that the stream of visitors soon to be following the Lewis and Clark Highway down the Clearwater River can be assured that the river of the "shining waters" is just as clean as it looks.

[From the Alameda (Idaho) Intermountain, Aug. 5, 1960]

CLEARWATER

Idaho's second most popular river system, the Clearwater drainage, is far ahead of the Snake and the Bear River Basins in the war against pollution. There is something in the name.

The Lewiston Morning Tribune has proudly ticked off the projects: A $350,000 disposal plant at Lewiston completed 3 years ago at the river's mouth; Grangeville and Cottonwood plants on Clearwater tributaries; a collection system under construction at Kamiah, and a $31,000 project voted last week by Kooskia.

That leaves Orofino, about 45 miles upstream from Lewiston, the only sizable town on the Clearwater without a treatment plant. "We are confident," says the Tribune, "that Orofino will follow its neighbors in building a disposal plant as quickly as possible."

Only serious hitch in the cleanup was that contractors weren't able to get a line across the river from Lewiston to that expensive plant. With streamflow unusually low and better engineering this time, a third attempt is expected to succeed this month, and the idle plant will finally go into service to the relief not only of Lewiston but the Washington and Oregon communities downstream.

The Federal grants in aid have given impetus to pollution control across the Snake River plain, but southern Idaho still has a long way to go. Twin Falls and Blackfoot are still big polluters, and booming Alameda long ago outgrew its primitive plant. Idaho Falls, Boise, and Pocatello are newly out of the pollution business, thanks to new or enlarged disposal systems, but at least two dozen Snake River communities and a dozen industries are still peeing in the creek. Rupert approved a $210,000 project in June; Twin Falls voted Tuesday.

At extreme ends of the State, the panhandle and the Bear River drainage are a jumble of a few treatment plants, some planning by cities worrying about financing (the smaller the town the greater the per capita cost), and no action at all.

Idaho's highly manageable water courses are justifiably described as our greatest natural asset. The rest of the State, especially the south where reuse is so vital, should work away until the clear water appellation may be applied to every Idaho stream.

Antarctic Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 12, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Antarctic Treaty," published in the Indianapolis, Ind., Times of August 10, 1960. The editorial is in favor of the ratification of the treaty.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Times, Aug. 10, 1960]

ANTARCTIC TREATY

The Antarctic Treaty, now under debate in the Senate, is an imaginative venture in international affairs—an effort to insure that a whole continent, the size of the United States and Europe combined, shall never be used except for peaceful purposes.

In it the United States and the U.S.S.R. agree for the first time on principles which are the heart of the U.S. policy and are essential to the preservation of world peace.

The Senate should ratify this treaty promptly.

Support is bipartisan. Opposition apparently is based on fear of recognition of Soviet presence in the area.

But Soviet scientists are there now and have been for years, whether we recognize it or not.

It is argued that military importance of the frozen continent is increasing. One purpose of the treaty is to demilitarize the area before science makes it worth a war.

The treaty forbids military activity including nuclear explosions and authorizes full inspections to insure these restrictions are observed—something the United States consistently has demanded and which the Soviet Union has previously refused.

American observers are permitted to go anywhere in Antarctica, or fly over any part of the continent, at any time.

As Senator MIKE MANSFIELD said, in Senate debate, "It would certainly be unfortunate if we should fail to ratify the first international agreement which provides such an unlimited right of inspection."

Some argue the United States should claim the whole of Antarctica. We never have claimed any part and neither has Russia.

On the other hand, seven nations, all friendly to us, have made such claims, some conflicting. The treaty avoids recognition of any of these claims, leaving our scientists free to continue research over the whole continent.

But most important is the peaceful precedent being set, applicable to the coming problems of space and perhaps eventually even to the presently dangerous race in world armaments.

Interstate Fair, Unique in Many Ways, Celebrates 70th Anniversary This Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 12, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, traditionally, "Come to the Fair" time symbolizes a significant custom in our way of life.

Currently, the fair season is just getting underway in Wisconsin, and across the country.

Overall, fairs offer both urban and rural folks a chance to get together, to review the accomplishments of the past and preview some of the promises of the future.

The civically oriented individuals, groups, and public officials who are carrying forward such programs are to be warmly commended for their splendid work.

In 1960, the La Crosse Tribune published an informative editorial reviewing the uniqueness and significance of this fair.

I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the La Crosse Tribune, Aug. 9, 1960]

INTER-STATE FAIR, UNIQUE IN MANY WAYS, CELEBRATES 70TH ANNIVERSARY THIS YEAR

The La Crosse Inter-State Fair will celebrate its 70th anniversary this week, and its fourth season at the new fairgrounds near West Salem.

The interstate fair is unique in several respects. It is one of the largest of its kind in the State and one of the few to accept entries from two other States in the open classes.

It is both a county and district fair, since the junior fair is restricted to only La Crosse County exhibitors.

It is independently operated, receiving some State aid for premiums but no county aid. It is operated principally on income received from the gate, grandstand, exhibit space, and concession rentals.

A program of continued enlargement and improvement was started when the move was made from La Crosse to the present grounds, but it has been somewhat held down by lack of funds. Some work, nevertheless, has been done each year.

A novel experiment started 2 years ago has met with success, giving the 4–H cattle exhibitors use of the barn for the first 3 days, and the open class the final 3 days. The program has eliminated the need for open tents for 4–H animals and the resulting mess of mud brought on by rains.

The board of directors should be congratulated for its progress and planning which has resulted in the fine exposition we have today.

Residents of the area should support the efforts with their attendance during the week. This year's fair will offer one of the largest displays of livestock in its history, plus an exhibition building full of home economics, crafts, culinary, garden, crops, flowers, and other displays.

Commercial displays again will be many and diversified. A full week of entertainment features will include large and small car racing, a country and western jamboree, horse show, horsepulling contest, antique car show, and many others.

The dairy building will house what may be a record display of butter, cheese and other dairy products.

All-in-all the Inter-State Fair is one of the largest and finest in the State—the finest in this part of the State and well worth the nominal price of admission.

So, let's go to the fair.

Repeal of the Connally Reservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 12, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, one of the leading groups in this Nation supporting the President in urging the repeal of the Connally Reservation to the Statute of the International Court of Justice is the Committee for Effective Use of the International Court. This group of distinguished Americans has at its head one of the most respected judges on the Federal bench, Judge Learned Hand of New York, as honorary chairman, and the former general counsel of the Department of Defense, Robert Dechert, as chairman. The sponsors include David K. E. Bruce, Ambassador to Germany; James B. Conant, former Ambassador to Germany and former president of Harvard University; Thomas K. Finletter, former Secretary of the Air Force; Jefferson B. Fordham, dean of the University of Pennsylvania Law School; Erwin N. Griswold, dean of the Harvard Law School; Alfred M. Gruenther, president of the American Red Cross; Edward C. King, dean of the University of Colorado Law School; Grayson L. Kirk, president of Columbia University; Henry R. Luce, editor in chief of Time, Life, and Fortune; John J. McCloy, former High Commissioner for Germany and chairman of the board of the Chase Manhattan Bank; Mrs. Millicent C. McIntosh, president of Barnard College; Robert D. Murphy, former Under Secretary of State; George N. Shuster, former president of Hunter College; Arthur K. Watkins, president of International Business Machines; Henry M. Wriston, former president of Brown University and chairman of the President's Commission on National Goals; and such distinguished members of the American Bar as Harrison Tweed, Joseph N. Welch, and Bethuel M. Webster.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the statement of position of this organization, eloquently stating the arguments for repealing the Connally Reservation, and an article from the Reader's Digest entitled "The United States Is Impeding World Law."

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES IS IMPEDING WORLD LAW

(We believe in the "rule of law." Yet, one short phrase added by the Senate to a recent treaty effectively prevents this country from leading the world toward that goal.)

(By William Hard)

I write this frankly to advocate the repeal of six words in a treaty of the United States having to do with the operations of the International Court of Justice of the United Nations. The six words are: "As determined by the United States."

In advocating their repeal I tread in august footsteps. President Eisenhower wants them repealed. So does Vice President NIXON. So does Secretary of State Herter. So does Attorney General Rogers. So does the American Bar Association under the leadership of one of its most eminent ex-presidents, Charles S. Rhyne of Washington, D.C.

But there is vehement opposition. It includes distinguished men like Frank Holman, another ex-president of the American Bar Association, Clarence Manion, ex-dean of the Law School of Notre Dame University, and Raymond Moley, columnist for Newsweek.

Some extreme opponents to the repeal of the six words even say that President Eisenhower and all the other leading advocates are engaged in a sinister plot against the Constitution and against the independence of the United States. It is a fierce fight. Let us see how it began.

In 1946 the U.S. Senate was considering the acceptance by the United States of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. Some 40 countries have accepted that jurisdiction. They agree to submit all their international-law disputes with other countries to the Court if those other countries have similarly agreed to do so. The United States is one of them. But with a catch.

The catch is in the word "jurisdiction." The United Nations is forbidden by its charter to intervene in matters within the domestic jurisdiction of its members. So, consequently, is its legal organ, the International Court of Justice. Therefore, to hammer the nail completely down, the resolution before the Senate in 1946 specifically warned the Court to keep its hands off disputes "with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States." The Senate Foreign Relations Committee thought that this act of caution was enough.

Senator Tom Connally of Texas did not agree. On August 1 of 1946 he took the floor and made a motion. It was overwhelmingly adopted. To the resolution before the Senate then were added the six words "as determined by the United States." This Connally reservation is called by its opponents "our American self-judging reservation."

What were its practical international consequences? The Connally reservation was adopted, in varying words, by eight other countries. One of them was France. Let us see what happened to France as a result.

France went to the International Court of Justice with a case against Norway. The Norwegian Government and certain Norwegian banks had borrowed large sums of money from investors in France. When the French Government undertook to press the claims of those investors against Norway, the Court pointed out that France, in declaring its acceptance of the Court's "compulsory jurisdiction," had excluded disputes within French domestic jurisdiction "as determined by the government of the French Republic."

"Well," said the Court, in effect, "if France can make such a reservation, Norway may now reciprocally make a similar reservation. Accordingly there is no case before the Court." So France was left holding the bag for its aggrieved investors.

The International Court of Justice does not seek political compromises. It seeks law. There are 15 judges, each serving for 9 years. Nominations for judgeships are made by the "national groups" in the Permanent Court of Arbitration (established in 1889) at The Hague in the Netherlands. These national groups, including one from the United States, send their nominations to the United Nations in New York, which acts upon them through majority votes. A vigilant effort is made to spread the judgeships among the principal legal systems of the world. This effort, to date, has been very successful.

The present judges include one from the United States, four from Latin America, four from Western Europe, one from the Arab world, one from south Asia, one from Australia, one from Nationalist China, two from Communist countries (the Soviet Union and Poland). Certainly a wide spread.

No one has yet been able to show that international politics enter into any decisions of the Court. On that point a case worth reciting is the case of Britain against Iran. Iran had shaken the whole world, including the United Nations, by expropriating the properties of the Anglo-Iranian Oil Co. Britain went to the Court, seeking redress. Thereupon Iran gave some international legal education to Britain—and incidentally to the United States—by claiming that the matter was entirely within its own domestic jurisdiction. The Court sustained Iran, dismissed Britain's case. On the Court there was a British judge, Sir Arnold McNair. Did he denounce the Court. He did not. He voted on the side of Iran. That's being a judge.

The record of the Court clearly indicates that it deserves international moral confidence in its field—the field of law. But some of its American friends grossly exaggerate what it can do in the world. They say such things as: "The world no longer has a choice between force and law. If civilization is to survive, it must choose law."

This sounds as if the Court could reach out and impose its decrees on every international problem in the world. Such talk naturally scares a lot of American patriots half to death. I assure them that the Court deals only with problems of an international legal character.

Consider the following questions:

Should the United States recognize Communist China? Should the United States increase its loans and grants to India? How many refugees from oppression should the United States welcome to its shores? How many yards of British woolen goods should the United States admit to its domestic market?

There is not a shred of international law on any of these and similar questions unless and until the United States voluntarily makes them international questions by signing treaties about them.

But the Court can promote and confirm world peace in many large ways. There are scores of contentious treaty disputes in the world it could deal with. One involves the United States and Switzerland. Under an old treaty Swiss citizens resident in the United States are exempt from military conscription here. The Swiss Government claims—with much alleged proof—that we nevertheless are today conscripting Swiss citizens into our Armed Forces. Swiss governmental officials express the view that it would be of no avail to take their claim to the International Court of Justice because the United States, upon arriving there, would simply say, under the Connally reservation, that the matter was solely a domestic matter, "as determined by the United States."

I inquire: Is the United States an honorable nation? I profoundly believe it is. Therefore, I think that we should earnestly request the Swiss Government to take us to the International Court of Justice, there to plead our cause without benefit of any Connally-reservation subterfuge.

In maintaining our Connally reservation, we are now rather lonely. France, after losing its case against Norway, repealed its "Connally reservation." Similar reservations have also been repealed by Britain and by India. According to Secretary of State Herter there are now only six countries which, having gone through the form of accepting the court's compulsory jurisdiction, have nullified their acceptance by reservations. These countries are: the United States, Mexico, Liberia, the Sudan, the Union of South Africa, Pakistan.

But who can tell? Treaties are multiplying. Many countries, influenced by the example of the United States, might adopt "Connally reservations," if they find that compliance with those treaties begins to be inconvenient.

Every treaty is international law between and among the countries signing it. Our treaty of 1903 with Panama, for instance, giving us sovereignty over the Panama Canal Zone, is international law between Panama and the United States. We should not, by our example, give Panama any justification for suddenly declaring the Panama Canal Zone question a question within Panama's domestic jurisdiction "as determined by Panama."

It is to our interest, as well as to our honor as a law-respecting people, to support the sanctity of treaties and to uphold their binding force upon all signatories, including ourselves.

Vice President NIXON has pointed out the constantly expanding network of treaties regarding American investment and American trade in foreign countries. Those treaties need protection, the most authoritative protection possible. Mr. NIXON has thereupon wisely proposed that the United States and every country with which it makes any such treaty should pledge themselves jointly to take the interpretation of that treaty to the International Court of Justice for final and binding judgment.

We can start toward that end by adopting the current U.S. Senate Resolution 94. It leaves our 1946 acceptance of the International Court of Justice completely intact in all its terms about "domestic jurisdiction" but eliminates simply the "self-judging" six words.

Resolution 94 was introduced by Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota, who is a determined Democrat, but it is earnestly supported by the present Republican administration. Its passage requires a two-thirds majority. Much public support will be necessary to get that two-thirds. It is not a partisan matter. Write your Senators, Democratic or Republican.

If the resolution is passed, we shall then, and only then, be in a position to address some cogent remarks to that apparently total disbeliever in world law, the Soviet Union.

On October 7, 1952, a U.S. military airplane was shot down by Soviet gunfire in the vicinity of northern Japan. We summoned the Soviet Union to the International Court of Justice and demanded damages. We claimed that our plane was flying legitimately over Japanese territory. The Soviet Union claimed that it was flying unlawfully over Soviet territory. But the Court did not proceed to public hearings in which the contestants could face each other. Why? Because the Soviet Union flatly refused to accept the Court's jurisdiction. We got no verdict and no damages.

Yet it was difficult for us, I think, to complain. The Soviet Union, in asserting that the incident took place over its own territory, was in effect asserting that the matter was within its own domestic jurisdiction—as determined by itself. Under reversed circumstances might not we have been tempted to assert that the matter was within our own domestic jurisdiction—as determined by the United States?

The Soviet Union, nevertheless, is farther away from accepting the reign of law than we are. As a member of the United Nations, it is a party to the statute of the International Court of Justice and is eligible to have—and does have—a Soviet jurist on the bench of the Court. But it has never accepted the Court's compulsory jurisdiction even under such limitation as our Connally reservation.

At Geneva, Switzerland, five anti-Communist countries (headed by the United States) have been confronting five Communist countries (headed by the Soviet Union) in a great debate. The anti-Communist countries have presented a plan leading toward total, permanent disarmament. At the end of their plan they make a couple of obscure allusions to international law. I venture a humble suggestion.

Let us put "international law" at the very beginning of our plan. Let us give "international law" a primary place in the negotiations at Geneva, and then let us say to the Soviet Union: "This treaty, if signed and put into operation, will be the most momentous treaty in the history of the world. It will inaugurate a new era for mankind. And it will be international law among all the countries that sign it. This has been the recognized rule ever since there have been treaties in existence.

"Now: Inevitably, when this treaty has gone into practice, there will be complaints of violations. Human nature remains imperfect and quarrelsome. What to do with these complaints? We shall have sworn not to settle them by force. The only alternative is to settle them by law.

"So: Will you and the countries allied with you pledge yourselves to let all such charges and accusations go to the International Court of Justice? Will you pledge yourselves to accept its decisions? You declaim against war. Will you accept peace? In the interpretation of this treaty will you accept law? If not, then all your oratory about the enactment of this treaty and about the observance of it is a web of elaborate mockery."

Such, I think, should be our language to the Soviet Union at Geneva. But we should remember the old legal maxim that he who seeks redress in a court should go there with his hands clean. Ours, in this matter, are considerably soiled. We have accepted the "compulsory jurisdiction" of the International Court of Justice with a reservation which, on many occasions, could impede justice. We have made ourselves our own judge as to whether or not the questions bound to arise under any disarmament treaty are within our own domestic jurisdiction—"as determined by the United States." I continue to contend (with deep respect for Senator Connally) that we cannot effectively lead the world toward world law until we repeal the Senator's six words.

STATEMENT OF POSITION

At the very time the United States is trying to win and hold the respect of uncommitted nations outside the Iron Curtain, it is continuing its recorded distrust of the International Court of Justice. At the very time the United States is trying to foster the rule of law among nations as the ultimate substitute for the rule of force, it is continuing its "self-judging" limitation on its adherence to the Court. Our committee believes this limitation should be repealed.

THE BASIC TERMS OF ADHERENCE

Our country's adherence to the Court was pursuant to a 1946 Senate resolution. The resolution repeated the provisions of the statute creating the Court (part of the United Nations Charter) under which any country may accept the Court's jurisdiction as compulsory in disputes meeting these requirements: the dispute must be with another state accepting the same obligation, it must be a legal dispute, and it must concern either the interpretation of a treaty, or a question of international law, or the existence of any fact which would constitute a breach of an international obligation, or the reparation to be made for such breach.

In addition the Senate resolution, as introduced and unanimously approved by the Foreign Relations Committee, provided that the adherence should not apply to disputes on matters essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. This principle is implicit in the nature of international law and in the text of the Court statute, and was already expressed in the United Nations Charter. It is just as important to other nations as to the United States. Its restatement in the resolution may have been unnecessary, but of itself would not have impaired our adherence to the Court in any way.

THE "SELF-JUDGING" RESERVATION

During the debate on the Senate floor, however, this provision was amended by adding eight final words, so that, as filed, our adherence to the Court did not apply to disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America "as determined by the United States of America." In other words, for deciding whether a matter is essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States (and thus outside the jurisdiction of the Court), the United States substituted itself for the Court. By adding this self-judging reservation the United States reserved the power to prevent the Court from passing on the matter, and thus reserved to itself a complete veto as to what cases could be brought against it.

THE BOOMERANG

The existence of a self-judging reservation in the adherence of any plaintiff country creates a like right for the defendant country (even though the defendant's own adherence contained none), because of the statute's requirement that adhering nations accept the same obligation. Thus when France (which had a self-judging reservation) sued Norway (which did not), the Court held that Norway could deny jurisdiction simply by announcing that in Norway's opinion the dispute was within Norway's domestic jurisdiction. Two years later (1959) France withdrew its self-judging reservation.

This boomerang effect of the self-judging reservation is probably its most serious aspect from the viewpoint of immediate economics. Thus foreign countries, despite their adherence without a similar reservation, can prevent the Court's passing on the validity of their taking of U.S. citizens' property or on the adequacy of any compensation proffered. The United States and the citizens it protects, who have a larger stake in foreign investment than any other country, can thus be deprived of their day in an international court.

OUR COMPANIONS IN DISTRUST

After the United States filed its adherence to the Court with a self-judging reservation, seven other countries adopted such self-judging reservations. France and India later dropped theirs, leaving such reservations now in effect by Mexico, Liberia, Union of South Africa, Pakistan, the Sudan, and the United States. Including these, 38 nations have now accepted the Court's compulsory jurisdiction.

The Court is well constituted to earn respect. It has 15 judges, each elected for 9 years, with five elected every 3 years. No two can be nationals of the same state. They are nominated by members of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, and elected by the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council (without any veto power). The Court has conducted itself conservatively, and given no indication of a desire to extend its jurisdiction. We may terminate our adherence to the Court by 6 months' notice.

Speaking of the Court in his state of the Union message of January 8, 1960, President Eisenhower said: "There is pending before the Senate a resolution which would repeal our present self-judging reservation. I support that resolution and urge its prompt passage." The Senate Foreign Relations Committee held hearings on this resolution (S. Res. 94), but deferred action.

LITTLE TO LOSE

This committee believes that the United States should withdraw its self-judging reservation, at once. The Court's compulsory jurisdiction would still not include disputes on matters essentially within our domestic jurisdiction, but the determination of whether a dispute involved such matters would be by the Court. Assuming that the United States would exercise the self-judging reservation only in good faith and not as an excuse to avoid defeat, our only risk in withdrawing the reservation would be that the Court in some future dispute would decide that the matter was not essentially within our domestic jurisdiction when we considered that it was. Based on the structure, history, and prospects of the Court, this committee believes that any harm to the United States from the acceptance of such a risk is most unlikely.

MUCH TO GAIN

The gains to the United States, however, from withdrawing the self-judging reservation, would be substantial and in the long run could be tremendous. With the reservation still on file, giving our country a veto power to prevent a decision of the Court, other countries are not prepared to assume that we will exercise the veto only in good faith. From their point of view our support for the Court is little better than that of the Iron Curtain countries, none of which has filed any adherence. We have put ourselves in the posture either of expecting to break our international obligations, or of being afraid to defend our conduct in court. We have prevented ourselves from showing the world the stark contrast between bona fide suport of the Court, and the Iron Curtain countries' rejection of it.

If we Americans wish the governments of other countries to follow our lead in the arduous search for a way to the rule of law among nations, we must renounce the self-judging reservation. We must strike from the rolls our recorded distrust, and become a true adherent of the International Court of Justice.

Corpus Christi Caller-Times Warns America Cannot Afford Second-Rate Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 12, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, with each passing day we are given additional evidence that building America's brainpower is just as vital to the protection of our Nation and the free world as developing nuclear weapons.

With both the free world and the Communist slave world armed to the teeth, it seems very clear that brains, not bombs, will decide whether mankind will finally exist in freedom or slavery or perish.

Education has been the hallmark of freedom, yet we find ourselves at a point in history where totalitarian Russia devoted 12 percent of its productive wealth to education while we are only investing 4½ percent of our gross national product in the pursuit of learning.

Most Americans seem to be in agreement that there is strong need to substantially strengthen our national educational system. But there is considerable disagreement in some quarters over whether the additional funds for the program should come from the local level, the State level or the Federal level.

My belief is that the need is so great and so immediate that additional investment in the national educational program should come from all governmental levels—local, State and Federal—

with local control of schools strictly reserved for the local board.

Recently the Corpus Christi Caller, one of Texas' finest daily newspapers, published an editorial which is worthy of the thought and consideration of all Texans and all Americans, particularly those of the South. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the August 9, 1960, issue of the Corpus Christi Caller entitled "America Cannot Afford Second-Rate Education."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA CANNOT AFFORD SECOND-RATE EDUCATION

This and succeeding sessions of Congress will be troubled by America's commitment to education. The concern of educators and Government officials with our educational posture goes to the very heart of our democratic system and its ability to survive in relentless competition with the Communist world.

As with most issues of substance, both the nature of the educational problem and the means used to solve it are subject to wide differences of opinion. A host of critical questions arise in any discussion of the subject. Here are but a few of those questions.

How can we have true equality of educational opportunity in the United States? How can we be sure that the pupil in Blanket, Tex., is assured the same standard of educational excellence (in instruction, if not in pretentious buildings) as that afforded, say, in Austin, Tex.? How can we offer the same educational opportunity to the school children of Mississippi and Georgia as in California or New York?

There is no lack, of course, of excellent school systems in most of the States of the Union. The problem does not lie in this field at all. It lies in the great majority of school systems scattered throughout the United States that are unwilling or are unable financially to support an adequate school program. This is the heart of the problem.

Texas, as with other States, has approached the problem through State aid. But even a cursory examination of the school systems of the State reveals that State aid does not bring a level of equal opportunity for a good education to Texas children—some can afford to hire only mediocre or inexperienced teachers while some can afford to air condition school buildings and attract the best teachers. The solution would appear to be more State aid to poorer schools. Lacking such aid, it is inevitable that Congress will be urged by this and other States to shoulder responsibilities being shirked by States and local communities.

If Americans do not already know it, they should be told in clear, strong language that second-rate education cannot support or maintain their Nation in a role of leadership. Increasingly complex machines and growing political, social, and economic problems make first-rate education imperative.

The Russian challenge in the educational field has been noted by Dr. Alvin C. Eruich, vice president and director of the Ford Foundation for the Advancement of Education, following extensive travels and study in Russia. He found that teachers were highly regarded and highly paid in the Soviet Union. He found that students in the 9th and 10th grades went to school 12 hours a day, 6 days a week for 10 months of the year. He found that the Russians were spending approximately twice as much per capita on education as the United States is.

"To me the accomplishments in the field of education which Russia has made in a relatively short time are much more frightening than announcements that come from Russia concerning atomic or hydrogen bombs or guided missiles," Dr. Eruich said.

Upon whose shoulders will be placed the burden of a first-rate educational system? It will most certainly be borne by all the people of the United States and administered by the Federal Government if States and local school districts are unable or unwilling to accept their responsibilities. For the stake is survival and leadership in a free world, not just the increasingly irrelevant question of "local control" of schools.

U.S. Public Favors U.N. Standing Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 12, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] introduced a resolution supporting the establishment of a Permanent United Nations Police Force.

In the past, I have cosponsored a similar resolution in the Congress.

Today, perhaps as never before, there is a very urgent need for establishing such a force to help the U.N. fulfill its obligations and attempt to iron out difficulties that threaten world peace.

Now, what do the American people think about such a program?

Recently, I was privileged to review a Gallup poll, published in the La Crosse Tribune pointing out that 72 percent of the Americans interviewed said that they would like to see the U.N. with a big enough army to deal with the brushfire wars throughout the world. Reflecting broad U.S. support for such a force, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GALLUP POLL—U.S. PUBLIC FAVORS U.N. STANDING ARMY

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—As a hastily assembled U.N. Emergency Force moves to restore order in the Congo, the American public is highly in favor of the United Nations having its own standing army large enough to deal with trouble like that in the new African state.

In the latest Gallup Poll survey—conducted while troops from 14 nations were arriving in the strife-torn Congo to take up U.N. police duty—72 percent of Americans interviewed said they would like to see the U.N. with a permanent army big enough in size to deal with small, "brush fire" wars throughout the world.

When this proposal was last put to the public—in March, 1958—66 percent were recorded in favor of a permanent international police force.

If such a force were created, the public would like to see it made up of troops from both small and large countries—including the United States and Russia.

The U.N. forces presently in the Congo are drawn largely from other African nations. None of the troops come from major world powers, although both the United States and Russia have sent supplies and planes to help transport the U.N. forces.

The American public was first asked this question by Gallup Poll reporters:

"A proposal has been made to build up the United Nations Emergency Force to a size great enough to deal with 'brush fire,' or small, wars throughout the world. Does this sound like a good idea or a poor idea to you?"

The vote at present and in March 1958: Permanent U.N. army?

[In percent]	*Today*	*March 1958*
Good idea	72	66
Poor idea	12	15
No opinion	16	19

In the current survey, voters were also asked:

"At present, the U.N. emergency force is made up of volunteers from small countries. Should it continue this way or should it include volunteers from such large countries as the United States and Russia?"

Te vote: Makeup of U.N. army?

	Percent
Include large countries	46
Small countries only	29
No opinion	25

Behind much of the minority opposition to including volunteers from the larger nations is a fear that Russian troops—if once established in a country under the U.N. flag—might create trouble and lay the groundwork for a Communist takeover once the international force had quit the country.

The U.S. public has long been in favor of establishing a U.N. standing army—a move which many observers believe might revolutionize present military planning. They point out that it might well mean a substantial reduction in the number of troops now maintained by each nation—including the United States—to take care of such "brush fire" conflicts as the Korean war.

At a time when U.N. forces were fighting in Korea, in the fall of 1950, the Gallup poll found more than 8 out of 10 persons in favor of U.S. participation in a standing U.N. army which would be kept in readiness at all times.

When the first U.N. emergency force was dispatched to the troubled Sinai Peninsula and Gaza strip in the late fall of 1956, surveys found 7 out of 10 Americans supporting such a move.

A Mortgage on America's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 12, 1960

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, recently the Director of the Bureau of the Budget called attention to our country's nearly $750 billion debt obligations. In that connection I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Mortgage on America's Future," written by Ernest A. Tupper, manager, Government Relations Department, American Can Co.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MORTGAGE ON AMERICA'S FUTURE

(By Ernest A. Tupper)

The headline quoted above is what Maurice Stans, Director of the Budget Bureau of the Federal Government, calls our country's

nearly $750 billion of debt and obligations. A little over a third of that, some $290 billion, is our present national debt. The remainder represents the obligations to which the United States has already committed itself. Briefly they are: $98 billion for defense, housing, public works, highways and similar projects; $27.5 billion of unfunded retirement pay for civilians in Government; $30 billion of accrued liability for military retirement; and $300 billion for future pensions and compensation for veterans.

How quickly these amounts increase in a short period of time is reflected in a few examples of expenditures in the past decade. Shown here are five areas in which Federal spending has increased significantly since 1950:

	1950	Today	Percent increase
(1) Agricultural program billions	$2.8	$5.1	85
(2) Natural resources ..do	$1.2	$1.8	50
(3) National security ...do	$13.0	$45.6	250
(4) Public debt interest ..do	$5.7	$9.3	60
(5) Public health ...millions	$244.0	$850.0	250

During this same period of time Federal taxes and receipts increased from $36.5 billion to $78.6 billion, or 115 percent.

The cost of Government operation is great. Presently some 11 million persons are employed by Federal, State, and local governments with annual payrolls equalling some $120 billion. The total expenditure of these governments equals nearly 27 percent of our total income. Put another way, it means that every working person spends, on the average, 2 hours and 16 minutes per 8-hour day providing the income spent by the Government.

The great tragedy, perhaps, is that so many people fail to realize just how big a tax burden they are carrying. Most of their tax burden is hidden. While the income, sales, excise, and gasoline tax are readily recognized, the hidden taxes on everything people buy, whether it be produced by a corporation, partnership, or an individually owned business or company, are not recognized. Nor is it apparent that there are also hidden taxes in the bill of the doctor, dentist, serviceman, or the monthly rent bill. The purchase price of a loaf of bread is estimated to contain some 151 separate taxes.

All of these taxes, and our present debt and obligations of nearly $750 billion, have resulted from the willingness of the people—you and me—to have the Federal (and local and State) Government provide services which we might better undertake on our own—or do without.

The trend continues. During the last session of the present Congress 20 major spending bills were introduced in the House and 20 others in the Senate.

If these bills were enacted into law another $55 billion per year would be added to the cost of Government. This would raise our annual budget from $80 billion to $135 billion.

Of particular interest at the moment are the following legislative proposals:

Federal aid to education to provide funds for school construction over a 3-year period. Minimum yearly cost $325 million.

Health care for the aged to provide hospitalization and medical care for those over 65. Minimum yearly cost estimated at $1.2 billion.

Housing to provide for Government purchase of FHA and GI mortgages on new houses. Yearly cost $1 billion.

Federal pay raises to provide pay raises for civil service and postal employees. Yearly cost $810 million.

Veterans' benefits to provide peacetime veterans with benefits comparable to those who served during World War II and the Korean conflict. Yearly cost $300 million.

Somewhere, sometime, somehow, and probably soon if it is going to be done at all, the majority of us in this Nation who have the right and privilege to vote must come to accept the hard fact that we, the people—every one of us—pay the whole cost of these big spending programs. If we fail or refuse to face up to this fact, and unless we speak and vote our convictions, we may well wake up some day to find that Government, after promising us everything we want, has taken away everything we had.

I believe that none of us is willing to see that kind of a mortgage on America's future foreclosed on us all.

World Markets Open for U.S. Milk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 12, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, confronted with ever-growing stockpiles of agricultural commodities, our Nation continues to face the need for increasing consumption, expanding utilization, improving distribution, and generally establishing a supply-demand balance.

In recent years, we have employed a kind of food-for-peace program. In a great many countries, this has filled a great humanitarian need. In addition, it has elicited good will for the people of this country.

In Congress, as well as in the Executive Branch, a great deal of thought has been given to further improving this distribution of surplus foodstuffs—now amounting to about $9 billion.

Distributed among our people, this would mean that every man, woman and child in the country would own about $131 worth of food. If equally distributed, a family of 5 would get, for example, 70 bushels of wheat, 105 bushels of corn, 1,500 pounds of grain sorghum, 5 bushels of barley, and more than a bushel of soybeans.

With about one-third of the nearly 3 billion people in the world still existing on inadequate diets, it must be difficult to understand why more roadways cannot be opened to channel the food from surplus stockpiles to the stomachs of hungry people.

Practically speaking, the route, of course, is not so direct. Yet, I believe one of the great challenges of our time—the accomplishment of which could do the American people immeasurable good, in terms of better relations with other countries, as well as in meeting a humanitarian need. Also, there is a great opportunity to create and benefit from commercial markets for our great, food-production plant.

Recently, the Wisconsin Agriculturist published a splendid article entitled "World Markets Open for U.S. Milk."

Reflecting the ways in which efforts are being made—and should be expanded—to find new and more effective ways of distributing our rich agricultural output—I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent to have an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal—illustrating the size of our surpluses—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wisconsin Agriculturist, July 16, 1960]

WORLD MARKETS OPEN FOR U.S. MILK

The next customer for U.S. milk and milk products may be living in Asia, Africa, or in Latin America.

World markets in dairy products are worth a closer scrutiny and that's just what Dairy Society International, a nonprofit, educational organization is doing in its farflung market expansion programs. Here's a picture of that society and its achievements.

It was chosen in 1956 by the dairy industry and USDA work with Foreign Agricultural Service in oversea market development for dairy products under Public Law 480. In this capacity it has introduced top quality U.S. milk to more than 5 million persons—in many widely separated countries throughout the world—and has demonstrated ways in which these people can obtain quality milk products through modern technology and enterprise.

WORK IN THREE CONTINENTS

In 17 international trade fairs, manned by top dairy experts, it has discussed milk product promotion with dairy leaders in Latin America, Europe, and Asia.

In seeking to widen markets, DSI has avoided disrupting international trade routes of the United States and of friendly milk producing nations. It works in milk-short areas where the need is great—where dairy diets are below standard and where the nutritional value of milk is not yet fully realized.

Funds for this work come from three main sources: (1) Foreign Agricultural Service (local currencies from Public Law 480 sales of farm products); (2) from Dairy Society International members, who represent all segments of the dairy industry; and (3) from cooperating groups in the host countries.

Four main types of programs are used:

1. Surveys to determine the potential market for milk and other dairy products in a particular country.

2. Research to find new ways of combining milk with local foods to provide better nutrition economically.

3. Demonstrations to show how dairy products can be made available to entire populations thousands of miles from the place the milk was produced.

4. Long-range educational programs to teach the value of milk in the diet, and to build confidence in milk as a wholesome food.

DSI has 14 years experience in international cooperation. The group today counts its membership in nearly 50 countries. The basic aim has always been to help solve the problem of dairy surplus in one world area and hunger and need in another.

This is no giveaway plan. It is a program to develop permanent commercial markets for dairy products.

Within the current year activities have included surveys in India, Spain, Iran, and Greece. Information was given to importers and dairy-minded persons in more than 30 countries.

Trade fair demonstrations during the last few months include four in India and one in Spain. These resulted in the sale of three and possibly four dairy plants.

The year 1959 marked the completion of 3-year educational programs in Colombia and Thailand. As a result of this program both countries saw substantial improvement in quality milk production—and an increase in milk consumption.

WORK WITH LOCAL GROUPS

The search for new products finds the society working on a better breakfast campaign for Brazil—where the traditional breakfast is coffee and a hard roll, and where there is not even a word in the language for "breakfast."

They are also working with two leading research institutes in India to find means of combining milk and its products with local foods that are plentiful.

Research on an inexpensive milk wafer in Pakistan is another project.

Interest in the potential widening of the world's use of milk is gaining. With industry awake to the possibilities of oversea trade, the course is clear.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 5, 1960]

YOUR SHARE OF FARM SURPLUS

Every man, woman, and child in the country owns $131 worth of food that has been paid for but which he is unlikely to ever see or use. At least that represents the value of his proportionate share of America's mammoth farm surplus.

If the stuff were equally distributed here's what a family of five would get, according to a report just issued by the Uhlmann Grain Co.: 70 bushels of wheat, 105 bushels of corn, 1,500 pounds of grain sorghum, 5 bushels of barley, and more than a bushel of soybeans.

That would mean some pretty full pantries and fruit cellars. A lot of us have forgotten how to grind our own flour, bake our own wheat bread, or make our own corn whisky and homebrew. Still, if we could only find some way to get rid of our $131 worth it would save the farmers a lot of grief, deprive the politicians of much campaign fodder and save ourselves about $500 million a year in storage costs.

Letter Carriers Express Appreciation for Pay Raise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR ENGLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 12, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, the Oakland, Calif., branch of the National Association of Letter Carriers recently passed a resolution expressing its appreciation for favorable action on the postal employees pay raise bill.

In response to that organization's request, I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION COMMENDING THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. SENATE

Whereas the Honorable Senators are to be commended for their earnest and wholehearted support of the letter carriers request for economic equality; and

Whereas according to law the letter carriers are not allowed to the bargaining facilities enjoyed by the majority of unions; and

Whereas after furnishing the Honorable Senators with facts and figures on how we stand economically we have to look to the Members of Congress to understand our needs; and

Whereas this year we are all very proud of the way Congress united in cause even in the face of the Presidential veto and brought our struggle to a most gratifying conclusion: therefore be it

Resolved, That branch 76, N.A.L.C., of Oakland, Calif., go on record as commending the Members of the U.S. Senate for their courageous passage of H.R. 9883 and the overriding of the veto that followed.

Adopted at the meeting of July 19, 1960.

MARTIN P. SGLAV, *Secretary*.

Students' Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 12, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I want to highly commend the College Student Association of Carleton College in Northfield, Minn., and its past president, Bob Fliegel, for the institution of "Challenge," a program in which significant political and social problems are discussed and debated.

Public issues must be ventilated, especially in our colleges and universities. This new program at Carleton allows an opportunity for the students to hear speakers with opposing views on the current political and social issues. It will enable students to appraise critically the burning issues before our country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article, "New CSA Standing Committee Challenges Unquestioned Views," which appears in the March 12, 1960, issue of the college newspaper, the Carletonian, to be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CSA STANDING COMMITTEE CHALLENGES UNQUESTIONED VIEWS

Several weeks ago in a chapel address, Denis Baly raised the question, "What is a student's vocation?"

To Dr. Baly a student is a representative of a specific group with responsibilities and rights which are clearly marked. He reminded the Carleton student body that there were two universal duties which it was their privilege and responsibility as students to fulfill.

The first, the assimilation of knowledge and intellectual development leading to the formation of "acceptable" ideas and concepts, is the one which the Carleton student body pursues excellently.

The second, the constant critical appraisal of these ideas and concepts and the refusal to unquestionably accept the "obvious" assumptions underlying them, is the one which pursues the excellence of the Carleton student body. This is the challenge.

For the past few years various student groups in colleges across the country have formed organizations in an attempt to solve this problem. The questioning student, the student actively concerned with the significant and timely social and political questions, and the student actively involved in doing something about these questions had become scarce.

At Carleton this student is still scarce. One of the reasons this situation exists is that the student's views are not questioned—are neither vigorously attacked nor defended. The speakers he hears on Friday and Sunday morning, the newspaper he reads, and the people he talks with on campus too often work from the same premises, the same accepted principles as he does.

This can only result in intellectual atrophy, the forfeiture of the privilege unique to the student, and a reinforcement of the status quo for better or for worse.

Numerous intelligent and committed individuals who hold dissenting views on political and social principles, views which are not heard by the Carleton student body, will be brought to campus by the new CSA standing committee, "Challenge."

Debates between speakers with opposing views, views which force us to examine and justify the basic assumptions underlying our beliefs and ideas, will be provided. A Great Hall student audience had seldom seen such programs as an NAACP-White Citizens Council debate, a leading American industrialist defend his views against a Marxian economist, or a militant trade union leader challenge the opinion of a Carleton audience.

"Challenge" will initiate stimulating and controversial speaker and debate programs, will precede these programs with the publicity and information necessary to give the students an adequate background, will follow these programs with discussion and seminar groups led by faculty and students, and will be a focal point for student action in the political and social spheres.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*—Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*—5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*—3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg.*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa.*—4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, ———.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, ———.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, ———.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED — TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

A Negro's Life in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 13, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have in my hand an article from the U.S. News & World Report of August 1, 1960. It is entitled "A Negro's Life in Russia: Beatings, Insults, Segregation." I feel that the article is one which should be placed in the RECORD. All our friends of the Negro race might well read it and realize that what is happening around the world in relation to offsetting the livableness and the economy, such as is happening in Africa, is due to the very happenings which the author of this article, S. Omor Okullo tells about concerning the treatment which Negroes have received in Russia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEGRO'S LIFE IN RUSSIA: BEATINGS, INSULTS, SEGREGATION—INTERVIEW WITH A YOUNG AFRICAN WHO STUDIED AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MOSCOW

(Soviet Russia, right now, is posing as a friend and protector of Africans. What is the Soviet attitude toward Negroes? Is there racial discrimination in Russia? Some answers to such questions were discovered by S. Omor Okullo, a 26-year-old African from Uganda who spent 2 years studying at the University of Moscow on a United Nations scholarship. Recently he was expelled by the Soviets after protesting the way Russians treated African students. Mr. Okullo describes that treatment in this exclusive interview with a member of the U.S. News & World Report staff in London.)

LONDON.

Question. Mr. Okullo, you have written a letter to Soviet Premier Khrushchev protesting the treatment of African students at the University of Moscow. Why? What sort of treatment were you protesting?

Answer. We informed the Soviet Government about a Somali student who was attacked and beaten up and left unconscious by four Russian students.

Question. Why was he beaten?

Answer. His crime consisted of dancing with a Russian girl.

Question. Were there other incidents of this sort?

Answer. Well, one day the Russian students distributed a typed circular in the Russian language saying that the African students were getting too big for their boots in Moscow. What they meant really was that we came from poor homes and were getting big in Moscow and becoming an anti-Soviet group.

And one day one of the African students was insulted and called a "monkey." He was going in a lift, and merely asked them to stop for him on a certain floor.

These are a few incidents which we brought to the notice of the authorities. There were some other incidents which we did not like to bring up. We left them out.

Question. Were they similar incidents?

Answer. Yes; many of them involved African students with Russian girls. We told the Soviet Government that some Russian students have been dismissed from the university for being in the company of African students. And we further stated that, as we had come to the Soviet Union to study and not as refugees, we considered it right that we should be accorded more human respect.

Question. What was the result of your protest?

Answer. By appealing to the Soviet Government, we felt that something could be done by the Government to prevent what we did not wish to call racial discrimination.

But, instead of bringing cooperation between both sides, the Soviet authorities have been throwing African students out of the university.

Question. Did you feel there was much racial discrimination in Moscow against African students?

Answer. Well, that does not exist much. It has existed up to a certain limit. But I think it will change, because the Russians will realize that African students are not prepared to cooperate with them if they do not respect us as human beings in their country.

Question. How many African students were expelled from the University of Moscow?

Answer. I and two other students, both Africans.

Question. Why were you expelled?

Answer. Actually, there was no clear reason given to us. But what we understood was that we were accused of being leaders of the anti-Soviet group.

Question. How many African students are now studying in Russia?

Answer. There are roughly 600 students, but some are going in and others are leaving.

Question. How many have left because they were dissatisfied?

Answer. Well, 15 at least left recently, and 300 were withdrawn from the Soviet Union by the United Arab Republic.

Question. Do you think many more African students will leave?

Answer. I think if they have the means, financially, many are bound to leave—maybe most of them.

Question. Why are so many African students so unhappy in Moscow?

Answer. One problem is that living conditions are very unsatisfactory. Also, there is not any relationship between the Soviet students and the African students. Many times, when Russian students are discovered in the company of African students, the Russians are summoned and reprimanded by the Komsomol [Russian youth organization].

Question. Why do you think Russians are discouraged from associating with Africans?

Answer. I think mainly because of political reasons.

Question. What do you mean?

Answer. Well, because, in Moscow, Africans are treated as capitalists. And the Russian Government is aware that, if we are allowed to associate freely with Soviet students, probably that would have a deep influence on the Soviet students. You see, many of the Russian students are very primitive, socially, and some of our African students are more advanced than they are.

Question. Why were you accused of being a leader of the anti-Soviet group?

Answer. Because I have been a vice president of the African Students Union in the U.S.S.R. for 2 years, and they discovered our union was not a political one and was not prepared to be used for any political propaganda.

Question. Did you get the impression they wanted to use you for political propaganda?

Answer. Yes, they did. That's quite true.

Question. Did they try to indoctrine you politically?

Answer. In class, the teachers of Russian language try to find out the political views of the foreign students. If they find the student is really neutral—that he is unwilling to commit himself—then he is regarded as a dangerous man and politically undesirable.

For example, they asked us about our views on the U–2 and were very unhappy when I did not immediately take Russia's side.

Question. Do you think that many of the African students who now are studying in the Soviet Union are greatly influenced by Communist propaganda?

Answer. Well, I think most of the African students, say 95 percent, would like to remain African. By this I mean, if there are a few who have been influenced by the Eastern ideology, I think they will have no effect on Africans and African States.

Question. You mentioned that living conditions were poor. Could you give more details on that?

Answer. Well, you find a small room occupied by four students, and in winter there is no warm water provided in most hostels, and the country is extremely cold in winter. So I think from our point of view it is very uncomfortable for African students who are used to a warm climate. In the student's dining room the food is very poor.

Question. Did the Russians give you any financial help at all?

Answer. You get 900 rubles a month ($225 at the official rate of four rubles to the dollar), and they deduct 36 for your accommodation. So you have 864, out of which you must pay for food, transportation, books, and so forth, and the cost of living is extremely high. A pair of shoes would cost 300 rubles. They give you money for clothes only once, when you first get there—about 3,000 rubles. You spend about 2,000 of that on an overcoat and the rest for winter boots and a fur cap.

Question. Did you find the Soviets provided you with necessary facilities for study?

Answer. No; the Soviet Union deliberately violated their promise to the United Nations. Before going to the Soviet Union we were promised money for books, equipment, and other supplies. But, when we brought the matter to the Soviet Minister for Higher Education, he denied it and said the United Nations was not correct. I wrote the Secretary General, but before I got a reply the Soviet Union accused me of being as dangerous as the Americans and leader of the anti-Soviet group.

Question. What about recreation and amusements for African students?

Answer. Conditions for that are very limited.

Question. Can the African student go to dances with Russian students?

Answer. There are dances organized by the students, but they are limited to each country. They don't mix. The authorities frighten Russian students out of mixing with foreign students. By foreign, I mean those who don't come from Socialist countries.

Question. Were you African and other foreign students in class with the Russian students?

Answer. Yes; we were all together. But this year the Russians are starting a "friendship university" for African students, where we will be separated from Russian students.

From my point of view I disagree with that, and I tried to explain it to many Soviet authorities that, if the Russians really want African students or African people to understand the Russian way of life, it is better to invite African students to mix with the Russian students and study with the Russian students in the same universities. I explained to the Russian authorities that the "friendship university" is not different from universities in South Africa. It is different only in the ideology applied to it.

Question. Mr. Okullo, what was the main thing you learned from your experience in Russia?

Answer. What I gathered in a short time was that the Russians are different from what they are preaching about friendship with African peoples and African freedom. What I discovered was that most of these preachings are applied materially.

Question. How do you mean, materially?

Answer. They are not sincere about preaching friendship with African peoples. Africa now is the balance of power in the world. They know if they lose Africa they are lost.

The Great Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 13, 1960

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I am sure that all of us are looking forward to the great debate which the television networks have promised us for the presidential campaign, cognizant that it depends on legislation relieving equal time requirements on a trial basis for 1960 in regard to the two top offices. This legislation has been passed by the Senate, and now lies on the Speaker's desk in the House.

The bill which will make a serious debate on issues possible is the outgrowth of an article by Gov. Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois. He proposed last spring that the presidential candidates in this election be permitted to talk sense to the American people through the medium of a great debate on television, stripped of the hoopla and professional political trappings which usually characterize commercial political broadcasts.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD Appendix two discussions of the subject: Editorial from the Washington Post of Sunday, July 31, 1960, entitled "Unfinished Business," and a column by Roscoe Drummond for the same date, entitled "A Break for the Voter: Great Thing, The Great Debates."

There being no objection, the editorial and column were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The urgency of amending the so-called equal-time requirement for presidential candidates on public-service radio and television programs becomes the more apparent as the 1960 politicking warms up. For millions of people television will be their closest contact with the candidates. Almost everyone agrees that TV debates and speeches on the issues of the campaign can make an immense contribution to the democratic process. Yet the law still forbids the networks to present election-year programs of this kind on their own time without giving equal privileges to the candidates of the fringe parties.

The absurdity of this requirement was demonstrated recently when Lar Daly, who represents a mere handful of fanatics, demanded and was given equal time on the Jack Paar show because Senator KENNEDY had appeared on that program by invitation. Serious debates and discussions among the major candidates are obviously impossible so long as any windbag who can assemble a few followers and organize a party must be included in it. Fortunately, the Senate has passed a resolution that would suspend the equal-time provision as it applies to presidential and vice presidential candidates in 1960. Enactment of this measure ought to be one of the first undertakings of Congress when it reassembles in August.

A BREAK FOR THE VOTER: GREAT THING, THE GREAT DEBATES

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The prospective face-to-face television debates between Vice President NIXON and Senator KENNEDY should make this the most vibrant, engrossing, dramatic presidential campaign in memory.

Senator KENNEDY has already accepted. Vice President NIXON is agreeable and is making two suggestions designed to make the debates more meaningful and revealing to the public.

It seems to me that NIXON is right in proposing that the nominees speak extemporaneously—rather than read prepared speeches at each other—and that they be free to question each other on the spot.

This should be satisfactory to KENNEDY, who knows his own mind, has his subject matter at his fingertips and can speak off-the-cuff coherently and brilliantly.

Such a series of meetings between the nominees would be in the best tradition of the Lincoln-Douglas debates.

Something like them has long been desirable. It is now virtually certain that the KENNEDY-NIXON debates will take place.

This will not be just a show, not a stunt. Neither of the nominees wants to make it that way at all. Neither will be disposed to do so. These debates will be far more valuable than just a trial of wits. The results which would flow from them would be these:

They would enable the voters to measure and compare, much better than otherwise, the fiber and fitness of the nominees. Such face-to-face debate, with the candidates speaking their own minds in their own words, would relegate to the sidelines the Madison Avenue imagemakers and mimeograph machines.

They would vastly enliven and increase public interest in the campaign. More people would listen more attentively to lively debate than to the usual campaign oratory.

They will sharpen and deepen public interest in the issues of the election. These debates will not only stimulate us, they will educate us. They will help immeasurably to develop a public opinion which will better support the next President in measures he will want to carry out.

How much sharply focused, penetrating and fairminded discussion usually gets into a presidential campaign? It is very limited and far between. One of the reasons is that most presidential campaign speeches are delivered to the converted, for the converted and by the converted usually at intensely partisan, super-heated party pep rallies.

The prospective Kennedy-Nixon debates will be primarily directed to voters who haven't made up their minds and to voters who need better reasons before making up their minds. Others can listen in. Most campaign speeches are delivered to those who have already decided their vote and they are not often of a character to induce many to listen in.

Fortunately, circumstances conspire to make it natural and easy for Nixon and Kennedy to accept the debate idea this year. Wendell Willkie challenged F.D.R. to radio debate in 1940 but the President refused because he knew that he would be just making big audiences for his opponent. Nixon and Kennedy have about the same audience appeal. Each is alert and articulate.

Religious Exhibit at World's Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 13, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in our widespread efforts to counter the Communist ideological, sociological, economic, and military offensive, we have given considerable time and thought to blockading the outspreading of Communism in such fields.

However, we may well have ignored—or at least too little stressed—a major strength of our way of life: That is, the right and privilege to be spiritually free.

Perhaps no one appreciates this great heritage so much as those to whom it has been denied.

Recently, I was privileged to receive from Mr. Leslie J. Schlax, State secretary of the Wisconsin State Council, Knights of Columbus, a resolution adopted by its supreme council.

Basically, the resolution proposed the importance of stressing the significant role which freedom of religion—including all faiths—has played in the lives of our people and the history of the country.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 23 IN RE WORLD'S FAIR RELIGIOUS EXHIBIT

Whereas the consensus is that there has been an inadequate recognition of our religious heritage at recent U.S. national and international exhibitions; and

Whereas the Christian religion has played such an important part in the history of our country and greater emphasis should be given to such fact in future national and international festivals and exhibitions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Wisconsin State Council Knights of Columbus in annual convention assembled at Green Bay, Wis., That those planning all future U.S. national and international exhibitions, festivals and fairs be, and they are hereby urged and requested to give greater and more emphatic recognition to our religious heritage to such displays; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to our Wisconsin U.S. Senators and Representatives and to the U.S. Department of State by our state council secretary; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished the supreme council and it is recommended that said resolution be acted upon favorably at the supreme convention this year.

LESLIE J. SCHLAX,
State Secretary, Wisconsin State Council, Knights of Columbus.

Farm and Bank Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 13, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the agricultural community and the commercial banking community of New York State have long enjoyed a close working relationship that can well be a model to other States.

The annual Bankers School of Agriculture conducted at Cornell University has played an important role in fostering this cooperative relationship. For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the following editorial from American Banker printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROVEN SUCCESS FOR 15 YEARS—NEW YORK BANKERS SCHOOL OF AGRICULTURE AND WHAT IT TEACHES

Every summer for 15 years, 60 or more New York State bankers interested in farm loans have gathered for a week at the State Agricultural School at Cornell University. There they have learned the essentials of farm management in relation to agricultural credits. Their assemblage is the Bankers School of Agriculture, sponsored by the New York State Bankers Association.

In the 15-year period, graduates of the school's 2-year course—1 week for two consecutive summers—have numbered several hundred. Practically every rural bank in the State has had at least one man in this school. Some small banks have had more, while certain larger banks have had a dozen or more men take the course.

Perhaps it is different in some States, but in New York a practical farm background is possessed by few men coming into banking. Even small town education is more citified than countrified.

Most of the young men, therefore, who are cast in the role of farm lending officers need an understanding of the farm situation which their educational background and experience has not given them. Even those with some knowledge of farming need to sharped their perception and broaden their knowledge of modern farming to keep up to date.

And so this week at Cornell, 70 bank men—a majority of them younger, junior executives—are spending 5 days in classrooms listening to agriculture professors, and in the field visiting typical farms to study their management problems and consider the role of credit in production and efficiency. Concurrently with the first 2 days of the school, a graduate seminar for bankers who previously have attended the school is conducted as a sort of refresher course. The value of the school's courses is attested by the fact that 40 or 50 come back annually for the seminar.

Dean C. E. Palm, of the New York State School of Agriculture, in welcoming this year's school and seminar, pointed to one important fact in modern day farming that reinforces the importance of the bankers' agriculture school. So great and swift has been progress in agricultural science, he said, even the universities have difficulty in keeping abreast of the techniques of the upper 10 percent of farm managements. How important, therefore, that bankers allot time and assign their executives to spend a week making themselves aware of the fundamentals of farming in a changing agricultural community.

Educational work of this sort has been a touchstone of the work of the New York State Bankers Association for nearly 20 years, under the administraiton of Albert Muench, executive vice president. For senior executives, management school courses are available every year. For juniors, accelerated American Institute of Banking study and other courses are offered in summer sessions. Bank public relations is taught at a special NYSBA summer term. Attendance year to year in these schools evidences their accepted value among bankers of the State, and the practicality of their organization and development.

Thus the current week's agricultural school for bankers typifies for the country banker the education policy of the New York State Bankers Association and the recognition among New York State's bankers of the need for self-education.

The exchange of ideas, between professors and other bankers attending this school, constitutes a sharing of experiences which is making New York's farm lending more constructive and productive. Its students learn when to say "Yes" as well as when to say "No" in an area where sums at risk at loans now are ranging into many tens of thousands of dollars and over long terms of years.

Farming is a business today, and management has become all important. Why and how much a farmer borrows—too much or too little—too soon or too late—are questions which must be answered wisely and well by both banker and borrower. A school such as the New York Bankers School of Agriculture adds immeasurably to the lending sense of the men who attend it. We wonder why more States, where farming is still a major field of bank borrowing, do not emulate this New York State venture, a proved success now for 15 years.

Weaknesses of the U.S. System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 13, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Weaknesses of the U.S. System," written by David Lawrence and published in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEAKNESSES OF THE U.S. SYSTEM—RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT SEEN LACKING IF MAJORITY PARTY CAN'T ENACT PLATFORM

(By David Lawrence)

A different type of national political convention assembles here this week under circumstances that reflect seriously on the prestige of the United States throughout the world.

At a time of crisis, at a time when America boasts of her democratic institutions, the fact is that, among persons abroad schooled in the science of government, the term "responsible government" is not applied to the system in effect in this country. It is more often described as irresponsible government.

Thus, in the elections 2 years ago, the American people chose the Democratic Party to control and rule the Congress of the United States. Since its Members in the House and Senate comprise a majority of virtually two-thirds and since a few additional votes are usually available from the opposite party, even the veto of a President can be overridden. Why then cannot the major planks of the platform of the Democratic Party be put into effect by law—or rather, why haven't they been enacted in the last 2 years?

The truth is that, in actual practice, the Democratic Party does not command a majority because it is divided on such issues as civil rights and on many economic questions. There is no such thing as party discipline. A Member of Congress can desert his own party and suffer no penalty—not even the loss of a committee chairmanship, which his party can at will withdraw from him.

Theoretically, as Congress reassembles this week after a recess taken primarily to allow Members of both parties to attend their national political conventions, there is every opportunity to pass the most important provisions of the Democratic Party platform. If there is economic discontent or dissatisfcation among the American people with anything that can be cured by law, the party which has been in control of Congress for the last 2 years is responsible for failure to provide the remedy.

If the Members of the party in power do not face up to their obligations, the people presumably have a right to choose another party at the polls. But in virtually all the Southern States there is no active or organized Republican Party which puts up candidates for Congress. This, too, impresses foreign observers as a weakness.

The Democratic Party, moreover, needs to win something less than a majority of the seats in the Northern States and yet, by adding its Southern Democrats, can still control both Houses of Congress.

This week, as Congress reassembles, there is a novel situation which serves to reemphasize the irresponsibility of the present system. LYNDON JOHNSON, nominee of the Democratic Party for the Vice Presidency of the United States, is also the majority leader of the Senate. His sponsor at the Democratic National Convention at Los Angeles, SAM RAYBURN, is still the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Yet, for the action or inaction at the session beginning this week, there is no way at present by which the American people can fix responsibility on the Democratic Party.

Senator KENNEDY, the Democratic nominee for the Presidency, already has brushed aside the role of Congress at the current session. He says publicly that little can be done to fulfill the provisions of the platform because

the Democratic Party does not control the executive branch of the Government.

To observers, however, from other countries where parliament systems are in operation, this will appear to be a sweeping admission of the failure of the American system. For if a party commands virtually two-thirds of both Houses of Congress—enough to assure an overriding of the Presidential veto if the public desires a piece of legislation—it seems strange that the fault should be placed on the Chief Executive, who has no vote in Congress and has no right of participation in the actual writing of legislation. All he can do is appeal for the passage of needed legislation, which Mr. Eisenhower is doing in his message today.

Abroad the Prime Minister is chosen from and remains a Member of Parliament.

If there is something wrong with America for which the Republicans are to blame—and the speakers at the Democratic National Convention seemed to think so—then, it will be asked, why isn't it more important for the Members of Congress who belong to the ruling party to begin passing the corrective legislation at once? Why will they engage instead in maneuvers at this current session, which promises to be a continuation of the same political farce that characterizes the system of choosing party nominees at national conventions? Do the people really have a say, or do the political cliques and blocs that blame everything on each other actually run the country? And when will the people become sufficiently aroused to demand a system of responsible Government?

Mr. Khrushchev's Buttinsky Tactics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 13, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the days ahead, we will be witnessing some sharp challenging and counterchallenging in the political campaign.

As the battle for our election gets hotter at home, however, it's constantly necessary not only that we, as U.S. citizens—but also the political candidates—be careful not to give aid and comfort—and illusions of disunity—to the Communists.

As we know, Soviet Premier Khrushchev has gone on an extraordinarily reckless campaign of freelance trouble-making in the Congo, Cuba and elsewhere around the globe, including this country. The targets for Communist propaganda include efforts to create dissension among nations of the Western World, as well as to encourage disunity in the internal affairs of countries, including the United States.

As we know, the major differences between our parties arise not so much on ultimate objectives, I believe, but on ways and means of attaining these goals. Generally, these objectives include dedication to peace, providing a better living for our people, and cooperating with other countries to create a better world, safe for freedom.

Apparently, however, Mr. Khrushchev has the illusion that he can poke his nose into our internal affairs to create dissension and disunity.

To limit—if this is possible—his reckless efforts of attempted interference, I think it is appropriate that we remind him that our people are on to his game and will not be swayed by such buttinsky tactics.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor published a most useful, thought-provoking article entitled, "Think Again, Mr. K.," written by Roscoe Drummond. The article reflects the way in which our Government is moving ahead on general objectives—even while the campaign is underway. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 10, 1960]

THINK AGAIN, MR. K.

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—No one is better able to misread American public opinion than Soviet Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev.

When he was the guest of the United States last fall he apparently thought he could so soften up the American people with a combination of bonhomie and bluntness that President Eisenhower would have to give up West Berlin.

When he discovered that his calculations had been wrong and that the Paris summit was not going to yield him any one-sided agreements, he was sure that he could so vilify Mr. Eisenhower over the U–2 plane incident that the President would be immobilized at home and abroad for the rest of his term.

Mr. K. is still proceeding on this theory. There is good evidence that he is going to be proved wrong again.

It is obvious that the Soviet Premier now is acting on the premise that because of the presidential election and because the leadership of the United States is in process of changing there will be a political vacuum which he can exploit.

He is going to be wrong again.

I am convinced there is going to be no political vacuum, no passive, do-nothing marking of time in foreign policy during the remaining 5 months of the outgoing Eisenhower administration. There are two reasons:

1. Mr. Eisenhower is no ordinary lame-duck President. In fact, he isn't a lame-duck President at all since a lameduck official is one who is holding office after he has been defeated at the polls. He is retiring from the Presidency despite the fact that, as Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY has candidly said, he could be overwhelmingly reelected. He wouldn't run again even if the 22d amendment did not bar him. But what is important, as far as any political vacuum is concerned, is that Mr. Eisenhower remains steadfastly popular and politically powerful. These circumstances combine to enable him to function effectively even though another will be taking his place in January.

2. No significant change in the substance of American foreign policy is at stake in this election. There is no divergence in the main outlines of foreign policy between the two parties, between the two platforms, or between the two Presidential nominees. The choice between Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON and Senator KENNEDY will turn, not on policy differences, but on the voters' judgments as to who is more experienced, better trained, more mature and, therefore, better able to carry forward the foreign policy objectives on which the Nation is united. This means that President Eisenhower is free, within this broad area of agreement, to take whatever initiative he deems necessary without our friends and allies abroad having any fear that his actions will be reversed by the new President.

Mr. Eisenhower certainly does not find himself sealed into any political vacuum. There is considerable evidence that he is ready to move, indeed is moving, on several fronts.

Following consultation with the legislative leaders this week, he is moving to increase defense spending at some points. This is in part a response to the bellicose speeches of Premier Khrushchev and his threats to punish the nations with whom we have security arrangements. It is also due to the successful testing of the Polaris medium-range missile from submerged submarines. The President will authorize the building of five, instead of three, Polaris-firing submarines and will speed up the production of Polaris missiles.

To counter other Khrushchev moves, including his threats against U.S. bases abroad, Mr. Eisenhower and British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan are expected to meet shortly in Washington.

The State Department has informed the Kremlin that the United States will not tolerate any unilateral Soviet action against Western rights in West Berlin.

The President has submitted to the recess session of Congress an enlarged program of economic aid to Latin America.

The administration is participating in two meetings of the Organization of American States this month, one in Washington and another in San José, Costa Rica, to deal with the danger of a Communist takeover in Cuba.

This doesn't look like a political vacuum to me. It probably won't look like one to Mr. K. for very long.

Report From Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 13, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, with the resumption of Senate activities, I am again issuing my periodical reports to my constituents in South Dakota. I would like, at this point, to make this report a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS, THE CONVENTIONS, AND THE BIG CAMPAIGN

The three words "Congress," "conventions," and "campaigning"—added to the ugly word "communism"—pretty well totalize and typify the activities occuping the minds of most thoughtful Americans today when they permit their thoughts to stray beyond their own immediate problems and their home environments.

Incidentally, the usually slow-moving Senate is off to a fast start with four rather significant rollcall votes during the first 3 days of the session beginning August 8. The first vote tested the sentiment but did not decide the issue of whether this Congress will do anything to redeem the promises both major party platforms made about civil rights in their July conventions.

Of greater immediate concern to South Dakota, of course, is the question of farm legislation. Both political conventions pledged themselves to develop new comprehensive farm programs designed to expand

net farm incomes and to promote agricultural prosperity. Few expect that in this short session of Congress, an entirely new approach to farm legislation can be evolved and adopted. But many had—and some still have—high hopes some corrective action would be taken on our most urgent farm problem, that of mounting wheat surpluses and inadequate prices for annual wheat crops. Action may still occur, but the fact the House Agriculture Committee is not meeting and that indications point to a delay in recruiting a quorum of that committee prior to August 22, place a damper on optimistic hopes for effective wheat legislation during this short extra session of Congress, now planning to adjourn September 3. In all events, inaction thus far has deferred correctives too late for the current crop year. It is imperative that something helpful be done, however, in time for the crop year of 1961.

Communism never rests and seldom sleeps. The men in the Kremlin continue to stir up or sponsor trouble in Cuba, in the Congo, at the United Nations, by threats about Berlin, and in a dozen different ways and places. Firmness by America and the consistent Eisenhower policy of nonappeasement of the Communist overlords, however, continue to perpetuate peace and circumvent new Communist successes while our military might stands as a formidable warning to all those who would wage war to win friends or intimidate people.

Now, with regard to the big campaign. Thus far, politics have been present in all sessions of this extra session of Congress but not to the extent that some had feared. It may get better—or worse—time will tell. But up to now the public business has had prior consideration. After vote one on civil rights, the second and third dealt with the ratification of the so-called Antarctic Treaty which required the necessary two-third vote. The fourth vote, on August 10, gave approval to the recommendations of the Senate Appropriations Committee (of which I am a member) on civil works. It contains several very important projects and items for South Dakota on which much work was done in committee, and I am happy to report all of them were accepted by the Senate action last Wednesday.

Naturally, like any other candidate, I would much prefer to be back home in South Dakota visiting your communities, shaking hands, attending meetings, and "shaping up the fences" instead of being back here for my duties in connection with this recessed session of Congress. However, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, for example, I felt I should be here to protect our South Dakota projects and interests as, after all, this is the job I am paid to do. Whenever opportunity permits during the session, I shall return home to South Dakota but so long as there are important decisions to be made here, I shall have to leave campaigning to my friends and others and strive to represent your views and protect your interests on the Senate floor and in committee.

Fortunately, during the recent recess, I was able to get around in a good bit of the State, bringing to 217 the towns and cities I have personally visited since September last, when Mary and I made our annual tour of the State, including visits in every county of South Dakota. Actually, these annual visits which I have made each year during the congressional recess are among the most enjoyable and interesting phases of a Senator's job. "Shaking hands with the folks back home" and holding conferences around the coffee cups is well worth the travel and the time, and I shall be at it again as I have always done in the past, when this session of Congress finally adjourns. In the meantime, I recognize the importance of pending problems here and the protection required if our taxpayers and our opportunity system are not to be crippled or curtailed by excesses and extremes which can so easily be enacted by a Congress on the eve of a presidential campaign and in the heat of August in Washington, D.C.

Statement of Policy Concerning Postal Delivery Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 13, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the creation of a more effective postal delivery service is essential—if we are to meet the needs of ever-expanding population for the future.

In changing the patterns to meet new conditions, we recognize that serious problems often emerge involving management, transportation problems, interests of employees, service for the public and other factors.

As we know, there are legislative proposals currently before Congress relating to improving postal service, including the problem of how mail is to be transported.

Recently, I received a resolution from Clive B. McBain, branch secretary of the National Postal Transport Association. To give my colleagues the benefit of the "statement of policy" resolution adopted by the association, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LA CROSSE BRANCH,
NATIONAL POSTAL TRANSPORT ASSOCIATION,
La Crosse, Wis., August 9, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: I was a delegate to the recent 10th division convention of the National Postal Transport Association meeting in Madison, Wis., on July 20, 1960, and the following is a report of a special committee for statement of policy.

We recommend as a statement of policy by officers and delegates of the 10th division NPTA meeting at Madison, Wis., July 20, 1960, that resolution 3 of legislative committee No. 1, which is as follows: "We favor that Congress establish an independent postal transport structure within the Post Office Department, supervised and manned by postal transport personnel, and that all dispatch of mail be put under postal transport supervision, free from interference by outside parallel authority, to eliminate confusion and duplication, and to place unhampered management of postal transport in the hands of experienced employees, and that we further demand that the NPTA adopt the idea of exerting positive effort toward this end," comprises the statement of policy as recommended by this convention, and we further recommend that resolution No. 5 be revised to read as follows and be included as part of our statement of policy:

"We demand that the National Postal Transport Association exert positive effort with Congress to have mail in transit redefined to be all mail other than addressed to office of origin and until it arrives at destination."

The above statement of policy was approved by the convention. We certainly would appreciate your efforts in promoting this policy. Thank you and we appreciate your many efforts in the past on our behalf.

Sincerely yours,

CLIVE B. MCBAIN, Sr.,
Branch Secretary.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate debated minimum wage bill.

Senate committee approved Social Security Amendments of 1960.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 15139–15140

Bills Introduced: 4 bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3842–3845. Page 15139

Minimum Wage: Senate continued consideration of S. 3758, proposing amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Pending at recess was Holland amendment to limit the powers of the Secretary of Labor to regulate wages, hours, or other conditions of employment to those specified by the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1939, as amended. Pages 15140, 15153–15157, 15161–15177, 15187–15188, 15188–15192, 15195–15200, 15203

Quorum Call: During Senate proceedings today one quorum call was taken, which appears on page 15156.

Program for Monday: Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and recessed at 6:44 p.m. until noon Monday, August 15, when it will continue on S. 3758, minimum wage bill. Page 15203

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

SOCIAL SECURITY

Committee on Finance: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported with amendments H.R. 12580, Social Security Amendments of 1960.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, August 15, at 12 o'clock noon.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶ The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

Appendix

Problems of Wabash Valley, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, during recent weeks I made an extensive tour of the Wabash Valley in Indiana. This area covers over 80 percent of the State of Indiana and is constantly plagued with floods. I reported to the Senate last week, during the consideration of the public works appropriations bill, on the results of this tour.

Mr. Paul L. Hillsamer, editor of the Marion (Ind.) News Herald, has a real understanding of the problems of the Wabash Valley. In a recent column he discussed my tour of the valley and made some excellent comments which I believe are the feeling of the people of this area.

I plan to appear before the Appropriations Committee tomorrow to request additional funds for Indiana flood control. This is one further step we are taking in an attempt to provide flood control in Indiana in this generation.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Hillsamer's column, "The Editor Says," of August 12, 1960, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. This is what we are trying to do for Indiana.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE EDITOR SAYS

With the aggressive support of U.S. Senator VANCE HARTKE and civic leaders from a score of Hoosier towns, a project pushed by Marion's Ralph Roessler for 21 long years seems "ready to go."

That project is flood control measures in the huge—and often flooded—Wabash Valley.

The Wabash River and its tributaries have rampaged a score of times since Indiana's greatest flood in 1913. On five or six occasions, the damage has run into huge sums. Lives have been lost.

Responsible individuals estimate flood damage in the valley, during only the decade of the 1950's, at scores of millions of dollars.

Indiana is 20th among the States in receipt of Federal funds and financial assistance for flood control, but 5th in flood damage.

Senator HARTKE, in bipartisanship cooperation with Senator CAPEHART and Hoosier Congressmen from affected districts is determined that this situation be eliminated.

Marion's Ralph Roessler can and should be honored as the one man who awakened Indiana to the constant flood menace and who spurred and spurred and spurred public officials until, finally, something is going to be done.

Roessler, now retired, dined at Fisherman's Paradise, on Shaffer Lake, on May 21, 1939.

Admiring what had been done in the way of water control in that area, he conceived an idea—

Why not dam the Mississinewa (perhaps near old Connor's Mill) and not only control its waters but also create a State park in that rich historical area?

Roessler returned home and the next day presented his ideas to the Marion Kiwanis Club.

The Kiwanis immediately swung behind Roessler's thinking.

One of the most enthusiastic proponents of Roessler's project was the late Ed Camp, general manager of the Chronicle Publishing Co.

A steady drumfire of publicity on the matter commenced.

The years passed—including the years of World War II during which such projects could only be thought about, mulled over, and delayed until after war's end.

Flood control became Roessler's consuming passion.

He accepted appointment to various commissioners, including the Indiana Flood Control and Water Resources Commission, of which he has been vice chairman for a decade.

He traveled extensively in promotion of his ideals and spent many dollars of his own money.

Whenever Mr. Roessler found one or more persons to listen he made a speech.

Most important of all, he demanded and ultimately received the attention or the U.S. Army Engineers.

The three dams planned north of Marion are the first portion of the results of Roessler's long labors.

The principle is the same but the locations are different than first envisioned by Roessler, that long-ago day at Shaffer Lake.

Roessler originally thought of the Conners Mill area—and not of flood control for the whole valley.

After years of study and planning, the U.S. Army Engineers recommended three dams, located (in general) north of Marion.

Despite scattered opposition, flood control for the whole valley will start with these three dams—at Dora, Peoria, and east of Wabash.

And then, if HARTKE can push through the necessary legislation, the Engineers will go through the valley—at accelerated speed—and solve the flood problems of the whole valley, from Peoria to Portland to Mount Vernon.

"The Army Engineers' present plans are too leisurely," HARTKE says. "It would take 100 years to do a complete job at the pace contemplated.

"We must have a crash program to rid Indiana of the flood menace. The job can be done during this decade—in other words, over a 10-year period. It will cost perhaps $150 million.

"It will pay for itself in the savings of scores of millions of dollars of flood damage, every year or two, and in the saving of human lives.

"There will be byproducts such as tremendous recreational advantages. But the real purpose will be flood control."

HARTKE recently made a 5-day tour of the towns in the Wabash Valley.

Everywhere he met and talked with scores of people, nearly all in agreement that the time to do the job is now.

In Marion, high-ranking Army engineers publicly offered to stake their personal reputations that the dams at Dora, Peoria, and near Wabash would not "back up" and cause more flood damage in Marion and Grant Counties.

Nearly every newspaper in the area visited by Senator HARTKE has thrown its support solidly behind a comprehensive program—now.

Support of flood control in this valley area is completely nonpartisan and bipartisan.

There is reason to hope that, within 10 years, flood destruction will be as antique in the Wabash Valley as, for example, the museum at Matter Park in Marion.

News Herald has one suggestion to offer. The dam at Peoria should, as a matter of common justice, be named for the man who for 21 years has thrown his energy, personal magnetism, and every spare hour into the fight to make Indiana conscious of the fact that raging floods are not inevitable and can be prevented.

That man is Ralph Roessler.

The dams and reservoirs planned at Dora, Peoria, and in Wabash County will cost approximately $50 million.

Indiana will pay 1 percent of the cost, the Federal Government the balance.

The first reservoir will be just north of the village of Dora, damming the Salamonie River.

The Mississinewa Reservoir will be the second of the three located 1,000 feet south of the bridge at Peoria, in Miami County.

(This is 7 miles upstream from Peru, 23 miles downstream from Marion.)

An earthen dam 9,800 feet long will be constructed at Peoria, with a top 40 feet wide.

The depth of the dam at pool level will be 53 feet.

It will handle a runoff of 8.5 inches of rainfall from a drainage area of 810 square miles.

A permanent lake will thus be created extending some 10 miles upstream from Peoria.

The Salamonie Dam at Dora will create a permanent pool covering 950 acres and draining 552 square miles.

The dam will be 6,500 feet long and 46 feet deep and the 950 acre pool will be 800 feet wide.

Runoff water to the extent of 8.11 inches will be handled.

The villages of Dora, Monument City and New Holland will be eliminated and several houses will have to be moved from Mount Etna.

East of Wabash and West of Indiana State road 5, the third reservoir will be constructed. It will drain 708 square miles and handle 4.08 inches of runoff water.

The construction will be dry dam type with no permanent pool. The dam will be 6,000 feet long.

These three dams will be only the beginning, if Senator HARTKE can get a complete and integrated proggram for the whole valley off the drawing boards and into production.

The Senator's first step will be introduction of legislation establishing a Wabash River Basin Interagency Water Resources Commission.

Within such a commission will be representatives of all interested agencies, commissions, and committees and affected areas.

This type commission already exists in other river basin areas. Such procedure has been recommended by the Hoover Commission, President Truman's Water Resources Commission and President Eisenhower's Water Resources Commission.

With a new administration in Washington next January, a more aggressive and sympathetic White House attitude toward conservation, food control, and other such projects may be expected.

Inasmuch as flood waters in the 1959 flood alone caused more than $50 million damages in the Wabash Valley, it would appear that a soundly engineered program of valley flood control is long overdue.

The work at Dora, Peoria, and Wabash County is only the beginning of the complete program advocated by HARTKE.

Details on work which should be done west and southwest of Marion will be published at a later date.

The flood control program in whole and part has been criticized because it will provide a bonus of recreational facilities.

That is true.

It will also stabilize the water supply in the huge Wabash Valley—which includes 61 counties in Indiana and 27 counties in Illinois—33,000 square miles.

It will save our Hoosier soil—and nature takes 400 years to replace 1 inch of topsoil.

There will be other "side" or "bonus" benefits.

But the whole purpose of this project is flood control.

A State flooded as often and severely as Indiana during years past, should certainly be interested if the expenditure of $150 million (or even several times as much) would eliminate this annual hazard to life and property.

The proposals for dams at Dora, Peoria, and Wabash County have received some opposition, a natural development.

We have the word of highly skilled and qualified men that they are the first necessary steps in the solution to this expensive Hoosier hazard.

These Army Engineers agree that damage to Marion by back water is not a danger, or even a possibility.

Marion should not be the only city in the affected area to storm and complain.

The Marion Chamber of Commerce's members will soon have an opportunity to vote their convictions on the matter.

Let's hope that as in many other conflicts the local chamber stands squarely in favor of the right—which, in this case is flood control.

It is time to tame the Wabash.

Radio Address of Dr. Carsun Chang

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, just recently, I had the pleasure of reading the transcript of a radio address by Dr. Carsun Chang, of San Francisco, Calif., given over a west coast station, and later published in the Chinese World.

In his address, Dr. Chang provokes some serious thoughts and suggestions relative to aid to Asian countries, and the present effect in relation to the ultimate objective, which is democracy.

In order that my colleagues and others may have an opportunity to read and study the words of Dr. Carsun, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Recently some significant pronouncements were made by the two pillars of the Communist bloc: the U.S.S.R. and Communist China. Khrushchev, on his recent trip to Vienna, threatened that the Soviet Union might take reprisal if U.S. rockets stationed in Italy were fired over Austrian territory. After his return to Russia, he made another threat, saying that if aggressive forces in the Pentagon dared start an intervention in Cuba, Soviet artillerymen would support the Cuban people with their rocket fire. In regard to the riot in the new, independent Congo, Khrushchev said that the Soviets would not hesitate to take resolute measures to cut short aggression. These pronouncements of Khrushchev directly involve three continents namely Europe, America, and Africa, whereby the U.S.S.R. threatens to take reprisal or intervene.

At a reception in commemoration of the second anniversary of Iraq's revolution, the Foreign Minister of Communist China, Chen Yi, appeared. He said that the Chinese Government and people have always stood for peaceful coexistence among nations with different social systems. These seemingly obliging words were then followed by charges against the United States and affirmation to support (1) the Cuban struggle against the United States, (2) the Algerian war of national liberation, (3) the Congolese people's struggle in defense of national independence, and (4) Japanese opposition to the Japan-United States military treaty.

With the above pronouncements in mind, one may ask the following question: Is coexistence a possible policy between the Communist bloc and the free world? If nations with different social systems are going to live side by side, then a boundary line must be drawn according to which one bloc remains on one side while the other should never interfere. It also means one kind of government may prevail without fear of subversion by the other. Yet these pronouncements plainly show that the Communist bloc really has no intention to observe any boundary line whenever and wherever there is a chance for the infiltration of communism.

It is further to be remembered that the Soviet and Chinese Communists hold a strong belief in world revolution advocated by Marx and Lenin, even after a new policy of coexistence has been declared in the postwar period. We have been facing a most critical situation since Mao Tze-tung and Khrushchev came into power. The foreign policy of the United States has so far taken the following directions: containment policy, NATO, SEATO, military and economic aid as counter measures against communism. Her role in the postwar period consists of many aspects, such as military alliance, world leadership in democracy, economic aid and development funds. Such a multipurpose policy cannot be dealt with within a short time, therefore I shall restrict myself to one region, that is, the Far East.

Within the limits of Far Eastern problems, I have chosen to discuss with you tonight the correlation between American aid and democracy.

The idea of democracy can be traced as far as the recent period is concerned, to Wilson's motto—to make the world safe for democracy. If one goes farther back, one can trace its foundation to the Founding Fathers, who built this country on the basis of the doctrine of natural rights.

The idea of democracy is a political conviction; it transformed Europe since the French Revolution down through the 19th century. Democracy gives new hope to the Asian nations, which suffered from despotism in the past.

This fight for democracy must be carried on by a pure conscience, and a real enthusiasm akin to that of Paine, Jefferson, and many others. The people of the world will definitely be disappointed if they find democracy mixed with a policy of expediency, in which case, it will become a label or an ornament.

However treacherous and ruthless Soviet Russia may be, it is remarkable how persistent, thorough, and vigorous a program they have of promoting communism. This is the secret of their success. How does the United States compare with them in this respect? In what spirit is the United States defining democracy? The Asians are longing for a new movement, out of which a new form of government may take place in peace and order. The United States is opposing Communist dictatorship in the name of freedom and democracy.

Nevertheless we find that among the allied friends there are a number of dictators. Though it may be argued that there was no choice but to accept those who were already in power in these Asian countries, the fact remains that such a policy has produced not a few corrupt governments which will have no future to speak of in this fast changing world. This tolerance with dictators certainly gives the oppressed people both under Communist and non-Communist dictators very little hope of a new life and a new form of government.

It cannot be denied that the best use of the billions of dollars of American aid was made by Great Britain, Germany and other NATO powers. The evident reason was that these Atlantic countries which always had a democratic tradition, were able to use the American aid in a constitutional way. But the Asian countries with no such tradition merely looked upon the assistance as a sort of windfall that could be spent with no parliamentary control. Even though we know there have always been American directors appointed to keep in check the proper use of the aid in the respective countries, it has not been the custom for the respective governments to submit an estimate and an account to its own legislative organ for approval.

They are only too glad not to be dependent on the consent of parliament for the use of this revenue. What actually happens in so many cases is that the Asian dictators succeed in organizing a powerful army as their weapon with which they can suppress their people and disregard the parliamentary control. The U.S. military aid makes a dictator so sure of his power and his income that he can transfer the other sources of revenue for other self-protective purposes, such as a strong police force, intelligence services and party expenses and his economic policy subsequently is directed to the building up of his own party interests instead of increasing wealth for his people's welfare.

One cannot help noticing the signs of political instability impending everywhere when one follows the recent major events in the Far East.

Syngman Rhee's fall is a clear example of illegality and the misuse of American aid. Everybody knows that the control of the purse is the most important function of a parliament and of the democratic procedure.

When such a big item as military expenditure is paid by foreign sources, the natural consequence is that it gives much more independence to the dictator who feels that he no longer needs to fear any control by parliament and public opinion.

To all appearances then we must say that the American policy of leading the world towards democracy has only created a situation in which dictatorships are permitted to grow up more speedily. Thus the military aid policy and democracy are actually

going in opposite directions. This is a great dilemma which faces the American public.

As a friend of the United States and as a believer of democracy, I would like to offer some suggestions which may bring about a readjustment of the present situation in the Far East.

First of all we all agree that democracy must be the guiding principle for the governments of the Asian countries. Then it is necessary that these government be placed on a constitutional basis from which a better way of life may evolve to be shown to all the oppressed people. Any ruler who is anti-communistically inclined, yet not a believer of democracy, cannot be expected to lay a foundation or to build a tradition of democratic government. As a remedy against the excessive power of such a ruler, he must be asked to render a detailed account of the money spent on military forces and personnel, to be passed by parliament.

The military power which has been created by the U.S. taxpayers' money is not the personal property of such a ruler or his party, but involves the destiny of the people for whose benefits the aid has been given. Only by following the democratic procedure can the people understand that this aid is for their protection and not for the ruler or his party's interests. The people then can see for themselves that a better government is provided for them. Only such a government can have a legal and stable basis that will last. Only such a government can provide the proper training of a younger generation, to grow up in a democratic way of life. It can also be a rallying point for the 15 million overseas Chinese living in Hong Kong, Singapore, Indonesia, and Thailand, etc. Once a stable, democratic government is secured in Formosa, not only will the pro-West liberals in Japan feel much strengthened but South Vietnam and Korea will also be glad to have her as an ally.

Thus we see that the actual establishment of democratic governments in the Far East is an urgent and serious need to be met immediately. If the United States, Great Britain, and the other NATO powers really believe in giving such guidance, they must give it their clear-cut and full-hearted support as a fundamental policy in their realings with the Asian nations. Attitudes of indifference or fluctuation at this hour can be interpreted by the Asians that the United States and Great Britain are only making use of their countries as a bulwark of defense against Communist invasions but are not genuinely interested in giving a new political life to them.

In the same way these Asian nations are likely to believe that the Western Powers are not really sincere in their advocacy of democracy and in their denunciation of dictatorship. That would certainly be against the expectation of the whole world which looks upon the United States and Great Britain as leaders of the free world.

Furthermore, the aid is not merely a question of finance of economic goods and techniques. It is a part of government function. This kind of money can only be rightly spent by a well-ordered and clean-handed government. We may use a simile to say that the financial assistance given to a country can be compared to a house just being built. If it were built on solid ground, it would stand firmly. But if it were built on sandy ground, it would soon fall apart. Examples of such quick falling apart have already been seen in the cases of Syngman Rhee in Korea and Menderes in Turkey and may be followed by other Asian countries.

In the last 2 years after a number of dictatorships had been established in Asia, some Americans have expressed doubts as to whether the democratic form of government in Asia would really work or not; yet there were the Meiji Reform based on a constitutional system and the Indian Republic as evident proofs against such doubts.

I firmly believe that a democratic government can be operated with good results in any country of Asia if a liberal leader who does not like arbitrary methods is given a chance. The Western World need not doubt the Asians' adaptability to the democratic form of government.

The vital question now is how to put into practice the democratic form of government among the Asian nations. Two things should be done in the undertaking of such a task. The first to give aid and advice are responsible government authorities such as the Pentagon, the State Department and the U.S. Information Service, because aid can only be given from one government to the other.

The second involves the questions of party politics, election, parliamentary procedure, free press, party platforms, and political education of the people. The latter could be assigned to an advisory council for democracy a private organization put on a bipartisan basis, which may consist of trained leaders of both the Republican and the Democratic parties and also of constitutional lawyers. They are to see that the deemocratic processes are functioning rightly in the Asian countries; and they may speak to the party leaders of the Asian countries to give their advice when needed. Representatives may be sent to these countries to observe the actual operations in central governments, local organs and trade unions. It is expected that they should take an impartial attitude towards all parties and all classes in these countries. These two kinds of organs, the government authorities and an advisory council for democracy, can work together like the Soviet Russian Government and the Communist International.

As democracy is not something that can be delivered as goods in a number of days, therefore such a council is needed to give encouragement and inspiration for the training of the Asian countries towards democracy. It is set up to help them to be ready for the democratic processes.

I can assure the people of the United States that besides the 15 million overseas Chinese scattered all over the world, all the people on the mainland of China, except the ruling Communist Party in Peiping, will be ready to welcome such a change.

If the United States is determined to carry out this fight for democracy, the Chinese on the China mainland and in Southeast Asia will see for themselves the advantage involved and will certainly contribute their share without hesitation.

What is often overlooked is the fact that American aid, while it is a part of American foreign policy, works out as an integral part of the domestic affairs of another country which receives the aid. It is hoped that the U.S. Government will make a reappraisal or reexamination of this aid policy in the light of both sides: the donor and the receiver.

With the aid, the United States expects to strengthen the military and economic forces of the receiving country in the fight against communism, but instead, the aid is actually freeing the arbitrary leaders from parliamentary control. Thus it happens that the results achieved are contrary to the original idea of America's policy of realizing democracy in the world. By such reexamination, I trust that the United States will not refuse to revive the idea of democracy in the Asian countries with a new vigor, a new determination and dedication. Who knows but that another Mazzinni, another Masaryk, another Paderewski, another Gandhi and another Sun Yat-sen will arise as an answer to this call to bring about the liberation longed for by oppressed people everywhere.

Desegregation of Eating Facilities in Stores—Lessons From the Sit-Ins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there have been some very important results from the use of wise and forthright preventive activity in connection with equal opportunity in respect of eating facilities in stores. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Attorney General Rogers, issued August 10, 1960, and an editorial praising the results, from the New York Times of August 14, 1960.

There being no objection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Attorney General William P. Rogers announced that officials of major variety chains reported to him today that the initiative and cooperation of local public officials, citizens' committees, and merchants, have recently resulted in desegregation of eating facilities in their stores in some 69 southern communities. It was further reported to the Attorney General that in over 70 percent of these 69 communities, desegregation of eating facilities in the stores was accomplished without prior demonstrations or "sit-ins" and that similar progress in other cities is anticipated in the near future.

On June 1, 1960, the Attorney General and Assistant Attorney General Harold R. Tyler, Jr., invited these representatives to discuss informally appropriate means whereby southern communities could voluntarily work out desegregation of lunch counters and eating facilities. It was agreed that the most effective method of accomplishing this objective would be to approach the problem community by community with the assistance of interested local groups and merchants. Noting that local ordinances requiring racial segregation in certain establishments raised serious constitutional questions, the Attorney General emphasized that progress in this area was necessary in the national interest and because the standing of the United States as a leader of the free world suffers as the result of acts of racial discrimination.

In commenting upon this report, Mr. Rogers said:

"It is heartening to know that private initiative and cooperation have been instrumental in assuring equal treatment of all citizens in so many communities in such a comparatively brief time."

In complimenting the company officials on the progress made, the Attorney General added:

"It is significant that where responsible local citizens take the first steps, the necessary transition to desegregation of eating facilities in stores can be accomplished without disruptions and loss of business. The results to date are most gratifying and it is to be hoped that, in the light of this experience, responsible leaders in other communities will initiate similar programs."

Among those at the meeting were representatives of F. W. Woolworth Co., S. H. Kress & Co., W. T. Grant Co., and other major variety stores.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 14, 1960]

LESSONS FROM THE SIT-INS

Lunch counters in department stores in 69 southern communities have been desegre-

gated. In 70 percent of the communities the desegregation was a voluntary arrangement with neither demonstrations nor publicity. This announcement came the other day from Attorney General William P. Rogers after a conference with executives of the stores, in which he suggested that putting an end to demonstrations would be in the national interest "because the standing of the United States as a leader of the free world suffers as a result of acts of racial discrimination."

The voluntary desegregatoin of southern department store lunch counters suggests that greater progress can be made in ending racial discrimination in a quiet and effective manner than some of the more pessimistic think possible.

Another conclusion to be drawn from the quiet adjustment of racial relations at some southern department store lunch counters is that in important areas communication between the races is being reestablished in the South. Communication was blocked for a time in the period of tension that followed the Supreme Court's decision in the school desegregation cases.

Business is taking a new lead in southern race relations. The Negro did not sit-in on the South. He came early to help build southern agricultural economy and he is an important producer and consumer in the contemporary South of increasing urbanization and rising industry. This fact is getting fresh recognition.

The Arms Control Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, there are far too few voices raised to plead for an intelligent and wholehcarted effort for peace by our Government, especially in the crucial negotiations over the suspension of nuclear testing. Those who favor immediate, unilateral resumption of underground testing at least for the purpose of refining detection research, are numerous, powerful, and articulate. It may be that this Nation sadly and reluctantly will have to follow that course.

Yesterday's lead editorial in the Washington Post and Times Herald hit this argument hard in a powerful final paragraph, which I quote:

Perhaps the most skilled and enlightened and sustained American efforts in this field would not prevail against Soviet intentions. But this can only be conjecture until such efforts are put forth. The Soviet position has yet to be tested in depth; a comprehensive long-range American position has yet to be formulated. The next administration faces this double challenge, and nothing else that it undertakes will be more vital.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARMS CONTROL CHALLENGE

We do not envy Ambassador Lodge what apparently is to be his last assignment at the United Nations, the forthcoming meeting of the Disarmament Commission, to which all U.N. members belong. His task is to get the Commission to blame the Soviet Union for failure of the 10-nation Disarmament Conference at Geneva. This he may well be able to do, for whatever the final posture of the negotiations, it was a crude walkout by the Soviet delegation that ended the meetings.

But who will thank him, or this Government for "proving" what many already believe and what others are forbidden to believe? And who, among the peoples of the uncommitted nations particularly, is really interested in blame-fixing? Will this help to reduce tensions, or increase them? Will it pave the way for a resumption of talks, or make the way more difficult? The Soviet total disarmament plan, to be sure, has so far been presented in unrealistic generalities, and there is little to suggest that adequate controls are contemplated. But at the same time, American preparation for the Geneva conference was belated and superficial. The nonnuclear powers will be in no rush to conclude that America alone is serious and sincere about arms control.

While Mr. Lodge labors in New York, his hapless deputy, Ambassador Wadsworth, will be trying to keep the nuclear test ban talks alive in Geneva, lest the efforts for arms control disintegrate altogether. But at Geneva the United States is now in the uncomfortable posture of being seemingly unable to agree to Soviet inspection of the forthcoming American underground tests designed to improve detection methods, whereas all along it has been the Russians who had seemed to be the holdouts on inspection. Meanwhile, the Soviet delegation has made some concessions on the details of a permanent inspection system, concessions by no means adequate but important enough to make continuation of the talks essential. Only Congress could rescue Mr. Wadsworth from his predicament, by authorizing disclosure of some of our obsolete nuclear weapons data, and this is unlikely to happen.

Mr. Wadsworth may find his new job, as successor in the U.N. to Mr. Lodge, a welcome respite from the 2 years of haggling at Geneva. But he may return just in time to face Prime Minister Khrushchev in the General Assembly next month in a broad disarmament debate, if the Soviet leader comes to New York as he has hinted. Will the prospect of this confrontation doom the test ban talks, too? Will a new man in the Wadsworth post at Geneva be able to unsnarl the tangled threads and save what measure of agreement has been won? Or will the strong forces within the administration that have sought to undercut Mr. Wadsworth and torpedo these talks ultimately prevail?

As President Eisenhower conceded the other day, we are getting nowhere in this complex and intricate field, and the prospect is not encouraging. It is altogether likely that Mr. Khrushchev is more interested in propaganda than in accommodation at this point. Yet each day that Russian missile prowess increases, each day that China progresses toward membership in the nuclear club, each day that outstanding political problems remain unsolved and the cold war goes on, the need grows for a beginning on arms control that would reduce the risk of actual war and restore some measure of East-West confidence and understanding.

Perhaps the most skilled and enlightened and sustained American efforts in this field would not prevail against Soviet intentions. But this can only be conjecture until such efforts are put forth. The Soviet position has yet to be tested in depth; a comprehensive long-range American position has yet to be formulated. The next administration faces this double challenge, and nothing else that it undertakes will be more vital.

More Federal Judgeships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a major feature of our free way of life is the maintenance of a judicial system that we believe provides the maximum justice under law to our people.

As a Nation, we are growing by leaps and bounds. Unfortunately, however, our judicial machinery has not been expanded adequately to assure speedy justice for disposal of cases that arise in the U.S. courts. Between 1941 and 1959, for example, the population increased 36 percent and the gross national product 376 percent. The number of cases filed in Federal courts increased about 50 percent during the same years; unfortunately, the number of judges on the Federal bench increased only about 25 percent.

Three years ago, the Judicial Conference of the United States, which is the governing body of the whole Federal judiciary and which includes the Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and the chief judges of all Federal circuit courts of appeal, recommended over 40 additional judgeships be distributed among the districts and circuits with the most crowded calendars.

As yet, regrettably, no effective action has been taken to fill this very great need to strengthen our judicial system.

Recently, President Eisenhower again urged overdue action by Congress for creating additional judgeships. Will this voice for justice—and the needs of our people—again go unheeded.

I well recognize, of course, that efforts are being made in this so-called "bobtailed" session of Congress to handle only major legislation. In my humble opinion, however, the need for adequate judges for our people is a timely and essential need and should be acted upon by Congress. Recently, the New York Times published an editorial again stressing the need for additional judges. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE FEDERAL JUDGES

An adjournment of Congress before passage of a measure to increase the number of judges on the Federal bench would be an inexcusable dereliction of duty. The record of congressional inaction to date on this desperately needed legislation would be unbelievable, except that it happens to be true.

In the face of the staggering increase in the number of cases flooding into the Federal courts Congress has failed for 6 years to make any increase at all in the number of judges to deal with them. During this period the Judicial Conference of the United States, highest official nonpartisan authority on Federal court administration, has been calling for new judgeships, in increasing numbers as the years have gone by, to meet the

mounting crisis. The last Conference appeal called for 54 new places on the Federal bench. It is said that with the present judicial strength nearly half of the civil cases will have to wait from 1 to 4 years to come to trial.

Since the present Congress began work several bills for new judgeships have been introduced, but not one has come to a vote on the floor of either House. Now the one that seems most worthwhile to support is the bill of Representative CELLER (H.R. 12552) for 35 new judgeships, 19 fewer than the Judicial Conference thinks are necessary. Last January the House Committee on the Judiciary approved the Celler bill and the Rules Committee has cleared it for action on the floor, but without any further results. A Senate bill for 25 new places was reported out toward the end of the last session of Congress but did not get any closer to passage than that.

Now Senator JOHNSON, Democratic vice presidential candidate and Senate majority leader, has apparently decided to oppose any action on the judgeships at all in the present session on the ground that there isn't enough time before the end of the year to create and fill the new positions. This is certainly not convincing to the public.

Atascosa Soil Conservation District Passes Its 20th Year of Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, some of the most vital work in the field of agricultural progress and development in the Nation is being done in our soil-conservation district organizations. It is vital if we are to save the family farmers and rural life in America.

In many areas, the SCD leaders have done a remarkable job of making America a better place to live, a more productive land. One of the most noteworthy of these is the Atascosa Soil Conservation District with headquarters in Pleasanton, Tex. Leaders in the Atascosa district have done outstanding work in this program which is passing its 20th year of progress. I know the people in this area; they are self-reliant, hard-working, God-fearing people who are determined to save their soil and their habitat and heritage.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an editorial on this subject from the August 3, 1960, issue of the Pleasanton Express entitled "More Conservation Needed."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORE CONSERVATION NEEDED

Soil conservation is now 20 years old in the Atascosa SCD.

It has accomplished a great deal, but it hasn't accomplished enough. Census figures shows that Atascosa County lost 2,000 of its rural folk in the last 10 years.

You can rationalize this, if you like, and say that the prolonged drought was responsible for this wholesale migration from the soil. That would be partly true. But the trend was established before the drought.

It is our conviction that, through soil conservation, the Atascosa SCD is capable of supporting profitably those 2,000 persons that we've lost plus those who are now on the land.

Soil conservation is truly everybody's business in the Atascosa SCD. It could be the lifeline of survival for the small farmer, the small rancher, and the small town.

This cold fact is apparent: Every businessman in Atascosa County lost 2,000 potential rural customers from 1950 to 1960. It is equally apparent that every small town in Atascosa County, like those the country over, was established to serve a rural population. None has much other reason for existence.

Businessmen, we feel, are keenly aware of this situation. The overwhelming amount of advertising support for this conservation edition indicates it.

The soil conservation problem in this district is to turn nonproductive land into profitable production and to increase the profits on land already in use. After touring a considerable part of the district—after talking to many conservationists—we firmly believe that it can be done. But it won't be easy.

We still have hundreds of thousands of acres of brushland producing far below its potential. We still have farmers who'll watch topsoil blow into the fence rows and remark: "It'll blow back when the wind shifts." Water continues to cut ugly gullies in what should be productive land.

This is no indictment of the soil conservation district. Only God knows what this country would be like today if it hadn't been for the district's work over the past 20 years.

But the plain fact remains that men best qualified to comment say that we haven't scratched the surface so far as soil and water conservation is concerned in this area.

If the surface isn't scratched within the next 20 years, it may never be scratched. No less an authority than Dolph Briscoe, Jr., has said that the next 20 to 25 years will determine whether south Texas will become the world's greatest grassland or a brush-choked desert.

An American Citizen's Rights and Responsibilities Under the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent speech entitled "An American Citizen's Rights and Responsibilities Under the Constitution," delivered by a 16-year-old high school junior, Richard J. Stillman II, of Carlisle, Pa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN AMERICAN CITIZEN'S RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

(Address by Richard J. Stillman II)

Let us envision our Constitution as a huge balance. On one side we find the American citizen's rights under the Constitution, and on the other side the citizen's responsibilities under the Constitution. In order to understand why this relationship between the rights and the responsibilities must be kept in balance, let us first look at the basic concepts of this document.

The distinguished British Prime Minister William Gladstone once wrote: "I have always regarded that Constitution (of the United States) as the most remarkable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect, at a single stroke, in its application to political affairs."

Why should our Constitution have impressed such a noted foreigner? Perhaps in large measure it was due to the high intellect and broad vision of such Founding Fathers as Washington, Franklin, Madison, and Hamilton. They evolved our Constitution from many sources: the democracy of ancient Greece; the laws of Rome; the English Magna Carter and Bill of Rights; the Mayflower Compact; and the writings of Rousseau, Locke, and Paine.

Inherent in the Constitution is a philosophy of the diffusion of power, and a balancing of the rights and responsibilities. What is the purpose of this diffusion of power? Undoubtedly, the writers of our Constitution learned from history that "Power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts obsolutely" (Lord Acton). Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin all are symbolic of this centralization of power. Accordingly, the U.S. Constitution enumerated only specific powers to the Federal Government with the remainder residing with the States or the people.

Moreover, within the Federal Government power is divided among coequal branches—legislative, executive, and judicial. The legislative branch, consisting of direct representatives of the people, makes the laws; the executive branch, headed by the President, enforces the laws; and the judicial branch, made up of the courts, interprets the laws. Currently, one of our presidential candidates is advocating a more powerful executive branch. Is this what the architects of our Constitution envisioned? Or was it a branch coequal to the other two?

Now let us turn from the constitutional diffusion of power to its end product—the rights and responsibilities of the American citizen. As I mentioned before, let us envision our Constitution as a huge balance. On one side we find the American citizen's rights under the Constitution; and on the other side, the citizen's responsibilities under the Constitution. In order to understand why this relationship must be kept in balance I shall present each side of this balance. First, the rights of the citizens.

1. Basic freedoms: The first 10 amendments to the Constitution provide these basic freedoms: free speech, press, religion, the right of assembly and petition, and the right of a fair trial by jury. This Bill of Rights points up the fact that the state is but to serve its citizens. I repeat, the state is but to serve the citizen. It is government's continuing role, though, to preserve these basic freedoms. After the recent TV scandal there were many advocates of greater Federal control over this important media. Would this not constitute a surrendering of part of our individual freedom?

2. Necessary public services: At the local, State, and national level necessary public services are essential. Law enforcement, fire protection, postal system, schooling, health measures, and roads are some of these necessary duties of Government. On the other hand, Government must repeatedly guard against assuming too many services which may lead to socialism—the enslaver of individual initiative and freedom.

3. Free enterprise and the capitalistic system: It was the pioneering spirit built into the words "Go west, young man, go west" which symbolized America as the land of

opportunity. The Constitution with its amendments permits each citizen to achieve those goals feasible within his own capabilities. Such opportunities have produced the world's highest standard of living.

To this point I have shown the three rights guaranteed by the Constitution: basic freedoms, appropriate public services, and free enterprise and the capitalistic system. In counterbalance to the three basic rights. I see three major citizen responsibilities to his Government, responsibilities that must be accomplished by the citizen in order to preserve his rights. Rights are easy to take for granted, but the citizenship responsibilities in our democracy require hard work. Let us look at these three duties.

1. Comprehension of current events and the function of Government: Redbook magazine recently conducted a nationwide survey of 500 young men and women to determine what these voters knew about would-be presidential candidates. The lack of rudimentary knowledge was readily apparent when only 48 percent could identify Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY'S political party, and only 23 percent could remember Senator SYMINGTON'S home State. The writer commented, "The results reveal ignorance and confusion among many of our younger voters about the best-publicized figures in America today—ignorance of who they are, confusion about what they believe."

This ignorance is cause for concern and should receive further attention by our leaders. It is from apathy and lack of facts that the seeds of communism and totalitarianism may be sown. As Thomas Jefferson once wrote, "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, it expects what never was and never will be."

2. Appreciation of our American heritage: America truly has a great heritage that was born of Washington's era and enriched by each succeeding generation. A fundamental understanding of America's past is the best rebuttal to foreign "isms." In order to fully appreciate our American heritage it is necessary for the citizen to understand our Constitution. Abraham Lincoln once said: "Let it [the Constitution] be taught in schools, in seminaries, and in colleges, let it be written in primers, in spelling books and in almanacs, let it be preached from the pulpit, proclaimed in legislative halls, and enforced in courts of justice. And, in short, let it become the political religion of the Nation." Only through a knowledge of our American heritage to include an understanding of our Constitution, will a citizen be able to appreciate Daniel Webster's classic remark: "Thank God I am an American."

3, Recognition of citizenship responsibilities to country: We must perform certain services for our country—in peace and war. This may be accomplished by participation in civic and governmental affairs, voting, abiding by the laws, and defending the Nation in event of war.

The necessity for accepting this responsibility of service to country was recently stated by Secretary of the Army Wilber M. Brucker, "Rome fell because the individual Roman citizen forgot his own unshirkable moral and physical responsibility for the defense of the state, not only on the battlefield but in every aspect of life."

In summary, the two-way relationship between the three rights and the three responsibilities of a citizen must be kept in balance. Although the Constitution provides the climate for this relationship, it is necessary for each generation of Americans to preserve it. If this continues, Abraham Lincoln's statement will always remain true, "That government, of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Extension of the Sugar Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, our farmers have always sought the right to produce more of the sugar that is needed in this country. It seems almost unbelievable that in a country which is burdened with surpluses our farmers are denied the right to produce a commodity which is in short supply—a commodity of which we import over one-half of our requirements.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution bearing on this problem adopted at a recent joint meeting of the directors of the Western Sugar Beet Growers Association and the Red River Valley Beet Growers Association.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF DIRECTORS OF WESTERN SUGAR BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION AND RED RIVER VALLEY BEET GROWERS ASSOCIATION

At a joint meeting of the directors of the Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, and Red River Valley Beet Growers Association, held at Fargo, N. Dak., July 29, 1960, consideration was given the fact that for the first time in more than 25 years we have a crop of beets growing in the United States, with prospects for marketing only a small percentage of the sugar from this crop prior to the expiration of our Sugar Act. Further, that our sugar beet acreage for 1960 was set by the U.S. Department of Agriculture at a time when our marketing quota was much less than our present quota of 2,514,945 tons. We are therefore unable to produce sufficient sugar to completely fill our new quota, notwithstanding the urgent demand for additional sugar beet acreage, and the need for production within the United States of a much higher percentage of the sugar required for distribution and consumption in the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the directors of the Western Sugar Beet Growers Association, and Red River Valley Beet Growers Association, that Congress upon reconvening in August 1960, is hereby requested to give consideration of the urgent need for extending the Sugar Act, expiring March 31, 1961, for purposes as follows:

1. To assure an adequate supply of sugar at prices fair to the consumer and to maintain a domestic sugar industry which will produce a larger share of the sugar needed for distribution within the United States.

2. That the beet sugar quota be set at 2,400,000 tons plus a pro rata share with other domestic areas of 100 percent of the increase above 9,600,000 tons in consumptive estimate of sugar required for distribution in the United States.

3. That the Congress set quotas, with pro rata shares in increase in annual consumptive estimate, for mainland cane, Hawaii, Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands on such basis as these areas may be expected to supply annually.

4. That "deficits" of any domestic areas be first pro rated to other domestic areas; and be it further

Resolved, That the Sugar Act be extended for a term of 4¾ years in order to give assurance to growers that invest in farm equipment and to processors, that expenditures for facilities will be usefully employed during such extension period.

Congress Should Reject Ike's Plea for Careless and Uninformed Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the President of the United States has denounced Democrats as wasteful spenders constantly for 8 years. This has been the steady and unremitting theme of his administration.

And yet he greeted this Congress when we convened last week with a demand that the Senate restore $600 million cuts made by the House in his foreign aid bill. He also told us to "kick in" an additional $100 million. On top of this he asked for some 22 programs, most of which would cost money and which in the aggregate would unbalance the budget by billions, if we should vote for them. And the President topped off this message with the stern admonition that he would flatten any reckless spending proposals with his veto.

And then he asked for an additional $600 million of new authorization for aid to Latin America. This morning the Foreign Relations Committee of this body has been considering this request.

Mr. President, I have voted for additional funds for economic aid, and I shall do so again; but unless the Foreign Relations Committee is able to develop a far more explicit and precise formulation of why and how and where and when this money is needed than the President or his Secretary of State have come up with in their several public statements to date, I shall not consider voting to commit hundreds of millions of dollars for such a vague and amorphous purpose.

No State or city or corporation or bank would consider authorizing expenditures on such a dim and foggy basis.

Mr. President, the Milwaukee Journal last Friday spoke out in criticism of this request, and wisely suggested that "There will be a new President and a new Congress in January. Together they can take a careful and informed look at the need for more Latin American aid."

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PRETTY VAGUE PROGRAM

President Eisenhower asked Congress this week to hurry through a $600 million appropriation for an enlarged Latin American aid program.

At the President's Wednesday press conference, James Reston of the New York Times asked: "Mr. President, would you spell out for us the ideas you have in mind for your new Latin American program?"

Here is the Presidential answer in part:

"Well, by and large it's this: To find better ways of getting a cooperative effort in this country—in these nations to bring about the thing they are always talking about, a rise of living standards throughout their nations. What we need is something, and programs which we can work ourselves and have enough authorization or intent behind them that we can begin to give more hope directly to people throughout this hemisphere.

"I am not asking for a specific program, Mr. Reston. I'm saying that I would like to have an expression of the sentiment in the Congress, and its intent that we would, together, find ways to bring about this raising of living standards and bring better life to these people generally. I don't want to make the program from here for South America, as you can well see. They are the ones that have to make the programs or cooperate with them."

Secretary of State Herter appeared before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Thursday to push the $600 million appropriation. He was a bit more explicit—$100 million would go for special rehabilitation work in the earthquake stricken area of Chile and another $100 million into the President's emergency fund for mutual security.

Over all, however, there remains a most disturbing vagueness about this sudden program. In view of this, plus the fact that the United States is already distributing more than $160 million in foreign aid each year to Latin America, a busy and short-lived Congress might be well advised to let this issue cool.

There will be a new President and a new Congress in January. Together they can take a careful and informed look at the need for more Latin American aid.

Rockets Away

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the National Space and Aeronautics Administration recently announced a 10-year timetable of 260 space shots—averaging about 2 major launchings a month.

The space scorecard now shows the United States leading Russia about 25 to 7 in the successful space shots.

We recognize, of course, that it is difficult—even for experts— to compare the relative values and significance of the space launchings by the United States and the U.S.S.R. Nevertheless there is a considerable body of informed opinion—with which I agree—that now believes that the composit value of U.S. launchings exceeds that of the Soviet Union.

To the gloom-and-doom prophets, this might be somewhat dismaying; yet I personally feel that even these self-styled prophets—deep in their hearts—are patriotically exultant over our progress in space even though it may take a little fuel away from their campaign rockets.

Reflecting the heartening way in which we are moving ahead, I ask unanimous consent to have two items printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. One is an editorial entitled "Outer Space Scorecard" from the Saturday, August 13 edition of the Washington Daily News; and and editorial entitled "Rockets Away" from the August 13 edition of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Aug. 13, 1960]

OUTER SPACE SCORECARD

United States now leads Russia in successful space shots, 25 to 7.

It's ahead in exploring space close to the earth.

Soviets hold the weight-lifting championship. (Their rocket launchers have lifted 5 tons of instruments; ours only 1½ tons.)

And Russia leads in exploring space around the moon.

Here's the box score:

Russia was first to orbit the earth, orbit the sun, loop the moon, hit the moon, orbit an animal, photograph hidden side of the moon, detect magnetic ring around the earth, maneuver a space craft in flight, monitor life activities in orbit (checking on dog's pulse, blood pressure, and breathing rate), detect an ionosphere around the moon, gage the moon's magnetic field, establish absence of radiation belt around the moon, control temperature inside a satellite, and put a satellite into north-south orbit.

United States was first to discover two radiation belts around the earth, to gage effect of solar explosions on earth's magnetic field, beam a recorded voice from space, photograph earth from space, use solar energy to power satellite radios, establish shape of earth, tape-record satellite information for delayed delivery on ground command, shut off and restart a satellite launcher in space, recover an object from orbit (just accomplished this week).

Also, United States has launched first weather, navigation, and communication satellites. It launched first reconnaissance satellite, though this failed to function properly, and first double-header satellite—which did work.

United States holds the reoord for long-distance communication—22½ million miles.

It all adds up to this: Scientists feel United States has produced more significant information than Soviets.

Navy is enthusiastic over success of its Polaris missile, but doesn't like the noise its missile-carrying atomic submarines make.

It's launched an extensive research program for ways to mute the subs, make it harder for them to be detected by underground listening devices.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post and Times Herald, Aug. 13, 1960]

ROCKETS AWAY

Space buffs must have had figurative stiff necks this morning if they tried to keep up with all the doings up yonder. A Polaris missile and an Atlas missile whizzed down the test ranges. The X–15 rocket plane climbed to new heights where the pilot reported things were very blue and "really fantastic." Out in the Pacific the Navy joyfully retrieved for the first time, after many misses, a capsule fired back to earth from the latest Discoverer satellite, heralding the successful recovery of animal and man-bearing satellites which will follow.

Perhaps most sensational of all the acts in the American space carnival was the Echo communications satellite. A thousand miles out, this cellophane-thin, 100-foot, self-inflating balloon was orbiting the earth every hour and a half. At night, it was destined to be as bright as any star in the heavens, by far the most easily seen of any satellite yet launched. Scientists at a dozen private and Government institutions were bouncing radio signals off Echo, including a message from President Eisenhower inviting all the world to join in similar experiments.

The last venture offers the most immediate prospect of extensive peaceful application. It should soon be possible to build a world-wide television system employing a series of such reflecting satellites and enabling people all over the world to watch the same live program simultaneously. The opportunities for improved ordinary communication and for news dissemination or government propaganda are enormous, and both the Soviet Union and the United States undoubtedly will press Echo and similar programs vigorously.

The rocket plane flight and the Discoverer success represent advances with great ultimate significance for manned space travel, for military reconnaissance, for arms control systems and for mapping and weather analysis. The successful missile tests are a reminder that the great powers are moving quickly and steadily toward the day of prime reliance on pushbutton, intercontinental weapons.

It was a busy day, indeed, in space. And a wondering earth can only guess how these new strides in rocket technology will shape its future.

George Knierim, Agriculture Instructor From Floyd County, Tex., Teaches Farmers of India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it sometimes seems to me that press reports and other news media lay an unfair and disproportionate emphasis on the bad instead of the good parts of our various programs of foreign assistance.

Perhaps this is because sensational stories of waste or mismanagement or worse stirs more popular interest than straightforward, uncolored reports of the inspiring, day-to-day work of the dedicated men who carry out our foreign assistance programs almost around the world.

One such dedicated, hard-working man is George Knierim, of Floyd County, Tex., who for the past 5 years has served as an agriculture adviser on water use with the U.S. International Cooperation Administration in southern India.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellently written feature story concerning Mr. Knierim's work which was published in the July 28, 1960, issue of the Matador (Tex.) Tribune entitled "Texan in India Sees Hope for Hungry."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAN IN INDIA SEES HOPE FOR THE HUNGRY

A workingman receives 34 cents per day in the Tungabhadra Valley, Mysore, State of

southern India, where George Knierim is instructing farmers to increase production through newly acquired irrigation. Knierim, a native of Floyd County, Tex., accompanied by his wife and younger son, Larry, 9, visited in Matador last week with his sister and family, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Pohl and daughter, Carolyn.

George Knierim is listed as agricultural adviser, water use, with the U.S. International Cooperation Administration for four States, Mysore, Kerela, Andhra Pradesh, and Madras, in southern India. He has been overseas 5 years and will return as soon as his leave is up.

Knierim has had 18 years experience in irrigation, much of the time with the Pima Indians in Arizona. His home is in Chandler. His experience exactly fits his present assignment in India.

His challenge is 823,000 acres of land in the Tungabhadra Valley which can now be irrigated with water from one of India's 7 new dams. The soil is good (although depleted in some instances) and the climate is ideal, never dropping below freezing and averaging 70°.

The problem is teaching farmers to use irrigation who have no money and who have lived through generations with the specter of famine always at their doors. For the past 3 years the farmers have been wasting 60 percent of the water.

Knierim believes India may eventually feed its hungry people, many of whom have never owned a pair of shoes and have a life expectancy of 35 years. Millions live and die without ever having had all the food they want.

India has many problems. It has twice the population of the United States and half the territory. Experts believe the 400 million population will double within the next 10 years.

George Knierim is a patient and practical man. He realized that the farmer in India on his small farm (average 2½ acres) could not acquire modern farm equipment. He could not buy it, nor could he earn enough to operate it (gasoline is 70 cents per gallon in Bangalore, India, where he is stationed).

Oxen and hand labor alone must be the answer. Knierim started out with the most primitive implements (like those used by the Mormons in Utah about 1875) and built wooden plows with steel-pointed shares, and made wooden drags with which to level the soil.

He also built wooden ditchers which the oxen could pull. The India farmers were amazed at the progressive equipment. He made an inexpensive level with two bamboo poles and some rubber tubing which the Indian farmer could use to check the elevation and know how to level his land. He gave field demonstrations and worked in the fields with the farmers. They were amazed and delighted.

One blacksmith received an immediate order for 40 plows like Knierim had built. In the rural areas of India the population is 95 percent illiterate, but the farmers could understand the equipment he was introducing. He went to great pains to make it simple.

In his first demonstration he hired some poor oxen because otherwise most of the farmers would say, "That is good, but those oxen are fat; mine are poor and they cannot pull the plow," so it was best to have poor oxen like most of the farmers owned.

He is showing the farmers how to save every precious drop of irrigation water, introducing better planting methods and better seed.

He also instructs agricultural students from India's agricultural colleges. Primarily, however his work is irrigation. His services were requested by the Indian Government and his salary is paid by the U.S. Government under its mutual security program.

BORN NEAR FLOYDADA

George Knierim, who is 46, was born near Floydada. He graduated from Lockney High School in 1930, and from West Texas State College, Canyon, in 1938 after working his way, most of the time by milking cows. He received a degree in agriculture from New Mexico A. & M. College, Las Cruces, in 1940.

He married Miss Beulah Robinson in Canyon, and they have two sons.

After their marriage Mr. Knierim taught school at Folley in the north part of Motley County. He was a vocational agriculture teacher for 8 years in New Mexico and Arizona, and was with the U.S. Department of Agriculture for 7 years.

Following their visit in Matador, they proceeded to Boulder, Colo., for a visit with their oldest son, Willis, 20, who is taking summer courses at the University of Colorado, following his freshman work in Linfield College, at McMinneville, Oreg. He is majoring in political sciences.

WILL RETURN TO INDIA

Mr. and Mrs. Knierim and Larry are going back to India. Back to their Far East home in Bangalore where it is 1,500 miles to a grocery store (where they can buy American food).

Back to a land of poor people—and a very few, very rich—where the ancient soil of India, on which millions have died of starvation, may through the miracle of knowledge and irrigation be made to produce food for teeming millions, and millions yet unborn.

World's Largest Electric Power Generating Unit Placed in Commercial Operation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the world's largest electric power generating unit was placed in commercial operation recently in Indiana.

Mr. R. E. Doyle, of Fort Wayne, vice president and general manager of the Indiana & Michigan Electric Co., announced the operation of the new generating unit at the newly constructed Breed plant in Sullivan County, Ind. The generating capacity of the new unit has been rated at 475,000 kilowatts.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report on the opening of the new plant which appeared in the August 5, 1960, edition of the Farm News of Grant County.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD'S LARGEST ELECTRIC POWER GENERATING UNIT IS PLACED IN COMMERCIAL OPERATION

The world's largest electric power generating unit—capable of fulfilling the electric requirements of more than a million average American homes—is now in commercial operation.

The giant 475,000-kilowatt turbine-generator at Indiana & Michigan Electric Co.'s single-unit Breed plant in Sullivan County has been declared in commercial service by R. E. Doyle, Jr., vice president and general manager.

Mr. Doyle also announced that the generating capacity of the new unit had been revised upward to the new rating of 475,000 kilowatts from the original level of 450,000 kilowatts. He explained that the unit had undergone extensive tests and had been successfully operated at close to 500,000 kilowatts. Based on this performance, the revised rating was established.

The commercial operation of the unit—which is 40 percent larger than the next biggest turbine-generator now in service—comes as the climax to a period of construction and testing that extended over a period of 3½ years. Ground was broken for the power station in late 1956, and in the ensuing months construction workers moved well over a million cubic yards of earth at the site, raised 6,300 tons of structural steel, and poured 63,000 cubic yards of concrete.

The plant is located on the east bank of the Wabash River, about 20 miles southwest of Terre Haute. It is tied into the I. & M. system and that of its parent firm, American Electric Power Co., by a 186-mile double-circuit 345,000-volt transmission line extending to a new substation west of South Bend. This new line increased to 1,226 the number of circuit-miles of 345,000-volt transmission line extending throughout the 7-State AEP system.

Total cost of the plant, where only finishing touches remain to be performed, is estimated at $71.5 million. This is exclusive of the cost of the various transmission switchyard, substation, and line facilities required to interconnect and integrate the Breed plant with the balance of the I. & M. system, and, in turn, with the rest of the AEP system.

Mr. Doyle emphasized that the plant's single unit not only is the largest in the world from the standpoint of capacity but also is expected to be the most efficient power producer ever built.

Design calculations and expectations are that the unit will have a thermal efficiency represented by the consumption of 8,535 B.t.u. per kilowatt-hour generated. Its thermal efficiency would thus be 40 percent.

However, final determination of this efficiency must await actual operation over a period of at least several months. (As a comparison, the Nation's most efficient plant, according to the latest Federal Power Commission reports, required 9,093 B.t.u. per kilowatt-hour.)

Major contributing factors to the anticipated efficiency, aside from the unit's size, are its steam pressure of 3,500 pounds per square inch, an initial steam temperature of 1,050° F., and double steam reheat temperatures also of 1,050°. (At 3,500 per square inch pressure, the breed unit is well above the critical-pressure level of steam—3,206 pounds per square inch—at which point water passes into steam without an intermediate boiling stage.)

Breed is the first of two 475,000 kilowatt units on the AEP system. A similar unit is being built by I. & M.'s sister company, Ohio Power Co., at the Philip Sporn plant on the Ohio River at Graham Station, W. Va. It is slated for operation later this year.

The new unit will raise I. & M.'s total generating capability to more than 1,450,000 kilowatts, an increase of about one-third. It will also boost the entire AEP system's capacity above the 6 million kilowatt level, making it the first private utility system in the world to achieve that milestone in generating capability.

As a yardstick of its size, the Breed unit has a power-producing capacity greater than the combined capabilities of all powerplants in any one of the States of Vermont, Rhode Island, Delaware, Wyoming, Alaska, or Hawaii. Or, taken in another way, the plant—by operating at capacity around the clock for 365 days—is theoretically capable of producing more than 4.1 billion kilowatt-hours a year. This is more electric power than is

consumed annually in any one of 15 States: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Rhode Island, Delaware, North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, Montana, Wyoming, New Mexico, Utah, Nevada, Alaska, or Hawaii.

The plant is expected to burn 1.4 million tons of coal a year, all of which is supplied by Ayrshire Collieries Corp., Indianapolis, under a 15-year contract. Ayrshire developed its new Thunderbird mine nearby for this purpose and built a private 6-mile railroad to connect the mine and powerplant. The rail line is tied in with the Chicago & Eastern Illinois Railroad by a spur track.

Provision was made in the plant's design for the eventual construction of a second 475,000-kilowatt unit. Likewise, provision was made in the coal contract for a doubling of the fuel supply at that time.

While the 475,000-kilowatt unit is capable of producing 110 percent more electric power than the AEP system's previously largest units (225,000 kilowatts), it occupies a cubic space only 75 percent larger, helping to bring about a reduction in the capital cost per kilowatt of generating capacity.

The turbine generator consists of a high-pressure section and a low-pressure section, both of approximately equal dimensions and equal capacity. Each machine is 112 feet long, almost 21 feet wide, and 15½ feet above floor level, and weighs approximately 875 tons.

The plant's single boiler is as tall as a 23-story building and produces 3 million pounds of steam per hour. Its spent gases exhaust to a concrete stack rising 577 feet above ground level, or 22 feet higher than the Washington Monument.

General Electric Co. built the turbine generator and Babcock & Wilcox Co. the boiler. Booth & Flinn Co., of Pittsburgh, performed the general construction work; Green Construction Co., Oaktown, Ind., carried out the excavation and earth moving.

The plant is named in honor of the Breed family, long prominent in the affairs of American Electric Power Co. The late Richard E. Breed of Marion was one of the founders of the company and served as an early president, chairman, and director.

Indiana & Michigan provides electric service to more than 285,000 customers in 166 communities in northern and east central Indiana and southwestern Michigan. This area has an estimated population of 1,350,000.

The company's headquarters are in Fort Wayne, with division offices in Fort Wayne, South Bend, and Marion.

In addition to the new Breed plant, I. & M. also operates two other major power stations: the 525,000-kilowatt Tanners Creek plant at Lawrenceburg and the 390,000-kilowatt Twin Branch plant at Mishawaka.

The B–70

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 15, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, appearing in yesterday's Parade is an interesting article entitled "The Greatest Plane of Them All."

It describes the B–70, which the Senate was active in supporting this year, and which will become, in my estimation, one of the greatest, if not the greatest, weapons that the world has ever known.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREATEST PLANE OF THEM ALL

(By Opal Ginn)

The year is 1966. An American businessman leaving London boards his airliner at dawn. Swept 80,000 feet above the Atlantic, he outraces the sun westward at such speed that it appears to set in the east. Five hours after takeoff he walks down the ramp at San Francisco. He must wait 3 hours for the sun to rise again.

This vision of the future could come true if Uncle Sam goes ahead with plans already well advanced. For the aircraft capable of this amazing performance is the celebrated B–70, half plane, half spaceship.

This versatile aircraft is designed as a nuclear bomber with a 7,000-mile range. It will be equipped with new devices for foiling enemy interceptor planes and missiles. Recently a congressional report hinted the B–70 might take over the high-altitude reconnaissance role, using only U.S. bases.

Dressed in "civvies," the B–70 could be changed into a jet transport. Its bomb bays could be converted into baggage holds and its 156-foot, pencil-slim body fitted with seats for as many as 150 passengers.

LONG LIVE THE QUEEN

Leading experts like J. L. Atwood, president of North American Aviation, which is building the B–70 prototype, see the plane as winning the great race for the world's airways. Both the Russians and British are working at top pressure to develop supersonic airliners that will grab off the rich market for high-speed travel. The B–70—which will fly three times the speed of sound, or better than 2,000 miles an hour—could become America's queen of the skies.

By 1975 more than 400 supersonic airliners will be whistling across the world's horizons. Whether the majority will be American made will depend on how speedily the B–70 can be adapted to civilian needs. Chief snag: the initial cost of converting the blueprints into a production-line model, estimated to range between $500 million and $1 billion. This is more than the commercial aviation industry can raise. Probable solution: Government aid, utilizing money already spent to develop the B–70.

MORE FLIGHTS FASTER

Apart from speed, what are the advantages of a triplesonic airliner?

In the long run, the B–70 means cheaper fares: it will have a much faster turnaround and can pack in more passengers per mile than present jets. For trips up to 1,000 miles, today's subsonic jets produce 160 million seat-miles a year.

Triplesonic jets, it is estimated, would produce over 300 million seat-miles. The difference would be even greater for trips over 4,000 miles. Results in dollars: a triplesonic airliner would yield up to 25 seat-miles for each dollar invested, compared with 17 seat-miles per dollar for today's fastest airliners.

It will mean safer, more comfortable air travel. At 15 miles altitude, there is no weather. Winds move at a tranquil 5 to 10 miles an hour, so there will be no bumpiness, no air-sickness.

The B–70 can fly the 7,000 miles between London and San Francisco without refueling. Its new boron fuels are not only extraordinarily economical but give 40 percent more zip and power.

Maintenance of the triplesonic airliner also promises to be cheaper than that of present jets. Most of its equipment will be plug-in units. Equipment needing repairs simply would be whipped out and replaced in a minimum of time.

Nor would major alteration be necessary for the world's principal airports. The B–70 can take off and land on almost any of them.

Of course, there are still technical problems to be solved. Even in thin air, the triplesonic airliner will set up friction which can heat its outer shell hotter than 900 degrees. This can be overcome by a honeycomb shell of special aluminum and steel alloys.

The noise of the plane's six giant jets is not so easily controlled. There is also the question of broken windows on the ground caused by the boom of the plane as it breaks the sound barrier. This can be avoided by holding down the speed until the plane reaches 40,000 feet.

There is also a navigational problem linked with the plane's terrific speed. At 2,000 miles per hour, a tiny error would be progressively magnified every second.

To solve the problem of keeping on course navigation will be controlled by electronic devices which will set a course automatically by the stars. The pilot will handle only takeoffs and landings.

RIDE OF THE VALKYRIE

Will the triplesonic airliner be followed by even faster planes? The latter can be built, say the experts. But beyond triplesonic speed the law of diminishing returns begins to operate. Takeoff and landing requires the same time; the journey itself would be cut not by hours but only by minutes—and at soaring expense.

The Air Force has named the B–70 the Valkyrie, after the beautiful but terrible maidens of Norse legend. They rode their winged horses over the battlefield to choose dying warriors to be carried back to Valhalla. The modern Valkyries may have an equally exciting chore: racing against the sun as they speed around the world carrying peaceful travelers.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt*.....Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*.....Cleveland House
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*, 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*.....
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md*.....
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*.....
Bible, Alan, *Nev*.....
Bridges, Styles, *N. H*.....
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak*.....
Bush, Prescott, *Conn*.....
Butler, John Marshall, *Md*.....
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va*.....The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*.....
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*.....
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind*.....The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans*.....Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo*.....
Case, Clifford P., *N. J*.....
Case, Francis, *S. Dak*.....4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex*.....2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*.....
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*.....
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*.....
Cotton, Norris, *N. H*.....
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*.....
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*.....
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*.....
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*.....
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*.....
Eastland, James O., *Miss*.....5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*.....
Engle, Clair, *Calif*.....
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C*.....
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*.....5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del*.....
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark*.....
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz*.....
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*.....
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*, University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*.....
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*.....
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*.....
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*.....
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa*., 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*.....
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla*.....Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*.....
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*.....
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y*.....
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex*.....
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C*.....
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C*.....
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y*.....3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn*.....4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass*.....
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla*.....
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*.....
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*.....
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*.....
Long, Russell B., *La*.....
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg*.....
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn*.....2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*.....
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*.....
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*.....
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*, The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*.....
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa*.....4501 Conn. Ave.
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg*.....4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*.....
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*.....
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak*.....122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont*.....The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*.....
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*, Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I*.....
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*.....
Proxmire, William, *Wis*.....
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va*.....
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*.....
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*.....
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass*.....2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*.....
Smathers, George A., *Fla*.....
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala*.....4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*.....
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*.....
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*.....
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C*.....
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis*.....2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*.....
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex*.....
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak*.....Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*.....

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, Martin, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, Prouty, ———.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, ———.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, ———.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit. Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Democratic National Convention Keynote Address by Senator Church

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 16, 1960

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, during the recent Democratic National Convention, the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH] delivered a brilliant and eloquent keynote address. His address set the tone of the convention. His address was well composed, masterfully delivered, and splendidly received. Seldom in the history of our country has the honor of delivering a keynote address to a national convention come to one so young as the junior Senator from Idaho; never has it come to one who has spoken more sincerely, more pungently, or more eloquently.

I ask unanimous consent that his very able address, together with some editorial comment which I have collected, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address and the editorial comment were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEYNOTE ADDRESS BY SENATOR FRANK CHURCH, OF IDAHO, AT THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION, LOS ANGELES, JULY 11, 1960

A keynote speaker is often expected to perform like a cheerleader at a pep rally. But these are solemn times that summon us to reason together. We are Democrats, not because our party has always done everything right, but because it has been the principal party of progress. We face the future with assurance, because of the way our party has served the country in the past.

No other party, for example, has furnished so many great Presidents—the author of our liberties, Thomas Jefferson; the framer of frontier freedom, Andrew Jackson; the sentinel of integrity in public office, Grover Cleveland; the scholarly architect of world order, Woodrow Wilson; the giant of humanitarian reform, Franklin Roosevelt; and that indomitable man of the people, Harry Truman.

Nearly everybody now acclaims the liberal reforms that Democrats had to hammer out, against determined Republican opposition, a few short years ago—the Social Security Act, to give a minimal retirement income to our senior citizens; the minimum wage and hour laws, to upgrade menial wages to decent standards; the REA, bringing electric light to the countryside of America; and the Federal housing program, which has enabled the bulk of our people to become the owners of their own homes.

I wish that time would permit a review of all the achievements of former Democratic administrations. But the laurels of the past alone do not entitle us to the keys to the future. We will deserve to win the coming election, not on account of yesterday's service, but on the basis of the programs we present for today, and the plans we project for tomorrow. Therefore, I must speak to you tonight of the grave crisis confronting us all.

Ours is an awesome age. We live anxiously in the shadow of the mushroom cloud, and wonder whether the human race itself is to be consumed in the witchfire of thermonuclear war. We see the world in upheaval, polarized about two gigantic adversaries, the United States and the Soviet Union. At stake is the shape of the future.

If the Soviet Union is communism on exhibit, even more is the United States the showcase of democracy. How urgent it is for us to demonstrate to all the watching world that democracy has the will to serve vital public needs. How ironic that our national administration should have fallen into the hands of the "holdback" party, during the times that beseeched us to push ahead.

For the heralded "crusade" of 1952 brought only complacency back to Washington. It was the same old "keep cool with Coolidge" attitude of the twenties; it was the familiar "prosperity is just around the corner" spirit which prevented Herbert Hoover from ever coming to grips with the great depression. Once the new Eisenhower "team" had been installed, Madison Avenue eagerly took charge, and a barrage of bland ballyhoo soon filled the land. Like a drug, if you please, it has tranquilized our leadership for ever 7 years.

Now we must be done with this addition. We must seek candid answers to the hard questions: Where do we really stand? Where are we headed? What must we do about it?

We are told by the Republicans to be content, that they have done as much about our problems as we can afford, and that the present prosperity attests to their prudent management of our affairs.

But do we have a wholesome prosperity? I submit it is a pitch-man prosperity, the kind that results when government is run by hucksters not unaccustomed to selling inferior products by wrapping them in bright packages.

It is no accident that big business profits are higher than ever, nor that small business is failing at a record rate. The Republicans tell us that this is due to the immutable law of the survival of the fittest. The fittest, of course, are the biggest, as anyone knows who has ever been in an alley fight. If small business doesn't want to get licked, it will have to get out of the alley. In any case, it is "paternalism," according to the Republican rulebook, for the Government to intervene as referee.

Who suffers from this pitch-man prosperity? Not just small business, but the farmers as well.

This administration, in dealing with the farm problem, has treated the American people like the fabled blind men of India who went to see the elephant. One felt his side and thought him like a wall; one his tail and thought him like a rope; one his ear and thought him like a fan:

"And so these men of Indostan
Disputed loud and long,
Though each was partly in the right,
And all were in the wrong."

To the farmers, the Republicans have said: "Price supports have induced you to overproduce. We will lower them. Less food will mean higher prices, and this will make you prosperous."

To the consumers, they have said: "We are lifting acreage restrictions and reducing the farmers' price supports. This will mean more food at cheaper prices in the marketplace."

To all of us who are taxpayers, they have said: "We are paring down the farm program to save you taxes."

With such conflicting arguments, the administration won approval from a Republican Congress, in 1954, of its flexible price support program, and the use of the veto has kept it alive ever since. With the same arguments, the program is still defended, despite all the accumulated evidence of its failure.

Has it helped the consumer? The housewife will tell you that groceries are higher than ever.

Has it helped the taxpayer? Why this administration has spent more money on its farm program than all previous administrations combined, from the time the Department of Agriculture was first established in 1862. Instead of declining, our surpluses have grown mammoth. Just to maintain them, now costs us more than a billion dollars a year. For some of those who own storage bins, this may be the road to riches, but for the farmer, it is the road to ruin.

Farm income has dropped 23 percent since 1952, while costs have continued to rise, in a squeeze that has driven nearly 5 million people off the farms. We Democrats reject the proposition that the family farm is finished. The farmer is entitled to a fair return on the food and fiber he raises, and no prosperity is genuine that excludes him.

Yet those who pay for this pitchman prosperity are not confined to either farmers or small businessmen. Workingmen pay for it. Elderly people on pensions pay for it. Everyone who has to borrow pays for it. The cost is exacted in higher interest rates.

I swear Rip Van Winkle could have gone to sleep during anytime in this century past, and upon awakening, could readily have determined which party was in control, merely by asking, "How high are the interest rates?" And, if they were hovering up there close to the ceiling, he could bet his life that the Republicans had taken over in Washington.

One of the first acts of this administration, in 1953, was to raise the interest rates, a policy that has already cost the taxpayers $12 billion, just to pay the increased interest on the national debt. Imagine what the boosted tax cost has been on money borrowed by the States, the cities, and the school districts of the land.

But even this is not all. Pile on top of it the added money paid out by every person who has had to buy his TV set, refrigerator, or automobile, on the installment plan, and you can begin to understand how spiraling interest rates have intensified the inflation, and lifted the cost of living to an alltime high.

The fact is that the tight-money policies of this administration have sapped our vitality and shackled our economic growth. Compare the past 7 years under this Republican administration with the previous 7 years under the Democrats. During the Truman administration, our gross national product increased an average of 4.7 percent each year. Under the Eisenhower administration, the increase has averaged only 2.3 percent, less than half as much. And if our growing population is taken into account, the per capita rate of growth for the 7 years under the Democrats was four times as great as under the Republicans.

Indeed, our economic vigor has been undermined to the point that our urgent needs at home have been left untreated like festering sores.

Private slums are spreading through the rotting cores of our big cities, while our urban renewal and public housing programs are "too little and too late." Our private automobiles are stalled in traffic jams, while rapid public transportation, for lack of funds, lags 20 years behind our needs. Private dissipation flourishes, while public education flounders. The classroom shortage has not been met, and we continue to spend more for liquor and tobacco than for public schools. To sweeten private life, our stores display a billion bottles of deodorant, yet a modest bill to reduce the stench from our polluted public rivers was vetoed, and the urban air—thickening with contamination—begins to threaten public health.

We have cared so much about "conspicuous consumption" that our lives are cluttered with gadgets. Yet, we have cared so little about our public responsibilities, that both young and old have been neglected; gangs of switchblade delinquents haunt the public streets, while the lack of adequate medical care for the aged is fast becoming a national disgrace.

What does all of this portend for America? Are we to become a modern Babylon of public want amidst private glut? Is this to be the last port of call for the great American Republic? Such has been the direction of our course—under this Republican administration.

I say to you: The issue in the coming election is not Dwight Eisenhower, whether the strong or the weak; it is not RICHARD NIXON, whether the new or the old; the issue is our country's course—whether we can risk another 4-year ride on the Republican train.

For it is the same old train. He who sits in the cab up front cannot change the direction of the ride. The train runs on Republican tracks, and they are fixed in place. To change direction, we must change trains, and that is just what the American people plan to do in November.

What will be our new direction? Well, let's see what the Democrats in Congress have done—even in the face of veto, and the threat of veto—these past few years.

We have advanced the cause of good health through larger appropriations for vital medical research against cancer, heart disease, tuberculosis, and a host of other chronic ailments.

We have kept faith wtih our forefathers by overcoming 40 years of resistance, to embrace Alaska and Hawaii within the Federal Union, as our 49th and 50th States.

We have broken a stalemate in the fight for full equality under law, by enacting the first civil rights legislation in 80 years, to better protect the right to vote for all our citizens, regardless of race or color. Much remains to be done, but it is already clear that the Democratic Party is dealing most effectively with the lingering problem of racial intolerance, even as we have rejected religious bigotry. We are proud to count among our leading contenders for the Presidency itself, both Protestant and Catholic alike.

But in other fields, the work of the Democratic Congress has been blocked by the Republican veto. In the field of continued development of our water resources—so important to my own State of Idaho, and the future of the country—the Republican Cabinet is split. One half wants "no new starts," the other half demands "more new stops." Four times in 4 years, rivers and harbors bills have been vetoed.

Twice the Congress has tried to give aid to depressed areas of chronic unemployment, and twice have the bills been vetoed. Twice, because of vetoes, we have seen an adequate public housing program cut below our minimal needs, and many have been the times that Congrses has been frustrated in its efforts to deal with the worsening farm problem. Half a dozen major farm bills have been vetoed since 1956.

If only there had been a Democrat in the White House, these past 7 Republican years, and we had continued to enjoy the same rate of economic growth we experienced during the previous 7 Democratic years, there would have been plenty of revenue to enact all of these programs into law, plus urban renewal and school construction besides, without deficit spending, and without need for any increase in Federal taxes.

This is why the American people are determined to put an end to divided government. Not only are they going to reelect a Democratic Congress, but they are going to make sure that the man we nominate in this convention becomes the next President of the United States.

We must make the change. Our problems at home call for it. Our predicament abroad compels it.

The President and his representatives, under the Constitution, conduct our foreign policy. For over 7 years, they have staged it as though the world were a grandstand, where showmanship might be the easy substitute for statesmanship.

Before it's too late, we must begin to see the world realistically. We live on a shrunken planet, where the prevailing order of the past three centuries has been destroyed. New nations rise from the wreckage of old empires, so that our world, like ancient Gaul, lies divided in three parts: One part consists of the Western nations, led by the United States; one part of the Communist nations, dominated by the Soviet Union; while the third part is made up of the newly emerging nations in the old, colonial regions of Africa, Asia, and the southern seas.

These undeveloped and uncommitted nations are the "no man's lands" on which the destiny of the human race will be decided. For if the continents of Africa and Asia are drawn behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, the economy of Western Europe is at once undermined. And if we yield Europe, Asia, and Africa to the Communists, the balance of power will fatally shift against us, thus assuring eventual Communist domination of all the world.

Two ways of life—freedom and communism—are locked in mortal competition. Until the debris has been cleared away from the wrecked summit conference in Paris, until the tumult that turned the President back from Tokyo is better understood, we cannot know, for sure, what form this competition may take. But this we do know: we shall either win it or lose it. There is no way out of it. History's verdict will be rendered. The days of our years will determine whether freedom shall endure.

Accordingly, we must inquire, How have the Communists been doing in this dire contest?

A few months ago, my wife and I stood in a long line which moved slowly across the Red Square in Moscow, into the marble mausoleum beneath the Kremlin wall. We went there to see the mortal remains of Lenin and Stalin, laid out upon beds of bronze. The mausoleum is the pagan cathedral of world communism, and each day the "comrades" comes there, three and four abreast, in a never-ending procession.

It is the same procession that emerged from the ruin of Russia at the end of the Second World War to thrust up a Red empire—the only new empire of the 20th century. It now engulfs all of Eastern Europe and vast China, and encloses a third of the world's people within its spreading reach. Its method of expansion has always been conquest, either from within or from without; in no Communist land have the people ever freely voted the system in, and in no such land have they ever been given a chance to vote it out.

Now the tyranny invades the Middle East, and plants its seeds in restless Africa.

I have listened to Nikita Khrushchev, behind the closed doors of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. I have heard his certain prediction that communism would win history's verdict. He boasted that, although we may be freemen, our grandchildren will be Communists.

Is this an idle boast? The Communists have seized a third of the world in 15 years. History does not record another conquest so large in so short a time. I submit to you that the fateful decisions taken in Washington today and tomorrow will determine whether or not our grandchildren shall be free.

These are the grave stakes deeply involved in the coming national election, and the mission of the Democratic Party is to reawaken America to the mighty task before her. The hinge of the future swings on the United States. The maintenance of peace, the preservation of freedom, the fate of the world, all ultimately depend upon American principle, American prestige, and American power.

What has been happening to American principle? Under Truman we had a Marshall plan to restore economic strength to the free governments of Western Europe, but of late we have courted tyrants, as though they were the friends of freedom.

We have pinned medals upon the chests of hated dictators like Peron of Argentina and Perez Jimenez of Venezuela, and when they were driven into exile, we were aghast at the stoning of our own Vice President on the streets of Caracas.

We have carelessly furnished weapons to other petty tyrants, like Batista in Cuba, who turned them upon his own people, and now we are dismayed at the vehemence of the "Hate America" rallies in Havana.

We have helped to arm a Fascist Franco in Spain, and a Communist Tito in Yugoslavia, until the world has been left to wonder if we still stand for freedom. And as traditional American principles have been obscured, a tide of suspicion and hostility rises against us.

We must also ask: What has happened to American prestige?

Long have we been known as a generous people. Since the end of the Second World War, we have given freely of our treasure to help raise standards in far-flung parts of the world. To the needy, our hand has been extended in friendship. Yet, an overemphasis on military aid has caused the hand, in many places, to be mistaken for a fist. Worse still, by allowing our surplus foods to pile up in massive quantities, by failing for too long to implement an imaginative food-for-peace program, this administration has wrongfully permitted the ugly image to spread of a fat America hoarding food in a hungry world.

But our prestige has suffered in yet another way. We live in an age of science, when men equate national excellence with technological achievement. In such a competition, how could this country—the most highly industrialized and technically advanced in history—possibly stumble and fall behind? Well, during these Republican years, we've done it.

Somehow we lost, and have yet to recapture, the initiative in space. The Russians were the first to launch a satellite, the first to strike, and then to photograph the far side of the moon, the first to orbit the sun. So effectively have they capitalized on these feats, that our own public opinion experts tell us that the average citizen of the world believes today that the Soviet Union has become the leading scientific nation. Don't ever discount the effect of this upon people in primitive lands, where the promise of

modern science alone seems to hold out hope for a better life in the years ahead.

So we are left with the final question: What has happened to American power?

As long as the Russian and Chinese Governments live by the sword, our military strength must be second to none. We understand that arms alone can never perpetuate the peace, but can only buy us time with which to supplant the rule of force among nations with the rule of law.

Yet it must be clear by now that if this objective is ever to be won, if nuclear weapons tests are ever to be suspended, if open skies for the prevention of surprise attack is ever to be established, if enforcible arms control is ever to commence, these complicated problems will be worked out—not at ceremonial summit conferences—but through long, painstaking, and skillful negotiation. At the conference table, our chances for success will depend upon our ability to negotiate, not from weakness, but from strength.

What has happened to our strength? Our Army has shrunk from 20 to 14 divisions. Our Navy has lost scores of fighting ships. We concede to the Russians superior numbers of intercontinental ballistic missiles, which we ourselves describe as the "ultimate weapon." Still, we are told by this administration that we need not match the Soviet Union in missile strength, for this would impose too heavy a strain upon us. Is it possible that the richest Nation in history can no longer afford to be the strongest?

In these many ways, we have watched our country shrink in stature, only to be told that Mr. NIXON, the single aspirant in either party who upholds the very policies that have led us into fiasco, is the man best qualified to lead us out.

Well, the American people won't be fooled. Remembering the famous admonition of Theodore Roosevelt, "Speak softly and carry a big stick," they are not about to substitute, "Talk tough and carry a toothpick."

They know that scowls will never scuttle the Communist thrust, that this can be accomplished only by a mighty striving to revive American principle, to restore American prestige, and to rebuild American power.

I shall never forget the words of a Polish lady, spoken to me last year on the square of the inner city of old Warsaw. She spoke with a wisdom and perspective forged in nearly a century of life. "Senator," she said to me, "America is truly the hope of the world."

It is the American Revolution—not the Russian—that has served as the inspiration of all people who would be free.

It is the American industrial revolution—not the touted "class struggle"—that has created, here in the United States, the world's most classless society.

It is the American technological revolution—not the proletrian state—that has produced, here in the United States, a standard of living that is the marvel of the world.

Nominate a man who will summon this priceless heritage to work. Give us a leader whose program will match this atomic age, and the Democratic Party—true to its tradition—will once again lift our country upon the highroad of destiny.

For only an awakened and rededicated America can raise a standard around which the great fraternity of the free can rally, to summon from a new-found unity, the resolution and the strength to make history's verdict ours.

This is the case for all America that the Democratic Party must carry to the people.

God help us plead it well.

EDITORIAL COMMENT

Los Angeles Evening Express:

"The keynote speech at the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles was a brilliant political address delivered in dynamic fashion by young FRANK CHURCH, U.S. Senator from Idaho.

"It was a red hot attack on the 7 years of Republican administration in which the speaker detailed what he asserted to be the failures of the top GOP leadership in dealing not only with domestic issues, but also with the tense international crisis.

"And highly laudable in his forceful fighting keynote address was his assertion that peace, freedom, and the fate of the world 'all ultimately depend upon American principle, American prestige, and American power.'"

Los Angeles Examiner:

"As to Senator CHURCH's keynote speech, it was a vigorous and masterful statement in the grand old tradition of partisan politics."

Washington (D.C.) Post:

"The Democratic keynote speech of Senator FRANK CHURCH * * * was a competent partisan address to a partisan convention assembled for the serious business of choosing a man qualified to be the next President of the United States."

The Portland (Oreg.) Oregonian:

"Senator CHURCH has well performed the task assigned him."

The New York Times:

"Senator CHURCH's speech was superior to many such in the past. * * * There is a great deal with which we agree in (his) analysis; but we do not find it so easy as he did to apportion the praise and blame along strictly party lines."

Idaho Statesman (Boise):

"Idahoans generally, and her Democrats particularly, will applaud the honor and accomplishment involved in Senator FRANK CHURCH's keynote address at the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles. A finished orator, Mr. CHURCH undoubtedly set the theme of the convention, and he did it well.

"What we are watching is American history in the making, and Senator CHURCH, assigned an important place in that activity, did an excellent job in a modernized, fairly brief type keynote address. Unlike tradition, which says that keynoters talk their way into the political graveyard, we think the young Senator attracted favorable attention to himself and the State he represents. Often we disagree with his liberal philosophies but Monday night we felt that he filled an important pair of political shoes with deep determination and enthusiasm. As Idahoans we are proud of the recognition that came to one our citizens."

Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune:

"We commend the speech to the readers of the Tribune, not simply because the speaker is an Idahoan whom many in this area know personally, but, more importantly, because the speech itself is a particularly good one.

"Unlike the usual keynote address, this one wrestles seriously with serious issues: perilous difficulties abroad, wasteful consumption and irresponsibility at home, the erosion of American power and prestige, an absence of executive leadership.

"More than anything else, this was a statement of faith in what the Nation could do if she set herself to doing it, and a declaration of what she must do if disaster is to be avoided.

"It has not traditionally been the purpose of a keynote speech to scold or enlighten but to enthuse, and this one contains its fair share of the trappings of convention oratory. But it contains, in addition, a larger proportion of substance than conventions have grown accustomed to."

The Salt Lake (Utah) Tribune:

"The keynote speech of young, handsome Senator FRANK CHURCH of Idaho at the Democratic National Convention was in keeping with the new political accent on youth and the electronic age.

"While dynamic and to the point, the 45-minute address was terse and restrained, compared with some keynote addresses of past political conventions.

"The sincerity of the youngest Member of the U.S. Senate was impressive.

"Senator CHURCH spoke without notes and without using a teleprompter.

"The able Idahoan drew favorable attention to his State and to the Intermountain West. Many oldtimers undoubtedly recalled the days when another Idaho Senator, the late William E. Borah, was prominent in the conventions and operations of the opposing party."

The Intermountain (Pocatello, Idaho):

"It was a superb appeal to his party. He implored them to restore freedom as the Nation's key export commodity, and to proceed without apology to take new Federal action against festering domestic problems.

"The Senator warned against our becoming a modern Babylon, privately glutted in a state starving for lack of purpose."

The Garden City (Idaho) Gazette:

"FRANK CHURCH did Idaho proud Monday evening.

"His keynote address at the Democratic National Convention in Los Angeles was another example of the masterful oratory that Idahoans have long recognized in the young Senator.

"Once before Idaho produced a U.S. Senator who was known throughout the Nation for his oratory and who brought fame to the Gem State. FRANK CHURCH's performance Monday night has put him well on the way to being a second Borah in the eyes of the country."

POLITICAL COLUMNISTS

C. F. Byrns in the Fort Smith (Ark.) Southwest American:

"The high spot in the first session of the Democratic National Convention Monday was a brilliant keynote speech by the Senate's youngest Member, Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Boise, Idaho. * * * If there has ever been a keynoter so young, I do not recall it. There have been few who approached his oratorical skill and his attractive personality.

"Senator CHURCH impressed me, not alone for what he said, but how he said it. In a gathering such as this, the speakers normally and obviously refer to written scripts. Senator CHURCH may have had a manuscript tucked away somewhere out of sight; but if he had, he neither used nor needed it. He spoke easily, vigorously, dynamically, and persuasively, covering multiple ideas and situations with sharp criticism of the present administration—which was the object of the meeting."

Roy Ringer in the Los Angeles Mirror News:

"CHURCH of Idaho, at 35 the youngest U.S. Senator, was proof incarnate that the slam-bang art of political oratory is far from dead.

"Matching gesture to voice, inflection to emotion, his 45-minute keynote address was in the grand tradition."

Richard L. Strout in the Christian Science Monitor:

"Boyish looking FRANK CHURCH's national televised keynote address fulfilled all the standard qualifications of this kind of performance, and added something more.

"Because the United States is engaged in a desperate struggle with communism the Democratic keynote had deeper significance. It not only indicated the prospective Democratic line of attack, but in its own way it seemed to make the attempt, however successfully, to voice the call to greatness which the times require.

"Thus his address, which was interrupted 42 times by applause, touched great issues. The apple-cheeked young Idaho Senator used a style and delivery which were, for this kind of thing, relatively models of restraint. In fact, at various points he seemed to get near the issues that really separate the two great parties."

Frank Hewlett in the Spokesman Review (Spokane, Wash.):

"Idaho's Senator FRANK CHURCH was showered with more than 150 congratulatory telegrams Tuesday on his keynote speech before the Democratic National Convention.

"They came from all sections of the country—and included two from self-styled Republicans who said he had converted them.

"The press also treated the Gem Stater well.

"The Los Angeles Times said he 'did not disappoint the throngs who came to hear him' and the New York Herald Tribune praised the delivery and sincerity of the man from the potato State.

"Only three or four of the stack of messages were critical. A couple merely attacked the Democratic Party's past position on international affairs.

"An Illinois fan said 'Your speech was like giving light to the blind.'

"A New Yorker commented 'inspiring speech, fit for president' and a Missourian said 'Your speech was the best since Franklin D. Roosevelt.'

"An Ohio man said 'run for president' and one from Tennessee said 'Can't think of a stronger ticket than KENNEDY and CHURCH.'

" 'Would be to God that there were more men like you in our great country,' said a message from Rhode Island and from Washington, D.C., came one saying 'Applying now for front row seat on your bandwagon.'

" 'Help me organize Republicans for KENNEDY,' messaged a California woman and a New York telegram said 'A Republican small businessman thought your speech excellent.'

"From his home State there was a message from Pocatello which read, 'Fine job, FRANK,' and from Nampa was a message saying the speech was excellent and added the 'TV reception here was fine.' "

Eleanor Roberts in the Boston Traveler:

"The man who won the vote—without so much as a battle—as the glamour boy and Demosthenes of the Democrats last night was handsome, 35-year-old Senator FRANK CHURCH of Boise, Idaho.

"He provided the chief excitement in an otherwise dull evening.

"When he finished his impassioned moving keynote speech—delivered with such force and in such colorful language—he not only brought the convention to its feet for the first time, but left viewers at home silently cheering.

"Obviously, CHURCH knew his speech perfectly. And since he had no need of a teleprompter, he could concentrate on putting it across. Almost every sentence was accompanied by gestures, like raising hands high to indicate how interest rates on installment plans had 'piled up' during the Republican administration.

"It was a dramatic, serious speech in spite of the many catch phrases, and no elder statesman could have put over more effectively the terrifying warning that Russia had conquered one-third of the world in 15 years, a historymaking record."

The Scope of School Lunch and Special Milk Programs in Wisconsin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 16, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, over the years, the school lunch and special milk programs—as enacted by Congress—have provided, first, a most worthwhile outlet for our surplus milk and other farm products; and, second, a constructive way for improving the health of the youth of the Nation.

I have considered it a privilege to support legislation for carrying forward and supporting these fine programs.

In Wisconsin, the programs have been utilized by our citizens in a variety of ways, including school lunches, distribution of milk to institutions, child care centers, summer camps, and for disaster relief.

Under the supervision of Gordon W. Gunderson, the program has been going forward splendidly.

Recently, I was privileged to receive a résumé of the report from Mr. Gunderson. Reflecting the way in which this national program is serving the citizens of Wisconsin, I ask unanimous consent to have this résumé printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE OF WISCONSIN,
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION,
Madison, August 10, 1960.

Hon. ALEXANDER WILEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILEY: In keeping with my promise to you some time ago to send you some detailed information concerning the school-lunch and special milk programs as soon as final data was available, I should like to report the following information to you at this time:

SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

There were 1,778 schools participating in the program with an average daily participation of 182,992 children (peak).

During the course of the year, these schools served a total of 29,958,137 type A lunches with milk. An additional number of lunches were served without milk, but, since they are not reimbursable, we did not keep a tabulation of them.

Payments from Federal funds for the school-lunch program totaled	$1,515,088.35
Payments by children totaled	7,312,903.64
Adult payments	521,301.42
Other income	260,603.11
Federal reimbursement for special milk served to schools participating in the lunch program totaled	1,304,128.80
Operation deficits met by school districts amounted to	1,524,853.40
Total income	12,438,878.72

Wholesale value of commodities donated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture to schools in Wisconsin (8,410,339 pounds) (includes distribution to 343 nonpublic schols), $2,608,509.96.

Expenditures reported were as follows:

For food (including special milk served in schools participating in the lunch program)	$7,735,077.84
Labor	3,562,762.65
Equipment	388,758.75
Other expenditures	321,070.84
Refunded to district general funds from earnings	252,234.31
Total expenditures	12,259,904.39

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

There was a substantial increase in the number of half pints of milk utilized in the special milk program. Total consumption of milk, both in the school lunch and special milk programs, amounted to 91,968,438 half pints. Of this number, 29,958,137 half pints were served as a part of the type A lunch and the remaining 62,010,301 half pints were utilized in the special milk program. Total Federal funds utilized for the special milk program this year amounted to $2,136,780.24. Of this amount, $832,631.44 was paid to school districts not in the lunch program.

COMMODITY DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

We distributed 4,987,695 pounds of commodities to institutions, welfare, child care centers, summer camps and for disaster relief, having a wholesale value of $794,191.68. At the present time there are 216 institutions receiving commodities regularly, nad there are 12 counties, 2 cities, 1 village, and 6 towns participating in the distribution of commodities to 23,121 welfare recipients. We have 7 child care centers and 231 summer camps operating this summer, serving 131,350 children.

Attached are detailed statements of the breakdown of commodity distribution, both as to kinds and total weight of commodities distributed and the dollar value.

The commodities distributed for disaster relief involved the flood which occurred at Odanah, in Ashland County, this spring. On this occasion the Ashland Public Schools cooperated with the Red Cross Disaster Relief Units and used the high school kitchen for the preparation of foods which was transported to the families isolated by the flood waters. USDA donated flour and powdered milk were utilized in baking bread at the high school kitchen and transported to the families in need. Other commodities available were also prepared at the high school kitchen and transported ready to eat. During the early part of these operations, the food was transported by helicopter and, after the water had receded somewhat, it was transported by tractor and truck. A mass feeding center was set up at Odanah to take care of families which had been evacuated from their homes and this center was maintained until the families were again able to move back into their homes.

Sincerely,

GORDON W. GUNDERSON,
Director, School Lunch Programs.

John Harris, of Dallas Times-Herald, Sets Record Straight on False "Oath" Being Circulated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 16, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in recent weeks I have received several letters from Texas asking for information on the thoroughly disproved false "oath" concerning the Knights of Columbus pledge.

It is reported that this unfair and untrue propaganda was circulated in the West Virginia primary in a vain effort to cast a reflection on Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY. The people of that proud State are to be congratulated for having the good judgment and sense of fairness to see that such material has no place, or should have no place, in free, honest elections.

Recently Mr. John Harris, a news correspondent with the Washington bureau of the Dallas Times-Herald, wrote an excellent, straightforward feature article in an effort to set the record straight and exposing the false "oath." I ask unanimous consent that his important article, entitled "False Knights of Columbus 'Oath' Has Been Circulating 50 Years," published in the Dallas Times of August 10, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FALSE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS OATH HAS BEEN CIRCULATING 50 YEARS

(By John Harris)

Even though this is the year 1960, there's no use fooling ourselves—the religious issue will loom large in the presidential campaign.

Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY said the issue died in the hills of West Virginia, where he won a primary in overwhelmingly Protestant country, and maybe it did.

But the regrettable fact is that its ghost goes marching on.

Now ghosts—even delicate and touchy ones with religious connotations—can't be swept under rugs. That is why this was written.

For a ghost of shadowy dimension and mysterious origin is again haunting the land as it has done for nearly half a century—especially around election time.

GHOST IDENTIFIED

This weird specimen is the form of an alleged oath taken by members of the Knights of Columbus, a fraternal organization of Catholic men.

Couched in terms worthy of a fifth-grade society, the oath says the organization is pledged to kill all non-Catholics.

KENNEDY being a Catholic, the idea seems to be that this could hurt his chances in the campaign. The oath was circulated during the West Virginia primary in April, and apparently didn't have much success.

Now it is showing up again in various parts of the country.

FALSE "OATH"

Let's take a look at this "oath." Its propagators claim that fourth-degree Knights of Columbus must pledge themselves to:

"Wage relentless war, secretly and openly, against all heretics, Protestants and Masons and to extirpate them from the face of the earth without regard to age, sex or condition by hanging, burning, boiling, strangling, burying alive and to rip up the stomachs and wombs of their women and to crush their infants' heads against the walls in order to annihilate their execrable race."

Actual obligation taken by fourth-degree Knights of Columbus is the following, and a publication issued by the organization offers a $25,000 reward for proof that it is not:

GENUINE OATH

"I swear to support the Constitution of the United States. I pledge myself, as a Catholic citizen and a Knight of Columbus, fully to enlighten myself upon my duties as a citizen and conscientiously perform them entirely in the interests of my country, regardless of all personal consequences. I pledge myself to do all in my power to preserve the integrity and purity of the ballot and to promote respect for law and order. I promise to practice my religion consistently and faithfully and to so conduct myself in public affairs and in the exercise of public virtue as to reflect nothing but credit upon our holy church, to the end that she may flourish and our country prosper to the greater honor and glory of God."

The Library of Congress, has over many years patiently answered requests for information on this matter. Its files reveal at least how our ghost first got into politics.

WHERE IT STARTED

It appears that 47 years ago a gentleman named Eugene C. Bonniwell decided to run for Congress from the Seventh District of Pennsylvania. Bonniwell was a member of the Knights of Columbus.

He was opposed by Thomas S. Butler, who won. During the campaign, some anti-Bonniwell forces circulated the "oath" to help Butler get in.

Butler later repudiated this help and said it lost, rather than gained him votes.

The Control of Crime Through Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL HAYDEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 16, 1960

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, because of the excellent way in which the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia, Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, has set forth the importance of effective cooperation between the State and the Federal authorities having jurisdiction over the enforcement of laws to control and punish criminal activities, I am directing the attention of Senators to an address that he is delivering this evening at Richmond, before the convention of the Virginia State Sheriffs' and City Sergeants' Association.

All of us who have been privileged to serve with him in the Senate have repeatedly observed the way in which Senator ROBERTSON has forcefully demonstrated his ability to utilize his wide and accurate knowledge of historical facts to stress the importance of maintaining a clearcut distinction between the functions to be performed by the State and Federal Governments. At Richmond there will be no departure by the Senator from his usual clarity of expression in that respect.

We have in common experience gained as law enforcement officers when we were young men. Senator ROBERTSON was the Commonwealth attorney for Rockbridge County for 6 years and I was the sheriff of Maricopa County in the Territory of Arizona for 5 years. I learned, as he did, that there are those who will commit crimes and that there are always available many others who can be depended upon to support law and order when convinced that honest enforcement efforts are being made.

As the Senator from Virginia clearly indicates, the availability of speedy transportation has made crime a national menace. I join with him in praise for the way in which the Federal Bureau of Investigation is rendering invaluable assistance to the States in resisting the impact of organized crime. No such help was available when we were county officers.

In 1923, I first became acquainted with J. Edgar Hoover, then a young man serving as an Assistant Director of the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice. I was impressed with his earnest plea for the establishment of an Identification Division in that Bureau where fingerprints from all parts of the Nation could be assembled and classified. I promptly agreed to assist him in that effort because during my service as sheriff fingerprints and a photograph which I had the good fortune to obtain from the Ohio State Penitentiary resulted in the capture of Louis V. Etynge, who, after I brought him back from San Francisco, was convicted of murder in the first degree.

When the Department of Justice appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1924 was under consideration, I joined in urging that the Bureau of Investigation be provided with funds to acquire, maintain, and exchange criminal identification records with the State and city authorities, and my recollection is that about $50,000 were made available for that purpose.

It was not until 1931 that Mr. Hoover's proposal was finally consummated by the permanent establishment of the Division of Identification in the Bureau of Investigation. As Senator ROBERTSON points out, during the intervening 36 years the FBI Identification Division has acquired more than 150 million fingerpoint cards in its files.

I ask unanimous consent that the address to be made by Senator ROBERTSON, to which I have referred, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CONTROL OF CRIME THROUGH COOPERATION

(Remarks of Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON at the convention of the Virginia State Sheriffs' and City Sergeants' Association, John Marshall Hotel, Richmond, Va., August 16, 1960)

For 6 years, I served as the Commonwealth's attorney for Rockbridge County, and will always be grateful for the experience, because, through it, I learned about county government and the problems of law-enforcement officers. I soon learned that a Commonwealth's attorney could not hope to make a record as a good prosecuting attorney without a good sheriff. You can't send a felon to the penitentiary before he is caught, and after he is caught you can't convict him without proving criminal intent and the corpus delicti.

A joke is told on some criminal lawyers that their fee is determined by whether they must furnish the evidence or have it furnished by the client. Commonwealth's attorneys must rely principally upon their sheriffs in establishing the fact that a crime has been committed and connecting the prisoner with it.

Nothing more clearly indicates the march of time and changes in social customs than the history of the office of sheriff. It was an office we inherited from our English ancestors, where it existed among the Anglo-Saxons even before the Norman Conquest. In fact, the word "sheriff" is a Saxon word indicating the executive officer of a shire, or English county. The Saxons probably elected their sheriffs, but after the Norman Conquest the sheriff became the personal representative of the King, appointed by him from a list of three submitted by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Judges of the King's Bench. As the personal representative of the King, the sheriff was the most important and most powerful man in his

shire, which was known as his bailiwick; and, incidentally, the office was very remunerative. I don't know what the early office of sheriff paid in England, but I find a record of the fact that in Scotland the deputies, there known as sheriff's deputes received salaries from $2,500 to $10,000 a year, so the sheriff probably received as much as $25,000 per year.

However, in Scotland, in addition to being an administrative official, the sheriff and his deputies were also trial justices for misdemeanors and warrants on small claims.

When the Colonial Government was set up in Virginia, we naturally followed the English system, with sheriffs appointed for a term of 1 year by the Governor (the King's representative) from a list of three peace commissioners recommended by the county court. The sheriffs of that day and time were also tax collectors, and that duty is still exercised by the sheriffs of West Virginia. From colonial days until a fish and game department was created in 1916, Virginia sheriffs were the sole game wardens; and until the creation of the motor vehicle division, they were highway traffic patrolmen, combining all of these duties and functions in some counties for the munificent salary of $600 a year, plus some small fees which usually went to the deputies, as they received no salary. About the only thing the Virginia sheriff doesn't have to do that the English sheriff did is to furnish liquor and other refreshments to the judges. But even in that pleasant function of the English sheriff he has assistance from a distinguished group known as "riders with the sheriff."

The appointment of sheriffs by the Governor continued until the spring of 1775, when the then Governor, Lord Dunsmore, suspended normal governmental functions, declared martial law, and took refuge on a British man-of-war. On March 20, 1775, a convention was held in the city of Richmond to consider what steps the Colonies should take to preserve their freedom, and as stated in the call of the convention: "To bring about a return of the halcyon days of peace and prosperity." That was a remarkable convention, attended by two representatives who afterward became President—Washington, who represented Fairfax; Jefferson, who represented Albemarle; and Benjamin Harrison of Charles City County, father of a third President. Rockbridge, which was then a part of Botetcourt, was represented by John Bowyer; Augusta, east of the Alleghenies, was represented by Thomas Lewis (a descendant of John Lewis, the first white settler in the valley), and Samuel McDowell. The area west of the Alleghenies that extended to the Mississippi River was represented by John Harvie. Shenandoah County, then called Dunmore, was represented by a young Lutheran preacher named Peter Muhlenberg. It was in that convention that he made the acquaintance of George Washington, who in 1776 named him a colonel in the Continental Army, where he served with much bravery and distinction and rose to the rank of major general.

The convention met again in Richmond on July 17, 1775, and again on December 1, 1775, and at this last session, among other things, made provision for the appointment of sheriffs. Under the terms of that resolution, whenever the term of a sheriff expired his successor was appointed for a term of 1 year by the county court. In colonial times the office of sheriff in Virginia, as in the mother country, was a very high and respected post, but in Virginia the work of the sheriff has always been difficult, at times dangerous, and in many counties underpaid.

In many respects, I think Virginia has the best government of any State in the Union. I am satisfied that in no State is justice administered on a cleaner and higher basis, but I have frequently felt that we in Virginia have not attached sufficient importance to the offices of sheriff and city sergeant, nor adequately remunerated the clean, able, and brave men who have been willing to assume those important posts.

One must smile as he reads the record that there could be no court held in Augusta County for 4 years after it was formed from Orange in 1738 because no one could be found willing to assume the duties of sheriff. And for many years after the county was formed, there was a continuing order of the court exempting from jury duty in Staunton citizens of the county who lived on the Mississippi River. We have expected too much of our sheriffs and city sergeants and at times have required them to make brick without straw. The real significance of that Biblical reference was that the children of Israel had to furnish their own straw, gathering it in the fields at night after making brick in the concentration camps all day. And out of the meager salaries and fees allowed our sheriffs and city sergeants we have expected them to respond to every call for help (traveling at their own expense), and, when some major crime has been committed, to spend days and weeks in working up the evidence.

It was not surprising that our State and local law enforcement officers found themselves unable to compete with ruthless bands of organized criminals, operating across the State lines. Good roads and fast, easy means of transportation became the allies of organized crime as far back as 1920, when bootleggers and hijackers began to operate in this country on a major scale. It was in response to this situation that the Federal Government in 1934 passed the Fugitive Felon Act. As you know, this act, as it exists today, makes it a Federal offense to flee across State lines to avoid prosecution, custody or confinement for serious criminal acts. The FBI has had the responsibility of investigating violations under this statute, but before it can enter such a case, there must be indication that the fugitive has left the State, and local authorities must agree to extradite the criminal when he is located. The law provides for Federal prosecution, but, very properly, this rarely occurs since the primary purpose of the act is to locate and return to local custody those individuals who have committed serious crimes.

The value of this cooperative function, between Federal and local governments, is evident when statistics for the fiscal year 1959 are noted. In that year, 1,149 Fugitive Felon Act subjects were located by the FBI, an increase of more than 12 percent over the previous alltime high established in 1958.

I mention this act, because it seems to me that it furnishes the framework of a proper relationship between the Federal Government and local governments for cooperation in law enforcement. It is a framework in which the responsibilities are shared, but the primary responsibility for crimes of a local nature remains with the local law enforcement officers. There are, of course, other proper areas where the Federal Government can and does assist you in your most important work. When I spoke to your group in 1936, I urged you to make full use of the facilities which had only recently been made available to you through the FBI. The FBI National Academy had been initiated only in 1935, the year before I spoke to your group, and I urged your members to attend the courses of training provided by the Academy, which is commonly referred to as the "West Point of law enforcement." I'm glad to learn that you have done so. Since the inception of this Academy, there have been a total of 133 graduates from the State of Virginia, and of this number, I am informed, 94 are still active in law enforcement in Virginia.

One of the most notable Virginia graduates of the National Academy is Col. Charles W. Woodson, Jr., superintendent, Virginia State Police, Richmond, Va., who is currently president of the International Association of Chiefs of Police. Colonel Woodson was also the president of his National Academy class in 1940.

Two very excellent officers in the State of Virginia have been selected to attend the National Academy starting on August 15, 1960. They are Sheriff Harold Clark Taylor, Isle of Wight County, and Lt. Julius Marvin Boyers, police department, Staunton, Va.

It is heartening to note that the citizens and law-enforcement officials of the State of Virginia have recognized the professional nature of police work and are actively participating by sending police officers to the FBI National Academy.

Other services of the FBI which I called your attention to in 1936 were the FBI Laboratory and the FBI Identification Division.

During fiscal year 1959, a total of 1,886 examinations were made by the FBI Laboatory on specimens submitted by Virginia law-enforcement agencies. The FBI Laboratory is an excellent source of scientific aid which is available to law-enforcement agencies simply for the asking. The examination of a piece of evidence is performed without cost to the agency, and, if requested, the FBI will send the laboratory technician to testify as an expert witness at a local trial, also at no cost to the agency.

The FBI Identification Division now includes in its files 156,402,518 fingerprint cards, representing over 75 million persons. Ninety-five law-enforcement agencies in the State of Virginia are presently contributing to this division.

The FBI has established a disaster squad of highly trained fingerprint experts who, upon the request of law-enforcement authorities, are immediately dispatched to disaster areas in an effort to identify casualties. This humanitarian service has been utilized in the last several years largely in connection with plane crashes. In January of this year, the disaster squad was called upon to assist local authorities in identification of the victims of the plane crash which occurred in Charles City County, Va. This again, it seems to me, is a proper function of the Federal Government.

Another service provided by the Federal Government is the FBI police schools.

During fiscal year 1960, a total of 54 police schools were conducted by the FBI in the State of Virginia. In addition, the FBI conducted five specialized law-enforcement conferences on the subject of auto theft during the first part of 1960. These schools not only acquaint officers with new investigative techniques and methods, but also advise them of the many ways the FBI can assist them in the solution of a crime through the use of their Laboratory or Identification Division.

Schools of this nature are an example of the excellent instruction that is available to law-enforcement officers today. Officers, because of the highly professional nature of their work, should constantly strive to keep abreast of new scientific methods and techniques which they may apply in the course of their investigations.

In spite of the cooperation between local law-enforcement officials and the Federal Government, and in spite of the modern methods of scientific detection and identification, crime in the United States continues to rise.

An estimated 1,553,992 serious crimes were committed in the United States in 1958, a rise of 9 percent in comparison with the previous year. This rise in crime has far exceeded the rate of population increase in the country. The overall rise of 9 percent for 1958 was supported by increases in each of the 7 serious crime categories, namely, forcible rape, robbery, burglary, larceny over $50,

aggravated assault, murder, and automobile thefts.

Preliminary crime data for 1959 reveals that crimes against the person rose 7 percent. Crimes against property increased 1 percent, according to reports received from police in cities over 25,000. Some individual offenses, showed marked changes as follows: Aggravated assault, up 7 percent; murder, up 5 percent; rape, up 4 percent; and robbery, down 2 percent. Burglary showed no noticeable change, while auto thefts and major larcenies rose 2 percent and 1 percent respectively.

The continuing increase in crime is reflected in statistics for the first 6 months of 1960, when crime increased an additional 9 percent. During this period there was a sharp upward trend in serious crimes reported by cities over 25,000. Robberies were up 13 percent, reflecting the highest increase, followed closely by burglaries with a 12 percent rise, while larcenies over $50 rose 8 percent. These figures for the first 6 months of 1960 show a total of 462,396 offenses against property reported by contributing cities. That is an increase of over 40,000 more burglaries, robberies, and thefts than occurred during the same period in 1959. The minimum loss which this figure represents is a staggering $134 million.

In view of this increase in crime, all of us, and not only those of you who are immediately responsible, should concern ourselves with the problem of law enforcement. In my opinion cooperation, as exists between the State and Federal Governments, is the most effective weapon against the criminal world. This cooperation, however, must extend to every citizen of the United States.

In speaking of the continued increase in crime in the United States, J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has observed that many citizens have a detached attitiude toward crime; that they are seldom concerned with the plight of their neighbors who have been victimized by vicious criminals. He pointed out that all too often brutal crimes arouse only morbid curiosity or mild sympathy for the victims, instead of indignation and concerted action against lawbreakers who all too often have shown utter contempt for human lives and rights.

Mr. Hoover cited the fact that the rising tide of crime is not attributable alone to our population growth, but is traceable primarily to the two following conditions:

(1) There has been an unfortunate spread of moral deterioration among growing communities of our population. This is not evinced alone in the rise of bank robberies and crimes of violence but includes the willingness of many law-abiding Americans to compromise their ideals if an easy dollar can be made. This concept is commonly known in our society as "payola."

(2) Public apathy toward crime and other dangerous conditions has been on the rise in too many American communities. Such apathy attacks man's sensitivity to the difference between right and wrong. Its symptoms are lethargy, self-indulgence, and the desire of personal pleasure before duty.

The problem of young people involved in crime activities is tragic. The increasing frequency of youth crimes is compounded by an increasing savagery in their commission.

Many authorities in noting the continued increase in crime and the resultant danger to our country have loudly advocated the establishment of various types of national crime commissions and national police forces. Crime commissions and national police forces are not the answer to this serious problem. Local crimes should be handled by local authorities with the assistance of the many cooperative facilities available to all law enforcement today.

There have also been in recent years many proposals for invasion of the police powers of States by the Federal Government, in the guise of so-called civil rights bills, while the U.S. Supreme Court on a number of occasions has used the due process clause of the 14th amendment as an excuse for invading the police powers of the States, especially with respect to religious and loyalty issues. Those of us who have opposed these invasions have not done so because of any lack of sensitivity to the rights of every American to enjoy the benefits of the Constitution, but because we know that ultimately the enjoyment by all citizens of all their civil rights depends upon the preservation of a Federal Union composed of sovereign States which had reserved to themselves or the people thereof all powers not delegated to the Central Government. The retention within the States of the police power is one of the most important elements of sovereignty which were wisely retained by the State governments at the time of the formation of the Union. Alexander Hamilton recognized this. In spite of his reputation as an advocate of a strong Central Government, he wrote in The Federalist, No. 17, as follows:

"There is one transcendent advantage belonging to the province of the State governments, which alone suffices to place the matter in a clear and satisfactory light—I mean the ordinary administration of criminal and civil justice. This, of all others, is the most powerful, most universal, and most attractive source of popular obedience and attachment. It is that which, being the immediate and visible guardian of life and property, having its benefits and its terrors in constant activity before the public eye, regulating all those personal interests and familiar concerns to which the sensibility of individuals is more immediately awake, contributes, more than any other circumstance, to impressing upon the minds of the people, affection, esteem, and reverence toward the Government. This great cement of society, which will diffuse itself almost wholly through the channels of the particular governments, independent of all other causes of influence, would insure them so decided an empire over their respective citizens as to render them at all times a complete counterpoise, and not unfrequently, dangerous rivals to the power of the Union."

Even though Hamilton may not have been accurate in his prediction that the retention of police power in the States would make them "dangerous rivals to the power of the Union," he was entirely accurate in his appraisal of the importance to the concept of federalism of the retention of the police powers within the States. It is no accident that the dictatorships of the recent past, and the Communist nations of the present, are called police states. Every government, of course, exercises police powers; but in the police states those powers are exercised with oppressive ruthlessness by the Central Government rather than by local jurisdictions.

Those of us who represent you in the Federal Government must maintain the concept of States rights if our Government is to remain one of individual freedom and opportunity. But the success of our efforts, and the retention of our liberties and opportunities, depend to a great extent upon those of you who have the duty and responsibility for exercising the great police powers which you continue to hold. I know that Virginia peace officers will, as they have in the past, be worthy custodians of these powers.

Address by Hon. Alan S. Boyd, Member, Civil Aeronautics Board, Before Association of Local Transport Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 16, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the recent brief adjournment, it was my pleasure to attend the quarterly regional meeting of the Association of Local Transport Airlines, held in the Beverly Wilshire Hotel, July 18–19, in Los Angles, Calif., at which Pacific Airlines was the host.

The Honorable Alan S. Boyd, a distinguished member of the Civil Aeronautics Board, addressed the meeting on the subject of the future of local service and short-haul transport airlines.

Quite aside from the usual exchange of pleasantries between guest speaker and audience, this address was hard hitting, advised the immediate development of a system of class mail pay rates and admonished the member carriers of ALTA to prepare themselves psychologically for an efficient class rate system. Airline managements were also cautioned to develop a favorable climate for the local service carriers to insure an eventual reduction of subsidy by a judicious use of the CAB "use it or lose it" policy.

When the regulator and the regulatees, as represented by this energetic industry association known as ALTA can talk straight from the shoulder to each other as was done in this address, great strides in public-interest concepts and their application to short-haul air-transport industry can be envisioned.

Knowing of the sincere interest of Senators in the subject of short-haul air transport to some 533 smaller communities of the 50 States, I ask unanimous consent that the speech which the Honorable Alan S. Boyd delivered on this occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LOOK TO THE FUTURE

In looking to the future of the local service carriers, it is obvious that for some time the main concern of those carriers with Government regulation will continue to be the level of direct subsidy payments. Subsidy is provided to the locals by Congress to assure the maintenance and development of services which meet the public interest in and need for air transportation of mail, passengers, and cargo over routes and through communities which cannot immediately or soon support airline operations profitably.

Granted that such services are essential and that subsidy is still necessary to their support. Nevertheless, we who are believers in a self-sustaining free enterprise system must recognize that subsidy is a financial crutch. It is evidence of internal weakness. The sooner the industry is rid of it, the better. Manifestly, this cannot be done

tomorrow. But I believe that over a reasonable period of years the local service carriers can be so strengthened within as to become self-supporting, thereby eliminating the need for subsidization.

I am sure that you all join me in wanting to see strong, independent local airline companies, free of the necessity to depend on outside priming. Reliance on continued subsidy payments over the long run is risky in itself. The temper of the times goes into the making of such payments. It may be assumed that many persons will insist that the locals at some time throw away the crutch, as did the trunkline operators. Conceivably it could be jerked away by a Congress pressed by the need to appropriate great sums of money for other purposes. As you know, the executive has already touched on the subject from a budget standpoint.

I personally do not believe that drastic cuts are imminent or desirable now, but I know that the carriers and the Civil Aeronautics Board are expected to come forward with plans which will lead to the end of subsidy. Probably it will go up before it goes down, especially in consideration of anticipated service expansion and the acquisition of costly new flight equipment. An increase in subsidy need can easily be explained. It can be justified, however, only by demonstrating that the increase is the temporary means of accomplishing the final objective, which is subsidy-free, profitmaking local service operations, characterized by safety, speed, adequacy and economy.

The reconciliation of these many requirements will not be easy of attainment. Nor can it be effected in a haphazard way. A program is needed. Neither Congress, nor the Executive, nor the public, nor the CAB will be long content with the idea of paying out public funds in unknown quantities for an indeterminate number of services. The position will have to be regularized. It is much too loose today. The Board at present is unable with certainty to fix payments that are required by individual carriers until after a lengthy, tedious, ex post facto review of carrier operations and claims. Disallowances and compromises have us all unhappy. It is for these reasons that the Board and its staff are working so diligently with the local carriers to formulate a system of class mail pay rates.

The Civil Aeronautics Board is vested by statute with the authority and responsibility to ascertain the amount and methods by which subsidy is to be paid. It is necessary for the Board to justify to Congress its request each fiscal year for specific sums of money to be used for subsidy purposes. Up to now we have exercised this authority on a somewhat ad hoc basis. In my opinion, this system has not given us the degree of control over the matter that we should have, and intend to have in the future.

By control I mean simply that the Board should be in a position to know in advance what substantially will be the subsidy cost to the Government for the operation of each segment of a carrier's route, depending upon the type of equipment and number of schedules operated. The carriers will have the benefit of the same information. The class rate system as presently conceived should provide carrier management with a sounder basis for operational planning, and should provide the Board with a better understanding of what service will be provided for how much subsidy money during the ensuing year.

Additionally, it is hoped that the advent of class rates will markedly diminish debate on disallowances of claimed expenses and costs.

The Board feels that it has given full evidence of good faith and a sincere desire to bolster the progress of the local service carriers. The recent announcement of our decision on rate of return is an example. Others include the elimination of various certificate restrictions, and what we trust are beneficial route awards. We must have similar evidence of good faith from the industry.

I ask you to prepare yourselves psychologically for the class rate system. I ask you to help in its development and to use your best efforts to make it work when it is instituted. I am not entirely happy with progress in this connection so far. I will accuse no one of dragging his heels, but I will say this: Subsidy is the local service carrier's Achilles' heel and if I were you I would not risk the consequences of moving so slowly as to make a better target of my most vulnerable spot.

The introduction of the class rate system may not be an altogether happy change for all carriers. However, not all carriers are happy with the present arrangement. We are going to devise a system which we feel is equitable. We are going to put it into effect on January 1, 1961. We believe a class rate will be an improvement in the public interest and in the interest of the local service carriers as a whole. We can and will make it work.

The time is fast approaching for the first large-scale review of the "use it or lose it" policy. No doubt, this will involve service at communities you would like to drop and others which you would prefer to continue. In many cases the communities where you want to drop service will themselves want it continued. One of the fundamental questions here will be whether the service actually provided constituted a fair trial to develop the passenger (or cargo) potential.

In these cases do not waste the Board's time in asserting that the burden is on the community to show that it did not have a fair trial. One burden you carry under subsidized regulation is that of showing you provided the best possible schedule of service consonant with the other requirements of your system. For your own best interests do not attempt to shift this burden; rather, prepare yourself to carry it candidly.

It is my belief that the Board must act with dispatch in pruning dead limbs from the local service tree. This becomes a necessity in view of the growing volume of the annual subsidy bill. But we do not propose to eliminate a community if it can be shown that the carrier failed to provide reasonably adequate service during the period under review. Nor will we eliminate services only because they are not profitmaking. Elimination will be based on a showing to the effect that the services are no longer required by the public convenience and necessity.

The application of the "use it or lose it" policy will surely result in the abandonment of some stations, but it does not follow that local service will diminish in the sense that fewer points will be served by local carriers. As below-minimum traffic points are eliminated, promising new points will be added to your systems on a trial basis. Many points of proven potential to be abandoned by the trunkline operators will be picked up profitably by the locals. As you know, the Board has taken the initiative in putting the issue of suspension of the trunks into the local service area cases. Recently the Board has approved suspension of 57 trunkline authorizations. In cases now pending, there are at issue 79 other trunkline points for suspension or deletion.

Step by step it is the intention of the Board to build up your systems. This will take time. Under the Federal Aviation Act, a point cannot be permanently deleted from a carrier's certificate without a formal hearing. But the Board does have a procedure available to dispose of cases on the pleadings through the means of temporary service suspension of the trunks and exemption to the local carriers. The Board has not and will not hesitate to use this procedure when it makes good sense to follow a policy of suspension and replacement. At the same time, however, it is essential to develop a favorable climate for the local service carriers to insure an eventual reduction of subsidy. Judicious selection of points and routes to be served by the local carriers, and relaxation of restrictions on their services should go to the accomplishment of the desired end. Longer stage length operations have been made possible by permitting extensive nonstop operations between terminals where there is no competition, and one-stop operations between terminals where there is competition after one or two round trips a day have been provided to the immediate points. Effective use of your skip-stop authority is a means of improving the economics of your operations.

The foregoing views on local services and subsidy therefor lead me into the vital subject of public relations. My impression is that your relations with Congress are excellent. This is due in large part to the very efficient efforts of your genial Executive Director, General Adams. Mutual acquaintances in Congress speak of him with affection and respect. You are to be congratulated on having made so fortunate a choice to conduct the affairs of ALTA.

The cost-benefit study you had prepared for Congress earlier this year was a fine piece of work. It was directed at Congress to give a greater understanding of your operation—in effect a report of stewardship on moneys appropriated to the industry. But Congress is composed of a very small segment of the population. In the final analysis it is the general public who provides you with the crutch to which I referred in the beginning. In my judgment you need a broad public relations program directed at the general public, a program so designed as to advise the public of your problems—to gain public understanding—to obtain public support by showing the public benefits derived from local service operations.

Why do you operate DC–3's when others operate jets or turboprop equipment? Why do you make so many stops? Why is it that you only serve my town at 5 o'clock in the morning? Why don't you use helicopters? Why don't you fly on Sunday?

These are examples of many questions to which the public would like to have answers.

The kind of public relations I am talking about does not require paying for space in the newspapers or for time on radio or television. The industry you represent is big business in this country and is a legitimate subject for news or magazine articles or station sponsored coverage.

It will require a lot of work to bring this idea to fruition, but if you are willing to persevere, there is every reason to believe that you can obtain space in magazines such as Life or Look. The Saturday Evening Post has editors constantly looking for worthwhile material. The American Weekly comes into millions of homes with the newspaper each Sunday morning. An article in Reader's Digest could be of immense value to the industry.

Space like this is not for sale. It is available to people and enterprises which are newsworthy or which have a story of general interest to tell. The local service industry should easily qualify.

Your industry got its toehold in the forties. It spent most of the fifties suffering from malnutrition. The decade beginning with 1960 should be one of sustained growth. The burden, of course, is on you. You must win the support and sympathy of the general public through national media and through contacts in the communities throughout the Nation which you collectively serve. Your intimate knowledge of local needs should make it possible for you to put your story over and to enlist support. You must convince the people on your routes that your

locally concentrated activities will result in better air service for them. Explain to them the technical why's and wherefore's of trunk suspension and local substitution. Educate them in airport and flight equipment problems and airline economics to the extent that they will willingly back your efforts to replace the trunks.

It can be shown that you can meet the greater part of the air transportation needs of smaller cities more effectively than low-frequency, or off-hour trunk services, that you will operate the equipment suitable to their needs and their airport facilities, that you must be free of trunk competition between many points in order to build up your financial position. True, some communities in losing trunks will have to forgo single-plane service or nonstop service to distant points, but this transportation does not constitute the bulk of air travel from smaller cities and towns. Given the opportunity to enjoy their full support, you can do a better job for them.

This is your first public relations job. You must follow up by solidifying your position before Congress and the Board. I believe you can do this by cooperating with the implementation of a sound program for the control and gradual elimination of subsidy.

In these endeavors I am sure that you will have the wholehearted assistance of the Board. I urge you to exert every effort toward their accomplishment and your own reward.

Nation's Jobs Total Shows Rise in July

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 16, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Nation fortunately is moving forward economically—despite the outcries of some who would falsely give the impression that we are "on the rocks." In July, for example, the number of employed reached an alltime record of 68,600,000.

We recognize, of course, that there is still a small percentage of unemployed as well as some other economic problems throughout the country. Those, of course, must be dealt with as quickly and effectively as possible.

Reflecting the forward movement in our employment—a fundamental factor in our overall economy, however—I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the Milwaukee Journal printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 11, 1960]

NATION'S JOBS TOTAL SHOWS RISE IN JULY

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Unemployment has dropped to 406,000 in July, while the number of people holding jobs increased by 110,000, the Labor Department reported Wednesday.

The number of unemployed dropped from 4,423,000 to 4,017,000, while the number holding jobs increased from 68,579,000 to 68,689,000.

EXCEPTIONS CITED

Secretary of Labor James P. Mitchell described the changes as mainly seasonal.

He noted as exceptions a better than seasonable pickup in construction employment and continued job cutbacks in the steel industry.

The overall reduction in unemployment was about usual for this time of year, and the seasonally adjusted rate of unemployment of 5.4 percent compared with 5.5 percent in June.

DECLINE EXPLAINED

Unemployment among teenagers dropped sharply—by about 550,000—but employment among adults rose by nearly 150,000 as a result of cuts in jobs in durable goods industries, mainly in autos and steel.

Seymour L. Wolfbein, the Labor Department's top manpower expert, attributed the decline in employment in the auto industry to model changeovers.

He said the steel production decline was the major weak spot in the economy.

"But it is not fair to say that this is a harbinger of recession," he said. "We're still operating at record alltime highs in total employment."

The number of unemployed workers covered by insurance rose more than seasonally to 1,700,000, an increase of nearly 150,000.

Statement To Be Delivered by Senator Douglas at the Silver Anniversary Convention of Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 16, 1960

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement to be given by me at the silver anniversary convention of the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America meeting this week in Chicago.

There being no objection, the statemented was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PAUL H. DOUGLAS ON THE SILVER ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION OF THE CATHOLIC WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America will hold their 25th annual convention in Chicago during the week beginning August 15. Elaborate preparations have been made to make this silver anniversary the largest convention ever held by this organization. It is anticipated that the exetnsive program planned will attract more than 7,000 members of the Catholic War Veterans and its auxiliaries. I assure them all a warm welcome from our great, hospitable city of Chicago.

The convention committee has set up an agenda calling for a full schedule of committee meetings that will study and prepare resolutions for action by the entire body. Hundreds of resolutions have already been received covering many phases of American life including "Veterans Affairs," "Youth Welfare," "Catholic Action," "Americanism," "Membership," and many other subjects in which an organization of war veterans is vitally interested.

At various times throughout the convention, prominent Americans are scheduled to address joint sessions of the Catholic War Veterans and its auxiliaries. These men, all outstanding in their particular field, will bring to the Catholic War Veterans and through them to all veterans and Americans messages on "National Secuitry," "Veterans Affairs," "International Relations" and other vital subjects.

Although the convention will have many serious aspects, varied and interesting recreational events have been arranged for the members of the organization, their wives and families. On Tuesday evening preceding the convention, Comiskey Park will hold Catholic War Veterans night with a baseball game between the Chicago White Sox and the Detroit Tigers to be followed by a fireworks display. On the following day a golf tournament will be held at the Acacia Country Club, and at noon a band concert will take place at State and Madison Streets in downtown Chicago. Throughout the week there will be other interesting activities and ceremonies including a parade on Friday evening, and on Saturday morning a Pontifical High Mass will be celebrated by His Eminence, Cardinal Meyer, archbishop of Chicago. Closing events of the week-long gathering will include a banquet on Saturday evening to be followed by the convention ball.

The Catholic War Veterans of the United States came into existence in the year 1935 when it was founded by a former Army chaplain, the Right Reverend Monsignor Edward J. Higgins, LL.D., of Astoria, Long Island, N.Y. Recognizing a need for a militant veterans organization composed of Catholic men and women who served their country in time of war, Monsignor Higgins founded an organization that has grown throughout the years and now has posts in more than 40 States.

Over the past quarter of a century the Catholic War Veterans has been been a bulwark against many of the tyrannical "isms" that constantly threaten our country and its freedoms. Since its beginning the Catholic War Veterans have brought their greatest force against the evils of communism and its insidious designs to destroy Christianity and create a godless world. For the 25 years that this organization has been in existence it has steadfastly supported and protected the traditions that have made America the great country that it is.

As well as fighing relentlessly against communism the Catholic War Veterans have been active on other fronts sponsoring such programs as "Americanism," "Catholic Action," "Leadership," "Membership," and "Veterans Affairs." In addition, through its publications and other media of communication this organization has encouraged active civil defense programs, educational activities, and youth programs as well as the establishment of scholarships.

In the field of veterans' affairs the Catholic War Veterans has always exerted its influence. Each year the organization has sponsored or lent its support to legislation that would be beneficial to veterans, their widows, or dependents. Through welfare and rehabilitation officers located throughout the country it has assisted countless veterans in obtaining benefits under the laws of the Veterans' Administration. The Catholic War Veterans have maintainued a strong and active hospital program giving comfort to our thousands of hospitalized veterans. These and many other programs stand as a tribute to the Catholic War Veterans on this, its 25th anniversary.

The Catholic War Veterans have received the acclamation of numerous Government agencies, business groups and patriotic, veteran and fraternal organizations. It has the approbation of the present Pope, John XXIII, and all Popes from the date of the founding of the organization. It has been lauded by every President of the United States and by numerous legislators and other statesmen.

Article II, section 1 of its constitution best describes the aims and purposes of this great organization:

"This organization of Catholic War Veterans is established to promote zeal and devotion for God, for country, and for home:

"(a) For God: To promote through aggressive organized Catholic action a greater love, honor, and service to God; an understanding and application of the teachings of Christ in our everyday life; recognizing the wisdom of the church in all matters of faith and morals.

"(b) For country: Through a more vivid understanding of the Constitution of the United States of America and through active participation in the promotion of its ideals of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, to develop a more zealous citizenship; to encourage morality in government, labor, management, economic, social, fraternal, and all other phases of American life; to combat aggressively the forces which tend to impair the efficiency and permanency of our free institution.

"(c) For home: To promote the realization that the family is the basic unit of society; to aid in the development of an enlightened patriotic American youth; to assist all veterans and widows and dependents of deceased veterans.

"(d) These objectives are encouraged without regard to race, creed, or color."

As they celebrate this silver jubilee, the Catholic War Veterans can look back upon a history of accomplishment and to the future with a feeling of confidence.

I am sure all their many friends join in wishing for them the best convention in their history and continued success in working for their high ideals.

Seaton Is Acclaimed for Conservation Achievements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 16, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the preservation, conservation, and best utilization of our natural resources is an absolute must—if these resources are to be ample to serve the generations of the future.

To accomplish such a broad-scope task, however, requires great efforts and support from individuals, organizations, as well as local, State, and Federal Governments—in their appropriate roles.

Consequently, the Nation can be particularly proud of the role of Secretary of the Interior Fred Seaton in providing sound, realistic leadership for such a constructive, creative program.

In recognition of his outstanding services, the Secretary was recently cited by one of the foremost conservation groups in the country for "distinguished and courageous service rendered in the conservation and management of the country's natural resources."

Recently, the Conservation News, published by the National Wildlife Federation, contained an article on the citation to the Secretary. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEATON IS ACCLAIMED FOR CONSERVATION ACHIEVEMENTS

Secretary of the Interior Fred A. Seaton was cited June 20 by many of the Nation's foremost conservation groups for distinguished and courageous service rendered in the conservation and management of the country's natural resources.

Seaton, principal speaker at the annual banquet of the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, was given a distinguished conservation service award in a surprise ceremony by 15 major organizations representing official agencies, societies, and millions of outdoor enthusiasts and conservationists.

A spokesman for the groups said that this is the first time they have jointly honored a Cabinet member for conservation achievement and service. He said they were pleased to be able to honor Seaton in the West where much of the public lands administered by the Interior Department are located.

Citing Seaton were the Western Association of State Game and Fish Commissioners, International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, Boone and Crockett Club, Izaak Walton League of America, National Audubon Society, National Parks Association, National Rifle Association of America, National Wildlife Federation, Natural Resources Council of America, North American Wildlife Foundation, Sierra Club, Sport Fishing Institute, American Forestry Association, Wilderness Society, and the Wildlife Management Institute.

Bordering the large scroll presented Seaton are scenes depicting conservation issues in which he has taken part since becoming Interior Secretary in 1956. The presentation was made by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, president of the Wildlife Management Institute, and former chief of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Claude D. Kelley, president of the National Wildlife Federation, also participated in the presentation.

Seaton's conservation and natural resources management accomplishments cited on the scroll were actions in which he:

"Protected Federal wildlife refuges from unwise exploitation; maintained the famous Tule Lake and Lower Klamath National Wildlife Refuges (California and Oregon); advocated and actively worked for the establishment of the Arctic Wildlife Range (Alaska); blocked encroachment upon the Wichita Mountains National Wildlife Refuge (Oklahoma); dedicated all duck stamp funds to the acquisition of waterfowl lands; and

"Aggressively pushed toward completion the Mission 66 national parks program; acted forthrightly to prevent inundation of the world famous Rainbow Bridge National Monument (Utah); prevented encroachment upon the Kennesaw Mountain National Battlefield Park (Ga.); established the new Virgin Islands National Park; and

"Insisted that the salmon runs of the Columbia River and tributaries be perpetuated; promoted strengthening and broadening of the Federal Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act; directed that recreational needs be planned as an integral part of all future reclamation projects; took the lead in plans to set aside and preserve seashore and lakefront areas for public use; supported wilderness preservation; and

"Took steps to require unauthorized occupants of public lands along the Lower Colorado River to recognize Federal authority to control and regulate such occupancy; and issued orders to provide public access to unappropriated public domain lands for recreational uses."

Address of Rear Adm. Beverly M. Coleman, Manassas Battlefield, Manassas, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 16, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address made by Rear Adm. Beverly M. Coleman at the annual exercise in commemoration of the First Battle of Manassas, Manassas battlefield, July 16, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF BEVERLY M. COLEMAN AT THE ANNUAL EXERCISE IN COMMEMORATION OF THE FIRST BATTLE OF MANASSAS, MANASSAS BATTLEFIELD, JULY 16, 1960

WHY THEY FOUGHT

I. Introduction

Madam Chairman, ladies of the UDC, honored guests, and fellow visitors to this historic site, we have met today in commemoration of the military engagement here enacted nearly 100 years ago. For these annual meetings we are indebted to the District of Columbia chapters of the United Daughters of the Confederacy, of which Mrs. Imes, our chairman, is division president, and it is these kind ladies and others like them who have kept alive over the century an interest in the study and commemoration of the Civil War that have largely furnished the inspiration which will bring about the interesting happenings awaiting us in the coming 4 years.

II. The centennial

If there are any who regard such memorial exercises as but efforts to keep alive a past better forgotten, let me for a moment address myself directly to them. The U.S. Congress has seen fit to create a National Civil War Centennial Commission. Such action was warmly approved by the President, and the Commission has as its chairman Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, and as vice chairman, former Gov. WILLIAM M. TUCK, of Virginia.

The stated objective of this National Commission is that:

"This study must be based on a broad knowledge of the underlying facts. From the ingenuity and resourcefulness with which an unprepared people met the challenge of the first truly modern war, much can be learned. It goes without saying that where fables and legends have obscured the real truth, the truth must be made clear. We are not preparing to commemorate a romantic myth; we are making ready to look closer at a chapter of our own history, and the chapter must be accurate."

Our wisdom will be extended if we approach our studies in the activities of the coming centennial with clear, unbiased, and objective minds, giving credit where it is due, acknowledging brave and patriotic deeds of all who performed them, understanding fairly the motives of the actors in the great conflict, and in the spirit of the Civil War, characterized by an unknown author as "the last war between gentlemen."

III. First Manassas—Baptism of fire

The tactical operations of this First Battle of Manassas are too well know to need dis-

cussion here. But one aspect of the encounter merits notice. Most of those who later served as commanders of high rank in the eastern armies of both sides were active participants in this engagement. In the South, as of course in the North, many of the early leaders of units large and small had served as officers in the regular army of the United States. And a number were veterans of the battles and campaigns of the Mexican War. But first Manassas furnished the initial experience in Civil War combat for many in all ranks who thereafter continued to serve their respective sides.

In the northern Army were McDowell in full command; Burnside, who in 1862 led the Army of the Potomac at Fredericksburg; Sherman, whose Armies of the Tennessee, the Cumberland, and the Ohio marched through Georgia in 1864; and David Hunter, who ravaged the Shenandoah Valley in 1864. Also participating were Howard, Franklin, Porter, Tyler, and Heintzelman, all of whom later became distinguished commanders of high rank, and the able Artillerists Griffin and Ricketts, whose batteries performed so magnificently in taking their close-in position on Henry Hill in the very teeth of Jackson's brigade.

With the southern forces were General Beauregard and Gen. Joseph E. Johnston, the latter senior by a few days but permitting the former to carry out plans he had already formulated for the engagement. In lower echelons of rank were Longstreet and Jackson, who became General Lee's corps commanders when the Army of Northern Virginia was formed later. Others were Ewell and A. P. Hill, both promoted to corps command under General Lee in the reorganization which followed the death of Jackson in 1863. Jeb Stuart led the 1st Virginia Cavalry Regiment. Also taking part were Jubal Early, Kirby-Smith, Wade Hampton and his legion, Bee, Bartow, and Nathan G. Evans, the last named assigned the duty of holding the Stone Bridge over Bull Run at the left end of the Confederate line.

Evans' small force of half a brigade was the first to come under fire in the morning when Tyler approached the bridge with a brigade of Federal regulars. Shortly thereafter Evans received word the Union main body was executing a flanking movement and crossing the run at Sudley Ford on his left. Leaving four companies to hold off or delay Tyler, he quickly moved the remainder of his command to Mathews Hill where he engaged and drove back Burnsides' brigade forming the Union advance. Evans' delaying actions gave time for Bee and Bartow to come to his assistance and they together slowed the enemy column long enough for Jackson to take the main holding position of the day. This early decision of Evans has been termed "the quickest and coolest bit of military thinking done in this battle."

And a private in the ranks of the 1st Virginia Cavalry who subsequently rendered substantial service to his beloved commander, Jeb Stuart, wrote years later:

"When the bugle sounded on the morning of the 21st, in counting off, I was No. 1 in the first set of fours and rode at the head of the squadron that day. Nothing afterwards occurred in my military career that gives me more satisfaction to remember."

His name was John S. Mosby.

IV. Why they fought

It is not difficult to understand the point of view of the young men of the North who took up arms. Since early childhood they had been taught to love and be ready to defend their country. The immortal words of Nathan Hale in the Revolutionary War, "I only regret that I have but one life to lose for my country," and the inspiring toast of Stephen Decatur, "Our country • • • may she always be in the right; but our country, right or wrong," were well known to them. And they, like the young men of the South, were aroused by the vacuous oratorical platitudes of many hack politicians, fire-eating fanatics, and rabble-housing newspaper editors, too many of whom were quite willing to expose others to the hazards of warfare but were reluctant so to subject themselves. And so these young men marched off to fight for a cause in which they believed, and they acquitted themselves with honor and distinction.

Many persons who have never stopped to consider the influences which motivated those who fought for the Confederacy are quite willing to acknowledge their clearly demonstrated soldierly qualities, but regard them as misguided individuals who fought for reasons which they did not comprehend or in which they did not believe. But a limited understanding of human nature and an elementary knowledge of the historical happenings of the years immediately preceding the outbreak of the war should enable one readily to discern the truth on this point.

Toward whom does man entertain the strongest feelings of affection and obligation? Toward those to whom he is most closely bound by ties of blood and kinship. Next in order come his friends and neighbors. It is those whom he regards as his "people." One sees this clearly in General Lee's resignation of his commission in the Federal Army with the words, "Save in defense of my native State, I never desire again to draw my sword." Perhaps the fundamental difference lay in the fact that in the more thickly settled northern areas this feeling of "neighborliness" extended beyond State boundaries and drew emphasis to the meaning of the term "country," while in the more sparsely settled South the term "one's people" related more to the fellow citizens of one's State. Thus, with equal belief in the justice of his cause, one fought for his "country" and the other for his "State."

But there were two things that particularly aroused the ire of the people of the South: The overbearing attitude of many too-zealous crusaders and the falsely pious air of a number of the hypocrites in the north.

Harsh criticism by missionary spirits who do not or will not understand one's problem, and who are not themselves faced with the same problem, is strongly resented by any normal human being. On January 27, 1843, the Anti-Slavery Society in the north adopted a resolution declaring that "The compact which exists between the North and the South is a covenant with death and an agreement with hell." In February 1859, the New York State Anti-Slavery Convention met in Albany with addresses by Wendell Phillips and William Lloyd Garrison in support of a doctrine of the independence of States and an advocacy of disunion.

In October 1859, the fanatical John Brown undertook at Harpers Ferry to bring about an uprising of the slaves which, had it been successful, would have resulted in the murder of untold numbers of southern people. In the North, Henry Ward Beecher, Henry David Thoreau, and Ralph Waldo Emerson outdid themselves in eulogizing John Brown, Emerson going so far as to term Brown "the new saint awaiting his martyrdom, and who, if he shall suffer, will make the gallows glorious like the cross."

And then there was the hypocricy of many New Englanders who were so deeply disturbed about colored slavery in the South but evidenced little concern over white slavery in their own States, where children of tender years toiled in the textile mills from early morning until night under conditions highly injurious to health and with slight interest of their masters in their welfare. An Englishwoman in 1829 addressed an American audience in terms of reproach: "In your manufacturing districts you have children worked for 12 hours a day and • • • you will soon have them as in England, worked to death." Child labor was practically unregulated until after the Civil War. A few laws had been passed, but they remained on the statute books as so many dead letters. The inevitable result of this lack of regulation was not only that very young children were worked, but they worked long hours, overtime, and at night. Even in Lowell, Mass., where conditions were particularly favorable, little mites of 10 were on duty neraly 14 hours a day, and then did household tasks and went to evening school. A special report of the committee of the Massachusetts Legislature in 1866 disclosed witnesses from New Bedford and Fall River testified that in both places children of 7 were employed. In answer to the question: "Is there any limit on the part of the employers as to the age when they take children?" the reply was, "They'll take them at any age they can get them, if the are old enough to stand—I guess the youngest is about 7. There are some that's younger, but very little."

Few colored children in the South were treated in a manner approaching the inhumanness of many of these mill owners, and it ill behooved those intellectuals of the North to overlook shortcomings at home while bitterly denouncing persons elsewhere. The view of many southerners on this point was well expressed in the Book of Matthew:

"Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam out of thine own eye; and then thou shalt see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother's eye."

The better minds of the South recognized the moral wrong and harm of slavery and hoped, in time, to be able to overcome their hotheads at home and to moderate and ultimately eliminate this practice in a gradual and peaceful manner. But even theye were embittered by the action of those crusaders in the North who castigated them indiscriminately and seemed bent upon applying the torch and the sword.

The well-intentioned of both sides suffered from the acts of the fire-eaters in their midst, described by a northern officer and writer as:

"The shrill, rabid, tongue-lashing, notoriety-craving, and woe-breeding demagogues, whether born in the Northland or the Southland, who, by their rancorous, malignant speech, kindled the fires of our war. Read what appeared almost daily in the Southern press, consult the files of Congress, and mark the provoking, snarling poison-barbed language in the proceedings of Abolition conventions."

But when the die was cast, there was but one course open to them—they must go with their people. And so they did. In Virginia, her highest ranking military son, Robert E. Lee, declined the command of the Federal Armies to go with his State, writing his sister: "The whole South is in a state of revolution, into which Virginia, after a long struggle, has been drawn, and though I recognize no necessity for this state of things, and would have forborne and pleaded to the end for redress of grievances, real or supposed, yet in my own person I had to meet the question, whether I should take part against my native State." He was joined by many brother officers who entertained similar views. And countless numbers of her civilian sons who had opposed secession quickly enlisted as privates in the ranks of her forces, among them John S. Mosby, who wrote, "Virginia went out of the Union by force of arms and I went with her." These, with thousands of others, were impelled by the feeling that, regardless of personal views on any other points, they must stand by their people. And this they did for 4 long and hard years.

Those soldiers of the North and the South who fought because of a patriotic feeling of duty and obligation to their country, their State, or their people were the better men

referred to by the English philosopher, John Stuart Mill, thus:

"War is an ugly thing, but not the ugliest of things; the decayed and degraded state of moral and patriotic feeling which thinks nothing worth a war is worse * * * A man who has nothing which he cares about more than his personal safety is a miserable creature who has no chance of being free, unless made and kept so by the exertions of better men than himself."

And our Nation as it exists today can survive only so long as the people of each succeeding generation subscribe to that same point of view.

V. Conclusion

May we enter upon the coming observance of the centennial with a sincere desire to learn the lessons to be derived therefrom and in the spirit displayed at Appomattox by General Grant in his generous terms of surrender and prompt provision of rations to the Confederate troops, by the Union bands which there played "Auld Lang Syne," and by General Chamberlain commanding the V Corps assigned to receive the arms and colors of Lee's men, who, as General Gordon, at the head of the Confederate column, approached with downcast eyes and the feeling that the lines of soldiers in blue, standing at "order arms," were gloating over the spectacle, directed the sounding of a bugle call which brought the whole Federal line from right to left to "carry arms," the marching salute. General Chamberlain described that which followed:

"Gordon catches the sound of shifting arms, looks up and, taking the meaning, wheels superbly, making with himself and his horse one uplifted figure, with profound salutation as he drops the point of his sword to the boot-toe; then, facing to his own command, gives word for his successive brigades to pass us with the same position of the manual—honor answering honor."

I would like to leave you with this last request. In your study of the Civil War—its origin, causes, and the events leading up to it, its actual conduct during the 4 years of the struggle, and the trying times of readjustment which followed—see if you, too, do not reach the conclusion that those who were the quickest to forgive, the most willing to give credit where credit was due, and the most ready to establish a firm and lasting peace, were the ones who had subjected themselves to the rigors and dangers of the field of battle.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Address by Rear Adm. Elton W. Grenfell, U.S. Navy, to the National Rivers and Harbors Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Rear Adm. Elton W. Grenfell, U.S. Navy, Assistant Chief of Naval Operations, at the 47th Annual National Convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, Washington, D.C., on May 26, 1960.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY REAR ADM. ELTON W. GRENFELL, U.S. NAVY, ASSISTANT CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS (LOGISTICS), AT THE 47TH ANNUAL NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, MAY 26, 1960

President Buckman, members of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, I am honored and happy to be here today to address this distinguished group on the occasion of your 47th annual national convention. I am fully aware of the serious items concerning our rivers and harbors that you have been, and will be, discussing during the next few days. I have looked over your agenda and realize only too well the seriousness of the situations affecting the rivers and harbors in this country. It is consoling to the laymen to know that we do have a capable group of men and women who appreciate the value of our rivers and harbors and who do take action to keep them as a valuable asset to our country's welfare.

Rivers and harbors in this United States of ours have in the past been of great value to the military forces of this country. Indeed our rivers have been of great military importance in shaping the development of our United States. The Navy's participation in the days of the Revolutionary and Civil Wars in battles fought on many of our rivers and in our harbors was of great significance. We in the Navy appreciate the importance of maintaining coastal harbors and inland waterways in a high state of efficiency at all times.

Indeed I feel that a new and vastly important status should be now considered for the inland waterway systems of our country. Therefore, I would like to leave this message with you for your consideration and future planning. If it were the misfortune of this world to become involved in a terrible allout nuclear holocaust which would inflict terrific damage to the major cities and air and surface transportation systems of our country, our inland waterways would become a most important factor in recovery. Certainly some, probably the most important, of our major coastal harbors would be of little use for many months if not years. Therefore, it would be necessary to utilize many of the smaller towns on our rivers, as well as on our coasts for the purpose of beginning rehabilitation and recovery, towns that had little military value and that had escaped damage.

We also must not forget that there will be a large number of friendly ships in the oceans that will survive when the nuclear exchange takes place. For example, it is estimated that at any given moment there are over 4,000 ships at sea in the North Atlantic Ocean alone. Most of this shipping will probably be untouched and will be available to us for recovery and rehabilitation purposes provided we can use some of our small coastal ports and inland waterways in uncontaminated areas to start rehabilitation.

A similar philosophy applies to our Navy and why we should continue to keep a modern and powerful one in the future. Here again, over half of our Navy's ships are at sea at all times and they too would survive in large numbers to continue to control the sealanes, making recovery and rehabilitation a possibility.

Now a few words about this fine Navy of ours. First, briefly what are its missions today? Its primary mission is to maintain control of the sealanes and the air above. It is also responsible for the projection of offensive power from the sea to the land of any potential enemy and likewise to prevent such a projection of power and from the sea to our own lands and territories.

The greatest age of seapower lies not in the past, but just ahead, as modern technologies bring to full fruition man's age-old struggle to conquer and utilize the vast, all-encompassing ocean spaces of the earth. The movement to sea of a larger percentage of the world's total offensive strength is inevitable.

Why do I say this is so? Well these are the answers; first, it stands to reason that one of the best deterrents against a potential nuclear threat is that of the mobile deterrent in the vast expanses of our ocean areas. But this is not all. Coupled with that mobile deterrent capability, your new Navy, just as in the past, will continue to have a versatility and a capability, such that any military threat, hot, cold, or limited war, can be coped with expeditiously and efficiently.

For example, our new attack-type carrier striking forces move with great speed over the surface of the oceans. They have a powerful nuclear striking capability and a strong conventional weapons capability as well.

The important thing to remember is the mobility of these seagoing bases, their ability to be here today and gone tomorrow, or better said, here at this moment and 35 miles away in another hour—a most difficult target to cope with for any type of weapon.

The Polaris submarine system is well known to all of you. Many military theorists consider that this system may soon be among the foremost of our nuclear retaliatory systems; this because it will be almost impossible to locate the launching position of the Polaris submarine.

It is also well to remember that this will be more than an other deterrent system. The Polaris submarine, like other ships of our Navy, will have the versatility to perform many Naval combat missions. It is not just a submarine that can be used only in the event of a nuclear war. It will be a highly, mobile, seagoing base with a powerful offensive punch.

In addition to the powerful Polaris missile, it will carry torpedoes and sonar gear, and will have the military characteristics of just about any other modern, nuclear attack-type submarine. It will be able to conduct many of these missions, all part of the Navy's tasks, without detracting from its nuclear offensive capability. Missions such as ASW activity observation of shipping traffic in and out of enemy ports, etc., can be performed with a security necessary for the success of the mission.

I mentioned a moment ago the fact that it will be almost impossible to locate the launching position of the Polaris submarine system. I would like to enlarge on that statement a little bit. If you will but take a map of the world and look at the terrific size and area of the oceans and seas surrounding the Eurasian Continent, and then if you will mark off a distance of 1,500 miles from the Eurasian Continent seaward, it will give you some idea of the vast ocean area in which our submarines may operate. You will note I said our submarines, not just the Polaris submarines.

All of these nuclear submarines can operate unseen in the depths of this ocean area for periods up to 60 days. Finding any of these submarines is most difficult and then classifying the submarines as to identity is an even more difficult, if not impossible, problem. Indeed it makes the task of finding the proverbial needle in the haystack look like a simple one. Our Navy has spent billions of dollars since the end of the war improving our antisubmarine warfare effort. We have made progress, it is true, but we still have a long way to go solving this one.

The mere fact that we have introduced virtually an invulnerable system as the new nuclear powered attack submarines and the Polaris submarines has caused any potential aggressor considerable consternation and will further cause him the expenditure of large sums of money to build up antisubmarine forces to cope with the situation.

In discussing the Navy's place in an atomic age, I am speaking of the Navy's place today, tomorrow, and for many years to come. We are living in an atomic age now, with all the potentialities of peaceful applications of atomic power, as well as military applications in war. Whatever may unfold in the years ahead, the atomic age will be characterized by a continuing struggle between the forces of freedom and the concepts of communism.

Our country is now in the greatest competition in our history, and the very survival of our way of life is going to depend in large measure upon the extent to which we, all of us, industrialists, businessmen, educators, clergymen, statesmen, labor leaders, and military men, recognize this competition and its very long term potentialities. The objective of the United States in this struggle is to preserve the American way of life for our own people, and to help maintain a world climate within which freedom for other peoples of the world may flourish, and in which independent nations may develop and prosper.

Within these broad national objectives, the Armed Forces have four primary responsibilities. First, they must act as visible instruments in support of American foreign policy. Second, they must help to deter armed aggression short of a general nuclear exchange. If this fails, they must quickly gain control and win. I say help to deter, because this is not solely a military problem. It is also a problem of national will to use our economic,

political, and military power, wisely and positively in the defense of freedom wherever it may be threatened. It also requires the will and determination of other free peoples to stay free. The third requirement of the Armed Forces is to deter all-out nuclear war. Last, the Armed Forces must be able to win any type of war into which we are forced.

Let's look at these three broad military responsibilities and see where the U.S. Navy fits. American foreign relations are a day-to-day, every-day-of-the-year operation involving trade, cultural exchanges, political problems, questions of economics, education, world health programs, defense problems, and the whole range of human affairs.

U.S. naval forces play a vital role in these day-to-day relationships throughout the world because American warships represent the United States in many foreign ports day in and day out throughout the year.

When we speak of the deployment of the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean Sea, and the 7th Fleet in the Western Pacific, we are speaking of dynamic forces in constant motion, forces which are constantly on the move, constantly calling at various ports throughout the area of their responsibility, visiting the ports of many different countries, and helping to create better understanding between Americans and the peoples of other nations. This is a day-to-day routine. It is in this year-round operation that naval forces are useful instruments in support of American foreign policy.

The very ease and facility with which American warships can be moved, make them most flexible in protecting Americans and U.S. interests abroad, and in handling any other assignment they may be called upon to perform. Individual ship assignments, or reassignments, or rescheduling of of operations can be effected to suit the needs of the international situation without wholesale relocation of fixed facilities and installations.

Our ships perform goodwill functions which help to cement good relations between our country and others. U.S. naval ships effectively support the President's people-to-people program in foreign ports throughout the world. For example, last year ships of our Navy visited 285 ports in 85 different countries.

Our ships carry the spirit of American friendship in missions of mercy in countries beset by natural disasters, such as the Ceylon floods last winter, typhoon relief in Japan, earthquakes in Africa, and rescue missions at sea in both air and sea disasters. The Navy takes these in stride because our ships are constantly on the move. They are immediately responsive to orders to go wherever they are needed, for whatever purpose. The primary purpose of naval forces is to fight, but they are effective and useful in furthering American interests abroad in positive, peaceful ways too. The mere presence of powerful naval forces in an area is often enough to maintain tranquility.

Naval power is silent power, restrained and controlled. It is friendly but strong, pleasant but firm. It is a reminder to our friends that we are near at hand, and ready to help them against aggression. It is a warning to would-be aggressors, quiet but effective.

Readiness for action of any kind, of course, is not new to the Navy. This has been the day-to-day peacetime role of seapower for many decades in the history of our country. These capabilities, improved by technological progress, perfected by concentrated training, and refined by many years in the development of tactical doctrine and strategic concept, are more important to our country today than ever before. They are more important because the range of threats is greater than ever before. The variety of situations is infinitely more complex. Our forces have to be more flexible than ever, more readily responsibe to sudden emergencies, and more versatile in dealing with a wider range of possible situations.

This is why the Navy places such emphasis upon mobility, and multipurpose capabilities, and weapons system flexibility. In the event of aggression, naval forces can perform many kinds of tactical missions, conduct counteroffensive operations, defensive operations, support operations, and diversionary operations. They can achieve strategic objectives, too, not only by the strategic deployment of fleet units in various parts of the world, but also in their contribution to our general nuclear war deterrent as well.

However, I would like to emphasize that while the Navy has an important place in an atomic age, we are just part of an Armed Forces team. The Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the fighting marines, all have a vital job to do in defense of our country.

The Army today is a hard-hitting, streamlined service. The Air Force is forward-looking and powerful. The Marines are always lean, tough, and combat ready. We in the Navy are proud to be a member of that team. All the services have an important place in an atomic age.

In closing, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to leave with you today some important thoughts that I hope you will retain and pass on to your friends and relatives. The requirement for a powerful Navy in this day of fear and uncertainty is a proven fact. There is no doubt that our strong Navy has maintained a sufficient balance of power to help prevent or curtail serious wars during the past 15 years. The continued need for a strong Navy in the future is likewise most evident. This new Navy of the future, like ours of today, will continue to be one which can cope with any type of situation, be it all-out war or that condition of stress and uncertainty that we have been facing during the past 10 or 15 years. Your Navy today is a strong, efficient military machine. We all must see to it that it is kept that way.

Address of Representative Robert W. Hemphill, Rock Hill, S.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the remarks of the Honorable ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Member of the House of Representatives from the Fifth District of South Carolina, delivered on July 25 at Rock Hill, S.C.

Representative HEMPHILL paid tribute to the late C. Harris Williams of Rock Hill, S.C. Mr. Williams was one of the great humanitarians of our day and it was through his kindness of heart and sincere personality that made all the people of South Carolina have so much love and respect for him.

The people of South Carolina feel it appropriate to erect a memorial to Mr. Williams at McDow Park, which is in the city of Rock Hill. I feel it very fitting that Representative HEMPHILL's address to those gathered at this event be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW GLORIOUS IT IS TO LIVE

(Address by Representative ROBERT W. HEMPHILL on the occasion of the dinner of the C. Harris Williams Memorial Fund at Joslin Park, Rock Hill, S.C., July 25, 1960)

Mr. Chairman, my good friend Billy Hayes, honored members of the C. Harris Williams Memorial Fund Steering Committee, honored senator and members of the York County legislative delegation, distinguished guests of near and far, and fellow friends of the late and beloved we gather to honor this evening.

I have been honored many times by invitations to speak to groups or assemblies, each time in humble reflection of my inadequacies, gratitude at the opportunity of discussion and fellowship, but no occasion has aroused by reflection on good deeds, or good works, as this occasion. Each of us, I am sure, has rejoiced in many friendships, experienced the warmth of treasured companionship, leaned on the sympathy of great understanding, and eagerly sought the compassion and understanding of a fellow traveler on the high road of today's civilization—and all of us have had the good fortune of knowing and loving as a good friend, our late and great friend, Harris Williams. Tonight and always we delight to do honor to his memory and perpetuate his good deeds.

When we think of the way of life he expressed, we are reminded of the poem:

"We live in deeds, not years; in thoughts, not breaths; in feelings, not in figures on a dial.
We should count time by heart throbs. He most lives
Who thinks most, feels the noblest, acts the best"—Bailey.

To all of us who love nature there are days so glorious and exhilarating that life is a certain conquest, nights so filled with radiance that we are sure of our destiny, resolved to our duty of usefulness. Such was every day and night to Harris. His life was a mission—of joy, of help, of happiness, of fun, of faith, of usefulness. Never seeking the acclaim of high office, too big to be charmed by the little pleasures of personal acclaim, he went his way doing good, spreading sunshine, showing by example how glorious it was and is to live, to inspire, to help a fellow man.

His loyalty was legion. His loved ones, his home, his church, his country, his community, his business, his friends, all enjoyed the fierce loyalty of his devotion. One could but mention his family, and his face would glow with pride and love. No friend ever dropped in but "Won't you drop by the house?" automatically signaled his love and family pride.

He became a legend long before his time. One of the stories about him tells of his instrumentality in getting robes for his church. They teased him about a request that "C. Harris Williams Gulf Service" be lettered on the back. His spontaneous grin at the joke was quickly followed by his invitation to "come down to Neely's Creek next Sunday and join us." He loved his church and he served its purposes—how many were his charities will never be known—the good he did was exemplary of a Christian life.

He served his country in time of war and in time of peace.

"The man who loves his home best,
And loves it most unselfishly,
Loves his country best."

—*Holland.*

Such was only part of his service. I personally remember his unstinting service as a member of the York County grand jury, unstinting, unselfish, interested, untiring. He

never shirked a duty, gloried in every task for public good. He accepted every appointment to commissioner and to boards carrying duty without renumeration, work with little chance of appreciation or praise. In his home county are statues or progress bearing the indelible imprint of his character and devotion.

He loved politics. He knew the increasing role of politics in the life of the Nation. He could have run for any office with assurance of voluminous support, confident of election. His ability was well known, his concern for his fellow man an every day effort, and his love for people was salutory. Instead, he participated with tremendous vigor, finest sportsmanship, and greatest loyalty. Happy and fortunate was the candidate who had his friendship. To him politics was fun, though a necessity. He believed in—

"The freeman casting, with unpurchased hand,
The vote that shakes the turrets of the land."

—*Holmes.*

Yes; he bet on politics. If he won, he never chided the loser; but if he lost, his was the loudest, the best sportsmanship, publicly acclaiming his mistake, laughing his way into the hearts of his opposition. He was known, loved, respected—never hated. Judge and juryman, legislator, senator, sheriff, clerk, and constable all sought his advice, basked in the sunshine of his friendship. Would that more men took such interest in politics—every election would present a challenge, every political aspirant a seeker of high purpose as a requisite of high office.

As we move ffom horizon to horizon in the life of this good man we reflect on a few of the intimate personal expressions of his belief:

A community that could always count on Harris to be in the forefront.

Almost every parade in a nearby town knew "Mister Rock Hill" was there.

No Federal court ever met in Rock Hill but the admiration of court officials brought this smiling citizen to the courtroom.

No visiting judge ever had a complete term in York unless he met Harris.

No horse show could hope for success without him.

He never asked for himself—always for others.

I know of many men who received the mercy of the court because of his insistence.

I know of men inspired of great service in public office because of his sustaining friendship.

I know of young men now training in the military academies because he sponsored them.

Like others, I cannot know the full measure of his charity; he used his talents to bless his fellow men; but I hope to echo here the silent praise of people everywhere, people who have been helped or guided, a chorus of gratitude for good works.

And so in fetting tribute we gather here tonight determined to perpetuate his memory in the lives of young people tomorrow and in the future.

And as the young of succeeding generations find happiness and seek guidance for usefulness under optimist guidance, I hope the story of Harris Williams will be told and retold. And those who knew and loved him as a friend will remember:

A friend, in work, in play, in sorrow;
The same yesterday, today, and tomorrow.

And others, blessed by his charity, heartened by his smile, made happy by his association, or just a silent admirer, will recall his way of living a glorious life.

If you can give the unforgiving minute
Sixty seconds' worth of distant run,
Yours is the world and all that's in it,
And, what's more, you'll be a man, my son.

Thank you.

West Virginia Newspaper Editor Ralph E. Fisher Writes Compelling Editorial on Communist Threat

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, those Americans who live and work in the large metropolitan areas and who rely for information upon metropolitan newspapers are inclined to forget the vital role of the small weekly newspaper in keeping alive the currents of opinion in our towns and villages.

Such a publication is the Moorefield Examiner in Hardy County, W. Va., an oracle which has served well the communities in the hills and valleys of the South Branch area of our State. Its editor, Ralph E. Fisher, last year received the award for the best editorial in the West Virginia weeklies. Mr. Fisher has also served as president of the West Virginia Press Association.

I have received a recent editorial from the Examiner of the caliber which won Mr. Fisher his previous award. It is the sort of courageous appeal which calls upon each of us to measure up to his full responsibilities and—rare among newspapers—even calls for higher taxes if need be to fulfill our national responsibility.

I commend this excellent commentary to the attention of my colleagues and ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Moorefield (W. Va.) Examiner, Aug. 10, 1960]

CANCEL YOUR INSURANCE

This will kill you.

All things are related to each other and everything is in a continuous flux. Change occurs because there are opposites opposing each other. But in the course of things it turns out that the opposites are not really opposed, but are really united. This is called "the unity of opposites." This actually means whenever we see struggle there is hidden in it the meaning of unity on a higher level. Or another way of expressing it is that struggle is a necessary form of progress and all existing things carry within themselves the seed of something opposing them. This philosophy further maintains that such changes occur in a sudden leap after the tension between opposites has been growing for a while and that in this leap something new is born, a new quality of essence.

Does the above paragraph make sense to you? It had better for we were perfectly serious when we said that it would kill you. About a billion people in the world believe that nonsense fervently. It is Communist dialectic and is the basis of their philosophy.

The above dialectic, a philosophy about the movement of all things in terms of opposites-in-unity has been combined with materialism, which is the explanation of all things in terms of matter. According to the Communists the dialectic movement of history is a movement of matter rather than ideas and "matter" is the process of economic production. The Communists further maintain that matter moves and that its movement is dialectic. It gets more confusing when they say that each condition already contains in itself the forces which oppose it but from this opposition flows change and unity on a higher level. Thus our capitalistic society supposedly contains within itself the tendency toward socialization and violent change will occur (the revolution) and then the progressive elements of capitalistic society (technology) and the proletarian forces will unite on a higher level (Communist society).

The paragraphs above are a short course in dialectic materialism and are the basis of the Communist movement. Can you imagine 600 million Chinese peasants, 30 million illiterate Congolese, millions of Russians, Egyptians, Cubans, Syrians and others understanding that hogwash? Nevertheless that is the kind of stuff Marx, Hegel, Engels and Lenin have left to the Communists and in 43 years the movement has grown from one man in a room in Zurich to a good chunk of the world's land mass containing a billion converts.

We believe that the Communists do not understand it either and are ashamed to admit it to each other and once caught in the current have to spend all their waking hours trying to justify such silliness.

Nevertheless it is the deadliest threat our civilization has ever known and because it is so empty and meaningless offers nothing to refute. Under that crazy philosophy the Communists justify anything—genocide, murder, atheism, lies—any crime in the book. Under such a philosophy only violence will secure their aims, thus by any means they will subvert a people, pack ballots, incite riots, commit treason, break agreements, commit theft, distort the truth or go to any lengths to foment unrest if it will further their aims. They makes no bones that their aim is to destroy the United States, they say it, they publish it, and they teach it and Khrushchev bluntly says "We will bury you." Russia is completely mobilized under the Communists and their entire energy is directed toward our destruction. They mean it and they believe it. We aren't talking through our hat when we say that, every bit can be fully documented.

And we are sitting on our duffs, fat, dumb and happy, living on the highest standard the world has ever known. We are perfect targets for the Communist propaganda in the rest of the world. Even a dullard must be aware that they have established a beachhead in the West since they have taken over Cuba. Russian and Chinese "technicians" are right now directing the affairs of Cuba and are sending endless streams of Cuban Communists into every Latin American and South American country, all trained in Communist methods to stir up unrest and hatred against the United States. And they have a fertile field to work in.

The Communists constantly use thermonuclear blackmail against us, openly boasting that they have 300 rockets zeroed in on U.S. targets. Man, unfortunately, has actually achieved the means of destroying this world. We don't think the Russians will precipitate a thermonuclear war any more than we will, for certainly if we ever are hit the retaliation will be automatic and

just as deadly. Any war will probably be a war with conventional weapons. Both sides in the last war had poison gas and didn't use it and we think the same conditions will apply in this struggle.

But make no mistake about it, we are now in world war III. It is being waged on the economic front, on the political front, on the diplomatic front, and it constantly flares up in the "brush fire" incidents in all parts of the world. And all in all things haven't been going too well for us since 1946 when we were the most powerful and respected nation the world has ever known. The Communists have said they expect to take us over by 1973 and some of them have even said by 1970. They expect to strangle us economically, diplomatically, and politically without actually waging a shooting war. But never forget they have the capabilities of inflicting a hundred million casualties on us and no one actually knows how the survivors will react from an appalling situation like that. The only consolation we can offer is that Hardy countians will likely be among the survivors. Small comfort that.

Don't ever forget that the Communist definition of "peaceful coexistence" is complete submission on our part.

The bald fact is that we are kidding ourselves working for our retirement and for our children or grandchildren. There simply won't be any future for us or our children unless we wake up and do something. Unfortunately, under a democracy such as ours we don't act, we only react. It is high time we started acting and doing something positive. The question naturally arises: what?

First of all, we suggest that we start with our children, teach them about our heritage, our history, and our ideals. Teach them about our Founding Fathers and our Nation's real heroes. It has become unfashionable in our country to be patriotic. And if we ever needed patriotism it is now. We can start taking our civil defense program seriously. We actually need bomb shelters, we need food and water for survival in those shelters, and we need to know what to do if a thermonuclear attack occurs. Russia has a well integrated civil defense program and those people are well disciplined and trained. Certainly if they believe we will attack them we are only being foolish not to expect they will attack us. Another thing we can do is support the "Voice of America" program which is beamed into the satellite countries and into Russia. The Soviets are spending 10 times as much to jam that program as we are to send it. We can give more economic aid to countries to compete with the Russians. We hold no truck with this business of cutting down foreign aid. It is the best of insurance and is one field in which we can outdo the Russians with ease. It is not a giveaway program, for 90 percent of the money is spent right here in our own country with American manufacturers, American farmers, and American labor. We can spend more for defense. We can assure our Congressmen and our Senators that we are prepared to assume more taxes to protect ourselves and that this is no time to be niggard when our very existence is threatened. As we stated before, in our democracy we never act, we only react, and our Congressmen and Senators will only act when the people want it. It is our job to assure them we do want more defense appropriations and more foreign aid. Another thing we can do is to read and study the methods of the Soviets and to be able to detect their propaganda and to refute it. We have placed an excellent book in our library, "Protracted Conflict," by Dr. Robert Strausz-Houpe and Associates, which we consider one of the best written on the subject. We earnestly urge you to read it. Another project we must continue is to keep West Berlin free and to keep Formosa free. Those two showcases of democracy are perfect examples of life in a free world and are there for the East Germans to see and for the Chinese Communists to see. Japan is another showcase for all the Orient to see and we must keep that country out of the Communist orbit at all costs.

And above all, we can wake up our neighbors, relatives, and friends. We ask you to join with us in this fight for not only our way of life but our very existence.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, due to the extreme sensitivity of some of our friends on the other side of the aisle about anything which is said on this side of the aisle that smacks of a political character, I would normally follow the practice which many of us have done of sending down some matters for the Appendix, and not making too much of a point of presenting them here; but in the light of the objections that have been made, I ask unanimous permission to include in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent article by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover.

Mr. President, this month's issue of the American Bar Association Journal contains an excellent article by the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, describing the important function of the FBI in our Government. Mr. Hoover emphasizes the care with which the FBI selects men as special agents who will be dedicated to upholding the dignity of the law, who will have allegiance to ideals of just and fair play and who will do their jobs honestly, fearlessly, and zealously.

J. Edgar Hoover has been Director of the FBI for more than 30 years. In that period the FBI has achieved world renown as a law-enforcement agency. He has given personal example of dedication, honesty, and courage, in which all those who serve the public take pride. I know that Mr. Hoover's article will be of great interest to many Members of the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION: THE PROTECTOR OF CIVIL LIBERTIES

(By J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation)

The basic conflict in the world today is between the concepts of a government of law and a government of men—of democracy versus totalitarian communism. How this issue is ultimately resolved will decide the fate of mankind for many generations to come.

The terrifying reality of the brutal abuse of power—how one man, Joseph Stalin, in frenzies of self-grandeur and egotism, controlled the lives of literally millions of people—was vividly depicted by Nikita Khrushchev before the 20th Party Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956. All too often forgotten today, this speech affords an appalling insight into the cauldron of terror and fear which is created when law does not exist.

Coming from the Communists, particularly the No. 1 Soviet Communist, the portrait of a tyrannical Stalin, brutally suspicious and cunningly cruel, becomes more meaningful. Here was a man who, through deceitful skill, concentrated all reins of government into his own hands. Just to enter into his physical presence meant personal risk. "It has happened sometimes," a former associate reported, "that a man goes to Stalin on his invitation as a friend. And when he sits with Stalin, he does not know where he will be sent next, home or to jail."

In this regime of personal power, the law became what Stalin said it was. He was the prosecutor, the judge, the jury, the court of final appeal—all rolled up into one brutal club of oppression. In the widely publicized case of the so-called Russian doctors (referring to the doctors arrested in 1953 just prior to Stalin's death on charges of treason but later released) Stalin personally issued orders for the conduct of the investigation. Confessions were to be secured. "If you do not obtain confessions from the doctors," Stalin reportedly told his Minister of State Security, "we will shorten you by a head."

Needless to say, the doctors confessed. Khrushchev's comments in this connection tell us most graphically how a dictatorship works; how different it is from a government of law where the dignity of the human personality has meaning. "Stalin personally called the investigative judge, gave him instructions, advised him on which investigative methods should be used; these methods were simple—beat, beat, and, once again, beat. The case was so presented that no one could verify the facts on which the investigation was based. There was no possibility of trying to verify facts by contacting those who had made the confessions of guilt."

Such tactics, again according to Khrushchev, meant mass arrests and deportations of many thousands of people, execution without trial—in the main, and in actuality, the only proof of guilt used, against all norms of current legal science, was the confession of the accused himself; and, as subsequent probing proved, confessions were acquired through physical pressures against the accused.

THE COMMUNIST SYSTEM: TERROR AND BRUTALITY

This is the testimony of the Communist system—a system of terror and brutality which at this very minute still crushes the minds, bodies, and hearts of millions of men, women, and children around the world. Under a dictatorship, the historic principles of justice, mercy, and fairplay are abrogated. Whim, prejudice, and suspicion become the ruling motifs. Habeas corpus, fair trials, law enforcement agencies dedicated to securing the true facts—these are not the ingredients of a dictatorship. Communist propaganda talks much about Socialist legality, proclaiming that Communist morality is superior to bourgeois ethics. But these mouthings are Aesopian language, designed to conceal the true facts. Under communism the judicial system exists to enforce the will of the state and the party, as defined by the ruling clique, not to secure justice for the individual.

In Great Britain and the United States, partners in the fight for freedom, the dignity of the law—as contrasted with the tyrannical power of a human ruler—gives validity to our democratic way of life. A man's home may be ever so humble, so humble that the winds and the rains pour through its thatchless roof, yet that dwelling is inviolate from

any arbitrary intrusion of the Government. That man has certain rights under the law which guarantee to him the privilege of freedom. This is the great tradition of liberty which we in America have interited from English law.

The law enforcement agency—whether local, State, or National—is an integral part of the judicial framework of freedom. In fact, the judicial system can operate fairly and effectively only when the complete and accurate facts are revealed in the course of the legal proceedings—facts which are unalloyed by personal prejudice, whim, or bias. Most vital in determining the guilt or innocence of the accused is that the official authorities—the judge, the jury, the court officials—know all the facts. This can occur only if there are law enforcement agencies dedicated to the high principles of integrity, honesty, and efficiency.

The FBI, as the investigative arm of the U.S. Department of Justice, is dedicated to preserving the liberties which form the fabric of our constitutional government. In my 36 years as Director, this has been the main principle motivating its existence. The FBI is a servant of the American people, working around the clock to protect their rights, lives, and property.

By no stretch of the imagination is the FBI a national police agency. In fact, as is well known, the FBI's jurisdiction is strictly limited. At all times the FBI is under the supervision of the Attorney General and the President. Each year I appear before committees of the Congress to explain the operations of the FBI. Our procedures are closely scrutinized when FBI cases come before the courts of the Nation. Moreover, an alert press is constantly vigilant to the work of the FBI. Hence, only the highly misinformed can call the FBI a Gestapo or an agency threatening our civil liberties.

The FBI, moreover, is strictly a fact-gathering agency. It does not make recommendations or evaluations, authorize or decline prosecution, issue clearances or pass opinions relative to information gathered. This is the duty of other officials of the Government. Certainly, it is not the function of an agency which collects the facts in a given situation to also pass judgment on them. This differentiation is a salient feature of democratic law enforcement.

The basic duty of the FBI is to investigate violations of the laws of the United States, to collect evidence in cases in which the United States is or may be a party in interest, and to perform other duties required by law or administrative directive. The FBI performs these functions, yet scrupulously protects the liberties of the individual. The criminal and the subversive must be defeated, yet the historic rights of the individual must be held inviolate.

THE FBI: A HIGH CODE

Most important in protecting civil liberties is the maintenance of a high code of ethics by law enforcement. Every special agent of the FBI is dedicated to upholding the dignity of the law. He holds an inner allegiance to those ideals of justice and fair play which have made this Nation great. He is a man of integrity who does his job honestly, fearlessly, and zealously. In these days of payola, he does not allow personal temptation and insidious favoritism to interfere with the validity of his investigation. He is impervious to the glib tongue of the fixer or the undercover gift of the unscrupulous. He does his job without fear of outside intimidation, political reprisal or competitive undercutting. He is guided at all times by loyalty to his agency, to his profession, to a way of life. This is the integrity, I am proud to say, which is the kernel of FBI operations and the rock upon which good law enforcement rests.

Vital in developing a high ethical code of law enforcement operations are high standards of personnel recruitment and training. The FBI maintains rigid physical, educational and moral standards in the selection of personnel, both special agent and clerical. To be eligible for appointment as a special agent, for example, applicants must be between 25 and 40 years of age; graduates of State-accredited resident law schools or 4-year resident accounting schools with at least 3 years of practical accounting or auditing experience. Graduates of law or accounting schools not requiring at least a resident junior college degree, or its equivalent of resident college work, as an admission prerequisite must have received at least a degree from a resident junior college, or its equivalent in resident college work. The applicant must also be able to pass a rigid physical examination. Before being offered an appointment, qualified applicants are comprehensively investigated to determine whether they possess unqualified personal integrity and character.

Special agents, upon reporting for duty, are given an intensive 13-week period of training prior to actual field assignment. This course includes, among other things, instruction in constitutional law, Federal criminal procedures and ethics of law enforcement. The agents study the rules of evidence and are instructed in searches and seizures, interviews and confessions. The special agent learns that he is a servant of the people, a protector of the right of the individual. He develops an esprit de corps, a loyalty to doing his job in the right way. The law-trained special agent, of course, is enabled to make an excellent contribution to the work of the FBI. I wish to pay tribute to the fine quality of the graduates which America's law schools have sent us. We in the FBI are proud to have them as special agents. They are doing an excellent job.

I might mention that in addition to training our own special agents, the FBI provides training for local law enforcement officers. In 1935, the FBI National Academy was founded for the purpose of training selected local officers as police instructors and administrators. To date, over 3,800 officers have graduated, representing every State in the Union and many foreign countries. These men, upon returning to their home departments, instruct their brother officers in the fundamentals of good crime detection. We estimate that over 200,000 local officers have benefited from this training. The Academy's curriculum includes, among other things, courses designed to promote respect for civil rights. Moreover, the FBI, if requested, will conduct police training schools in local departments. Every effort is made by the FBI to promote higher standards of law enforcement throughout the Nation.

MODERN SCIENTIFIC TECHNIQUE—BETTER LAW ENFORCEMENT

Experience has shown that any danger from law enforcement to civil liberties comes not from evil intent, but from law enforcement officers poorly trained, ill-equipped and untutored in the ethics of the profession. Third-degree tactics, illegal searches and seizures, unlawful arrests, abusive language and demeanor—these are the acts of the poorly trained officer who lacks the technical know-how of competing with the criminal. In years past, unfortunately, certain areas of American law enforcement utilized bullying, personal mistreatment, illegal arrests and detentions. Admittedly, these nefarious tactics do still occasionally occur. But they are becoming much less frequent. The modern-day officer, learning up-to-date scientific techniques of crime detection, is using skill—not brute force—to achieve his ends. Hence, the vital need today for communities to realize that adequate salaries, equipment, training and, above all, respect for the profession are absolutely necessary. In the final analysis, the protection of civil liberties rests on the attitude of the individual citizen of this Nation.

Technical crime detection methods are most vital today in increasing the efficiency of law enforcement. Day after day fingerprints and the scientific laboratory are solving criminal cases. A piece of dirt, a fleck of paint, an old orange peel—these often become the clues to prove guilt or exonerate the innocent. The microscope, the test tube, the spectrograph become the ingredients of the law enforcement officer's skill. He utilizes intelligence, resourcefulness, and initiative to solve cases.

During the fiscal year 1959, for example, the FBI laboratory conducted almost 185,000 scientific examinations of evidence submitted by law-enforcement agencies in every State of the Union. The facilities of the FBI laboratory are available free of charge to any duly constituted law enforcement agency. This means that any police department or sheriff's office in the Nation, even though small in size, has available the latest techniques of crime detection to help fight crime. FBI technical experts will examine the evidence submitted and furnish the submitting agency a written report of their findings. Later, if the local case goes to trial, the FBI examiner will testify as to the results of his examination, again without cost to local authorities.

PROVING INNOCENCE: A CASE IN POINT

Many times the FBI laboratory is able to prove innocence. Not long ago, for instance, a book of blank money orders was stolen in a southern city. Two of the stolen money orders were passed by an individual who identified himself with a driver's license. Local police subsequently arrested a man whose name corresponded to that on the money orders and who lived at the address listed on the driver's license, charging him with the theft and passing of the stolen items. Three eyewitnesses definitely identified the resident as the passer of the money orders, despite his pleas of innocence. The result: a sentence of 4 years in jail.

While this individual was serving his sentence, more of the stolen money orders were passed. These money orders, along with those previously passed, were sent to the FBI laboratory for examination. Here, it was determined that the individual serving the prison term had not prepared any of the writing on the stolen money orders. As a result, this person's sentence was completely vacated.

Fingerprints represent another weapon of attack against the criminal. At present the FBI's Identification Division has over 155 million sets of fingerprints on file. They are divided into criminal and civil files, the former representing roughly 20 percent of the total number. These prints are daily rendering yeoman services to the cause of law enforcement. If a criminal is arrested, for example, the law enforcement agency need only send his fingerprints to the FBI Identification Division. They are immediately searched through the FBI fingerprint files—which takes only minutes. The submitting agency is expeditiously advised of the results of the check. In this way criminal fugitives are often located. In fact, during 1959 a total of 16,967 criminal fugitives were identified through FBI fingerprint searches. The services of the FBI Identification Division are available without cost to law enforcement agencies throughout the Nation.

The FBI is today a service institution on a national level to American law enforcement. To think of the FBI as an isolated, highly secretive and prideful agency on the national level, intent on concentrating power in its own hands, is not to be truthfully

informed on American law enforcement today. The FBI is working valiantly to aid local law enforcement on all levels to meet the problems of the day. Crime is a serious menace and all of us in law enforcement must work together. The weapons of attack against the criminal—such as police training, science, fingerprints—must be utilized to the fullest extent. The criminal is exploiting to his own advantage the latest technological developments of society. Law enforcement can do no less. This means that all law enforcement, local, State and national, must work together. This is a basic operating principle of the FBI.

I received a letter some years ago from a local sheriff. He was appreciative of an FBI-conducted police school held in his hometown. "This school was very well received in this territory, and I just wanted you to know that we appreciate the efforts of you and the men of your organization in affording training programs for officers on the State, county, and city level." He pointed out that law-enforcement officers are intelligent, sincere, and tolerant, but their chief handicap "has been a lack of training and a lack of understanding of the legal processes to which a person arrested is entitled."

This letter, in my opinion, reflects the courageous and wholesome attitude of American law enforcement. These men, wherever they may be, are interested in doing a good job. They want to protect the rights, lives, and property of our citizenry. The biggest problem facing them is to secure the working knowledge to do the job. This means that every community must do its share to provide these men with the working tools; as long as the community is niggardly with funds, support, and interest, then law enforcement will do a poor job.

An efficient law enforcement, dedicated to the democratic spirit of America, is our best protection against abridgment of our civil liberties. America does not need a national police. Such an organization would be contrary to the democratic traditions of this Nation. The answer to the crime problem lies in a strengthening of the present system of fraternal, voluntary, and cooperative law enforcement, local, State, and national. These agencies can do the job. The FBI is proud to be a part of this system of law enforcement, protecting the liberties of this land of the free.

Military Pay Equalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the August 12 edition of the Washington Post and Times Herald, and which brings attention to the military pay equalization bill now pigeonholed in the Senate Armed Services Committee. Although it is not often I find myself agreeing with the position taken by the Washington Post and Times Herald, this editorial clearly and ably points out the necessity for Senate action on H.R. 11318, and I hope that, if this editorial has not already come to the attention of my colleagues, they will take time to read these brief comments.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STILL TIME FOR FAIRPLAY

President Eisenhower properly included among urgent items of unfinished legislation the House-approved bill to rectify an injustice done 114,000 veteran officers and men of the armed services. This bill would abolish the so-called "inferior retired list," to which those retired prior to enactment of the 1958 Military Pay Act were relegated and thus unfairly deprived of full retirement pay benefits of that act. Many of these retirees were outstanding combat men of World War II, decorated for bravery in action.

In the name of economy, Congress ill-advisedly restricted all personnel retired prior to enactment of the pay law to a 6-percent increase, whereas officers and men retired after the arbitrary cutoff date were given a much larger pay raise, based proportionately on the active-duty pay scales. The latter formula for adjusting retired pay to active duty pay had been in effect for a century. The 1958 departure from tradition has caused widespread consternation among those now in the services, who fear that similar injustices may develop in the future.

The House unanimously voted to equalize the pay of all retired officers and men, but no action has been taken on the Senate side. The bill is pending before the Stennis subcommittee of the Senate Armed Services Committee. It has been reported that the subcommittee favors a review of the whole system of military retirement benefits. Such a review may be desirable, but there is no good reason why the inequity of the 1958 act should not be rectified in the meantime. There is yet time for the Senate to assure fairplay for the men stigmatized by the act as unworthy of the full increases awarded fellow officers who have retired since 1958.

The Retail Independent Drugstore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the heart of our free enterprise system is the independent businessman and in particular the retailer on Main Street who serves thousands of communities throughout our land.

Recently, I read two interesting and thoughtful editorials which tell a great human interest story about the retail independent drug store. The community of Wood Lake, Minn., has lost its drugstore and the editor of the Wood Lake News in a moving, informative and thoughtful editorial tells what happens in a community when the local drug store closes up and a community is without a pharmacy.

Then, too, the editor of the Albany Enterprise, Albany, Minn., reminds us what an important asset the retail pharmacy is to every community. In its editorial entitled, "An Important Asset to a Community," the Albany Enterprise editor calls attention to the fact that the Parry Drug Store of Richmond, Minn., is no more. The editor appeals for another druggist to open such a business because of the importance of the pharmacy as a vital part of the health protection for any American community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these two editorials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wood Lake (Minn.) News, July 14, 1960]

LET'S KEEP WHAT WE HAVE

Wood Lake has lost a true and valued possession—its drugstore.

The trend of the times all over the country is—the small town gets smaller. Yet we in Wood Lake were proud of the fact that the 1960 unofficial census shows that we have held our own—and when the official returns are tabulated and our citizens who were away at the time of the official nose count are listed, we should show quite a gain—very unusual in the towns of the 500 class.

Yet we have lost our drugstore. Kind of hard to understand, isn't it? What the reasons are, of course, is a matter of pure conjecture on our part.

For instance, we wonder whether we would be losing it if some of the people who very seldom went into the place, but bought their prescriptions and the hundreds of other drugstore items in some other town, had stayed here to shop?

If these people would take their total bills and compare them with local prices they might be in for a big surprise. In most instances shopping in Wood Lake would have saved them money.

Sure—there are the so-called hot specials or leaders in larger towns that look mighty good—but— we're talking about the total bill comparison—not that between just a couple of items at a given time. Local stores advertise specials, too—and we have examined the ads in a good many of the exchange papers we get from the area and find that overall, Wood Lake prices compare very favorably.

Naturally we shop elsewhere for items of clothing, shoes, etc., that aren't available here. Why not stop there, and hold on to what we have in Wood Lake?

Then there is the matter of friendly cooperation. People who locate in a small town do so becauses they like smalltown atmosphere and living and expect to find it. Perhaps it's time we each examine our motives and policies. Do we always try to promote the good of the town and not just struggle for individual gain? Maybe a policy of working together in a spirit of give as well as take is long overdue.

Most of the residents of Wood Lake have bought homes and/or business property. We pay taxes here. We live here. We have a swell town full of swell people.

By the same token Wood Lake should be a good enough place to buy all our groceries, all of our hardware, all of our farm machinery; all of our feed; and all of our milk, cream, and produce should come to our own place of business. Perhaps that's all we need to do to keep the 1970 census from showing a terrific decline.

As stated before, the possible reasons for losing our drugstore are pure conjecture on our part.

Let's all start thinking and doing, shall we?

[From the Albany (Minn.) Enterprise]

AN IMPORTANT ASSET TO A COMMUNITY

An important cog in the health of any community is the pharmacist. Richmond lost their drugstore recently and already Ed Parry's services are being missed. Unlike druggists in larger cities, the local pharmacist depends solely on local patronage. His personal attention to your prescription needs deserves your support. For Parry Drugs, this article is too late. We hope

that Richmond has a druggist back soon. In the meantime Albany people should continue to support Dinndorf Drugs, while St. Josephites should bring their drug business to Jaren Pharmacy.

Msgr. Lucyan Bojnowski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. DODD
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, Connecticut and America lost a great patriot spiritual leader July 28 when Msgr. Lucyan Bojnowski passed away in New Britain, Conn. By any man's measure this immigrant Polish priest achieved greatness during his 92 years by and through his dedication to assist the oftentime forgotten legions of oppressed, homeless and aged citizens.

Monsignor Bojnowski built orphanges, homes for the aged, and schools for the underprivileged, and then established an order of Roman Catholic nuns to administer these institutions. In fact he was instrumental in assisting thousands and thousands of men, women, and children to realize the great American dream.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial praising Monsignor Bojnowski which appeared in the New Britain Herald of July 28, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MSGR. LUCYAN BOJNOWSKI

How shall the worth of a man be appraised, by his personal material possessions or by his spiritual wealth? If by the former, the Right Reverend Monsignor Lucyan Bojnowski died poor. If by the latter, he had riches beyond the capacity of men to inventory.

It has often been said that no individual had more beneficial influence on this city than the founder of the Catholic Church of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, whose death has ended a career devoted to the welfare, spiritual and material, of thousands of his fellow men. Others have contributed to the city's growth and have helped to chart its course. But Providence chose as its special instrument for tasks of this kind in early New Britain, a man born in lowly circumstances in a foreign land, who rose by his own zeal to a lofty station in life and won the admiration and esteem of the community. Thus does destiny give evidence of its watchfulness over the affairs of men.

The present generation may read for inspiration the life stories of Monsignor Bojnowski printed in the newspapers. When he came to New Britain it was a small town suffering from growing pains, among which was a lack of sturdy labor. From the cities and meadows of Poland, streams of emigrants crossed the sea to escape oppression and seek new horizons in this land of opportunity. Many came to this city. Monsignor Bojnowski, who was then a struggling parish priest, assumed the responsibility of their guidance. If this discipline seemed harsh in contrast with today's liberal views on human behavior, it was justified by conditions of the times.

In the new priest the leaders of industry and business saw a power for good and they gave him their wholehearted support. The result of this mutual cooperation is seen by the place in the community now held by people of Polish blood. To be a Pole in those days meant to be industrious, thrifty, and God-fearing. These characteristics have endured with the passing of time and their existence can be traced to the strong hand of this parish priest.

Monuments to the memory of Monsignor Bojnowski are numerous. They include the magnificent house of worship on Broad Street, the nearby parochial school through whose doors have passed so many prominent citizens, an orphan asylum that has been a haven for boys and girls in need of friendship, St. Lucian's Home for the Aged on Burritt Street, the Catholic Leader, a weekly newspaper printed in the Polish language, the order of Mary of the Immaculate Conception and the beautiful Mother House on Osgood Avenue and St. Joseph's Home, a residence for women, in New York.

Despite his great achievements, Monsignor Bojnowski continued to be a humble priest, accepting with modesty the acclaim and applause of prelates and laymen.

The last chapter in an epic of New Britain has been written. Its protagonist will live in the hearts of his fellow men while their memory lasts.

To quote Hilaire Belloc: "He does not die who can bequeath some influence to the land he knows."

"Mr. Social Security" Notes Success of Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, 25 years ago, the social security program was enacted to provide for folks over 65 with a degree of "new hope" for the later years of life.

Traditionally, there have been arguments pro and con, as to whether or not this type of program fits philosophically into our free-enterprise system. Despite the controversy, however, the social security program has continued—and has been improved and expanded—to carry out its objectives of serving our senior citizens.

During its quarter century of existence, the program has been modified in a number of ways. Currently, Congress is considering additional changes.

Among the recommendations by the Senate Finance Committee, for example, is a sound proposal for increasing "extra earnings" for folks receiving benefits, from $1,200 to $1,800—a proposal which I have been happy to sponsor both this session, and in the past.

Upon the inauguration of the program, Mr. Arthur J. Altmeyer, of Madison, Wis., became its first Administrator—and ultimately became known as "Mr. Social Security."

Recently, Mr. Altmeyer reviewed the 25-year progress of the program, and made some recommendations for further improving its provisions, to better serve our people.

The Milwaukee Journal published an informative article entitled "'Mr. Social Security' Notes Success of Act," by Carl Eifert.

Reflecting upon the progress and ultimate objectives of this program, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 14, 1960]

"MR. SOCIAL SECURITY" NOTES SUCCESS OF ACT—ALTMEYER OF MADISON WAS FIRST ADMINISTRATOR OF INSURANCE PLAN 25 YEARS AGO

(By Carl Eifert)

MADISON, WIS.—The feasibility of social insurance has been proven in its first quarter century of existence in this country, Arthur J. Altmeyer, "Mr. Social Security," said Saturday.

Altmeyer, a Madison man, was the first administrator of the social security system authorized by a law signed by President Roosevelt 25 years ago Sunday.

"The big challenge of the next 25 years is to provide protection against ill health," Altmeyer said.

He said it was "no longer speculation, as it was in 1935" whether such a gigantic system could be administered successfully.

WAS FIRST CHAIRMAN

Altmeyer, who was the first chairman of the social security board and later commissioner of social security until 1953, said contributory social insurance was the first phase of the program.

"The second phase, I hope, will become less and less as time goes on—public assistance. This is supposed to be the second line of defense against destitution, providing protection on the basis of need to those who don't get it under the first phase."

(The social security system embraces a number of programs. Two are based on compulsory insurance—Federal old-age survivors and disability insurance and unemployment compensation. The latter is administered by the States. Other State administered programs aided by Federal money are old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to the blind, child welfare, maternal and child health, public health, service to crippled children, and vocational rehabilitation.)

NEW FIELDS SEEN

"Our job during the next 25 years is to build upon the success we had in the last 25 years in establishing nationwide contributory social insurance so that it covers four of the individual economic hazards people face. Unemployment is one. The others are old age, death of the breadwinner and permanent total disability."

These items are covered now, but the system should be made more effective, he said. About one-third of the Nation now has no protection whatsoever against unemployment, he said.

There is 90 percent coverage in the case of Federal old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, Altmeyer said, "but there is no reason why it shouldn't be universal—100 percent."

RESULTS OF ILLNESS CITED

There are economic consequences of illness, he said: "The wage loss when people are sick and the cost of medical care.

"I say that's the big challenge. I feel in the next 25 years we are going to provide protection in this large, unprotected area of economic losses due to ill health."

Altmeyer now is a consultant in this country and abroad in the field of social security.

Paul A. Raushenbush, the director of the State unemployment compensation department, got into that field in 1932, 3 years before the Federal social security bill was passed. He was brought into the State industrial commission by Altmeyer, then secretary of the commission.

"I'm the aborigine in this country, of unemployment compensation—the oldest guy in terms, at least, of seniority," Raushenbush said.

STATE WAS PIONEER

The Federal unemployment compensation program, designed for administration by the States, was based on the Wisconsin system.

Now, Raushenbush said, unemployment compensation revision "is a perennial question in almost every State legislature."

Looking at the country as a whole, he said, there have been three major changes since the program began. In the beginning, there was a waiting period of 3 weeks before unemployment benefits began. One week is typical now.

The maximum duration of benefits generally began at 13 weeks. Now the most typical figure is 26 weeks (34 in Wisconsin).

Benefits have also climbed from a typical $15 a week to around $35 ($49 in Wisconsin).

ADJUSTMENT MADE

Benefits, Raushenbush says, have pretty well kept pace with the cost of living, "but have not kept pace with wage levels in many States. In 1959, Wisconsin practically caught up by adjusting weekly maximum benefits every 6 months by basing them on a percentage of the average wage in the State."

Another Madison man—the "father of social security"—died last May. He was Prof. Edwin E. Witte, who was executive director of President Roosevelt's Committee on Economic Security. That group drafted the social security program.

Other Wisconsin men who could claim major credit for social security were the late Prof. John R. Commons of the University of Wisconsin, world famed labor economist, who developd the theoretical basis for the system, and Wilbur J. Cohen. Cohen was a pupil of Witte and later his assistant in Washington, D.C. Witte was an assistant to Commons.

Newark Leading Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the latest census statistics indicate that New Jersey, with 6,018,570 living within its borders, has the highest population density in the Nation—800.2 persons per square mile. Even though many areas of the State are relatively lightly populated, New Jersey cities and suburbs are growing at a brisk pace.

It is particularly important, therefore, that the best possible use be made of the highly populated areas. Good planning for development and redevelopment is essential. I was particularly gratified to read, therefore, in the July 24 Newark (N.J.) Sunday News, an article which describes the great efforts now underway to make use of one tool for city rebuilding, the title I provision of our urban renewal program.

The reporter, Andre Briod, shows how Newark and New Jersey have, for the moment at least, a commanding lead in support of completed title I projects. He also points out that Newark has been commended by the FHA on its progress.

The article shows how one Federal program has been put to work in dynamic New Jersey. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWARK LEADING URBAN RENEWAL

(By Andre Briod)

Newark and New Jersey have received more Federal money in support of completed title I projects than any other city or State in the Nation, according to the Federal Urban Renewal Administration.

The figures, which rank this city and State together as the Nation's leaders in the field of urban redevelopment, show that Newark has received about one-fourth of $20,134,000 in Federal money allocated to projects now listed as completed, while one-third of all such Federal contributions to date have been assigned to this State.

The figures, made available by the URA yesterday, do not take into account a number of projects under construction elsewhere in the Nation. When they are completed the rankings are expected to change, but Newark and New Jersey would still stand high on the list.

Five cities in this State have completed seven projects to which the URA has furnished a total of $7,571,000. Of that amount, $5,273,000 has gone to Newark, all of it to the Colonnade Park project.

Newark enjoys its status in the redevelopment field solely on the basis of the $20 million Colonnade Park venture, which in reality is still short of physical completion.

The only city in the Nation with completed title I projects receiving a comparable amount of Federal financial support is Baltimore, which to date has closed the books on two projects to which the URA contributed $4,033,000.

TWO SEPARATE PROJECTS

The URA, for technical reasons, lists Colonnade Park as two separate projects, with the Broad Street portion of Colonnade Park designated as one and the Clifton Avenue site as the other. In fact, however, Colonnade Park is a single undertaking and has been regarded as such by its developers and by the city since its inception.

About 200 families are living in the 720 units in the two 22-story buildings at the Broad Street site. The third, a 540-unit building at the Clifton Avenue site, is to be ready for partial occupancy in September.

A Colonnade Park spokesman declared yesterday that, counting those apartments already occupied, 350 apartments of the 1,260 in the entire project are committed for rental.

The completion of the dealings between Newark and the URA last month resulted in the delivery to the Newark Housing Authority of a letter from the URA regional office in Philadelphia commending the city on its progress. Warren Phelan, director of the region within the jurisdiction of that office, said it was the first communication of its kind ever sent to any authority in that territory.

Phelan noted that Newark and Baltimore are both within region II, along with Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, all cities which are considered leaders in the redevolpment field.

Other New Jersey cities which have completed title I ventures are Perth Amboy, Passaic, New Brunswick, and Long Branch.

PROJECTS COMPLETED

Perth Amboy has completed two projects to which the URA contributed a total of $1,325,000, an amount greater than those granted to completed projects in most of the major cities in the country.

Passiac received $734,000 for its Pulaski Park project, on which the URA closed accounts last month. The Bishop Street project in New Brunswick, also officially completed last month, received $157,000 in Federal support. Long Branch's Russel Court project was supported by an $82,000 Federal contribution.

The share of the financial burden which fell to the New Jersey cities as a result of site acquisitions and demolitions totaled $3,785,000. Less than $1 million of that was paid out in cash. The majority of the cities' share was credited to municipal facilities and improvements which were included in the projects and which in some cases were partially paid for by the State.

A few cities, particularly New York, Pittsburgh, and New Haven, have under construction title I projects which would place them ahead of Newark's ranking when they are completed.

By the same token, however, Newark has planned and has received preliminary Federal approval for a number of projects which would, if completed, continue this city's prominence in the redevelopment field. None of the new projects planned here are expected to be started before next year.

Capital Times Hails U.N. Job in Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times recently praised the splendid work for world peace accomplished by Dr. Ralph Bunche and the U.N. Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold in the African crisis. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT COULD BE SUBSTITUTED FOR THE U.N. IN AFRICAN CRISIS?

We hope that the bitter-end critics of the United Nations have been watching along with the rest of the world in these last tense weeks of trouble in Africa.

Do they still think that the U.N. is a useless "debating society" that can serve no purpose in bringing peace to the world?

Though the problems in Africa have by no means been settled, is there any other way that the present crisis could have been dealt with more effectively and reasonably than the U.N. has?

One by one, the U.N. is facing the problems in this crisis that has been years in building up. And one-by-one these problems are being worked out with great skill and resoluteness.

The skillful, patient and inspired work of Dr. Ralph Bunche and Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjold has won new prestige for the U.N. before the world and increased their personal stature enormously.

The U.N. has achieved many things in the past to illustrate its usefulness to the world,

but if it had done nothing else its work in the African crisis would have more than proved the wisdom of its existence.

The African situation should make even the enemies of the U.N. ask this question:

What would we be doing now to deal with this problem if we didn't have the U.N.?

The State of Business and the Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we have become accustomed for nearly 8 years to reading honeyed phrases on the state of the Nation's economy. Regardless of what ominous signs there were, we were always told that things were bright. Time and again I have called attention of this body to our lack of economic growth, to the tragic unemployment situation, the trend in housing starts and other signs of weakening economy. I have worried that our dollar growth has not kept pace with the expanding population and inflation to the end that Mr. Khrushchev's prediction that the Soviet Union soon would surpass us economically might come true.

In the current Newsweek there is a keen and concise analysis of statements at President Eisenhower's news conference on the state of business and economy. This article, I have learned, was prepared by Mr. Hobart Rowen, who writes much of the Washington business news. I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Business" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESS

Backed as he is by a massive array of statisticians and economic advisers, the President commands more than ordinary respect when he offers an opinion on U.S. business. But when President Eisenhower cited Government statistics at his press conference last week to point up the "hopeful signs" in the economy, his optimism surprised most of his own advisers. Some sample presidential quotes, and the facts on which they are presumably based:

"Gross national product for the second quarter is even higher than we had estimated." The revised estimate was only slightly higher ($505 billion vs. $503 billion) and was made several weeks ago. The real concern is the third quarter of the year—when administration economic experts expect a slight rise at best.

"Employment is almost 69 million, another record." The high employment reflects the bulge in service industries and Government jobs; industrial employment is down. Unemployment, which the President didn't mention, is over 4 million—a high 5.4 percent of the labor force.

"Personal income is over $400 billion." The June rate is a record $405.8 billion, but the month-to-month increase has been slowing steadily; it was down to only $1.1 billion in June.

"Right now, they are building houses at a rate of 1.3 million, which is, I think, with one exception, as high as we have ever been." The rate of new housing starts is nowhere near recent highs (e.g., 1.6 million a year ago). Allowing for a recent revision in the Government's method of computing housing statistics, home builders are, in fact, having their worst year, with one exception, since 1954.

"Retail sales continue to go up at a record." Total retail trade dropped during July to $18.3 billion, lowest level in 3 months. It is no higher than it was a year ago, despite rising population and rising prices.

In at least one respect, however, the President did confirm the majority opinion of his experts: Despite his overall optimism, he saw no signs of a burgeoning economy.

Problem of the Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the platform adopted by the Democratic Party at Los Angeles asked for a comprehensive group of programs for the urban areas of the Nation. Once put into action the programs would help us deal with the backlog of work in our cities and suburbs.

An editorial in the Morning Call of Paterson, N.J., on July 27, expresses some of the grassroots feeling about the need for such Federal action. It is an example of the growing realization that national programs are needed for a national problem. I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEM OF THE CITIES

City government used to be called, at the beginning of the century, our worst failure. This has since been taken in hand, so that cities compare in this respect favorably with counties and States. Yet New York's Mayor Wagner has good reason to term urbanization "America's No. 1 domestic problem." With him we are in complete accord.

Cities are struggling with housing shortages and urban renewal programs. Paterson is anxious to get redevelopment off the ground. Cities are being choked by the private automobile, which bids fair to drive unsubsidized mass transportation out of existence. Education, public health, and the control of crime present difficulties which tax the city's entire resources.

The greatest difficulty is that cities are not permitted to find their own way out of their plight. They are straitjacketed by State governments. State constitutional amendments might relieve them, but these are hard to get, usually needing the consent of selfish groups which profit by the cities' inability to act with authority.

A possible solution is Federal aid, which the Democratic platform promises where warranted. There are good arguments for establishing a Department of Urban Affairs. Agriculture and labor have departments set up in their interests. Why not the cities, where the majority of Americans live?

Home Improvement Plan of the Federal Housing Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, one of the most uniquely successful programs carried on by the Federal Government is the home improvement plan of the Federal Housing Administration.

I believe my colleagues will be interested in learning that there are now 13,700 authorized lenders cooperating with this Federal program, forming the financial backbone of an $11 billion a year property improvement plan.

I take special pride in the fact that this program is headed at the present time by a native of Massachusetts, Roy F. Cooke, of Athol. Under his leadership, home improvevment loans have multiplied spectacularly, and stern measures have been taken to protect the public from a few "fly-by-night" contractors who might injure the reputation of this vast business.

So that this fine record of Government cooperation with private business in the interest of the homeowners of America can be widely available, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Cooke's address of August 11, 1960, entitled "The Most Unique Plan in the World," and delivered to the Better Business Bureau of Garden City, N.Y., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOST UNIQUE PLAN IN THE WORLD

(By Roy F. Cooke, FHA Assistant Commissioner, property improvement program)

It is always a pleasure for a Washington Government official to be so pleasantly and generously received.

I find some businessmen outside of Washington are a little skeptical of Government men, but I promise you, I have no forms for you to fill out, at your own expense, nor any inquiries about how you conduct your business.

Instead, I bring you the greetings and warm wishes from Federal Housing Commissioner, Julian H. Zimmerman. The FHA property improvement program is only one of a number under his jurisdiction; the others are home mortgage insurance, homes for servicemen, cooperative housing, rental housing, housing for the elderly, military housing, trailer courts, and the urban renewal programs. The outstanding feature about all of these efforts is that none of these programs would be possible without the complete cooperation of private industry in this great free-enterprise system of ours.

On the other hand we are oldtimers in the field of urging better housing for all. The Federal Housing Administration has been tested by time and criticism and this year we are entering our 26th year of business.

My responsibility is FHA title I of the National Housing Act. I am here to tell you how FHA title I—the Government's property improvement loan insurance program—does business, and how you can profit by doing business with title I. I believe no banker objects to making money, especially

when the net proceeds of the loan is insured by the Federal Treasury.

We like to refer to the FHA property improvement program as the "3 R's." These "3 R's" for us in title I symbolizes three little, but mighty important words: "Remodel, repair, repay."

Wrapped up in these "three little words" is an $11-billion-a-year industry—property improvement. This is not a one-shot expenditure of $11 billion, but the yearly outlay by American homeowners to maintain their properties. A great portion of this money to maintain homes comes out of savings or income. On the other hand, at least 20 percent of this home-repair investment must be financed by lenders.

The FHA title I loan insurance program began in 1934. It was a depression device to stimulate our sagging economy. In those days very few lenders, especially banks and saving and loans, had any experience or interest in installment credit lending.

It developed that it was up to FHA title I to lay down the broad principles of consumer credit and guarantee loans until lenders gained experience. All this was done to induce lenders to make unsecured loans to homeowners to promote our industrial recovery.

Today I am proud to report that FHA title I is a going business. We have 13,700 approved title I lenders, including branches engaged in installment credit lending in about every county of the Nation and in every possession. We are self-supporting; paying all of our overhead—salaries, claims, rent, equipment, etc.—and have a sizable reserve for insurance. There are more than 60 new lenders entering the FHA property improvement program each month.

Title I pays its own way by charging a one-half of 1 percent insurance premium on each dollar of the net proceeds of the loan. This insurance premium has been reduced three times since 1954 when the rate was lowered from 0.75 to 0.65 percent, in August 1957 to 0.55 percent, and in April 1958 to one-half of 1 percent. But the rate to the borrower has remained the same, $5 discount. This rate gives the lender a good net profit, plus 90 percent insurance on the unpaid balance in event of claim.

During this period of premium reduction, the average loan has increased from $200 to nearly $1,000. These larger loans have resulted in bigger profits to lenders because the initial cost of putting sizable loans on the books is the same as for smaller loans.

At this time, title I has over 2½ million active loans in its insurance portfolio valued at nearly $1¾ billion. New loans are being insured at the rate of about 5,000 per banking day and the amount insured each month often reaches $100 million. These are all consumer loans.

We consider consumer credit as the most modern advancement in banking and truly one of the great creative ideas of this era because it enlarged the buying power of the average man who lacked cash. Title I is pleased to be one of the outstanding pioneers in this business and financial revolution.

Now what does this huge property improvement market mean to all lenders engaged in our title I program? Already we have insured 24 million loans valued at more than $13 billion. There are over 50 million homes in this Nation and more than 1 million new ones are being built each year. This presents an inexhaustible market for home improvements—additions, alterations, decorations, air conditioning, etc.—whether a house is 1 or 50 years old. It is well to remember, "A home is only as modern as the last improvement."

Of the 50 million houses I just referred to, it is of interest to analyze them. The most recent survey shows that 66 percent are from 20 to 30 years old and that 45 percent of them were built before 1920; 30 million have not been painted in 10 years; 16 million have no central heating; 9 million no hot water; 9½ million no bathtubs, but still, 23½ million are owner occupied. What a market. Let your own good business sense and imagination evaluate this tremendous market especially in view of the new technological developments and the young family formations seeking to establish a modern home.

Many modern families—you, and the families of your sons and daughters—have been reared in the use of consumer credit. We know it's the way to buy and obtain possessions which would otherwise be impossible if it were purely a cash transaction. However, a recent Federal Reserve survey showed that 50 percent of all families have no installment credit obligation. Also, it showed that of families with annual incomes from $3,000 to $7,500 per year only 40 percent used consumer credit which leaves a 60 percent market to be developed. The basic function of consumer credit is to aid the purchaser, and in view of these figures there is a lot of of pent-up purchasing power available in this country. However, on the other hand, sales promoted by unwise and risky credit use are dangerous to the economy of the Nation.

Often the question is asked, "What rules for granting consumer credit should a good lender use?" The criteria I use, and this is based on experience in both banking and manufacturing, are (1) consumer credit is intended to serve the buyer rather than the producer; (2) consumer credit should be granted on a sound basis to create an asset and not a liability; (3) consumer credit should be sold on a commonsense basis; (4) consumer credit should be extended in accordance with the accepted code of ethics perfected by industry and the banking profession; (5) determine the full obligation of the borrower so that his credit will not be over-extended; (6) good consumer credit builds character in the borrower—it does not destroy it; and (7) a loan well made is a loan half paid.

So that FHA title I may keep all fingers on the pulse of its program from a practical operating approach, we have created two advisory committees who meet periodically to give us advice. The members of these committees are appointed by Commissioner Zimmerman.

The Lenders Advisory Committee consists of 25 of the leading consumer credit bankers in the country. These lenders represent each geographical area of the Nation. We are in constant communication with our Lenders Advisory Committee and find its advice from the practical operating point of view most helpful and useful. We have the same regard and admiration for the local title I lenders groups which have been organized in the larger banking communities throughout the Nation.

Our other committee has a membership of men on the president or vice president level representing business, building material manufacturers, retail dealers, the National Better Business Bureau, and a credit rating organization. This group is known as the Industry Advisory Committee. It advises title I on how the program is working for the dealers and consumers.

All in all, we have a balanced program that operates for the benefit of all—the lender, the manufacturer, the dealer, the contractor, and the homeowner.

To assist lenders in collecting on delinquent accounts, we have begun the use of a communication to delinquent borrowers known as the "preclaim letter." This preclaim letter is sent at the request of the lender by the local FHA office to the homeowner advising that his account is overdue and the lender is about to file a claim with the Government for the unpaid balance. The results of this letter have been amazingly successful; 55 percent of all delinquent accounts, where this letter has been used, have been paid in full or made active again. This letter is now in nationwide use and is available to all title I lenders.

Another assistance given approved title I lenders is the policing of unethical dealers and contractors, commonly known as "suede shoe boys" or "dynamiters". After thorough investigation, we have listed over 6,500 such operators who are out to cheat and swindle homeowners by not installing material according to contract or exorbitantly overpricing the job. A disappointed homeowner is not a good payer on a loan. This type of contractor or dealer is put on our precautionary measures list which to all intent and purposes, precludes him from doing title I business because no lender will buy his paper except under certain regulatory conditions.

This precautionary measures list program is most effective because legitimate contractors can serve the homeowner without the shadow of suspicion which a few morally low ones can cast on the 165,000 contractor-dealers participating in the title I program.

To help our contractor-dealers further, we have an educational program underway. Our dealer relations unit and financial representatives, which are spotted throughout the Nation, meet with and address manufacturers' sales meetings, conventions of trade associations, State and local groups, to advise them on the operation of title I. We find that most contractors are reliable. However, to safeguard the reputation of ethical contractors against the fly-by-night, we urge homeowners to follow these suggestions: (1) check carefully the contractor's reputation. Ask your banker, chamber of commerce, or better business bureau if there is any doubt in your mind; (2) avoid all gimmicks. You want full dollar value on your improvements only. You cannot get something for nothing; (3) buy standard merchandise. Avoid the just as good brands unknown to you; (4) compare the price given, if you think it is high, with that of another known contractor; (5) read your written contract and be sure that you understand it before you sign it; (6) never sign any blank papers or notes. Obtain a copy of all papers you sign; (7) sign your completion certificate only after you are thoroughly satisfied with the completed property improvement; (8) report any complaints of poor workmanship to your lending institution immediately; (9) choose your contractor as you would your doctor; and (10) remember, no one can protect you against yourself.

About the biggest compliment paid the FHA property improvement program came by way of a visitor from Australia. After sitting in on one of our title I industry advisory committee meetings he spoke: "I have visited all countries of Europe studying housing but this is the first and only country in which I've seen bankers, industry, and Government sit down together and work for the common good of the homeowner. It is truly the most unique plan in the world," he said.

A Fable Teaches Lesson in Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a very interesting fable, written by Mr. Frank Macomber of the Copley News Service, entitled, "Can We Have Something for Nothing? A Fable Teaches Lesson in

Economics," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the fable was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAN WE HAVE SOMETHING FOR NOTHING? A FABLE TEACHES LESSON IN ECONOMICS

(By Frank Macomber)

Something for nothing.

We hear a lot about it. Some people, particularly politicians, like to promise it. But can we really have it?

Here's a fable that gives an interesting answer:

Once in a faraway land there was a small, tree-shaded town of 10,000 inhabitants. The people there were happy, thrifty, industrious, and enjoyed more of the good things of life than those in most parts of the world.

Three men in this town were able over the years to accumulate fortunes. One amassed a million dollars. The other two saved half a million each. These three practiced thrift and displayed ability beyond that of most. They were pointed to by others as the wealthiest citizens in the town.

But after a time there were those who said it was not fair that three people had so much of the community's wealth. When this talk reached the point of unpleasantness, the three decided they would distribute their fortunes to the townspeople. The millionaire got 10,000 $100 bills and gave one to each of the town's citizens. The two with half-million dollar fortunes gave each citizen a $50 bill. So each of the 10,000 citizens received $200 they hadn't expected.

They reacted like most people who get a windfall. Some traveled, a few spent their money in riotous living and others in less questionable ways. But after a few months few if any of the 10,000 still had their extra $200.

Now these good people had overlooked something important. It was the fact that the three men with the fortunes had not kept their money in a bank. It was tied up in factories and businesses which employed people. To raise the $2 million they distributed, the three men had to liquidate their factories, sell their machinery, etc.

So soon there were 200 people out of work in the town—people who had been employed in the factories and businesses of the three men. And soon shopkeepers had to curtail because of the unemployment and reduced buying power of the community. So another 100 were out of jobs.

But the people of the town were generous. They agreed to put all 300 unemployed on relief. This suited the 300 fine. They didn't have to work and had time to enjoy themselves.

Soon, however, the town government began to run short of money to keep these people on relief in the manner in which they had become accustomed. So the town council voted to tax everybody an extra $200 to keep the 300 on relief.

How's your arithmetic? We have 10,000 times 200, minus 300 by 200, minus 10,000 by 200, minus 2 million, minus 3 factories, minus 300 jobs. That's something for nothing.

Confessions of an American Spy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, one of our country's outstanding writers, Mr. Tom Anderson, editor of Farm and Ranch magazine, has written an excellent column on his recent visit to Russia. Mr. Anderson very definitely gained the impression that in many areas the Soviets are still very far behind the great progress which has been made by our country under our free enterprise system. I ask unanimous consent that this informative and encouraging column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD in order that it might receive the attention which I feel it merits.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Remember the game "I spy" (or "hide and seek")? It was the favorite game of my generation. I'm delighted to learn that it still is. Until our U–2 got caught spying on Russia, I was afraid that the coexistence-brotherhood jag our leaders have been indulging themselves in, might have led to cancelling our spying activities. Can you imagine Khrushchev running back to home base screaming, "One, two, three for the American spy in our sky?" Brings back the olden days. Also brings back into sharp focus my recent trip to Russia, where our party was spied on relentlessly.

In Russia, special floors are reserved in some hotels to house the secret police who are in charge of room service. They service each room with hidden microphones, to record conversations and telephone calls. And, their maid service includes sending photo equipment to your room (while you're out and won't be bothered) to photograph the papers in your bag and provide other small services, for which no tipping is expected.

The Russian security police have a habit, we were told, of slipping into the rooms of visiting editors—and others—to examine all film. Any pictures found to be nonflattering are exposed and carefully put back in place. The photographer for one of our leading weekly news magazines made frequent trips to the airport to lock his film in the safe on our airplane. He found evidence in Moscow that his bag in his hotel room had been opened.

I spied on Russia, too. Checked out Khrushchev's claim that Russia would catch up with the United States, economically, in 7 years. Russia won't catch Spain in 7 years.

We saw their best collective farms. They had to be. We drove 50 to 100 miles to get to each. The people on the collectives don't live as good as our plantation slaves did. And they have less freedom.

In the Russian revolution millions of peasants thought they were fighting the czars to get their own little piece of land. Ninety-five percent of Russian farms are in state or collective farms. Formed by uniting the small farms of millions of Kulaks—little family farmers who owned their land and were murdered (by Khrushchev and his crowd) in one of history's bloodiest purges after the Communists came to power.

Much of the hard labor in Russia is done by old women—or maybe they just look old. The workers in the field were almost all women. Invariably, as we drove by they would straighten up and gaze at us—as if we were from another world—which we were. They probably hadn't seen a car pass all day—just bicycles, wagons, carts, pedestrians and trucks. Trucks driven by their menfolk. Trucks which looked very much like U.S. Army surplus.

"Can we take pictures?" (This was before they knew about our U–2 pictures.)

"Certainly," responded the block of ice masquerading as a woman interpreter-guide. "All countries have their own security regulations. Here, you can take pictures of anything not connected with defense."

The next day we were driving out to see a State farm, and one of the editors asked this so-called woman several times to stop the car so he could take a picture. She always refused. (The picture would not have been flattering.) Finally, when we were passing through a village which looked like those in a TV western, the editor said, "I must stop here." She paid no attention. Some of our fellows referred to her as the "Iron Maid." Maid was not the right word.

The usual collective farm had clusters of drab, primitive-looking shacks surrounding several farm buildings, groups of poorly dressed, runny-nosed children and an oversupply of workers about as busy as a feather-bedding fireman on a diesel locomotive.

There are practically no fences in the Soviet Union. The livestock are herded mostly by women. There are almost no beef cattle in Russia. Steak, when you can get it, comes from dairy culls. Russia overtook America last year in the total production of milk, according to Russian claims.

The Russians claim to have one tractor to every 400 acres of arable land. We have one for every 90 acres. The new and proudly proclaimed sugar beet harvester we saw in operation in the Ukraine required that the women workers rehandle most beets. As an ex-beet farmer, Secretary Benson commented privately that he had better harvesters than that 25 years ago.

Moscow is full of slums, some built before the war, and some brandnew. Most families live in one room, share a community kitchen and bath. In fair weather, the streets are full of people. Because the streets are better than home.

Red Square is the largest square I've ever seen. Across from it is the city's one big department store, Gum. Hundreds of people buying everything from rugs to caviar. It was just like Macy's, 50 years ago. I went in to buy a souvenir, but there were no worthwhile dust collectors.

Our guides, or keepers, saved the Kremlin for last. It is huge, and ugly. But, the museum is one of the best in the world—chariots, jewelry, works of art—bought, received as gifts, stolen by the czars and their Communist successors. The palace of the czars is maintained in all its regal splendor. After the peasant sightseers take in this, they are then taken to Lenin's house, also within the Kremlin walls. Lenin lived amidst surroundings as plain as a sharecropper's in this country.

We went to the Bolshoi opera, one of the world's best. It was wonderful. But a block away the restrooms don't have tissue. The Russians have concentrated on excelling in a few things: Opera, ballet, airplanes, and materials of war.

In Kiev, we went to the ballet. Exquisitely done, I would have enjoyed it more though, if I hadn't been bathless for 2 days and unshaven. My room in the best hotel in Kiev had a hot water faucet, but no hot water.

Nearly everything you see in Russia makes you think, "The worst we've got beats this." The unemployed in America live much better than the average man in Russia. My earliest recollections date back to 1915. That is modern, compared to Russia today. You wonder where the skill and industrial power to build sputniks come from. You conclude it must be from imported scientists, stolen secrets, and in factories in some far-off place, like beyond the Ural Mountains.

The main incentive of the people is what you would expect anywhere there is no profit incentive: To work as little as the government bosses will tolerate. Many of the workers seemed employed in an all-day goof-off. An all-day coffee break, without coffee. We watched for an hour, on one state farm, nine workers exercising a horse. He was a cavalry horse tied on a 20-foot rope to a stake, and the group stood in the circle and kept him running by whirling their hats, hollering, and jumping. But I guess they had to have something to do since they're not allowed to leave the job.

The Russians have a very clever way of reducing man-hours—they use women.

In Russia everything is sold in government stores—stores whose show windows are apt to display a single dusty suit, a row of dirty canned vegetables, or other merchandise you'd expect to find in the country store where you traded in 1913.

They ask you such questions as: Why is there no free schooling, no free apartments in America? Why do 6 million Americans starve every year? Is it true that you can go from State to State in America without a passport? Or even move from one city to another without permission from the Government? There are few open towns in Russia where people are free to enter and leave the town. Most are closed to tourists. Russian sputniks might go to the moon, but Russian citizens can't go from one city to another.

Russia has now had a taste of those American tourist dollars and wants more. So, you can now get a conducted tour of Russia, by "Intourist." You'll get to see about as much of Russia as you'd get to see of America by signing up for visitors' privileges at San Quentin. The Russians are now ready to receive you. NIXON has tested the atmosphere with cosniffer Milton Eisenhower. Adlai's had it. And Ike will get reinvited if he apologizes for the U–2 flights.

If you're planning a vacation trip to Kremlin land, as thousands of Americans are, be sure to do these things first: (1) See a psychiatrist; (2) consider Alcatraz instead. It's prettier, the food and accommodations are better, and it's safer.

Social Security To Observe Its 25th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the silver anniversary of social security will be celebrated on August 15. Many Americans will remember on that day, I am sure, the long struggle and debate which preceded enactment of this legislation. Many more Americans, however, now accept social security as a necessary part of life today.

Those of us who believe that the social security system may well serve as the vehicle for a program of medical care for the aging and aged are, I am sure, particularly interested in many of the very kind things which will be said about social security in the next few days.

One such birthday wish has already been given by the Morning Call, Paterson, N.J., in its issue of August 3. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIAL SECURITY TO OBSERVE ITS 25TH ANNIVERSARY

The silver anniversary of social security will be celebrated on the 14th of this month. Social legislation became law on that day in 1935 when the late F.D.R. placed his signature on the bill Congress enacted to provide financial assistance to peoples and families whose breadwinner no longer can be gainfully employed.

Social security is a three-pronged program, (1) public assistance, (2) old-age, survivors, and disability insurance, and (3) employment security.

All three phases of this legislation—since 1940 when first payments were made—have materially benefited society and have been largely instrumental in keeping families together. Benefits are forthcoming at death, retirement, or disability.

Employment security serves in two ways. It helps workers find jobs and pays weekly unemployment benefits to those eligible for payments who are out of work.

Public assistance pays money to individuals and families in need because of certain conditions, and who qualify under State and Federal law. Aid is given to needy people 65 or more years old; to people who are too blind or too disabled to work; and to families whose providers are dead, disabled, or out of the home for a prolonged time.

Old-age, survivors, and disability insurance provide payments to families when the head of the household has worked and paid into the social security fund long enough to be insured and then retires, or becomes severely disabled, or dies.

The American people should be grateful for the social security system that relieves despair and brightens the remaining years of those who reach the autumn of their lives in the knowledge that theirs is a government with a social conscience which won't permit humans to near the end of the road without security from want.

We join with the community in hailing the widespread benefits of social security.

Birthday Greetings to a Chilean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter to the editor, published in the August 1, 1960, edition of the Washington Daily News, written by the distinguished Latin American journalist Persio Franco, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIRTHDAY GREETINGS TO A GRAND OLD CHILEAN

Don Emilio Bello Codesido, of Chile, was 92 years old yesterday.

The First International Conference of American States was held in Washington from October 2, 1889 to April 19, 1890. All the delegates who attended it are now dead.

However, the second conference was held in Mexico City from October 22, 1901 to January 31, 1902. Don Emilio is the one survivor of this historic occasion. That is why he is considered and called the "Dean of Pan-Americanists" and "Patriarch of the Americas."

More recently, when the American Foreign Ministers held a meeting in Santiago, Chile, August 12–18, 1959, they unanimously asked Don Emilio to preside over the opening of the first session and he did so admirably.

Don Emilio has been President of Chile, and is a grandson of the very outstanding Venezuelan intellectual, Don Andres Bello.

I'm sure that all friends of pan America and all friends of Chile would salute him personally, if they could, on his birthday. Viva Don Emilio. Viva Chile.

World Soil Scientists Meet in Madison, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during this week, the International Soil Science Congress is meeting at the University of Wisconsin.

For the conference, about 1,100 soil scientists from 40 to 50 nations will present, and listen to, about 400 papers on the subject of soil.

The Congress marks the first return to the United States since its first meeting in 1927 in Washington, D.C.

The selection of the University of Wisconsin as the site for the 1960 conference, I believe, was most apropos. Over the years, the university—one of the great educational institutions in the country—has been a leader in the field of research, experiment, and development for improvement of soil and other aspects of agriculture.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal published an informative article on the Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have this article and an editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal welcoming the soil scientists printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 11, 1960]

WORLD SOIL SCIENTISTS COMING TO STATE

MADISON, WIS.—Dirt will be discussed here next week on a scale to put back-fence gossipers and sewing circles to shame.

More than 1,100 soil scientists from all over the world will assemble at the University of Wisconsin for 8 days and collectively, hear more than 400 papers.

It will be the seventh congress of the International Society of Soil Science. The society, which began a half century ago in central and western Europe, has had many more meetings than that, but not until it was reorganized after World War I did world congresses begin.

The first was held in Washington, D.C., in 1927 and this is the first return to the United States since then. Meanwhile, the congress has met in the Soviet Union, Great Britain, the Netherlands, Belgian Congo, and France.

UNITED STATES PLAYS BIG PART

The Soil Conservation Service (SCS) of the U.S. Agriculture Department has played an important role in developing the congress to worldwide status.

About 400 of the visitors will be leading soil scientists from 40 or 50 foreign nations. Some of them, from underdeveloped countries, are coming on grants which the congress' organizing committee obtained from

agencies of the United States and the United Nations, and from private foundations.

Buses carrying nearly 200 foreign scientists left New York August 5 to see farming operations and agricultural experiment stations along the route to Madison, where the party will arrive Saturday.

Similar bus tours to both coasts will follow the Congress. A 15-day trip will take 125 foreigners through Iowa, Nebraska, and the Southwest and end up at Berkeley, Calif. An 11-day trip will take 150 visitors through the South will end up at Washington.

TOURS ARE A FEATURE

"Field study tours always have been an outstanding feature of these international meetings," said Emil Truog, emeritus soil professor at the university, who is congress manager. "Many of the visitors will take tours Thursday to see the university farm, the Hancock Experiment Station, and other places of interest."

MEETINGS AT UW

Originally, the 9-day program had 2 open days, Thursday for Wisconsin tours, and Sunday for rest and worship. But the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) of the United Nations requested a full day symposium on tropical soils and this has been scheduled Thursday. It will be led by Charles E. C. Kellogg, Washington, Assistant Administrator of SCS and vice president of the society.

Elaborate tour guides have been prepared by State colleges and universities along the routes and also by the SCS. The visitors will see all phases of soil research. Pits have been dug for observation of soil profiles (layers) at various places.

Many of the visitors will be housed and fed at the university. Meetings will be held in halls of the Memorial Union and the Wisconsin Center.

The 150- by 100-foot floor of the old red gymnasium is full of exhibits prepared by the agriculture department, the land grant colleges, and foreign nations. Nationalist China, for instance, sent paintings of plant inoculation. SCS has prepared a big layout showing the whole plan for carrying out soil surveys and their use in farm and watershed planning.

Governor Nelson and Conrad A. Elvehjem, university president, will welcome the Congress at an opening general session Monday morning. The same program includes a discussion of the world "freedom from hunger" campaign by FAO's director general, B. R. Sen.

ROLE TO BE DISCUSSED

There also will be a talk on the role of soil scientists in this campaign by Richard Bradfield of Cornell university, the society president. A paper on the productivity of the U.S. arable soils will be presented by Kellogg.

After that, the proceedings will become technical. Another general session will be held Monday afternoon and thereafter one is scheduled every day except Thursday and Sunday. The many commissions of the society, which carry on study programs between Congresses, will have nearly 50 single and joint meetings.

The congress has three official languages, English, French, and German. Speakers may take their choice, but UW men in charge of papers and summaries say that, with few exceptions, the papers will be given in English.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal]

WELCOME TO SOIL SCIENTISTS

Madison is honored today to welcome 1,500 of some of the world's most distinguished scientists who might well hold the future of the world in their hands.

Meeting at the University of Wisconsin will be the Seventh International Soil Science Congress, one of the oldest of the international scientific societies. It has met previously only in Washington, D.C., England, Holland, the Congo, and France.

Perhaps little of the 400 highly technical papers to be presented here will be understood by the general public. Yet all peoples of our world recognize that what these specialists are about is basic to human existence and of first importance to the peace of civilization.

Many coming from overseas want to see how America produces a surplus of agricultural products while other countries are always hungry. Americans, undoubtedly, will learn from them some things to help with our problems.

But beyond the meeting of scientific minds, this is an admirable opportunity for important people of all lands to meet those of others, an opportunity for which the program-makers here have planned well.

Our visitors could have picked no better place than Wisconsin for this people-to-people meetup. Wisconsin is the land of the open mind, the open threshold. These, too, we must believe, are the avenues to human understanding out of which peace may grow.

Timely Article on the Organization of American States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in the light of the opening this week of the critical and historic meeting of the Organization of American States, in San Jose, Costa Rica, I should like to cite a most timely and informative background article on this fine organization in which the United States is proud and honored to hold membership. The article in question, entitled "The Organization of American States," appeared in the August 2 issue of Newsday, and was written by Leonard Baker, chief of the Newsday Washington bureau. Mr. Baker deserves praise for the succinct but highly informative review he has presented of the life history of OAS, and of the nature and purposes of this vital hemispheric grouping of States. Mr. President, because of the relevance of this excellent article I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIFYING FORCE OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE: THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES—ACTING AS A UNITED NATIONS-LIKE POWER IN THE TWO AMERICAS, THE OAS PROVIDES A CENTRALIZED FORUM IN WHICH THE NATIONS OF THE WESTERN HEMISPHERE CAN CARRY OUT PROGRAMS OF MUTUAL ASSISTANCE

(By Leonard Baker)

WASHINGTON.—Convinced that "their welfare • • • will increasingly require intensive continental cooperation," the United States and 20 Latin American nations in 1948 established the Organization of American States (OAS) as the vehicle to provide that cooperation.

Tuesday a special meeting of the foreign ministers of those 21 nations will tackle two serious threats to that spirit of cooperation enunciated 12 years ago. Venezuela has accused the Dominican Republic of "acts of intervention and aggression" culminating in an assassination attempt against Venezuelan President Romulo Betancourt last June. This is more than an isolated squabble between two countries. Venezuela, under Betancourt's leadership, represents the movement within Latin America toward democratic government. The Dominican Republic, under the dictatorship of Rafael Trujillo, represents the old order of Latin American governments, anxious to stifle freedom within its own borders and among its neighbors.

Under a request from Peru, the ministers will then consider the subversive activities within Latin America by Russia. These activities, it is feared, have been spurred by the growing rapport between Cuba and the Kremlin. The United States is hoping for a strong declaration aimed at blocking any extension of communism into the Western Hemisphere.

Coping with these threats will not be simple. Within Latin America are deep-seated animosities among nations, strong vocal support for the Cuban revolution and the lingering fear that Uncle Sam is not a benevolent friend but—as he has sometimes been in the past—a scheming mercenary.

Giving promise of success, however, is the recognition by all members of the OAS that their fates are intertwined. The United States first accepted this principle in 1823 with the adoption of the Monroe Doctrine. Three years later, Simon Bolivar, the George Washington of Latin America, tried to promote a collective security agreement among the Latin American countries. He failed but the acceptance of his ideas grew as the nations became more aware of the problems they faced.

FIRST CONFERENCE IN 1889

In 1889 this sentiment produced the first international conference of American states. Meeting in Washington, this country and neighbors south of the border voiced the principle of continental solidarity. In the years since, this principle has been buttressed by concrete actions. Together the American nations worked to promote trade, wipe out disease and increase educational opportunities. They agreed to settle disputes peacefully and stay out of the affairs of their neighbors. When World War II came, they decided that an attack against one would be an attack against all.

In the late 1940's, the nations agreed to consolidate the work of the past 50 years. And in 1948, at Bogotá, Colombia, the Organization of American States was born, dedicated to preserving the freedom of the Western Hemisphere, the freedom of each member country and the freedom of man.

The OAS has set up technical aid programs, peacefully settled border disputes, established a student fellowship program, attacked disease and last year brought forth the Inter-American Development Bank to provide capital for investment-hungry Latin America.

The supreme organ of the OAS is the Inter-American conference, which meets every 5 years to chart in broad lines the course the OAS will follow for the next period. The day-to-day operation is in the hands of the council, which meets twice a month and has one delegate from each country.

A consultation of foreign ministers can be called to meet extreme and urgent threats to peace. The first such meeting under the aegis of the OAS was in 1951 following the outbreak of the Korean war. The ministers did not meet again until 1959 when Cuba,

the Dominican Republic and Haiti accused each other of assisting invasion forces. The ministers called upon all member nations to observe strictly the rules of nonintervention and spoke out against "antidemocratic" regimes.

This action indicated that the ministers are more prone to rely on persuasion than direct action. Their powers range from recommending the withdrawal of ambassadors to the use of armed force. The expectation is that the meetings beginning Tuesday will also attempt persuasion rather than direct action out of fear of disrupting the spirit of "American solidarity and good neighborliness" which is the basis of the OAS.

Plate Glass Industry Protests Further Tariff Reductions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 17, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the principal points of a statement by Robinson F. Barker, vice president, glass division, Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., before the U.S. Tariff Commission on August 17, 1960.

Mr. Barker has made a distinguished presentation of a problem that is acute not only in the glass industry of Pennsylvania, but is a matter of diminishing returns if not complete oblivion to many segments of our economy. As the time for negotiations on further GATT agreements approaches, I have been very glad to note that industry has taken up the cudgel in earnest, as represented by the fine statements before the Tariff Commission and the Committee on Reciprocity Information. Mr. Barker's is certainly one of the most effective pleas in defense of American industry and American labor. It warrants closer reading which I hope its inclusion in the RECORD will afford.

There being no objection, the excerpts from the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM STATEMENT OF ROBINSON F. BARKER, VICE PRESIDENT, GLASS DIVISION, PITTSBURGH PLATE GLASS CO., BEFORE THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION, AUGUST 17, 1960

My name is Robinson F. Barker. I am vice president and general manager of the glass division of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., and have been in the glass business for 25 years.

First, I wish to thank you for the opportunity to appear here.

My company—PPG—has previously filed with you three confidential memoranda in opposition to further reductions in existing tariff rates—one relates to sheet glass, one to plate glass, and the third to optical glass. * * *

I appear to present facts which will demonstrate the complete lack of justification for any further reduction in existing tariff duties and the absolute need for the granting of relief at the earliest practicable date by invoking the escape clause provisions of the Trade Agreements Act.

The problem can be stated simply—the U.S. sheet glass industry is losing the domestic market. We respectfully submit that this should concern not only the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information but also the American public at large.

Of course, we are mindful of the desirability of reciprocal trade relations among the nations of the world, and it is not our purpose to quarrel with the wisdom of the concept underlying our country's overall international trade policy.

But, we are also mindful of the fact that loss of the U.S. sheet glass market to foreign producers necessarily jeopardizes thousands of jobs as well as sizable investments which people in this country have made over a long period of years. * * *

It is not pleasant to report to you that commencing with August 1959 each succeeding month with but one exception—December 1959—has witnessed a decline in the number of our factory workers employed. It has now reached the point where nearly 25 percent of our normal complement of 2,900 sheet glass factory workers are unemployed. My company is not unique in this respect, and we believe that our experience is typical of all domestic sheet glass producers.

The principal markets for sheet glass include the building construction, automotive (including laminating and tempering), sash and door, mirror and specialty manufacturing, and glass jobbing industries. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, the total volume of sheet glass shipped in 1959 by the domestic producers was $134,502,000 (U.S. Department of Commerce Facts for Industry Series BDSAF-375-09, Feb. 18, 1960).

* * * * *

Having asserted that the U.S. sheet glass industry is losing the domestic market, I should state the bases for this assertion. If my assertion is correct, as I firmly believe it to be, then this forum presumably will wish to know how this came about, what role the tariff has played, what domestic damage has resulted, and, finally, what can or should be done about it.

Let's begin with some basic facts.

Import impact: In 1950 foreign imports of sheet glass into the United States totaled a modest 31.7 million pounds. In 1959 these imports had risen to the staggering figure of 502.6 million pounds. This represents an increase over 1950 of 1,485 percent. * * *

The rate of penetration of this market by imports has been fantastic. In 1950 foreign sheet glass imports were equivalent to 2½ percent of the total estimated domestic production. In 1959 imports increased to over 31 percent.

I cannot refrain from observing that in the 10-year period in which this foreign penetration occurred there were a series of reductions in the U.S. rates of duty applicable to imported sheet glass—the 1951 Torquay reduction and the subsequent Geneva reductions in 1956, 1957, and 1958—all on top of prior severe cuts together aggregating 62 to 67 percent.

These figures demonstrate that the amount of imports as well as the ratio of total U.S. production supplied by imports increased each year over the previous year shown, with but one exception, 1957. Although we do not pretend to have the complete explanation for the 1957 decline in imports, we do know that the domestic demand was off sharply in that year. This is in contrast with a preceding 2-year period of unprecedented demand which undoubtedly led to some scare buying in 1956. With U.S. demand down in 1957 it is logical to assume that the foreigners concentrated more on other markets in that year in preference to the United States.

Decline in exports: During the 1950–59 period U.S. sheet glass exports have declined substantially. U.S. exports in 1950 were 13.4 million pounds, or 231,837 SSE 50-foot boxes. By 1955 U.S. exports had declined to 7.2 million pounds, or 124,026 SSE 50-foot boxes, and in 1959 to only 4.3 million pounds, or 74,046 SSE 50-foot boxes. Thus, the 1959 exports amounted to only three-tenths of 1 percent of total U.S. production. Contrasted with imports amounting to over 31 percent of domestic production, the picture is certainly a dismal one for this American industry.

One further word about exports from the United States—in recent years we have seen our export markets slowly dwindle away for the reason that more and more countries are establishing their own sheet glass plants. These plants not only serve their own respective domestic needs but also create additional sources of imports to the United States. As a result, during the 1956–59 period, over 30 countries shipped sheet glass into this country.

The foregoing might well be captioned "The Problem Confronting the U.S. Sheet Glass Industry."

I will summarize the reasons which have occasioned the loss of a substantial part of our market to the foreigners and then take up each in some detail. The reasons are as follows:

1. There is equality of technology, labor skills, and productivity among foreign and domestic producers.

2. Ocean freight rates constitute no barrier to importation into the United States.

3. Most important is the fact that the foreigners have an overwhelming cost advantage over the domestic producers. This permits the foreigners to cut well below domestic prices.

4. Finally, successive reductions have increased the ineffectiveness of our tariffs in equalizing or offsetting in any way the foreigners' cost advantage.

Equality of technology: Considering, first, equality of technology, labor skills and productivity, I am mindful that there is a line of thought in this country that American industry can always meet—and beat—foreign competition simply by the adoption of production-line techniques and mass mechanization. Possibly that line of thought might have application to some domestic industries, I don't know. But I do know that it does not apply to sheet glass.

It must be remembered that the flat glass industry had its origin in Europe and over the years a large number of European companies entered the flat glass manufacturing business. Today, many of those old established companies are of great size (even by American standards) and they operate internationally.

Those European companies have large research and engineering organizations and their plants are highly mechanized. Many of the European sheet glass facilities have undergone extensive enlargement and modernization since the end of World War II. Unquestionably the Europeans possess sheet glass technologies equal to those used in this country. Moreover, the quality of their product is comparable to that produced in the United States.

These same observations, only to a slightly lesser degree, are applicable to the Japanese sheet glass industry. And in this connection I respectfully urge that you mark well the fact that in 1959 Japan, which has been steadily increasing its position as a world sheet glass supplier, moved up to second place in the foreign invasion of the U.S. sheet glass market.

In summing up this point, it is indeed fair to state that by reducing our sheet glass tariffs this country has not been giving needed sustenance to small, weak foreign glass manufacturers; rather it has given vast, powerful, international companies more "fat."

Ocean freight rates: The second reason why we are losing the U.S. market to foreign competitors is that ocean freight rates constitute absolutely no barrier to importation. A few illustrations will make my point.

Using Boston as our first example, you will be interested in learning that the freight rate from Antwerp to Boston is 84 cents per hundredweight. This is to be compared with the rate of 86 cents per hundredweight which is applicable to shipments from our nearest plant at Clarksburg, W. Va., to Boston.

Another illustration, the rate from Liverpool to Miami is 73 cents per hundredweight. This compares with the rate of $1 from Clarksburg to Miami, Clarksburg again being our nearest plant.

Turning to the west coast for our final illustration, we find that the rate from Yokohama to San Francisco is $1.24 per hundredweight. This is 38 cents lower than the $1.62 per hundredweight rate from our nearest plant, Henryetta, Okla., to San Francisco.

Foreign cost advantage: By far the most important reason underlying the success of the foreigners in invading the U.S. market is the overwhelming cost advantage they possess over the domestic producers.

This cost advantage applies not only to the cost of labor, by far the most important component of total cost, but also to the cost of raw materials.

Let's examine now what this cost advantage amounts to.

Labor costs: Turning first to comparative labor costs, you will observe that in 1959 the average hourly wages in Japan, excluding fringe benefits, were 33 cents and that such wages (including fringe benefits) were 69 cents and 75 cents, respectively, in West Germany and Belgium.

Our average hourly wages in that year were $3.72. Thus, our wage rates were four times those of Belgium, five times those of West Germany, and eight times those of Japan.

While no data were available respecting Japanese fringe benefits, it is unlikely that such benefits would increase the Japanese 33-cent figure above a maximum of 40 cents.

With respect to our PPG figure of $3.72, I should mention that labor contracts we have negotiated in recent months have provided for increases which will raise the $3.72 figure as follows:

February 1960	$3.82
September 1960	3.87
February 1961	3.92

The significance of this almost insuperable labor cost advantage held by the foreigners is best appreciated when it is realized that our labor content represents more than 50 percent of our total costs in making sheet glass.

Raw materials cost: Is the foreigners' labor cost advantage offset by higher cost of raw materials? The answer is "No." In fact they have an advantage here too.

We had listed a cost comparison between Belgium and the United States of four principal materials needed in the manufacture of sheet glass. Since the memorandum was filed we have obtained comparable costs of a fifth principal material—dolomite—and, accordingly, this additional information is also reflected in this chart which now accounts for 96 percent of the batch composition.

Raw materials cost comparison shows that PPG's costs are approximately 14 percent higher than those of the Belgians. So, here again we are at a marked disadvantage in competing against them. * * *

Domestic price disadvantage: With their tremendous cost advantage obviously the foreigners can and do undersell us consistently in this market. Furthermore, as I will demonstrate, regardless of the level of domestic prices at any given time, the foreigners are able to sell at prices ranging from 8 percent to nearly 25 percent below us. * * *

During the period prior to April 25, 1960, the western European producers laid-down prices ranged from 7.8 percent (Chicago and Miami) to 12.3 percent (New Orleans) below PPG. And, during that period, the prices of Japanese sheet glass laid down on the west coast were approximately 16.5 percent below our prices.

Effective April 25, 1960, we cut our delivered prices to meet this competition and for a brief period we were quoting at approximate parity with the European producers. This, however, was short lived and in a matter of days the foreign producers announced reductions which effectively restored and in some cases even exceeded their previous differentials under our prices. * * *

The post-April 25 differentials of the western European producers below PPG on B quality glass ranged from a low of 9.9 percent (Chicago) to a high of 11.1 percent in Seattle (port city) and 11.9 percent in Pittsburgh.

Japanese prices for single and double strength glass on the west coast after April 25, 1960, have ranged from 16 to 19 percent below our delivered prices and in Miami their prices are now approximately 23 percent below ours. This evidences their ability to quote even lower prices whenever they wish to invade a particular market.

It is apparent, therefore, that our April 25, 1960, price reductions did not effect any significant shrinkage in the differentials in favor of the foreign producers. In fact, in important instances, those differentials were further widened.

Since the date of the filing with you of our memorandum, there has been a price development which I should bring to your attention.

On or about July 14 at least one U.S. importer sent telegraams to its U.S. glass jobber customers indicating that its Western European factory sources were about to increase their sheet glass prices approximately 6 percent. Shortly after that date a number of the European sheet glass producers published such increased prices. I do not know at this time whether those new prices have actually been put into effect. Nor do I know what has motivated this action. I cannot help but observe, however, that this foreign price activity occurred on the eve of the issuance of the witness schedule which lists those who are appearing before you in connection with this extremely vital tariff mater. Whether this is a mere coincidence I do not know.

In addition we realize, of course, that there is nothing whatever to stop the foreign producers from reestablishing the same deep price cuts as soon as these hearings are concluded.

In any event, we learned just last week that one of the domestic producers has also recently announced slightly higher sheet glass prices. A comparison of the new prices announced by the European producers with those of that domestic producer indicates that were such prices to stick there would be a moderate narrowing in the differentials which previously obtained. The amount of this narrowing seems to approximate 3.7 percent.

My company has not changed its prices and is studying most carefully these recent developments.

Obviously, these price gyrations have not materially altered the basic disadvantages which confront us. Foreign sheet glass continues to be sold at considerable price differentials below domestic prices. And, foreign producers continue to possess substantial advantages in every significant element of cost.

Invasion of automotive market: Proponents of tariff reductions in sheet glass from time to time contend that the domestic producers have a significant advantage in making sales to the large volume domestic automobile manufacturers. This is not the fact.

Chrysler Corp., which fabricates half of its glass parts, is presently purchasing 70 to 80 percent of its raw sheet glass requirements from foreign producers. Similarly, the Ford Motor Co., both a producer and fabricator of glass, has contracted to buy sheet glass heavily from abroad. Such glass is used by Chrysler and Ford for fabricating side lights and rear windows. Also independent fabricators of auto glass parts are purchasing a large volume of their sheet glass requirements from foreign producers.

The all-important product for automotive glazing when tempered is seven-thirty-seconds inch A quality heavy sheet glass. Prior to April 25, 1960, the published prices of the Western European producers for this product laid down in Detroit were 12 percent lower than ours. This was 4½ to 5 percent greater than the differential those producers were quoting in Detroit on B quality SS and DS window glass, which products are not generally used in automotive glazing.

After April 25, 1960, the differential in most bracket sizes of seven thirty-seconds inch A quality heavy sheet glass was increased from 12 to 14 percent, and in the case of the bracket size needed for automotive side vents to 17.5 percent. These differentials are to be compared with a differential of 8 percent which the European producers applied after April 25 in sales of SS and DS B quality window glass in Detroit.

Manifestly these prices, on their face, show that the Western European producers are engaging in an all-out effort to capture the large volume domestic automotive market.

I am informed that PPG's sales and profits in recent years were the subject of comment in a brief filed by one of the importers that is urging for another tariff reduction. For that reason, I feel that I should speak to this subject.

In 1959 PPG had net sales of nearly $607 million and net earnings of $44.1 million. Comparable figures in 1958 were $513.7 million and $32 million. We have recently reported sales of nearly $324 million and net earnings of about $25.7 million for the first 6 months of 1960. Viewed abstractly these are large amounts of money but let us examine for the moment their sources.

For competitive reasons PPG, like most diversified companies, does not disclose its sales and profits for separate products. For the most part PPG derives its sales and earnings from the operations of its five major divisions; namely, glass, paint and brush, fiber glass, merchandising, and chemicals and cement (through a wholly controlled subsidiary).

Each of these divisions in turn deals in multiple products. For example, sheet glass is only one of the many products handled by our glass division. Other such products would include plate glass, laminated glass, tempered glass, multiple-glazed units, structural glass, storefront metal, and special glass products for national defense purposes.

Presumably references to PPG's consolidated sales and earnings are made to suggest that each of its many product lines is relatively profitable. This, of course, is not the case. And, with respect to sheet glass it should be obvious that no industry with a heavy investment can make a satisfactory profit contribution when operating at 55 percent of capacity in a market fraught with intense price competition of the type I have described.

By way of summary, the tariff on sheet glass declined from 60 percent in 1939 to 14.8 percent in 1959. The absence of effective tariff rates, coupled with excessively low wage rates, has enabled European producers to sell in the United States at prices 8 percent to 17½ percent below domestic producers and has permitted Japanese producers to sell as much as 25 percent below. As a result, imports of foreign sheet glass increased from 2 percent to 31 percent of domestic production in the short span of 10

years—from 1950 through 1959. In the absence of vitally needed tariff relief there is every reason to believe that this steady loss of markets will continue unabated. It should be kept in mind that many cost disadvantages of the domestic producer are the direct result of rules and regulations which have been established by our Government to attain the high standard of living which prevails in this country. I have in mind here our laws relating to minimum wages, collective bargaining, social security and taxes—to name a few. After helping American workers to secure a fair wage, it cannot be the policy of the Government to promote buying abroad to avoid the resulting higher wage costs of domestic producers. These cost disadvantages materially affect our ability to compete.

At present, we are producing at only 55 percent of our capacity with nearly 25 percent of our normal number of sheet glass factory workers out of work. Operating at such a low rate sharply increases our per unit cost of production, which in turn places us at an even greater competitive disadvantage. In addition, our inventories of sheet glass have been steadily increasing even at our current low rate of operations. Today our inventories are at an all time high and nearly double what they were a year ago. We believe that our experience in this regard is typical of all domestic producers.

In conclusion, I invite your careful attention to one of the most alarming situations which faces us—namely, the steady loss of our position in the American market and the substantial denial of participation by us in the increased demands of the U.S. market for sheet glass. It is my understanding that there is agreement in many quarters that the decade in the sixties will open a golden period of dynamic growth in American industry. Based upon our research and development, and market studies we have every reason to believe the market for sheet glass will be an expanding one. However, under the conditions which presently exist, and which I have endeavored to outline to you, we have no present hope or expectation of sharing in that growth.

We do not believe that it is the purpose or policy of our Government under the Trade Agreements Act or any other provision of law to deny to any American industry—and in this instance particularly to the sheet glass industry—the opportunity to participate in the indicated steady economic growth of our country. That participation, we fear, may be difficult if not impossible unless prompt action is taken to place us on some basis of equality with the foreign sheet glass producers in the U.S. market. We do not ask for, nor expect, an embargo—we ask only for a fair opportunity to compete.

For all these reasons we respectfully submit that this Commission should report to the President of the United States that the peril point for sheet glass has been reached and exceeded, and that pursuant to the provisions of the Trade Agreements Act this Commission institute on its own motion an escape clause investigation in order that action may be taken at the earliest practicable date to extend essential relief to this industry.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Realistic Attitudes Urged on Import-Export Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the increasing ability of industries in other countries to undersell American products in both foreign and domestic markets poses one of the major economic issues of this period. Whenever constructive approaches to American policy are suggested, consistent with our national interest in an expanding trade among nations of the free world, I believe they deserve the most careful attention we can give them.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. John T. Connor, chairman of the board of the Manufacturing Chemists' Association, and president of Merck & Co. of Rahway, which appeared in the Journal of Commerce on June 9, 1960.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REALISTIC ATTITUDES URGED ON IMPORT, EXPORT PROBLEMS—MCA BOARD CHAIRMAN SEES NEED FOR WORKING WITH OTHERS IN DEVELOPING BETTER ARRANGEMENTS ON WORLD TRADE, ALSO URGES CLOSER UNITY IN UNITED STATES

(By John T. Connor)

The events of the last 2 years prove we can no longer afford to believe that American goods have some divine right to world markets.

If you consider that the difference between what we exported during 1958 and 1959 and what we imported during those years amounts to a $7 billion deficit, the hard truth of the matter is symbolized in a dramatic way.

Certain realities have to be faced: The European Common Market, for example, and the European Free Trade Association.

The European Common Market was organized to eliminate gradually the tariffs among its six-member nations and to increase productive efficiency by such means as pooling manpower, transport, and sources of energy. Earlier this month I saw at firsthand how well the ECM is achieving its goals. It was a very impressive view.

COST FACTOR NOTED

The future may well hold serious problems for American firms trying to export to the Common Market countries. European costs of production, research, marketing, and distribution are so much lower than in this country that competition in European markets by American-made products against similar products made in Europe will be severe.

Even though the U.S. export picture is somewhat brighter for the first few months of 1960, the long-term basic problems still remain, in my opinion, and the U.S. domestic trade situation may also deteriorate because of our competitive disadvantages.

I speak from experience when I say that domestic producers in the United States and Canada in the chemical industry are steadily losing business to imported materials. Japanese vitamins, to take just one example, are sold in this country at prices that have now approached the absolute minimums which domestic producers need to break even. Yet we are restricted by the Japanese against selling U.S.-made vitamins in Japan. The same experience is being shared by other industries, as you know. What are we going to do about it?

I'd like to suggest one or two answers. Each of the suggestions has a common base, that of the need for understanding.

First, all of us must come to a complete understanding and realization that the world is closing in on us. And then we must make others understand that, too.

For a start, take European business leaders. Ever since the war they have been preoccupied with building up their own industries. And the United States has helped them with trade and aid so that today Western Europe is economically powerful, a most desirable condition.

REAPPRAISAL URGED

But now the time has come for a new look at the situation by Europeans. They must be made to realize that we in the United States, and in Canada, are indeed partners in the world trade family. They must realize that we have an economic entity to think about, too, and that American jobs are important to the American people.

Our friends in Western Europe today see only one goal before them: Unification of the European economy by, as they put it, bridging the gap between the ECM and the EFTA, and they are quite anxious to have all possible American help in reaching that worthy objective. They are determined to avoid a costly and destructive trade war between two blocs that should be friendly. We should lend our "good offices" to that end.

But because of their preoccupation with their own affairs, our European friends seem completeley indifferent to the trading problems we in this country face. They are inclined to dismiss the $7 billion unfavorable balance of trade in the last 2 years as temporary and to adopt an attitude of "you can afford it."

FORUM SUGGESTED

What we need now is a forum at which American and Canadian viewpoints can be brought forcibly to the attention of our European colleagues. We need some central body which will give consideration to the problems of world trade which we in this country face. The future economic programs of our allies in Europe should not ignore the obstacles confronting North America but should give them room in their plans, just as we in this country have planned our economic programs with Europe's interests very much in mind, ever since the end of World War II.

Such a forum may be created if a proposed new organization comes into being. It has been recommended that the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, the OEEC, be remodeled into the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, or the OECD. Eighteen countries of Europe are members of the OEEC and the United States and Canada are associate members.

In the new organization the United States and Canada would be full members, and the emphasis would shift from the recovery of Europe from the war to promotion of world trade on a multilateral, nondiscriminatory basis. Another major activity of the OECD is seen to be helping the newly developing nations of the world reach economic maturity.

Hopefully, then, our country would have a place in the new organization where its views could be formally presented and considered. But if the OECD should not become a reality, or if, after it is established it should not prove to be an effective forum, then we must seek other means to have our interests adequately represented.

Another area in which we need understanding is right here at home. One step in the right direction was the establishment, last year, of the Business Council for International Understanding, the BCIU.

The BCIU sponsors regularly scheduled sessions for intensive training of international business executives at the American University School of International Service in Washington, D.C.

The program is not designed just for the new, junior executive; many U.S. based, senior international executives attend as well as the overseas-bound. Enrollment is limited to 25, with 6 sessions scheduled for 1960. Wives attend a special course in the final week of each session.

The program stresses American customs and values in the light of foreign attitudes toward them, coupled with a grounding in American foreign policy by top Government officials.

In addition, half the course is devoted to specialized study in selected area: Latin America, Western Europe, Middle East, South and South East Asia, Far East, and "special groups." Private consultations are arranged with appropriate officers of the State Department and other U.S. Government departments and agencies, as well as foreign diplomats in Washington and businessmen familiar with the area, to discuss specific commercial and political questions.

Twice a week, lectures from distinguished leaders in these categories are scheduled—one at a coffee hour, the other a dinner meeting. Participants may also attend "coffees" at the School of International Service to hear other distinguished speakers.

We need more of such forward-looking activities.

MORE COOPERATION NEEDED

And, finally, better understanding must be reached between Government, industry, and labor in this country.

Too often business is inclined to think of Government as an antagonist, to regard its dealings with Government bodies and agencies as contests. Similarly, there are individuals in Government office who look upon industry as something to be controlled and restrained.

And the relationships between labor and industry, and labor and Government, also cry out for better understanding of the realities in today's world.

LABOR ATTITUDE IMPORTANT

Leaders in labor unions, particularly, must give recognition to the fact that many European manufacturers, who compete with domestic manufacturers in overseas markets

and in the U.S. market now have modern equipment and a high degree of automation, quite comparable to the best we see in this country.

Labor union leaders must give weight to the wage differential between domestic and foreign producers. They already know the facts. They know, for example, that if you use the labor cost of France as an index of 100, then the wage index in Holland is only 81, whereas in the United States, it is 385.

With such cost factors built into the situation, how long can we reasonably expect that the United States can be an effective competitor.

The United States, if it is to compete successfully with other countries in world markets and at home, can no longer afford the traditional American practice of placing labor and management in direct opposition to each other. Nor can we afford governments which adopt either a promanagement or a prolabor point of view.

CONFERENCE SUGGESTED

Perhaps we should have a White House conference between representatives of industry, labor and Government for the purpose of initiating a program of bringing the 3 elements closer together in an understanding of how this country, is faring in international trade. I am optimistic enough to believe that, once a full understanding is reached, solutions to our major trading problems will be conscientiously sought and found.

The Western European nations, starting almost from scratch, have in 15 years, achieved economic progress without endangering their economic stability. I refuse to believe that we can not accomplish the same thing.

But to accomplish it we will have to adopt new policies and new approaches to replace those which are no longer compatible with the conditions of today.

Our future prosperity will have to come, not from annual pay raises won at the bargaining tables without productivity increases, and not from arbitrary price increases. Our future prosperity will have to be wrested from markets here and abroad in fair and open competition.

If and when that concept is accepted as the basis for action by our industries, our unions and our Government, we can begin to move forward again.

Conservation of Wilderness Areas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as we move into the closing weeks of the 86th Congress, a major piece of legislation is yet to be acted upon—the wilderness bill to set aside portions of our country for the enjoyment of future generations.

This bipartisan, national proposal for the establishment of a policy and program for the preservation of some of our American wilderness has been the subject of two hearings here in Washington before the Senate Interior Committee, and six hearings in Western and Southwestern States.

The proponents of the measure have been patient and cooperative in adopting clarifying amendments and acceptable suggestions. All of these changes have resulted in a number of committee prints as well as a substitute proposal.

Senator JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana, has performed an excellent, responsible service by bringing together these amendments and introducing, on July 2, 1960—1 day before the Congress recessed—a "clean" bill, S. 3809.

Support for the wilderness bill continues to grow, in spite of the long delay. Mr. Leonard Hall, one of our most distinguished writers, and the recipient this year of the Thomas L. Stokes Award, in a letter published on June 14, 1960, in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, asks, "Who is for the wilderness bill?"

In answering his own question, he points out that "a large number of Senators and Congressmen are waiting a chance to vote favorably on it." Among the bill's supporters he also lists "conservation groups across America, garden clubs, women's clubs, sportsmen's organizations, labor organizations, outstanding newspapers and magazines, countless prominent Americans as individuals."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hall's entire letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. I also ask unanimous consent that an article from the Christian Science Monitor of July 21, 1960, quoting the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 14, 1960]

A FEW TALL PINES, A LITTLE SHORT GRASS—WRITER APPEALS FOR BILL TO PROTECT FEW BITS OF WILDERNESS LEFT FROM AMERICA'S PAST

(A letter to the Post-Dispatch by Leonard Hall)

If any of the primeval beauty of America is to be saved for future generations—if any of our land is to be preserved unspoiled as it was when the Creator made it available to us—then every effort must be made by citizens of goodwill everywhere to secure passage of the wilderness bill.

This bill has been before the Congress since 1956. It has been exhaustively studied and approved by the administration, the Department of Agriculture, Department of Interior, and Bureau of the Budget. It has not been enacted into law because it is being fought to the last ditch by powerful groups whose interest is in turning the people's natural resources into cash for private profit; and these groups influence many individuals, lawmakers, and bureaus in our Government.

What is the wilderness bill? It is a proposal to take the outstanding primitive and untouched areas in our national parks, fish and wildlife refuges, and national forests—and to protect these against exploitation by means of a wilderness preservation system sanctioned by national law. This would simply mean that areas now or in the future designated as inviolate wilderness would be removed from departmental regulation which can always be changed by a stroke of the pen. It would provide that additions, deletions, or changes in the wilderness system would be subject to public hearings and review by Congress.

Why should we preserve wilderness in America? The spoilers and exploiters say we cannot afford to save any untouched, unused land. They say this is "single-purpose use" as against what they call "multiple use." The difficulty in this "multiple use" concept is not that it is basically bad, but that for some it means sustained yield timber cutting, for some it means loading the forest range with sheep and cattle, for some it means establishing mining claims through political means and then skinning off the timber, and for some it seems to mean using every acre for all these purposes and more, besides.

The fact is, there is nothing single purpose about wilderness as specified in the wilderness bill. No areas now open to timber cutting are included, no existing private rights are endangered, no established uses of national parks, forests, monuments, or wildlife refuges are upset. On the other hand, the multiple-use concept is clearly present in the use of wilderness for watershed protection, hunting and fishing, camping, carefully controlled grazing, and, most important of all, scientific research. Only timber cutting and certain other commercial enterprises are excluded.

Why wilderness? The late Aldo Leopold said: "Wilderness is the raw material out of which man has hammered the artifact called civilization." To the pioneer, wilderness is an adversary to be conquered; to the exploiter in an unprincipled age, it is resources to be turned into profit. But to man in an advanced culture, surely there is time and wealth and reason enough to try to save some untouched remnants of this "raw material of civilization" for scientific study, for philosophical contemplation, for spiritual enjoyment.

There is little enough wilderness left and the time for saving even a few tag ends is short. Never again will living man see the long-grass prairie "where a sea of prairie flowers lapped at the stirrups of the pioneer." A tiny bit of short-grass prairie "where Cabeza de Vaca saw the horizon beneath the bellies of the buffalo" has been rescued and set aside to show where once the prairie schooners of the Forty-niners passed.

Oil wells, vegetable fields, citrus groves, and subdivisions have taken the last of the coastal prairie—and the virgin pine of the Lake States and giant white oak forests of the Ozarks are gone forever; and most of the big cypress, as well. Of 200 wilderness coastal areas investigated by the National Park Service, some 20 were considered as worth trying to save—and already several of these have been lost to superhighways and bulldozers. So far we've saved the Quetico Superior International Park in Minnesota and Ontario; and wild areas in the eastern national parks. Most remaining opportunities lie in the West.

Who is for the wilderness bill? The administration, as already stated, a large number of Senators and Congressmen who are waiting a chance to vote favorably on it, conservation groups across America, garden clubs, women's clubs, sportmen's organizations, labor organizations, outstanding newspapers and magazines, countless prominent Americans as individuals.

Who is against the wilderness bill? A small but exceedingly powerful group who believe they should keep the right to turn natural resources belonging to all Americans into personal profit for themselves. The only reason they are ahead is our inertia. It is time to shake off this inertia and get the wilderness bill passed.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, July 21, 1960]

AMERICA, THE BEAUTIFUL

Another session of Congress is nearing its end without action on the wilderness bill, the legislation which would safeguard approximately 55 million acres in various parts of the country as "areas where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by

man." This proposal lies buried in Senate and House committees, and similar measures have met a similar fate session after session since 1949.

This sometimes is a bit difficult to comprehend since there has been a widespread demand that part of the country be preserved as nearly as possible in its original condition. Posterity surely is entitled to see at least small tracts of virgin timber, of duneland and mountain untouched by bulldozer and unmarred by neon. Conservtionists, women's organizations, civic groups, labor unions, newspapers, and politicians have been pleading for years for the necessary legislation. They have not even been asking that any money be spent, merely for the protection of areas which already are Government property.

The only opposition is a largely hidden one, that of interests which believe they should be free to exploit any and every bit of the earth whenever they see profit to be gained. Congressional inaction can be attributed only to the influence of these interests or to apathy. Neither motive is a creditable one—least of all in legislators who orate so often about "the American heritage."—St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Rights of the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, Life Lines, a triweekly publication issued by Life Line, a patriotic and religious educational organization, regularly presents some of the most stirring pro-American information published in the United States today.

Much of the material appearing in Life Lines serves as the basis for a daily radio program by Wayne Poucher, Life Line commentator. This program is broadcast by a large number of stations located in every section of the Nation.

All of the material contained in Life Lines, published at Washington, D.C., is worthy of attention by Americans who are concerned about saving freedom in the world. A recent article is of particular interest at this time, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHTS OF THE STATES

For the last 30 years or so, we have been witnessing in America a skilled propaganda campaign, carried on by the dedicated and zealous mistaken enemies of freedom to discredit and destroy popular respect for our constitutional doctrine of States rights.

This vital principle of our Republic is set forth in plain language in the Bill of Rights of the U.S. Constitution. Nevertheless, the antifreedom forces long ago set the principle down for destruction. They know that, if literally enforced, this formula for freedom is an effective barricade against socialism, communism, or world government.

Thus an all-out campaign was put underway to fool the American people into believing that the States rights doctrine was a useless something left over to us from the more simple years of our history as a nation. We were told repeatedly that the basic reasons for maintaining the rights of the States had melted away with the coming of mass production, rapid transportation, universal communication, and a mobile population.

Even as the propaganda campaign against the doctrine of States rights was going on, the rights themselves were being washed away by a torrent of laws and Executive orders originating in Washington. More and power was concentrated on the mushrooming Federal bureaucracy. And the American people were told that this new centralism was not only inevitable but was good as well.

A number of other significant happenings were taking place during this time. For one thing, the U.S. Government extended official recognition to the Soviet Government of Russia. This was done at a time when many authorities considered that the Soviet regime was on the point of collapse. A few years later our country's participation in World War II again saved communism from complete destruction.

Other things happened. As the enemies of freedom continued their efforts to weaken and destroy States rights, our Government proceeded to give away American tax dollars by the tens of billions to nations all over the world. Domestic spending by the Federal Government kept jumping upward, even though times were good. Our taxes became a back-breaking burden. Our national debt soared upward to heights never before known, in peace or in war.

The language of our Constitution was expressly designed to safeguard our governmental structure against this kind of costly destruction against this kind of costly destruction. But written language alone, no matter how eloquent, can not protect our liberties. Such language must be backed up by intelligent, patriotic effort if it is to be effective.

Our Constitution assumes that its clear language will be enforced by and in the courts of our Nation. In recent years, however, the Supreme Court of the United States has not halted the excesses of Federal legislation and Federal administration in undermining the interests of States rights. In fact, the Court's decisions have lent strength to those measures that add power to the Central Government at the expense of the powers of the several States of the Union.

Unless an end is brought to centralization of power by judicial decree, it is only a matter of time until the States will be deprived of all sovereignty and power in the enactment and enforcement of laws for the protection of their local citizens. And this, too, is certain: We cannot destroy the rights of the States without at the same time destroying the United States as a nation where individual liberty is taken for granted.

Capital Times Endorses Mansfield's Plea for National Primary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Madison Capital Times, which has fought hard for the fullest possible popular democracy for more than 40 years, has published an enthusiastic endorsement of the recent speech by Majority Whip MIKE MANSFIELD for a thorough study of our present method of nominating the President of the United States, together with a long, hard look at the prospect of a national primary.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATOR MANSFIELD PROPOSES A NATIONAL PRIMARY SYSTEM

For months the Capital Times has contended that the convention system of choosing presidential and vice-presidential candidates is a farcical betrayal of our democratic system.

The conventions this year drove our point home with millions of Americans who watched these melancholy spectacles. Since the conventions there has been a growing interest in abandoning the present system and substituting a national primary in its place.

This growing sentiment has found expression in a proposal made by Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, the majority party whip and the most likely candidate to succeed Senator LYNDON JOHNSON as majority leader in the event that JOHNSON is elected Vice President.

Senator MANSFIELD noted in suggesting a national primary on the floor of the Senate Monday that the televising of the two conventions this year "led millions of Americans to question the entire nominating and electing procedure as it now operates."

Under the present system, he said, "the nominees come into the arena of deliberations with the bulk of the vote totals cemented beyond the reach of deliberation."

Nothing was more obvious in the two conventions this year than that the delegates were meeting to ratify decisions already made in preconvention deals among politicians across the country.

There never was any doubt that KENNEDY and NIXON had the nominations in the bag before the conventions were called to order. Nor did the delegates have a choice as to the Vice Presidential selections. They were chosen by the Presidential candidates and in the case of JOHNSON, the delegates were not even given an opportunity to express themselves in a rollcall.

The result is that there is deep dissatisfaction across the country with both tickets and a rising demand that something be done to improve the nominating process to give the people more control over the choice of candidates they will have to vote for.

The Capital Times is glad to see that the need for reform is being recognized by officials in Washington. We hope that is doesn't end with a speech by Senator MANSFIELD.

Steps should be taken immediately to draft legislation to provide for a national primary so that the people, not the political bosses in the smoke-filled hotel rooms, choose the candidates for the highest office in the land.

To continue the present system makes a farce of democracy.

Faith To Move Mountains

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, each Sunday evening at 10:30 p.m., e.s.t., Dr. Samuel M. Shoemaker, rector of the

Calvary Episcopal Church in Pittsburgh, the distinguished son-in-law of our former colleague, Senator Alexander Smith, broadcasts on radio station KDKA. In a recent broadcast he said:

One of the most helpful things that I see in America today is the growing number of people who are coming to associate our cherished freedom with our inherited faith.

In recent weeks, there have been other broadcasts and a number of sermons preached on the theme that our form of government is based upon the teachings of the Bible and calling attention to the fact that implicit in the propaganda program of the Communists to destroy our democratic institutions is an effort to repudiate the Bible and destroy our faith in God. All polls indicate that the current major concern of the American people is fear of another world war. Candidates for public office are promising a major strengthening of our defense posture. While God undoubtedly expects those made in His image to utilize the powers with which He has endowed them the Bible clearly teaches that we labor in vain to build a temple of peace that is not dedicated to the victory of moral force. Many will recall that in the midst of framing a great instrument under which we have enjoyed constitutional liberty the venerable Franklin said:

If it be true that not a sparrow can fall to the ground without His notice, how can we hope to see a new empire rise without His aid?

Last Sunday, Dr. Shoemaker voiced over the radio an eloquent plea for the recapture of the type of faith that the early Christians had, the type of faith that enabled the Founding Fathers to win their unequal struggle for independence and freedom.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address by Dr. Shoemaker entitled "Faith To Move Mountains."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FAITH TO MOVE MOUNTAINS

(By Dr. Samuel L. Shoemaker)

"If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you."—St. Matthew 17: 20.

People without faith sometimes alternate between believing that those who have faith are the most fortunate, or the most foolish, people in the world. They envy it, or they despise it. But while they teeter between a desire for faith, and ridicule of it, they must employ at least enough of it to go on living. And life goes on asking questions of them: Where did we come from? What are we doing here? Where are we going? Everybody that gets above living like the animals thinks about these things, and knows that life of itself offers no answer to them.

We know that if there is any answer, it lies in the realm of faith. Faith, at its simplest, means that life signifies something, that it is not pure senseless accident. This belief is hardly tenable without the further belief that life contains a positive purpose, and that this exists because behind life there is a Purposer. So faith comes to mean virtually faith in God.

WHAT IS FAITH?

Faith starts when you begin with this axiom, and put it to the test. As Unamuno, the great Spanish philosopher, said, "To believe in God is to long for His existence, and, further, it is to act as if He existed; it is to live by this longing and to make it the inner spring of our action. This longing or hunger for divinity begets hope, hope begets faith, and faith and hope beget charity. Of this divine longing is born our sense of beauty, of finality, and of goodness."

Jesus, whatever more He was, was a great genius in the art of faith. It is evident to anyone that He could do things with faith that most people cannot do; that He had more faith in God, more faith in faith, than any other man that ever lived. We turn to Him as the great Expert in faith.

We all remember the story of the Transfiguration, when He took Peter, James and John and went up into a mountain, and was transfigured before them, so that "his face did shine as the sun, and his raiment was white as the light." The spirits of Moses and Elijah appeared also, and from the cloud which overshadowed them came a Voice which said, "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him." The three apostles were frightened by this experience, until Jesus came and touched them and told them not to be afraid.

FAITH "WORKS"

Then, coming down from the experience on the mountain, there met them the father of an epileptic boy who begged Christ to have mercy on his son—he had brought him to the disciples but they could not cure him. And Jeus, full of the great experience which had just come to Him, full of an immense and intense faith, spoke sharply, "O faithless and perverse generation, how long shall I be with you, how long shall I suffer you?" He may have said it to the father, but more probably I think it was with the spiritually incompetent disciples in His mind. Then, shaking this sharpness from Him, He turned to the man as with a smile of gracious welcome, and said, "Bring him unto me."

It was then the belief that epilepsy, and much else, were caused by evil spirits. Moderns dismiss all this with a wave of the hand. We might do well to be a little better informed before we throw out the hypothesis of evil spirits so summarily. Some men very close to this powerful elemental kind of faith have believed in them, and still do. In any case, Jesus rebuked the evil spirit, and the child was cured. The power that had been given on the mountain was needed the moment He came down from the mountain to help a helpless sick boy. The same power that had made the body of Jesus transparent with light made this diseased human body radiant with health.

The disciples then asked Him why they had failed to cast out the evil spirit, and Jesus said, "Because of your unbelief: for verily I say unto you, if ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you."

Here is the concentrated essence of Jesus' faith. Here you see it in action, living and triumphant. Here is the vivid contrast, not only between the boy whose own faith is not mentioned, and the father's which is a little stronger, on one hand, and Jesus' faith, on the other; but also between the inadequate faith of the disciples, and the adequacy of Jesus' faith. Here is that tremendous word from Him about faith that removes mountains.

Let us take these words of His, and apply them minutely to ourselves.

UNBELIEF CUTS OFF POWER

"Because of your unbelief." That was why they had been incompetent to do what obviously should have been done, and what was done the moment Christ Himself arrived. We, too, are disciples of His. We, too, meet many who are figured for us in this epileptic boy—all kinds of sickness, all kinds of human suffering. We come into our Lord's presence in church, then we come down from this personal, oft-repeated transfiguration, and there meets us a world that is "lunatick and sore vexed" just as the boy was—a world that has been flung into the fire of war, into the water of uncountable human tears, by some evil and sinister force within itself. We see the tragedy about us on all sides, and we long to help, and we try to help, and we fail. And we come to Jesus and say, "Lord, why could not we cast out this spirit of evil, of hatred, of intolerance, of injustice, of cruelty, of anger, of war?" And He levels His eyes at us, and tells us the unvarnished truth, "Because of your unbelief." Not a man or woman of us can escape that judgment. We know it is true. There is none of us, no matter how much faith we may have, no matter how long we have been believers, or what "mighty works" we may have been able to do with our faith, for ourselves or for other people—there is not one of us that is not intimately and personally convicted by those words. "Because of your unbelief." That person might be well today, that relationship might be solid, that home unbroken, that group of people dominated by the right instead of the wrong motive, that community touched with the right spirit, yes, even the world itself freed from the scourge of war, but for one thing—our unbelief—our closedness to God's full love and power, our unreadiness to spend and be spent as Christ was when He came from the mountain. Yes. That is the world's great curse, the actual unbelief of us professed believers. How we do need to pray, "Lord, I believe: help thou mine unbelief."

"If ye have faith"—He goes on now to the positive—"as a grain of mustard seed . . ." Jesus loved that little mustard seed, loved the way the tiny thing broke open in the soil, and took root, and grew up into a tree that could house the birds of the air. I think He felt His own movement was like that, would grow and spread that way from tiny beginnings. "If you have only as much faith as a tiny grain of mustard seed, ye shall say to this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove. * * *"

"This is all folly," says the skeptic; "faith doesn't move mountains; dynamite and steamshovels move mountains, but faith doesn't move them. Go to the engineers that built the Panama Canal, or tunneled through the western Pennsylvania mountains, and they will tell you how to move mountains." Some of the arguments about religion would never arise if everybody had a little imagination, and, I might say also, more of a sense of humor. Jesus had just come down the slopes of an actual mountain. He had just seen the power of God banish a long-standing and grave human illness. And filled with the power of faith, He put vividly its immense possibilities before them, saying in His strong, oriental way, "This mountain would blow away and be found in another place if only you had as much faith as is figured by a tiny grain of mustard seed."

ONE NEGRO BOY

Perhaps we shall not understand what He meant until we let Him move some of our personal mountains for us. Here is a frail Negro boy, whose mother was sold as a slave—a sensitive, musical, whimsical boy with insatiable curiosity, balked at every turn to get an education. But that boy felt in his soul that he was meant to turn his personal curiosity about nature to the benefit of his people. And he believed in God. He ploughed through his difficulties one by one, got his education, and became one of

the great citizens of this country, one of its outstanding practical scientists, and one of the great benefactors of his race. I doubt if he could have done it without his faith, but by faith George Washington Carver removed, not only his personal mountains, but many a mountain of difficulty for his people.

THE MOUNTAIN OF PRIDE

His mountains were outside. Some people's mountains are inside. They have a mountain of pride which makes them want to run everything they touch, turn every situation to their own advantage, they thirst always to be right, and the ego is the greatest thing about them. Now there's a mountain for you. It stands between them and any true relationship, any true success. What can move pride? Can hard knocks from without do it? Not always. Can a direct pursuit of humility do it? They sometimes grow proud of their progress in humility. There is only one thing that can remove the mountain of pride—it is a great gratitude, a gratitude of precisely the kind induced in people when they find faith. Faith puts God in the center of every picture. When we truly believe, we are amazed at the goodness of God toward us. We know that God has given us something we could not give ourselves. Such gratitude alone can tear down the mountain of pride, from which many suffer, many who do not even know it, and become people for whom allowances always have to be made if the rest of us are to get along with them at all. O for some faith to remove that mountain.

THE MOUNTAIN OF FEAR

For many the mountain is a mountain of fear or a mountain of sorrow. Someone we love is in danger. We fear what the news may be in these next few hours or days. Or perhaps a message comes that wipes the sun out of the sky and sets up a throbbing ache in our hearts. Can even Christ move that mountain? We still hear His promise, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say to this mountain, remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove. * * *" Does it mean stoicism, teaching ourselves to endure, to stop caring? Far from it—it means the far more delicate and difficult solution of making us care all the more, but taking the personal hurt out, remembering the power of faith to transmute the meaning of personal sacrifice. That faith rests upon belief in the sovereignty of God in His universe, and the great corollary to this, that "all things work together for good to them that love God." That faith was sealed in the sacrifice of our Lord on Calvary, when He by faith changed forever the significance of the cross of shame, and made it the Cross of Salvation for the world. When we lift up our own losses and sacrifices and bring them under the transforming power of His Cross, faith moves the mountain of sorrow and of fear.

RELIGIOUS STOLIDITY

Sometimes our religious conservatism and immobility are very much like a mountain. We are traditional Christians, temperamentally impersonal, inclined to let others take the lead in spiritual things. We know that if Christians down the ages had been as cold and stiff as we, there wouldn't have been any Christians down the ages at all! But we sit down in the shadow of that mountain helpless and hopeless. Then Christ speaks to us, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed. * * *" and we know it is true. Bit by bit, like steam shovels eating away the sides of a mountain, Christ's living faith eats away the hard bits of self-consciousness, self-enforced loneliness, spiritual pride, and conservatism. And in their place we begin to experience a joyous, confident, contagious faith.

"Nothing shall be impossible unto you." Nothing, that is, which is consistent with the will of God for us and for His world. We have the whole range of possibility within that majestic and wonderful will of God, in which our faith can operate unhindered. A big vision is given to us, say for our own lives, or for our work: we do not see all the means available, but faith goes into action, and prayer; and slowly the vision is turned into reality. There is a lot of imagination in faith, divine, creative, wide-foraging imagination; for faith takes in all the possibilities. Garner and write down the details of the vision while it burns in your mind. Let the imagination roam freely. Bring it all under the purging discipline of prayer, so that all the self gets cooled out of it, and all that God can do through you is preserved. You may have a secondary part in fulfilling the vision, such as Harriet Beecher Stowe had in the abolition of slavery; but it may be a very necessary part. Let the vision grow and lie complete in your mind and in you prayers. Let God shape and modify it. And keep always in mind the immense promise, "Nothing shall be impossible unto you." Who knows what great, needed vision may be forming already in the imagination of someone today, for which the world will one day be thankful? "Nothing shall be impossible."

Let us live much more in our Lord's promises, then we shall do much better in living by His commands. Let us remember that prayer is always faith active, faith persistent, faith growing. Let us remember that the final leap of faith is not the letting in of credulity, but of courage; we only believe because of sufficient evidence; we only stick to our belief and live it out because our wills move up quickly behind our minds and courageously act; and because faith is the gift of God, we must constantly be coming back to God for fresh endowments of it through His grace. Let us all worship now with the prayer in our hearts for ourselves and for one another, "Lord, increase our faith."

Political Divisions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, a great many people listen to Mr. Erwin E. Canham's comments on the political news. He is editor of the Christian Science Monitor, and his comments come over the air on WMAL on Sunday nights at 8 o'clock weekly. His last comments in relation to the adjourned session of Congress and the Republican and Democratic viewpoints are very interesting and constructive. People listen to Mr. Canham because what he has to say is factual, never bitter nor venomous.

I ask unanimous consent that an editorial, entitled "Political Divisions," written by Mr. Canham, and published in the Christian Science Monitor, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICAL DIVISIONS

(By Erwin D. Canham)

The adjourned session of Congress is revealing the deep divisions of American politics. They show the two political parties profoundly split, even in an election year, and even with three of the four major candidates present and active in the Senate.

There are three positions being presented to the American people and their legislators. There is the Kennedy-Johnson position, the policies of the Democratic platform—except on civil rights, on which they want to postpone action. This Kennedy-Johnson position is one of advanced social liberalism or radicalism. It has the support of organized labor, it possesses an eloquent and intelligent brains trust, and it has the hope of gaining also the support of disgruntled and disadvantaged farmers.

Next is the position of Vice President NIXON, and of his running mate Ambassador Lodge if he were represented, and of the Republican platform. It is a position of moderate liberalism—of social reform under safeguards and brakes. It is a middle-ground position. Under normal circumstances, perhaps a substantial number of Congressmen would support this position, especially including many Democrats. It may well have the support of the rank and file of organized labor, certainly of unorganized working men and women, and of the vast middle-ground majorities of the Nation.

CONSERVATIVE VIEWPOINT

And then there is the position of the conservatives, which include most of the Republicans in Congress and the southern Democrats. These conservatives favor the minimum degree of Federal governmental intervention in private affairs, they believe many problems can be adequately and safely solved by State and local action. They would not go so far as Vice President NIXON and the Republican platform on most issues.

The great advantage possessed by the conservatives is their control of committee chairmanships and in some cases—as in the House Ways and Means and the Senate Finance Committees—actual committee majorities. They have real legislative power, which becomes especially potent when there is a time limit, as in the current 3-week session of Congress. (The session, of course, may be extended. There has been talk of it.)

These lines of interest cut straight across the political campaign. They create difficulties for both political parties. They expose and emphasize the illogical principles and makeup of the two political parties, since each party contains inconsistent and irreconcilable elements within it.

One of the great debates of American politics is whether it is better and safer for the public to have division of power within the parties, just as we have it throughout all the rest of American Government, or whether it would be better to have monolithic consistent parties. Efforts have been undertaken for many years to weld the political parties into integrated unities. Such efforts have rarely succeeded and never survived for long, although from time to time potent political leaders have put together large majority coalitions which had considerable survival value. But there was usually some element holding these coalitions together.

DEMOCRATIC ADVANTAGE

A Democratic Party politician, starting with the advantage of the traditionally Democratic South, always has some hope of creating a majority by bringing together the South, the labor-dominated cities, and the farmers. A Republican, not having the heritage of the South, has a much harder time making a majority, and usually does so with the cement of personal leadership.

It is a matter of calculated risks and choice of evils for the Democrats, and having taken up a position of advanced liberalism with their presidential nominee and their platform, they now are marking time on civil rights.

However, they are not marking time on other social legislation. Senator KENNEDY and his liberal allies are pressing hard. Not so his Democratic colleagues from the South—that is, the conservatives among them. And Vice President NIXON is somewhere in between, striving for a moderate program of social legislation which on the whole tends neither to satisfy the radicals nor the conservatives but which may well suit the needs of the Nation.

Recent Successes in Science Demonstrate Anew America's Overall Superiority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, by all objective standards, it has been a bad month for those who derive satisfaction or seek political advantage by downgrading this country in its race with the Soviet Union for global scientific superiority. A fistful of recent achievements by our scientists and specialists have demonstrated once again that America is second to none in the race for space.

What is more, the peaceful objectives of all our efforts must be clear to all who will take the trouble to study the record.

A number of newspaper editorials all across the country have applauded these recent scientific advances. I ask unanimous consent that one of these, appearing in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle of August 13, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SPACE AGE ROCKETS IN

In the most dramatic few hours in our space science history, American rocketeers and electronic specialists have opened the door wide to the Buck Rogers age of space travel and also made possible easy, worldwide television, radio, and telephone communications.

At the same time, they sent another monster Atlas missile roaring 5,000 miles down the South Atlantic, crammed full of experimental test equipment to advance our knowledge in several ways.

What we hope the world will note about all this is the obviously peaceful intent of all these successful experiments. President Eisenhower has invited anybody in the world who desires it to make use of the 10-story balloon satellite, "Echo," to aid communications. By use of this balloon, it just might be possible, for example, for the Olympic games that open in Rome soon to be televised all over the earth while they are going on.

Recovery of the Discoverer XIII satellite nose cone, the first such object recovered after orbiting around the earth, is one of the final touches to prove that space travel is possible to man. Before sending a human into outer space, it was necessary to prove that he could be recovered safely, and this experiment goes a long way to prove that.

There are collateral benefits to all these experiments, some highly technical. But, just as our recent success with a photography satellite was primarily a weather-watching project, so the latest American successes are most important for their advancement of space science.

Not too many years in the future, a combination of these probing, communicating missiles, with perhaps a man-carrying satellite in addition, will bring about the open skies the free world needs to assure it of safety against surprise attack. These were indeed historic shots into the blue.

The B–52

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, as many Senators know, for a number of years I have advocated the strengthening of the B–52 plane program, which, with all of its new features and modifications, makes it a fine defensive ship in every respect. On Saturday, August 11, there appeared in the Wichita Beacon an editorial entitled, "Use What We Have—The B–52." I ask unanimous consent that that editorial, which speaks so pointedly, positively and so pertinently be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

USE WHAT WE HAVE—THE B–52

The caveman had been getting along fairly well, chunking rocks at the game he wanted to kill, and at the enemies he wanted to keep away from his home cave.

Then he heard of a brand new weapon. Og, a few caves down the trail, had an idea for making a spear. Unfortunately Og hadn't made the thing yet.

However, when he did, it would be great, and he was going to help all his neighboring cavemen make spears and have the most up-to-date weapons possible.

Did his neighbors give up their rock-throwing? Did they discard their piles of rocks, and sit around waiting for this superweapon of Og's?

Of course not. If they had, they would have starved and their enemies would have moved in and taken over their caves and their women.

The United States finds itself in a weapons dilemma that is essentially the same as the caveman's. We have on the drawing boards some wonderful superweapons—missiles and Polaris submarines and B–70 airplanes.

Unfortunately, just like Og's spear, these superweapons are not yet reality. The United States is far behind Soviet Russia in the missile race. The B–70 is still, for all its wonders, a paper airplane.

We do have proven weapons, weapons that are real, that are here. The prime one is the B–52 missile platform bomber.

We don't seem to be as clever as the caveman. We're sitting around waiting for our superweapons, and are refusing to keep up production of the B–52's.

Senator ANDREW SCHOEPPEL deserves a lot more credit than he will probably get, for standing on the Senate floor Thursday and making a plea for more B–52 production.

"I would rather have one proven weapon defending our country than all the modern weapons which still are at the drawing board stage," he told the Senate and the world.

He's been saying this for years. So has Wichita, which produces the B–52. The unfortunate thing is that too many people think such pleas are merely made to buck up the economy of Wichita by keeping the airplane workers busy. Or the cynically think the Senator's heartfelt speech is just another campaign effort.

That simply is not true. Such people as Gen. Thomas S. Power, Strategic Air Command Chief, have told the country and its leaders over and over again that we must have more B–52's.

Gen. Curtis LeMay, the former SAC commander, used to maintain that SAC needed to be able to send off a first strike of 1,000 aircraft.

What is the B–52 strength of the Nation now? By next spring, if present production keeps up, an alert of 80 bombers in the air will be the best SAC can possibly do.

That is a terrible gap. Something has to be done, and done right now.

"There are only about 40 B–52's about to be ordered, carrying production into 1962. However, the program will end then if the fiscal 1962 budget does not contain funds for more of them," Senator SCHOEPPEL said Thursday.

The problem isn't with the people of this Nation. They have long been demanding that the Nation have the best protection. The Republican Party platform promises to "intensify, accelerate and increase" the national defense efforts.

What is President Eisenhower's reaction to this promise? He has just told Congress that he has decided to start using the added appropriations for special defense projects which were ordered by the last congressional session. Those funds, which were meant to be put to work, were put in the deep freeze.

It's fine to have missiles and Polaris submarines and B–70's. But until we get them, let's put to use the weapons we have now, that are here, that are in production. Let's get a decent force of B–52's to protect the free world.

And lets get started on them now.

Houston Press Given Recognition as "Last but Not Least" by Time Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, it has been my pleasure to note on many occasions over the last several years that the Houston Press, one of Texas' most outspoken, hard-hitting daily newspapers, has consistently, strongly supported efforts to establish a National Seashore Park on Padre Island, and has opposed fencing up the beaches of the Gulf of Mexico.

The Houston Press editorial support of the Padre Island National Park project is just one of many examples which might be listed showing how the managing editor of the Press, Mr. George Carmack, and his staff utilize their columns in the best interest of the people. Mr. Carmack has an enviable service record in the South Pacific in World War II, so it is not unusual for him to exhibit courage now.

The current issue of Time, August 22, 1960, has an extremely interesting report in its press section on the valuable service the Houston Press has contributed to its readers. One matter not reported in Time, which I would like to add, is recognition of the incisive, penetrating reporting of the Houston Press' Washington correspondent, Mr. Neil McNeil. Although he is a young man, experience has taught me that Neil is among the top-ranking journalists who work on the hill.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the article from the August 22, 1960, issue of Time entitled "Last But Not Least."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESS—LAST BUT NOT LEAST

By most standards, among Houston's three daily papers, Scripps-Howard's evening Press rates last. With 102,590 in circulation, it is hopelessly behind the evening Chronicle (199,128) and the morning Post (215,063). Its 50-man editorial staff cannot compare with the Post's 90 or the Chronicle's 110, and it suffers periodic, crippling talent raids not only by its wealthy rivals but by the other papers in the Scripps-Howard chain; the Press has lost three managing editors in the last 10 years. All this might be expected to give the Press a real weak-sister inferiority complex. Not so: it happens to be the brashest, liveliest, and most voluble paper in town.

Far more than the Post or the Chronicle, the Press fills the role of municipal watchdog—with a tendency to yip at everything from murder to pay raises for Houston city councilmen. Alarmed at Houston's high murder rate, the Press labeled the city "Murdertown, U.S.A.," campaigned so relentlessly for tighter gun registration laws that it drew scathing mail from nearly every quail-hunting and skeet-shooting type in Texas. Last January, impatient with the slow-moving police investigation into the slaying of Houston Housewife Wilma Selby, the Press rapped the police in an editorial and posted a reward for the killer. The chastened police promptly bestirred themselves, within 10 days collared Mrs. Selby's murderer (Time, Aug. 15).

Editorial boldness: Houstonians have learned to expect outspokenness from the Press, a paper that has little to lose and much to gain from piping up. The Press' editorial vigor gains extra measure from the timidity of the Chronicle and the Post. Established and prosperous, locked for years in a seesaw battle for economic first place, both papers hesitate to take stands on sensitive issues that, by offending any group, might jeopardize their positions.

On the South's most sensitive issue, the race problem, neither paper has shown any inclination to copy the Press' boldness. The Chronicle generally temporizes, the Post—run by onetime WAC Commander Oveta Culp Hobby—usually maintains editorial silence. This month, when Federal District Judge Ben C. Connally ordered the city's laggard school board to step up the rate of public school integration, only the Chronicle and the Press editorialized on his decision. The Chronicle was mild and vague: "It is hoped that all citizens will cooperate." The Press said: "Judge Connally's order is one with which we all can—and must—learn to live."

Enthusiasm in a vacuum: The Press often takes the lead in news enterprise. It was the first to expose kickbacks at Houston's city-owned farmer's market, the first to report police shakedowns on small businessmen, the first to note scandals in the U.S. Internal Revenue Service in Texas, the first to spotlight a State pardon and parole board racket.

In the vacuum provided by his competitors, Press Editor George Carmack, 53, a 6-foot, 4-inch Tennessean who rose through the Scripps-Howard chain, moves with the enthusiasm of a newsman who would rather be forthright than first. Carmack's small staff cannot hope to outproduce the Post and the Chronicle, and the paper frequently relies on sheer sensationalism. But with an independence of spirit rare in a chain newspaper, rarer still in Houston, the third-ranking Houston Press has clearly demonstrated that last is not necessarily least.

Soil Science Congress Meeting in Madison, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as I mentioned yesterday, a highly significant international conference is now taking place at Madison, Wis.; that is, the Seventh International Soil Science Congress.

Historically, an enemy of mankind has been hunger. Fortunately, our own country has been blessed, not with a deficiency, but with a surplus of food. Regrettably, however, this is not true throughout the world. According to estimates, from one-third to one-half of the people of the nearly 3 billion people on earth exist on inadequate diets.

Reflecting further upon the constructive work of this Congress—attended by about 1,500 delegates from 40 to 50 nations, I ask unanimous consent to have two articles—one from the Milwaukee Journal and one from the Wisconsin State Journal printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 15, 1960]

SCIENCE URGED TO CURB WORLD HUNGER THREAT—SOIL EXPERTS CONSIDER PROBLEMS INVOLVED AT AN INTERNATIONAL PARLEY AT MADISON

(By R. G. Lynch)

MADISON, WIS.—Hunger remains the major threat to the future of mankind, scientists attending the Seventh International Soil Science Congress were told Monday.

Dr. Binay Ranjan Sen, director general of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), said:

"Of the three historic enemies of mankind—war, pestilence and hunger—which in the past have taken such a heavy toll of human life and happiness, war and pestilence are already under some measure of control."

ADVANCES ARE NOTED

"Recent advances in medical science, supported by large scale public health measures, have won significant victories against epidemic and endemic diseases.

"A global war today, with the employment of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons, could not be contemplated by anyone who is even remotely interested in the survival of the human race.

"But hunger still remains a major threat to the future of mankind."

The former secretary to the Indian Ministry of Agriculture added: "In the consciousness of what is at stake, let us therefore all work together and hasten the day when man's eternal scourge—hunger—will be a thing of the past."

Sen said FAO experience had confirmed that in soil management the two outstanding factors were intensive use of chemical fertilizers and conservation of water and control of its use.

Nearly all soils in underdeveloped countries, he said, are low in fertility and lacking in one or more of the essential plant nutrients, and in some cases needed lime, as well.

Speaking of the FAO freedom from hunger campaign, he said that in Iran, the use of phosphates and nitrogen had increased production of cereals by 50 percent to 150 percent. One or more nitrogen plants are under construction in Iran, Pakistan, India, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Formosa and others are in the planning stage, he added.

India plans to increase its use of fertilizers in 10 years from 120,000 tons annually to 1,750,000, he said.

Water problems, Sen said, involved water logged and saline soils and inefficient irrigation. He said education in this field was necessary, as well as work with the soil.

NELSON URGES ACTION

In a statement read by his agricultural coordinator, Robert Lewis, Governor Nelson urged the scientists to resolve the "ironic paradox of widespread hunger in the midst of occasional surpluses and potential abundance."

He said it was the duty of the United States to manage abundance of farm products for the use of humanity and with justice to the farm people who produced it.

Nearly a third of the world's people, he said, did not get enough to eat and for them "outright starvation is one of the real and menacing dangers that 'normal' life affords." The mission of the soil scientists, he said, was to speed knowledge and wise use of the soil and its conservation in the world.

POPULATION IS PROBLEM

Dr. Richard Bradfield, chairman of the Agronomy Department of Cornell University, said that unless something was done to reduce the rate of population increases, agriculturists could only delay the day when the world population would exceed the food supply.

Bradfield, president of the social science congress, said that 1 billion acres in the humid tropics seemed to have the greatest potential for expansion. He said the area had a continuous growing season and plenty of water, but these conditions had led to depletion of plant nutrients and had left the soil surface acid, thus reducing the effectiveness of commercial fertilizer.

The congress is being attended by more than 1,500 persons from 40 to 50 nations. It will continue through August 23.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal, Aug. 15, 1960]

ONE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DELEGATES FROM 50 NATIONS OPEN SOIL CONGRESS HERE TODAY—STATE PIONEERING WORK SETS STAGE FOR SCIENTIFIC MEETING

(By Robert Bjorkland)

Madison took on the distinct character of the United Nations Sunday as 1,500 soil scientists registered for today's opening of the Seventh International Soil Science Congress.

Ranking soil scientists from 50 nations will be in the Wisconsin Union Theater on the University of Wisconsin campus at 9 a.m. today to participate in the sessions aimed at promoting peace and health of people by alleviating hunger in the world.

Some came direct from their countries, others have been touring the East and the Midwest to learn more of U.S. agriculture and its soil types.

FIRST TRIP

For many, this was their first visit to America and there were firm first impressions.

G. F. DeConinck, soil surveyor for a research institute in Brasschaat, Belgium, had his chance to meet Americans for the first time and found them with "not so much formality as people in Belgium have."

DeConinck searched cautiously for his words as he commented on the pride Americans have in America with almost a "complex of superiority."

LESS PRODUCTIVE

And after seeing the farms, he said that American farms were larger and much more mechanized, but European farmers were able to get much more productivity per acre.

The leader of the 32-member delegation from the Soviet Union was on his second trip to the United States.

I. V. Tiurin, Moscow, director of the Soil Science Institute, said that he took part in the first international session held in Washington, D.C., in 1927.

The Russian scientists come from the Academy of Science, Agriculture Academy, Ministry of Agriculture, numerous universities, agriculture teaching institutes, and chairs of soil science.

WEST COAST TOUR

Tiurin plans to be in Madison through the entire 9-day congress and travel through the South and return to Washington, D.C. Other delegates will go to the west coast. Their stay in the United States will be for 25 days.

C. K. N. Nair, of the College of Agriculture of Kerala state, India, said that the big American grant of surplus wheat was giving India "breathing space" so it could get started in its farm development programs to increase food supplies.

Nair said his trip here and that of nine other Indian scientists was completely financed by the Ford Foundation.

FOREST SOILS

Dr. Walter Wittich, chief of the forest soils institute at Gottingen University in Germany, said that he would take a special trip through Wisconsin to study forest soils.

His impressions of America were largely set by his son who was in the United States as a physician, and Dr. Wittich said it all turned out to be as he had imagined.

The big second-floor gymnasium area of the old red armory was filled with exhibits. More than a half acre of paneling was required to form the booths where soils material is on display.

PIONEER WORK

Wisconsin was a correct setting for the soil congress because of the intensity of soil conservation practices in the State and the pioneering work done on farms.

The stripcropping practices that are so popular through the State were worked out after ideas were sought from an old German farmer.

Coon Valley watershed became the first experimental conservation district in the world, and work started there put Wisconsin out in front in getting soil conservation practices on the land.

We Must Climb to the Hilltop

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts has written an article on the national purpose for the August 22 edition of Life magazine which I commend to the attention of my colleagues. It is an article of nourishing wisdom.

There is one passage that I should particularly like to quote:

If we are to recharge our sense of national purpose, we should accept no invitations to relax on a patent mattress stuffed with woolly illusions labeled peace, prosperity, and normalcy. We should congratulate ourselves not for our country's past glories and present accumulations but for our opportunities for further toil and risk. Rather than take satisfaction in goals already reached, we should be contrite about the goals unreached. We ought not to look for excuses in the budget, but for justification in the dizzying rush of events and in the harsh realities of our time.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this splendid article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL PURPOSE DISCUSSION IS RESUMED—WE MUST CLIMB TO THE HILLTOP

(By Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY)

In all recorded history, probably the sagest bit of advice ever offered man was the ancient admonition to "know thyself." As with individuals, so with nations. Just as a man who realizes that his life has gone off course can regain his bearings only through the strictest self-scrutiny, so a whole people become aware that things have somehow gone wrong, can right matters only by a rigidly honest look at its core of collective being, its national purpose.

Thus, while on the one hand the fact that we have felt the urge to debate our national purpose signalizes our arrival at a potential crisis point, on the other hand the fact that we have entered into the debate willingly, indeed with gusto, bodes well for the eventual outcome.

Among our overindulgences of the past decade has been the lavish use of a kind of cloudy rhetoric that only befogs the truth. Yet basically we Americans prefer plain talk and commonsense. It is these we must apply if we are to know ourselves again.

The facets of this debate on national purpose are many. Other than to agree that the whole subject vitally needs airing, the debaters are split a dozen ways as to which aspect of it demands greatest emphasis. Some prefer to dwell on what has happened to our national purpose—whether irrevocably lost, permanently strayed or temporarily sidetracked; others on why what has happened has happened; others on what can be done by way of remedy or retrieve. Above all, the debate turns on precisely what this "purpose" is that, momentarily or forever, has gone from our midst.

The distinguished contributors to previous installments of this Life series have offered a variety of definitions of our national purpose, all of them valid. From this it can be seen that no one word or catch phrase will suffice to pinpoint it. Our national purpose is resident, obviously, in the magnificent principles of the Declaration of Independence and of the Constitution and Bill of Rights. It also plainly appears in the writings of Jefferson, Madison, and Hamilton, in the words of Jackson and Lincoln, in the works of Emerson and Whitman, in the opinions of Marshall and Holmes, in Wilson's "new freedom" and Franklin D. Roosevelt's "four freedoms." In common, all of these pulse with a sense of idealistic aspiration, of the struggle for a more perfect Union, of the effort to build the good society as well as the good life here and in the rest of the world.

There is, I think, still another way to describe our national purpose. This definition, while almost a literal one, is nevertheless not a narrow one. It is that our national purpose consists of the combined purposefulness of each of us when we are at our normal best: striving, risking, choosing, making decisions, engaging in a pursuit of happiness that is strenuous, heroic, exciting and exalted. When we do so as individuals, we make a nation that, in Jefferson's words, will always be "in the full tide of successful experiment."

Such a definition, because it implies a constant, restless, confident questing, neither precludes nor outmodes, but rather complements, the expression of national purpose set forth in our declaration, our Constitution, and in the words of our great Presidents, jurists and writers. The purpose they envisioned can, indeed, never be outmoded, because it has never been and can never be fully achieved. It will always be somewhere just out of reach, a challenge to further aspiring, struggling, striving and searching. Quest has always been the dominant note of our history, whether a quest for national independence; a quest for personal liberty and economic opportunity on a new continent from which the rest of mankind could take heart and hope; a quest for more land, more knowledge, more dignity; a quest for more effective democracy; a quest for a world of free and pacific nations.

It should be said at once that no nation has a corner on striving and aspiring any more than on virtue and compassion. Thus our national purpose finds echo in the minds of men of good intent everywhere. But our purpose may differ from others in the particular background against which it evolved and by three fundamental facts about us:

First, Americans, more than other peoples, have since independence cherished a strong sense of destiny.

Second, we have always been optimists about our national future. Down through the decades we have had our indentured servants, our slaves and Simon Legrees, our sweated immigrants, our Okies, our depressed and discouraged folk of many stripes. But we have been unfailingly confident of winning through all obstacles to realize our dream.

Third, Americans have always been willing to experiment. With no fedual inheritance, with little dead weight of caste or tradition, we have ever been in the mood for bold adventure. Our forefathers would not have tossed aside old associations and crossed the seas without it. New frontiers have always seemed unfolding on our horizon.

With these basic considerations, and because of them, the pace of change in this land has been faster than anywhere else on the globe. The change has been less noisy and melodramatic than in Russia or China, among others, for since 1865 it has lacked any real elements of violence. We believe in progress by evolution, not revolution. But for precisely this reason the progress has been deeper, saner and more continuously rapid. In our energy, our resourcefulness and our powers of organization, we can assert that the United States has been and is the most dynamic nation in history.

Since this is so, why then our current widespread sense of staleness, of frustration; why the gnawing feeling that we may have lost our way? In my mind there are two broad answers.

One is that the very abundance which our dynamism has created has weaned and wooed us from the tough condition in which, heretofore, we have approached whatever it is we have had to do. A man with extra fat will look doubtfully on attempting the 4-minute mile; a nation replete with goods and services, confident that "there's more where that came from," may feel less ardor for questing.

The second answer is that we have, of late, lacked the leadership we require—

human frailty being what it is—to remind us of our national purpose, to direct its shaping for current ends, to spur us to new efforts, to encourage and, if need be, to exhort.

In his stirring speech at Queen's Hall in London seeking World War I volunteers, David Lloyd George, soon to be Britain's Prime Minister, described a snug valley in his native Wales. Nestled between the mountains and the sea, shielded from the storms and stresses of the outside world, that little valley offered its inhabitants a placid and sheltered life. But on occasion, Lloyd George recalled, the young men of the valley would refuse to stay put. They would climb its highest hill to be inspired by the majestic peaks in the distance, to have their energies sharpened by the mountain breezes.

Too many Americans in the 1950s, I believe, have been living too much of the time in such a valley. We have felt contented and complacent and comfortable. Now it is time once again to climb to the hilltop, to be reinvigorated and reinspired by those faraway peaks, the principles that are vital to our national greatness, that underlie our national purpose, that foster our "American dream."

Whether we see them or not, those peaks never change. Whether we remember it or not, their meaning never diminishes.

Thus the task that lies ahead is not to create a new national purpose, but to try to recapture the old one. This is no call to retrogression, for this purpose, born 184 years ago, will be as noble and as fresh 184 years hence—and beyond.

It is those same old slogans and same old solutions, surrounding the national purpose, that we must guard against. The old ways will not do. They cannot do. The Census Bureau predicts that, if the present curve of growth continues, our population will reach 260 million in only 20 years. When we think of how this increase alone will clothe all our problems in growing urgency, we know that when we once again seize hold of our purpose, we will have to do so with new ideas and new vigor.

Where and how do we apply our national purpose to the challenges of 1960?

Survival is often listed as the major challenge today, and certainly other issues are overshadowed by the one issue that could render the rest moot. But although our physical safety as a nation is more imperiled than ever before in our history, survival alone is insufficient as an expression of national purpose. Mere physical survival, at the cost of our way of life, would be worth little; more importantly, survival alone is hardly an aspiration worthy of a great nations. The nobleman who, when asked what he did in the Rench Revolution, replied, "I survived," may have been hailed for his wit but for little else.

We remember too seldom that survival is threatened not only by ever more awesome weapons of death and destruction but also by a lack of aim and aspiration. Outside the walls of every nation that has grown fat and overly fond of itself has always lurked a lean and hungry enemy.

Competition with that enemy is today deemed by some to be our major challenge; but it, too, reflects our national purpose inadequately. We are, indeed, in competition with the Soviets, and to a large extent our hopes for the future rest on our comparative efforts in economic growth, in the arms race, in scientific achievement, in aid to other nations, in propaganda, in prestige, and in a host of other fields.

But we will err tragically if we make competition with the Communists an end in itself. Whatever we do in the name of that competition—improving our race relations, expanding our economy, helping new nations, exploring outer space, and all the rest—we ought to be doing anyway, for its own sake, whether competition exists or not.

Peace is humanity's deepest longing, and with the failure to achieve it all other aspirations fail, too. In acclaiming it as the major expression of our national purpose, however, we must know what sort of peace we mean. Certainly the unjust peace of subjugation, the uneasy peace of cold war or the fruitless peace of an interval between hot wars is far from a goal that will satisfy.

Prosperity, like peace, is desired by all, and our political orators have traditionally held out the goal of personal and national economic well-being as a primary American aim. But the good life falls short as an indicator of national purpose unless it goes hand in hand with the good society. Even in material terms, prosperity is not enough when there is no equal opportunity to share in it; when economic progress means overcrowded cities, abandoned farms, technological unemployment, polluted air and water, and littered parks and countrysides; when those too young to earn are denied their chance to learn; when those no longer earning live out their lives in lonely degradation.

No single one of these four challenges—survival, competition, peace, prosperity—sums up our national purpose today. The creation of a more perfect Union requires the pursuit of a whole series of ideals, ideals which can never be fully attained, but the eternal quest for which embodies the American national purpose:

The fulfillment of every individual's dignity and potential.

The perfection of the democratic process.

The education of every individual to his capacity.

The elimination of ignorance, prejudice, hate and the squalor in which crime is bred.

The elimination of slums, poverty and hunger.

Protection against the economic catastrophes of illness, disability and unemployment.

The achievement of a constantly expanding economy, without inflation or dislocation, either in the factory or on the farm.

The conquest of dread diseases.

The enrichment of American culture.

The attainment of world peace and disarmament, based on world law and order, on the mutual respect of free peoples and on a world economy in which there are no "have-not" or "under-developed" nations.

A dream? Of course—the American dream. No candidate for office, unless we were foolish or deceitful, would promise its fulfillment. But we are in urgent need of public men who will work toward its fulfillment, guiding, directing, and encouraging the popular impetus toward that end.

That this impetus exists is beyond question. We are not a people in panic or despair. We have not gone over the hill of history. We have simply, and fortuitously, begun to recognize that somehow we have gotten off the track, and that to get back on we will need stern effort, spirited leadership, and common sacrifice.

If we are to recharge our sense of national purpose, we should accept no invitations to relax on a patent mattress stuffer with woolly illusions labeled peace, prosperity, and normalcy. We should congratulate ourselves not for our country's past glories and present accumulations but for our opportunities for further toil and risk. Rather than take satisfaction in goals already reached, we should be contrite about the goals unreached. We ought not to look for excuses in the budget, but for justifications in the dizzying rush of events and in the harsh realities of our time.

For these are harsh times. The future will not be easier. Our responsibilities will not lessen. Our enemies will not weaken. We must demonstrate that we can meet our responsibility as a free society—that we can by voluntary means match their ruthless exploitation of human, natural, and material resources—that freedom can not only compete and survive but prevail and flourish.

It is not enough to debate: "What is the meaning of America?" Each of us must also decide "What does it mean to be an American?" Upon us destiny has lavished special favors of liberty and opportunity—and it therefore has demanded of us special efforts, particularly in times such as these.

It requires each one of us to be a little more decent, alert, intelligent, compassionate and resolute in our daily lives—that we exercise our civic duties, whether paying taxes or electing Presidents, with extra pride and care—that we use our freedom of choice to pursue our own destiny in a manner that advances the national destiny, in the work we produce, the subjects we study, the positions we seek, the languages we learn, the complaints we voice, the leaders we follow, the inconveniences we endure.

If a dark corner of Africa needs technicians—if a troubled spot in Asia needs language specialists—if a Soviet threat in Berlin requires patience and determination—if the space race requires better schools—we must and can demonstrate that the dedicated efforts of free men can meet these needs better than the efforts of totalitarian compulsion.

Every American must take far more seriously than he has in the past decade his responsibility for achieving and maintaining a democratic society of a truly model kind, worthy to be the champion of freedom throughout the world.

We Americans must again commit ourselves to great ends. We must resume our searching, surging, questing. Then, assuredly, we will come nearer the vision of John Adams of Massachusetts, who, in 1813, assured his friend Thomas Jefferson that our Republic would someday "introduce the perfection of man."

Korean Youth Will Benefit From Kansas City Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STUART SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in the spring of 1959, a group of 22 members of the Women's Kansas City Commission for International Relations and Trade made a 20,000-mile trip through the Orient. The good-will visit of these Missourians was a great success, and serves as an excellent example of the role that individual citizens can play in furthering the cause of international understanding.

I commend the story of this trip and the work of this group to all interested persons and ask unanimous consent that a letter from Mrs. Charles S. Demaree, dated June 30, 1960, and an article from the Kansas City Star, September 20, 1959, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator STUART SYMINGTON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: We left Kansas City April 1, 1959, and returned May 5, after visiting Alaska, Japan, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Thailand, Cambodia, the Philippine Islands, and Hawaii. Authorized by the city council and commissioned by the mayor, we went as good-will ambassadors from Kansas City, Mo. From our reception in those countries and the favorable publicity both at home and abroad, we feel assured our mission was unusually successful.

We "patted on" over 5,000 red hearts which read in Japanese or Chinese, "Everything's up to date in Kansas City." Also designed especially for us was a beautiful gold medallion, showing the Eastern and Western Hemispheres slightly overlapping, symbolizing our interdependence. In the middle of the United States is a tiny red enamel heart for Kansas City, "The Heart of America." Around the medal's rim are the words, "Women of the World United for Peace." These medals we presented to the most distinguished women in each country—women outstanding in government, education, social work, the arts, and business, e.g., Mrs. Syngman Rhee; Mme. Chiang Kai-shek; the newly wed Crown Princess of Japan; Dr. Helen Kim, president of the largest girls' college in the world (over 5,000 students) and for whom a Korean national holiday was declared on the occasion of her reaching the venerable age of 62; Helen Magsaysay Ho, internationally famous artist of the Philippines, and many others. We presented these medals at the receptions and garden parties we gave in each capital, inviting hundreds of native guests.

Senator Pacita Gonzales is the only woman in the Philippine Senate. (I had written her, and many other people, before I left Kansas City.) She invited us to be her guests at a regular session of the senate. Granted the special privilege of the floor, she extolled our commission, the purpose of our visit, and the importance of Philippine-United States relations, in a 20-minute address. She pointed out the previous guests so honored with seats on the floor of the senate were Members of the British Parliament. Later she gave me copies of the congressional record of her speech and a tape recording of it.

In Japan, we wished to place a wreath in honor of Japan's Great Emperor Meiji, grandfather of the present Emperor who freed Japan from feudalism some 80 years ago. The Head of the Imperial Household in Kyoto not only arranged for the presentation of a magnificent wreath of white chrysanthemums, the national flower, but gave us the rare privilege of holding the ceremony at the front of Coronation Hall, where all of Japan's Emperors are crowned. He told us we were the first foreigners ever to see inside the Imperial Shrine. It was an impressive and moving experience.

We took with us a film made by the Kansas City Chamber of Commerce, entitled "Sound of a Million," showing a typical day in the lives of people living in the heart of America. Our foreign viewers evidenced great interest and could not fail to be enlightened.

Within a week after our return home, we discussed our trip before a capacity audience of 300 at the Woman's City Club here. Since then we have shown films, exhibited our purchases, and made hundreds of speeches to men and women members of organizations of all kinds, and all over the State of Missouri.

In the fall, our members gave $1,500 to help educate young girls and boys who were victims of the Korean war. After conversion into relief hwan, the gift amounted to about $2,200. We have just sent a check for $500 to our Ambassador in Chile, where we visited in 1957.

Each commissioner paid her own way. The collective expense of our "Salute to the Orient" was over $100,000. We think we made a valuable contribution to better international understanding and friendship in a highly important and strategic part of the world.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. CHARLES S. DEMAREE,
President, the Women's Kansas City Commission for International Relations and Trade.

[From the Kansas City Star, Sept. 20, 1959]

KOREAN YOUTH WILL BENEFIT FROM KANSAS CITY PROJECT

(By Erma Young)

Although the season was April, the melody was "Jingle Bells," as an 8-year-old Korean orphan sang for American friends visiting in Seoul. The Christmas song was the only one the girl Kim, Young Hi, could manage in English. It amused her listeners and bothered the little singer not at all that the "Jingle Bells" came out "Yingle Bells."

The memory of this child and other needy boys and girls of Korea has prompted a move of the Women's Kansas City Association for International Relations and Trade to assist in youth projects there. Three checks, totaling $1,400 and representing contributions of the association, are on the way to Korea. The members contributed from $25 to $100 each. Miss Emma Hall, chairman, Dr. Hester Wilson and Mrs. Julian Huckins, cochairmen, headed the committee for the project.

Holy King orphanage in Seoul, home to little "Yingle Bells," as the Kansas City women call the child, will receive $180. Sixty dollars supports an orphan for 1 year. One thousand dollars will finance teacher and secretarial training for three young women students at Union Christian College, Seoul.

The remaining $220 will be used for the "Shoeshine Boys and Girls" project, a war orphans plan in which Mrs. Syngman Rhee, wife of the president of Korea, is especially interested.

The money has been forwarded by Mrs. Charles S. Demaree, president of the association, to Henry F. Arnold, public affairs officer, U.S. Embasy, Seoul. In a letter to Arnold, Mrs. Demaree explained that the State Department had advised her to send the checks to him and ask him to make the presentations to the beneficiaries. The letter also expressed appreciation for the friendliness and courtesy shown the Kansas City women when they were in Korea last April, as a part of a 20,000-mile air trip through the Orient.

"Yingle Bells" and a 5-year-old child girl, Lee Sook Hi, also from the Holy King orphanage, were brought to Korea House, a government center, by the orphanage president, Lee Hong Joo. The Kansas City association members, who were being entertained at Korea House that day, had expressed interest in the work being done with war orphans.

Miss Nancy Jane Jones, a member of the Kansas City group, had visited the orphanage earlier and had chosen Kim Young Hi as the child to meet the ossociation. Lee Sook Hi shyly stepped forward and tugged at the visitor's skirt, as if to say "Take me, too." So the 5-year-old went along with the older girl. She smiled proudly as "Yingle Bells," dressed in red overalls, green sweater, and a yellow hair bow, sang for the Kansas Citians. Mrs. Demaree's letter requested that the $180 allocated for the orphanage be distributed for 1 year's care for Kim Young Hi and 2 years' care for Lee Sook Hi.

Through Dr. S. Luk Kim, president of Union Christian College, and Dr. L. George Paik, former Minister of Education in Korea and now president of Yonsei University, the association members learned of the great need for help in educating young Koreans. Dr. Paik was host to a group of the Kansas Citians in Seoul. Mrs. Demaree later talked with Dr. Kim when he was given an honorary degree at Park College, Parkville, last June.

Dr. Kim said that Union Christian College was the only one in Korea that accepts young women students who cannot pay. Many of the girls are daughters of Christian ministers who were killed in the war. He explained that $1,000 would educate three young women and prepare them to earn their own living. He indicated that he would choose the three students to benefit from the Kansas City donation.

When the Kansas Citians were guests of Mrs. Rhee at Kyung Mu Dai, the Rhee home, the President's wife told of the "shoeshine boys and girls," a project to help homeless wanderers learn a trade. The project for boys and girls who sleep in the streets and doorways was begun by the Pusan middle police station and has since attracted help from the city of Pusan, the 2d ROK Army District Command, and various world organizations for children's relief.

Facts on Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 18, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the rural electrification program—now 25 years old—has brought the miracles of electricity—heat, light, and power—to millions of families, farms, churches, schools, and other establishments.

The REA has been particularly important in serving fringe areas that were not commercially profitable.

Today, for example, more than 96 percent of America's farms are electrified—more than one-half of which are served by REA.

Today I received from Richard A. Dell, director, legislation and research, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, an REA factbook. Reflecting upon the scope of service which this splendid program has provided this country in its 25-year lifetime, I ask unanimous consent to have a brief synopsis of its highlights printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUICK RURAL ELECTRIFICATION FACTS

(NOTE.—The following material is, in a way, a synopsis of this book. It offers a quick reference source for the essential information about rural electrification. In addition, some of the items contain later figures than those included in tables and charts in the pages which follow. This is possible because total, comprehensive statistics are available long before official breakdowns are made public.)

BASIC FACTS

Electric systems financed by the Rural Electrification Administration connected 139,000 new consumers during 1959, now serve 4,736,000 homes, farms, and other rural establishments.

REA has 987 active electric borrowers; 983 of them are consumer owned. REA has made electric loans to 24 profit power companies, totaling $20,067,200. Four of the power companies are active borrowers at this time.

Rural electric systems serve consumers in every State except Connecticut, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Hawaii.

More than 96 percent of America's farms are now electrified, compared with 10 percent when REA was established in 1935. More than half are served by REA borrowers.

NATURE OF THE PROGRAM

Rural electric systems are locally owned, controlled, and operated by the people they serve. Members elect directors, who establish system policy.

REA, a Federal agency within the U.S. Department of Agriculture, serves only as a banker for the systems. It does not generate or distribute electric power.

Funds for REA loans are annually authorized by Congress. Loans are repaid over a 35-year period, with interest at 2 percent.

Rural electric systems provide service on an area coverage basis, even in the most sparsely settled areas. The systems average just over three consumers per mile of line. A comparable national average for the profit power companies is not available, but reports indicate they average more than 30 consumers per mile of line.

The rural electric systems are voluntarily associated in State, regional, and national service organizations. Nine hundred and fifty-eight systems are members of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

The systems, usually through State associations, publish 28 monthly consumer magazines with a total circulation of more than 2½ million.

FINANCIAL RECORD

REA has approved loans totaling $4 billion for rural electric service.

As of December 31, 1959, REA borrowers had repaid $823 million in principal, and $397 million in interest. Of the principal payments, $154 million had been paid in advance of the due date. Only a fraction of 1 percent of repayments due was in arrears more than 30 days.

The net worth of the systems totaled $602 million in December 1959—18.2 percent of total assets. This was an increase of 1.6 percent over 1958.

Operating revenues for the systems amounted to $618 million for 1959, an increase of 9.8 percent over 1958. Net margins totaled an estimated $87.7 million, an increase of 16.6 percent over 1958. Forty-five systems had deficit net margins in 1958, and 148 failed to make debt service—REA's standard for judging the financial health of its borrowers.

PURPOSE OF LOANS

The bulk of REA loans are now made for system improvements and generation and transmission facilities. In fiscal 1959, 17.3 percent of loan funds were for generation, 19.2 percent for transmission, 26.3 percent for system improvements, 35.4 percent for new distribution facilities, and 1.8 percent for consumer wiring, plumbing, and equipment financing.

RETAIL POWER SALES

The rural electric systems sold 25.3 billion kilowatt-hours in 1959. Average monthly residential consumption per consumer was 343 kilowatt-hours, an increase of about 10 percent over 1958.

The average cost per kilowatt-hour for residential rural electric consumers in 1959 was 2.52 cents. The average monthly residential power bill was $8.64.

WHOLESALE POWER SUPPLY

The wholesale power requirements of rural electric systems are doubling about every 5 years.

Rural electric systems generated 4.9 billion kilowatt-hours in 1959, and purchased 24.3 billion kilowatt-hours.

Of their wholesale power purchases in fiscal 1958, the systems bought 9.1 billion kilowatt-hours (39.1 percent) from profit power companies at an average cost of 8 mills per kilowatt-hour. They bought 10.8 billion kilowatt-hours (46.5 percent) from Federal and other public suppliers at an average cost of 5.4 mills per kilowatt-hour.

The following is the breakdown of Federal power sales in fiscal 1958: Rural electric cooperatives, 8.6 percent; city-owned power systems, 20.1 percent; profit power companies, 12.3 percent; private industry, 18.5 percent; Federal defense agencies, 30.5 percent; State and other public bodies, 10 percent.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Address by Senator Kefauver to the National Association of County Officials

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 19, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I had the honor this week to address the National Association of County Officials at their silver anniversary conference at Miami, Fla.

It has been my experience that the men and women who make up this organization are a vital ingredient of our American democracy. Our Nation is composed of cities and counties and States—each with its important role in government.

It is at the county level where the problems of today are growing into a most serious challenge as our population explosion spreads the cities widely into the suburban areas of the country.

This challenge is being met courageously and with good planning by these county officials who carry the heavy burden of coming to grips with rapid development of their political subdivisions.

Most of the programs that the national association sponsors and works for are programs which the Democratic Party has worked for and sponsored over the year.

I ask unanimous consent that my speech before this outstanding association be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW THE DEMOCRATS STAND ON THE AMERICAN COUNTY PLATFORM

(Address by Senator ESTES KEFAUVER at Miami, Fla., to National Association of County Officials)

It is a great honor and privilege—for a number of reasons—for me to be here with you today.

It is always rewarding to speak to members of your organization, because you are the people upon whom such a large percentage of our citizens must depend for good government, for efficient government, and for progressive government.

It is a particular pleasure to be able to be with you at this silver anniversary conference. Your organization is not only growing venerable, it is also growing by leaps and bounds in size and, more to the point, in importance.

I am honored to represent—at least informally—the Democratic Party and the Democratic point of view. I am certain that you could have gotten a more polished speaker but you could not have found one who believes more deeply in the Democratic program and its importance to the future of our great country.

Recently, I took a little trip that carried me through all of the 95 counties of Tennessee. For me, it was a worthwhile trip in many ways.

During that trip, I talked with hundreds of county officials. I have seen many of them here today. I learned much from these men and women and, again, I wish to express my gratitude to them.

Despite their many, many problems, most of these public servants are devoted to their tasks and are full of enthusiasm about their counties. They are full of good ideas and good plans, and the vast majority of them face the future with optimism.

Yet, almost every one of them stressed the importance of solving one basic problem: What do we do with an expanding population, a greatly increased need for services, and a shrinking tax base—and a near breaking point in local taxation?

I believe that the Democratic Party over the years has evolved a partnership between the Federal Government and State and local governments which, if followed and fostered in the future, will solve this underlying problem.

This partnership has three foundation stones.

First, the Democratic Party believes that it is best to attempt solving local problems locally, just as it is best to let private enterprise do most jobs.

A few years ago at an annual conference in Chicago, your association approved a resolution calling upon every county in the United States "to prepare itself for the assumption of the greater governmental responsibilities which lie just ahead so that local governments across the Nation may justify the faith and confidence which have been reposed in them by the people." In my view, county governments must continue to assume more and more resopnsibilities in the years immediately ahead.

Second, local governments have encountered many problems without assistance, and these problems are common to local governments throughout this county. In this area, there is need for Federal and State cooperation with, and assistance to, municipalr governments.

Third, administratively, the best way to handle these problems is through the advice and help of the State, county, or municipality.

Many of these problems are the direct result of an almost exploding population in our country. But many of them stem almost wholly or in large measure from two migrations, which are ever increasing in intensity.

One is a migration from the cities to the suburbs, and this migration will not cease until we take the drastic steps necessary to clean up and rebuild our cities.

The other is a migration of people from the farms to the urban centers. I deplore not having a farm program which will permit families to stay on the farms. But I recognize that increased mechanization will continue the flow of people to the cities.

The crush of population has and will continue to multiply the great urban-suburban problems of which we are all only too familiar.

These problems are common to thousands of communities. And, in the view of the Democratic Party, the local communities have no way of solving many of them without help. The widespread nature of the problem and lack of a local solution adds up to a national responsibility.

Every State is at the limit—or close to it—of its taxing ability. So are counties. So are cities.

The Federal Government on the other hand, even under the restrictive Internal Revenue Act of 1954, is able to assist in many of these matters.

Without Federal assistance, many pressing problems will not be solved.

This truism—this fact of life—is reflected time and again in the American county platform.

I have been familiar for many years with the general objectives of the National Association of County Officials and where you stood on literally thousands of pieces of Federal legislation. In preparation for meeting with you today, I have studied your most recent platform and policy statements in detail.

The question that I am supposed to answer is: Where does the Democratic Party stand on them?

The short answer is that the Democratic Party goes at least—and I repeat, at least—95 percent of the way with you.

A good indicator of this great similarity of objectives and means is to compare the American county platform with the domestic planks in the Democratic platform which was actually drawn up recently by the delegates to the Democratic Convention in Los Angeles.

Take almost any subject that you choose—airports, housing, tax on local bonds, highways, aid to dependent children, urban renewal, regional housing, control of water pollution, etc., etc., etc.—and you will find that on almost any one subject there is a striking resemblance between the two platforms. Naturally, there are some differences, especially in detail—and I shall discuss the major of these differences later—but, on the whole, they are strikingly similar platforms.

It might be pointed out that there is also a remarkable coicidence between the platform of the Republican Party and that of your organization.

Does this really mean that there is no difference between the parties on the major subjects of interest to you as county officials?

I think not.

If you examine the Democratic and Republican platforms in detail, I think you will discover that they reflect a considerable difference. The Republican platform is liberally sprinkled with high-sounding phrases but is short on specific commitments.

Further, there are better indicators of the differences between the parties than election-year platforms. The real differences show up in a number of other ways.

It has been Democratic Presidents and Democrats Congresses which have originated almost all of the partnership programs which are keystones in your American county platform. If you go down the long list of Federal-State-local cooperative programs, you will find that almost every one of them is a Democratic program in origin.

Also, on the question of timing, the Democrats have favored establishment of Federal aid plans before being forced into them by the sheer weight of adverse circumstances. If things get bad enough, the Republicans will support a "crash program," which frequently is too little and too late. Their recent program for area redevelopment is a good example. They are not willing to admit that States and local governments need assistance until things have hit rockbot-

tom. They will admit to a national responsibility only as a last resort.

Another difference comes in the question of enthusiasm. Whereas the Democrats have enthusiastically initiated many programs of power development, highway modernization, control of water pollution, and a hundred others, the Republicans go along with these programs with a marked lack of enthusiasm—you might even say they drag their feet from time to time.

Last, but not least, is the question of which of the parties has the better record of delivery on promises. When looking to the future for expectations, we must look to the past for performance.

And when we look back it is clear which of the parties has delivered on the programs of importance to you. It is clear which of the parties has supported these programs in Congress when the chips are down. And it is clear which party's Presidents have signed such programs into law and which party's Presidents have scuttled such programs through use of the veto.

President Eisenhower has vetoed important legislation with respect to housing, urban renewal and slum clearance, area redevelopment, public works, aid to airport construction, and stream pollution control.

As you know, the use of the President's veto power has somewhat dampened Federal assistance programs. It has not ended them, but the veto and the threat of veto have resulted in the drastic scaling down of a number of specific programs. The constant reminder that the public works bill was vetoed twice last year serves to delay many very badly needed projects.

I said earlier that I would discuss the points of difference as well as the points of agreement between your platform and that of the Democratic Party. I could find only two differences of any consequence.

First, your platform is specific in its opposition to the establishment of a Federal Department of Urban Affairs. As I understand the Democratic proposal, the new department would work not exclusively on urban problems but would concern itself with suburban and metropolitan problems at the same time. After all, the problems are so intertwined as to be inseparable. As this proposal is spelled out in the coming months of the campaign, I hope that you and your association will follow its development with an open mind. I think that such a cabinet office might be almost as useful to many, many county officials as it will be to city officials.

The second major difference of opinion comes with respect to Federal aid to education, which is supported by both major political parties. I shall not try to proselytize on this subject, but rather explain why I favor Federal aid to education and why my party is for it.

The most common justification for Federal aid to education is the need for building an educational system in this country that will allow us to compete with the Communist countries in the years ahead. This is a valid justification. If our educational system falls behind theirs in this age of frightening technological advance, the next generation of Americans will fall hopelessly behind in national defense, and then it will be too late to do anything whatsoever about it.

For myself, I would advocate radical improvements in our educational system if there were no external threat at all. We are the richest nation in the world, and we can afford not only an adequate school system but a really first-rate educational system for all our children. Sadly enough, this is lacking in many places.

There is no argument that it would be preferable to have our school system brought up to par by local or State efforts. And in recent years local communities and States have made herculean efforts to keep up with the demand for more and better schoolrooms and for more and better paid teachers. Yet there is a serious shortage of both today.

The chief stumbling block, as you all know, is tax resources. At the moment local tax resources are stretched to the breaking point.

The Federal Government does have the tax resources to be of assistance and this Federal aid can be rendered in such a way as to leave local control unimpaired. It can also be rendered in such a way as to allow States and local communities flexibility as to how the funds are to be used, either for school construction or to supplement teachers' salaries.

I have talked too long, but I find that the question of Federal-State-local cooperation is not only one of the most interesting but one of the most complex questions that we face. We must and, I believe, we will continue to solve it on a case-by-case basis.

There is no magic formula, no single equation. But where there is good will, mutual trust, and a spirit of cooperation, we can go forward with a number of vital and progressive programs.

Your association has a program and a platform which are so close to those of the Democratic Party that I can see no obstacle to our going forward together.

Without Federal and State cooperation with, and assistance to, local communities, many of our problems will not be solved. They will simply canker and increase and ruin the life of our communities.

With continuing cooperation, they will be solved and America's great potential will be realized.

Thank you.

Polish Children's Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 19, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the American Research Hospital for Children in Poland is a dramatic and imaginative expression of the heart of America at work in the cause of peace and justice.

It has been my privilege to work closely with the man who conceived this project and who is the guiding light, Mr. Biernacki-Poray. In this year's mutual appropriations bill we shall have the opportunity to provide the means for the long overdue start on this wonderful project.

The story of the Children's Hospital in Poland was best described in an article published in the Saturday Review of July 23, 1960. The title of the article, "What One Man Can Do," reveals the answer to the success of this project.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT ONE MAN CAN DO

(By Hallowell Bowser)

In this era of multibillion dollar military budgets and multimegaton atomic weapons, a large percentage of the modest, constructive projects undertaken by average citizens have a way of being overlooked. As a result, many of us nurse the brooding conviction that there is nothing the ordinary citizen can do to change his world, a world in which he feels disconnected, helpless, alienated from the governmental processes which intimately affect his life. Fortunately, there are many exceptions to this general rule.

Consider the story of Mr. W. O. Biernacki-Poray, who practically singlehandedly conceived, designed, and obtained the support of the American and Polish Governments for the projected American Research Hospital for Children in Poland. Not much has been said publicly about the project, but there is a fair chance that within a few years it will be regarded as one of the impressive symbolic ventures of our time. It is a venture which took shape because one man decided to act on his convictions.

The story begins in February 1958, when 3-year-old Christina Biernacki-Poray, of Montclair, N.J., was stricken by a violent, mysterious virus infection. The incident had a shattering effect on her father, a Polish-born architect now living in the United States. "The vigil of that agonizing night, the desperation of that longest night of my life," he later said, "brought to a focus in my mind the real need for a practical way to help the sick children of countries which, like my native Poland, had grossly inadequate medical facilities. Within 3 days my Christina was on her way to recovery. But meanwhile I had formulated the idea of building in Poland a medical center for children."

Mr. Biernacki-Poray's characterization of the state of medicine in Poland was hardly exaggerated. Describing the Polish scene circa 1957, Polish-born author, Christine Hotchkiss, wrote in her book "Home to Poland":

"In Infant Jesus Hospital in Warsaw I saw X-ray apparatus glued together with tape, surgical instruments black with age and still used in operating rooms. Few thermometers are available, one large hospital had only 12 to go around."

Such medical conditions were not untypical; even before the devastation of World War II, Poland's medical facilities were inadequate by general European standards. During the war, some 6 million persons living in Poland lost their lives, and postwar boundary reshuffling cost the country almost 11 million people and crippled its economy. Today, most Polish families live in one room, have no refrigeration, and share a kitchen and bath with six other families. Medical conditions are of a piece with this picture of general deprivation.

With this situation in mind, Mr. Biernacki-Poray went to Washington in the manner of Mr. Smith or Mr. Deeds. Soon, despite discouragement and extraordinary difficulties, he had pledges of cooperation from the U.S. State Department, the Polish Government, and CARE, and from John Richardson, Jr., an investment banker who had previously done a heroic job of obtaining American medical supplies for Poland. Senators Hubert Humphrey and Jacob Javits, Representative Clement J. Zablocki, Dr. Howard Rusk, and the editor of SR were among the many others who supported the project.

The difficulties were legion, but Mr. Biernacki-Poray kept moving. On June 17, 1960, the mutual security appropriations bill was amended to permit the expenditure for the hospital of $3,500,000 (tourist rate) in American farm-commodity credits on deposit in Poland. Construction will take about 3 years, and will probably begin this fall, after the hospital committee arises privately an additional $150,000, and signs an agreement with a foundation or medical center willing to supervise the flow of information between the hospital and medical authorities outside Poland.

The Children's Hospital was designed with imagination and loving care by Mr. Biernacki-Poray, who contributed gratis his services and those of his staff. The building is a low-lying, T-shaped, 400-bed structure that incorporates such modern elements as radiant-panel heating and cooling, and a circular dormitory designed to give the nurses easy access to their young patients. The hospital will occupy a high plateau just outside the steel center of Krakow, in full view of the city. The Krakow site was chosen because the city's population has more than doubled since prewar times, with little improvement in medical facilities. Another consideration was the fact that the Jagiellonian University of Krakow, the oldest medical center in Europe, is in this city. The Children's Hospital will prove an invaluable clinical and research component of the university's medical school; for this reason, completion of the hospital is scheduled for 1964, so that it may be presented to the university at ceremonies honoring the institution's 600th anniversary. The hospital is expected to have an ameliorating effect on standards of medical practice throughout the middle and east European countries.

Not the least of the hospital's good effects is the positive encouragement which it should give to men of good will who are diffident about translating their beliefs into action. Gleaming high above Krakow, the American Research Hospital for Children may someday signalize to men everywhere the fact that individual initiative and dedication can have a positive effect on seemingly remote governmental processes. But whatever its larger implications, the hospital will be a reassuring sight to the parents of Krakow, and will certainly stand as something of a monument to W. O. Biernacki-Poray, who has shown us what one determined man can do.

Support for Extension of Conservation Reserve of the Soil Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 19, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as we know, the conservation reserve of the soil bank is dead—after 1960—unless action is taken by this postrecess of Congress.

We recognize, of course, that the conservation reserve is not a perfect program.

During its brief lifetime, shortcomings have emerged. However, there have been an extensive number of offsetting factors, including the removal this year of an accumulative total of about 28 million acres from production.

If the soil bank is not extended, we must recognize that a large proportion of this land next year will come back into production.

By logical deduction, it is reasonable to assume that an imbalanced supply-demand situation will be further thrown "out of kilter" because of the increased output from the enriched acreage coming back into production of crops—many of these now heavily in surplus.

As we know, the administration has recommended the extension of the soil bank. As yet, however, Congress—without approving any alternatives to this overproduction problem—has been reluctant to provide such an extension.

Today, I was pleased to receive from Mr. A. D. Sutherland, chairman of the land-use committee of the Izaak Walton League of America, the views of the league on the need for extending the conservation reserve.

Reflecting the public-interest views of this splendid organization, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAND RETIREMENT—CONSERVATION RESERVE—SOIL BANK

As chairman of the Land-Use Committee of the Izaak Walton League of America, permit me to express our views on the conservation reserve program. Our conclusions were arrived at after listening to officers of the Farmers' Union, National Grange, American Farm Bureau Federation and members of the Departments of Agriculture and Interior. As a result, at a national meeting in 1954, it was our conclusion that a soil bank program is sound from a conservation point of view as well as from a taxpayer's point of view.

Permit me to give the reasons.

1. The current $2,300 million annual payment for surplus crops is a clear indication that millions of acres of land are unnecessarily used to the detriment of the soil and the taxpayer.

2. That upon the expiration of the present contracts covering 28 million acres in the conservation reserve, these 28 million acres will be added to lands now producing food.

3. Past history has taught us that if a payment is made to retire a part of a farm, the owner used the payment to increase the production on the remainder of the land.

4. The past acts of Congress have provided for a retirement of a comparatively small portion of the lands over a period of years and the program has not been fully implemented. The effect of retiring 28 million acres as provided by the act in effect in 1959 will not be known until the end of 1960.

5. Planting idle lands to grasses and trees holds the soil from erosion by wind and water, affords cover for wildlife and from a conservation point of view is a sound program.

With this in mind, we believe the objective of preserving soil not needed for crops and a reduction in the annual cost can be accomplished by an act of Congress which would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into 3-year contracts with wheat producers. A sufficient acreage should be contracted for so as to eliminate the wheat surplus. The same directive can be made to apply to lands producing corn and cotton. The remaining acreage shall be retired as in the judgment of the Secretary of Agriculture shall be necessary to control an overproduction. The total acreage to be retired should be not more than 60 million acres. The cost of such a program as to wheat is illustrated by the following:

Estimated annual surplus, 500 million bushels.

Estimated production per acre, 20 bushels.

Acres to be reduced to eliminate surplus, 25 million acres.

COST OF CONSERVATION RESERVE WHEAT PROGRAM

Market under price support, $1.75 per bushel.

Average yield per acre, 20 bushels.

Average receipt from wheat per acre, $35.

Average cost to producer, 60 percent.

Average cost per acre to producer, $21.

Net yield per acre, average $14.

Acreage to be reduced to eliminate surplus, 25 million acres.

Average payment per acre, $14.

Annual cost per year to eliminate surplus of wheat, $350 million.

Using a similar formula applicable to corn, the estimated cost of eliminating the surplus corn crop would be in the neighborhood of $120 million.

The foregoing program would eliminate rigid controls of price and production and permit the operation of a free economy, which has been basically inherent in the fundamentals of the American way of life.

You may be assured that the Izaak Walton League of America is a disinterested party except from a public point of view, and we submit our proposals in all sincerity.

Vice President Nixon Wrong on Medical Care Plan for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 19, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the following statement made some weeks ago by Vice President NIXON on the matter of medical care for the aged. I ask unanimous consent to have the statement printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT REGARDING THE ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL CARE BILL

The administration medical care bill deserves the support of all American who recognize the need for better medical care for the aged and who want to meet that need without adopting a program which would open the door for socialized medicine, as would the Forand bill.

It is superior to the Forand bill in these respects:

1. The administration bill provides coverage for 12½ million people over 65 who do not have the resources or the opportunity to obtain adequate health insurance coverage.

The Forand bill provides no coverage whatever for 4 million aged people who are not covered by social security. Over 2 million of these 4 million have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. This important group of 2 million is covered by the administration bill.

2. Under the administration bill those who are eligible for the program have complete freedom of choice as to whether they desire to participate in it or to provide for their own protection on an individual basis.

The Forand bill compels all those on social security to participate in the program regardless of whether they need it or want it.

3. The administration bill provides for the use of virtually all medical facilities and services, including medical, nursing and other health services, in the patients' own homes, thereby serving the need of the patient most effectively and economically.

The Forand bill would put a still heavier load on already overburdened hospitals and skilled nursing homes, since its benefits are

available only in institutions. In effect, in order to get the benefits of the program, those participating would be forced to go to hospitals and nursing homes, even when they did not desire to do so.

4. The administration bill preserves the opportunity for private insurers to continue to expand their insurance coverage for the aged. The Forand bill would inevitably curtail the opportunity for continued growth in the coverage and adequacy of voluntary health insurance and would set up irresistible pressures for establishing a compulsory health insurance program for all people regardless of age—a development which inevitably would lead to the socializing of the medical profession. Importantly, the administration program avoids that threat because of its basic voluntary nature.

5. The administration program provides a comprehensive 10-point benefit program which would substantially meet the costs of long term or other expensive illness. The Forand bill provides only a 3-point benefit program limited to the first dollar costs involved in institutional care and surgery. In a nutshell, the administration bill offers the best protection against the costs of catastrophic illness.

The difference between the administration's program and the Forand bill goes to the fundamental nature of our free society. The Forand bill and similar plans would set up a great state program which inevitably would head in the direction of herding the ill and elderly into institutions whether they desired this or not. Such a state program would threaten the high standards of American medicine.

The administration program recognizes the medical problems of the elderly but preserves our basic American principle—a freedom of choice. This would permit elderly citizens who need medical care to accept institutional treatment if they desired and would also enable them to stay home—a choice which many of them undoubtedly would take—and still receive the medical care which they need in the advanced years of life.

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I think the Vice President erred in his assessment of the advantages of the administration proposal as against those of the Forand bill, and I would like to comment briefly on the major points in his statement.

Even if the administration proposal were passed by the Congress, no one would receive benefits without the action of State legislatures. Ninety-nine State legislative bodies would have to act on enabling legislation and authorizations. The prospect of favorable State action should be judged in the light of the recent statement by 30 State Governors, representing more than two-thirds of the U.S. population, advocating that health insurance for the aged be provided through the OASDI system, rather than through Federal-State financing.

Further, before the claim for coverage of 12½ million people could be realized, each State would have to enter into negotiations with insurance carriers, and each person potentially eligible would have to prove his financial need and many would have to pay an enrollment fee.

And in the highly unlikely event that all of that were accomplished, an enrolled individual would have to pay medical bills of $250 from his own resources—$400 for a retired couple—before he could receive the first penny of benefits from the administration's so-called health program.

The Vice President states that each individual eligible would be free to choose whether he wishes to participate. The individual's choice is limited in reality only to whether he will accept the benefits if his State offers them. The taxes to finance the program would be equally compulsory under the administration program as under the Forand bill. And how much freedom would there be for the individual living in a State whose legislature was either unwilling or unable to raise the funds necessary to participate? As I understand freedom—it means freedom to participate—as well as freedom not to participate. The Vice President seems to understand "freedom" to mean only freedom from participation in the social security system.

Vice President NIXON claims that the administration program "preserves the opportunity for private insurers to continue to expand their insurance coverage for the aged," while the Forand bill would not. Private insurance flourished as never before after social security benefits were initially enacted, though similar fears were expressed at that time. Private pension plans have grown in the last 25 years to supplement the basic social security pension. An identical development can be expected in the health field, once basic health protection is provided through the social security system.

Mr. NIXON says that the Forand bill would lead to the socializing of the medical profession. Such a statement is pure sloganeering. The Forand bill leaves all existing relationships between doctor, patient, and government unchanged, providing simply a mechanism for paying certain bills.

The Vice President seeks to persuade us that the Forand bill would result in herding the ill and elderly into institutions whether they desired this or not. I find it hard to believe that Mr. NIXON is not fully aware that no one can get into a hospital without being admitted by a physician. Providing insurance against the costs of hospitalization will not result in a massive exodus from the homes of America to the hospitals. Instead, it will remove the economic barrier to needed hospitalization so that medical necessity can govern whether a person will enter a hospital.

Now the task of providing the aged citizens of our country with some protection against the burden of high medical expenses is obviously an immense one. It cannot be solved with a single stroke of the pen, or with empty promises. There is no panacea. After much study in both Houses of the Congress, a way was proposed by which we could begin to meet this problem. It seemed reasonable to approach this problem as, 25 years ago, we approached the problem of providing some income security to the aged citizens of that generation. The earliest pensions under social security were, indeed, modest ones but they provided the sound basis on which a social security program which provides a real measure of dignity in old age has been built.

The Forand bill, by covering all those eligible for social security, covers the vast bulk of the aged. Social security beneficiaries as a proportion of the total population are continually increasing. Once this large group is provided for, it is a simple matter to extend coverage to those outside the system as, for example, one of the Senate versions of the Forand bill—S. 3503—of which I am a cosponsor, already does. No one has come up with any suggestion which would provide benefits to as many people as would the social security approach.

Expenses for hospitalization are by far the largest single item of health care costs for the aged. There is no better place to start attacking the problem than by providing for financing of institutional care.

The administration decided on a different approach. Instead of advancing a modest workable program, such as those contained in the Forand, Kennedy, McNamara, or Anderson bills, the administration took it upon itself to promise the American people "the works," in the hope that the fact that it could not deliver the goods would somehow be obscured.

In contrast, no one claimed that the Forand bill would solve the problem of protecting all of America's aged from all their medical bills, but it does provide a firm foundation on which we can build in the future.

We are proud that we have proceeded responsibly to meet this vast problem. We are proud that we are proceeding in a great tradition. Just 25 years ago, when the Congress passed the original social security Act, President Roosevelt used these words as he signed that bill into law:

> We can never insure 100 percent of the population against 100 percent of the hazards and vicissitudes of life, but we have tried to frame a law which will give some measure of protection to the average citizen and to his family against the loss of a job and against poverty-ridden old age. This law, too, represents a cornerstone in a structure which is being built but is by no means complete.

President Roosevelt understood that these problems could be met, one solid and constructive step at a time. He did not feel it necessary to promise the people everything, while delivering nothing.

Tribute to Gov. Gordon Browning, of Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 19, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on June 29, 1960, at Huntingdon, Tenn., more than 2,000 Tennesseans gathered to pay tribute to one of Tennessee's most beloved sons, Gordon Browning.

Gordon Browning has served his Nation and State in an exemplary fashion.

He has won commendation as an officer in the U.S. Army, contributed outstandingly to the national scene as a Member of the House of Representatives in the 68th to 73d Congresses, and served three times as a most distinguished Governor of Tennessee. He is loved and revered by his friends as a courageous and uncompromising fighter for what he thinks is right, and as a champion for the truly good things in life.

At this gathering Jack Norman, Tennessee's immediate past Democratic national committeeman gave an address in tribute to Gordon Browning which was truly worthy of the occasion and serves as an inspiration to those who heard it. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from Jack Norman's outstanding address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM AN ADDRESS BY JACK NORMAN, GORDON BROWNING DAY, HUNTINGDON, TENN., JUNE 29, 1960

It is good that we gather here in his community and in the living presence of our honored guest to pay our respects, express our appreciation, and evidence our affection for the life and service of this good citizen, trusted public servant, and friend.

The son of sturdy God-fearing parents, his early opportunities were favored by their dispositions, but obstructed by their outward circumstances. Though removed above the pressure of poverty, their economic situation was dependent and fluctuating. The benevolence, the modest and prudent integrity, the true devoutness of these good people, shown forth at an after period, expanded and beautified in the character of their son; his heart was nourished by the constant exposure to such influences, and thus the better part of his education prospered well.

The receipt of political honors can be minimized to some degree by the admission of the part of fate and circumstance. The proper and loyal administration of public office is expected, is correct, and deserves no particular compliment, but the deserved appellation of being a good man, a good husband, and a good citizen is the honor which our guest wears within rather than without. It is this honor which he has earned that brings you here today for this expression of affection and confidence.

It is quite likely that his sterling worth and strength of character have been more clearly manifested in his defeats and disappointments than in his successes and triumphs. With the pleasures and honors of all of those high offices, there were necessarily mingled the pressures and vicissitudes incident to their duties and obligations. We who so highly regard him found the origin of our respect in his vitality and strength before such pressures. The keystone of that respect is the firm knowledge that his faith and truth and justice have never wavered. His fundamental concept of duty was never tarnished by expediency. His path could have been much easier through the lowlands of compromise, but he accepted the treacherous high road of right without hesitation. With the suggestion of a compromise of honor, his mouth opened in denunciation like the breach of a cannon, you knew there would be an explosion. This was Gordon Browning by impulse and nature.

I have seen him under pressure and in defeat. It was here that I saw the man. I saw him in Chicago, assailed, threatened, and castigated, but immovable, unwavering, and steadfast before a sense of loyalty and adherence to his conception of his act. His faith and determination were as little affected as an onrushing river into which there has been thrown a pebble.

What have been the fundamental concepts of this man?

He has staked his life on the simple proposition that a firm faith in God is the fit support for every action of a man, that one's own religion is a matter between one's self and one's maker, that religions are different roads converging to the same point, that it does not matter that we take different roads so long as we reach the same goal, that in reality there are as many religions as there are individuals.

He has held that there is no reason to suspect human nature, that it will respond to any noble and friendly action, that no human being is so perfect as to warrant his destroying him whom he wrongfully considers to be wholly evil. He has manifested an undying faith in the responsiveness of human nature. He has believed that we must not lose faith in humanity, that humanity is an ocean, if a few drops of the ocean are dirty, the ocean does not become dirty. He has an ultimate faith in the worth and judgment of his fellow men.

In government he has contended that democracy should embrace the doctrine of natural rights. He believes the theory that the standard of utility or of the happiness of the many makes democracy the preferable form of government. He insists that only democracy makes possible the full realization of the most characteristic potentialities of human personality.

In his profession and on the bench he has held that human rights are sacred and that equal justice is the will of God.

We shall all remember him for his courage. If he was convinced that he was right, the decree of his court, his espousal of the legislation and his executive order were as definite and determined as his order to his military command. This attribute runs through the fabric of his life like a red thread through a piece of white cloth.

The qualities of character, integrity and service about which we have spoken will not be had by chance. In government as in anything else, indifference permits incompetence. The voter's apathy creates the opportunity for the energetic demagogue and the crafty political hypocrite. Too often democracy provides the food for political parasites.

I could not conclude these remarks with the failure to mention his greatest asset in life. Still, quiet, reserved, and exalted in her warm enthusiasm, devoted in her love, she has moved with him as the inhabitant of a higher and simpler world. When he has sailed on troubled seas, Miss Ida's love made the burning sand grow green beneath him and the stunted shrubs to blossom. When the sun of pressure scorched his bare head, when his feet were chilled by the ice of prejudice, when the hail of trouble and tribulation beat round his temples, Miss Ida's love has rocked him to sleep in every storm. Seas and hills and horizons have been between them, but their souls always escaped the restrictions of place and met in a paradise of love. God bless both of them.

Refutation of Charges of Subversion of the Foreign Policy Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 19, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on July 15 there was inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD certain material, the import of which was to suggest that the Foreign Policy Association is engaged in the circulation of subversive material.

This material presented only one side of the controversy, and I think it is only fair that the answer of the Foreign Policy Association to the attack on its program should also be brought to the attention of readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I submit a memorandum prepared by the Foreign Policy Association which contains a point-by-point answer to the charges made against that organization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this document be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD along with certain editorials and articles from southern newspapers concerning this matter.

I have received an estimate from the Public Printer that this material will cost $297 for printing it in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM OF FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION, JULY 15, 1960

To: David Warner, regional representative of the Foreign Policy Association.

From: Department of Public Information, Foreign Policy Association.

Subject: Open letter from the Waldo M. Slaton Post No. 140, American Legion.

In an open letter to David Warner, a regional representative of the Foreign Policy Association in Atlanta, the Americanism committee of Waldo M. Slaton Post No. 140 of the American Legion asked for explicit and categorical answers to a series of 12 questions, directly and indirectly related to the association and its publications. We chose not to give further publicity to the matter by making a public reply during the period when the grand jury had the questions under consideration.

For the information of our many friends, this memorandum now provides those answers, question by question. It is designed to remove certain misunderstandings and false allegations about the FPA, and to reaffirm the educational value and purpose of the FPA's great decisions program for community discussion of pressing world affairs issues, including the peril of communism.

Question 1 deals with the question of "interorganizational coordination," at the time when Alger Hiss was president of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Following the end of the Second World War, private organizations interested in citizen education about foreign policy and international affairs were properly concerned with the best means of carrying out their respective tasks in the new circumstances of increased U.S. responsibility in world affairs. These organizations reviewed their own programs and consulted informally among themselves as to possible coordination of their activities. Far from leading to interorganizational coordination, however, these consultations ended in the decision that the individual organizations would pursue their own separate paths.

Question 2 implies that in the 1947 yearbook of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Hiss endorsed the Foreign Policy Association.

The Foreign Policy Association is mentioned in this yearbook only once, in connection with the recommendation that the Carnegie Endowment should "strengthen its relationships with other organizations principally engaged in the study of foreign affairs."

This can hardly be called an endorsement. Even if it should be so called, it is com-

pletely unwarranted to draw from this fact any unfavorable inferences about the Foreign Policy Association.

We wish to make perfectly sure that nothing said in this memorandum in denial of the allegations in questions 1 and 2 is read to imply any disrespect or disavowal of the Carnegie Endowment. Indeed, in 1956, a close working relationship was set up between the Foreign Policy Association and the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, under the presidency of Joseph E. Johnson and the chairmanship of Harvey Bundy, when the two organizations cooperated to found the World Affairs Center for the United States, which has since become an integral part of the Foreign Policy Association.

The Carnegie Endowment is a valued ally in the cause of citizen education in world affairs, which continues to enjoy, as it has throughout its history, the participation and support of a long roster of distinguished Americans, including, in addition to its present officers and trustees, under the chairmanship of Whitney North Seymour, such outstanding Americans as Dwight D. Eisenhower, Elihu Root, John Foster Dulles, and John W. Davis.

Question 3 refers to two unproved allegations about Vera M. Dean, editor of two of the Foreign Policy Association publications (the Headline Series and the Foreign Policy Bulletin), made in 1947 by a witness before a congressional committee, and quoted as such in the report of the Reece Committee on Tax Exempt Foundations.

To the first charge, that she signed the Golden Book of American-Soviet Friendship, Mrs. Dean states that she does not recall ever doing so, and in fact has long had a policy against signing such public memorials.

She labels as utterly false the second charge that she was active in a Communist-front organization, called the Congress of American Women. In fact, at the time of her alleged participation in it, she was actually participating in an anti-Communist organization, the International Assembly of Women, sponsored by Lady Reading of Great Britain and by Mrs. Ogden L. Mills, wartime president of the American Women's Voluntary Services.

To the allegation that Mrs. Dean's writings were included in "a Communist kit for teachers," Mrs. Dean points out that her writings are sold on the open market, and that she has no way of knowing, much less controlling, the ways in which they are used. She does know that several of her books, published by McGraw-Hill, Knopf, and the Harvard University Press, are used as texts in many leading universities throughout the country.

It will help to understand the nature and standing of these allegations to keep in mind the fact that the report in which they appeared also included a remarkably strong expression of dissent by 2 members of the 5-man committee. Brief representative extracts follow:

"The minority does not agree with the report submitted by the majority. It not only disagrees with that report but earnestly believes hat it should never be published."

"Each step of the proceedings of this committee placed an ugly stain on the majestic record of the U.S. House of Representatives and the great tradition of the American people. The minority membership of this committee, feeling that fundamental American principles were under attack in the committee, diligently attended its meetings despite the many other congressional responsibilities that were equally demanding of their attention. The majority membership operated primarily through proxies held by the chairman."

"The hard truth is that, by the manner in which the proceedings of the committee were conducted and by the self-evident bias of the majority report, the committee has failed in the most basic way to carry out the mandate of the Congress. The results of the proceedings are of no value to the Congress, and it was, therefore, a complete waste of public money."

A footnote says: "This report submitted by two minority members of the committee may, or may not, be a minority report. One member of the majority has indicated that he disagrees with the report submitted by the staff and approved by two members of the committee, and that he intends to file separate views, although he assented to the submission of the staff report as a 'majority' report. However, that is a problem for the parliamentarian. It is mentioned only to emphasize the unreliability of the report submitted by the 'majority'."

Questions 4 and 5 include allegations about the author of a book which is one of 11 mentioned in a suggested reading list on one of the great decisions fact sheets. The book, "The United States and China," by John K. Fairbank, published by the Harvard University Press, was described in a review in the New York Times as "the best book on China in our time."

Dr. Fairbanks, professor of history at Harvard University, was in Formosa visiting Chiang Kai-shek and his government at the time the letter from Waldo M. Slaton Post was received. His record of opposition to communism is such that he was assailed by Soviet Communists in the New Times (Moscow, January 18, 1950) as "an American intelligence agent." His book is standard in libraries across the country and is used as a text in leading university courses on China and American foreign policy in the Far East.

In recommending many books that reflect different points of view on a given subject, the Foreign Policy Association obviously cannot endorse all and actually does not endorse any of the volumes. Many books listed describe attitudes and beliefs which exist in the world and must be taken into account by our policymakers, such as speeches by Khrushchev or a book by Mao-Tse-tung. An awareness of what these men have to say and what other writers think of them, is at least as important as a good map of China, the Soviet Union, or Red satellite nations. To inform readers that these books and opinions exist does not in any sense imply endorsement of their contents. Such books provide the raw materials for intelligent appraisal and the process of discussion. Is a public library to be condemned because it has on its reference shelves a copy of Karl Marx?

Similarly, Professor Fairbank, and other authors on great decisions lists of suggested readings, refer to a wide variety of authors and sources for a variety of reasons; and they cannot be assumed to endorse or espouse so many introductory opinions. The Fairbank book, for instance, refers to books by a wide variety of writers including John Foster Dulles, Father Harold Regney, officials of the Chiang Kai-shek government including Chiang Kai-shek himself.

For the same reasons, we do not believe it necessary or even appropriate to comment on allegations about authors merely referred to in the books included in our suggested reading lists. Surely it would be impractical as well as un-American to believe that it is necessary to run security checks on every name even mentioned in each book before that book can be listed for reference.

Question 6 is divided into two parts: the first part deals with the same allegations as question five, about authors of books referred to as secondary sources in other books listed in great decisions reading lists. The answer to question five partly covers this point.

We believe that widespread discussion is the best possible protection against subversion and propaganda. Indeed, it is the traditional American protection.

We believe that authors and books recommended in our materials should be identified by their professional qualifications. We do not believe that Americans need a complete dossier of unproved allegations to enable them to evaluate a writer's statements, in open discussion with fellow Americans.

The second part of question 6 deals with alleged actions and attitudes of John Nason, now president of the Foreign Policy Association, Inc., and formerly president of Swarthmore College. The situation referred to in this question took place in 1959. Mr. Nason left Swarthmore in 1953.

Question 7. Mr. Warner's testimony before the grand jury was not made under oath, no such requirement having been placed upon him by the grand jury. He is ready to repeat under oath anything he said in those hearings.

Question 8 asks if a representative of the Foreign Policy Association would be willing to testify under oath in answering charges related to the alleged Communist record of Emil Lengyel, whose articles have appeared in various publications of the Foreign Policy Association.

The Foreign Policy Association submitted through its counsel to the next grand jury a statement denying the charge that Lengyel was a Communist and the other charges made by the Church League of America; and offered to present any witnesses the grand jury desired to have testify under oath.

As far as the record of Prof. Emil Lengyel as an active champion of democracy and enemy of totalitarianism is concerned, his writings speak for themselves.

It is true that his name did appear on the stationery of several organizations which were, at a later date, placed on the Attorney General's list. However, at the time of his sponsorship neither he, nor the other distinguished Americans who were listed on the same letterheads, had any reason to believe that these organiaztions were to be used for Communist front purposes. They were for the most part organizations formed to fight fascism and nazism, and to forward the allied war effort.

His association with these organizations was purely nominal except when he spoke for some of the war relief organizations. He spoke, for instance, for the Russian-American section of the International Workers' Order at the direct request of the Treasury Department, in a letter dated March 7, 1944, which bears the annotation: "This group is undertaking to sell enough war bonds to buy a heavy bomber."

To the evidence of his stanch devotion to the American democratic system contained in his published works (available at local public libraries) can be added the following facts:

He is on the official blacklist of the Soviet Union, Hungary, and other Communist countries.

His book "1000 Years of Hungary" was removed by Soviet officials from the exhibit of books presented by the United States at the American National Exhibition in Moscow. His pamphlet, now in its third edition, "The Soviet Union, the Land and Its People," is on the recommended list of the board of education of New York City and other large cities.

He is a member of the Committee of One Million Against Admission of Red China to the U.N.

At the present, Dr. Lengyel is on the Advisory Board of the American-Asian Education Exchange, where his fellow members are some of the best known anti-Communists in the United States; such as Gen. James A. Van Fleet, Dr. Daniel A. Poling, Hon. Joseph C. Grew, and Stanley K. Hornbeck, distinguished American diplomats and former Ambassadors. Chairman is the Honorable Charles Edison.

For several years Dr. Lengyel was president of the New York Chapter of the American-European Friendship Association, the aim of

which is to foster cultural relations between the United States and the free world. National chairman of this organization is Mrs. George N. Shuster, wife of Dr. George N. Shuster, leading Catholic layman and former president of Hunter College, New York.

Question 9: Photostatic copies have been distributed, and are available for inspection, of letters of endorsement from both President Eisenhower and former President Truman, as well as from John Foster Dulles, Adlai Stevenson and many members of the U.S. Senate. Senator AIKEN has not endorsed the great decisions program, stating that he has a firm policy against endorsements of any kind. A copy of his letter, listed, in error, as an endorcement, is attached as exhibit A. Exhibits B and C are copies of letters from Presidents Eisenhower and Truman.

Question 10 asks for identification of the man and his organization who started the present campaign against the Foreign Policy Association.

The man referrd to is Edgar C. Bundy. In connection with an earlier attack by Mr. Bundy on the National Council of Churches, the national council, in a pamphlet published in 1960, included the following questions and answers about Mr. Bundy:

"Finally, this question: What Are Some Facts About Those Who Have Attacked the National Council of Churches and Protestant Clergymen and Laymen?

"Edgar C. Bundy, Wheaton, Ill., general chairman of the Church League of America, advertises himself as lecturer, soldier, traveler, journalist, evangelist. Poses as an authority on military affairs. Is a major in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

"His favorite theme is the menace of communism. He attacks the National Council of Churches, the World Council of Churches, local councils of churches, and Protestant clergymen as either being Communist or Communist sympathizers.

"Lecturers on these themes, for pay, before women's clubs, American Legion posts, Rotary, Kiwanis, the Daughters of the American Revolution and other community organizations. He is the author of 'Collectivism in the American Churches,' in which he attacks councils of churches and Protestant clergymen. Bundy has been quoted as describing the late Senator Joseph McCarthy as 'the greatest man alive' and saying 'I like McCarthy and his methods.'

"Bundy was a leading supporter of the resolution condemning UNESCO passed by the American Legion Department of Illinois convention statement which condemned a Girl Scout handbook as being 'un-American.' Bundy has been associated in various activities with two identified by the Anti-Defamation League as professional anti-Semites, Allen Zoll of New York and Harry A. Jung of Chicago."

So far as we know, these statements in the pamphlet have not been challenged.

Question 11 deals with activities of the National Council of Churches, its relationship to the Foreign Policy Association, and its right to speak for the 39 million Americans who belong to its constituent communions.

In a letter to the Foreign Policy Association, a spokesman for the National Council of Churches says:

"The National Council of Churches does not arrogate to itself the power to speak for its 33 constituent communions in any way that is binding upon them against their will. Nor does the National Council of Churches presume to speak for each and every one of the more than 39 million members of its constituent communions. The National Council of Churches does articulate representative views of its constituency arrived at by responsible, representative, democratic processes after careful study and deliberation by representatives of its constituent communions."

No one representing the national council has urged recognition of Red China upon the Congress or the American people. The position of the national council on communism is made clear in the following statements, included in a letter written to every Member of the U.S. Congress, signed by Roy G. Ross, general secretary and duly elected and authorized representatives of its constituent communions:

"The National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., and its constituent communions are and always have been unalterably opposed to communism. Its unqualified conviction was expressed in the council's policy statement of May 19, 1953, that:

"No body of people is more concerned to combat communism than the church groups of our country," and; "These churches are the greatest bulwarks of freedom in the United States."

Such conviction was reasserted in the recent resolution of the council's general board last June, "reaffirming the consistent position of the National Council of Churches expressed in many official actions opposing evils, the violation of human rights by Communist and other tyrannies."

Questions 10 and 11 also raise questions about Foreign Policy Association statements on American policy towards China, and Foreign Policy Association responsibility for views expressed by the Chairman of the Foreign Policy Association Board in an issue of the Headline Series entitled "Should the United States Change Its China Policy?"

The Foreign Policy Association makes it explicitly clear in this publication, and in all of its publications, that it is a "nonpartisan educational institution which does not take a position on any issue of U.S. foreign policy."

In keeping with Foreign Policy Association's usual policy of impartial objectivity, the issue of the Headline Series which contained Mr. Seligman's article also contained another article entitled "The United States Should Not Change Its China Policy," by Prof. Richard L. Walker of the University of South Carolina.

The most convincing statement of the value of this publication can be found in a letter to Mr. Seligman, from the executive secretary of the Committee of One Million Against Admission of Red China to the United Nations:

"DEAR MR. SELIGMAN: We just received the latest Headline Series published by the Foreign Policy Association entitled "Should the United States Change Its China Policy?" by Prof. Richard L. Walker and yourself.

"I read this with great interest. Although I am in disagreement with many of the points you make, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you on your very lucid and fair presentation of your point of view.

"The Committee of One Million since its inception in 1953 has advocated and welcomed public discussion on this crucial issue.

"If funds were available, the Committee of One Million would be quite prepared to circulate the booklet containing the arguments presented by yourself and Professor Walker as it now stands. Professor Walker adequately presented our point of view and, believing this to be the correct approach, we would have no qualms over presenting your point of view at the same time.

"Once again, I offer my congratulations on your article.

"With all best wishes and highest regards.

"Sincerely yours,

"MARVIN LIEBMAN,
"Secretary."

While the Foreign Policy Association does not express an opinion on specific questions of foreign policy, it did, in a 40th anniversary statement in 1958, make perfectly clear its basic belief that "communism is the central problem with which the United States must deal in its foreign policy because '• • • the professed goal of international communism remains a constant, dominating and inescapable threat to the United States and the free world as a whole.' "

Opposition to Communist philosophy, domination or expansion must certainly be built into an organization which includes on its board, as does the Foreign Policy Association, such men as Eustace Seligman, a lifelong law partner of the late John Foster Dulles, Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, banker and former U.S. Assistant High Commissioner to Germany; James B. Conant, ex-president of Harvard University; Roswell L. Gilpatric, lawyer, former Under Secretary of the Air Force; Christian A. Herter, Jr., Boston attorney; Frank R. Milliken, executive vice president of Kennecott Copper Corp.; John W. Nason, ex-president of Swarthmore College; John D. Rockefeller 3d; former U.S. Senator H. Alexander Smith; Emile E. Soubry, executive vice president of the Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey); and Walter H. Wheeler, Jr., chairman of the board of Pitney-Bowes, Inc., and member of the War Production Board in World War II.

Question 12 deals with the endorsements of Senators TALMADGE and RUSSELL, referred to in a Foreign Policy Association statement in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution.

The Foreign Policy Association statement in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution referred to letters written by these two Senators to constituents endorsing their participation in great decisions discussion programs. The letter from Senator RUSSELL is available. Mrs. P. L. Hay, Jr., of Macon will testify under oath that she received the letter from Senator TALMADGE. These letters have not been presented as overall endorsements of the Foreign Policy Association.

SUMMARY

This memorandum would not be complete if all these negatives were not balanced by a positive statement of the values of the great decisions program in which more than 300 newspapers and 183 schools and colleges have cooperated in almost every State in the Union; and which has been sponsored in many of these communities by local chapters of many national organizations, including Junior Chamber of Commerce, the League of Women Voters, the AFL–CIO, American Association of University Women, American Legion, bar association, Congregational Churches, Young Republicans, Young Democrats, YMCA, YWCA, the National Council of Catholic Women, and the National Council of Jewish Women.

We believe that this widespread participation, increasing every year, reflects a characteristic American response to the urgent world problems facing the United States today.

Discussion cannot be free or useful unless it is discussion based on the best possible information about the problems to be discussed. Before we can reach an agreement on the policies we need to maintain effective American leadership in the cause of freedom, before we can decide how we must handle the dangers of Communist expansionism in a nuclear age, we must know as much as possible about the nature of communism and the Communist threat; we must understand the nature of the power we have and of the power we must deal with.

Great decisions materials, widely used and praised by scholars, journalists, statesmen, and religious leaders, not only in Georgia but throughout the United States, make available in compact form, facts on which the great decisions of the coming year must be based.

On the basis of these facts, more than 250,000 Americans in informal discussion groups in thousands of communities are able to make their own decisions on what they think American policy should be.

Great decisions most frequently arise when there are strong differences of responsible opinion on questions of importance. We can all be grateful to live in a country where such decisions can be faced in the full light of knowledge, and where friends can gather, without fear, to argue, agree or disagree with one another.

The freedom to engage in such public debate is a major element in American greatness.

We, at the Foreign Policy Association, are indeed grateful for the broad public support which enables us to provide, in usable and economical form, at least a small portion of the information materials required to nourish this essential democratic debate.

[From the Macon News, May 2, 1960]

A CARELESS LEAP

The members of the Fulton County Grand Jury who accused the Foreign Policy Association of spreading "insidious and subversive material" must have been completely out of anything else to do and desirous of making trouble for a useful and respected organization.

If the grand jurors are critical of FPA's great decisions program because it makes citizens better informed about the world in which they live, then the grand jurors are correct. Those of us in Macon who have participated in and been benefitted by great decisions can testify by the thousands as to the value of the program. Because this community responded to the challenge and inspiration inherent in a plan to increase man's information, we now know more than we formerly did about such matters as the Cuban situation, the Communist plans to take over the world, Red China's ambitions, problems involved in African nationalism and such like.

The Foreign Policy Association, which sponsors great decisions, is about as subversive as a platter of apple pie and cheese with the Stars and Stripes waving over it and the national anthem being played in the background. Such men as Adlai Stevenson, John D. Rockefeller III, Dr. James B. Conant, and a host of others do not carelessly lend their names to just any venture.

The grand jury should have looked before it leaped so carelessly. Thanks to its solid reputation, the Foreign Policy Association's good name is not harmed, but one cannot help but wonder how a group of Fulton County citizens could have acted so irresponsibly.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, May 2, 1960]

GRAND JURY'S OFF BASE IN CRITICISM OF FPA

In otherwise constructive presentments, especially in the field of race relations, the Fulton County Grand Jury made a serious mistake in launching a broadside attack on the Foreign Policy Association, an organization devoted to studying international affairs and their effect in this country.

Perhaps in no other field do the American people deserve more enlightening information than in the field of foreign affairs. Whether this be favorable or unfavorable, public discussion and education in a world in which the United States no longer can isolate itself is important and necessary. Those who would censor or restrict discussions and withhold information from the people make the job of policymaking all the more difficult.

The Foreign Policy Association has on its board of directors some of the Nation's leading citizens. To accuse such men as John D. Rockefeller III, Dr. James B. Conant, Jervis J. Babb, and many, many others of like stature, of supporting "subversive propaganda tactics" is McCarthyism pure and simple. It is also so ridiculous as to be not worth considering.

[From the Atlanta Journal, May 6, 1960]

THE LABEL WON'T STICK

Atlanta's deputy school superintendent, Dr. Raul Stephens, declared that he was unable to find the slightest justification for the "subversive" charge aimed at the information materials circulated by the Foreign Policy Association.

The Fulton County grand jury last week asserted the FPA's "Great Decisions," discussion reports to be "insidious and subversive" and urged that they be eliminated from the public schools.

Dr. Stephens made a thorough study of the reports and found the charges unsubstantiated. If there is any rebuttal to his findings, let the accusers cite chapter and verse. The public is entitled to know exactly what information is considered undesirable.

In the consideration of controversial subjects, students will be confronted by a great many viewpoints, including some that are decidedly anti-American.

Does this mean that unfriendly statements of Castro and Chou En-lai should be censored out of the newspapers?

In discussing the Communist challenge to the Western World, it is necessary to point out the aims, advances, and sources of appeal of communism.

Must we then cease to speak of this challenge?

It is for the new grand jury to wind up this piece of unfinished business. The charges must be substantiated or disavowed before the matter can be dropped. It must not be left dangling and unresolved.

[From the Chattanooga Times, May 10, 1960]

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

Along with a constructive report on the school-racial situation in Atlanta, the Fulton County grand jury recently charged the Foreign Policy Association with spreading "insidious and subversive material." The Atlanta Constitution dealt with the report in two editorials, on successive days. It praised the report which, among other things, strongly endorsed "the right of voters in each school district to determine the fate of schools." In the other editorial, the Constitution said that the report attacking the Foreign Policy Association was "ridiculous" and not worthy of consideration.

David Warner, FPA regional representative in Atlanta, assailed the attack on the association as "like something out of the Dark Ages."

The Foreign Policy Association formed in 1918, has, ever since, been a helpful force in enlightening the people on foreign policies. It has a record of constructive aid to our Government in giving information and opinion which has supported our foreign policies. It has, says Mr. Warner, "never been investigated or indicted by, or to our knowledge, even accused by any committee of Congress."

The grand jury is said to have been influenced in its strange report by the Foreign Policy Association's discussion programs, "Great Decisions," on such subjects as "Communist Time Table for 1960," "Divided Europe; Cooperation or Crisis," "Red China on the March," and "Cuba's Revolution."

Learning of the probe by the grand jury, Adlai Stevenson sent a telegram to Sam T. Turnipseed, chairman of the investigating committee, declaring, "The purpose of this telegram is to repeat what I have said publicly on a number of occasions and that is that the Foreign Policy Association has my emphatic indorsement in its educational programs on world affairs."

One of the weaknesses in the American scene is the underground attack on "the right to know." Dr. James B. Conant, prominent in the Foreign Policy Association, is dedicating his late career to advancement of education. To associate him or the FPA with subversive tactics is the last word in irresponsible propaganda.

[From the Atlanta Journal, May 12, 1960]

STEVENSON REPEATS FPA ENDORSEMENT

(By Douglas Kiker)

Adlai Stevenson has reiterated his "emphatic endorsement" of the Foreign Policy Association, and its great decisions discussion program for the benefit of Atlanta American Legionnaires.

The Waldo M. Slaton Legion Post No. 140 had wired Mr. Stevenson on May 6, inviting him to come to Atlanta and testify before the Fulton grand jury which, in its last presentments, accused the FPA of distributing "incidious and subversive" materials to Georgia schoolchildren.

Mr. Stevenson wired the grand jury during its investigation, endorsing the FPA.

In his answer to the Legion post's telegram, the twice-nominated Democratic presidential candidate said that he "has no plans to be in Atlanta in the near future," but if he did he "would be glad to express again his emphatic endorsement of the FPA and its great decisions program."

The letter was written for Mr. Stevenson by his executive secretary, William McC. Blair. The letterhead showed that it originated from the law offices of Stevenson, Rifkind & Wirtz in Chicago.

Mr. Blair, in a second paragraph, added: "I should perhaps add that the office (apparently referring to the law office) is surprised that any credence at all should be given to Edgar Bundy and his absurd bulletin.

The "Americanism committee" of the Legion post has circulated in Atlanta editions of News and Views, a publication highly critical of the FPA. It is edited by Mr. Bundy in Wheaton, Ill., and published by the National Laymen's Council of the Church League of America.

David Warner, southern director of the FPA, has charged—in an apparent reference to the Bundy organization—that "criticism of the FPA obviously did not originate in Georgia." But the Legion vigorously denied this.

The Legion post has not yet released Mr. Stevenson's reply to their telegram, but copies of it were sent to other agencies in Atlanta and made available to the Atlanta Journal.

A spokesman said Thursday that individual members of the "Americanism committee" would not answer any questions privately and that all queries should be directed to the committee as a whole.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Your Hometown: Will It Grow or Decline During the 1960's?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 20, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the revolutions in technology, industry, transportation—yes, in our economic system itself—have resulted in great changes in our economy, including shifts of population from rural to urban areas, and between urban communities.

The population growth—now at about 180 million—also poses new, difficult problems, in terms of jobs, housing, education, and other community facilities, to meet the needs of more and more people.

If we are to plan adequately for the future of our citizens—if our cities are to be well designed—if all our communities are to experience maximum growth then we need to carefully review and analyze the factors influencing such growth and development, and plan accordingly for the years ahead.

Recently the National Publisher, official magazine of the hometown newspaper industry, published an informative article by Gustav E. Larson, entitled "Your Hometown: Will It Grow or Decline During the 1960's?"

Reviewing in a splendid way the factors involved in community progress, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR HOMETOWN: WILL IT GROW OR DECLINE DURING THE 1960'S?

(By Gustav E. Larson)

Many thousands of small communities in the United States have virtually disappeared over the past 100 years. Our Western States, cutover areas, and coal regions can point to hundreds of ghost towns where workers and people left when the minerals were mined out, the price of silver dropped, or when the trees were gone.

Abandonment of roads, railroads, waterways, and building of new transportation routes brought an end to many other thriving small towns. Many small trading centers have been stranded as buyers drove over new highways to the larger trade centers.

FUTURE BLEAK?

Many small towns will not survive or grow in years ahead. Even now many face a bleak future because of consumer shifts from coal to other fuels, and because of increased mechanization of agriculture. These changes have closed mines and reduced the number of farm customers for small towns. Changes in markets, roads, and technology will continue. Some small communities will gain but others will lose. This is a cost of progress.

What will determine the growth of your hometown? In the past, towns that died did so because they did not replace a dying industry with a new one. Workers moved on to other areas. Today there are big investments in small towns—investments in homes, businesses, streets, water supplies, churches and schools.

The older people who have the investments stay and push for area developments. It is the young who leave. This is the stage at which stock-taking should begin for the small town.

Are small towns growing or declining? Based on the 1940–50 census and what we have seen of small town growth and decline over the past decade towns under 500 did not do as well in population growth from 1940–50 as did larger towns. As you move up the town size scale from the 500 to 999 group, to the 1,000 to 2,499 group, and so on to our larger city groups, each larger size group generally shows more growth than the size group below.

Only 52 percent of Georgia's small towns under 500 gained population from 1940 to 1950, for example, but of the towns in the 500–999 group nearly 74 percent gained. In the 1,000 to 2,499 group 84 percent gained.

This smalltown growth experience of Georgia is evidently better than the smalltown growth record of many other States which showed greater percentages of small towns in the population loss group. In Iowa, for example, only 41 percent of the towns under 500 and 46 percent of the 500 to 999 group showed gains for 1940–50. Many small towns are expected to show population gains from 1950–60. But these will probably be towns chiefly located within the influence of larger city centers.

GROWTH FACTORS

County seats and university towns are also expected to show up with gains. A majority of the small rural area towns under 1,000 are expected to remain static in population or show some decline.

Why do some small towns decline and others grow? The size of the town in 1900 has had a great deal to do with its growth since then. In Mississippi if a town had a population of only 250 in 1900 its chances of becoming an urban place (1,000) by 1950 were 1 in 100.

William C. Hallenbeck, an authority on the growth of American urban communities, explained it this way, "The growth of cities has become a selective process. Only certain places grow. The basis of selection seems to be functional; that is, cities grow where cities are needed, not just because they are cities. In some cases this is a part of a regional population growth where more adequate and better distributed service centers are required. Also, places may be selected as the location of new activities of production or service and draw to themselves workers and their families and those to operate the facilities and services of community living."

What this means is that growth attracts growth. Larger towns have built-in economic growth advantages working for them. As a town develops more retail and other services, builds churches and schools, installs and expands water supply and sewerage afcilities, and builds homes and office buildings, it attracts new economic activity such as industries. The reason is that the larger town can provide better services and facilities than can its smaller town competitors.

LOCATION VITAL

Geographic location also influences economic growth potential. A region that is growing and going places will bring growth to many of its small towns, too. But where small towns are located within a growing region determines their growth potential. Small towns near larger cities (10 to 30 miles) have better prospects for growth than do small communities which are more isolated from larger population centers. This is so because industries wish to be near the many services needed for plant operation and also to have access to the cultural and recreational advantages of the larger centers.

Some kinds of small towns have had excellent records of growth and should continue to. Most county seats, State capitals, university towns, and some tourist towns have done well because Government, education, and tourism have been growing industries. The excellent growth rate of county seat towns has resulted in large part from the increased numbers of field offices and agencies of the Federal Government established in county seats. This brought more farmers into county seat towns and created an expansion of retail services as farmers stayed to shop. The farmers consequently bought less in centers formerly visited.

INDUSTRY PREFERENCE

Does industry favor smalltown locations? In industry preference for small towns as locations for new plants was recently reported to the Office of Area Development by four Southeastern States as follows: State A, in 1959, 75 percent of our new plants were near towns of 10,000 or less population. In capital investment, however, the total outlay for new plants or plant expansions in all small towns was less than the total for all larger towns of over 10,000; State B, during 1959, 43 percent of all new plants were located in towns of 5,000 to 7,000, 22 percent in towns of 10,000 to 20,000; State C, of the 163 new plants established during 1957–59, 35 were in towns under 1,000 and 79 in towns of 1,000 to 10,000; State D, 35 percent of plant locations or expansions occurred in towns of less than 2,500, 63 percent in cities of less than 10,000.

The foregoing figures submitted by State development agencies included homegrown industries, new branch plants or relocations from other areas, and plant expansions. Keep in mind that the majority of all new industries established in most States are small plants, employing fewer than 50 workers. It is these smaller industries which are widely scattered in small towns throughout a State. These small industries offer the greatest hope for the economic future in most small towns.

But small towns, particularly those near larger city centers, are also getting many large plants. To illustrate, 14 out-of-State firms established branch plants in one Southeastern State during 1959. Of these, six located in large cities and eight in the smalltown size group. Out-of-State plants were most important from the total employment point of view. It appears from the information obtained that industries favor smalltown locations, the larger industries generally preferring small towns near larger population centers.

SMALLTOWN BENEFITS

Reasons industry favors smalltown locations for new plants include the desire to avoid congestion, availability of labor, attractive wage rates, availability of workers who can be easily trained, high productivity of labor, desire to avoid large city competition for labor, and availability of large plant sites at reasonable costs.

Other smalltown advantages frequently cited are: more leisurely living, greater friendliness of smalltown people, smalltown desire for and interest in industry, and the existence of development groups ready and willing to do what they can to help an industry. Some companies have reported that they wanted to become part of a community and this was considered easier to attain in a small town than in a large one. Some company management personnel felt that life was too short to spend so much time commuting to and from work.

Disadvantages of small towns some businesses cite include: the lack of trained workers, the nonexistence or shortage of auxiliary services and supplies, and the less than satisfactory transportation facilities. Industry also frequently makes the point that, if any substantial number of workers must be imported, they may be dissatisfied with community facilities for education, culture, and recreation. Water, sewerage, police protection, and fire protection facilities were also considered by many industries to be inadequate in many small towns.

What does all this mean to small towns which want to do something about economic growth? It means that most small communities will have an opportunity to obtain some kind of new job producing activities.

PLANNING FOR GROWTH

Most small towns located within the influence of larger population centers will probably grow whether they want to or not. It is these small towns which have the best opportunities of acquiring the larger plants. The problem here is one of planning for orderly growth more than one of stimulating growth. It is in communities of this type that industrial parks may be a real inducement to new industry because adequate sites are often not available in the nearby metropolitan areas.

Administrative centers, university, and tourist towns should continue to do well in the future because government, education, and tourism are expected to continue to be growing industries. These towns should work to improve and expand activities which fortify their positions as administrative, education, and tourist centers. This does not mean they cannot develop industry, too. The same things that attract tourists attract industry; and many of the newer growth industries have large numbers of engineering and other professionally trained personnel who wish to live near or in education centers.

Research and development companies and some of the growth industries employing large numbers of engineers reported to the Industrial Location Division of the Office of Area Development that they must locate their new plants where their professional personnel can take courses leading to advanced degrees, see an occasional play (at least twice a year), and commune with other engineers. One of these companies said they believe at least one Ph. D. per 1,000 population is necessary to provide the intellectual communication needed for its staff.

SUBURBS BOOMING

There are, too, the small towns which are developing chiefly as "bedroom" centers for workers commuting to large cities or to larger small towns which offer industrial jobs. These "bedroom" towns are also acquiring more and more retired people. Perhaps there is an opportunity here for some small towns that cannot get industry to increase local business opportunities by making their towns specialists in meeting the needs of retirement people and those workers commuting to jobs in other places. Attractive low cost rental units, recreation developments, adequate medical services, and shopping areas are some of the advantages which could draw more and more such workers and retirement people to these towns.

It is the small towns in rural areas which face the toughest job of area development. Here the roadblocks to growth include isolation from larger population centers, nonavailability of skills, and lack of services and facilities which larger industries need. While occasional large plants will locate in or near these rural-type small communities, the real hope for the future for these communities lies in the direction of small industries based on local resources and markets and development of latent tourist and travel potentials.

Keep in mind, however, that the future economic development of the rural-type towns can be strongly influenced by sound water and land development policies and programs such as are now being worked out by the U.S. Study Commission, Southeast River Basins, with headquarters in Atlanta. Tourist industry dollars (and industries, too) flow into and will continue to go into areas which can provide water.

The services of the Office of Area Development and other agencies of the U.S. Department of Commerce can be of help to you in your day-to-day work on community and industrial development. You can get such assistance simply by contacting the manager of the U.S. Department of Commerce field office close to you.

Use these facilities to help plan and carry out area development programs that fit your town.

The Senate Wage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 20, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Senate Wage Bill," which was published today in the Baltimore Sun.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE WAGE BILL

The House, which had drawn a more limited measure, is expected to balk at the Kennedy minimum wage bill which the Democratic candidate has pushed through the Senate, after compromising sharply on the number of persons covered. Since he had to give somewhere, Mr. KENNEDY preferred to give on coverage, and to retain the $1.25 per hour minimum, up from the present $1. (For workers now covered, the wage would rise by stages to $1.25 in 1963; for newly covered workers, by stages to that figure in 1964. The basic hours of work per week would also be staged for the newly covered, to be reduced to 40 hours in 1964.)

Those who favor the Kennedy bill argue that it would expand consumer purchasing power, enhance demand and employ some of the unemployed, of whom by common agreement there are too many; it is a worrisome point in an economy otherwise in general good shape.

The trouble with that argument, as against the argument for a more cautious approach, as in the House bill's $1.15 minimum, is that while some effects on purchasing power, demand and employment may be granted, the Kennedy formula would encourage adverse forces too.

Where, if the $1.25 minimum should become law, is the extra 25 cents an hour coming from? Of those employers who would be affected, not all would reduce their profits to meet the enlarged payroll. Many would take one or both of two other courses. They would tighten their production efficiency, to reduce the number of those they employ; or they would raise prices to meet the higher pay. Other tides in the economy might, of course, ameliorate or cancel out these counterforces. They would be forces none the less, and need to be considered and weighed before any new minimum wage legislation is finally passed by the Congress.

Counteracting Communism in Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 20, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, Communist penetration into Latin America is becoming a matter of increasing concern to all of us. The present meeting of the Organization of American States represents one way—and a very important way—to defeat the malignant aims of international communism. A condemnation of the Communist-influenced government of Fidel Castro will, we hope, result from the conference and lead to further measures for quarantining the Communist infection in Cuba.

It is much easier, however, to condemn Communist actions than it is to plan constructive counteractions. I want today to call attention to an excellent article by Bernard J. Flatow entitled "A Suggestion for Meeting the Communist Threat in Latin America," which was printed in the August 8 issue of Export Trade, because in this article Mr. Flatow does have some positive and very good proposals for U.S. action in Latin America.

One of the major points which Mr. Flatow makes, is that the Communists have relied heavily on the anticause to unite their followers—causes like anti-imperialism, antimilitarism, antinuclear weapons. What we can do to combat this, Mr. Flatow urges, is to adopt a few anticauses of our own—causes like anti-violence, anticensorship, anti-illiteracy, anti-Soviet intervention in national politics. These causes, he suggests, can easily be promoted through such existing civic groups such as Rotary clubs, Boy and Girl Scouts, professional groups, labor unions, church groups, and other similar organizations.

I have found many of Mr. Flatow's suggestions interesting and perceptive. I believe that they deserve a wide circulation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include this article in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SUGGESTION FOR MEETING THE COMMUNIST THREAT IN LATIN AMERICA

(By Bernard J. Flatow)

The Communist-inspired Castro administration is the first successful step in the Soviet attempt to penetrate the political, economic, and social life of this hemisphere. Their ultimate goal is to extend this influence throughout the Americas. If we do not immediately prepare to defeat the Communist purpose, we will probably be confronted with many Soviet-dominated governments in Latin America before the next decade is over.

Despite repeated warnings of this nature, the United States has neither understood nor prepared itself to meet the Red challenge.

FAILED TO TOUCH A RESPONSIVE NOTE

It is true that during the past 25 years we have paid more attention to our Latin American relations than we had previously. But, in general, we have failed to touch a responsive note in the Latins. This is so, chiefly because our increased attention has consisted mostly of new methods, new programs, and new policies—but with the same old thinking.

These new methods, programs, and policies such as the point 4 program, technical aid and military assistance have all had as their unexpressed purpose, the preservation of a status quo which the people of Latin America have been attempting to change for many years. For example, while all of Latin America is clamoring for revolutionary land reform we continue to supply scientific and technical aid whose ultimate effect is to perpetuate the existing system and to impede the popular land reform movement.

We have supported many administrations with callous disregard of the popular will. We have traditionally recognized de facto governments in Latin America regardless of how they came to power. We have followed the policy that recognition implies acceptance and requires support. The present situation in Cuba shows the fallacy in such thinking.

Our traditional method of dealing with governments which do not necessarily represent the will of their people has produced sterile situations which have in no way added to the prestige or popularity of our cause.

Assistance in the form of new credits for developing natural resources, improving communications, extending public health facilities, transportation, and education are of little avail if not accompanied by the type of propaganda which appeals to the Latin American man in the street.

NEW APPROACH REQUIRED

A new approach is required—one based upon mass psychology, an area in which the Communists are past masters.

The Soviets understand the secret of the mass conscience. They have learned that the mass, or mob, provides the precise vehicle through which the individual is able to express his hostile feelings and not be held personally responsible for his deeds.

Like the people of less-developed areas in other parts of the world, the Latin American masses have a reservoir of hostility built up through years of oppressive regimes aided by our insensibility to their national temperaments. This lack of sensibilidad in our policies and programs plus the absence of imaginative thinking at some very high levels have given the Communists practically free reign in presenting to the Latins a distorted image of what we really are and stand for.

THE COMMUNIST APPROACH

In view of the successes which the Communists have achieved, it would be wise to examine and evaluate their tactics. The Communist approach to mass incitement involves three basic elements:

1. Exploitation of general hostility.
2. Designation of a common enemy.
3. Organized leadership.

Psychological research has shown us how common it is for a person to be angered by someone and to take out his feelings of hostility on another.

The Communists have learned to utilize the hostility of masses of people, who in many cases have no connection with communism, in order to further their own imperialistic ends. Even more ominous is the fact that they have learned to do this without exposing themselves as an organized political entity. The nationalization of the Bolivian tin mines, the Jacobo Arbenz Red administration in Guatemala and the machinations of Fidel Castro are vivid cases in point of how clever they have become at getting others to do their work.

THE ANTICAUSE

But communism does more than merely provide an outlet for general hostility. Once it arouses mob passions, it directs these emotions toward a specific common enemy. This is accomplished by establishing what might be called the anticause. It is a known fact that the easiest way to acquire an ally is to first find a common enemy. This is one of the basic tactics used by the Communists to penetrate and consequently subvert large segments of Latin American society. They have used considerable ingenuity in finding anticauses of such a general nature that they have succeeded in uniting many diverse groups under one banner.

The Communists do this either by portraying the common enemy (usually the United States) as being opposed to some popular cause (such as greater social benefits for workers, national sovereignty of the particular country in which they are operating, peace, disarmament, and so forth) or by picturing the same enemy to be in favor of some unpopular cause (such as capitalistic imperialism, exploitation of workers, intervention in the affairs of a sovereign state, war, atom bomb research, and so forth).

DEFENDERS OF THE PROLETARIAT

At the same time, they also attempt to monopolize certain ideas by presenting themselves as the sole defenders of the rights of the proletariat, the true friend of the working class and the only defense against exploiters of the masses, dictators, imperialism, capitalism, militarism, dollar diplomacy, and so forth.

But despite a few positive labels such as "friend of the proletariat" and "champion of the working class" it is the anticause which is the Communists' chief stock in trade.

Count the banners and placards in any pro-Communist mass meeting and you will find that 80 percent to 90 percent of them refer to their anticauses. They very seldom tell you of what they are in favor.

EXPLOIT POLITICAL DYNAMITE

In their drive to exploit the potential political dynamite behind these anticauses, they are using everyone from the teenager to the military, from the unemployed to the housewife, the nationalist to the immigrant.

They exploit the traditional unrest in the ranks of Latin American high school and college students and offer the opportunity for leadership to those too young to achieve it within the established political parties.

They utilize teenagers to foment trouble and thus provide a new outlet with its inherent thrills to this unstable element.

They use the disgruntled lower income group housewife to protest against inflationary trends, rent laws, food prices, scarcities, etc.

USE THE UNEMPLOYED

They push the unemployed into the front lines of their demonstrations in order to force emergency employment measures from the governments—measures for which they take credit, but which usually do nothing to solve the employment problem.

They attempt to set the civilian population against the military by advocating the distribution of arms to the workers and by the same tactic try to instill distrust of the established government in the military.

They incite labor leaders and ambitious politicians to press for gerater social benefits for the workers, knowing that the more benefits, the higher the cost of production, consequently higher prices, less purchasing power, loss of markets, and a host of other economic difficulties, all of which lead inevitably to inflation of the currency.

At present, one of their prime anticauses is the Trujillo dictatorship in the Dominican Republic. It is a most astute anticause because practically all of us are against the freedom-destroying tactics of Trujillo. But the value of the anti-Trujillo cause to the Communists is that they are able to present themselves as the leaders of the anticause and the foregone conclusion which many Latin Americans draw is that if the Communists are against such a cause as Trujillo represents, they must per se be in favor of all that he opposes. This, of course, is not true, but it is the type of specious reasoning that they count upon to further their psychological aggression.

ACCUSATION WITHOUT PROOF

And so it is with all their anticauses. They rely upon accusation without proof, innuendo, halftruths, and similar subtleties to incriminate their opponents and to establish themselves as the source of all good things to all men.

They are a band of political prostitutes who will jump into any bed which they feel they can exploit to their own advantage.

Once the idea of an anticause has been sufficiently disseminated, the Communists have established a beachhead from which they launch their attack. This is the point where their organizers bring the mob into play.

THE ORGANIZED MINORITY

The Communists believe that the organized minority can wield a greater political and social influence than the unorganized majority. The examples of the tactical application of this tenet vary from the heckling of an opposition speaker or a wildcat strike in a key industry to such international incidents as the stoning of Vice President NIXON.

From the innumerable successes which they have achieved, it seems prudent to admit the logic of their theory. This, of course, leads us to only one conclusion: the unorganized majority must now be organized or be dominated by the Communist-organized minority.

Men of principle are always at a disadvantage when they compete with the unprincipled. They are subject to almost any foul play which the adversary may decide to use. And in this battle for men's minds we are in that position. However, we are not without resources to present our cause and our anticauses with greater psychological impact.

The anticause so adroitly employed by the Communists gives us an excellent vehicle for rallying our supporters and awakening them to the inherent dangers in the continuance of their complacency.

Franklin D. Roosevelt used this tactic successfully when he enunciated his four freedoms. Two of his principles—freedom from want, freedom from fear—were anticauses.

The number of pro-Democratic anticauses which could be sponsored today is incalculable. Here are just a few: anti-infla-

tion, antiviolence, anti-illiteracy, antisubjugation of minorities, antirigging of elections, anticoncentration camps and forced labor, anticensorship, antisuppression of civil liberties, antilimitation of travel and free exchange of ideas, antijamming of radio broadcasts, antipersecution of nonconformist intellectuals, antisubversion of religious principles, antisubversion of family life, anticonformism and elimination of opposition, antigenocide, and anti-Soviet intervention in national politics.

Superseding all of these anticauses is the one great anticause which must be the nucleus of our counterattack—the defeat of international communism in the Americas.

As the international Communists have succeeded in uniting the discontented elements who have swallowed their line, our efforts must be directed toward providing leadership for the mass of unorganized anti-Communist sentiment.

Throughout this hemisphere are innumerable groups and organizations which represent millions of people. The avowed purposes and principles of these groups would appear to be so diverse as to have nothing in common with each other. However, we can utilize the tactic of our opposition and unite them all in this great anticause.

There already exist organizations with international affiliations whose cooperation in the anticause could give this drive the momentum which it requires to get started. Professional and social groups, welfare organizations, labor unions, educational institutions, Rotary and Lions International, Boy and Girl Scouts, the churches and temples of organized religious sects, the Masons, and many others are all potential sources of support. It is essentially a question of making them aware of the danger involved in not uniting against the common enemy of international communism.

A central committee composed of members from every country in the hemisphere could be formed to act as the coordinating body of the movement. Outstanding Democratic leaders of all the American Republics could be invited to collaborate with the central committee.

National committees would be formed in each country and each national committee could be autonomous. The principal work of the national committee would be to support all anti-Communist groups who wished to publically express their anti-Communist sympathies. Established non-Communist political parties would be encouraged to include anticauses in their platforms. The dissemination of anticause information in schools and universities, labor unions, and religious groups would naturally be a function of the national committee.

Thus, a great wave of pro-Democratic forces which are now disunited could be set into motion and rallied around the common anticause.

Through the use of special insignia people could be encouraged to identify themselves with the anticause. In this way, the leadership which until now has been lacking and the designation of the common enemy could be provided.

Funds for such an organization could be obtained from governments and numerous private sources. The largest international companies would undoubtedly be interested in supporting it.

A training school for leaders would be required. Publications and public relations material would have to be continually produced and revised.

An ever-constant vigil would have to be kept to see that the basic principles of the anticause were not subverted by the Communist opposition.

It is essential to develop this movement as a cooperative inter-American undertaking. We need the support of all the non-Communist groups in the Americas. Then, too, by having national committees in each country, it would be easier to present the movement as a popular one. This is precisely what the Communists do when they call themselves, "Partido Comunista de Venezuela, do Brasil, etc."

In all countries of the hemisphere are dozens of prominent citizens who could be organized as the nuclei of each national committee. These people have not come forward previously because there never has been an organization dedicated solely to the cause of combating international communism. Given the opportunity, they will provide the leadership.

TAKE ADVANTAGE OF U.S. COMPLACENCY

For many years we have been content to sit back behaving as though our traditional democratic majority was in no danger. The Communists have made political capital out of our complacency. They count on our remaining complacent. They rely upon the correctness of their theory of the organized minority to give us a long-term lease on our fool's paradise.

Their goal is to foment utter confusion and chaos and to make it practically impossible for anyone to govern without their cooperation. In this way, they believe that they can eventually dominate the political stage in Latin America without the need to actually govern. They seek to conquer by posing a constant threat to established governments and thus negotiate deals and attain goals far beyond those to which their numbers would legitimately entitle them. In other words, they are trying to cash in on their nuisance value.

The Communist challenge is unrelenting. The time for our counterattack is now. The keys to the solution are the intelligent utilization of the anticause and an effective organization. At this moment the Communists have the advantage.

If the democratic tradition is to survive in Latin America and elsewhere it will have to organize itself and its partisans. It will have to provide its supporters with the same emotional appeal and psychological uplift as the Communists offer theirs.

Democrats Seeking To Insure Labor's Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 20, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Democrats Seeking To Insure Labor's Aid." The article was written by Nicholas P. Gregory, and was published in the Philadelphia Inquirer.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS SEEKING TO INSURE LABOR'S AID
(By Nicholas P. Gregory)

WASHINGTON, August 19.—The drive by the Kennedy-Johnson ticket to ram through the Senate the $1.25 minimum wage bill and the health-benefits-for-the-aged bill, is motivated by a desire by the Democrats to assuage labor.

Since 1958 labor has fared badly in the Democratic-controlled Congress. Of the 76 legislative requests demanded by labor only a mere 7 were approved and sent to the White House and 2 of these, the depressed areas bill and a minor measure, were vetoed by President Eisenhower.

Of course, the depressed areas measure is up again for consideration. This time it is backed by the President as well as Republicans and Democrats. If the measure is approved, it must meet the President's conditions before it is signed.

Among the other five that were approved by the Congress and signed by Mr. Eisenhower were bills raising railroad workers' retirement and unemployment benefits, setting up partial Government financing for health insurance plans for Government workers and upping the pay of 1,600,000 Federal and postal workers 7½ percent.

The Federal pay bill wage advance is somewhat minimized because the President ordered a cutback in the Government work force to pay for the cost of raising salaries.

To offset even these modest successes was enactment by the 86th Congress of the Landrum-Griffim labor reform bill, which labor's rank and file bitterly fought.

The measure curbed some of labor's important weapons against management such as organizational picketing and outlawed consumer-boycott picketing. Labor charged that these two provisions in the Landrum-Griffin bill totally blocked their attempts to organize workers.

The Democratic-controlled 86th Congress scuttled labor's request to boost unemployment benefits and set minimum standards for them. Further, it ignored proposals to improve workmen's compensation, to give farmworkers the protection of Federal laws, to outlaw State laws banning the union shop, and to approve a Federal fair employment practices law.

Despite this sorry record, labor is solidly backing Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, Democratic presidential aspirant, and his running mate Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

At the same time, labor has launched a hard-hitting campaign against Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, who surprisingly, is receiving substantial support from the South. When NIXON visited Greensboro, N.C., the other day, he was virtually mobbed by admirers.

NIXON'S visit to Greensboro was interpreted by political forecasters as boosting Republican hopes of carrying North Carolina for the first time since 1928.

Labor's latest attack against NIXON in the Political Memo, official publication of the Committee on Political Action and Education of the AFL–CIO, is on the Vice President's farm policy.

The AFL–CIO says that NIXON indicates that if he is elected President he will name a new Secretary of Agriculture. It then points out that last February the Vice President had said that Ezra Taft Benson was the greatest Agricultural Secretary in history.

Need for Increasing Dairy Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 20, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday, the Senate—and wisely, I believe—passed S. 2917—to establish price supports for dairy products as follows: $3.22 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk, and 59.6 cents per pound for butterfat.

I would sincerely hope that the House of Representatives now will take speedy action on the measure.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have a statement—emphasizing the need for final action by Congress on the measure this session—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

As the Congress well knows, the U.S. farmer—particularly the dairy farmer—now suffers from an imbalance between income and outgo.

According to reports, the dairy farmers have taken a cut of 7 percent in the average price for all milk sold at wholesale, and 14 percent in the price received from manufacturing milk from the 1947–49 average.

Meanwhile, farm costs have skyrocketed upward. The Department of Agriculture, for example, reports that items used by the farmers have increased 13 percent, and family living items 19 percent, above the 1946–49 average.

As a more specific illustration of skyrocketing farm costs, I cite the following:

Motor vehicles, up 47 percent; farm machinery prices, up 58 percent; farm wage rates, up 50 percent; farm real estate taxes, up 94 percent; increases costs per acre on farm real estate debt have gone up 164 percent.

Now, I am well aware that the enactment of this legislation would not wholly cure this situation.

The establishment of a price support level for milk at $3.22 per hundredweight, and for butterfat at 59.6 cents per pound, by no means provides a price level necessary to the farmer to meet these rising expenses of operation. However, it would be a modest step—in my humble judgment, too modest—toward establishing a higher floor—above the present $3.06 per hundredweight for manufacturing milk—for prices under dairy products.

Personally, I would like to see the price support level raised substantially higher. If, however, even this modest proposal could be enacted, it would, in a small way, provide greater support for the dairy economy.

At this time, I want to stress that—while I am deeply interested in the dairy farm economy—this is not all that is at stake in this legislation.

Across the Nation, not only farms and farm-equipment producing industries, but also local drugstores, hardware stores, car dealers, truck and tractor sales and service establishments, and many other services in the community are dependent, in part, or wholly, upon farm buying power. Consequently, improvement in income would benefit not only the dairy farmer, but a substantial segment of the overall economy.

We recognize, too, that the consumer has a stake in such price determinations. In many cases, in my State of Wisconsin, however, I want to point out that milk sold at about 6 cents per quart on the farm is retailed within 24 hours at 24 cents. This great price spread serves to illustrate that the farmer (a) is receiving a disproportionately low share of the retail price for his product, and (b) that it is not the farmer who is responsible for the rising cost of living. Even though the rising living costs have slowed down in recent years—and this is an important objective—I do not believe the farmer should be the principal one to underwrite stability in prices, particularly when this may jeopardize the farm, and other segments of the economy.

I well recognize that the enactment of S. 2917 would by no means act as a panacea-type step to eliminate the cost-price squeeze, and to restore to the dairy farmer a proportionate share of our national income.

The measure, however, I believe, does represent a minimum step that can, and should, be taken at this time to assure a moderately improved price floor while we are attempting to find a more workable solution for the farm, and particularly the dairy situation.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 680, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Saturday, August 20, 1960

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate committee approved numerous nominations and three bills.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 15685–15694

Bills Introduced: Two bills were introduced, as follows: S. 3870–3871. Page 15686

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 3800, to provide a method of regulating wage rates for employees of the Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard (S. Rept. 1858);

S. 3269, authorizing Secretary of the Navy to convey certain property to the State of Hawaii (S. Rept. 1859); and

S. 3299, to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maine of certain lands located in such State, with amendments (S. Rept. 1860). Page 15685

Social Security Amendments—Aged Medical Care: Senate resumed consideration of its unfinished business H.R. 12580, Social Security Amendments of 1960, and adopted all committee amendments en bloc, and the text of the bill, as amended, will be regarded as the original text for purposes of amendment.

Pages 15694, 15697–15723, 15725–15741

Program for Monday: Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and adjourned at 3:12 p.m. until 10 a.m. Monday, August 22, when its unfinished business will be H.R. 12580, Social Security Amendments of 1960. Pages 15686, 15741

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

COMMITTEE BUSINESS

Committee on Armed Services: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported the following: the nominations of Gen. Lyman L. Lemnitzer, to be Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Gen. George H. Decker, to be Chief of Staff of the Army, Gen. Nathan F. Twining, to be placed on the retired list in the grade of general, and 3,606 nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force; S. 3800, to provide a method for regulating wage rates for employees of the Portsmouth, N.H., Naval Shipyard; S. 3269, authorizing Secretary of the Navy to convey certain property to the State of Hawaii; and S. 3299, to provide for the conveyance to the State of Maine of certain lands located in such State (amended).

Also, the committee adopted a report of its Procurement Subcommittee relative to a study on military procurement, and agreed to file same with the Senate.

Prior to these actions, in open session, hearings were held on the nominations of Generals Lemnitzer and Decker, where the nominees were present to testify and answer questions in their own behalf.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, August 22, 1960, at 12 o'clock noon.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶ The Congressional Record will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, for $1.50 per month, payable in advance. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, directly to the Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. For subscription purposes, 20 daily issues constitute a month. The charge for individual copies varies in proportion to the size of the issue. ¶ Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and is sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶ With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.

Appendix

Address of Senator Keating to the National District Attorneys' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. MOSS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the National District Attorneys' Association held its annual conference in Boston, Mass., on August 11, 12, and 13 of this year. I had the honor to attend and to hear the remarks of Senator KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, as he by wire addressed the members of the association at their final banquet on August 13.

Edward S. Silver, district attorney of Kings County, Brooklyn, N.Y., and immediate past president of the National District Attorneys' Association, at the closing dinner of their conference, stated that Senator KEATING's talk ought to be read not only by every prosecutor in the United States, but by every legislator in our country.

I agree that the statement of Senator KEATING should be available to every prosecutor and every legislator and I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ORGANIZED CRIME—WHAT CAN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT DO ABOUT IT?

(Remarks of Senator KENNETH B. KEATING at the conference of the National District Attorneys Association in Boston, Mass., August 13, 1960)

Mr. Chairman, members of the National District Attorneys Association, it is a distinct personal pleasure to be with you tonight. Both as legislator and as lawyer I feel preeminently at home in this good company. This conference, I might add, is proof of the twofold attribute of the law. It doesn't merely send people away. It brings them together, as well.

I must say, Ed, that my pleasure is the greater because you are in the chair.

Ed and I are on different sides of the political fence, but with a fellow like Ed you just cut a hole through the fence and maintain a continuous good neighbor policy. After all, friendship was "invented" long before politics.

At the outset, let me tell you how warmly, how wholeheartedly I commend this fine association for the public-spirited initiative you have displayed in accenting, in emphasizing the tremendous and fateful challenge that life—and death—on our highways represents for America.

It is, indeed, one of the grimmest ironies of this century that thousands of our fellow countrymen set out each year on pleasure trips—that end in the cemetery—or in the hospital.

I have often thought the concept of the motorcar in the public mind needs a new definition. The handling of firearms is surrounded by all manner of training and care and caution. It is not a mere matter of learning how to pull the trigger. But in the case of driving, all too often it is, so to speak, the ability to pull the trigger that qualifies a citizen to drive his car on the public highway.

For this reason, we have millions of people moving about our Nation with loaded guns—and many of them without any conception of the lethal quality of the weapons they grasp in their two hands. To me it is, therefore, immensely heartening that this association has thrown the floodlight of its interest and its dedication on a problem that cannot, that must not, be accepted as one of the scourges of civilization. It is the part of civilization to rid itself of scourges—and you gentlemen, by your forthright and dynamic acceptance of this grave challenge, are rendering a service of incalculable significance.

Tonight I should like to talk to you about a malignant cancer this Nation suffers from—the cancer of organized crime. I shall discuss it in terms of its national implications and in relation to the role of our Government in meeting its nefarious challenge.

Following the investigations and disclosures of the Senate Crime Committee in 1951—when a nation learned to its shock and anger that vice and corruption had become major industries in the United States—there was the fervent hope that drastic action would be taken to break the back of organized nationwide crime.

As a matter of record, certain steps have been taken in this direction, notably the creation of the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section in the Department of Justice. But today, 9 years after the Crime Committee's report, the proportions of the entire problem remain mountainous and frustrating.

We are still forced to prosecute alleged murderers and thieves for such comparatively innocuous offenses as tax evasion and contempt of court. There is evidence that organized crime syndicates continue to flourish in this country and, indeed that they are constantly spreading their influence into previously legitimate undertakings.

The hired killers, the narcotics peddlers, the labor racketeers, the blackmailers, the illegal gamblers are still in business. They intimidate honest citizens, corrupt entire police forces, make the public streets unsafe at night, exploit many businessmen and workers. They are a blight upon the land, a running sore of evil, and it will take courage and determination to wipe out the conditions in which they thrive.

There have been enough studies and exposés. The time for counterattack is long overdue. Crime is at war with America. It is high time we declare war on crime.

Unless you are aware of the magnitude of the situation, you will be shocked by the statistics. Crime in the United States today is at the highest point in its history. Almost 8 million major crimes are now committed each year. What does that mean. It means that everyone in this land can expect to be the victim of a major crime at least once in his life if he lives to be 60 years of age. The crime rate has increased almost four times faster than the population of the country since 1950. There were more convictions for extortion, fraud, bank robbery, and gambling offenses last year than ever before in the life of the Republic.

J. Edgar Hoover pointed out in a recent speech that the total cost of crime for the entire Nation "has reached the alarming figure of $22 billion a year—or nearly one-third of the cost of running the entire Federal Government for a year." This is not a very impressive image of the leader of the civilized world. This is America with a scar on its face—a scar of shame.

One of the major obstacles to effective law enforcement at present is the absence of any statutory authority (with few exceptions) for the Federal Government to deal directly with organized interstate criminal activities. The contention that crime is strictly a local problem has been used to defeat efforts to fill this gap in the Federal legal arsenal. Most crimes, of course, are strictly matters for local law enforcement.

But a local enforcement agency, no matter how effective, just cannot deal with crimes that spill over into other jurisdictions. Interstate criminal operations are purposely organized to escape the authority of any one local law-enforcement agency. Criminality doesn't end at State borders; why should law enforcement? We're not chasing speeders here. We're chasing the enemies of society.

The specter of a national police force has been one objection frequently raised to expanding the Federal Government's role in law enforcement. In my view, there is no danger of such a development. At the present time, there are some 347,000 citizens engaged in some kind of law-enforcement work.

This includes uniformed policemen, law-enforcement agents, and clerical, administrative, and custodial personnel concerned with police protection activities. Of these 347,000 law-enforcement employees, 326,000 are employed by State and local governments. On the other hand, only 21,000 are employed by all the Federal law-enforcement agencies combined, including the FBI, Immigration and Nationalization Service, Bureau of Narcotics, and Secret Service. To give one direct comparison, the FBI employs only 6,000 special agents compared to the 24,817 policemen employed by the city of New York alone.

An interstate crime bill certainly would require expansion of the FBI, but not in a manner which would give cause for reasonable concern to any person. The FBI still would be limited to investigative activities. Direction of its activities would remain under the Attorney General, and decisions as to whether to prosecute would remain with the local U.S. attorneys and other Department of Justice officials. The FBI, under the outstanding leadership of J. Edgar Hoover, has never sought expansion of its jurisdiction or an increase in its powers.

The tradition developed during Mr. Hoover's long and brilliant career has established guidelines for the functioning of the agency which would in no way be altered by increasing its personnel.

In its simplest terms, an interstate crime bill would make it a Federal offense to use the facilities of interstate commerce to break certain specified State laws. The laws specified relate to the types of crimes to

which these interstate syndicates are particularly prone, such as narcotics trafficking, fraud, murder, and gambling.

The bill is far reaching, but I do not believe it can be called drastic—although even some drastic measures to deal with the present menace would be justified. In many ways, my proposal is simply an extension of a trend started more than 60 years ago when Congress enacted the Lottery Act to cope with nationally organized lottery activities. Later, there were similar acts dealing with such previously local offenses as train robbery, cattle stealing, white slavery, and kidnappings. In every one of these fields the same thing happened: local criminals outgrew local law enforcement controls.

The intervention of the Federal Government in these cases has been very effective. The train robber, the white slaver and the kidnaper have now virtually vanished from the scene. It is time we moved with equal vigor against the new colossus of organized crime that confronts us today.

The practical operation of such a bill is easy to illustrate. Let us suppose, for example, that we wanted to move in on a big gambling syndicate operating out of New York with outposts in Chicago, Tampa and San Francisco. All you would have to prove is one overt act by a member of the conspiracy involving interstate commerce such as a telephone call or an interstate shipment, or the use of the mails. You could then close in. In one case, with a single conspiracy indictment, you could bag the rich overlords at the heart of the operation in New York and the lieutenants who were running things in Chicago, Tampa and San Francisco, and as many of the other small fry as you found wriggling in the bottom of the net. And that is not all. If the chiefs of police or sheriffs in certain towns and counties were mixed up in the mess, they would become defendants also.

This procedure in no way interferes with States rights, since under the terms of the law, state policies would control the definition of offenses. Nor would it throw an undue burden on our Federal law-enforcement officers.

A man can always do a better job with less trouble if he has the right tools. This is the right tool for breaking up these syndicates.

There is another aspect of crime control I have never been able to understand and that is the special protection we appear to be willing to give to crime plotted by telephone. This great scientific invention is fast becoming the privileged tool of the criminal. Recent court decisions have virtually succeeded in transferring the telephone into a private channel for organized crime.

I believe that we urgently need a Federal eavesdropping statute applicable to wiretapping and all other forms of electronic interception of conversations. Such a statute would permit Federal law-enforcement agents to utilize these devices for obtaining evidence of crime, but only under the safeguards of a court order. At the same time, as a protection against abuse, severe penalties should be provided for any electronic snooping not authorized by court order. And these penalties should be invoked against policemen, as well as ununiformed sleuths who ignore the limitations of the law. There is no criminal worse than a man who breaks the law he is sworn to uphold.

Congress should also make it clear that the States may adopt the same type of eavesdropping regulation.

In the recent decision by the U.S. Court of Appeals in New York in the Pugach case, a majority of the court refused to enjoin the introduction of wiretap evidence in two State court prosecutions. At the same time, every judge on the court agreed that Federal law makes it a criminal offense to present such evidence in a State court. One judge went so far as to invite the U.S. attorney to institute criminal proceedings against the New York district attorneys if they attemped to introduce any wiretap evidence.

This decision emphasizes the incredible legal situation which now prevails.

New York has the most well-balanced, carefully safeguarded, up-to-date laws on the subject of wiretapping and other forms of eavesdropping of any State in the Nation. Nevertheless, a New York district attorney, who acts in full compliance with the requirements of the New York law, now must face the risk of Federal prosecution. I cannot conceive of anything more illogical and indefensible.

If crime were not such a serious problem, the present situation would be ludicrous. I cannot believe that anyone in Congress intended, when the Federal Communications Act was passed, to make criminals out of district attorneys who obtain State court orders permitting wiretapping. We must act promptly to restore some sense and sanity in our handling of this subject.

The stark and ominous reality we must face is that crime is at war with America. It is about time America declared war against crime.

Congress must not delay any longer coming to grips with this challenge to our security. Immediate action is needed on the measures I have outlined. Comprehensive study is needed also to devise other solutions to this appalling nationwide scourge and shame. A national crime commission should be appointed to probe deeply into all the ramifications of this problem.

This should be a citizen's commission divorced from Congress, politics, or any existing law-enforcement agencies. Such a commission is imperative to adjust our operations against crime to the needs of today and the future. Many people shrink from such tasks—they display a certain disdain toward the whole subject of crime. But no one with the public welfare truly at heart can afford to shirk the duty to attack this evil.

In bringing these remarks to a close it is well to be reminded that even in our fight against crime no compromise can be condoned in according to every defendent his full constitutional rights. I would not stand for any departure from the requirements of due process no matter how heinous and outrageous the offense involved or how serious the problem to be dealt with.

At the same time, I do not equate a proper concern for the rights of an accused with a mawkish, sentimental dedication to safeguarding his every interest or convenience at the expense of the community. Law-abiding citizens have rights, too. I have tried to describe tonight some of the ways the Federal Government can protect those rights more effectively, but consistently with our traditions and principles.

Looking at Our Common Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of our colleagues the text on an address by the Honorable Jesse P. Wolcott, Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, and a very distinguished former chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee. Chairman Wolcott delivered his address before the West Virginia Bankers Association in Charleston, W. Va., on July 15, 1960.

The address follows:

LOOKING AT OUR COMMON PROBLEMS

(By Jesse P. Wolcott, Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, before West Virginia Bankers Association, Charleston, W. Va., July 15, 1960)

Your invitation to be with you today is especially welcome, representing as you do another of the State associations which has done so much to promote a keen sense of public responsibility in the field of banking.

I welcome, too, the prospect of renewing many warm friendships and the opportunity of discussing some of our common problems in banking.

Let me remark briefly on the fine cooperation and spirit of helpfulness being extended to our examination staff here in West Virginia by the State banking department. I know that Robert McLeod, our supervising examiner, has been generally pleased with the relationship that exists here, and has told me so on several occasions.

This is, in truth, "America's most scenic vacationland." And beyond the vacation splendor that meets the eye at every turn West Virginia has a great number of other assets. Your State is moving forward toward a more balanced industrial growth through diversification in the chemical, mineral, and lumber industries, and I believe your State ranks first, before all States, in glass and pottery production.

Right along with all of these achievements I find, too, that the bankers of this State have paid close attention to the credit needs of individuals, business, agriculture, and industry, in an effort to help build a sound economic base for West Virginia.

Now after these compliments for West Virginia, let me turn the pages of my talk to the problems facing us as bankers and businessmen in the years immediately ahead.

I shall divide my remarks into three general areas: First, bank management; second, our inter-relationship; and, finally, a capsule review of national legislation in our field.

Now, bank management. Just last week I read in one of our leading banking publications of the tremendous and growing need for management personnel in our financial institutions. The needs have been estimated to range all the way from 30,000 new top level management men to 50,000 within the next 2 or 3 years.

A weakness, if it can be described as such, in our business is the developing lack of trained and experienced personnel to replace senior level officers on the threshold of retirement. Most of these "oldtimers" now ready to retire, weathered the dark and cloudy financial storms of the depression years. They learned the hard way, through practical experience, how to run a good bank. I take my hat off to those of you who fit this category—to the oldtimers in banking. We owe you a debt of gratitude for the way in which you have kept the banking business on an even keel, through war and peace, through good and bad times.

However, I am sure that you will agree with me that good bank management consists of more than mere expertness in the routine aspects of running a bank. I think it demands the three essential qualities of (1) technical competence, (2) economic understanding, and (3) conscientious responsibility. Weak or bad bank management will result from weakness in any of these overriding qualities—and the early bank failures of the 1920's and 1930's presented many instances where banks were wrecked by management which lacked either sound con-

science, competent technique, or economic understanding.

Today, bank management—the young people who are coming into the business—must understand economic conditions and fortify themselves as far as possible with technological and economic knowledge, in order to wisely cope with the changes which occur in a free market economy. Herein lies a job for the oldtimers—to pass along the accumulated knowledge that has been gained through experience of the young men and women coming into banking today.

But beyond this legacy of knowledge, we must also strive to develop better techniques to meet the problems and financial demands that face us in our communities—or, in the end, lose our position of leadership in the world of finance to other, more aggressive, financial institutions, or to governmental programs dedicated to solving these same problems.

Banks recognize the need for interested and responsible directors—but let's not forget another important requirement: A competent and well schooled staff. We must make sure that replacements are in prospect and in training for responsibilities that they, in time, will be expected to assume.

To find the caliber of personnel needed by banks, careers in banking must be made attractive and challenging.

Banks must pay the going rate to attract and keep the high type of personnel which has so long gravitated in their direction. A definite promotion policy should be worked out by the bank. There should be opportunities for prospective junior management men to participate in the making of decisions, to work on special projects, to be heard, and to obtain prestige on the job. Banking has long been known for its enlightened attitude toward fringe benefits and educational opportunities. These are strong points for a banking career and should be continued.

We know that the need for seasoned top-level management personnel will double in the next 15 to 20 years, and banks able to fill their need for competent and trained managers will be those which begin now to plan for the future.

Let me point out another problem which plagues us from time to time. That is the lack of internal security in your bank. Now the problems of bank defalcation and robbery will be covered quite adequately by another speaker, Mr. Evans, but I want to add my own thoughts to those already presented. Over the past few years the chief causes of bank failures and closings have been defalcation and embezzlement. These failures, in great measure, reflected a lack of internal protection and an inadequate system of controls and audit. There are yet some bankers who feel that an annual examination by one of the supervisory authorities can somehow serve as an effective audit, a delusion that all supervisory agencies have sought to dispel.

Records show that bank embezzlements are on the increase. Millions of dollars are taken each year; but it is not possible to make an accurate estimate of the loss sustained because many of the shortages have existed, though concealed, for years.

In the last calendar year a total of 1,632 banks reported embezzlements to the Federal Bureau of Investigation. A total of at least $13 million was involved. There were 349 convictions. This total is in contrast to 1955, when there were 260 convictions, with an estimated shortage involved of $4.5 million, involving 1,168 banks.

Motives for embezzlers' activities are many and varied; but whatever they may be, good internal controls are certainly helpful in reducing this problem.

I say again, there is no substitute for continuing internal controls, and I urge you to apply all the known preventative internal security measures to insure the safe and sound continuance of your bank.

OUR INTERRELATIONSHIP

In turning to the interrelationship between the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and banks I want to tell you that your deposit insurance membership record is good. In fact, there are only two noninsured banks in West Virginia, so it is quite evident that you have taken advantage of the value of Federal deposit insurance.

Although we desire to extend insurance to all eligible banks, we do rely on the principle of voluntary membership in the Corporation, which has proven to be the most satisfactory.

Since we are so close in our relationships, I needn't tell you that the fundamental objective of the Corporation is a sound banking system: a sound banking system which is in a position to meet its liabilities without difficulty, but which is also in a position to serve the legitimate credit demands which are made upon it.

So far as you are concerned, a sound banking system means strong banking units with sound assets, with adequate capital, operated in harmony with sound banking principles and in accordance with the banking laws and regulations; in other words, a system composed of banks in strong financial condition, under proper management.

You may notice my remarks today have emphasized good management. I intend to make the point frequently to stress that supervision is no substitute for good management and cannot, of itself, insure the maintenance of a sound banking system. It can only contribute to that end.

Within this finance industry of which we are a part, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation has earned a most enviable reputation. We are proud of our achievements, and humbled by our successes, and we seek advice and accept it judiciously. We try to answer your questions by explaining reasons, rather than be sending you a copy of regulations. We always seek your active cooperation and understanding.

I believe Aristotle brought up this matter of understanding and appreciation several centuries ago, when he said: "The environment is complex and man's political capacity is simple. Can a bridge be built between them?"

The foundation stones for Aristotle's bridge must be information, candor, and continuous reporting to the citizens.

Through these foundation stones a bridge can be built. In our form of government, more than in any other, the bridge of understanding and support depends on information and the interest of the people.

Now the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is threatened with the loss of its independence. Legislative proposals are pending before Congress which would remove the Corporation's flexibility and independence. The Corporation has vigorously opposed the notion that it should become a stepchild of the executive branch of Government under the Budget Bureau.

We rightfully contend that the Corporation, having the responsibility for the protection of the Nation's money supply, should be independent while remaining within the framework of the Government. The Corporation must be a part of Government in order to escape private pressures; yet, within the Government, it must be free of political pressures.

Can Aristotle's bridge be built here?

The independent status of the Corporation must be continued. Will you show the leadership necessary to uphold this independence? I trust that you will agree with me that the Corporation must be free at all times to use its techniques when and if an emergency occurs—an event that we all hope will never happen.

I like to think that the margin between success and failure is a narrow one. This margin can only be bridged by mutual concern and cooperative effort.

NATIONAL LEGISLATION

Since I have maneuvered myself into a discussion of legislation—something which comes to me quite naturally after having served in the Congress for 26 years—I shall take up my third point: national legislation.

The Congress that recessed just a few days ago has not yet finished its work. More than 17,000 bills and resolutions were introduced during the 86th Congress. Out of this maze of legislative thinking, I would estimate that more than 100 bills could be labelled as banking and finance proposals. Some of these ideas are well thought out, others are the pet schemes of planners and pressure groups. Only a small fraction of all these bills will be able to survive the delays, referrals, committee hearings and opposition that wells up when a bill finally comes to the floor of either House of Congress.

Some of the proposals are well ahead of their time; others are keyed to today's circumstances and political trends. As history shows, the deposit insurance idea first came to light as a legislative proposal in the 49th Congress, back in 1886—and was not enacted into law until 1933. About 150 bills were introduced during the 47-year period between the conception of the idea and the final enactment of the proposal in the form of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

Banking has traditionally been recognized as a business which has close public interest ties, and which is peculiarly subject to examination and regulation. In fact, both Houses of Congress early recognized the importance of the field by creating standing Committees on Banking and Currency. To these committees come the matters which will eventually affect your business, and which will affect the supervisory agencies.

This session of Congress, following the leadership of both of its Banking and Currency Committees, enacted legislation which will have a direct impact on your bank operations and the work of the Corporation.

I am sure that you know of the enactment into law of the bank merger bill, which amended the Federal Deposit Insurance Act to provide safeguards against mergers and consolidations of banks, where there might be a lessening of competition or the tendency to create a monopoly.

We were pleased, too, with the forthright and timely action on the assessment bill, an idea proposed by the Corporation a number of years ago to simplify your task of determining and computing your semiannual certified statement and assessment return.

The enactment of this proposal by the Congress will help you to reduce your paper work, financial cost and man-hour requirements for the computation of assessments. In addition, it will now be possible for the Corporation to reduce its audit costs, and to complete an annual verification on assessments reported by the banks. In the past we have audited on a selective basis only about 1,000 banks, out of the more than 13,000 insured institutions, over a 3-year period.

I would like to discuss some of the proposals pending before Congress which have not fared too well, but which might be revived and given attention in the future.

The status of the Corporation is continually under congressional fire as I have already told you. Some of these proposals would enlarge the Board of Directors from three to five members; another bill would prohibit the Comptroller of the Currency and any members of the Board of Governors or staff of the Federal Reserve System from serving on the Corporation's Board.

Another bill proposed this session of Congress would require public hearings prior

to determination and actions of the Board on applications coming before it on such matters as admitting banks to insured status and the opening of branches.

The question of branches comes up in another bill, which would require the consent of the Corporation for the establishment of a branch by any insured State or national bank, and for the establishment of a branch by a State bank which is a member of the Federal Reserve System. This same bill requires consent of the Comptroller of the Currency for the establishment of a branch of a national bank.

There has been proposed a plan to allow all banks to join the Federal Reserve System upon payment of a nominal fee of $10. Bank holding company operations would be limited by a bill prohibiting the approval of such operations where they are opposed by State authority.

There are proposals for a national system of mutual savings banks, a central credit union facility, and equality of taxation among financial institutions.

There are bills which would amend the Employment Act to make stability of prices an explicit aim of Government economic policy; then, there are bills which would remove the current 4¼ percent ceiling on long-term Government bonds; and still another bill would require all lenders to state separately the finance charges on loans, both on amount and in terms of the simple rate of interest.

Few of these bills I have mentioned have been enacted into law, although some continue to make progress. In the field of banking I feel that we have fared well during the 86th Congress. This is due in great measure to the bringing up to date and recodification work undertaken by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee under the leadership of Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON, of Virginia, chairman of the committee.

His sponsorship of the Financial Institutions Act of 1957 and continued attention to the need for modernized laws and regulations stand as landmarks for banking legislation.

Although the Financial Institutions Act did not receive consideration by the House, the act did serve as the base point from which Congress went ahead with a piecemeal updating of laws affecting banking. In quick order, bills were passed to liberalize the lending powers of national banks; reserve requirements of Federal Reserve member banks were reduced in certain areas and under certain conditions. The relationship of savings and loan associations to holding companies has now been defined. The Federal Credit Union Act has been amended. Other bits and pieces of the Financial Institutions Act of 1957 have been picked up in other bills and enacted into law, or are today moving forward as items separated from the former omnibus bill.

I earlier mentioned other bills more directly concerned with Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which were enacted into law this past year.

So, in any summing up, we can safely conclude that we have had 2 good years on the Hill in Washington.

But in this cheerful report I must add one somber note. Based on my own experience in Congress, and from firsthand observation, I would say that the banking fraternity has fared well; however, there are many ideas, plans or bills proposed, or on the legislative drafting boards, which could seriously affect the banking business.

Not all of these proposals will see the light of a congressional committee hearing or get to the floor of the House or Senate for consideration; but some will survive the long and difficult journey to the President's desk and will be enacted into law. In order to carry out your responsibilities as a good citizen and banker in your community you should be aware of these proposals and legislative developments. Being well-informed, articulate and active in your community on State and national affairs is one of your civic responsibilities which should not be overlooked.

As bankers dedicated to the general welfare, with certain public responsibilities and community leadership duties, you must rededicate yourself to the belief that private commercial banking is the principal banking system for this country, and that within our Nation's finance industry we all have a great number of interests in common.

To survive in the world of business we must serve, and to serve we must put aside the minor differences that from time to time divide us. We must look forward to the larger goal of maintaining a sound, free and independent financial system for the overall good of the Nation's economy.

After looking closely at our common problems in banking, let me sum up my talk by again stressing the need for continued attention to the developing problems of good bank management. I want to reemphasize the important role that you play in the vital work of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation's efforts to safeguard the money supply by maintaining a stable banking system and thereby promoting a sound financial economy. And, finally, I want to add to my remarks on national legislation the hope that you will become more completely concerned with the dynamics of public affairs.

Your judgment and action on these three important matters will do much to shape the future of the banking industry.

Supergrades for Examiners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. President, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of August 18, 1960, concerning a proposal to bring the hearing examiners in key agencies into the civil service supergrade rating. I agree with this editorial that these examiners serve as the backbone of our regulatory system. They perform a judicial function comparable to that performed in Federal and State trial courts. In order to assure that we have the type of competent men we need in these examiner positions, I favor the proposals pending in the Congress to provide more supergrade ratings for such examiners. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPERGRADES FOR EXAMINERS

In view of the furor over the defects of regulatory agencies, it is regrettable that a rudimentary reform measure has been lost in the congressional mills. This is a proposal to bring the hearing examiners in key agencies into the civil service supergrade rating. The 200 or so examiners who are involved are the backbone of the regulatory system. These career public servants preside over hearings which can play a decisive part in subsequent Commission action in cases affecting all consumers. Because of the increasing complexity of regulatory procedures, a competent examiner must bring judicial fairness and extensive legal scholarship to his task.

If the Government is to recruit—and keep—the ablest legal talent, salary level ought to reflect the examiners position near the summit of the career service. More supergrade ratings (which would bring the salaries to about $18,500) are needed for examiners who now receive a maximum of about $14,000. The American Bar Association, and the chairmen of four major regulatory agencies, support the increase. Representative OREN HARRIS, who has been investigating the needs of the agencies, has warmly endorsed the proposal.

Bills which would effect the chance are lost in two House committees and there seems little hope for action in the present short session. If such action is not now feasible, the very least that should be done is to hold hearings on pending measures so as to clear the way for adoption next January.

Proposal by Hon. Jack R. Young, President, State National Bank, Corsicana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the Texas Bankers Record of June 1960, written by a good friend of mine, Mr. Jack Young, president of the State National Bank of Corsicana, Tex.

As the article points out, it is a positive approach to the problem of allowing banks to operate their time deposit departments under the same laws applicable to other savings institutions. I commend it to the Members of this body.

The article follows:

POSITIVE APPROACH TO A TOUGH, OLD PROBLEM: LET BANKS OPERATE TIME DEPOSIT DEPARTMENTS UNDER SAME LAWS APPLICABLE TO OTHER SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS

(By Jack R. Young, president, State National Bank, Corsicana)

Bankers throughout the Nation are genuinely and rightfully disturbed about commercial banking's position with respect to the savings associations. Are we not, however, letting our indignation about discriminatory tax laws blind us to the facts, and is not this indignation causing some unsound thinking on the subject? There is indeed an immediate need for action but I think that we should move from the negative approach employed thus far to a positive program of improvement of our own position.

My first suggestion is that individual banks reexamine our policies with a view toward strengthening our competitive position. Here I refer to the matter of rates and charges. And secondly, I propose that we start an immediate study of the desirability and feasibility of seeking new laws and amendments to existing laws that would either require or permit the separation of our time deposit operations from our demand deposit operations, and provide for the establishment of mortgage loan departments to be operated on the same basis as other savings institutions, with the income

from mortgage loans being taxed at the same rate that savings associations are taxed, whatever this might be. For the research of this approach I suggest that committees, preferably of our existing bankers associations, be appointed. The idea of separate departments for time and demand operations is neither new nor novel, for it was only a few years ago that Texas banking laws required that State banks maintain separate departments for savings funds and demand funds, without commingling such funds.

Just how would the separation of time and demand funds be beneficial? First, it would place us on an equal footing competitively if it permitted us to operate our time deposit departments by the same rules that are applied to other savings institutions and then it would serve to clarify to bankers, the supervisory authorities, and the public the difference in time and demand deposit operations and thus remove many doubts and misunderstandings. Banks would be in a position to offer their depositors attractive returns on such funds as they might want to invest and it would help bankers to pinpoint operating costs and to make revisions that would be beneficial to themselves and their customers.

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST BANKS' SAVINGS DEPOSITORS

At present there is a tendency on the part of both supervisory authorities and bankers to make no distinction between time deposits and demand deposits, with the exception of the small differential in reserve requirements. As long as this condition exists and we are urged to maintain fixed ratios without regard for the ratio of time to demand deposits, we canot profitably pay higher rates than we are now paying and as a consequence there is discrimination against commercial bank savings depositors. This is just as unfair as inequality in taxation.

None of my comments should be construed to mean that we should abandon our fight for equality in taxation but it is my opinion that a positive program to improve our own operations will meet with more favor among lawmakers than the negative position of trying to impede the growth and expansion of a competitive industry. Indeed, many Congressmen have already expressed scorn for this stand.

My proposals are made on the premise that the mere removal of discriminatory tax laws is not the final answer to our problems. The very nature of the savings business permits it to operate with far less expense than demand deposit banking and as a consequence it is not likely that we shall ever be able to compete on interest rates, etc., until there is a whole new set of rules by which to operate.

I do not believe that our continued tirades against the savings institutions are going to help our cause or improve our position greatly. Our present negative program should be replaced with one that will seek out our own weaknesses and bring about needed improvements.

The removal of discriminatory tax laws is certainly a legitimate pursuit but this alone or a combination of this and extensive advertising programs to convince the public that savings and loan insurance is not as protective as insurance in commercial banks is not sufficient to improve commercial banking's position in this period of transition. The matter of insurance is at best only a weak selling point and if it were significant, it is pretty safe to bet that the laws would soon be amended.

INFLATION MAKES PUBLIC MORE INVESTMENT CONSCIOUS

It would seem proper at this point to take stock of just exactly what is happening to us. What are our problems? Much of the cream to which we have become accustomed is being skimmed off not only by savings and building and loan associations, but also by other investment media such as Government and municipal securities. Inflation has made the public investment conscious and whereas a few years ago, many people were satisfied to leave their funds on deposit in banks, they are now seeking at least partial offsets to the declining value of the dollar. If it were not for the existence of savings institutions, other investments would be sought. It seems to me that the better approach for banking is to strengthen its own operations and thus place itself in a position to pay competitive rates, whatever they are.

With the loss or depletion of many large accounts, I am afraid that we are going to find eventually that we do not have the revenue to defray the cost of the many unprofitable accounts which we are now servicing at inadequate fees. The figures will be changed somewhat but the same will be true even if we are successful in diverting the demand accounts to our own savings departments. Regardless of which way these accounts go, it is becoming more and more apparent that we are going to have to give far more consideration to service charges and other fees than we are at present.

We should keep up a relentless fight for tax equality not only from a competitive standpoint but also from the fact that it is a dangerous doctrine that would remove such a large segment of our economy as is now going into savings institutions from a tax to a nontax status. It is neither morally right nor economically sound to continue to permit this huge flow of funds into savings institutions where for the most part they escape taxation.

NEED FOR THOROUGH STUDY, POSITIVE ACTION

There is a need for immediate action, for many banks are beginning to suffer from loss of income and pyramiding expenses. In our own case, the two local banks have lost some $3 million in deposits in the past 3 years while two building and loan associations have increased their resources by $6 million, and are currently increasing them at the rate of $150,000 per month. I believe there is an urgent need for a thorough study of the whole problem for it is my opinion that bankers are going to be disappointed if they are depending upon a revision in the tax laws to improve their situation materially. I think the realistic view is that if we succeed in impairing the ability of a competitive industry to pay higher rates by means of taxation and interest rates remain high generally that we have accomplished no more than diverting the funds from savings institutions to some other channel, notwithstanding the strange attitude of an industry of this magnitude that it should not assume a reasonable share of the national tax burden.

With all respect for and gratitude to the fine Congressmen who have worked so diligently on behalf of commercial banking, it is my thought that the bills now pending in Congress have little chance for success in their present from and that even if they were passed, they would fall far short of accomplishing their objectives. Perhaps these measures would serve to restrict the operations of the savings and building and loan associations, but it is unlikely that commercial banks would benefit greatly. I think that we certainly should continue to seek passage of remedial tax legislation but look more to our own resources and our own resourcefulness to strengthen our position.

Bankers everywhere are now doing an enormous amount of talking on the subject and I think that it would be helpful if they would let their views be known to their State and national associations for this is the logical way to correlate our thinking.

Connally Reservation in True Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, one of this Nation's most respected periodicals, the Saturday Evening Post, has performed a great public service in its editorial of August 20 entitled "If We Agree To Submit Domestic Issues To 'World Law,' It Will Be for Keeps." The editorial clearly and succinctly cuts through the verbiage of misdirected idealism and correctly pinpoints and projects the true issue as one of whether the United States is to protect its sovereignty and constitutional processes from the undermining of violent and revolutionary doctrines now sweeping many parts of the world. It is a forceful and convincing argument for retention of the Connally reservation and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IF WE AGREE TO SUBMIT DOMESTIC ISSUES TO "WORLD LAW," IT WILL BE FOR KEEPS

The eminent legal Pollyannas who want this country to show its confidence in a nonexistent entity called "world law" advance a unique argument to persuade their less-trusting fellow citizens. This argument is that it is safe to repeal the Connally amendment—which permits this country to decide whether a possible case for the World Court's attention is or is not of purely domestic concern—because, if we don't like what the court decides, we can get out. We could either give notice of withdrawal from the court or exercise our veto power in the United Nations Security Council to prevent enforcement of the decision.

As Alfred J. Schweppe, of Seattle, who has labored prodigiously within the American Bar Association in behalf of a realistic attitude on this subject, puts it, "This is an astonishing suggestion from persons who profess to be deeply concerned with high principles of world leadership for the United States." With the horse on the loose, we could lock the stable door. What an "image" of the United States that would create. The truth is that once we surrender the right to withhold cases which we think are of domestic concern from the international court, "there can be no retreat with both peace and honor."

Barring an unthinkable and revolutionary action like leaving the court, we would be permanently hooked. We would, again quoting Mr. Schweppe, "be giving to an international tribunal, without right of appeal or other redress, power to decide questions arising under the U.S. Constitution that might affect our country, its several States and each of us in a manner contrary to that contemplated by the Constitution. Granted that in most circumstances no such dire situation would arise, there is every reason to retain any safeguards we now have. The temper of the world is not yet above seizing an advantage when one appears."

Advocates of this retreat describe the Connally amendment as "self-serving," as if there were something discreditable in a live-

ly concern for the national interest. Self-saving would more accurately reflect the purpose of the Connally reservation, although it does not fit the propaganda purposes of the various committees which are springing up. Up to now the United States has not used the Connally amendment in a narrow or obscurantist manner. And Mr. Schweppe asks, "If the United States cannot be trusted to be fair in this matter, how, from our standpoint, can more trust be reposed in this international tribunal?"

Despite the apparent feeling of many American liberals and good example setters, this country has no monopoly on deviousness and self-service. Other nations, moved by self-interest or revolutionary fervor, can reasonably be expected to profit from any excess of optimism on our part respecting the prospects of world law. As more and more new nations emerge from the jungle to take seats in the U.N., the need for caution before giving up more of our sovereignty increases. It would be unfortunate if some of our legal bigwigs were forced to learn this simple truth only after they had succeeded in undermining such defenses as we have against the violent and revolutionary doctrines now sweeping the world and craving recognition as world law.

Korea and the Lessons of the Past

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I present for your attention and the attention of all my distinguished colleagues of this great legislative body the text of an editorial appearing in the Los Angeles Times on Sunday, June 26, 1960. I commend the reading and consideration of this to all who are blessed with the divine ability to think and to think clearly.

The editorial follows:

KOREA AND THE LESSONS OF THE PAST

Ten years ago the North Korean army—Russian trained, Russian armed, and Russian staffed—crossed the 38th parallel for its almost unimpeded drive to the southern tip of the peninsula. That was June 25, 1950.

UNEXPECTED RESULTS

The Communist plotters expected a quick and cheap victory. Instead they started an international conflict which lasted 37 months, cost hundreds of thousands of lives (33,629 of them American), and revived the military power of the United States and its allies. They had fallen into a state of trusting weakness. Korea opened their eyes and hardened their determination to halt the Red expansion.

Throughout the war and in the face of overwhelming repudiation the Communists reiterated the lies that (1) it was the South Koreans who attacked first; (2) the Chinese forces which intervened when it became clear the North Koreans were beaten were all volunteers; and (3) Russia was neutral in the conflict and not involved. Now these myths have been fully and finally exploded by the former Polish military attaché to both China and North Korea, who was in Korea for much of the war.

Writing in the current issue of Life, Pawel Monat, who defected to the West last year, gives a detailed account of the efforts made by the Communists to mask Russian participation in—and, indeed, sponsorship of—the Korean war. He shows that the invasion of South Korea was carefully and fully planned in Moscow, under Stalin's personal direction. And it was supervised in Korea, by the Soviet Ambassador to North Korea, Lt. Gen. Vladimir N. Razuvayev.

SUCCESSFUL SECRECY

The Soviets made elaborate, and successful, efforts to hide the fact that Russians were actively participating in the war, from fear of both the military and propagandistic consequences which might result if they were exposed.

Russian fighter pilots were ordered never to fly over the ocean or over enemy-held territory, so that if shot down they could not be captured by U.N. forces. Russian advisers, combat engineers and antiaircraft gunners were dressed in Chinese uniforms, were seldom allowed closer to the front lines than 20 miles, and had top-priority evacuation orders in case the U.N. forces broke through suddenly.

With Stalin's death in March 1953, Monat writes, there was an immediate feeling among the Communist high command in Korea that the war would soon end. Communist military leaders in Korea knew by this time that the war could not be won, yet Moscow refused to agree to an armistice except on Communist terms. Four months after Stalin's death the armistice was signed.

But the war has never really ended. The Communists have instead made a mockery of the armistice terms which prohibited further military buildup. Though the Chinese forces were eventually withdrawn behind the Yalu River, the North Korean army has been completely rebuilt and reequipped. Hundreds of new tanks and planes have been added to the Red arsenal, as well as modern artillery and hand weapons.

The two U.S. divisions which remain in Korea are still, however, disastrously underequipped. Mechanization is, at best, rickety and undependable: some trucks have been rebuilt as many as nine times. New armor is almost unknown and in some cases replacement parts are so scarce that tanks have simply been dug in as permanent gun emplacements. Even the hand weapons of individual soldiers are out of date: rifles, carbines, and machineguns are almost all of World War II vintage.

NEW ARMS TO EUROPE

While new and potent weapons have been trickling out of U.S. arsenals, almost all have been put into the hands of our troops in Europe. The danger in Korea, however, is as great as that on the Continent. The Chinese are much less stable and much less astute in judging U.S. determination than the Russians.

Monat writes that Mao entered the Korean war in 1950 partially in an effort to divert the minds of the Chinese people from domestic difficulties. China is still plagued by these difficulties, and the recent anti-American ranting from Peiping suggests that Mao might again find a war to his benefit.

This possibility is too great to be ignored. Ten years ago we learned the hard way that Communist China is a ruthless and determined, if enigmatic, foe. Now we seem in danger of forgetting that lesson. Korea is a prime target for Communist conquest, for it is the steppingstone to Japan, the keystone of the free world's Asian defense perimeter.

If the bloody example of a decade ago is not to be repeated in Korea, if the lives of our 50,000 troops there are not to be needlessly placed in jeopardy by tempting the Communists with an easy target, our military forces in Korea had better be adequately armed, and quickly. History has allowed us one desperate chance in Korea; we can't expect another.

Excerpts of Interview Between Senator Alexander Wiley and Dr. T. Keith Glennan, of NASA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the pace of our progress in space exploration has magnetically drawn the spotlight of respect and admiration by our own people, and the world. As a nation, our endeavors are: contributing, shot by shot, to our space knowledge; establishing a far faster rate of progress than had earlier been anticipated; and again reflecting favorably upon the ingenuity of a free people—putting their shoulders to a task.

With the rapid-fire space launchings and probes, it is difficult to keep abreast, not only of the specific shots, but of the significance of those ventures to the community of scientific knowledge, and to the ultimate conquest of the forces and elements of space.

Although there have been criticisms of our programs, it is not—realistically speaking—humanly possible to create beforehand a complete blueprint upon which to construct such a complex program—with so many yet unknown factors.

Despite the fact that the Soviet Union started well ahead of the United States, today, we—in my humble judgment, based on expert opinion—are the leaders in space exploration, and the progress of our programs is moving ahead at a far faster rate than that of the Communist nation.

Recently, I was privileged to discuss the highlights of our space exploration with the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Dr. T. Keith Glennan, who is providing a splendid kind of leadership in this field.

I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of our interview printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TV INTERVIEW BETWEEN SENATOR ALEXANDER WILEY AND DR. T. KEITH GLENNAN, OF NASA

Mr. WILEY. Friends, welcome to the program.

In the 1960's, the exploration of space will offer new challenges, adventures, problems, and promises for all of us—and for mankind. In these fast-advancing times, man's thinking, ingenuity, imagination—and, yes, his perspective—must extend to the new horizons. The home, fireside, community, and the national and international boundaries can no longer be the limits of our planning, dreaming, and vision.

To cope with the emerging challenges, man must attain a "satellite's eye" view, not only of his progress, but of the new interrelationships of men and nations on the globe—and of our planet, earth, to the universe.

Today, our exploration of space is only in its infancy. As a young child—beginning

to walk, step by step—we, the people of earth, are moving forward gingerly—and yet, with confidence—into the unknowns of space.

As yet, there is no known yardstick by which to determine, evaluate, or predict the ultimate knowledge which the mysteries will unveil for mankind.

However, the tremendous progress already attained within a short time reveals—within our present limited vision—the prospects for dramatic, yet practical, benefits from further development of instruments and vehicles for exploring and utilizing space.

Briefly, now, let's review the accomplishments, projected plans for the future, and the practical benefits and rewards of space exploration.

To present the space picture to you, I have invited Dr. T. Keith Glennan, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Welcome, Keith.

Mr. GLENNAN. I am happy to have the opportunity to discuss our program with you, Senator WILEY.

Mr. WILEY. As I recall, the United States has launched about 23 satellites, with 13 now in orbit?

Mr. GLENNAN. Yes; that's right. And I should point out that two of those are in orbit around the sun, of course.

Mr. WILEY. What, specifically, are these satellites doing up there?

Mr. GLENNAN. Senator, I would classify the accomplishments of our satellites into two broad categories. The first is the basic research category. This would include the Explorer and Vanguard series, which give us highly technical information about which we had earlier only been able to theorize. I refer to such matters as the Van Allen radiation belt; the concentration of low energy particles in space; radiation and magnetic storms and fields; and micrometeorites. All of these are tremendously important from the standpoint of basic research, and they help us in achieving our objectives of a more practical nature.

The second category of accomplishments goes toward the practical applications of our space program, and this would include the Pioneer, Transit, and Tiros series. From these we have the beginnings of reliable longrange communications, exact all-weather navigation, accurate earth and planetary mapping, and weather and climate prediction, and possibly control. These are scientific accomplishments to shatter the imagination, and they are at hand. Just as a case in point, we have here a half-scale model of Tiros I, which transmitted from orbit 23,000 excellent photographs of the earth's cloud cover, including the formation and movement of hurricanes and other violent weather phenomena all over the world.

Mr. WILEY. That's a splendid space-view of our accomplishments. Would it be your judgment, then, that—even though the Soviet Union launched the first sputnik, we are now ahead of the Communists in overall performance in space?

Mr. GLENNAN. It is impossible to gage Russia's overall performance in space, Senator, because space capability depends so heavily upon what is being done on the ground. Because of the policy of secrecy followed by Russia, it is difficult to compare their status with our own. I say unhesitatingly that from the standpoint of orbiting satellites—and not merely based upon numbers—that the genuine scientific accomplishments of our satellites surpass those of Russia.

Mr. WILEY. As I understand, you recently announced a new timetable of projects for the future Keith. Would you give us a brief review of the program?

Mr. GLENNAN. Within the next 10 years, NASA plans about 260 major space shots, amounting to an average of more than 2 a month.

Before too many months have passed we hope to achieve a suborbital flight of an astronaut and, before the end of next year, a true manned orbital flight under Project Mercury. In, 1961, also we should see the first launching of an Atlas-Centaur vehicle employing for the first time liquid hydrogen as fuel.

In 1962 we hope to impact the Moon with a scientific payload and launch a spacecraft to the vicinity of Venus or Mars, or perhaps both.

In 1963–64 we should see the launching of the awesome Saturn vehicle, which we have here in model form. This 3-stage giant will be some 185 feet high and 21 feet in diameter at the base, will weigh about 1 million pounds as it stands on the launch pad, and will develop 1½ million pounds of thrust in the first stage alone. This scale model of a man standing at the base (pointing) gives you some conception of the size of the Saturn vehicle.

Also in the 1963–64 period we should see an unmanned soft lunar landing, as well as an Earth orbiting astronomical and radio astronomy laboratory. Unmanned vehicles are expected to circumnavigate the Moon and return to Earth, and reconnoiter Mars or Venus, or both.

In the 1965–67 period we will launch a program which we expect will lead to manned circumlunar flight, and an attempt to establish a permanent near-Earth space station. After 1970 we envision man on the Moon.

We recognize, of course, that unforeseen problems could slow down the achieving of these goals; or, conversely, breakthroughs could accelerate the program. At this time, however, we feel that this is a realistic plan for the 10 years ahead.

Mr. WILEY. The timetable of progress for the future is most impressive, inspiring, and challenging.

In looking ahead in space, it appears that the practical rewards may be just as dramatic and exciting as the idea of manned flights into space and to and from other planets. As a member of the Senate Space Committee—as a citizen—and as a taxpayer—I am also interested in—as I know you are—these practical benefits. Would you review these for us?

Mr. GLENNAN. Although it's difficult to predict all the ultimate rewards of space, there are a number of foreseeable benefits, some of which I have already indicated:

(1) Improved radio, telephone, teletype, and television communications;

(2) more effective weather forecasting to minimize loss from tornadoes, hurricanes, and other storms and benefit agriculture and conservation programs for preservation of our natural resources;

(3) a stronger defense;

(4) further man's efforts to utilize heat and light from the sun and other natural forces of the universe; and

(5) generally gather other data and information about the elements and forces of space for harnessing them to serve mankind.

CONCLUSION

Mr. WILEY. I'm sure you'll agree that creating a greater public understanding of what we're "shooting for"—and what the benefits will be—is a most worthwhile objective.

Mr. GLENNAN. Very definitely. To secure the broad support of the people of the country—who must provide the resources and the personnel—for manning the space program—this is absolutely essential.

Mr. WILEY. In conclusion, I want to congratulate you, Dr. Glennan, and your agency, for the splendid, outstanding accomplishments of the past, as well as the amazing plans you have for the future. Along with you, I sincerely believe that the forces and knowledge of space will play an increasingly significant role in the daily lives, security, welfare, and progress of our people in the years ahead.

Mr. GLENNAN. Thank you, Senator Wiley.

Mr. WILEY (to the audience). Now, friends, thank you for being with us.

Fair Labor Standards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND

OF FLORIDA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I note in today's New York Times an editorial entitled "Fair Labor Standards." It deals with the minimum wage bill which we passed in the Senate last week and which at the time I stated was, I thought, a hodgepodge including about everything that could be put into one act, without any real system or any real uniformity, or any actually fair treatment of the millions of people involved.

Mr. President, I read from the editorial only the last sentence:

Certainly nothing in the measure more clearly symbolizes the degree to which we have departed from the realistic objectives of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

That comment was made with reference to the much-discussed new wording in the bill which made the bill so broad in its coverage as to cover all business affecting interstate commerce.,

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS

With the final vote in the Senate last week both Houses of Congress have completed action on bills providing for what might be termed the "fourth round" of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. The original legislation called for a minimum wage starting at 25 cents an hour and reaching 40 cents an hour by 1945. In 1949 the figure was raised to 75 cents and 1,300,000 workers were added to the number covered. In 1955 Congress voted $1 as a minimum and added 2 million to those in the guaranteed minimum wage class.

By far the more sweeping of the two measures that have now passed is that sponsored by Senator KENNEDY. The House measure would raise the minimum wage to $1.15 an hour and extend the coverage by 1,400,000. Under the Kennedy measure the guaranteed wage would be increased by stages until it reached $1.25.

The most striking point about the Senate bill, however, is to be found in the additional coverage—present and future—for which it provides. The figure is now 4,-100,000. Before the authors of the bill began making concessions to reality the target was about 10 million.

There is nothing implicitly wrong in the figure 4,100,000 or even the figure of 10 million. What is wrong is that in passing the "fourth round" measure the Senate has moved further away from the basic concept of the 1938 law than has any legislative body in the intervening 22 years.

The minimum wage was originally advocated on four grounds: (1) to eliminate poverty caused by the existence of substandard wages; (2) to eliminate unfair competition which was based upon substandard wages; (3) to increase the purchasing power of lower income workers, and (4) to provide for maintaining a high wage structure in depressed periods. In the debate on the present bill the fourth argument was stressed almost to the complete exclusion of the three others and the phrase "increased purchasing power" might be said to have been the battle cry of the supporters of the bill.

Under the 1949 amendment coverage was to be extended only to those workers in jobs "directly essential" to production for interstate commerce. This phrase replaced the word "necessary" in a definition of the basic scope of the act. The word "necessary" had by that time come to mean, for example, that a window washer was in interstate commerce if he scrubbed the grime off panes that let light in on a firm that was operating in interstate commerce. If the word "necessary" wasn't strong enough to prevent the wholesale expansion of this Federal law in the area of intrastate commerce then what is to be said of the comparable phrase to be found in the Senate bill which would extend the law's benefits to all whose work "affects" interstate commerce? Certainly nothing in the measure more clearly symbolizes the degree to which we have departed from the realistic objectives of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

New President and Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful news story by Pierre J. Huss in the July 17, 1960, issue of the Houston (Tex.) Chronicle emphasizes that the next President of the United States will have to deal with the problem of Bolshevist intervention in the Republic of Cuba.

This article serves to emphasize the urgency for the Congress, by passage of appropriate resolutions, to make definite what the policy of our country is so that there will be no transitional uncertainty on change from the present to the next administration of the Federal Government.

The article follows:

NEW PRESIDENT TO FACE TOUCHY CUBAN PROBLEM—INTERVENTION BY RUSSIA POSES REAL HEADACHE

(By Pierre J. Huss)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Here is an indisputable election forecast: Whoever wins and goes into the White House in 1961 must face up to the toughest showdown in the Western Hemisphere since the Spanish-American War.

That will be the ultimate showdown between the United States and Communist-guided Fidel Castro of Cuba.

A major factor will be the brazen intervention in Cuba by the Soviet Union. Through persistently provocative anti-U.S. propaganda and threats, the Kremlin (along with Communist China) has worked to establish a Red beachhead under the nose of the United States by the building of airfields and submarine operational facilities on the island.

The 1961 President will find that by the time he takes office, Castro's Cuba will have advanced very far down the road of dancing to Moscow's tunes. Cuba's wild charges against the United States in the United Nations Security Council and Russia's championing of them strikingly illustrated how extensively Castro has been inveigled by Moscow.

REAL SHOWDOWN

The real showdown with Cuba will probably shape up about the time the new President takes office. He will most likely face an early decision on how rough to get with Castro, and whether further dangerous Moscow inroads in the Western Hemisphere can be prevented without resort to force. Here the President must work closely with the Organization of the American States.

The presidential candidates know now that Cuba has been selected by Moscow and Peiping as the ideological battlefield on which will be fought out the issue of whether the United States or the Communist nations will exert dominating influence in the Western Hemisphere. If Moscow wins, Latin America could go Communist before 1970. Thus the new President's task in fighting that battle will be far from enviable.

Khrushchev has set the keynote of the war of nerves and propaganda the Communists henceforth can be expected to wage against the United States. Although United Nations diplomats brand this fright propaganda as largely huffing and puffing, Khrushchev said in a recent speech:

"Don't forget that the United States is no longer far from the Soviet Union, and Soviet artillery can give necessary support to Cuba if neeed be. Let the Pentagon remember the last rocket tests, in which we proved we can hit a target at a distance of 8,000 miles."

Those at United Nations who have given much thought to the Cuban-American problem are convinced the Castro's government actually would not grant Russia the right to build missile bases on the island, or even airfield, but might allow Soviet submarine facilities.

COSTLY PROJECT

United Nations military men point out that the use of Cuban soil by Russia or Red China for military bases of any kind would be costly and cumbersome and might even trigger U.S. intervention with the consent of the Organization of the American States. In fact, Antonio Nunez Jiminez, one of Castro's closest henchmen, flatly stated on return from a swing behind the Iron Curtain that his country would never permit a Soviet military base in Cuba.

But this same Cuban voiced what U.N. diplomats suspect will be the primary aim of Castro and Khrushchev in their anti-United States onslaughts. He called for the surrender to Cuba of America's important naval and air base at Guantanamo. He charged that the United States is hoping the Cubans will attack the base, intending to seize on that as an excuse for military intervention in all Cuba.

Nunez added: "We will not do it."

An expert viewpoint bearing directly on the Guantanamo Bay situation was given recently by Dominican strongman Rafael L. Trujillo, himself often a target of the Communists. He said:

"Briefly, my evaluation is (1) the Castro Communists have long planned to oust the United States from Guantanamo Bay and in fact the campaign is already underway; (2) the base, owing in part to its peculiar geographic circumstances, can be rendered almost untenable.

"There will be no sudden assault or pitched battle. The Communists are much too clever for that. There will be an agonizingly protracted political, economic, and subversive siege which can be exploited to the hilt for propaganda purposes. The Communists are aided by the fact that there is little or no enthusiasm for the continued existence of the base by even anti-Castro Cubans.

TRAINING BASE

In peacetime, Guantanamo Bay has great value as a U.S. fleet training base. In wartime, it is one of the chain of bases from Newfoundland through Bermuda to Puerto Rico and Trinidad that provides protection for shipping and facilities for antisubmarine warfare.

U.S. rights to the base rest on treaties signed in 1903 and 1934.

Bipartisan Accord on Middle East Is Healthy Sign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, it is gratifying to note that the platforms adopted this summer by both major political parties contain substantial agreement on American relations with the Middle East. In particular, both pledge continued allegiance to the noble state of Israel and to vigorous efforts to end blockades and other acts of international piracy.

This bipatrisan accord shows clearly that the American people firmly believe that Israel is here to stay and that this country must continue its aid and assistance to the end that the independence of that nation will be insured. A recent editorial in the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat and Chronicle points up the importance and significance of this interparty accord on Israel and the Middle East. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, Aug. 17, 1960]

HEALTHY ACCORD ON MIDDLE EAST

It is politically healthy that the two major parties, in the present campaign, have achieved substantial agreement on Middle East policy. Neither party shows any sign of a diminishing interest in the welfare and friendship of this turbulent area. Both platforms urge negotiations between Arabs and Israeli for a mutually aceptable settlement of the causes on Mideastern tension. Far away as this goal may now seem, it would be a sad mistake not to believe in it.

The Democrats, on the troublesome Arab refugee problem, propose resettlement in lands "where there are room and opportunity for them," but they do not say what lands. Except for token numbers, Israel refuses to repatriate Arabs because of Arab hostility to the State of Israel. The GOP promises it will keep trying to remove obstacles to Israel-Arab peace, including the refugee problem. It could have been more enlightening by telling us how it hoped to do so.

President Nasser of Egypt likes neither platform—from which one might conclude

both parties are on pretty solid ground. He is unhappy because both documents recognize the existence of the State of Israel. The real pinch on Nasser, we suspect is the two-party denunciation of blockades. Nasser has illegally been blocking the Suez Canal, an international waterway, to Israel shipping.

Barring some unforeseen development, Mideast policy is not likely to be a campaign issue. The bipartisan accord in supporting the integrity and independence of all Mideastern States, gives the lie to Soviet charges of American imperialistic aims in that area. It would be folly to disturb a U.S. policy which in recent months has proved our interest is one of genuine friendship, with no thought of interfering or dictation in Middle Eastern affairs.

The Message of Abraham Lincoln to Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, at the Republican National Convention held last month in Chicago the delegates from Pennsylvania had the honor of hearing an address by one of Pennsylvania's distinguished citizens, Raymond Pitcairn, of Jenkintown, Pa.

Mr. Pitcairn, born in 1885, in Philadelphia, is an active business, religious, and civic leader. He is greatly interested in the world around him, and particularly the political processes in the United States.

He was an early supporter of Dwight David Eisenhower for the Presidency of the United States, and is now a strong supporter of the candidacy of RICHARD M. NIXON for that office.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including this address to the delegates so that it may be called to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and to the American people.

The address follows:

THE MESSAGE OF ABRAHAM LINCOLN TO OUR TIMES

(Address by Raymond Pitcairn at Chicago, Ill., to Pennsylvania Republican National Convention caucus, July 24, 1960)

A century ago, on November 6, 1860, Abraham Lincoln was elected to his first term of office as President of the United States. Today he might be regarded as a compromise candidate, for he was chosen on the third ballot after the efforts of others had arrived at an unsoluble standstill. Significantly this reveals the violent differences of opinion which divided and confused our country 100 years ago.

There were insistent demands before and after his election, that Lincoln lay down a program, state his position, and give his answers to the grave problems that beset the Nation. Many who doubted his ability accused him contemptuously of vacillation and indecision. His refusal to commit himself on certain important issues before taking office brought bitter charges that he had neither plan nor policy with which to meet the crises that threatened to destroy the Union.

After his election Lincoln received a visitor, John M. Palmer, whom he had known in Illinois. They were close friends, and discussion about policy and issues went on while Lincoln was being shaved. Referring to old times, Palmer said jokingly:

"Mr. Lincoln, if anybody had told me that in a great crisis the people were going to go out to a little one-horse town and pick up a one-horse lawyer for President, I wouldn't have believed it."

Lincoln rose up, lather on his face, and Palmer feared he was displeased. But the President put a hand on Palmer's knee. "Neither would I," he said, "but it was a time when a man with a policy would have been fatal to the country. I have never had a policy. I have simply tried to do what seemed best each day."

Can it be possible, and is it believable, that a man without a policy can become a wise, firm, and competent President of the United States? The answer appears clearly in a record of Lincoln's statescraft. As the war progressed the abolitionists, their preachers in the North, and a delegation of clergymen from Chicago hounded Lincoln to delay no longer to issue immediately a proclamation of emancipation.

He was denounced by Horace Greeley in the press as showing no heart in the fight against slavery. A friend urged him to set the Negroes free on Independence Day, and so make Independence Day more sacred than ever.

Lincoln replied, "I would do it but if I did three more States would rise and go over to the Confederacy."

Months of agony were to pass before the country was prepared for Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation.

The abolitionists with a single objective could hew to the line. How much more difficult the task of Lincoln, the statesman, to prepare the way, while awaiting the arrival of the appointed time. For by premature importunate action he could so easily lose his cause.

Truly the outspoken abolitionists were needed in the cause of freedom, but without their statesman Lincoln at the helm, their cause must, indeed, have failed.

This is again a time of grave crisis for our Nation. The United States has been defied and derided by a powerful enemy which rules its people with an iron hand. Both abroad and at home the United States is threatened by pressures of relentless policy. Our most cherished institutions are endangered by men who know what they want, and have no scruples in seeking it. What kind of President, in these perilous times, would best guide and lead the American people?

Abraham Lincoln had faith in the fundamental principle of democracy—that the people can be trusted, in the long run to recognize and accept the leadership and choose the policies which will guide their destinies. Repeatedly they have rejected the spirit of benevolent autocracy which tells men what to think and takes away their freedom to decide. And James Reston, in one of his articles wrote, only partly in jest, that "if any candidate for President of this country candidly admitted some day that he was sorry, but he did not have all the answers to all the questions confronting the human race, he might be swept into office by the commonsense of a grateful electorate."

Today the American people are witnessing an extraordinary and somewhat disreputable spectacle. A candidate for the Presidency, of high character and honorable record, RICHARD NIXON, is being badgered and beset to answer questions on every conceivable subject in politics, economics, international affairs, and social relations. Some of these questions are asked by his political opponents; some under the thin guise of friendly or constructive criticism. Some concern matters on which he may not properly give positive opinions while actively engaged in the Nation's business as Vice President of the United States. Many are immaterial to the real issues before the American people, and some verge on the ridiculous.

It is time to recall and reflect upon Lincoln's opinion—that in times of real crisis a leader with a hard-and-fast policy can be "fatal to the country." Lincoln claimed no preconceived wisdom with which to meet unpredictable circumstances. He did declare his humble faith in principle, and his firmness in the right as God gave him to see the right. But while enduring the bitter criticism of his powerful enemies in the North, as well as in the Confederacy, he consistently admitted that he could not answer all their questions, nor foresee solutions to problems not yet clearly defined or ready for decision and action. In his last public address, shortly before he died, he answered demands for a statement of policy by saying, "I am considering and will not fail to act when satisfied that action will be proper." Throughout his career Lincoln led and frequently waited patiently for the formation of public opinion before taking action.

Yet Lincoln did have a real and steadfast policy, which was to deal with situations according to his training in the wisdom of the common law, which does not legislate for the hypothetical. In a sort of passion for platforms, plans and programs many would-be leaders of the American people and self-appointed prophets are doing exactly that. They make promises, many of which will not be kept, and many of which cannot be kept. They offer blueprints for a future which may never be built. They undertake to impose their fallible judgments on the future destinies of nations and their fellow men.

How wise was the policy of Lincoln, who "tried to do what seemed best each day," knowing in his humble heart that "sufficient unto the day are the evils thereof."

If it were reasonable to decide arbitrarily, in advance of the event, the human issues involving constitutional questions of public policy, the Chief Justice of the United States might confer with his associates and declare in advance just what labor and management may do. But even in the light and urgency of the event, aided by their knowledge of the law and by hearings of the parties to a controversy, the Supreme Court Justices often differ in their decisions, sometimes by the minimal margin of five to four. Even the statesman's decisions like those of every one of us, cannot be governed by exact science or dogmatic foresight. They are guided, or should be, by just principles applied to the art of living. They may be applied wisely or foolishly, constructively or destructively, according to the character of the statesman or individual involved.

Today we Americans are well aware that the most unfortunate and unhappy peoples in the world are ruled by men who make all the plans and claim to know all the answers. Therefore, the people are willing and eager, in great majority, to trust and follow the leadership of a man whose abilities are known, and whose competence and integrity have been tested by years of distinguished public service. No Vice President in the Nation's history has served his country so earnestly and faithfully, in so many fields, as RICHARD NIXON. No other man has been a candidate for the Presidency as well prepared to deal with dangerous international conditions in which our survival and that of the free world may be involved.

No political platform should attempt to blueprint the solution of every future problem. While our legislatures look to the future and our courts base their decisions on precedents of the past, our Chief Executive must deal with the present. Many national

and international problems, now unforeseen and unforeseeable, must be left to the judgment and discretion of a President of sound principle and tested experience.

Executive ability rests on the ability to lead men of differing opinions and diverse interests to act together for at least so much of the cause as they may be led to agree upon in unity. A multiplicity of ill-considered and provocative platform dictation can prevent the accord which true statesmanship can achieve. And the science of statesmanship is the science of the possible.

You may have gathered that I don't want Senator KENNEDY to be disappointed when he said of us Republicans: "We know they will invoke the name of Abraham Lincoln on behalf of their candidate," despite the fact, as he charged in his bid for the U.S. Presidency, that RICHARD NIXON "has often seemed to show his charity toward none and malice for all."

Today I submit we all need the message of Abraham Lincoln to our times. It needs telling to our friends, the Independents and Democrats, without whose votes we cannot win. It needs to be told especially to the dissatisfied in our party who may be tempted to sit on their hands, but whose generous support in work and funds we must have if we are to win.

And if we should fail to win, how great will be the loss to all of us, and how tragic the disaster to our country and the whole free world.

Retirement of Peter J. Cahill, Secretary-Treasurer of the National Association of Letter Carriers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Letter Carriers is an outstanding organization of postal employees, with leadership throughout the years of ability, vision, and sound judgment.

One of the ranking officials for years of the NALC is Peter J. Cahill, the secretary-treasurer of this splendid organization.

Due to arriving at the retirement age, Peter Cahill retires this year.

For years Peter Cahill rendered outstanding service as an employee of the Post Office Department in the Boston Postal District, and in the Post Office Department in Washington, occupying responsible supervisory positions during his years of employment. He always performed his duties in an outstanding manner, receiving many high commendations.

For years in the Boston Postal District, and later, at the national office, Peter Cahill has been a dedicated member and official of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

He has been the "right arm" so to speak, of a great leader, and one of the finest men I have ever met, William C. Doherty, national president of this splendid organization of postal employees.

I am also proud to number Peter Cahill as one of my most valued friends.

While in retirement, I know Peter Cahill will always treasure his association with the NALC and will always respond to any service the NALC may call upon him to perform.

In retirement, and in other fields, Peter Cahill, always active and dynamic, will lead an active life.

I congratulate my close friend, Peter Cahill, in his many years of dedicated service as a postal employee and supervisor, and as a member and officer of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

I wish for him every happiness and success in the years that lie ahead for him.

In my remarks, I include a portion of a report relating to Secretary-Treasurer Peter J. Cahill made by National President William C. Doherty to the members of his organization, a splendid and deserved commendation of Peter Cahill.

As President Doherty well said, "He was and will be to the end of his natural days, a letter carrier's letter carrier."

A portion of the report follows:

RETIREMENT OF SECRETARY-TREASURER PETER J. CAHILL

The conclusion of these comments on the operation of our national headquarters must, unfortunately, end on a sad note. What must be said, I assure you, is difficult to reduce to writing, and yet express the feelings I have for the officer concerned.

Reference is made to the retirement of Secretary-Treasurer Peter J. Cahill at the Cincinnati convention. Having reached the mandatory retirement age of 65, under the provisions of our national constitution, Pete Cahill must relinquish his official connection with NALC this year.

It has been my good fortune to have known Pete almost from the date I entered the postal service 37 years ago. Even then he was a veteran of some 10 years' service in the postal establishment of his native city of Boston, Mass. Over the years our association has been close and cordial, even during the few times when he did not always see eye to eye with my thinking, or vice versa.

In fact, I think one of Pete's finest attributes is that he has the courage of his convictions and the intellectual honesty not to evade a situation simply because it means taking a stand that might be momentarily unpopular or held by a minority. Withal, he was and is one of the best team players it has been my pleasure to work with in more than 30 years of active association with the NALC.

After serving 6 years as chief clerk of the NSBA, from 1946 to 1952, Pete was elected national secretary at the New York convention. When the offices of secretary and treasurer were consolidated in 1956, he became the first officer to hold the combined position.

It occurs to me that it would be impossible to list item by item the numerous and varied contributions Pete has made to the NALC over the years. Branches and individual members having business with him during the time he was NSBA chief clerk and later national secretary-treasurer will attest to the fact that he was always a champion of the letter carrier. Perhaps it could best be summed up by saying that after his family and his church, Pete Cahill had no consuming interest for his great abilities and talents outside the letter carrier movement.

He was and will be to the end of his natural days a letter carriers' letter carrier. As such, I know every member joins me in wishing Pete Cahill the best life has to offer for many, many more years.

Address by Hon. James A. Farley Before the Rotary Club of Los Angeles, July 8, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend in the RECORD, I include the following:

ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY, FORMER CHAIRMAN OF THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE, ROTARY CLUB OF LOS ANGELES LUNCHEON, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., JULY 8, 1960

This Nation is in the middle of the greatest crisis since 1776. Now, as then, the question is: To be or not to be? It is, therefore, a time for plain talking.

I foresee no great difficulty on domestic issues. Of the 100 basic acts of the first and second Roosevelt administrations not one has been repealed; all have, on the contrary, been expanded by both parties. What were called rash and expensive experiments of the Democratic Party are now hailed as built-in bulwarks against another depression by a sadder but not necessarily wiser Republican Party. It is somewhat gratifying, of course, to see the selfsame Democratic policies once called by the GOP creeping socialism now being merchandised, after considerable adulteration, as its very own brand of dynamic conservatism.

While we cannot help but be flattered by the attempted imitation, it is a fact that the sense of quality inherent in the American people leads them to accept no substitute for very long.

The care of the old, for which we were so bitterly criticized, was written not by us but by the fourth commandment. Twenty-five years of experience have proven that honoring thy father and thy mother is more likely to strengthen a nation than to destroy it.

Twenty-five years of experience have also taught us that the American economy rests upon stronger shoulders than child labor.

Twenty-five years of experience have taught us that a well-regulated securities market is as much a protection to the vast majority of honest security dealers as it is to the intelligent investor.

Eight years of recent experience have proven that honesty is the monopoly of no single party. Encompassed in the vast multitudes in both parties are some who do not measure up to an understanding of public trust. But it ill behooves a party which unduly dramatized a deep freeze to call attention to a phase in which is must necessarily stand shivering in a vicuna overcoat on the same spurious issue.

What is an issue is that the great administrative agencies, now regulating a great part of the daily life of every American, have fallen into disrepute. Naturally, the American people will turn to the Democratic Party, which created these great institutions, to return them to the power of the U.S. Government instead of the people they are supposed to regulate. Right now, as the Supreme Court has observed, they are responsible to neither the Congress nor the Executive. This is either administrative anarchy or a bureaucratic autocracy and the American people will stand for neither.

By the same token, that no part of any nation has the right to intimidate all, the Democratic administration must assist both labor and management to clean their own houses.

Our economic system has come a long way, from men with their hats in their hands to the collective bargaining table. But the right to collective bargaining does not include the privilege of ganster-led unions to paralyze the country for its own private gain any more than the right of selling securities gave the privilege of swindling the investors. I do not exclude from this charge that form of management which prefers corrupt leadership in labor, but I do identify this unholy alliance as a mortal conspiracy against both the working men and women, the stockholders and, indeed, the Nation. But labor and management have been recognized to a point where the American way demands that all business be done aboveboard—and none under the table.

However, I consider the great issue to be one of nothing less than national survival. We shall not survive, nor will we deserve to survive, if we desert the basic moral platform by which this Nation came into existence. The men of the Philadelphia convention of 1776 exampled those essentials of American character to which we ought to adhere, if we value not only our lives but our sacred honor.

By their ideal, an American is a brave man. "Give me liberty or give me death" could have been spoken by no coward. Courage is not only the wise course; it is now the only course, because there is no place for even cowards to hide.

By their ideal, an American is also an intelligent man. Atomic war is dangerous, of course, but no more dangerous to the individual than any other war—as the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier proves. Yet there move among the American people self-appointed messiahs, who constantly call attention to the horrors of armed conflict, as if George Washington, Robert E. Lee, and Ulysses S. Grant were not aware of the devastation of war. Do these false prophets think Bunker Hill was a picnic? Do they mistake the death march from Bataan for a May walk? There never was a bargain basement price for freedom as the heroic martyrs from the Boston massacre to the Hungarian revolt prove. No party and no free nation can deliver peace. Indeed, the very same Republican Party which promised peace in Korea, as a principal factor in the 1952 election, was forced to land troops on the beaches of Lebanon in full and final proof of the rashness of its promises of 1952. To commit this Nation to a peace-at-any-price leadership is tantamount to the surrender of the free world. We cannot answer Communist brinksmanship with "lameduck" slinksmanship.

Further, by the ideal of the Founding Fathers, the American is also a man who believes in religious freedom. That principle condemns a Nazi Party which persecutes a grand rabbi of Warsaw or a Pastor Niemueller as it despises any communistic regime that crucifies a Cardinal Stepinac and a Cardinal Mindszenty. Now, this very month, the United Nations accused Red China of genocide—the systematic killing of Buddhists and Buddhist priests in Tibet. Yet there are those among us who would urge that we consider recognizing Red China, even while this massacre is in progress.

How shameful can one get? But assuming that the plight of these brave little mountain people does not present sufficient grounds for pause in the appeasers' program by what possible theory can they write off the Americans now in Red Chinese or Siberian prisons? A course of recognition is nothing more nor less than the ratification of the illegal seizure and detention of Americans. That principle, most had thought, was settled by the War of 1812.

Indeed, if the seizure of Americans is not a cause of national action then Presidents Jefferson, Madison and Monroe were, according to our new self-appointed prophets, nothing but an opinionated group of nationalistic warmongers.

The fact is that these Johnny-come-latelies to the Democratic Party have assumed an intellectual superiority which they do not possess. They are willing to risk the fate of the nation on what they regard as their divine understanding and persuasive powers—a conceit so great that they believe they can negotiate a spectacularly successful Communist terror into giving up two-thirds of the world. What they do not comprehend is understood perfectly well by the ordinary American, that is, that there is no trouble in getting the Communists to agree; the trouble comes in getting them to keep their agreement. High sounding are the reasons they advance but unclouded by either fact, common sense, history or honor.

Nor does their mischief end with their idiotic foreign policy. It extends to what amounts to the splintering of the Democratic Party.

This is what I mean. The Democratic Party, ideally, is an American party composed of Americans, thinking for America. It is not an alliance of special interests forming a coalition by which each special interest gets its share of power as if it were a division of loot. This country cannot afford to have a foreign policy based upon political pressure groups, seeking favors for the homelands of its fathers. If they could but see it the question is not where their fathers came from but what kind of an America their grandchildren are to live in. So much for hyphenated Americanism.

Again, there is nothing more dangerous to a nation than exploitation of racial differences. It is absurd, and unconstitutional and disgraceful that a Negro does not have access to every educational institution and every public convenience in any State of the Union. And it is equally absurd, and unconstitutional and disgraceful to apply a reverse racial prejudice to bar a Caucasian born south of the Mason-Dixon line from any public office, including the Presidency. Thomas Jefferson, the founder of this party, would be barred from the candidacy of this party if we listened to the reverse-bigots on the ground that his parents were of the white race and he was born in Virginia. I would have none of either.

Further, I am chagrined to report that the convention is about to be disturbed in its deliberations by a spurious shower of pseudo-messages, more inspired than inspirational, urging a specific candidate. Of course, every American has the right of petition but I cannot refrain from pointing out that each telegram or message telling a delegate how to vote is something less than a compliment to the judgment of the recipient. I wish not to demean the work of those who have labored so hard to contrive the effect of seemingly spontaneous outburst. Indeed, I believe that they are receiving assistance from sources not contemplated but perhaps acceptable. More particularly, it seemed to me that I saw some smug Republican faces happily signing petitions. But, perhaps I was mistaken and they may have been the happy smiles of bona fide supporters who had signed twice.

In any event, it will not recommend the Democratic Party to the American people if its decisions are reached by stampede, or even by deadlock, as the disastrous deliberations of 1924 prove. I have no doubt that the convention will select a candidate who, like Jefferson, Jackson, Cleveland, Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Truman, has personal honor enough to admit he seeks the office instead of instigating a futile and unmanly methods of trying to appear as if that great and majestic office seeks him.

I have said that I have confidence in the candidate the Democratic Party will select. It is my earnest wish, however, that the platform committee will provide a sound foundation upon which the party can stand, and not an equivocal magic carpet subject to directional changes.

I was appalled, for example, by the recommendation of a former New York Governor who urged the platform committee to accept no plank which committed the party to a stiffer policy with the Kremlin. What then does he recommend—a softer one?

Further, I also note that the ex-Governor of Illinois is prepared to accept the nomination to the Presidency apparently in the belief that it is the duty of God, the Democratic convention, and the American people to force it upon him. To paraphrase a current statement, to send Governor Stevenson to negotiate with Mr. Khrushchev is to send the cabbage patch to the goat.

I have traveled as much abroad as almost any man in this party. I, too, value the opinion of the world. But I am sure that sound policy cannot be based on loss of self-respect. I am sure that the great Democratic Presidents of the past would deal, and deal effectively, with the rising Communist tide wherever it appears. I am certain that strong Presidents need not justify to the world, the American people, nor their consciences the prevention of new communistic states, where democracy formerly ruled. The Republican administration which promised it would roll the Iron Curtain back has presented us with a Red picket fence coming perilously close to the Western Hemisphere. Here and now, I state my convictions. Any American administration which refuses to protect American citizens and American property in any quarter of the globe, on the ground that its action will be called Yankee imperialism, has in effect struck the flag. Let us not perform the disgraceful act of offering the American people a spurious dove of peace, when every page of recent history identifies it as the white flag of cowardly surrender.

I have been criticized for speaking out, as if I should hold my views in deference to the slinkiness of appeasement for the sake of the unity of the Democratic Party.

As a member, and a loyal working member of the Democratic Party for more than 50 years, I need no instruction from them on party loyalty.

This party stands in grave danger, if their views are adopted, of becoming the party of appeasement. Unless this is effectively rebutted at the convention it will not be the instrument of the American people. Because this country still has as its motto "In God We Trust," and by it, I am convinced, the American people are willing to stand.

Resolution of Grand Parlor, Native Daughters of the Golden West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to call your attention to the text of a resolution by the Grand Parlor, Native Daughters of the Golden West, San Francisco, Calif., dated August 11, 1960. I am sure you and all the distinguished Members of this great legislative body will join with me in complimenting these native daughters of the State of Califor-

nia for passing this resolution and sending copies thereof not only to members of the House Un-American Activities Committee but to the President and Vice President of the United States and to all Members of the House of Representatives and Senate from the State of California.

The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION OF GRAND PARLOR, NATIVE DAUGHTERS OF THE GOLDEN WEST

To the Honorable Members of the U.S. Congress from the State of California.

SIRS: At the recent anual convention of the Native Daughters of the Golden West, a fraternal and patriotic organization of California-born women dedicated to the principles of our order—love of home, devotion to the flag of the United States, veneration of the pioneers, and an abiding faith in the existence of God—the delegates in convention assembled unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas it has been documented and proved that the Communist conspiracy is and has been working to infiltrate our schools, churches, press, radio, organizations, and government, it is vitally necessary to the safety of our country that we be alert to seek out and expose those who have infiltrated our country and hope to bring about the destruction of the American Government we love; and

"Whereas the House Un-American Activities Committee is one of the chief bulwarks on which the people of this country may rely in full confidence; and

"Whereas, Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, says, 'Today, communism is the major menace of our time. Today, it threatens the very existence of our Western civilization': Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Native Daughters of the Golden West in convention assembled, do commend the work of the House Un-American Activities Committee and support its continuance until all danger of subversion and espionage is over; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the committee, Representative FRANCIS E. WALTERS, the President and Vice President of the United States, and all Representatives and Senators from the State of California."

Respectfully yours,

IRMA S. MURRAY,
Grand Secretary.

The 1960 Pugwash Conference on College Deans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, if we are to mobilize our intellectual resources in time to meet challenges of our precarious days, we must encourage more conferences such as Cyrus Eaton, Cleveland industrial and world peace worker, is holding at Pugwash. Early last month 16 college presidents convened for the first of Cyrus Eaton's 1960 Pugwash thinkers conferences. Not long after 18 college deans and their wives came to Pugwash to devote 10 days of consideration of great ideas of the past as a guide to modern ethics.

By unanimous consent I am including hereafter the remarks Mr. Eaton made to the assembled deans and news items from two Nova Scotia papers:

[From the Oxford Journal, July 14, 1960]

NOTED COLLEGE HEADS HOLDING SESSIONS AT CYRUS EATON HOME

PUGWASH, NOVA SCOTIA, July 10.—Thinking rejoined lobster fishing and salt mining as one of this small seaside village's major industries this week, when 16 college presidents convened for the first of Cyrus Eaton's 1960 Pugwash thinkers conference.

The educators and their wives will be guests of the Pugwash-born American industrialist for 10 days, while they seek renewal of intellectual life through study and discussion of the classics.

Organizer of the conference and cosponsor with Mr. Eaton is the Association of American Colleges. Discussion leaders are provided by the Carnegie Foundation.

Following the presidential group at Thinkers' Lodge, will be 18 college deans and their wives. They, too, will devote 10 days to consideration of great ideas of the past, as a guide to modern ethics.

In a message to the college presidents, Mr. Eaton stated, "It is a source of immense satisfaction that Pugwash serves as the gathering place for those whose emphasis is on philosophy, history and the humanities, as well as science."

Noting that "Pugwash has become a familiar name in the far places of the world, from the warnings of the Pugwash scientists against the grave hazards of nuclear, biological and chemical warfare," Mr. Eaton added, "Pugwash conferences like this one, with concern for things that affect the spirit of man, play an equally important part."

Discussion leaders for both of this year's collegiate conferences are Dr. Carter Davidson, president of Union College, Schenectady, N.Y., and Dr. J. Harry Cotton, chairman of the Department of Philosophy, Wabash College, Crawfordsville, Ind. Dr. Cotton, who is spending his third summer at Pugwash, is an ordained Presbyterian minister. Dr. Davidson, in his second season at Pugwash, is ordained in the Congregational ministry.

Dr. Davidson describes the Pugwash conferences of college presidents and deans as a process of "intellectual retolling." In his view, they present a "wonderful opportunity for refreshment of the mind" by barring discussion of finances, faculty problems, and students, in exclusive favor of philosophical discourse. He points out that "the impast of the Pugwash conferences is making itself felt throughout the United States, so that college administrators are eagerly seeking the opportunity to attend."

The Pugwash Intellectual Life Conferences are entering their fifth year. Because of their popularity, they are held not only at Pugwash, but also at such other summer resorts as Asheville, N.C., and Wagon Wheel, Colo.

More than 20 Pugwash conferences of all kinds have been held in Canada, the United States and Europe in past years. Five Pugwash scientific meetings have brought together 112 authorities on nuclear, biological, and chemical warfare from 23 major nations, east and west.

It was largely in recognition of the contribution of the Pugwash scientific conferences to improved international understanding that Mr. Eaton was designated as 1960 International Lenin Peace prizewinner. The peace medal was officially conferred upon Mr. Eaton in Pugwash on July 1 before a Dominion Day gathering that attracted 15,000 people to this little town of 700. Prof. D. V. Skobeltzyn, director of the Institute of Physics of the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences, made a special trip from Moscow to Pugwash for the presentation ceremony.

Participants in the present Pugwash Intellectual Life Conference of College Presidents, and their fields of scholarly interest, are:

Dr. C. H. Becker., president of Wartburg College, Waverly, Iowa, theology and sociology; the Very Reverend Edward Bunn, S. J., president of Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., psychology; Sister Maria Corona, president of College of Mount St. Joseph, Mount St. Joseph, Ohio, philosophy and mathematics; Sister Catherine Francis, president of the College of St. Rose, Albany, N.Y., economics; Dr. Robert W. Gibson, president of Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill., history; Dr. H. G. Harmon, president of Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, educational psychology; Dr. R. T. L. Liston, president of King College, Bristol, Tenn., theology; Dr. Delyte W. Morris, president of Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Ill., speech pathology; Sister Mary Muriel, president of Mount Mercy College, Pittsburgh, Pa., humanities; Dr. R. W. Puryear, president of Florida Normal and Industrial Memorial College, Saint Augustine, Fla., social studies and religion; Mother St. Egbert, president of Notre Dame College of Staten Island, N.Y., philosophy; Dr. Paul F. Sharp, president of Hiram College, Hiram, Ohio, American history; Dr. Rembert Stokes, president of Wilberforce University, Wilberforce, Ohio, social ethics; Dr. Alan S. Wilson, president of Hillyer College, Hartford, Conn., natural sciences; Dr. Val H. Wilson, president of Skidmore College, Saratoga Springs, N.Y., philosophy.

Those who will take part in the forthcoming Pugwash Conference of College Deans, and their fields of scholarly interest, are:

Dr. Isabel R. Abbott, dean of Western College for Women, Oxford, Ohio, history; Dr. Richard L. Barber, dean of University of Louisville, Louisville, Ky., philosophy; Dr. Richard R. Bond, dean of Elmira College, Elmira, N.Y., biology; Dr. F. G. Bulber, dean of McNeese State College, Lake Charles, La., music; Dr. George W. Burns, dean of Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio. botany; Dr. John O. Eidson, dean of the University of Georgia, Athens, Ga., American literature; Sister Mary Emmanuel, dean of College of St. Teresa, Winona, Minn., English; Dr. Thoma H. Henderson, dean of Virginia Union University, Richmond, Va., educational psychology; Dr. Herschel Hendrix, dean of Upper Iowa University, Fayette, Iowa, administration; Dr. C. W. Huntley, dean of Union College, Schenectady, N.Y., psychology; Dr. Robert Kirkwood, dean of Washington College, Chestertown, Md., American history; Dr. Carl Kreider, dean of Goshen College, Goshen, Ind., economics; Dr. David G. Mobberley, dean of Lycoming College, Williamsport, Pa., botany; Dr. Mary J. Pearl, dean of Sweet Briar College, Sweet Briar, Va., classics; Dr. Thomas R. Ross, dean of Davis and Elkins College, Elkins, W. Va., history; Dr. Kenneth P. Smith, dean of Sterling College, Sterling, Kans., theology; Sister Mary Stephanie, dean of St. Joseph's College, North Windham, Maine, English literature; Dr. E. E. Towell, dean of College of Charleston, Charleston, S.C., chemistry.

Classics forming the basis of discussion for these two Pugwash Intellectual Life Conferences include Plato's "Symposium," Kierkegaard's "Fear and Trembling," Swift's "Gulliver's Travels," de Tocqueville's "Democracy in America," and Turgenev's "Fathers and Sons."

The two July gatherings will be followed by a Pugwash International Conference on Continuing Education from August 12 to 17. Heading the organizing committee for the international meeting is Dr. J. R. Kidd, director of Canadian Association for Adult Education. Serving as director of the Pugwash Secretariat, throughout the summer, as in previous years, is Miss Betty Royon, of Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. Eaton's assistant.

MESSAGE FROM CYRUS EATON TO 1960 PUGWASH CONFERENCE OF COLLEGE DEANS

The presence of this distinguished group of college deans in my native Pugwash gives me great pleasure. I hope you share my enthusiasm for this quiet and kindly community as a place for serious study, reflection, and discussion, combined with a simple, wholesome vacation.

In your contemplation here of the great problems of life, perhaps you will come forward with some fresh ideas for challenging your fellow citizens to make the most of their potentialities. Living as we are in an age of propaganda, it seems to me that we need to find new ways to wage the battle for men's minds. This is no mere contest between Karl Marx and Adam Smith, but a broad campaign ranging over the entire area of human thought and endeavor.

Governments the world over are thoroughly familiar with modern ways of forming and directing public opinion, and are taking full advantage of this psychological revolution. The ghost writer is in demand in the highest places.

All of us must marvel at today's amazing instruments of communication. At the same time, must we not stand appalled at the sorry use to which our press, radio, and television are to large extent put? Although these media could provide powerful means for education and enlightenment, their overwhelming emphasis is on dangerous jingoism, narrow nationalism, sensational excitement, and superficial entertainment. Unthinking readers, listeners, and viewers are lulled into insensibility to the serious issues of the day, into unawareness of the imminent danger of annihilation by nuclear warheads. (You will have noted with approval, I hope, the refreshing contrast presented by the constructive character of maritime journalism.)

This presents you and your colleagues everywhere with both a tremendous opportunity and a special obligation. Never was there greater need for the fullest utilization of the enviable ability you possess to think, to express yourselves and to influence others.

JULY 21, 1960.

[From the Amherst Daily News, July 25, 1960]

EATON URGES EDUCATORS TO PRODUCE NEW IDEAS

PUGWASH.—Cyrus Eaton today called upon American educators to "find new ways to wage the battle for men's minds."

The plea of the Canadian-born American industrialist was addressed to the Pugwash Conference of American College Deans currently in session at his Thinkers' Lodge here. A native of Pugwash who now makes his headquarters in Cleveland, Mr. Eaton has just returned to Nova Scotia for his second visit of the summer.

Labeling the present era "an age of propaganda," Mr. Eaton declared, "This is no mere contest between Karl Marx and Adam Smith, but a broad campaign ranging over the entire area of human thought and endeavor."

Mr. Eaton went on to point out that "governments the world over are thoroughly familiar with modern ways of forming and directing public opinion, and are taking full advantage of this psychological revolution." He observed with regret that "the ghost writer is in demand in the highest places."

The Cleveland capitalist deplored the "sorry use to which our press, radio and television are to large extent put.

"Although these media could provide powerful means for education and enlightenment," he said, "their overwhelming emphasis is on dangerous jingoism, narrow nationalism, sensational excitement and superficial entertainment."

According to Mr. Eaton, the result is that "unthinking readers, listeners and viewers are lulled into insensibility to the serious issues of the day," and especially "into unawareness of the imminent danger of annihilation by nuclear warheads."

Mr. Eaton noted parenthetically that the "constructive character of maritime journalism" presents a "refreshing contrast."

Mr. Eaton told the college deans that "this presents you and your colleagues everywhere with both a tremendous opportunity and a special obligation. Never was there a greater need," he added, "for the fullest utilization of the enviable ability you possess to think, to express yourselves and to influence others."

Always a booster of the attractions of the maritimes, and particularly Pugwash, Mr. Eaton said to the deans, "I hope you share my enthusiasm for this quiet and kindly community as a place for serious study, reflection and discussion, combined with a simple wholesome vacation.

"In your contemplation here of the great problems of life," he suggested, "perhaps you will come forward with some fresh ideas for challenging your fellow citizens to make the most of their potentialities."

During their 10-day sojourn at Pugwash, the college deans are seeking renewal of intellectual life through study and discusison of the classics. These Pugwash Intellectual Life Conferences, for college presidents as well as deans, are now in their fifth year. Organizer of the conferences and cosponsor with Mr. Eaton is the Association of American Colleges.

More than 20 Pugwash conferences of all kinds have been held in Canada, the United States and Europe in the past 5 years. Five Pugwash scientific meetings have brought together 112 authorities on nuclear, biological and chemical warfare from 23 major nations, East and West.

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, July 24, 1960]

EATON CHARGES PUELIC LULLED ON MAIN ISSUES

PUGWASH, NOVA SCOTIA.—Cleveland industrialist Cyrus Eaton said Saturday press, radio and television are lulling audiences "into insensibility to the issues of the day."

Eaton's comment was made in a message to eduactors attending the Pugwash Conference of American College Deans. He urged them to find new ways to battle for men's minds.

Although the media of communications could "provide a powerful means for education and enlightenment, their overwhelming emphasis is on dangerous jingoism, narrow nationalism, sensational excitement and superficial entertainment," he said.

"Unthinking readers, listeners and viewers are lulled into insensibility to the serious issues of the day and especially into unawareness of the imminent danger of annihilation by nuclear warheads.

"Never was there a greater need for the fullest utilization of the enviable ability you possess to think, to express yourselves and to influence others."

The college deans are spending 10 days at Pugwash seeking a renewal of intellectual life through the study and discussion of classical writings.

Bishop Ahr Lauds Slovaks for Their Loyalty to Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, among the many examples of adherence to a faith in America is the annual pilgrimage by Slovak Catholics in New Jersey. As an expression of faith and as a demonstration of determination, the annual pilgrimage is significant and heartwarming.

The Monitor, official Catholic newspaper of the diocese of Trenton, carried in its July 15 edition a story about the ceremony and a sermon which described the difficulties in maintaining the church in Slovakia. In the edition of July 8, John C. Scirenka, of Passaic, wrote a history of the activities of the Slovaks in America, centering particularly on the history of the Slovak parishes in the diocese of Trenton.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BISHOP AHR LAUDS SLOVAKS FOR THEIR LOYALTY TO FAITH

More than 1,200 Slovak Catholics participated in the annual pilgrimage in honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius, which opened with pontifical mass in SS. Peter and Paul's Church, Trenton, celebrated by Bishop George W. Ahr, Sunday.

The pilgrimage was sponsored by the eastern district of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

In his sermon, His Excellency commended the Slovaks' loyalty to the faith during the 11 centuries since the two apostles of the Slavs brought Christianity to Eastern Europe.

Assisting Bishop Ahr at the mass were Father Ladislaus J. Rakvica, pastor of St. Michael's Church, Trenton, as archpriest; Father William J. Capik, guidance director at Notre Dame High School, Trenton, deacon; and Father Andrew A. Okal, pastor of Sacred Heart Church, Carteret, subdeacon.

Deacons of honor to his excellency were father Joseph G. Olsovsky, pastor of St. Joseph's, Raritan, and Father Michael J. Churak, pastor of Holy Trinity, Perth Amboy. Father John C. Reiss, vice chancellor, was master of ceremonies to His Excellency, with Father John A. Dzema, assistant at Christ the King, Manville, as master of ceremonies of the mass.

Very Rev. Msgr. Joseph Tomko, vice rector of Nepomucene Pontificial College, Rome, preaching in Slovak, traced the history of SS. Cyril and Methodius as missionaries in Slovakia, where "a new paganism is quickly and systematically driving out Christianity."

During the past 10 years, he declared, Slovakia has lost more than 1,000 priests, 40 percent of the number in the entire nation. To offset this loss, a minor seminary dedicated to SS. Cyril and Methodius will be set up in Rome to train priests for Slovakia. To date, he said, 25 young men have been prepared for this work.

Last year, only one priest was ordained in Slovakia, a nation of more than 4 million inhabitants. Before the fall of the Iron Curtain, Monsigor Tomko said, Slovakia had 11 major and 5 minor seminaries. Today, he said, the Reds permit one seminary.

Following is Mr. Scíranka's account:

When the pilgrims of the eastern district of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America meet in Trenton Sunday to honor SS. Cyril and Methodius, the two apostles of the Slavs in general and the Slovaks in particular, no doubt several questions will come to the minds of not only their American neighbors, but also their children and grandchildren.

Among these may be, "When did the Slovaks come to Trenton? How did they organize? Who were the organizers? Who were the first priests and laymen to serve them?"

The Slovaks settled here about 1880, although prior to that time Venerable Bishop John Nepomucene Neumann, after whom the Knights of Columbus council in Riverside is named, visited Trenton on his missionary journeys. Bishop Neumann, born in Bohemia, the present day Czechoslovakia, spoke among a dozen languages Gaelic and Slovak.

Prior to that, Henry Loskiel, Moravian-Slovak missionary, preached to the Indians in New Jersey, 100 years before the Declaration of our American Independence.

William Paca, Governor of Maryland, was credited with being a Slav of Bohemian origin. It is an stablished fact that Augustine Herman, first Czech in America, served on the board of Gov. Peter Stuyvesant in New York and later made the first map of Maryland and Virginia, for which he received large grants.

Count Maurice de Benovsky, born in Vrbove, Slovakia, came to the aid of Gens. Pulaski and Kosciusko during the American Revolutionary War. He was befriended by Benjamin Franklin, then our ambassador to Paris, and came to Baltimore. Later he became king of the Island of Madagascar. Maj. John Polorecky fought under the command of George Washington and later lived in Maine, where his memory was recently honored.

The first Slovak society in Trenton was the SS. Peter and Paul Society, organized February 19, 1893. Eight pioneers were the organizers. They were Andrew S. Bogdan, Andrew Mras, Joseph Krafcik, Nicholas Bogdan, John Mras, Michael Varga, John Komjathy, and George Bogdan.

The name Bogdan, is widely used among the Slovaks and Slavs and dates from the times of SS. Cyril and Methodius. It means God given. We find the names of Bogdan and Matta in company with the first Poles in Jamestown, Va., who aided Capt. John Smith in building the first permanent English settlement in the New World. Tribute was paid to them during the recent 350th anniversary of Jamestown, when this writer wrote a special article about them, which later appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

These first eight Slovak pioneers of Trenton, after a meeting May 17, 1896, received permission from Bishop James A. McFaul, of Trenton, to organize a parish. At that time there were 103 Slovak families and 105 single persons, mostly men who had left their wives and families in Slovakia.

The parish was incorporated after a meeting January 29, 1900. Father Ladislaus Neuwirth was its first pastor and Michael Bodnar and Andrew Bogdan became the first parish trustees.

The first church was erected and dedicated on the Feast of SS. Peter and Paul in 1902. In the meantime, Father John Gurecky had succeeded Father Neuwirth as pastor. He converted the basement of the new church into a school and two lay teachers were hired, beginning classes in September 1902.

Father Alexander Kovacs was the next pastor, and during his pastorate, the rectory was built.

Father Coloman Tomchany, later named a domestic prelate with the title of Right Reverend Monsignor, served as pastor from March 1905 until his death in January 1948.

The parish rose to great heights under his leadership and the Dominican Sisters took over the parochial school in August 1908. After the death of Monsignor Tomchany, Father Andrew J. Sakson, a native son of the parish, became pastor. During his pastorate the parish celebrated its golden jubilee in 1950. He died just a year ago next week, July 14, 1959, and was succeeded by the present pastor, Father Ladislaus J. Petrick, a native of Passaic.

St. Michael's Parish, Trenton, was founded March 3, 1919. The first Society of St. Michael the Archangel was founded September 21, 1908, with J. Kubala and Michael Pluta, Sr., and 13 other Slovaks as founders.

The original parish committee consisted of John Andrejcik, chairman; Stephen Mikita, vice chairman; Gaspar Rehak, secretary; Urban Walachy, Sr., financial secretary; and George Sholtis, treasurer. The society was the first to contribute $400 to the parish fund.

In 1921 episcopal permission was granted to erect a church. The first pastor was Father Joseph Sabo, of Metuchen, who was followed by Father Lawrence Cierny. Father Cierny returned to Slovakia, where he was imprisoned and tortured when the Communists took over the country.

On November 15, 1926, Father Michael J. Kallok became pastor, remaining until October 15, 1931, when he left for Cudahy, Wis., where he died several months ago.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Arthur B. Strenski, P.A., now pastor of St. Joseph's, South Camden, was administrator of the parish, followed by the late Father John E. Rura and Father Joseph G. Olsovsky, now pastor of St. Joseph's, Raritan.

On December 3, 1936, Father Ladislaus J. Rakvica, present pastor,. assumed the pastorate.

The Slovaks began to settle in Perth Amboy in 1879. In 1895 when the Poles began to erect their church, the Slovaks aided them. However, 5 years later they began to think seriously of organizing their own parish. They founded the Society of the Holy Trinity with some 100 members.

In 1898 they bought six lots and a year later sent a committee to Father Francis Januschek, pastor of St. Mary's Church, Haverstraw, N.Y., for advice on how to proceed to organize a parish.

Bishop McFaul personally went to Perth Amboy to inspect the property, which did not meet with his approval. A new site was purchased at Penn and Neville Streets.

Father Januschek arrived in Perth Amboy September 29, 1899. The parish was incorporated January 23, 1900, with John Jabrocky and Paul Krempasky as first lay trustees. Father Nicholas Hodobay was named pastor July 13, 1904. During his pastorate the parish cemetery was bought.

In 1907, Father Hodobay prepared a class of 277 candidates for confirmation and was commended by Bishop McFaul for his work. He returned to Slovakia shortly thereafter and Father Hugolin Sebastian, O.Praem., administered the parish for a year until Father Joseph Suchy was named pastor April 17, 1909.

At that time the parish listed 2,700 members. A year later it had grown to 3,028. In 1912, it reached a new peak with 205 baptisms, 52 weddings, and 70 first holy communicants, and a parish membership of 4,500. A campaign was started to build a new church, but World War I intervened. During the influenza epidemic of 1919, 132 members of the parish died.

In that year, the erection of a new parochial school was started at a cost of $100,000, with permission of Archbishop Thomas J. Walsh, then bishop of Trenton and later first archbishop of Newark. The Dominican Sisters took charge and in 1927 it had 560 pupils with 11 teaching sisters.

Father Suchy was assisted for a brief period by Father B. Andrassi and later by Father John Didecky. Father Suchy took ill. He was assisted by Father Joseph G. Olsovsky from January 18, 1932, until November 15, 1934, when he was relieved of parish duties by Bishop John J. McMahon, and retired after serving 21 years in the parish.

On May 25, 1931, Father John E. Rura became administrator with Father Petrick as assistant. In May, 1936, Father Michael J. Churak was the first native son of the parish to be ordained, and celebrated his first mass in the church.

In July, 1948, Father Rura was elevated by Pope Pius XII to Papal chamberlain with the title of very reverend monsignor. He dedicated his efforts to the building of a new church, but died October 20, 1949, shortly after the 40th anniversary of the parish. He was succeeded on November 18 of that year by Father Churak, who became the sixth pastor. Under his pastorate one of the most beautiful churches was erected and was dedicated by Bishop Ahr.

In 1910, Father Stephen Ulrich visited Carteret and encouraged the people to form their own parish. Through the efforts of the First Catholic Slovak Union, Branch 324, property was purchased for the church at that time. Father Ulrich registered the parish in the Trenton diocese but the parish was officially organized May 6, 1912, when Bishop McFaul appointed Father Joseph Horvath, well-known priest-composer, as first pastor.

On August 6, 1912, it was decided to erect a new church, which was dedicated by Bishop McFaul July 13, 1913. Father Horvath stayed with the parish until 1922. He was succeeded by Father Honorat Rogovsky, who was pastor until June 7, 1932. In October, 1940, the Sisters of St. Francis began their catechetical classes. On March 23, 1948, Father Sakson was transferred to SS. Peter and Paul's Trenton, and Father Petrick came to Carteret. During his pastorate the parish celebrated its 40th anniversary.

A year ago Father Petrick was assigned to Trenton and Father Andrew A. Okal was named pastor of the Carteret parish.

The parish of St. Joseph, Raritan, was founded October 1, 1912. Its first pastor was Father Joseph A. Ketter, of German origin, who spoke Slovak. The first trustees were Michael Petrasek and Charles Matta. The new church was dedicated September 3, 1913.

In 1930, Father Michael J. Bacso, a native of SS. Peter and Paul's Parish, Trenton, who was ordained June 6, 1914, was appointed pastor. During his pastorate, in July, 1931, one of the first Slovak Days was held in Duke's Park in honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius, attracting some 25,000 Slovaks. A field mass was offered in the park. The late Gov. A. Harry Moore was speaker for the day.

During the illness of Father Bacso, Father Olsovsky was appointed pastor of the Raritan parish in 1937. A parochial school and many old Slovak fraternal societies may be found in Raritan.

The Slovaks organized several fraternal societies in Phillipsburg before 1909. On August 14, 1913, they formed a fraternal Society of St. Peter. Prior to that, on January 26, 1913, Father Patrick J. Quinn called a meeting and gave impetus to the formation of a parish for the Slovak-speaking Catholics. He deserves credit for this extraordinary action.

The parish of SS. Peter and Paul, Phillipsburg, was incorporated March 4, 1913. The organization work continued for another year when Father Bacso, now pastor of St. Clare's, Florence, was named assistant to Rt. Rev. Msgr. Patrick F. Connolly of St. Philip and St. James Church, Phillipsburg.

Father Bacso was assigned to work among the Slovaks of Phillipsburg and Martin's Creek. Services for the Slovaks of the area were conducted in St. Philip and St. James Church until 1921, when the Church of SS. Peter and Paul was erected.

Father Bacso labored in the new parish until 1930, when Father Rura, a native son of the parish, was named administrator, remaining 2 years. Father Rogovsky became pastor in 1932, remaining until his death November 14, 1938.

Under his pastorate, the Sisters of St. Francis assumed the teaching duties in the parochial school. On November 25, 1938, Father Petrick became pastor, remaining until March 1948, when he was named to Trenton, and Father Okal was given the

pastorate in Phillipsburg. Last year, Father Okal assumed the pastorate in Carteret and Father John J. Churak was named pastor of SS. Peter and Paul's.

Besides these parishes, the Slovaks live in almost every city in the Trenton diocese. In many of them they have fraternal societies and social halls.

All these parishes have contirbuted much to the priesthood and sisterhood. The first son-priest of SS. Peter and Paul's parish, Trenton, was Father Cyril Orendac, O.F.M. Conv., well-known Slovak missionary who was ordained July 27, 1913. Father Joseph Walachy, S.V.D., of St. Michael's parish, Trenton, is laboring in New Guinea as a missionary

Father George Harcar, C.S.Sp., a Trentonian, is vice president of Duquesne University, Pittsburgh. It is remarkable that some families like the Churaks of Perth Amboy, Harcars and Kandas of Trenton, each have two priest-sons.

In 1924 the First Catholic Slovak Union held its national convention in Trenton, and in 1930 the Slovak Catholic Sokol had its national convention and gymnastic and atheletic show in that city.

The following year the Slovak Day was held at Duke's Park, Raritan, and in 1932 in Perth Amboy, where the First Catholic Slovak Union meeting was held.

Slovak fraternalists in America look to the Trenton diocese with great pride for it has the largest fraternal societies now with Perth Amboy in the lead. May this pilgrimage in honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius bring more blessings upon the beloved Bishop Ahr, the priests, religious and people of the diocese, and all its citizens.

Breakthrough on Rails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, New Jersey State officials are now attempting to help keep commuter service alive by offering subsidies to railroads in return for contract promises of transit service for specified periods.

As an article in the New York Times of August 22 points out, New Jersey is the first State to offer such contracts. The article also emphasizes that the contract system is an interim effort that will ultimately be replaced by a more comprehensive one.

The New Jersey program is of interest to everyone concerned about the national effects of the mass transportation problem, and steps that may be taken until a truly national policy is finally drafted. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BREAKTHROUGH ON RAILS—JERSEY HAILS AID PACTS AS FIRST STEP TO EXPANDED RAPID-TRANSIT SYSTEM

(By George Cable Wright)

TRENTON, August 21.—The spotlight of public hearings was turned last week on subsidy contracts being drawn between New Jersey and eight of its nine commuter rail lines. The hearings posed these perennial questions in a new context: Why is continued rail passenger service important to the social and economic life of the metropolitan area? Are the residents of the area willing to underwrite the deficits that seem sure as long as rail transport is to be sustained? If not, who will underwrite them?

New Jersey's public hearings seemed to emphasize these things:

Adequate rail service for the New Jersey-New York commuter will be available for another year and perhaps for longer.

Much can be accomplished with only $6 million toward meeting the critical metropolitan transit situation.

The contract approach is more acceptable to the hard-pressed carriers than any yet devised in the New York, Boston or Philadelphia region.

A "FIRST" IN RAIL AID

New Jersey is the first State to offer such contracts. The enthusiam with which the major commuter lines have accepted them and agreed not only to halt further curtailments of rush-hour service but to improve such facilities has made it clear that a real breakthrough in the commuter rail crisis has been scored.

Dwight R. G. Palmer, State transit chief, hails the acceptance of the contracts by the carriers as a real "foot in the door."

He predicts that a long-range solution to the railroad problem that he plans to propose within 3 months will prove equally acceptable to the carriers and to the public. It will, he says, eliminate the grave problem "once and for all.".

The contract system, he concedes, is only a stopgap measure. The pacts to be signed within 10 days extend for 1 year. The signatories pledge to continue all existing passenger services deemed essential by the State for the contract period. Mr. Palmer reserves the right to reopen arbitrarily all contracts at the end of 6 months and to order any service revisions he desires.

Of the nine lines, only the Lehigh Valley rejected the proffered aid. A 10th carrier, the New York Central, was offered a subsidy to reactivate its defunct West Shore service, but it has rejected the offer.

Mr. Palmer's long-range solution will be far less costly than the multimillion-dollar blueprints heretofore unveiled and thus far more palatable to the public, which, directly or indirectly, usually foots the bill.

The plan would extend the Hudson Tube service—with new, air-conditioned rolling stock—west from Newark to Bound Brook and north to Morristown. It would link the tube trains with the New York City subways.

Regional bus lines and parking lots would merge the new rail system with new freeways soon to crisscross the State. To alleviate New York City traffic congestion, Mr. Palmer is expected to propose that trucks be admitted to Manhattan streets only between dusk and dawn.

The public, as a whole, has repeatedly indicated its unwillingness to bear the responsibility of financing such commuter transit projects. Mr. Palmer, cognizant of this, hopes for considerable help from the port authority in financing his long-range project. Some State officials are convinced he will get such aid.

The cost of building enough roads to cope with a sudden collapse of rail transit would be prohibitive, all experts agree. In addition sufficient parking facilities to accommodate the increased traffic are out of the question.

MANHATTAN WOULD SUFFER

The primary sufferers of any rail collapse would be lower Manhattan and the suburbs that house its labor force. Most of these people find it impractical to reach their jobs by bus or auto. These workers constitute the major portion of the city's 225,000 rail commuters.

Most of the men employed in that area and many of the women might be forced to migrate to more accessible residential sectors if rail service collapsed. At the same time a serious labor shortage could result among young women who hold clerical and secretarial posts.

Some idea of what impact a major shift of rail commuters from one community to another might have may be seen in this: Rail commuters in the New York area earn about $4 billion a year.

New York State seemingly has been less successful in solving its rail troubles than New Jersey. Its programs of reimbursing communities that extend tax relief to lines and of underwriting port authority attempts to purchase and lease rolling stock to carriers have run into many snags.

Last year the two States set up a bi-State transit agency to attack the commuter problem. Connecticut was invited to join but declined. Neither New York nor New Jersey, it appears, has yet utilized this agency.

Boston has attempted to solve its transit problem by levies on affected communities, Philadelphia by modest local subsidies. In each instance there has been little evidence of cooperation from the railroads.

THREE SUCCESS STORIES

In Chicago, Toronto, and Cleveland there is ample evidence that commuter rail problems can be solved—and most successfully.

Tackling the problem a decade ago, aggressive executives of the Chicago and North Western and Rock Island roads began to replace all their suburban Chicago rolling stock with new double-deck, air-conditioned cars. At the same time they erected rights-of-way along a local expressway into the Loop.

Now they are integrating their track systems with public garages and parking plazas. The result: their commuter services are annually producing substantial profits.

Panama Canal: Last Roosevelt Medal Holder Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as a close observer of isthmian life for many years, I have long noticed that it is featured by a series of highlights in some way or other related to the operation of the Panama Canal.

The latest was retirement on July 31, 1960, of Adrien M. Bouche, lock operator at Pedro Miguel and the last employee in the canal organization holding the Roosevelt Medal for construction era service.

An interesting biography of him sent me by William R. McCann of Hopewell, Va., in the form of a news story in the July 31, 1960, issue of the Panama American, supplies a permanent record of an employee who spent his life in the canal organization. He was one of the few who used his spare time exploring the jungle land and studying tropical flora and wildlife. He was an expert on Panamanian life, customs, and ethnology.

The indicated news story follows:

CANAL LOCKS TO CLOSE BEHIND BOUCHE'S LONG CAREER TODAY

Another era in the history of the Panama Canal comes to an end today when Adrien

M. Bouche locks his last ship up or down through Pedro Miguel locks. He is the only man still in the canal organization who holds the Roosevelt Medal given to those who have had 2 or more years of construction day service and one of two U.S. citizens who began work here during the construction years, and are still on the canal rolls.

When he ends his working day today to join the ranks of the retired, he leaves David W. Ellis of the dredging division as the sole U.S. citizen who was on the canal's rolls before the waterway began transiting ships from ocean to ocean.

Mr. and Mrs. Bousche are sailing for the United States August 10 on the Panama Line and expect to live in Staunton, Va.

Born in Mount Carbon, W.Va., Bouche came to the Canal Zone when Gatun locks were not much more than gaping holes in the ground and steam shovels were working to set new records in what is now Gaillard Cut.

He was only 11 years old when in 1909, he got a summer vacation job running errands in the Gatun office of Maj. William L. Sibert, Chief of the Atlantic Division. Except for short breaks in service he has been a regular employee since 1912.

After he graduated from the jobs as messenger, which he held during school vacations, he went to work as a wireman with the electrical division. In 1916, he became a motorboat operator with what was then the Marine Division and in 1918, after a brief stay in the United States returned to the electrical division as a wireman.

For the next 5 years he alternated between the electrical division and the locks division and in 1923 went permanently onto the locks division rolls. He has held jobs as wireman, locking locomotive operator, and junior and senior control house operator.

As control house operator, he leaves the service today with 44 years, 3 months, and 23 days to his credit—one of the longest service records ever attained by any employee.

Bouche is a walking encyclopedia of information, not only on the history of the Canal Zone but on local plants and minerals.

For many years his major offduty hobby was prospecting for plants which he sent to botanists, pharmaceutical, research laboratories, and other scientific institutions. His botanical hunts have taken him not only over most of the Isthmus but into the jungles of many parts of Central and South America as well.

Arabs Fear Eichmann Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Leo Heiman as it appeared in the National Jewish Monthly, August 1960 issue:

[From the National Jewish Monthly, August 1960]

ARABS FEAR EICHMANN TRIAL—WORLD OPINION MAY BE SHOCKED IF EVIDENCE REVEALS THE PART THEY PLAYED IN NAZIS' "FINAL SOLUTION OF JEWISH PROBLEM"

(By Leo Heiman)

The spectacular capture of Adolf Eichmann by Israel took official Arab spokesmen and political commentators by complete surprise. They soon found themselves on the horns of a terrible dilemma.

On the one hand, they could not defend Eichmann too openly, as this would have appeared to the world as additional proof of Arab complicity in his monstrous crimes. On the other hand, they could not welcome the arrest of a man who was once described by the ex-Mufti of Jerusalem "as the greatest friend Arabs ever had."

ALTERNATE SILENCE AND LIES

For 11 days after Eichmann's capture, Cairo and Damascus radio maintained complete silence on the subject, broken only by gloating (and false) communiques saying that Argentina was about to sever all diplomatic relations with "the Zionist gangster state" of Israel, because Israeli "goon squads" had kidnaped "innocent Argentine citizens" from Buenos Aires.

This was the only official comment of the United Arab Republic. Egyptian-Syrian press comment followed this line, with the tone set by the Cairo government mouthpiece, the daily El Goumhuriya, which stated editorially that not Adolf Eichmann, but David Ben-Gurion "is the real war criminal and bloodstained genocide killer."

In Jordan, the Government-controlled radio did straight reporting, quoting foreign news agencies, without any official comment. But two of Jordan's best known newspaper columnists and political commentators, Youssuff Hannah and Yahya Hawash, supported Nasser's line that "Eichmann is an innocent victim of a frameup, and it is Ben-Gurion and the Jews who are the real war criminals."

Writing in the Jordanian daily Al Shab, Mr. Hannah stated that "genocide and war crimes were invented by the Jews and perfected by the Zionists. The Torah is full of genocide propaganda and bloodthirsty teachings, and the entire Jewish religion is based on hatred, revenge, racial discrimination, intolerance, racial persecution, aggression, murder, looting and raping." His colleague Mr. Hawash, writing in Falastin, stressed that "compared to the Jewish gangsters, Hitler and the Nazis were pure saints."

The dean of Arab political commentators, one Akram El Khalidi, declared in a syndicated column that "the Zionist gangster state is full of bloody war criminals, compared to whom Eichmann and Hitler are innocent babies. When we liberate our stolen land of Palestine, we shall try the Jewish war criminals for genocide and crimes against humanity, and avenge Eichmann as well."

Behind all these pathological ravings—which only prove how right Ben-Gurion is in stressing that peace with the Arabs now is impossible, no matter how many concessions Israel makes—lies one obvious fact: The Arabs are afraid of being implicated in Nazi genocide crimes by Eichmann's testimony. A British dispatch from Beirut stresses this point: "The Arabs forecast a big propaganda war against them to spring from Israel's spectacular capture of Adolf Eichmann, and his forthcoming trial. It is common knowledge that certain Arab leaders, such as Haj Amin el Husseini, former Mufti of Jerusalem, and Rashid Ali el Gailani, former Prime Minister of Iraq, spent the Second World War in Berlin, canvassing Arab nationalist support for the Nazis."

What the British dispatch does not say, but what will most probably come out in the first weeks of Eichmann's trial, is this:

Eichmann, Himmler, Mueller, Heydrich, Rosenberg, and even Hitler himself did not at first contemplate the mass killing of Jews. What Eichmann and other top Nazis wanted was to deport all Jews from Europe to Palestine, Madagascar, and African colonies. Only after it became evident that Britain would not allow any Jews to enter Palestine, and that no Latin American, North American, or British Commonwealth countries would admit them in large numbers, did the Nazis begin to consider another "solution" of the "Jewish problem."

PLANNED DEATH GHETTO

Even then, they did not have in mind mass destruction by gas, poison, and fire. What Eichmann wanted was to herd all the Jews of Europe into some grand-scale "Jewish settlement area," and leave them there to die from hunger, disease, and exposure. Such a big-scale "Jewish settlement area" was actually delineated in the Lublin district of central Poland.

At that stage the Arab nationalists, headed by the ex-Mufti Haj Amin el Husseini, asked for a personal audience with Hitler. You don't know the Jews, he told the surprised Fuehrer. The Jews have enormous powers of resilience and survival. Even if left alone in the desert, without bread, water, fuel, or shelter, they'll find a way to survive. The only way to get rid of them is by gas and by fire. Moreover, the red-bearded Mufti told Hitler, the Arabs would be very unhappy if any Jews survived the Second World War, because that would increase Jewish pressure on Palestine. If Hitler wanted to secure the friendship and support of Arab nationalists, he should exterminate all Jews without mercy, the Mufti told him.

This sounded good to Hitler. Orders went out to force through the "final solution." Eichmann at first envisaged mowing down all Jews by machineguns. This was, indeed, done to many thousands in Russia, Ukraine, Baltic countries and eastern Poland, with the enthusiastic cooperation of the local populace. But to wipe out the remaining millions of Jews in Europe, some efficient factory-like automation was required. It was Eichmann who developed the gas chambers idea, the deadly and cheap zyklon-B gas pellets, and the giant smoking crematoria.

A welcome guest at the Auschwitz and Birkenau death camp centers was the ex-Mufti, and other Arab nationalist leaders. Captured photographs now available as documentary evidence in Israel, show the Mufti with Eichmann and a group of minor Nazi officials, standing at the Auschwitz railroad siding watching a transport of Jews being unloaded from a stinking cattle train, and herded toward the gas chambers. In the photograph, Eichmann looks thin lipped and serious; but the Mufti is smiling broadly, gloating over the suffering and death of so many Jews. Other Arab nationalist leaders, notably the former Iraqi Premier Rashid Ali el Gailani, and the defeated chief of the Arab Liberation Army, Col. Fowzi el Kaukji, are depicted on captured Nazi photographs as Eichmann's guests of honor at Auschwitz and other death camps.

The Yugoslav Government has sent to the Israeli police headquarters—set up to investigate Eichmann's crimes—a set of photographs which show the Mufti inspecting units of Nazi Moslem SS volunteers in Yugoslavia, and congratulating them for massacring Yugoslav Jews, the heaped bodies of whom are clearly seen in the background.

THEY MAY BE IMPLICATED

Arab Nationalists will therefore probably be implicated as equal partners in Nazi genocide crimes against the Jews, in Eichmann's forthcoming trial. What's more, they know it and they fear the trial's effect upon world public opinion. Eichmann himself will try to shift most of the blame upon Hitler, Himmler, and Heydrich, who are dead, and upon the Arab Nationalist leaders, now in Cairo and Damascus.

New evidence accumulated on Eichmann shows that during 1936–39 he admired the Zionist settlement in Palestine, and was willing to cooperate with the Zionist underground in smuggling German and Austrian Jews to the Promised Land. Zionist pioneers are the only good biological material within Jewry, and it's a pity to destroy them.

They are not diseased like the other Jews." Eichmann wrote in a report to his superiors, a copy of which is now available in Israel. Tragicaly, the British White Paper policy of appeasing the Arabs at the expense of the Jews, prevented more than a token number from entering Palestine.

During 1941, 1942, 1943 and the first half of 1944, however, Adolf Eichmann was the "prince of death," as the concentration camp survivors called him. But he was also Hitler's most honest official, a good and faithful husband to his wife, Veronica Loebel, and a loyal boss to his men. He never took bribes, gambled, drank, or romanced with other women. But in the summer of 1944, with the Nazi Reich crumbling, Eichmann saw that the end was near, and went completely berserk. He started drinking heavily, gambling, and romancing with women. In less than 3 months, he acquired three blonde mistresses. He also ran amuck in the death camps, speeding up the murder of Jewish survivors so as to eliminate the last surviving witnesses. But enough survived to tell the full story in the Israeli court.

Rights of the Workingman Under the Landrum-Griffin Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, many people from my district have asked me for a concise explanation of the rights of the workingman under the Landrum-Griffin bill and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the following:

If you are interested in labor and the problems of the workingman, please read the following provisions which state the facts about the Landrum-Griffin (antiracketeering) bill. They will show that this bill, repugnant to labor racketeers, is actually a labor bill of rights, protecting the union members from exploitation.

Under the Landrum-Griffin antiracketeering bill:

First. It is unlawful for a union official to betray his office of trust. The money he collects and uses and the properties he administers are solely for the benefit of the union and its members.

Second. It is mandatory that local union officials are elected by secret ballot.

Third. It is unlawful for unions to raise dues or assessments, except by a majority vote on a secret ballot.

Fourth. It is possible to discipline a union member only after giving him a list of the written charges, a full and fair hearing and reasonable time to prepare his defense.

Fifth. It is necessary for union leaders to file annual financial reports with the Secretary of Labor. These reports must show assets and liabilities, receipts for and sources of all funds. They must show and account for all loans to union members or employees.

Sixth. It is necessary for unions to adopt constitutions and bylaws and register them with the Secretary of Labor.

Why was this bill passed? Here are some of the excerpts from the McClellan committee report:

Dave Beck viciously abused the trust of the union's (Teamsters) 1½ million members and shamefully enriched himself at the members' expense.

Dave Beck took, not borrowed, more than $370,000 in union funds from the Western Conference of Teamsters Joint Council No. 28 building fund.

During the same hearings, Jimmy Hoffa made the following statement, exactly as quoted below:

They, the Congress, can pass all the bills they want to and it won't mean a thing. None of the bills worries me.

And to add to this un-American attitude:

To hell with them, the U.S. Senate.

I have been a friend of labor and labor unions, yet not unfriendly to industry. More industry in my areas means more jobs for my people and a better standard of living. I hope the above excerpts from the controversial antiracketeering bill show conclusively that this act is the best protection the individual worker can have. Our workers need organization, but they need organization without exploitation.

I shall continue to be alert to the problems of our workers and will always fight against the infiltration of Johnny Dio's and Jimmy Hoffa's, and others who would misguide and misuse the laboring man, into our areas of the South. Do not forget that Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, our present nominee for the highest office of the United States, said he knew something must be done to protect the workingman from such unscrupulous labor bosses and he, as well as our two Louisiana Senators and every Louisiana Member of the House, voted for the Landrum-Griffin antiracketeering bill on final passage.

Resolutions Adopted by the New Jersey State Federation of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to commend to the attention of the Congress the following resolutions adopted at the convention of New Jersey State Federation of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc., recently held at the State Teachers College, Montclair, N.J. These were kindly sent to me by Mrs. E. Gertrude Jackson, of Newark, N.J., the corresponding secretary of this esteemed organization:

Whereas we the New Jersey State Federation of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc., in the spirit of Christian love and care for all members of the human race, deplore the use of atomic and thermonuclear energy for other than peaceful and humanitarian purposes, and pledge our support to the elimination of atomic and thermonuclear weapons: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this convention urge our President, Secretary of State, and Representatives in the Congress of our Nation to pursue all sincere means which would bring to an end the testing and production of nuclear weapons; in accordance with the principle of peace which respects justice, freedom, human integrity and good will among men and nations; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of State and to the Senators from the State of New Jersey.

Whereas the New Jersey State Federation of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc., having seen the public school system in the State of New Jersey integrated; and

Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court in 1957 outlawed segregation in public schools; and

Whereas in the year 1960 there still remains segregation in many public schools of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Federal Government through its Federal courts and its U.S. Attorney General's Office proceed with greater haste to fulfill the mandate of the U.S. Supreme Court thereby guaranteeing equal education to all children of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and to the Attorney General of the United States.

Whereas we the New Jersey State Federation of Colored Women's Clubs, Inc., are deeply concerned with the discrimination against the free access to restaurants, lunchrooms in the South; and

Whereas those States abridge and deny the equal protection of the law to all of their citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention urge our President and Representatives in the Congress to employ all means to eliminate such undemocratic practices against the citizens of those several States; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States and our Representatives in Congress.

Significance of the Polaris Missiles System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an excerpt from the London Sunday Express of July 25, 1960, which catches the significance of the Polaris weapons system and, by so doing, pays tribute to our Navy and to our Navy's special projects director, Adm. W. F. Raborn. The article follows:

The Sunday Express sees one of history's decisive moments in the underwater firing of the Polaris. The paper says it means that Russia, until now preeminent in rockets, has been overhauled. Even if it were possible for Russia in one sudden attack to wipe out every land-based aircraft in the West, she in turn would be utterly devastated by the firepower of submarines. The paper observes:

"Suddenly, in spectacular fashion, the whole balance of power has shifted again from Russia to the West. No longer are the formidable fixed-site rocket batteries of the Soviet Union the ultimate in weapons of destruction. The Americans have made a technical breakthrough comparable to the first explosion of an atom bomb. It is a cause for rejoicing in every country where liberty is prized. It is a triumph for the forces of peace, for if Russia knows that to attack would mean suicide, she will not attack at all."

William Parker Kennedy, President of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, Honored on His 50th Anniversary as a Member

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in making a part of this RECORD a most outstanding event concerning a most outstanding American.

On September 3, 1960, at the Leamington Hotel, Minneapolis, Minn., William Parker Kennedy, one of America's foremost citizens and great labor leaders, who is president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, will be honored on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of his membership in that organization.

Among the many distinguished persons who will be present at that time to pay their respects to Mr. Kennedy will be the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey and Eugene J. McCarthy, Senators from the State of Minnesota; the Honorable Roy W. Wier, Joseph E. Karth, Fred Marshall, and John A. Blatnik, Representatives from the State of Minnesota, and the following State officials from the State of Minnesota: the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, Governor; the Honorable Karl Rolvaag, Lieutenant Governor; the Honorable Walter F. Mondale, attorney general; the Honorable Joseph Donovan, secretary of state; the Honorable Roger L. Dell, Thomas Gallagher, Frank T. Gallagher, W. P. Murphy, and Lee Loevinger, justices of the supreme court. Also present will be: Robert A. Olson, president, Minnesota AFL–CIO Federation of Labor; Walter Cramond, president, Minneapolis CLU; and R. D. Cramer, editor, Labor Review.

Mr. Kennedy's achievements in his many years of dedicated effort on behalf of his fellow man in all elements of our society have long been recognized. His preeminent standing in American life has been accomplished in the classic American tradition, having risen from the most humble beginnings.

William Parker Kennedy has been president of the Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen since July 19, 1949 when he was appointed by the board of directors. He was elected by the Brotherhood's 29th convention in 1950 and reelected at the 1954 and 1960 conventions. The Brotherhood, with headquarters at 1528 Standard Building, Cleveland, Ohio, has a membership of 218,000 throughout the United States and Canada. It represents railway employees in train and yard service and intercity bus operators. Besides representing the members in labor-management matters it furnishes sound life, health and accident insurance to its members and it is one of the largest fraternal insurance societies in America.

Mr. Kennedy was born in Huttonville, Ontario, Canada, April 3, 1892, and came to Chicago, Ill., at the age of 10. He attended Ogden School, Chicago.

At the age of 17, he worked as a news butcher on the Rock Island Railroad, between Chicago and Des Moines, on the Rocky Mountain Limited.

He first saw train service as a freight brakesman, on the Dakota division of the Great Northern Railway, working out of Grand Forks, N. Dak., beginning such employment October 1, 1909.

On July 24, 1910, he joined Wheat Sheaf Lodge No. 463, of the Brotherhood, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., and has held continuous membership since that time. He resigned from the Great Northern Railway in 1914 and entered the service of the Canadian Pacific Railway, as a switchman, at Calgary, Alberta, Canada, May 7, 1911. He continued in this employment until October 22, 1911.

He was employed as a switchman on the Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul Railway, at Minneapolis, Minn., February 1, 1912, and still retains seniority rights in this terminal.

In 1913, he transferred his brotherhood membership to Minnehaha Lodge No. 625, Minneapolis, Minn., and retains his membership in that lodge.

He served as president and local chairman of that lodge and January 2, 1920, was elected secretary of the general grievance committee on the Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific Railroad. In April 1921, he was elected general chairman of the grievance committee. He served in such capacity until June 1935.

He attended the 1917, 1919, 1922, 1925, and 1928 conventions of the brotherhood, as a delegate, representing his lodge. At the latter convention, he was elected to the board of trustees and served as secretary of such board until June 1935, when the board of directors appointed him to the position of vice president in charge of the northwest territory of the United States and all of Canada, west of Fort William and Port Arthur.

While serving as vice president, he participated in numerous wage and rule movements and headed the committee which negotiated the Electric Lantern Agreements. He was in charge of the committtee, at Washington, D.C., in the 1928 wage reduction fight, when the widely quoted brotherhood defense book "Main Street Not Wall Street" was prepared and published.

From January 1, 1944, to August 30, 1946, Mr. Kennedy was in charge of the superpromotion department of the bortherhood, with headquarters at the Sherman Hotel, Chicago, Ill.

While in this work, Mr. Kennedy handled 146 representation disputes in the United States and Canada, involving railroads in every section of both countries. He was successful in achieving 109 brotherhood representation victories.

At the 1946 convention, held in Miami Beach, Fla., he was elected general secretary and treasurer and assumed that office January 1, 1947, and was serving in that capacity at the time he was appointed president.

While general secretary and treasurer, he also served as national reporting officer for the Railroad Retirement Board.

From July to September 1934, Mr. Kennedy made an extensive trip through Europe studying labor conditions in England, Ireland, Scotland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, Holland, Belgium, France, Switzerland, and Italy.

In May 1955, as a guest of the Israeli Government, visited that country, addressing large groups of railroad and Government works in Tel Aviv, Jerusalem, Beersheba, Tiberias, Haifa, and Jaffa. In July 1956, he was a delegate to the 24th Congress of the International Transport Workers Federation held at Vienna, Austria, at which time he also attended meetings at London, Paris, Rome, and Barcelona. In July 1958, he was a delegate to the 25th labor congress at Amsterdam, Netherlands; also attended meetings in Norway, Sweden, and Brussels, Belgium.

While serving the Brotherhood as secretary of the board of trustees, he traveled extensively through Canada and the United States, studying financial and banking conditions and wrote a series of articles for the official publication of the Brotherhood, entitled "History of Banking in Canada." Such articles have been extensively quoted in many leading financial and trade publications.

He was instrumental in bringing the use of "piggybacking" to the railroad industry several years ago, a development that has since proven of great financial advantage to the railroads, and promises to bring even greater business to the railroads in the future.

At present, he is engaged on another campaign—one to bring order to the present chaos of transportation in major cities of the land, particularly in such metropolitan complexes as are growing in the New York, Washington, D.C., Los Angeles, Cleveland, and Chicago areas.

Mr. Kennedy was married January 21, 1913, to Amy Hannah Berglund at Minneapolis, Minn. Their daughter and three sons are: Miss Phyllis Kennedy, assistant to the librarian, at Minneapolis; R. P. Kennedy, attorney, Minneapolis, Minn.; W. H. Kennedy, traffic representative, Soo Line, Minneapolis,

Minn.; and D. C. Kennedy, department manager, Sears, Roebuck & Co., Minneapolis. Mr. and Mrs. Kennedy have four grandchildren.

Mr. Kennedy is a member of Minnehaha Lodge 165, A. F. & A. M.; Ancient and Accepted Scottish Rite, and Zurah Temple A. A. O. N. M. S., in Minneapolis.

It is most appropriate and timely that the ceremony honoring the 50 years of devoted service of Mr. Kennedy to the preservation and enrichment of our democratic way of life be held on the eve of Labor Day.

Domestic Olive Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLAN HAGEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit for the information of the Congress an open letter from Mr. Daryl Hutchins, manager of the Olive Advisory Board, protesting a proposal under which the protective tariff on imported olives would be reduced by GATT agreement. The proposal is currently under consideration for execution when GATT agreements are renegotiated. It is evident that such action by our Government would be ruinous to our domestc olive industry. Mr. Hutchins' open letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO AMERICANS

The California olive industry, for some 30 years, has been penalized by an inadequate tariff which has arrested development of the industry; which has put most of the American olive oil plants out of business; which has affected the living standard of the California farmer; which has, in name of good relations with friendly nations, penalized one segment of American agriculture to the benefit of America as a whole, and now with further reduction being considered by the U.S. Tariff Commission, can inundate America with the product of Mediterranean countries, with the product of Mediterranean labor, with the product of lower living standards, actually import unemployed Americans.

We are appealing, farmer to farmer, laborer to laborer, American to American, manufacturer to manufacturer, for assistance, be it in the form of public ire and objection as manifested through letters, or other means, to convey to the President and the Vice President, the U.S. Tariff Commission, Senators, Congressmen, the objection by friends of the California olive industry, to lowering the tariff on olives. The American standard of living is the highest in the world. One sure way to break this down is to import the concept of production in Europe, sale in the United States with the chief weapon for economic murder being the gun of labor cost differential: "Pay less in Europe for labor; sell for more in America," the word "less" encompassing nothing more or less than labor in the Mediterranean area, working for a dollar a day, whereas Califronia pays 12 to 35 times that amount for its labor.

Many American industries are now in a position similar to that of the olive industry's predicament the last 30 years. It is just coming to the attention of the American public at this time; that American industries are faced with economic delirium tremens, with delirium between taxes and tariffs where, on the one hand, the taxpayer pays to the limit to provide foreign aid, which many times turns up in the form of a factory in a foreign country, manufacturing goods expressly designed to sell in the United States, in a market originally created by industrious American businessmen, and selling for less because the goods cost less, because labor is paid less. On the other hand, the tariff, in the name of reciprocity, unilateral in many respects, creates a "no-holds-barred" climate, because no protection is afforded the American labor standard of living against its cheap counterpart; he either works for less or has a tariff wall between himself and other labor around the world. Why should American labor go backward 30 years to adjust itself to worldwide conditions?

There is much discussion given to minimum wage. If they are going to legislate minimum wage scales, then American industries must secure more money for their products to create a better living standard. You cannot increase the minimum wage and reduce tariffs at the same time and expect to operate in the black. To insure better wages, necessary protection in the form of an equitable tariff must be afforded American industry.

On August 23 the olive industry intends to make known that the peril point has already been reached; that the growth of the industry has been arrested, and that we need a higher tariff to maintain a rightful place for the California industry and not sacrifice it in the name of reciprocity.

The olive industry sympathizes with the steel industry, and the fact that imports have caused some 56,000 people their jobs in America in the steel industry alone, because we have given money to subsidize foreign countries' production. Each year, some 700,000 passenger cars have been lost to American production, which would have employed 65,000 American workmen. Where is reciprocity when trade barriers are erected in foreign countries and we have lowered ours? What is the reason behind this economic fallacy and where will it lead us?

Is it conceivable, where an American laborer wishes to keep up wage rates and American industry wishes to have satisfactory working arrangements with labor, that this concept can be advanced against tariff practices that completely nullify growth for so many industries, wherein we provide the wherewithall in the name of foreign aid for other countries, and yet do not allow sufficient write off to replace obsolete equipment here in America? The laborers and industry are operating with one hand tied behind their backs; and yet have to compete with the world labor pool, which is 30 years behind American advancement.

We in the industry feel that the 30 cents a gallon tariff, as initiated in 1930, represents a little more than one-third the original intended amount. In the words of the President: "Certainly I know we must find a substitute for the purely temporary business of bolstering the free nations through annual handouts. That gets neither permanent results nor friends." We agree with the President. However, 8 years later, we are still in the giveaway business; this time through concessionary tariff measures at the expense of a strong farmer, strong laborer, and a prosperous consumer.

In many areas, our strong farmers are growing weaker. The backbone of America, the man and wife, the farmers, who are long on determination and short on cash are becoming a passing memory. We must be realistic about tariffs. Our industry does not seek payments for not growing their product and it does not seek support prices. We will take care of our own, if the Government does not lower the barrier to inundate America with that which can put the small farmer and processor out of business. In the olive industry, if there is a surplus the Government does not take care of this problem; the farmer takes it on the chin.

DARYL HUTCHINS,
Manager, Olive Advisory Board,
San Francisco, Calif.

International Control of Outer Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the third colloquium on the law of outer space was held yesterday, August 16, 1960, as part of the 11th International Astronautical Congress in Stockholm, Sweden.

Dr. John Cobb Cooper, professor emeritus of international air law at McGill University and an authority on international law and the efforts to establish laws for outer space, in this, the space age, is presenting a paper at this conference.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including Professor Cooper's paper so that it may be called to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, and to the American people:

INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF OUTER SPACE—SOME PRELIMINARY PROBLEMS

(By John Cobb Cooper, LL.M., LL.D., honorary professor emeritus, international air law, McGill University, member permanent legal committee, IAF)

As part of any final decision on methods for the control of outer-space flight, certain preliminary questions must be answered. This memorandum seeks to raise the most important.

I. WHAT IS MEANT BY OUTER SPACE?

"Outer space," for political and legal purposes must be a finite geographic area, otherwise it could not be subject to "control." Also, it must be outside the areas subject to territorial sovereignty, otherwise it could not be subject to international control. It is therefore suggested that in any international convention for control of outer space or of flight into such areas the following opening statements be included:

"1. Outer space, for the purposes of this convention, is defined as the area whose upper or outer boundary is the outer limits of the solar system, and whose lower or inner boundary is the lowest altitude above the earth's surface at which an artificial satellite may be put in orbit around the earth.

"2. The contracting states hereby declare that no state has or can have sovereignty over such area or any part thereof or any celestial bodies therein."

My friends will recall that in 1956, before Sputnik I was launched, I suggested to the American Society of International Law a new convention: First, reaffirming absolute sovereignty of the subjacent state up to the height at which aircraft could be operated; then further extending limited sovereignty upward to 300 miles above the earth's surface; then accepting the principle that all space above should be free for passage.

In 1957, a few weeks after Sputnik I was launched, I published a memorandum in which I pointed out that my 1956 suggestion was based on earlier and then widely accepted scientific opinion to the effect that somewhere not far below 300 miles the atmos-

phere had sufficient density to prevent free satellite flight, but that Sputnik I had proved this premise to be unsound. It is nevertheless interesting to note that of the satellites now in orbit around the earth the most recent figures indicate that only those satellites with a minimum altitude of over 320 miles above the earth's surface have an estimated orbital life of more than a few months or a few years.

The legal necessity of fixing the lower boundary of outer space is clear. Under accepted principles of customary international law, the Chicago convention, and many national statutes, the area called airspace above national lands and waters is delt with as part of the territory of the subjacent state, which alone has the right to control all flight in this area and to prohibit the entry of foreign flight instrumentalities. However the legal status of outer space is, or under the proposed convention, would be diametrically opposed. For outer space we should accept the high seas principles cogently stated by Mr. Justice Storey in 1826 ("The Marianna Flora," 11 Wheat. 1):

"Upon the ocean, then, in time of peace, all possess an entire equality. It is the common highway of all, appropriated to the use of all; and no one can vindicate to himself a superior prerogative there. Every ship sails there with the unquestionable right of pursuing her own lawful business without interruption; but whatever may be that business, she is bound to pursue it in such a manner as not to violate the rights of others."

If this be the status of outer space, states could without question delegate to an international body the right to control the use of the area, or could between themselves agree on the type of flight permissible in the area. But whether the proposed control be political or functional, the area affected must be defined. An approximate lower boundary of outer space must be fixed. As the United Nations ad hoc Committee on the Peaceful Uses of Outer Space pointed out in its 1959 report, the upper limit of the airspace and the lower limit of outer space do not necessarily coincide. In fixing the lower limit of outer space at the altitude where an earth satellite may be put in orbit, no decision is required as to whether the absolute air space sovereignty of the subjacent state extends upward to that line.

The boundary here suggested would appear to be in the area of 80 to 100 miles above the earth's surface. At least one satellite has been put in orbit around the earth at a minimum orbital altitude (perigee) of 99 miles. At an altitude of 70 to 75 miles meteors have been observed in an incandescent, or burning state. At 100 miles altitude, and in fact much lower, the air no longer exists. At the earth's surface it consists of about 78 percent molecular nitrogen, 20 percent molecular oxygen, and small quantities of argon, carbon dioxide, and water vapor.

At 50 miles altitude the temperature has dropped sharply, the atmospheric density is only about one-millionth of the surface density, and not sufficient to contribute in any degree to the aerodynamic lift of flight instrumentalities.

At 100 miles altitude the temperature has increased up to 2,000° F. or more, the atmospheric density has further decreased to one-billionth of the surface density, the oxygen molecules have already broken down into separate oxygen atoms, and satellite flight has been proven practical. This extremely thin gaseous combination of a few nitrogen molecules, oxygen atoms, and perhaps particles of other gases, has little if any resemblance to the substance ordinarily called air which we breathe and which is needed to support the flight of aircraft envisaged when the Paris and Chicago conventions accepted the principle of airspace sovereignty.

This suggested lower boundary of outer space has therefore practical as well as legal advantages. It is a real boundary. Whatever future observations prove to be the lowest altitude of free satellite flight around the earth will be the lower boundary of the area subject to international control.

It is my recollection that this general boundary location was suggested at a meeting under the auspices of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences in which I participated. In any event, the proposal did not originate with me. My only contribution has been to analyze and elaborate its possible application.

(NOTE.—The statements as to the composition of the air and figures as to atmospheric density are paraphrased from testimony of Dr. Homer E. Newell, Jr., Assistant Director for Space Sciences, NASA, April 8, 1959, before a subcommittee of the U.S. Senate Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, p. 127, pt. I, printed record, hearings on Senate bill 1582.)

II. WHAT ARE THE PRESENT RIGHTS OF SOVEREIGN STATES IN OUTER SPACE?

Assuming that the legal status of outer space as already defined in this paper, is now analogous to that of the high seas, as I personally believe, or that such status will eventually be accepted by formal international agreement, certain presently existing rights of individual states must be acknowledged and preserved. These are particularly the rights of self-protection and self-defense.

The very limited scope of this memorandum will not permit more than the barest outline of how U.S. thinking has historically dealt with these questions.

As early as 1804 the noted Chief Justice Marshall said (*Church* v. *Hubbart*, 2 Cranch 187): "The authority of a nation within its own territory is absolute and exclusive. * * * But its power to secure itself from injury may certainly be exercised beyond the limits of its territory." This statement still stands in our jurisprudence. It would be directly applicable to the right of a subjacent state to secure itself from injury in outer space beyond its territorial airspace.

Our chairman today, Dr. Jenks, in his "The Common Law of Mankind," has quoted from a statement of Daniel Webster, as Secretary of State, in the *Caroline* case (1837) that necessity justifying acts of self-defense (outside national territory) is "confined to cases in which the necessity of that self-defense is instant, overwhelming, and leaving no choice of means, and no moment for deliberation." As Dr. Jenks points out, this statement was cited with approval in the Nuremberg cases. But certainly no emergency could leave less chance for deliberation than a threat from outer space.

Perhaps the most important analysis of the problem made in the United States is found in an address delivered in 1914 by the late Elihu Root as president of the American Society of International Law. Mr. Root served as Secretary of State and also as U.S. Senator from New York. In discussing the right of self-protection as a right recognized by international law he said (8 AJIL—6): "The right is a necessary corollary of independent sovereignty. It is well understood that the exercise of the right of self-protection may and frequently does extend in its effect beyond the limits of the territorial jurisdiction of the state exercising it"; and later, in a much quoted phrase he asserted "the right of every sovereign state to protect itself by preventing a condition of affairs in which it will be too late to protect itself."

As I said in 1959 in a paper on "Flight Space Law" published in Handbuch der Astronautik: "This principle has already been applied toward the regulation of flight. In 1950 the United States and Canada established air defense identification zones around parts of their respective shores. Admittedly the airspace over the high seas is not territorial space and enjoys the same international status as the high seas themselves. Yet the United States and Canada did not hesitate to establish regulations to prevent unidentified aircraft approaching their shores from the seas. The U.S. regulation, for example, requires that foreign aircraft must report their presence and identification when not less than 1 hour or more than 2 hours averaging cruising distance via the most direct route to the shore. This is a clear application of the right of self-preservation and self-defense applicable outside national territory and within international flight space. It may well be that the same right exists for subjacent states to act in outerspace above national territorial airspace to the extent deemed necessary for the protection and defense of the lands below."

In any future agreement for international control of outer space these national rights of self-protection and self-defense should be preserved. It is submitted that nothing in the United Nations charter is opposed to this view. While article 51 deals solely with the right of individual or collective self-defense "if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations," it is my firm belief that this does not take away already existing international law rights of self-protection which have long been supported as part of the international law applicable to all states.

III. IS INTERNATIONAL CONTROL OF OUTER SPACE INCONSISTENT WITH PROVISIONS OF THE CHICAGO CONVENTION?

In any convention dealing with the international control of outer space, the most careful consideration must be given to possible conflicts with the 1944 Chicago convention on International Civil Aviation. This will be particularly true if the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) is not chosen as the agency to exercise outer space control.

One of the major difficulties is that the convention deals solely with the regulation of the flight of aircraft. The term "aircraft" is not there defined. However, ICAO has adopted an annex to the convention containing the following definition: "Aircraft shall comprise all apparatus or contrivances which can derive support in the atmosphere from reactions of the air." Certainly this definition does not include rockets, guided missiles, earth satellites or more fully developed later types of spacecraft. Ordinarily these do not derive support from reactions of the air. A difficulty, however, will arise in case the ICAO definition is modified or amplified to include flight instrumentalities as aircraft even though they do not derive support during flight from reactions of the air. If that is done the most careful consideration must be given to a possible conflict in the regulatory powers of ICAO and the new space organization, particularly as to which agency can regulate spacecraft flight while passing through the airspace and before entering or after leaving outer space.

Article 3 of the Chicago convention specifically prohibits state aircraft from flying over the territory of another state without special authorization. Any new convention for the control of outer space must make it clear that this provision applies only to flight through the airspace. Otherwise serious difficulties may arise as to the flight in outer space of those flight instrumentalities which can derive support from the air while operating in the airspace but can proceed beyond into outer space and continue in flight as spacecraft.

Article 8 of the Chicago convention provides that no aircraft capable of being flown without a pilot shall be flown without a pilot over the territory of a contracting state without special authorization. Again this provision may create difficulty if ICAO modifies its definition of aircraft. Accordingly either

by amendment of the Chicago convention or by any new convention it should be made clear that this article applies solely to flight in the airspace. As it now reads there is no height limit as to its applicability.

Article 12 of the convention deals with the rules of the air. Each contracting state undertakes to keep its own regulations uniform to the greatest possible extent with those established from time to time under the convention. It then states: "Over the high seas, the rules in force shall be those established under this convention." As chairman of the drafting committee at the 1944 Chicago conference which brought this provision before the conference I then understood it to mean, and still do, that states who are parties to the Chicago convention have delegated to ICAO the power to adopt mandatory flight rules applicable to the flight of aircraft over the high seas. It will be noted that the convention places no height limit over the high seas as to the applicability of such rules. If ICAO modifies its definition of aircraft so as to apply to spacecraft, difficulties may arise as to whether the ICAO rules or the rules of an international space agency will apply to flight of spacecraft over the high seas. Even if the article is construed, as I believe, to be applicable only to flight in the airspace, conflicts of jurisdiction may be present so far as the movements of spacecraft are concerned in the airspace over the high seas, particularly if the ICAO rules and the rules of the new space agency are not precisely the same. Even then the question of which agency will have power to enforce the rules over the high seas will require very accurate thinking and drafting.

These appear to be the major presently foreseeable difficulties created by international control of outerspace if that control is not vested in ICAO. If it is so placed, the difficulties and possible conflicts will be very greatly lessened. These are questions which must be determined preliminary to any final decision as to methods of control of outerspace and flight instrumentalities proceeding from the earth's surface into outer space and thereafter returning through the airspace.

Federal Tax Deduction as Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which will aid taxpayers in their endeavors to provide education for their children and themselves. No grant or loan by the Federal Government is provided for in this bill. Assistance is provided in the form of an income tax deduction for a taxpayer to the extent of $600 paid by him for tuition for each dependent or himself. This deduction will be available for those taxpayers whose dependents attend private, parochial, secondary school, college, or university, and who are required to pay tuition.

Our country is the greatest in the world in the production of goods and in its material wealth. Our position in the field of education is a matter of speculation. Certain critics, notably Adm. Hyman G. Rickover, who studied the Russian educational system, assert that we are falling behind the Russians in this field. In any event, room for improvement exists not only in facilities and curriculum, but also in the availability of education. Reliable reports disclose that some brilliant students are denied higher educational opportunities for lack of funds. Others are denied educational opportunities for lack of facilities. Others are compelled to attend private or parochial schools because public facilities are overcrowded or unavailable. In many instances, taxpayers, because of the high cost of education, cannot afford the tuition for more than one of their children; and, consequently, the younger ones suffer. With the increasing cost of tuition, the burden on the taxpayer has grown heavier. The situation cries for remedy.

My bill provides a remedy. It provides assistance to the taxpayer without resorting to the timeworn remedy of more money. My bill will indirectly relieve municipalities of some of their burdens by diverting some of the students to private schools and will reduce to an extent the requirement of increased taxes to finance education.

Some Background on the Cash Relief Bill for West Indians and Other Non-U.S. Citizens Who Helped Build Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, when any of us in the Congress see our former colleague, the Honorable Maurice H. Thatcher, of Kentucky, or read one of his letters, we are constantly impressed by the tremendous amount of effort he still continues to exert in behalf of the causes of other people—he is a selfless do-gooder, and I use that term in its highest sense of approval and admiration. Perhaps, because the phrase "do-gooder" is often considered uncomplimentary, I should call him instead a good-doer, for he is certainly that.

Mr. Thatcher, only surviving member of the Commission which built the Panama Canal, and a former Civil Governor of the Canal Zone as well as the first Governor of the Canal Zone, has for years worked for better treatment of the construction workers and has never let an opportunity pass to impress upon the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries' Subcommittee on the Panama Canal, of which I am chairman, the need for legislation in behalf of those who helped build the canal a half century ago.

I am very proud and deeply touched as a result of receiving a recent letter from former Congressman Thatcher commenting on the enactment of H.R. 10511, which I introduced at his urging. I am sure many other Members of the Congress will be interested in Mr. Thatcher's letter, and so I include it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Appendix as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., *August 4, 1960.*

Mrs. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MRS. SULLIVAN: I wish to express my most earnest appreciation for your splendid service with respect to the enactment of H.R. 10511 at this session of Congress.

This measure—which became a law upon its approval by the President on the 14th of July—will benefit a group of non-U.S. citizens, retirees of the Panama Canal and Canal Zone organizations, about 4,000 in number. They are, as you know, chiefly West Indians (colored), who have rendered long, faithful, and effective service; and the straight $10 a month benefit for each such retiree named in the bill, when added—as it now will be—to the small cash benefits they are now receiving—will prove to them a veritable God-send.

You, Mrs. Thatcher, and I came to New York from the isthmus, by ship, in November 1958. During the voyage you and I had a full discussion of the plight of these retirees, and because of my familiarity with the subject I was able to supply valuable information; and you had seen for yourself certain aspects involved. You evidenced the deepest sympathy for them, and assured me that you would be glad to do what you could to aid them.

Accordingly, in February 1960 you introduced the measure; and as chairman of the subcommittee (of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries) on Panama Canal legislation, you arranged for a hearing on the bill, April 12 and 13; and asked me to appear and testify in its behalf, and to submit supporting evidence. This I did.

As you know, I am the only surviving member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, which was charged with the duty of supervising the building of the canal; and, also, during the construction era, I was Civil Governor of the Canal Zone. Afterward I served five terms in Congress, from Kentucky. Since my official service on the isthmus ceased, I have made six visits there, and have kept in touch, throughout, with conditions there; and have always sought to serve the just interests of the canal and Canal Zone Government employees; and this, of course, without charge or compensation.

Because I have known of the conditions under which those of the indicated group have always labored, I early felt, and have ever retained, a strong sympathy for them, and I am very happy over the recent outcome, and most grateful therefor. You have done a fine piece of humanitarian service in sponsoring this relief measure, and you have exercised diligence and skill. These beneficiaries are your everlasting debtors, and their representations to me indicate their sense of gratitude.

Speaking for myself, I am not only deeply appreciative for what you have done in this connection, but am gratified that I was privileged to aid somewhat the successful labors of such a competent legislator as yourself.

Mrs. Thatcher joins me in affectionate regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

MAURICE H. THATCHER.

Communist Subversion of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Evening Star of Tuesday, July 26, 1960:

COMMUNIST SUBVERSION OF YOUTH—BOTH POLITICAL PLATFORMS ARE DESCRIBED AS IGNORING DANGER OF SOME TEACHINGS

(By Constantine Brown)

Both the Democratic and Republican platforms include subjects intended to brace this country for the internal and foreign problems it will be facing in the sixties, except those of Communist subversion at home.

The standard bearers of both parties are fully conversant with the potential domestic difficulties we are facing because of the mounting efforts at subversion, especially of American youth, as a result of the efforts of international communism. In an effort to draw attention of leaders and the public to this grave problem, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has made public a well-documented study entitled "Communist Target—Youth."

Mr. Hoover pointed out that Lenin himself laid down the principle that "youth will decide the issue of the entire struggle, both the student youth and the working class youth."

American Communists, Mr. Hoover goes on to say, have been working diligently over the years on our youth. In 1959 their work was stepped up "when campuses throughout the Nation became prime targets of infiltration and recruitment. * * * The party began operating what amounted to a regular lecturing bureau with party spokesmen seizing every opportunity to project their views on campuses across the country."

Pointing to the extraordinary success of Communist-led youth in Korea, Japan and Turkey, Mr. Hoover said that many Americans believe that it can't happen here. But the Communists' success in San Francisco (when they stopped the hearings of the Un-American Activities Committee) proves that it can happen here.

Both Senator KENNEDY and the Democratic platform have endorsed the sit-in strikes of Negro students. The reasons for the sit-ins may or may not be valid. But the method is not.

It is not only political leaders who unwittingly give encouragement to youthful disdain for law and order. It is also some of their teachers, enjoying academic freedom, who prepare our youth by teaching them that our form of government is obsolescent.

The House committee has made available films of the San Francisco riots. Viewing them is a most chilling experience. These boys and girls had been fed academic poison from bottles with insidious labels. Many teachers and professors follow the new philosophy propounded by the Canadian psychiatrist, Dr. Brock Chisholm in his book, "Prescription for Survival," and reiterated by him at the National Conference of Social Welfare at Atlantic City last spring. As reported in the Washington Star on June 9, 1960, he stated that dependence on the obsolete Constitution of the United States is a form of magic Americans must give up to survive in the nuclear age.

And, according to a report in the Washington Post and Times-Herald of June 11, 1960, the Rev. Dr. Samuel Miller, dean of the Harvard Divinity School, stated that the new dimensions of life have made the old-time God "at least questionable, perhaps irrelevant, or even ridiculous."

Vincent X. Flaherty, Los Angeles Examiner columnist, reported that a psychology textbook used in Los Angeles high schools contained a shocking questionnaire. "For how much money," it asked, "would you do or suffer the following: Eat a pound of human flesh? Drink enough to become intoxicated? Choke a stray cat to death?" These are but a few of like questions, but the alltime low was reached by the following: "For how much money would you spit on a crucifix?"

It would seem that the controversial congressional bill demanding loyalty oaths for students is putting the cart before the horse. It is the professors and high school teachers who bend the twig.

Young boys and girls who have been taught that patriotism is corny, that God is "ridiculous" and morality "for the birds" are pushovers for Communist-inspired riots. And the growing number of youthful demonstrations since the San Francisco episode should cause our political leaders to at least raise their eyebrows and ask themselves: Will mere spending of dollars to build new school buildings and raise the pay of the teachers suffice to meet this problem which has been swept under the rug by the two conventions?

Medical Aid for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the following is a copy of an advertisement appearing in various newspapers of the country. In my opinion it places the problem of medical aid for the aged in its proper perspective. Because it does just that, I call the attention of my colleagues to it by placing it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

MEDICAL AID FOR THE AGED—LET US HELP THOSE WHO NEED HELP

You're walking across a busy street and you see an elderly man stumble and fall. What do you do? If you're like 99 out of 100 Americans, you help him to his feet.

But if you see that same man crossing the street without any trouble, you let him go his own way. He doesn't need help. He hasn't asked for help. And if you offered it to him, chances are he'd resent it.

Now helping others is the decent thing to do. But helping those who don't need help doesn't make much sense.

Right now Congress is considering how it could go about helping our older people meet the costs of their health care. Our older citizens deserve every consideration. Certainly they are entitled to the chance to live their lives as fully as possible, with dignity and independence, with faith and pride in themselves.

But every physician knows better than to think that all older people are sick. They aren't. The great majority of them are in good health. Some are not.

By the same token, all of those over 65 are not hardship cases. Some are needy. Most are not.

As physicians, we deal with older people every day. And we believe that older people differ from younger people only to the extent that they have celebrated a few more birthdays. We believe that the elderly must be treated as individuals because they are individuals—as different from each other as their fingerprints.

The American Medical Association hopes Congress will keep these facts in mind if it enacts a law to help the aged pay the cost of health care. The AMA believes our Nation, as well as its senior citizens, will best be served by a locally administered health aid program designed to help those who need help.

A program that will do this is envisioned in title VI (Medical Services for the Aged) of the Mills bill (H.R. 12580, 86th Cong.). Already passed by the House of Representatives, the Mills bill is now up for further congressional consideration. As physicians and as citizens, the doctors of America urge its passage.

We do so because we are concerned about those among the aged whose health needs cannot be met through private resources, health insurance or prepayment plans. Title VI of the bill introduced by Representative Wilbur Mills, Democrat, of Arkansas, is the answer to the problems of this minority. It proposes a Federal grant-in-aid program for the needy and the near needy—to be administered locally for the benefit of locally determined beneficiaries.

This bill will help those who really need help. And it allows those who don't need help to maintain their independence. Furthermore, by calling for local administration, this program allows experts on the spot to tailor government help to individual need. This is important because medical care is a personal thing; it cannot be mass produced, or administered at long range.

The American Medical Association enthusiastically endorses the principle of helping those among the aging who need help. We are equally sincere in our opposition to legislative measures that approach the problem on a shotgun basis—with the idea of increasing repeatedly the social security tax in order to finance health benefits for everyone who is covered by the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program, regardless of the individual's need.

There are many serious hazards in using the social security approach to finance medical and hospital care for our older citizens. When Government starts telling the doctor how to practice medicine; telling the nurses how to nurse; telling the hospital how to handle its patient—the quality of medical care is sure to decline. The cost of such a program eventually would be staggering, and would make a serious dent in the pay envelopes of millions of Americans covered by social security. Private voluntary health insurance, which has been doing such a magnificent job, would be undermined and, in time, destroyed.

Most important, perhaps, is the fact that such an approach would be just the beginning of compulsory, Government-run medical care for every man, woman and child in the United States. For it wouldn't be long before the Federal Government would be lowering the age at which people would be eligible, and adding one costly service after another to a program that would place your health care under the Federal Government's thumb. And let's not forget that our present health care is recognized to be the world's finest.

For the reasons stated here, and many more, the 178,000 physician-members of the American Medical Association strongly urge passage of title VI of the Mills bill and rejection of a compulsory Federal approach in any form. (Should you wish to know more about this problem, we suggest you discuss it with your family physician.)

Let us, together, with common sense and a full recognition of our common obligation, help those of the aging who need help.

Time To Redouble Our Dedication to the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been renewed American interest in and dedication to the United Nations. This has resulted partly from the challenge to the stature and importance of that world body posed by the crisis in the Congo.

Thoughtful consideration of the U.N.'s record to date—the wonderful progress which has been made and the accomplishments it has achieved—should lead all Americans to redouble their faith in this world forum. It should renew our appreciation that the U.N. offers the world's best hope for lasting peace.

The forthcoming resignation of Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge as our representative to the United Nations has also served to underscore the growing influence of the world agency in the search for peace with justice. As the Ambassador noted in his letter to the President on August 17, "The United Nations has grown greatly in size, and influence, and in indispensability as a preventer of war—and as a builder of peace."

Ambassador Lodge has contributed extraordinarily to the enhancement of the U.N.'s stature, as President Eisenhower noted in his letter regretfully accepting his resignation. Certainly, no objective observer can disagree with the President's view that Ambassador Lodge deserves "the gratitude of all the American people" for his tireless work in the U.N. His has been the voice of immediate truth, of American good intentions and good faith, in the face of Communist innuendo, distortion, and falsehoods. Through his efforts America's world standing has been increased and the virtues of democracy over communism have been more clearly etched for all the world to see.

Mr. President, a very thoughtful editorial in the Brighton-Pittsford (N.Y.) Post of August 18 points up some of the encouraging aspects of recent U.N. activities. It also notes the importance of the work of the American Association for the United Nations and its chapters in insuring America's continued strong participation in the U.N. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRAVO, U.N.

We don't know whether the situation in the Congo is fully under control—and it is obvious that it will be years before the new nation fully adjusts to its status as an independent State.

Yet, surely, in the midst of all the gloom on the world horizon, there is something wonderfully encouraging about the performance of the United Nations in this crisis.

It is true, perhaps, that the U.N. possibly isn't ready yet to solve the problem posed by aggressive world communism, but surely it has come a very long way in the years since its organization at San Francisco in 1945.

Every crisis surmounted means that much prestige gained, that much experience acquired. Obviously, the world is far from the "rule of law" for which the founders of the U.N. hoped, but the brilliant and imaginative work in the Congo shows that meaningful progress is being made.

We would also point out that this recent success should be tremendously encouraging to the Rochester Association for the United Nations, and groups like it throughout the world. All these groups, from time to time, must face vexation and frustration in their efforts, yet the success of the U.N. is rooted basically in the hold it has on men's minds everywhere. For this, associations like the local one can claim a major share of credit.

That knowledge should be a challenge for redoubled efforts in the future.

Profile of a City: Lawrence, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in including an article about my home city of Lawrence, Mass., which appeared in the Merrimack Valley Communicator, official publication of the Western Electric Co., in North Andover, Mass., issue of August 1960:

PROFILE OF A CITY: LAWRENCE

The lifeblood of Lawrence, down through its history, has been water.

Powerful and abundant, the waters of the Merrimack River raced over Bodwell's Falls—a tumbling rapid with a descent of only 4 or 5 feet—with a strength which aroused the interest and imagination of an Andover textile man named Daniel Saunders. Pausing frequently while crossing the wooden bridge which then connected Methuen and Andover near where the O'Leary bridge now stands, Saunders made a discovery: the thrust of the river at this point was much more powerful than casual observation would indicate.

His interest completely captivated when he proved his discovery by using nothing more than a square and a spirit level to reveal the true incline of the river from Lowell to the falls, Saunders' imagination moved to the fore with a vision of a great industrial city to be built on the banks of the Merrimack. No idle dreamer, he set about to make his thought a reality.

ESSEX CO. FORMED

Moving with quiet diligence, Saunders brought about the formation of the Merrimack River Water Power Association in 1843 with Samuel Lawrence as president-treasurer and Saunders as agent. This organization set about raising funds with which to build a dam and to purchase lands adjacent to the river. A year later, the association's interests were sold to another group which formed the Essex Co. in 1845 to develop the water power of the Merrimack River below Lowell. Abbott Lawrence was named president of the Essex Co., with Charles S. Storrow (later to be elected the city's first mayor) as treasurer and general agent. Mr. Lawrence, is his lifetime, was also a Congressman, served as a U.S. minister to Great Britain, and missed being nominated for the Vice Presidency of the United States by only five votes.

ONCE CALLED MERRIMACK

Despite the suggestion of many people who helped in the founding of the city, Daniel Saunders declined to have the settlement he brought into being named after him. Instead, he proposed that it be named Merrimack. In fact, the first post office established in the area was called the Merrimack Post Office. It was eventually decided, however, to name the city Lawrence in honor of the Lawrence family, so prominent in the industrial life of the valley.

In 1847, by Massachusetts Legislative enactment, land was taken from Methuen and Andover to comprise the town of Lawrence. The area taken from Methuen on the north bank of the Merrimack and from Andover on the south bank was about evenly divided and consisted of 6.75 square miles. So fast did the settlement grow, it was incorporated as a city in 1853. The present commission type of government went into effect on January 1, 1912.

THE LAWRENCE DAM

The Lawrence Dam, built just above the O'Leary Bridge, was in its day a masterpiece of engineering. Excavations for the dam began in August 1845. The first stone was laid in the center on September 19 of that year and the last of the capstones were placed just 3 years later.

Under the guidance of the officers of the Essex Co., Lawrence became a boomtown of industrial building. Where there were only 150 people in the settlement in 1845, there were 8,282 in the area just 5 years later. The Washington mills were laid out in April 1846. The Atlantic Cotton Mills followed a few months later. Many other mills quickly were placed under construction in short order.

DIVERSIFIED INDUSTRY

While Lawrence, for most of its history, was primarily a textile center—one of the largest woolen producers in the world—it has succeeded in effecting a diversification of its industries. It is today considered the leading wholesale trading center of the Merrimack Valley. Manufacturing is the predominant economic pursuit in the city. Principal products include leather and leather goods, paper and allied products, textile mill products, apparel and other finished goods, and machinery.

SOME FAMOUS SONS

A number of Lawrence men have made themselves known in the world of letters and of music. Lawrence was the home of Leonard Bernstein, the famous symphonic conductor, and of John McNulty, the author. Perhaps the most famous graduate of Lawrence High school is the dean of American poets, Robert Frost.

A native of San Francisco, Frost came to Lawrence via Methuen at an early age. Graduating from Lawrence High in 1892, he was covaledictorian of his class with Elinor White, who became his wife 3 years later. Frost played right end or left end (according to the coach's whim) for Lawrence High. The first Robert Frost poem ever published, "La Noche Trist," was published in the Lawrence high school publication, The Bulletin. In his senior year, he became editor of The Bulletin. Annoyed at the lack of material submitted for publication, Frost wrote one whole issue himself, then irately resigned as editor.

Following graduation, he worked for a while as a lamp trimmer at the Arlington mills. He then went into teaching in Methuen. Later to become a Pulitzer Prize winner, Frost first sold a poem to a national publication in 1894. It was "My Butterfly: An Elegy," and netted him $15. He moved from this area to Derry, N.H., where he took

up farming. Now he is on the staff of the Library of Congress.

Frost wasn't the only Lawrence poet to gain fame. It was a Lawrence native by the name of Ernest L. Thayer who penned the immortal lines:

"And somewhere men are laughing,
And somewhere children shout,
But there is no joy in Mudville—
Mighty Casey has struck out!"

Tenth Anniversary of the Repeal of the 10-Cent-Per-Pound Tax on Margarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, July 1 was the 10th anniversary of the repeal by Congress of the 10-cent-per-pound tax on margarine. The passage of the National Margarine Act of 1950 marked the commencement of a period of fair competition for colored margarine in interstate commerce and in most States.

Production of margarine has increased from 862 million pounds in 1949 to the alltime high in 1959 of 1,611 million pounds. Production for the period January–April 1960 was 6.8 percent ahead of 1959.

The 10-year period since the repeal of the old Federal margarine taxes and restrictions has been marked by a growth in the acceptance of margarine. Per capita consumption, on a national average, has increased from 5.8 pounds per person in 1949 to 9.2 pounds per person in 1959.

During 1958, manufacturers in the margarine industry shipped products valued at $219 million, an increase of 10 percent over 1954, according to the U.S. Department of Commerce. Value added by the manufacturer, as adjusted, totaled $56.7 million, an increase of 29 percent since 1954. New capital expenditures in the margarine industry were reported by the Department of Commerce to be 3.4 million, an increase from 1954 of 127 percent. Figures are not available for other years.

The margarine industry is composed of firms of various sizes and types of enterprises, including small, family-owned firms. There are 32 firms with 60 plants producing margarine in the United States.

The chief ingredients of margarine are highly refined vegetable oils. American-produced soybean oil and cottonseed oil are the major vegetable oils used. Between 1949 and 1959 consumption of these oils almost doubled to reach 1,218 million pounds, refined basis. Further increases are expected. Corn and peanut oils are also used.

By far the largest source of fats and oils used in margarine is the American soybean. Soybean oil used in margarine reached a new peak of 1,094 million pounds—refined basis—in 1959 and constituted 85 percent of all the fats and oils used in margarine.

Ten years after the act of 1950 there are still restrictions on the sale and use of margarine. The consumer cannot buy colored margarine in Wisconsin and Minnesota. Six States—Wisconsin, Minnesota, Idaho, Utah, North and South Dakota—still maintain per-pound taxes. The U.S. Navy cannot buy margarine for table use, although the other branches of the military can. There are various restrictions in State laws on dealers, State institutions' use of the vegetable spread and use by public eating places.

Major factors in the margarine outlook are continued population growth, plentiful supplies of major farm ingredients, a vigorously competitive industry, and continued increasing consumer acceptance that has raised per capita use levels for several years.

Margarine is 80 percent fat. The principal other ingredient is pasteurized, cultured skim milk. In 1959 margarine used an estimated 240 million pounds of dry skim milk or its equivalent in fluid milk. Salt comprises about 2½ percent of the finished product.

All margarine is fortified to provide a minimum of 15,000 U.S.P. units of vitamin A. Some margarines add vitamin D also.

Great Challenge to the U.N.—Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I commend to the serious study of my colleagues and to our policy planners in the State Department an article by Representative CHESTER BOWLES in the August 21 edition of the New York Times magazine, called "Great Challenge to the U.N.—Africa."

Congressman BOWLES is concerned that the continent of Africa is going to become subject to the most disruptive pressures of the cold war. Its galloping problems are grave enough without compounding the seriousness of them by bringing the cold war infighting to Africa.

Therefore, Mr. BOWLES, with his usual clarity of insight, proposes a program that would keep Africa out of the cold war by having the United Nations administer the help that the new nations need. His plan is imaginative; it is highly necessary; and, most important, it is workable. Further, it is not a negative, stopgap program, but rather a positive one of action.

This is a most judicious and statesmanlike article and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREAT CHALLENGE TO THE U.N.—AFRICA—MR. BOWLES OFFERS A PROGRAM THAT, HE SAYS, WOULD KEEP THAT EXPLOSIVE CONTINENT OUT OF THE COLD WAR BY HAVING THE U.N. ADMINISTER THE HELP ITS NEW NATIONS NEED

(By CHESTER BOWLES)

The recent explosion in the Congo, like a flare in a darkened sky, shows up the extent and depth of Africa's problems and the pressing need for bold American initiative in establishing a new relationship with that continent.

Africa's vast potential would be of enormous importance to the world even if the contest between freedom and communism did not exist. But if Africa, with all its tribal turmoil, nationalistic fervor and political confusion, is allowed to drift into the vortex of the cold war, the world is in for a time of troubles, the dimensions of which are appalling.

The land area of Africa is greater than that of China, the United States and India together. Although Africa's resources are only partially explored, they probably rival those of both the Soviet Union and China combined. With a highly favorable ratio of population to land and mineral resources, the long-range outlook for African economic development is auspicious indeed. The Communist nations, keenly aware of Africa's promise, have already been moving, as in Guinea, Sudan, and the Congo, to fill the vacuum left by the forces of European colonialism, which are now in precipitate retreat. Meanwhile, American foreign policy is caught uncertainly between fear of offending our European allies and a belated but growing awareness of the powerful economic and political tides which are sweeping Africa.

The difficulties which have faced our allies have, of course been enormous, as they adjusted to changing relationships with their former colonies. There are obvious exceptions but in many instances they have acted responsibly and ahead of events. The British followed their dignified withdrawal from India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon with an equally dignified transfer of power in Ghana and, soon, in Nigeria, Tanganyika and Uganda. General de Gaulle's imaginative offer of freedom to the to the French colonies in West and Central Africa was a farsighted act of a great European statesman. Therefore, no blanket indictment is justified.

But the truth of the matter is that events in Africa have taken our Government by surprise. As late as 1955, our missions south of the Sahara were still living largely in a colonial dream world. Of the four American consuls general whom I met there in the winter of that year, only one had ever had a black African to dinner. Our African service itself was very nearly nonexistent. Even those few officials assigned to Africa, with some notable exceptions, appeared oblivious to the clearly foreseeable series of explosions that lay ahead.

Thus, when the French suddenly left Guinea in 1958, we could think of nothing more affirmative to do than to await developments. The developments included a rapid influx of Soviet, East German, Czechoslovak, and Hungarian technicians and capital. In all fairness, I must add that our policymakers, however belatedly, are now making rapid progress in creating and training a new and promising African service.

Yet without clear, courageous policy direction, acutely sensitive to the special requirements and hard realities of the emerging new Africa, our ablest representatives will fail.

What then should be the basic ingredients of a fresh and affirmative American

approach to Africa? The first essential is that we know precisely what we seek.

We have no desire or need to control Africa, even if we could. Our national economic and political interests, as well as the long liberal traditions of our democratic society, all point in the direction of a constructive partnership with free, independent, politically stable, prosperous new African nations. Such a partnership would assure open trade and communications with Africa and the friendship and respect of the African people in promoting our common objectives of world stability, prosperity and peace.

What about Soviet objectives in Africa? The leaders in the Kremlin have made it abundantly clear that their end goal is not cooperation but domination. Behind all the blandishments, their objective in Africa as elsewhere is total economic and political control, achieved by whatever techniques of subversion, nuclear brinkmanship or military adventure may appear most effective at the moment.

Now if this is a realistic comparison of American and Soviet objectives, the deep-seated potential strength of our position in Africa comes into clear focus. Our position there can be made strong because what we want for Africa is more or less precisely what the Africans want for themselves. The Soviet position, on the other hand, is inherently weak because Soviet objectives directly oppose the dream of the newly free African peoples for national independence and the opportunity to make their own political and economic choices.

Although the advantage that these common objectives give us is very great, it must be grasped with sensitivity and courage, or the opportunity for creative action will be lost forever. To meet the requirements of the emerging new Africa, it will not be enough simply to stretch policies and procedures that have been proving increasingly inadequate elsewhere.

For instance, both American and African interests will be best served by keeping Africa as free as possible from the tensions of the cold war. Although this will be a formidable task, there are unique circumstances that provide a measure of solid hope that it may be accomplished.

The key lies in the capacity of the United Nations to take the lead in filling the economic and political vacuum in Africa and in the exceptional readiness of most Africans to accept the United Nations in such a role.

Thus the starting point for an affirmative new American policy in Africa should be a dramatically expanded concept of the United Nations' contribution—a contribution that would include not only internal and external security, but also economic progress and orderly political transition. This fresh approach could be dramatized effectively by the introduction of an American-sponsored resolution at the fall session of the General Assembly proposing a charter of conduct for all non-African powers in Africa.

Such a charter should be far more than a negative statement of what the great powers agree not to do in Africa. It would propose that all members of the United Nations agree to a broad-scale course of constructive economic and political action that will assure the independence of the new African nations, encourage their orderly political and economic development, and relieve them in large measure of the pulling and hauling of the cold war.

A commitment of this kind would enable the more developed nations to help meet Africa's vast and varied needs through the neutral machinery of the United Nations, rather than through the dangerously volatile competition of the power blocs, which has kept the world on the brink of war in the Middle East and in southeast Asia.

Let us examine more precisely what some of those commitments might be.

(1) A pledge by all nations to refrain from agitating propaganda within Africa and to end all efforts at direct or indirect subversion. The United Nations could be authorized to investigate all charges of violation and to report to the General Assembly.

(2) A similar agreement not to feed the arms race in Africa. In present circumstances the actual military needs of the new African nations are modest. It is to our advantage and that of the Africans to keep them so. Such a pledge might build on the foundation of Prime Minister Macmillan's presummit proposal for a NATO-Soviet agreement not to ship additional arms to Africa except those minimal amounts clearly necessary for internal security.

(3) An agreement by the great powers to channel the bulk of all economic, technical, and educational assistance to Africa through the United Nations. The essential machinery already exists in the U.N. specialized agencies, the Technical Assistance Administration, the Special Fund, the World Bank, and the new International Development Association. What is needed now is the will to substitute this international machinery to the maximum possible extent for the well-worn path of bilateral aid, which inevitably introduces the competition of the cold war.

The World Bank under Eugene Black and the U.N. Special Fund under Paul Hoffman have a particularly important role to play in Africa in planning national and regional development projects and in raising the necessary funds from public and private sources. Transportation and communications are largely undeveloped in Africa. Resources are plentiful, but precise knowledge is limited and access to them is often poor. Most of the conditions for rational and fruitful economic development are lacking.

The proposed charter would specify that the necessary leadership and coordination should largely be provided by international agencies which, because they have no political axes to grind, would have the confidence of the African governments.

(4) An imaginative and comprehensive effort through a newly created United Nations civil service to meet Africa's overriding need for experienced administrators, technicians, engineers, teachers, and professional men of all sorts—outside the context of the cold war. Although lack of able personnel is common to all underdeveloped nations it is acute beyond all degree in Africa, where such positions have long been filled, almost exclusively, by Europeans of the mother countries.

Precise figures do not exist, but it has been estimated that in 1958 some 30,000 European civil servants occupied administrative and technical positions in the various African governments, colonial and otherwise. Many of these civil servants have already left Africa and others are preparing to leave. Although most of those who may be induced to remain are uniquely qualified through their familiarity with the technical aspects of African problems, they will continue to work under the disadvantage of their former colonial associations.

Yet, for a generation or more, non-African civil servants, working under African policymakers, will be essential to the rapid economic and political development of the African nations. The essential question is, where will those non-Africans be recruited? To whom will they owe their first loyalties? Will they help bring the cold war to Africa? Or will they serve the cause of international cooperation and understanding?

In 1958 the United Nations developed a small program called Operational and Executive Personnel (OPEX) to help supply administrative, technical and operating personnel to underdeveloped countries. On the request of an underdeveloped nation, OPEX attempts to find a person with the necessary qualifications who is politically acceptable to the host country. Once the new employee has been agreed upon, OPEX makes up the difference between the salary and benefits which he would receive in his home country and the salary and benefits normally provided by the underdeveloped country.

This machinery provides the ideal answer to the administrative shortage now existing in much of Africa. The proposed United Nations charter for Africa should call for its immediate and massive expansion. The U.N. civil service could provide an exciting new future for thousands of men and women of all nationalities qualified in industrial development, tax collection, clerical and office management, school administration and teaching, agriculture, village development and police administration. It could bring to Africa the skilled administrators who are urgently needed, free both of political involvement in the new African nations and of direct involvement in the cold war.

(5) The establishment of a permanent U.N. Police Force for use in Africa and elsewhere along the lines of that at present being shaped in the Congo. Such a force now represents the major hope of the new Congolese nation for internal security and national unity. Similar tensions are certain to develop in other areas not only as an aftermath of the withdrawal of European control, but also as conflicts develop among the new African nations themselves.

In West Africa, for instance, colonial access to the sea and a delicate balancing between great powers were the determining factors in establishing borders. This resulted in strips of territory such as Togoland and Dahomey, and enclaves such as Gambia, in which tribal, ethnic and language groups were abruptly severed by diplomatic agreements in faraway capitals.

A map of existing African loyalties superimposed on a map of national boundaries, therefore, produces a crazy quilt of overlapping and intersecting lines. This situation has already led to considerable friction as various federations have been proposed, announced and dissolved.

It is not for the United Nations to decide the outcome of these matters—either to insure the status quo or to promote changes, however wise they may appear to be. This is a matter solely for the Africans themselves. However, it is a proper and essential objective of the United Nations to prevent such situations from exploding into violence and particularly to prevent the great powers from intervening in behalf of one side or the other.

The existence of an adequate U.N. Police Force, recruited largely by the African nations themselves, could do much to reduce the temptation for direct unilateral military intervention from outside.

(6) The proposed African charter might also provide for the setting up of a special African court of justice, perhaps associated with the World Court, and specifically empowered to settle disputes between African nations and between African states and outside nations. Such a court, with its members drawn largely but not exclusively from the African nations, would provide an additional barrier to outside intervention—provided the African powers could be induced to accept its jurisdiction without too many qualifications.

I do not suggest that the United Nations can successfully shoulder all the problems of the turbulent new Africa. However, I believe it can provide by all odds the most effective machinery through which to approach these problems while isolating them from the explosive antagonisms of the cold war.

The sense of vigorous purpose that a bold new leadership role in Africa could bring to

the United Nations could at the same time greatly increase the U.N.'s own prestige and effectiveness in speeding orderly development and in settling conflicts in other parts of the world.

Now let us frankly face the question of costs and alternatives.

The charter I have proposed calls for an unprecedented expansion of United Nations powers and responsibilities in Africa. The annual cost would amount to several hundred million dollars annually, much of which would be paid by the United States. The alternative, however, is not isolationist, inexpensive inaction. The alternative is a vast expansion of the cold war in Africa, in which American dollars will be increasingly matched against Russian rubles, American engineers against Russian engineers, and, eventually, American-made tanks against Soviet tanks.

Unless we are prepared to sit idly by while much of the world's richest and most promising continent becomes a bloody political and economic vacuum that ultimately will be filled by the Communists, this means that a major investment of American dollars and energies will be required in any event. The only practical question, therefore, is how can our dollars and our energies most effectively be brought to bear?

How would the Soviet Union react to the comprehensive United Nations charter for Africa which I have proposed? The Kremlin's dilemma in considering this question would be considerable.

The prestige of the United Nations in Africa is very great. By 1962 nearly one-third of the seats in the General Assembly will be occupied by Africans. If the Kremlin accepted our challenge to deal with Africa largely through the U.N., it would greatly limit, if not actually shackle, its program of subversion and infiltration there. If it rejected the proposal, or hedged its acceptance with political counterproposals, its true imperialistic objectives in Africa would become clear even to the most wishful thinkers in Léopoldville, Addis Ababa, Conakry and elsewhere.

In that case, much of the non-Communist world might still agree to proceed with most, if not all, of the proposed charter commitments I have suggested, including the U.N. police force, emphasis on U.N. multilateral development planning and aid the U.N. civil service and the special African court of justice.

If the Soviet Union still chose actively to oppose even these limited United Nations efforts, it would come into direct conflict not simply with America but with most of the non-Communist world. In those limited areas in Africa where the Kremlin was still able to operate unilaterally, it would be struggling—under the most adverse conditions—against the powerful flood tide of African nationalism which, with strong Asian and Latin American support, would be vigorously represented in the General Assembly of the U.N.

This brings me to the final decisive question: Is our own Government prepared to abandon our present inadequate and sterile approach to Africa and embark on a bold new effort in positive international cooperation there? Is it ready to regain the initiative in world affairs that we held in the days of the Marshal plan, to shake off our day-by-day obsession with Mr. Khrushchev's oratory and maneuvers, and to challenge the world through the U.N. General Assembly to a new cooperative beginning in the great African Continent?

If we timidly turn our back on this opportunity, only one thing is certain: Africa will rapidly become an ominous new battleground of the cold war, with explosively uncertain results. Let us hope, therefore, that we act positively, wisely, boldly, and soon.

More Panama Intrigue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in an address to the House on June 23, 1960, I revealed the determination of subordinate elements in the Department of State to engage in the treacherous act of raising the Panama flag over the Canal Zone in disregard of specific provisions of not only an act of this Congress, but as well the intent of House concurrent resolution 459 passed by the House of Representatives by the overwhelming vote of 381 to 12 and our treaty rights. So serious did this matter appear that on June 30, I wrote in protest to the Secretary of State Herter giving notice that should a formal display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone be made with the knowledge of his department that members of the House, who are clothed with Constitution in this regard, will press for his impeachment.

Were my fears exaggerated? Far from it. Information subsequently published in the New York Times of July 10, 1960, is to the effect that policy papers for changing the concept of the U.S. status in the Canal Zone are now in the embryonic stage, with the Departments of State and Defense at loggerheads over what should be done.

The stand of the Department of Defense is reported as being unequivocal in it determination for retention by the United States of exclusive sovereignty and control over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. With this view, the House of Representatives, as previously stated, has already voiced its approval.

The President, on July 9, announced a nine-point program toward Panama, which has been described as "pilot plan" for wider inter-American aid application.

Commenting on this plan, Dr. Jorge Illueca, Panamanian Ambassador to the United Nations, on July 11, emphasized that the Panama pilot plan has as its basis the "recognition of Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone" with the "flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone as a symbol of such sovereignty."

That, Mr. Speaker, from the words of a responsible Panamanian, reflects the objectives of radical Isthmian politicians and their communistic mentors. As I have repeatedly tried to stress, the formal display of the Panama flag over the Canal Zone is not a mere gesture of good will, but an action of the gravest significance, far better understood by Panamanian radicals than by officials of our Department of State.

Who is Dr. Jorge Illueca who speaks so strongly? I have done a little checking and made some interesting discoveries about his record.

Many will recall the negotiations, following the end of World War II between the Republic of Panama and the United States, for a Defense Base Treaty, which was signed on December 10, 1947. Despite the efforts of thoughtful Panamanians, opposition to approval of this treaty in Panama mounted.

Twelve days later, on December 22, the National Assembly of Panama, surrounded by a mob of some 10,000 demonstrators and scenes of indescribable tumult, accompanied by threats of personal violence to the members, unanimously rejected the treaty. The result was that the United States promptly evacuated all its military bases in the Republic, although they were established and maintained for the defense of Panama as well as that of the Canal.

Who were the leaders of that anti-American mob? One of them was Jorge Illueca of a certain anti-U.S. youth movement, El Frento Patriotico, who furthered his law studies at a college in the United States. Now he sits as the Ambassador of Panama in the United Nations, issuing public statements on matters of United States-Panama relations.

In these general connections, the vital fact—which is the crux of the entire situation—is that exclusive sovereignty was granted to the United States by treaty to provide and guarantee political stability in the Canal Zone. Without such provision and guarantee the United States would not and could not have undertaken the construction of the canal and its maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection. A further vital fact is—of which the Department is so naive as to ignore—is continued and insistent declaration of Panama that the official display of the flag in the Canal Zone is but the first step toward Panamanian nationalization of the Canal. Small wonder it is that our Department of Defense is in strong opposition to the Department of State on the all-important sovereignty issue, for which flying the Panamanian flag over the Canal Zone would constitute not only recognition of Panama's claim of sovereignty over the zone, but as well the destruction of U.S. sovereignty with chaos as the inevitable result.

In order that the Congress and the people of the United States may have no false illusions of the ultimate intent of Isthmian agitators and their agents in our country, I quote the following news dispatches as part of these remarks:

[From the New York Times, July 10, 1960]

UNITED STATES WEIGHS PLAN TO HELP PANAMA AND GUARD CANAL—LONG-TERM POLICY REGARDED AS CAPABLE OF SPARKING ECONOMIC REVOLUTION

(By Jack Raymond)

WASHINGTON, July 9.—The United States is preparing, as part of a far-reaching Latin American aid plan, a new long-range policy toward Panama. One official said it could set the stage for a major social and economic revolution in that country.

The new Panama plan is being developed to deal with the arrangement by which the United States controls the canal. But in its economic aspects it may serve as a pilot project in the high priority program now being fashioned by the administration to counter Communist and other anti-U.S. influences in Latin America.

Secretary of State Christian A. Herter has been called to confer with President

Eisenhower on the Latin American plan, which was announced yesterday at Newport.

The President has taken a direct hand in the Panama policy consultations. He is said to have expressed the hope that he can announce, before he leaves office, concrete new measures affecting Panama as a start on the new program for Latin America in general.

The Panama policy is being devised to assure the United States continued control of the Panama Canal, but without the skirmishes over problems of Panamanian sovereignty.

REMEDY A PREVENTIVE ONE

As in the broader objective for all of Latin America, the President and his advisers want to forestall in Panama a Castro-type of revolution—or some other excesses because of the growing demands of the Panamanian people, not only upon the United States, but also upon their own ruling political parties.

One of the major proposals under serious consideration would call for a civilian rather than a military Governor of the Canal Zone, which, according to the original treaty with Panama in 1903, the United States rules as "if it were sovereign."

Approval is expected soon for a Panamanian request for $15 million in loans to build roads that would open the jungles to agriculture. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is to provide $11 million and the Development Loan Fund $4 million. Loans are under consideration also for hydroelectric projects.

Other proposals provide for extensive financial support for the Panamanian Government, to assist in broadening the economic base so that the population of 1 million may live off something more than the operations of the canal.

It is considered ludicrous, for example, that in a country of lush foliage, where virtually anything can grow, fresh tomatoes are being imported from Costa Rica by air freight. Most experts, Panamanian and American, believe that agriculture has been neglected in Panama.

Financing plans are being studied here also that would help the Panamanians develop more industries.

Still other proposals would encourage a broadening of the political base of the ruling parties in the Republic of Panama. In this connection there is considerable optimism in Washington over the prospects of a move in that direction by President-elect Roberto F. Chiari, who is scheduled to take office in October.

The suggestion that a civilian Governor be named to run the Canal Zone and the Panama Canal Company, which operates the canal, fits in with the view at the State Department that the time has come to modify the military accent of the U.S. presence in Panama.

The Governor, who is appointed by the President, has always been a major general of the Army Corps of Engineers. This month Maj. Gen. William A. Garter, division engineer of the lower Mississippi Valley division of the Corps of Engineers, succeeded Maj. Gen. William E. Potter.

In addition, the headquarters of the Caribbean Command is in the zone. There are 5,500 military persons stationed in the zone, in addition to about 36,000 civilians. Military exercises are held there regularly.

However, the policy papers for changing the concept of U.S. presence in the Canal Zone are said to be in an embryonic stage, chiefly because of a dispute between the State Department and the Pentagon over what should be done.

The matter has come before the National Security Council, the President's highest advisory group, several times since last fall. The Panamanians had rioted, demanding that the Panamanian flag be flown in the Canal Zone.

The State Department, which long had urged changes that military authorities at the Pentagon have assailed as soft and appeasing presented a 117-page policy statement on Panama to the National Security Council.

The language irritated many officials of the Army, particularly because, in addition to attacking the Pentagon demands for firmness in Panama, the statement included aspersions about the "military mind" of the advocates of firmness.

The National Security Council asked the State Department to draft a substitute, shorter paper. The second 50-page document on Panama appeared to the Pentagon officials to be equally lacking in understanding their position.

Briefly, the military officials believe that the United States must be unequivocal in its determination to retain sovereignty and control over the canal and the Canal Zone. These officials fear that any more concessions, in view of the mounting demands of the Panamanians, would merely encourage more claims and perhaps nurture a demand for Panamanian control of the canal.

Authoritative sources have commented on the activity of a total of 200 "agents" in Panama who are said to represent the political interest of the United Arab Republic and Cuba as well as Communists. The diplomatic representatives of Cairo, which successfully seized the Suez Canal, are said to be unusually active in Panama.

Fears have been expressed that new riots might occur in Panama if some decision was not made before November 3 on the question whether the flag of the Republic might be flown in the U.S.-controlled zone. November 3 is Panamanian National Day.

Under the terms of the 1903 treaty, Panama granted to the United States "in perpetuity" the "use, occupation and control" of the zone areas "to the entire exclusion of the exercise by the Republic of Panama of any sovereign rights, power or authority."

The treaty has been amended twice, but the clauses affecting sovereignty have not been altered. In 1903, the United States agreed to pay Panama $10 million in gold and make annual payments of $250,000. The annual payments have now risen to $1,930,000.

State and Defense Department officials agree that it would be wrong merely to ride with the tide, relenting to increased Panamanian demands from time to time. But officials of the two Departments disagree sharply about what should be done.

[From the Panama American, July 11, 1960]

IKE'S NEW PLAN FOR LA TO START IN PANAMA; ILLUECA SEES RECOGNITION OF RP SOVEREIGNTY AS FIRST STEP

UNITED NATIONS, July 11—Panama's permanent delegate to the U.N., Dr. Jorge Illueca, today expressed satisfaction that the Eisenhower plan would start off with Panama, which, because of the Panama Canal, is the center of attention of all the peoples of the hemisphere.

The White House yesterday announced that the Eisenhower administration would work out a pilot plan of economic and social aid with Panama which would serve as a model for similar plans with other Latin American nations.

Illueca said this will be favorably received both in government and private circles in Panama, "because it not only has a spiritual significance but it also represents a constructive orientation which deserves to be encouraged. . . ."

"I attribute extraordinary importance to the fact that everything seems to indicate . . . that the pilot plan would have as its basis the recognition of Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone with its natural implications and it would mean, of course, the flying of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone as a symbol of national sovereignty, which would be in harmony with the patriotic sentiments of all Panamanians, prominent among whom are the young student generations that costitute the purest moral force in my country," Illueca declared.

[From the Panama Star and Herald, July 12, 1960]

PANAMANIAN ENVOY TO U.N. HAILS WASHINGTON'S PLAN OF AID HERE

NEW YORK, July 11.—Jorge Illueca, Panamanian Ambassador to the United Nations, said today the formulation of a pilot plan for Panama as part of a wider program of inter-American aid outlined by the Eisenhower administration will place relations between Panama and the United States on the highest level of cordiality and dignity.

Illueca noted that the Washington reports, carried in the New York Times on Sunday, referred specifically to Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone, which, he added, "We trust will lead to the flying of the Panamanian flag over that strip of the national territory."

He said it was encouraging that the Panama project is regarded as a pilot plan, which means that it will have priority. Among the purposes of the plan, according to the Times report, is the creation of conditions for a major economic and social revolution in Panama aimed at the formation of a more balanced economic structure.

Illueca said the basic means for carrying out such a far-reaching program will be a democratic and representative government in which the majority of Panamanians will have real and increasing participation, in order to assure all of equality of opportunity in the nation's social and economic life.

"Latin American public opinion," the Panamanian envoy declared, "undoubtedly will be heartened by a new inter-American economic policy which will strive mainly to raising the standard of life of the hemisphere peoples.

"Panama is a test case in Latin America and the planning that is followed in its territory will show the degree of cooperation that can be attained in the inter-American sphere, without prejudice to the full implementation of the pilot plan as agreed to between the interested Governments."

Illueca said two measures should be considered whose immediate application "will contribute to renew the faith of the Panamanian people in inter-American solidarity."

One is the raising of the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone, for what it represents for national honor.

The other is the elimination of the recent 10 percent increase in ocean freight rates for Panamanian ports, announced by the Atlantic and Gulf, Panama Canal Zone, Colon, and Panama City conference.

Panama, according to Illueca, could take the matter of the freight rates to the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations or the Council of the Organization of American States.

"This," he added, "would be unnecessary if the U.S. Government, in a gesture of friendly cooperation, should refuse to approve this increase in ocean freight rates in Panama."

Illueca pointed out that the U.S. Government-owned Panama Line is a member of the conference and would benefit from the proposed increase. He said the implementation of the increase would only serve to increase the cost of living in Panama.

He added there is precedent already for action by the Inter-American Economic and Social Council against increases in shipping rates. Also, he pointed out ocean freight rates of U.S. shipping lines have to be filed for approval with the Federal Maritime Board.

Caribbean Crisis Widens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Anthony Harrigan, associate editor of the News & Courier of Charleston, S.C., has written another excellent article in the publication U.S.A. on the subject of our Nation's difficulties in the Caribbean area. This article is entitled "Caribbean Crisis Widens" and was printed in the August 12, 1960 issue of U.S.A. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD so that it might receive the attention which it merits.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARIBBEAN CRISIS WIDENS

(By Anthony Harrigan)

When finally the Castro dictatorship is overthrown by free Cubans supported by the United States and its Latin American partners, the danger of Communist victory in the Caribbean will not have disappeared. Indeed the island-studded vastness of that sea is the scene of unparalleled opportunities for subversion by Red regimes. Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico and the Caribbean Federation already are targets designated by the conflict-managers of the Kremlin. If efforts to turn the Pearl of the Antilles into a Soviet satellite are a failure, then the United States public can expect that Communist efforts will be shifted to other islands along the southern sea frontier of our country.

Already there are reports of new Communist activity in Haiti. Reds from Europe, including the Iron Curtain countries, are being allowed to enter the country. Last May, a student demonstration took place in Port-au-Prince where 400 participants denounced "Yankee imperialism." Puerto Rico has harbored for a long time nationalist extremists who hate Uncle Sam. Gov. Luis Munoz Marin, while professing strong friendship for the United States, has declined to allow that territory to be used as a base by free Cubans to smash Castro-type communism in neighboring Cuba. The conditions for future serious disagreements with the United States seem to be present in Puerto Rico.

A most ominous development is reported from the island of Jamaica. A group of back-to-Africa cultists calling themselves Rastafarians and adopting Mau Mau names and methods is active there. Two British soldiers were killed by Rastafarians last month. Jamaican police say that unidentified submarines, manned by white seamen, have been seen off the northern coast of the island. It is widely believed that arms, presumably from Communist sources, have been turned over to the cultists. In addition, Castro's agents have been sowing seeds of discord among the populace in Jamaica.

These conditions are not the only reason for concern among North Americans. The Trujillo regime seems headed for a major crisis. Even if none takes place in the next year or so, the aging of the ruler of the Dominican Republic poses a serious problem concerning the future of the island of Santo Domingo. This island, shared by Haiti and the Dominican Republic, has a long history of bloodshed and disorder. No one can predict what will happen there when Trujillo dies or steps down. If Communists were to seize power in the Dominican Republic, it would be relatively easy for them to keep it, because the people there are accustomed to authoritarian rule.

The financial mess in Haiti, accompanied by general chaos and lack of popular discipline and stability, makes that country an easy target for communism. The Caribbean Federation, with 3 million people in a long string of islands extending from Jamaica's Cayman Island in the northwest to Trinidad in the southeast off the coast of South America, is more a nation in name than in fact. Heavily populated, lacking industry and responsible leaders, it is in danger of complete fragmentation and then domination by a Communist minority. Red leaders in British Guiana are working on the leaders of the Caribbean Federation, seeking to draw them closer to communism.

MORE CASTROS?

Given these conditions, it is not unthinkable that a score of Castros may pop up in the Caribbean during the next decade. Every day that the tyrant in Havana is permitted to rule, the danger of bad example grows greater among demagogs in the region. And while the United States may legitimately use whatever methods are needed to free the Cuban people from Castro and his clique, our country must look beyond such action to creation of a comprehensive and constructive policy toward the entire Caribbean area.

Undoubtedly, the reaction of the left-"liberals" in both our parties will be to seek the solution of Caribbean problems through extension of massive government-to-government foreign aid. But this solution completely begs away the question of what must be done about the political climate of the Caribbean region.

The essential fact to bear in mind is this: The Caribbean is but another theater in which world war III is being fought. Moreover, it is a battleground for the struggle between capitalism and collectivism.

SEA OF THE AMERICAS

American free enterprise has an enormous stake in all the countries and islands of the Caribbean. It is a sea where U.S. merchantmen and tankers ply the trade routes. Across this sea, American companies bring cargoes of oil, iron, and bauxite; in the skies above the sea, U.S. airlines fly their dominant routes. The Caribbean is the sea of the Americas—South, Central, and Northern. It is a region rich in agricultural products consumed by the U.S. public. It is an area in which hundreds of enterprising North Americans started their businesses within the last decade. In the years ahead, if communism can be thwarted there, the Caribbean will be intimately connected with the daily lives of millions of southward-looking citizens. The Caribbean is a region where healthy and inspired North American leadership and influence can spread over a great arc, nourishing economies and cultures and fostering the politics of freedom.

But this North American projection into the Caribbean, carrying along great rewards for the peoples of the area, will be halted if any of the islands are turned into Communist protectorates. If that should happen, the United States would lose its most strategic area.

HOW TO WIN

What can be done to halt the spread of communism in the Caribbean? The first step, as the people of the United States are beginning to understand, is to stop Castro in Cuba. Beyond this, however, is the imperative need for coordinated anti-Communist action from Haiti to Trinidad.

Nothing is more important for successful action than a U.S. State Department staffed with personnel who are aggressively anti-Communist. There is an absolute necessity that the State Department Director of Caribbean Affairs be a man of demonstrated anti-Red zeal.

Our military men too can do much to check communism in the region. The Army's Caribbean Command, now based in the Panama Canal Zone, might be moved to a more centralized location in Puerto Rico. The Navy's Roosevelt Roads Base at Puerto Rico might be built up into a major installation as the operating base for a patrol force similar to the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. The need is not for heavy fleet units but for a strong and impressive "show the flag" force that would be a visible reminder to Caribbean peoples of the strength and good will of the United States, and of how military might can be a deterrent to Red aggression and shield against it. Permanent assignment to that fleet of a Marine Corps helicopter carrier with a battle team abroad would be especially useful.

Not enough is known in our country about the mercy missions conducted by the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean and about its aid-to-orphans program and other humane and charitable activities.

Backing up the visible signs of might must be a broadcasting and printing operation that would smother Communist efforts to subvert any Caribbean nation. The task in the Caribbean is a battle for the minds and loyalties of men, as elsewhere in a world threatened by Red aggression.

PRIMARY EFFORT

Much as these actions by our Government are desirable, the likelihood of their being taken promptly is not great. Heavy demands upon troop and fleet units elsewhere are cited as justification for looking on the Caribbean as an area that can be defended on a brushfire basis. It might require several years of intensive education to persuade the American public to accord such recognition to the importance of the Caribbean as would enable the military to receive the kind of political and economic support required for the assignment of armed strength there. As for creation of superior broadcasting facilities and printing presses necessary for an effective educational operation, the abysmal failure of our Government Information Agency to develop an adequate truth program for the Cuban people indicates that little can be expected in a hurry for the Caribbean region as a whole.

The continuing inadequacy of our Government agencies in fighting communism in the Caribbean area suggests that the primary effort must be made by private persons. Indeed, such an effort might prove to be more effective than any drive in which the permanent bureaucracy in the State Department and Information Agency has a part. A private anti-Communist effort in the Caribbean with stringent security supervision could not be easily subverted by anti-anti-Communists in key positions. Moreover, the personnel of such a private effort could be composed of staunch believers in free enterprise, not mere lip-servants.

What appears to this writer as a necessary and reasonable start for such a private effort is the formation of a Caribbean committee by the U.S. enterprises doing business now in the region. Such a committee would provide a central clearinghouse for political information so that the various enterprises would know the entire scheme of Communist effort against American capitalism in the Caribbean. From such a committee could emerge a common free-enterprise strategy, joint action of one sort or another, and coordinated information programs designed to keep America strong in the Caribbean. While individual companies are engaged in competition and have opposing business goals in some respects, it is nevertheless true that all the principal American firms doing business in the Caribbean have

a stake in defeating communism and strengthening capitalism there.

Unless private businesses in the United States make such a joint effort, our country may suffer serious reverses in the Caribbean during the next few years—with confiscation of U.S. property and establishment of Red protectorates becoming the rule rather than the exception. Time and again, the State Department and other government agencies have shown they do too little and too late in the fight to halt communism—even when they understand the menace.

If the American system is to be saved, U.S. private enterprise must organize and work for its own salvation.

Harry D. Strunk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, it was with great shock that I learned the news on Saturday, August 6, of the passing of my good friend and the great reclamation leader of Nebraska, Harry D. Strunk of McCook.

I have known Harry Strunk for many, many years. During all of this time he was an outstanding and vigorous fighter for the development of sound and practical reclamation projects and flood control in the Republican Valley. His efforts were ceaseless and his devotion to this cause complete.

I suppose it was the great Republican River flood of 1935 which claimed over 100 lives that caused Harry Strunk to strike out so vigorously and so unceasingly for better protection for his neighbors. That may have been the triggering reason; but he had always held a deep and abiding interest in flood control and in the development of sound, economic reclamation projects.

But in the middle thirties Harry Strunk started to wage a war which was still the center of his whole being the day he passed from us to his reward. Many of my colleagues who have sat on the Public Works and Appropriations Committees will remember him well. They will recall the long, lean, and weathered figure which appeared before their committees year after year. They will remember the intense face, the vigorous and eloquent speech. Most of all, though, they will remember the fire which burned throughout his being and the force that drove him, which he could so easily communicate to others.

Harry Strunk grew up in the newspaper business and for many years published the McCook Gazette at McCook, Nebr. He wielded a strong force in his community and his State, and became a potent force in the Nation in his efforts to broaden the concept of reclamation and to further the cause of flood control. Though primarily interested in the Republican River Valley, Harry Strunk worked diligently and hard for reclamation and flood control everywhere. No farmer in the reclamation States nor a single flood-threatened family anywhere in America had a better, truer friend. Their needs were his; their fears were likewise his.

He has created a living memorial to himself in the development of the Republican River Valley. But even at the close of his career he knew that his work was not done and he was still fighting.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say how deeply I will miss the presence of this great man. I cannot express in words my own feelings completely. Let me say only that a great and fighting heart has stopped beating and that his absence will be felt.

Let My People Go

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding leaders in the field of religion, and a great American, whose deep and understanding mind is appreciated by all persons, and by communicants and members of all creeds, and who is universally respected and admired, is the distinguished Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris. Dr. Harris is truly one of God's noblemen.

His nobility of character is an inspiration for all others to follow. His fine mind and his beautiful life are symbols of everything that is good, noble and uplifting.

In the July 24, 1960, issue of the Washington Star is an article entitled "Let My People Go" written by Dr. Harris, relating to the meaning, significance and importance of the Captive Nations Week resolution which was enacted by the Congress last year, under which the President each year issues a Captive Nation Week proclamation.

It was my pleasure to introduce this resolution in the House of Representatives following the passage of the same by the U.S. Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I include in my remarks the timely, appropriate and expressive article written by Dr. Harris, and to which I have hereinbefore referred:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—LET MY PEOPLE GO
(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate)

The test of America's boasted freedom is how much her freemen care for those who have lost their liberty. To revel only in one's freedom, and to forget the fetters of others, is a base betrayal of our own heritage. Such forgetfulness is an ominous prophecy that those who do not fight for liberty everywhere will finally lose their own. There is absolutely no question more vital in this day of besieging problems than the attitude of the free nations toward the lands Soviet Russia has bound with the shackles of serfdom.

There is nothing on which the conspirators of the Kremlin are more adamant than their insistence that their imperialistic robberies be recognized and the status of satellite nations be accepted as final. That assumption is a definite part of their strategy to communize the whole earth. They have the effrontery to suggest to the free world that they agree to coexistence with those who are using every foul force to stamp out the fire of freedom in lands once free but now under the Soviet's savage sway.

The greatest imperialists of the age so discount the intelligence of the human race and so distort the facts that they now charge the very Republic which gave Cuba its freedom wtih plotting its enslavement. The system with millions of slaves in its iron hold threatens to "free" Cuba. Could the big lie be stretched to bigger proportions?

It is an appeal to the best instincts of America which sounds in the call of Congress and of the President for a specific week of remembering the captive nations whose anguished cry, "How long, O Lord, how long?" must never be drowned by the glorification of our own freedom. Nothing which he heard in our free land aroused the ire of the crude and cruel peasant who stands at the top of the Soviet pyramid of brute strength as much as any reference to Hungary, and the other captive nations.

No wonder, for it is the one heinous blot that gives the lie to all the fair promises of this vast principality of evil which has invented its own inverted and perverted dictionary in which the holy word "peace" means simply the victory of their tyranny.

Captive Nations Week serves notice on the Kremlin that no rocket rattling will ever make America forget her vow to keep alive the knowledge of atrocities perpetrated until the submerged nations are rescued from the invader and their soil no longer defiled by this abomination.

Our Congress has called the roll of those now under the Soviet yoke: Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechloslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Rumania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, North Korea, Albania, Tibet, and others. To make sure that the idea of Captive Nations Week does not prove to be simply an ephemeral sop to the American conscience, Congress specifically declares that: "The President is further authorized and requested to issue a similar proclamation each year until such time as freedom and independence shall have been achieved for all the captive nations of the world." With wholehearted approval President Eisenhower sounds a trumpet which must never know retreat in his ringing words: "There can be no true peace which involves acceptance of the status quo in which we find injustice to many nations and repression of human beings on a gigantic scale."

And what does all this have to do with "spires"? Everything. It is under the church spires of America that there thunders the emancipating words of the Father God, to whom all souls belong and to whom all souls are dear, "Let my people go."

Every remembrance of the captive nations is a prayer. Their plight ought to be the subject of prayer in every temple of worship on the Sunday of the annual Captive Nations Week.

We can imagine no more moving scene in any church in America than the service at 11 a.m. on the dear Lord's blessed day of that week observed at St. Patrick's Catholic Church in the Capital of free America. Present were many whose ancestral roots are in the nations now enslaved. Many of them had fled from the present tyranny. From the high white pulpit of that lovely sanctuary, Bishop Philip M. Hannan proclaimed the unvarnished truth in sermon and in prayer. His was indeed the voice of

America, and the voice of the universal church as to the altar of the most high the shackled millions were lifted in the arms of Christian sympathy and intercession.

In such an hour of worship in any church we are reminded of the final judgment test of the Master who came preaching release for the captives as He asks the piercing question: "When I was in prison did you come unto Me?"

In the spirit of that moving service in St. Patrick's, let us pray—Our Father God, author of liberty, without ceasing we would remember the captive nations in their cruel bondage—proud peoples with their precious traditions stamped into the dust while alien Caesars exercise their ruthless sway over them. Above all the tumult and shouting of these volcanic days we hear Thy summons, even as in centuries past, "Let my people go." Give us to see that to acquiesce in the crucifixation of freedom anywhere is ultimately to nail our own liberty on the same cross, knowing that with what measure we mete, it shall be measured to us again. We ask it in the name of the Redeemer who came to proclaim liberty to the captives and deliverance to those who are bound. Amen.

VJ-Day Anniversary Recalls War Tolls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a most interesting editorial by Steve Walsh which appeared in his column the Bell Ringer, in the August 14, 1960 issue of the Lynn (Mass.) Sunday Post:

VJ-DAY ANNIVERSARY RECALLS WAR TOLLS

(By Steve Walsh)

In the majority of cases, death is not an easy or a pleasant subject to write about. Personal tragedy usually stalks the scene and sorrow is its helpmate. One thinks of that on this very day, the 15th anniversary of the ending of World War II. No conflict was of greater magnitude and the horror and misery created by the wanton action of worldwide participants was incalculable. Yet, miraculously, some men escaped this doom.

TIME OF WAR

It is true that, directly or indirectly, the average home felt the hand of the mailed fist pounding at its portal. Bad news brought a pang to the heart which is indescribable. But for those who were permitted by fate to live out an orderly existence, good fortune stood firm and fast.

That is one reason why the reading, the presentation, or the publishing of a will is often quite interesting. Make sure that there were millions during the war who never had a chance to put their houses in goodly shape before the storm brought elimination. Legal documents simply become unknown quantities.

Thus the recent announcement of the contents of the will of John B. Kelly, prominent Philadelphian, brought national study, due to its nonconformity; its humor, provisions and philosophy. Mr. Kelly rose from rags to riches; from toil as a hod carrier to prestige as a multimillionaire.

This grand gentleman became a world-famed sculler and the father of Princess Grace of Monaco, ran for high office in his State and was known for his charity to the needy as well as a socialite with the elite. After taking care of his family, in worldly goods, he wrote this appendix:

"Kids will be called kids and not issue and it will not be cluttered up with parties of the first part, per stripes, perpetuities, quasi-judicial, to wit, and a lot of other terms that I am sure are only used to confuse those for whose benefits it was written. Some lawyers will question this when they read my will, however, I have my opinion of them ,so that makes us even." At the end of his will came this:

TIME OF LOVE

"As for me, just shed a respectful tear if you think I merit it, but I am sure that you are all intelligent enough not to weep all over the place. I have watched a few emotional acts at graves such as trying to jump in, fainting, etc., but the thoroughbred grieves from the heart. So just remember, when I shove off for greener pastures, or whatever it is on the other side of the curtain, that I do it unafraid, and if you must know, a little curious."

These were the last words of a man who had that "down-to-earth" manner of living for which some of us crave. Famous wills of a kind are classified as good literature and Mr. Kelly's offering ranks among the finest. He knew that shrouds have no pockets; to live-and-let-live is a sound philosophy; to abhor any contest by hostile measures is common sense.

Of course the theory of self-preservation in time of peril must never be discounted. Yet, the question remains: "Will wars ever end?" Seemingly the answer is "No!" Look to history and find out why. Great praise to the men who sedulously strive for peace and find that loser's odds are heavy.

TIME OF PEACE

Man became the first weaponmaking creature at the beginning of the ice age, probably a million years ago. With few intervals, he has been at his neighbor's throat ever since. In World War II, the record left behind (in the United States) shows the Army having a total casualty list of 948,418, including killed, wounded, injured, captured and missing. "Destroy the complete population of Baltimore, Md., and you will approach that figure. Battle deaths for all theaters totaled 229,238 with 173,441 known to have been killed outright in action. The Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard suffered 148,775 casualties, the merchant marine, 6,066.

Optimists, to the contrary, this information is heartrending. It still leaves suffering and anquish on the face of America even after 15 years to which Lynn, the homeland of our hopes, paid a high percentage.

No one man could write all about that war. It was too vast; too terrible. At the end, high promise was given that never again would its ugly presence appear before us. Yet today we find that many World War II implements are out of date, and the new age has things like ballistic missiles, nuclear warheads and international systems to guide us from pending destruction.

Is it any wonder that we who pray snap the fife and still the drums and show war the monster as she is! In chapter III of Ecclesiastes one read: "A time to love and hate; a time for war, and a time for peace." Mr. Kelly, and his kind, leave us in a world where there is an uncertain state of affairs. We who ponder over his last message can recall what Bishop Bossuet said: "O death-We thank thee for the light thou will shed upon our ignorance!" Being one of them I, too, can say I am a little curious!

Recommended Changes in the Federal System of Unemployment Compensation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate to have in my congressional district a number of retired experts in many fields, whose retirement does not prevent them from taking an active interest in the area in which they have had so much experience.

Among these experts is Mr. William Netschert of Daytona Beach, who was formerly the research supervisor and deputy chief of research and statistics for the New Jersey Division of Employment Security. From his experience with unemployment compensation he has developed the following seven-point recommendation for changes in this program:

STATEMENT TO CONGRESS

Recommendations for a program of standards needed in the Federal system of unemployment compensation, under the Social Security Act of 1935 and the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, beginning at section 3301:

1. In any State, the potential allowance for total benefits in a benefit year shall be predicated on base wages of individuals in the same ratio for all who qualify. (Discrimination on the basis of wages is indefensible. The U.S. Supreme Court has declared the Constitution "nullifies sophisticated as well as simple-minded modes of discrimination" (see *Lane* v. *Wilson* (307 U.S. 286, at page 275)); but the expense of appeal on this precedent is so out of proportion with the gain, if won, that only a taxpayer's suit by a consumer wealthy enough would serve the purpose of testing this notion.)

2. The potential benefit allowance of an individual shall be predicated on all taxable wages of the individual in his base period.

3. Base wages not taxed shall not be benefited. (Taxable wages are the only common denominator.)

4. Dependency benefits shall not be allowed out of funds accumulated under the provisions of sections 3301, et seq., of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. (There is not now, nor should there be, any provision in titles III and IX of the original Social Security Act of 1935, for such payments: They are provided for in other titles of that act which are now administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, making provisions in unemployment compensation administration is duplication of effort. Furthermore, such payments, under what the late President Roosevelt called the "payroll contributions" under his social security program, constitute discrimination; and since when has an employer been held accountable for the size of a man's family.)

5. Employees of firms whose accounts in State funds are overdrawn, in the cumulative balance of benefit charges against contributions, shall be required to match their employers' contributions. (For seasonal workers, this would be the equivalent of a "sure-thing" bet on an 8 to 1 shot, and in some States to a 16 to 1 shot. So many firms and whole industries and even whole States

are so hopelessly overdrawn that continuance of this subsidy is unthinkable.)

6. In no case should the contribution rate of an overdrawn account be limited to 90 percent of the tax on employment in the Internal Revenue Code.

7. There should be provision in section 3303 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for additional credit allowances for employers who voluntarily match compulsory savings of their employees in commercial banks or in special State funds invested in savings accounts, under supervision of their State unemployment compensation agency. Such accounts to be established in lieu of standard unemployment compensation coverage by voluntary election of individuals, or groups, or whole plants. The moneys deposited shall be classed as special savings accounts and shall accrue to each individual's estate accordingly. The balance on hand shall be maintained at a level equivalent to half a year's earnings or more and withdrawal for any week of unemployment shall not exceed 1 percent of the individual's annual wages. (This is the best answer to the inflationary threat of the present system; it would be an anti-inflationary influence in prosperous times. If such a system had been in effect in 1957–58, there would not have been any need for Mr. HERLONG's H.R. 12065, now Public Law 85–441. Moreover, if the same ingenuity, which went into the design of the original unemployment compensation system, were put into the design of a voluntary system of compulsory savings, it could be made to work.)

Of course, this program will take a lot of political courage. It has in it the potential of a political asset: the American public believes in fair play and it will support those who show confidence in the willingness of the people to recognize fair play when they see it, despite the protests of minorities with vested interest in the present discriminatory system. The term "trust fund" itself implies equity and confidence. Why not, therefore, apply the principle all the way.

Rockets and Religion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I became aware recently of an important speech given before the Paterson (N.J.) Rotary Club on May 26, 1960, by Dr. W. M. Mebane, vice president and secretary of Thiokol Chemical Corp., of Bristol, Pa.

Dr. Mebane, speaking on the subject of rockets and religion, received a standing ovation from the members at the conclusion of his address, which was given without benefit of script. Fortunately, the speech was tape recorded.

It is good to hear a scientist in considering the salvation of the world take such a forthright stand in the field of theology. Following is the text of Dr. Mebane's speech:

Fellow Rotarians and guests, I have somewhat a feeling of humility in addressing you so soon after my very pleasant previous visit, and particularly so in following the same line of thought as before. Usually when one has the opportunity for such a distinguished audience to be captive, there is a strong temptation to do some selling—to sell himself, his company, to entertain, or to stir up some emotional response for one of these ends.

I will try today, however, to limit myself to the job of making you think quite seriously and realistically. In order to appreciate the significance of the technological developments of the past 15 years, it will be necessary to review the things which have generated great social forces in the past. Some of these are geography, climate, transportation, communication, but those which interest us most today have been man's ethical religion and his weapons.

Since the day when the caveman first picked up a stone to bash the head of his enemy, the development of weapons has determined the history of the world. This began when the early man discovered that he could put the stone on the end of a stick and wreak greater havoc with it. As the efficiency of the weapon increased, there was a parallel development of cooperative armament, from the clan to the tribe and finally to the nation. This movement gained momentum with the discovery of metal working.

In the valley of the Tigris-Euphrates River, ancient civilization grew where people discovered the metallurgy of bronze. As hand weapons improved, organized states developed, but there was no radical change until King Phillip of Macedon invented the phalanx. Until this time armies had been groups of men who went out and fought man to man with whatever weapons they could carry. The phalanx was a method of organized attack and defense, and it enabled Phillip's son, Alexander, to conquer all of the armies and nations within his ability to travel.

The next great invention was a discovery by a group of tough minded young men in the city state on the banks of the Tiber. This was that, as most swords were a yard or more long, a sword half as long and twice as heavy could be most effective for a system of in-fighting. This new idea of weapons, coupled with iron will and discipline, enabled Rome to conquer the world and hold it for centuries. The Roman Empire was not conquered by military power, but it fell because of internal deterioration of those characteristics which had made Rome great.

After the fall of Rome the rise of feudalism was in a great part due to advances in metallurgy which enabled the man-at-arms or knight on horseback to dominate many men on foot. Throughout the Middle Ages the man on horseback was the master, and enabled the few to dominate the many.

It was not until the English yeoman developed the longbow which could drive a steel tipped shaft with the hitting power of a 30/30 rifle that the knight began to yield to a newer force. At the battle of Crecy the English yeomen destroyed in a few minutes the flower of the armored strength of France. It was on this same battlefield that a knight was found dead of a hole in his armor which was not made by an arrow. That was the first time that black gunpowder had killed a man in battle.

The invention of black powder had been accomplished many centuries, perhaps 3,000 years, before, in China, but it had not been used in warfare. The gun was rapidly developed after its introduction, and it began a new change in the affairs of men. Up until now a mighty man of valor was a big and strong man, but now a small gun was known as the great equalizer, which made any man the equal of another in combat. It is not surprising that England was the modern cradle of democracy, because it was the English who developed the weapons by which the common man became the equal of his masters.

The effect of the family of weapons classed as firearms underwent no great change until during World War I when the English developed the military tank. This was a weapon against which the common infantry soldier was helpless, but this war was ended before the tank was fully developed. It remained for the German Panzer Divisions of World War II to demonstrate how completely warfare was changed. The panzer divisions enabled Germany to crush the not inconsiderable military power of France within a few weeks. General Rommel and others used the invulnerability and speed of the tanks to apply the tactics of Nathan Bedford Forrest to destroy all military opposition. This force was met by a similar force in the allied side, but the call went out to the research people and the military organizations to invent a weapon which would stop this mechanical monster.

In France back about 1915 was an event of significance. A German aviator and a French aviator passed each other in the air while on reconnaissance flight. It had been the custom of these aviators to wave at each other, but on this day one man raised a shotgun and fired at the other. Within a few months men had devised automatic guns which fired between propellor blades, and the business of aerial warfare was on its way.

When World War II came along, the airplane had advanced to the point where the fighter plane guns of World War I didn't bother much more than rain. Someone had to do something about it, so the call went out to the researchers to invent a weapon which would enable fighters and anti-aircraft crews to knock down those giant bombers.

In sea warfare a similar problem was developing. Cannon had grown larger, ships had to be larger to carry the larger cannon. They also had to be larger to carry the heavier armor plate, and the cycle of the race between armor and armament was reaching an absurd state. The battleship of 1940 weighed 60,000 to 80,000 tons and required crews of 3,000 or more men. The bombing planes were the deadliest enemies of the big ships, even though the 16-inch naval rifle was perhaps the most destructive weapon yet developed by man. Again the call went to the researchers to do something about weapons.

In each of these cases the problem was the weight of the gun and the force of its recoil. The airplanes, the foot soldier, and the ships needed a weapon with greater hitting power but with less weight and recoil. A 75 millimeter cannon was actually mounted in an airplane and fired in flight during the war, but the recoil almost stopped the thing in the air. It was definitely not a practical thing to do.

The only weapon known which had striking ability with little weight and no recoil was the military rocket. The military rocket was developed by an English ordnance man named Congreve around 1800. The rocket was first developed by the Chinese perhaps 5,000 years ago, but not for military purposes.

Napoleon gathered together a group of brilliant scientists to improve the artillery of his armies. His major interest in this was that the Russians had the finest field artillery in the world and he expected to conquer Russia. Many improvements were made in gunnery. Control of gunpowder quality, shaping of powder grains, rifled gun barrels, means of aiming, calculating trajectory, and dependability were developed. The result was that the gunner could hit what he was aiming at, whereas the rocketeer could not. The rocket was so erratic that it was abandoned by the armies of Europe in favor of the cannon before the end of the Napoleonic era.

And so the rocket came back into favor during World War II. Its freedom from recoil, relatively light weight as compared to cannon, and potentially unlimited range made it attractive in spite of its inaccuracy. Work was begun to solve the problem of accuracy and control.

The first reapplication of the military rocket was the bazooka, which enabled the common soldier to fire a rocket from a pipe carried on his shoulder which could definitely destroy the most powerful armored vehicle. They were so poor in accuracy it was difficult to score a hit much beyond 100 yards, but this was definitely a beginning.

Toward the end of the war our researchers had developed aircraft rockets, and so had the Germans. We are all familiar with the tragedy of Schweinfurt when we sent a large force of B-17's against this target and about half of them were knocked down by rockets.

The most dramatic field demonstration of rocket power was put on by the Russians. When the German army approached Leningrad they came within about 20 miles of it and dug in to organize for final assault and capture of the city. During the night the Russians brought up rocket launchers and fired artillery-type rockets with antipersonnel warheads into the trenches. It was reported that an entire army corp was wiped out overnight, and the Germans never did take Leningrad. It was not surprising that the Russians had so well developed artillery rockets. As early as 1917 an engineer named Riabouchinsky was making and testing such rockets near the old St. Petersburg, so it is highly possible that the Russians had about a 20-year lead on us in the study of basic rocket science.

The main problem in the use of rockets was guidance and control. Dr. Goddard in this country had demonstrated how pumps could be used to control the flow of fuel to the combustion chamber of the liquid rocket, and the Germans used his methods to build the V-2 rocket to which they applied a new guidance principle. They used the principles of the gyro stabilizer and the Schuler pendulum to give a space frame of reference for guidance.

After the war most countries went to work on rockets. The roeket is a simple device in principle. That which makes a shotgun kick is the same thing that makes a rocket go. With the shotgun the velocity of the shot, wadding, and gases multiplied by their weight, gives a figure which is exactly equal to the weight of the shotgun multiplied by the velocity with which is recoils. If one stands on ice skates and fires a shotgun, the recoil will propel one in the direction opposite from that of the shot. It makes no difference whether the ejected projectile is solid, liquid, or gas; it is the mass times the velocity that causes force. The hot gases used in rocketry have weight, and it is the expansion of the hot gases in the nozzle which gives the high velocity. The rocket is definitely a heat engine where heat energy in the gas is converted to kinetic energy of the jet by isentropic expansion, and the rocket obeys all the rules of thermochemistry and thermodynamics.

The technical problems in making large, long-range rockets are numerous. We had to learn the metallurgy of lightweight pressure vessels, and to pump large volumes of liquids in short periods of time. It is no small engineering feat to pump 50 or 60 tons of liquid from one tank to another within 60 seconds. The big liquid rocket has two tanks, one for oxidizer and one for fuel. A pump system transfers these under control to a combustion chamber which is fitted with a nozzle. The solid-type rocket has the oxidizer and the fuel intimately mixed and molded into a cake of designed shape and formed inside the rocket case. The basic principle is the same for both types.

Today the art of rocketry has grown to the point where both sides have some very effective guided missiles. For example, suppose we wish to destroy the city of Washington from here. We could take a relatively small rocket for the job. We would set it up somewhere around here and read into its control device instructions as to how it should take off, what direction is should travel for how many seconds, what changes in course it should follow, what corrections to make for earth's rotation, wind and weather conditions, and how high above the target it should explode.

If this rocket were to carry a thermonuclear warhead, I have no language to describe what would happen. I recently heard a comment by a man who saw the first hydrogen bomb experiment: "I wish fervently that it would be possible for all of the leaders of men to see one of these tests. It is so fantastically unreal that it defies language to describe." It would produce a fireball of many thousands of degrees of heat of about 25 miles diameter. Everything within this area is utterly and absolutely smashed by the brute mechanical force of the explosion and completely incinerated by the terrifically high temperature. And then of course there would be concentric areas of lesser damage but far too much for humans to survive, and the long lens-shaped area of radioactive fallout which would develop downwind.

If such a thing were used over New York City, 4 to 8 millions of people would cease to exist within the time of a finger snap; they probably would not know what happened. There are on both sides literally thousands of these devices in the warehouses of war. It is estimated that if half of these weapons were to be explosed within a few weeks, in a matter of a few more weeks not a cubic foot of air would be left on this earth which would not be certainly lethal. An all-out assault on this country could leave 40 to 60 million dead within a few days of the start.

There are other new weapons less advertised which are no less horrible. These are the radioactive, biological, and chemical devices. They are devices to immobilize or immolate whole populations at will without destroying property. Here again we are faced with the fact that both sides are no doubt well supplied with these weapons of war. It is said to have been demonstrated that it is practicable to render a population within a 500 square mile area completely helpless for sufficient time for an invading force to take over, after which the population may be reduced to slavery for the service of the conqueror.

It is not a figure of speech that the President and the leaders of other nations have used in citing man's capacity for self-destruction. It is as real as the fact that we are here in this room. The reality of the situation is explained by the actions of the nations as reported by recent news events. Man has not yet changed his nature and no matter how deadly serious the situation, we are likely to find world leaders trying to horse trade for any possible advantage from any decision.

I think possibly the explanation of the events in Paris (collapse of the summit conference) can be traced to some such human trait. How can men worship the idol of dialectic materialism and be expected to not play the game to the fullest possible advantage? When we deal with a materialist of this type, we cannot lead from weakness. We must lead from strength. The President explained that in his talk to the Nation far better than I could.

What is the salvation of mankind? Are we going to have a salvation? Are we going to destroy ourselves or are we to continue to sit on this razor's edge of in-between, armed to the teeth, and expecting devastation?

It has been 5,000 years since men first organized on the Yangtze, the Tigris-Euphrates, and the Nile Rivers into some sort of cooperative system of living together. It has taken all this time to evolve a system of law and ethics whereby we can live at peace with each other in our cities, our counties, and our States.

We have not made really important and serious progress in the development of a practicable and working international law. It is only now that our new weapons are forcing us to consider the reality of international law and order. The new weapon system is forcing men to make the greatest decision that mankind has ever had to make. We must evolve international law and justice or we will not survive. If we are to expect anything good, any improvement, we must change our basic philosophy of conduct as men, as states, as nations. In our side of the world much has depended upon the ethical standards which Western civilization has evolved. We lived by faith in each other, and it is hard for us to realize that half of this world has adopted this infamous philosophy of dialectic materialism which is a gnawing cancer in the side of all ethical religion.

How strong are we to throw off this disease? I fear we are not strong enough with our present standard of spiritual values. I believe that man must turn once more to the only real source of strength he has ever had. Man has never been within himself adequate to live and survive without outside spiritual aid. Man has never been strong enough to survive on his own intrinsic value. This absurdity of dialectic materialism is a weak crutch to support the needs of men, particularly since it is trying to destroy the only real hope the human race has ever had. There are five or more great ethical religions around this world which have always offered strength, hope and courage to men, the will to live, the will to grow, faith in the reason for life.

I am afraid that since the beginning of the 20th century we have paid more and more lip loyalty to these religions and less and less attention to really serious thinking. We are becoming more and more materialists. When you drive through the cities and towns of this country you cannot escape the thought that we are organized only for the living. We have little concern for the past and we avoid thoughts of the future. We must ask ourselves the fundamental question: Is man a living soul? Is there anything to this spiritual side of living? Is it really important? Or is it just a set of rules for living to which we have attached an emotional tag in place of the organization and procedures of jurisprudence?

Is it just an invention of the human mind against the unknown future which we fear, a sort of "hell insurance"? Has man invented God because he is afraid to live without a superior being on whom he may lean? Was the writer correct who said: "If there were no God, man would find it necessary to create one?" Objective philosophy has attempted to analyze these things for us, to explain why men make graven images, and build systems of theology, and concludes that these things are the result of man's fear of the unknown and man's self-insufficiency. We must take an intelligent interest in these analyses; in fact they are the basis of the academic comparative theology, but they have no strength to support us in our time of crisis. We must believe.

If we do not believe, another generation of people, who may be permitted to populate this earth after we shall have destroyed ourselves, will believe and live much by the things of the spirit and not entirely by the things of the slide rule. We have lived so much by the things of technology, chemistry, physics, biology, and the skills which we have in these things, we have forgotten all else. We are so insulated by technology from

God's nature, that we have forgotten what it is like.

We are much surrounded by noises, radios, TV's, entertainments, theater, automobiles, airplanes, and such that we have no time to obey the advice of the ancient prophet of Israel who said, "Be still and know that I am God." By what laws can we live together? In our fear and weakness we may get down on our knees and pray for an answer, but the answer has already been given to us. The ancient writer said, "Oh man, what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, love mercy, and walk humbly before thy God?" Then Jesus of Nazareth added something very great and very important to this: that if man is to survive, he must live with and respect his brother because he wants to do so and not because he is forced to do so. The choice is for us to make, we live with each other, respect each other as men, establish economic, social, and political justice throughout the world; or we continue a path of self-interest until we also become victims of the dialectic materialism of communism and go down in utter destruction.

Is this pessimism? No, it is using history which is a record of what man has done, to predict and plan for the promise of the future. We will follow a path of spiritual value, right thinking, right acting, under God, or we will perish.

National Conventions Highlight Importance of the House in National Picture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are back again in this historic Chamber to complete the work of the 86th Congress, and we have returned with a strengthened sense of the importance in the national picture of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. By unanimous consent, I am extending my remarks to include a radio address I made over station WIND in Chicago on the eve of the convening of the Republican National Convention and in which I stressed, among other significant matters, that the presidential nominees of both major parties were colleagues together in the 81st Congress and in the 80th Congress that preceded. I also mentioned the circumstances that the chairman of the resolutions committee at the Democratic National Convention and the keynoter at the Republican National Convention are both members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the 8t6h Congress. The radio broadcast follows:

I am speaking on the eve of the Republican National Convention with the Democratic National Convention just behind us, and I am thinking back only 12 years when first I came to the Congress, as the Representative from the Second Congressional District of Illinois. That was in 1949. There for the first time I had met JACK KENNEDY, now the nominee of his party for President of the United States, and DICK NIXON, the probable nominee of his party for the highest office in the world. I was a freshman Member, a first termer, and KENNEDY and NIXON were second termers, with only 2 years more of service in the House.

In this year of 1960, when we are facing perhaps the most serious fight for our survival in our history, one of these two young men who then were beginning only their second term in the House will be elected President of the United States to guide our ship of state and to carry the hopes of mankind in turbulent times with the world in the violent eruptions of dynamic changes. I am presuming of course that, as expected, Vice President NIXON will be the nominee of his party.

Also among my colleagues in the first Congress of which I was a Member were HENRY JACKSON, whom we all called by his nickname of "SCOOP," and THRUSTON MORTON. These are the relatively young men who now as chairmen of their respective parties will call the shots in the great campaign of this fall, a campaign destined for a high place in our national political history.

There were 435 of us in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States when we were sworn in the first week of January of 1949. The star of destiny was hanging over the heads of two in that group of 435 who were to battle for the Presidency in perhaps the most crucial period in our history. Also it was hanging over the heads of two others of that group who were to be the guiding managerial geniuses of the campaign of 1960.

When the 87th Congress convenes next January, I, if reelected, will look about the historic Chamber of the House, now with its 437 Members because of the admission to the Union of Hawaii and Alaska, and I will wonder over which of those 437 heads the star of a future destiny may be hanging.

The importance of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States in the making of Presidents is not to be overlooked by students of American politics. The House is very close to the people because its entire membership every 2 years must stand the test of the ballot box.

FROM MAYOR TO PRESIDENT

Grover Cleveland reached the White House from a start as mayor of the city of Buffalo in New York. That was the period when there was a large public interest in the conduct of the municipal chores. Cleveland caught the eye of the Nation and won the approval of the American people when as mayor of a city not as large as Chicago he effected economies, safeguards, and reforms in municipal government that long since have become fairly standard throughout the Nation. That seemed the road most likely to lead to the White House. Johnson and Baker of Cleveland, Pingree of Detroit, and Dunne of Chicago, at a later period, were the last of the era when crusading mayors were national news and national political idols.

Mayor Daley of Chicago has received more national and international news coverage of any chief executive of a city since that period because there has been an awakened interest in the tremendous and fascinating job of rebuilding great urban centers of population to meet modern conditions and an admiration of the herculean way Daley has gone about the job.

The fact, of course, is that nations cannot survive if their cities decay. Hence I would say that inevitably there will be a trend back to the days of Cleveland as regards the importance of the mayoralty in the national picture.

FROM STATEHOUSE TO WHITE HOUSE

The era of the Governors as the focus of popular national interest followed the era of the mayors. This was a natural development since many corrections of abuses manifested in municipalities, and reflected in the "Public be damned" attitude of traction and public utilities interests, required State legislation. Johnson of California, who ran for Vice President with Teddy Roosevelt and the Bull Moose, probably was the greatest of our Governors since he was the pioneer draftsman for much of the State legislation that put an effective check on prevailing evils of unbridled power.

Dunne of Illinois, with whom I served as Lieutenant Governor, must be placed high on the list of great American Governors if for no other reasons, and I think there are other reasons, than that his administration was responsible for the creation of a public utility commission that fixed the price of public utilities services on the basis of cost plus reasonable profit and also was responsible for the start of a program for good roads.

Today we have public utilities commissions in every State of the Union with the sole exception of Texas, I believe, good roads programs in all of the States. In general, the patterns in State government have been set, and now it is largely a matter of improvement and efficiency. The old days of crusading for new State instrumentalities are gone.

Today the gubernatorial office is largely administrative, an office requiring integrity, high administrative ability and a dedication to the public servce. It will continue to furnish a training school strictly on the administrative side for future Presidents, but I would think its glamour in the popular eye, a glamour that could lead to the White House, is on the decline.

There is a marked trend today toward the regional rather than the State approach. This is indicated by the increasing number of compacts among States in the same region to work jointly in common undertakings that Congress is asked to approve. A bill to approve a compact of the Great Lakes States has been help up for months in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs largely because there are three members of that committee from the Chicago area, Congresswoman CHURCH, Congressman MURPHY, and myself and, despite some unquestioned advantages in the compact, we wish more assurance than we have received to date that the other States in the compact would not gang up against Illinois in the Lake Michigan water diversion matter so vital to the people of Chicago.

But the point I wish to make is that in these compacts State sovereignty in limited areas and extent is being surrendered to regional sovereignty, and this is indicative of a trend. It all adds up, I think, to the diminishing attraction of the executive mansion for the young man who has set out to reach the White House. But, after all, I suppose destiny will continue to find her child wherever he may have wandered and guide him safely to his appointed spot.

COLLEAGUES IN 81ST CONGRESS

I was very fond of JACK KENNEDY. His simple democracy, his kindly consideration of the people in his office and around him appealed to me. I had heard of his heroism in the saga of the PT boat in the hostile waters of the Pacific. I knew, too, of the wealth of his family, and, perhaps more revealing, I had known his grandfather when "Honey Fitz" was mayor of Boston. Mayor Fitzgerald always will stand out in my memory as a man in public office who was all heart. JACK KENNEDY showed the same traits. Once I said to him, when he had put himself to much inconvenience to appear on a radio program, Quorum Call, I was preparing for my constituents in Chicago: "JACK, you come by this human charm naturally; you get it from your mother's father."

DICK NIXON was on the other side of the aisle, and in his freshman term had served as a member of the Un-American Activities Committee with the late Congressman Vail under the Thomas chairmanship. Once I clashed with him in debate on the floor of

the House. But when we did meet personally, as Members of the House frequently do during a session at dinners of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and similar occasions, the meetings were pleasant. Since he has been Vice President and circumstances have brought us together, there has been the pleasant nostalgia of a reunion of college alumni. After all, we were fellow graduates of the 81st Congress.

I would not have picked him out as likely to be a future nominee of his party for President. I suppose when William Jennings Bryan was a second termer in the 53d Congress—and seniority was much sterner then—none of his colleagues in the House would have picked him out. It would have been different, I think, in the case of McKinley because of his long seniority in the House and his reputation as an authority on the tariff, which then was the great political issue.

THRUSTON MORTON and "SCOOP" JACKSON, now the party leaders in the forthcoming battle for the Presidency, I knew much more intimately. "SCOOP," although only 37, was a fifth termer, having been elected to the 77th Congress at the early age of 29. MORTON was 40 and a second termer. He is of a wealthy Kentucky family and came to the Congress at 38.

Frank Roosevelt, namesake of his father, then a Member of the House and recently a campaigner for KENNEDY in the primary elections, and MORTON were members of a group of barbershop choristers that occasionally met in hours of relaxation during the 81st Congress, singing the classics of the yesterday under the direction of the old master, Congressman LOU RABAUT, and graciously recognizing the presence of one who enjoyed but could not sing by turning in my direction and singing "Irish Eyes."

I would expect both JACKSON and MORTON to conduct hard-hitting, hard-driving campaigns, but, after it all is over and the next President of the United States chosen by the people to lead the Nation in time of grave crisis, to shake hands, each with the feeling that the hand he clasped was as clean as his own.

FROM THE HOUSE TO WHITE HOUSE

I trust that I have not taken undue advantage of the invitation graciously extended me to appear on this program by talking of the Congress more in the terms of men than of measures. What I do wish to emphasize is the growing place in the overall national picture of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and in connection with the two national conventions of this year to bring to the attention of my listeners some significant phases that otherwise might be overlooked.

In the House there are 31 members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, 3 from the Chicago area. The present Secretary of State, Chris Herter, is a former member of that committee. It is to be noted that a Democratic member of that committee of 31, Congressman CHESTER BOWLES, was the chairman of the resolutions committee at the Democratic National Convention, and a Republican member of the committee, Congressman WALTER JUDD, will be the keynoter at the Republican National Convention. This is significant. It pinpoints the expanding importance of the House of Representatives in the making of policies and Presidents and one of the principle reasons therefore, the position of the United States as a world power. No longer are we a provincial people, beset only with local problems. What happens now in any part of the universe has repercussions in every American home. For better or for worse, our destiny under Providence has wedded us with world responsibility. The national conventions, as I have sought to interpret their significance, show the change this has made in the political scene.

TERM KEEPS HOUSE CLOSE TO PEOPLE

I would not pass over this opportunity to urge upon this radio audience, the men and women into whose homes my voice is reaching, a stout resistence to any suggestion that the term of tenure of office in the House of Representatives should be lengthened from 2 to 4 years. It is hard on Members of the House to run every 2 years. Of course, it is. But there is no law that compels a person to run for Congress, and once elected he may have an urge of duty to try for reelection, but there is no law to prevent his voluntary retirement if he chooses.

My experiences and observations during the years my constituents, to whose unfailing friendship I forever am indebted, have kept me in the Congress have confirmed and deepened my conviction that one of the greatest strengths of our Constitution is the provision that each member of the people's branch every 2 years must go back to his constituents for a new commission.

I doubt very much if the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States would be in its present enviable position of expanding influence if its members were elected for 4 years, contrary to the concept of the wise men who wrote our Constitution, the concept that one branch of the Congress, the House should be kept very, very close to and immediately responsive to the will of the people, and the other branch, the Senate, its Members serving for 6 years, acting as a check.

If ever the gulf between the people and their Congress is widened from 2 to 4 years we will have been started on the way to rule, not by the people, but by government itself.

I am proud to have been a member of the 86th Congress. There still is much to be done, and it will be done, advance in housing to bring a decent within the means of every family, broadening of the minimum wage concept that even the humblest are entitled to decent subsistence for their time and toil, medical care to save our aged from the tolls of pain and death they do not deserve. These are among our legislative objectives when we reconvene in August. But what already has been accomplished by the 86th Congress constitutes a page of brilliancy in the legislative history of our country.

New England Pays More for Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the cutback in residual fuel oil imports for New England for the last quarter of 1960, as ordered by this administration, will have adverse effects upon the economy of our region.

It will inflate the prices of a fuel that is essential to the operation of many industries, electric plants, housing projects, large apartment and office buildings.

This "planned scarcity" is designed to pressure New England into using more expensive domestic supplies of heavy crude oil, or to convert heating and energy plants to the use of coal as their basic fuel.

It will increase the costs for our industries and our residents.

My home city newspaper, the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune published in Lawrence, Mass., makes a strong case against this artificial policy that is so detrimental to the New England economy.

Under unanimous consent I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the pertinent editorial, "New England Pays More for Less" from the August 20, 1960 issue of the Lawrence Eagle-Tribune:

NEW ENGLAND PAYS MORE FOR LESS

Residual oil is tremendously important to New England industry. New England needs it in substantial quantity at a reasonable price. New England is not going to get it at least for the last quarter of 1960. The Department of the Interior has raised the price and reduced the import quota. The Department's acts, the New England Council estimates, will cost New England $10 million.

This additional cost to New England will be exacted while supply of petroleum throughout the world is so large that prices everywhere are going down. But the policy of Washington, in the name of the national defense, requires New England to get along with less and to pay more for residual oil.

The Presidential proclamation setting up the oil import quota program said the purpose of it is the preservation of "a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States." Official opinion underlying the program, therefore, ostensibly is that the reduction of oil imports will enlarge domestic markets for domestic producers and official theory ostensibly is that the enlarged markets will preserve the health and vigor of the domestic industry. The theory is persuasive when there is a diagnosis of serious illness in domestic producers and reason to think making New England pay more for residual oil will cure the illness.

The coal industry, rather than the oil industry, seems to be the one being treated by Washington at the expense of New England.

Residual oil is a heavy petroleum product left after other products are removed. It is extensively used for electric power and for industry and for heating large buildings. It can be imported inexpensively from Venezuela. In times of peace or war it can be brought more quickly from Venezuela than from gulf ports. Its competitor in New England is coal.

The New England Council asked the Government to establish a quota of 560,000 barrels a day for the last quarter of 1960, a period of heavy use of residual oil. The coal industry asked for a quota of 400,000 barrels.

The Government established what it called a compromise between the requests—415,000 barrels a day. A true compromise would have split the difference at 480,000. The quota obviously was not a compromise. Despite the noble words in the Presidential proclamation, it has all the appearance of an effort to help the coal industry try to force New England to turn from oil to coal.

Representatives of the New England Council visited Washington in July, after the price of residual oil had been raised 15 cents a barrel, and got the idea the Department of the Interior is not concerned by the disparity between the world price and the American price of residual oil and that, in determining what it calls a fair price for oil, it is interested only in the relation of the price of oil to that of coal and gas. Evidently, in the Department's mind, oil is not overpriced until it has risen to the point at which coal is less expensive.

As recently as May of this year, panelists at a New England Council discussion of the oil situation expressed the idea this country has an adequate national fuel policy in that it allows free competition between the different forms of fuel and enables different areas to use fuels that give the greatest economic advantage.

A completely free market for residual oil would cut the price by 56 cents a barrel. This is too much to hope for while the instinct to build tariff walls is strong. It should not be too much to hope, however,

that Government policy will strive to avoid giving a competitive advantage to one fuel over another—which appears to be the effect of the policy of increasing the cost and reducing the quota of residual fuel oil. It should not be too much to expect Washington to see the injustice of two prices for oil, one for the United States and a lower one for the rest of the world. It should not be too much to expect that a government concerned with vigorous, healthy industry will be concerned with the well-being of an industry as important to the Nation as that of New England.

Labor-Management Reporting Act Most Important Bill Enacted by 86th Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, of all the legislation enacted by the 86th Congress of the United States, only one law is likely to go down in history as an outstanding achievement, and that is the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959—better known as the Landrum-Griffin bill.

The need for this legislation became dramatically apparent because of the hearings held in the Senate and so obviously necessary because of the hearings held here in the House that its enactment was inevitable.

Since the law became effective, actions by the Department of Labor under the able direction of Secretary Mitchell have provided additional proof that the law was not only desirable but necessary. Mr. Mitchell has undertaken vigorous enforcement of the new law designed to clean out the underworld elements which in some instances have infiltrated and subverted a segment of the labor movement. He has appointed competent men to administer the law. They have functioned well and have in the course of a few months begun to bring order out of the chaotic conditions which once existed.

In the first 6 months of administering the new law, the Department has instituted investigations into 654 cases and has turned 75 cases over to the FBI for further inquiry. Of the 654 cases, 27 involved bill-of-rights violations of individual union members; 7 were embezzlement cases; 27 involved violence; 15 were officer-convict violations; 6 involved Communist-suspect officers; 6 unlawful disciplinary actions against individual union members and 1 involved extortionate picketing.

This is only the beginning.

As the Department speeds up its activities in this field, the investigations will increase and—although it may take more than a few years—the cleanup of the labor movement will be completed.

The law that has made this possible was one of the most bitterly-fought bills ever to come before the Congress. It was proposed only after long and careful investigation and was enacted only after weeks of hearings and long hours of debate. In my years in Congress I have never seen the kind of tension, the bitterness and the heat that the Landrum-Griffin bill generated. I suppose that in years to come the rollcall on acceptance of the Landrum-Griffin substitute will be marked as one of the most dramatic moments in the recent legislative history. I know that it was one of the most tense.

Many who supported the bill were accused of being antilabor. This was not in most instances the case. Personally I supported the measure because I felt strongly that it was in the best interest of the average working man and woman. I do not for a moment believe that the rank and file of labor union members support and believe in the kind of corruption, intolerance and injustice uncovered by the Senate and House hearings. It was to eliminate this, and this alone, which brought so much solid and stanch support to the measure.

Mr. Speaker, this vital legislation has begun to have its effect. With the kind of continued vigorous administration which was begun under Secretary Mitchell, the measure will go a long way toward clearing up the mess which was found in a part of labor's house.

Stockpiling for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I include a very interesting and informative letter signed by our colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. COOLEY, and appearing in the New York Times of July 20, 1960. There is no man better versed in the needs and necessities of the agricultural life of our Nation, and in connection with the legislation relating to agriculture, than Mr. COOLEY, the distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture:

STOCKPILING FOR SURVIVAL—NIXON FOOD BANK PLAN DECLARED IN PAST REJECTED BY ADMINISTRATION

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Many newspapers recently have given generous emphasis to the idea of a world food bank administered by the United Nations, and a suggestion that our great stocks of food be stored close to the centers of population, against the emergency needs of our people in the event of a nuclear attack.

This affirmative interest is encouraging to those of us in the Congress who, along with the President and the various executive departments, have the responsibility for developing, and for effective administration of, the Nation's food policy, including the sharing of our abundance with friendly peoples in other countries.

I regret, however, that these propositions of such great meaning had received so little attention in the press until Vice President NIXON, in a recent North Dakota speech, threw them into the political arena. Actually, they have been proposed in the Congress and in the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations for more than a decade. Both propositions have been rejected by the Eisenhower administration.

U.N. EFFORTS

The U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization made two attempts, in 1947 and 1949, to develop a world food bank. On each occasion they failed to gather sufficient support among the exporting nations. Subsequently, several congressional resolutions, by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, and others, were introduced, proposing a world food bank. A spokesman for the Eisenhower administration testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in May of 1956: "We see no need for the proposed world food bank." On June 27 Secretary of Agriculture Benson said: "The already burdened American taxpayer will question the vision of a world food bank which would require Uncle Sam to provide the stocks, the storage, and the cost of carrying the wheat."

In 1957, as chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, I appointed a special subcommittee, under the able chairmanship of VICTOR L. ANFUSO, of New York, for the specific purpose of examining our food preparedness for civilian survival in the event of war.

This subcommittee, on July 17, 1957, following public hearings, issued a report finding that, "In the event of nuclear war, the United States is utterly without a plan to immediately feed its civilian population, including its territories and possessions." It recommended that the Government move swiftly "to assure that emergency stocks of food commodities will be available at accessible locations as reserves against possible disaster."

ADEQUATE FOOD

Just recently, before Mr. NIXON made his speech, I made inquiry of the Department of Agriculture as to what has been done with respect to stockpiling. On June 7 I received the following from that Department's Food and Materials Division:

"This Department has made a number of studies of the effects that various types of enemy attacks would have on the food situation and has come to the conclusion that there is and would be adequate food in the Nation after an attack without Government stockpiling."

It is surprising that Mr. NIXON now seems totally unaware that his administration has consistently opposed these two propositions he now proposes as his "farm plank."

I hope that, with the help of the Times and of our other great newspapers, large and small, we shall be able to make determinations with respect to a world food policy and to stockpiling for survival, in the best interest of this Nation and the world, and that these undertakings of such moment will not be lost in the confusion and bitterness of partisan politics.

HAROLD D. COOLEY,
Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture.

WASHINGTON, *July 8, 1960.*

Hemispheric Security: Congress Must Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, soon after the Congress recessed, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev on July 9, 1960, pub-

licly declared that the Soviet, with its arsenal of rockets, is pledged to all-out support of Cuba in event that that country were attacked by the United States.

Does this provocative statement signify the existence of a mutual defense pact between captive Cuba and its Kremlin masters? I do not know, but believe it does. Nevertheless, this threat was and is a challenge of the most brazen audacity that could not be ignored and the President reacted promptly with a policy pronouncement on the next day, which I now quote:

The statement which has just been made by Mr. Khrushchev in which he promises full support to the Castro regime in Cuba is revealing in two respects.

It underscores the close ties that have developed between the Soviet and Cuban governments. It also shows the Soviet purposes in this hemisphere.

The statement of the Soviet Premier reflects the efforts of an outside nation and of international communism to intervene in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere.

There is irony in Mr. Khrushchev's portrayal of the Soviet Union as the protector of independence of an American nation when viewed against the history of the enslavement of countless other peoples by Soviet imperialism.

The inter-American system has declared itself, on more than one occasion, beginning with the Rio Treaty, as opposed to any such interference. We are committed to uphold those agreements.

I affirm in the most emphatic terms that the United States will not be deterred from its responsibilities by the threats Mr. Khrushchev is making. Nor will the United States, in conformity with its treaty obligation, permit the establishment of a regime dominated by international communism in the Western Hemisphere.

This was followed on July 12 with a statement by Premier Khrushchev to the effect that the Monroe Doctrine is dead, thus evoking a further statement on the matter by the Department of State on July 14 that I now quote:

[From the Washington Post, July 15, 1960]

TEXT OF MONROE DOCTRINE STATEMENT

In his remarks concerning the Monroe Doctrine at his press conference only July 12, Mr. Khrushchev again displayed his extraordinary ability to ignore facts.

In the first place, the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today as they were in 1823 when the doctrine was proclaimed. Furthermore, the Monroe Doctrine's purpose of preventing any extension to this hemisphere of a despotic political system contrary to the independent status of the American States is supported by the inter-American security system through the Organization of the American States.

Specifically the Organization of American States charter and the Rio Treaty provide the means for common action to protect the hemisphere against the interventionist and aggressive designs of international communism. Likewise, Mr. Khrushchev failed to mention that the Rio Treaty is the first of the regional treaties for which provision is made under article 51 of the United Nations Charter.

TREATY AIM CITED

Mr. Khrushchev might appropriately reflect on the fact that one of the considerations for establishing the Rio Treaty was that:

The American regional community affirms as a manifiest truth that juridicial organization is a necessary prerequisite of security and peace is founded on justice and moral order and, consequently, on the international recognition and protection of human rights and freedoms, on the people and on the effectiveness of democracy for the international realization of justice and security.

One of the principal purposes of the Rio Treaty was to provide a method for dealing with threats of imperialistic powers seeking to establish their domination in the Western Hemisphere.

A further remarkable development was revealed in Mr. Khrushchev's meeting with the press. Speaking as the head of the Soviet Government, he arrogated to himself the power to detremine what international agreements should or should not be binding—even though the Soviet Union is not a party thereto.

THREAT CALLED STRAW MAN

In this particular instance it was not only the Rio Treaty but also the treaty between the United States and Cuba covering Guantanamo, which he has sought to abrogate. While disregard for treaties to which it is a party may be viewed by the U.S.S.R. as a convenient approach to international relations, such an effort can only be regarded by law-abiding states as another example of Soviet intevention in the affairs of other countries.

Mr. Khrushchev's latest references to United States-Cuban relations are of a piece with his threat of July 9. As a pretext for his threat, he conjured up the strawman of a nonexistent menace of United States aggression against Cuba.

The threat of the use of force, made to blatantly by the Soviet chairman in relation to the affairs of nations of the Western Hemisphere is contrary to the basic principle of the United Nations Charter which rejects the use of force in the settlement of international disputes. This naked menace to world peace, brandished so callously by the Soviet leader, reveals the hypocrisy of his protestations in behalf of peace.

SEE BOLSHEVIK DOCTRINE

Moreover, these statements of Mr. Khrushchev appear to be designed to establish a Bolshevik doctrine providing for the use of Soviet military power in support of Communist movements anywhere in the world. Mr. Khrushchev speaks approvingly of the historically positive role of the Monroe Doctrine during the 19th century, when it was applied against the European imperialisms of that day, but declares that "everything has changed abruptly" now that it (the Monroe Doctrine) stands in the way of the new imperialism; international communism.

The principles which the U.S. Government enunciated in the face of the attempts of the old imperialism to intervene in the affairs of this hemisphere are as valid today for the attempts of the new imperialism. It consequently reaffirms with vigor the principles expressed by President Monroe: "We owe it * * * to candor * * * to declare that we should consider any attempt on their (European powers) part to extend this system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Today, nearly a century and a half later, the United States is gratified that these principles are not professed by itself alone, but represent through solemn agreements the views of the American community as a whole.

The agreements alluded to in the above statements are the 1947 pact of Rio, the 1948 Bogota Charter setting up the Organization of American States, and the 1954 Caracas Declaration.

With the sense of the statements above quoted, all thoughtful Americans of the Western Hemisphere, North, Central, and South, will heartily agree. But Executive pronouncements, merely reacting to crises created by our failure to lead boldly in making our position clear are not enough. They should be promptly followed up by adequate congressional actions on resolutions now pending in both Houses of the Congress to defend our policies from Bolshevist attacks.

In various previous addresses and unheeded warnings to this body, I have foreseen and predicted what is now happening, and outlined a definite program to remedy the situation in the Caribbean. So far, no conclusive measures have been taken and matters have been allowed to drift from bad to worse.

All the evidence increasingly emphasizes the necessity for immediate action and the gravest peril in further delay. We must make clear to all nations of the world exactly where we stand. Had the Congress and the Executive acted earlier, as they could and should have done, the present crucial situation might well have been avoided.

Thus, Mr. Speaker, I ask again: Why wait for new blows to fall which may start another world war?

Hyde Park High School a Pattern for the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in the district in Chicago that I have the honor to represent is located Hyde Park High School. It is a school with a glorious past, many of its graduates having reached places of high eminence. Walter Eckersol, regarded by oldtimers as the greatest of football players, came from Hyde Park. I have a personal sentiment for Hyde Park High School, stemming from the fact that one of my sons was a student there. The Hyde Park neighborhood has changed with the years. Now there are many Japanese-Americans, many Negro Americans, many Caucasian Americans, an integrated community abiding by the precepts of good neighborliness. Hyde Park High School is living up to its traditions. It is setting for the Nation, in this challenging period of change and readjustments, a pattern of an integrated high school that quiets the fears of the timid in the face of change and strengthens the faith of others that our America, under God, at last will make democracy come true.

To the Hyde Park High School PTA I am indebted for a copy of Alex Dreier's news commentary over NBC radio station WMAQ of Chicago on June 23, 1960, which by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include for the thoughtful reading of my colleagues, both from the North and the South. Mr. Dreier's commentary follows:

When Chicagoans talk about race relations, they usually are talking about race

problems, and there is quite a difference. Actually, a great many Chicagoans hold a very distorted, if innocent, view of the true situation in the Windy City.

Chicago has a great and crushing Negro population. And per capita crime in that population is appalling. Just about as appalling as it would be if the people of Chicago selected any other racial or ethnic group and compressed it into a horribly inadequate amount of space, and then denied the members of the oppressed group adequate economic opportunities.

What has always amazed most thoughtful people who have observed the Chicago racial scene is the number of Negroes who insist upon keeping all the rules, many of which are designed deliberately to keep them in a state of subservience, and raise their children to be conscientious, law-abiding citizens.

Why don't the Negroes react more violently to the ethnic and spiritual ghetto into which they have been driven? Some say they would, but the only immediate road out is violence, and that they do not want. Others, their vision marred by suppression, recoil and say that if the white man does not want him in his world then they will stay in their own, no matter how unsatisfactory it may be. Still others hope and pray for a better future, and work with civic and social organizations to better themselves while they try to gain a bit of empathy from a too-often unfeeling, or worse, unthinking, majority.

But there are numerous bright spots in an otherwise disgraceful situation. Hyde Park High School, on the Southeast Side, is one of them. Here almost every race, religion and nationality group is represented, and at almost every economic level. The area that sends Negro, white and oriental children to the high school is inhabited by workers on the lowest rung of the economic ladder, as well as the children of the well-to-do, and professors at the University of Chicago. Here, in race-conscious Chicago, is a large, integrated high school at peace with itself, and busy with the job of educating youngsters of every background. And the record shows it is doing a mighty good job of it.

This is the same high school that has produced so many leaders in so many fields, including a raft of well-known celebrities such as Steve Allen, Mel Torme, and Arch Oboler.

There is nothing magical about the Hyde Park formula. Intelligent administration, of course. And equally important, intelligent parents who care how their children think and act.

Yet, Hyde Park High School is unique in other ways. The standards are higher, and although much of its huge enrollment is from economically underprivileged areas, the vast majority of Hyde Park students go on to higher education, and many of them make it possible through scholarships.

It is true that in many parts of Chicago there is racial segregation. Only a fool or a liar would deny it. Here in Chicago, racial segregation takes the form of geographical segregation. A Negro cannot live anywhere he can afford to live. He encounters subborn, though often silent opposition. So where he lives, his children go to school. In the Hyde Park area, Negroes live among whites, or is it the other way around? Here, in one corner of Chicago, is the American experiment, and so far, it has been working far better than the bigots would have you believe. Here, in Hyde Park, is proof that school integration can and will work. And like it or not, the rest of Chicago had better look on and learn. For this is the Chicago high school of 10, 15, or 20 years from now. But ironically, if most of the fearful could observe this high school, they would realize they have little to fear.

The Sierra Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend remarks I submit the following article by Philip Hyde from the Christian Science Monitor in which Mr. Hyde describes the work of the Sierra Club. His words of praise for this dedicated conservation organization which are so richly deserved and his remarks about the club's powerful recent publication, "This Is the American Earth" by Ansel Adams and Nancy Newhall, warrant the attention of us all.

The article follows:

TO EXPLORE, ENJOY, AND PRESERVE

(By Philip Hyde)

If John Muir, our celebrated western naturalist, could today see one of his favorite projects, the Sierra Club, he would be surprised. He would also be immensely pleased, for his prime purpose in founding the Sierra Club in 1892 was to develop an organization that would become a strong voice for protecting the natural scene. From the small beginning of five men in 1892, brought together by Muir, the Sierra Club has grown to its present membership of over 16,000, and to a national prominence as a major voice for the protection of our natural scenic resources.

The club's motto reads: "To explore, enjoy, and preserve the Sierra Nevada and other scenic resources of the United States." It is made up of people who are dedicated to enjoying our natural scenic resources and to making sure they will be here for coming generations to enjoy. Though it has long since outgrown the possibility of holding a "club meeting," the membership is subdivided into a number of chapters which sponsor local activities, such as educational meetings, lectures, local walks, climbs, auto-tours, and camping outings. Much of the membership is concentrated in the West, but there are also active chapters ang groups in Chicago, New York and Washington.

EXPERIENCING NATURE

The Sierra Club sponsors a varied program of summer outings which emphasize the "explore and enjoy" part of its motto, but they are not without purpose in fulfilling its chief objective, for they are, in a sense, basic training for the rising conservationists, and are often scheduled in an area where a conservation problem has arisen.

Outings this summer include such varied places as the North Cascades of Washington, the High Sierra of Yosemite and Kings Canyon National Parks in California, the San Juan Wilderness in Colorado, Three Sisters Wilderness in Oregon, and the Sawtooth Range in Idaho. River trips are floating Sierrans down the Green and Yampa Rivers in Dinosaur National Monument, on the Green through Desolation Canyon, the Rogue in Oregon. An innovation this year in the expanding scope of outings is the canoe trip through Minnesota's Quetico-Superior canoe wilderness. Another outing, not all on the enjoyment side, is the Clean-up Week in a littered scenic area.

Behind this variety of activities is the philosophy that education and experience are prerequisite to conservation: that natural beauty, like freedom, will be most enthusiastically defended by those who have experienced it.

The present leadership of the club knows where it came from: mature people now who were the trailblazers and "crag rats" of yesterday, who know the joys of wilderness and want their children to know them, too.

TO STIR AWARENESS

In its work of making Americans more aware of their great natural scenic resources, the Sierra Club publishes the Sierra Club Bulletin, described as "that model of mountain periodicals" by Ronald Clark, British author. It has also, of recent years, begun to publish books of conservation significance.

BOOK HAILED

Its most recent publication, "This Is the American Earth," by Ansel Adams and Nancy Newhall, has been hailed as a landmark in American publishing. It expresses beautifully and powerfully what the Sierra Club stands for. With superb photographs made by Ansel Adams, and those of 30 other leading photographers, its moving, poetic text by Nancy Newhall poses the 6,000-year question: Will civilized man learn to live with his environment, so carefully and painstakingly prepared for him since the birth of the planet—or will he go on ruining it, and himself in the process?

His tools and technology today are more ruinously efficient than any he has before possessed during his brief tenancy on earth. Will the development of his most important resource, the spiritual, come soon enough to teach him how to use his hools wisely to preserve his environment, and himself?

Memorial Tribute to Philip B. Perlman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BYRON L. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago one of the greatest champions of civil rights that this country has ever known passed away—former U.S. Solicitor General Philip B. Perlman. Over the last two decades Philip Perlman had held many positions of great responsibility and had distinguished himself in all of them.

It was, for example, he who presented the restrictive covenant cases to the Supreme Court in 1947. The subsequent ruling in 1949 constituted an important milestone in the abolition of legal sanction for segregation.

While I had been fully aware of his vigorous and aggressive role for years in the struggle to stamp out racial discrimination and assure all Americans equal rights under the law, it was only recently my great privilege to serve with him on the Platform Committee of the National Democratic Convention in Los Angeles and to watch at close range his brilliant and incisive mind in action as the cochairman of that committee. Little could I know or suspect that this was to be his last contribution to that cause.

Time and again throughout our deliberations and the drafting of the platform, as throughout his entire career, he revealed himself as a prodigious and diligent defender of the downtrodden, as an uncompromising protector of those

people who have been the victims of prejudice. I am profoundly humbled by the opportunity and the experience of having shared in so small a way in the creation of that document, so appropriately entitled "The Rights of Man," which is an enduring monument to his memory.

Philip Perlman's passing is an irretrievable loss to the Democratic Party and indeed to the American people.

Louisiana State Winner in National Teenage Safe Driving Road-e-o Again From Third Congressional District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, the Third Congressional District of Louisiana, which I have the honor of representing, has produced for the third successive year the State champion in the National Teenage Safe Driving Road-e-o sponsored by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States.

Bill Vincent, 17, son of Mr. and Mrs. Britton Vincent, of Lafayette, senior and honor student at Lafayette High School, the Louisiana winner for 1960, has been in Washington for the finals of the ninth annual road-e-o. He finished first in the State competition at Ruston where approximately 50 victors in local contests participated. Jimmy W. Carter was State chairman.

Forty-eight State champions took part in the Washington events in which they were tested on their attitudes and their knowledge of road rules, given a driving machine test, interviewed and required to negotiate successfully four tricky obstacle courses in the District of Columbia Armory and a 6-mile run through District traffic. After all scores were compiled, prizes of $2,000, $1,500, and $1,000 scholarships were awarded to first, second, and third place winners respectively during a banquet at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, road-e-o headquarters. The Louisiana champion made a very good showing, placing 16th among the 48 contestants.

Young Price was accompanied to Washington by Donald E. Butcher, also of Lafayette, son of Mr. and Mrs. Edwin Butcher, of that city, a director of the Lafayette Junior Chamber of Commerce and local road-e-o chairman. Others in the Lafayette group visiting Washington were Mrs. Elden Butcher and Miss Gloria Foreman.

Bill brought with him for President Eisenhower a gold Lagcoe oil hat which had been presented to Bill for this purpose at a petroleum club luncheon in Lafayette by Leo Franques, chairman of the Louisiana Gulf Coast Oil Exposition. With the hat, symbolizing the Louisiana oil industry, the exposition, and Lafayette's position as the oil center of the South, was a scroll which read:

The Louisiana oil industry and its biennial exhibition, the Louisiana Gulf Coast Oil Exposition, is deeply honored to present this token of esteem to Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States, accompanied by our most sincere wishes for a long and happy future, and a most cordial invitation to attend the Fourth Louisiana Gulf Coast Oil Exposition in October of 1961 at Lafayette, center of petroleum activity in the south of Louisiana, our Nation's greatest producer of petroleum per acre.

The scroll was signed by Chairman Franques; Maurice Heymann, developer of the Heymann Oil Center at Lafayette; and Sidney C. Ory, president of the Lafayette Chamber of Commerce.

Through arrangements made by my office the presentation took place at the White House where Bill and Donald were received by Secretary of the Cabinet Robert K. Gray who accepted the hat and scroll in behalf of the President.

The Lafayette Junior Chamber of Commerce, with a membership of around 40 young men active in community affairs, sponsors numerous civic projects in addition to the safe driving competition which is open to both boys and girls. Cary Moore is president and the other officers, in addition to Donald Butcher, are Lionel Prejean, first vice president; Alvin O'Fleurty, second vice president; Earl Grand, secretary; Scott O. Brame, treasurer; and Tom Rogers, I. J. Mires, and Noel Diuffrida, board of directors. Formed several years ago, the organization meets for a luncheon program on the first Wednesday of each month and gathers for a night meeting on the third Wednesday.

In 1958 Louisiana was represented in the road-e-o finals in Washington by State champion Raymond Albert Young, son of Mr. and Mrs. William Young, of Centerville, who was accompanied by Ted L. McIntyre, son of Mr. and Mrs. F. P. McIntyre, of Franklin, representing the Franklin Junior Chamber of Commerce as a member of the board of directors.

Last year's Louisiana champion also came from the Third Congressional District. Bill Young, son of Mr. and Mrs. Pierre W. Young, of Lafayette, competed in the Washington finals. Accompanying him was Cary Moore, son of Guilliam Moore and the late Mrs. Moore, who is head of the Lafayette Junior Chamber of Commerce of which at that time he was vice president and local road-e-o chairman.

A World in Turmoil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission previously granted, I would like to introduce into the RECORD for the information of my colleagues the latest issue of my newsletter "Report to the People" for August 10, 1960:

A WORLD IN TURMOIL

Since my last newsletter report to you, the world has been in turmoil—in turmoil to such a degree that developments abroad have to a considerable degree overshadowed congressional activity.

Congress, of course, has been busy and has been in session since January except for the recess declared July 3 for the national political conventions. Much important and vital legislation was acted upon before the recess and much more is awaiting action before final adjournment.

I have delayed writing you this newsletter for several reasons, among them the fact that I had hoped before doing so to be able to report on the final actions of Congress on all major legislation. But with Congress ending its recess, a later issue of the newsletter will report on unfinished business of the House and Senate.

Then, too, I hesitated about writing this newsletter while deveolpments abroad—one after another—kept the world seething. These developments, starting with the U–2 spy plane incident and including the summit collapse and the critical situations which arose in Korea, Turkey, Japan, the Congo, and Cuba, left the world in a state of tension.

If nothing else, the developments abroad brought into sharp focus the problems of the hesitant leadership in our foreign policy program. They highlighted the lack of an aggressive leadership which, I maintain, is essential if we are to meet the challenges facing us in the world.

I expressed this view in Bridgeport on June 25 when I accepted nomination for re-election and I still maintain that ours is a world in revolution and in the last year we have suffered unexpected and incredible reverses. The situation in which we find ourselves is the result of a make-believe foreign policy—a policy which could cause countries in four continents to capitulate to communism.

In this world in ferment, our position has been weakened by lack of creative leadership and our only hope of survival is an aggressive foreign economic policy plus a strong military capability.

WHAT CONGRESS HAS DONE

Congress, with world tension tightening, has been active. When the recess began, Congress had acted upon 10 regular appropriations bills and several supplementals for fiscal 1960 and 1961 and sent them to the President. Elsewhere in this newsletter, I have reproduced a breakdown for your information showing the status of appropriations in the second session of the 86th Congress. I would like to point out, however, that other statements to the contrary, the Democratic-controlled Congress kept a close eye on expenditures and you will note that the amounts appropriated are several millions less than President Eisenhower had requested. But note, too, the Defense budget—particularly for the Polaris missile program—is higher than requested. The Polaris program, of course, gives great promise for an effective mobile missile launching capability and Congress authorized $241 million more for this program than had been requested by President Eisenhower.

In the field of foreign aid, I want to emphasize that I supported every effort to appropriate the full amount requested. In this area, I feel very strongly that we should do much more than has been done. The mutual security bill passed the House before the recess, but is under consideration by the Senate Appropriations Committee. It is my sincere hope the Senate will restore the funds trimmed from the foreign aid bill by the House.

In connection with this subject, incidentally, I expect and hope that with Congress reconvening the President will present

his program for aid to Latin America, where the crisis has been deepening and fostering new problems as the result of Castro's appeal to many Latin American countries. Not only is a strong program for our Latin American relations long overdue, but this Nation also should move forward in developing additional programs of this nature for all other critical areas of the world. It would not seem too early to prepare an economic program for the development of Africa, where the emergence of any newly independent but ill-equipped nation presents fertile soil for Communist activity.

Other legislation completed by Congress prior to the recess included:

Civil rights: I had voted for the House-passed civil rights bill at the time of my last newsletter. Later, of course, after a record filibuster, the Senate also acted on civil rights legislation. For those who may not have read my last newsletter, let me emphasize I have long been a strong advocate of civil rights. I felt the House-passed bill could be improved upon but nevertheless certainly represented a step in the right direction.

Sugar Act extension: I supported this legislation, passed after an all-night session, which gave the President complete authority to determine the amount of sugar to be imported from Cuba. I did so in view of our deteriorating relations with the Castro government and because I felt the President should have the power to act in an emergency.

Farm legislation: The farm problem is still in a muddle and I voted against a wheat bill providing for the maintenance of supports at 75 percent of parity. I still feel the administration has shirked its responsibilities in failing to offer a comprehensive farm program this year. Just before the recess, incidentally, one bill was enacted which can absorb some of the mounting surpluses on farm commodities. This was a measure authorizing the United States to participate in the 63-nation International Development Association to help underdeveloped countries. The law permits the overseas sale of some farm surpluses, with payment to be made in foreign currencies. Farm spokesmen say the new law may have a dual advantage. Besides serving to relieve the surplus problem, returns from sales, when invested in the nations in which the sales are made, can help create or expand markets for other U.S. commodities.

Federal employees' pay raise: This measure, passed over a Presidential veto, was less than a perfect bill. I supported it, however, because of a very definite need for substantially increased Federal salaries. Experience has shown that the Government needs higher salaries at top levels of Civil Service and there is a study presently being made which I hope will result in legislation to correct this shortcoming.

Rivers and harbors bill: This was legislation of particular importance to Stamford and the Fourth Congressional District I represent. Included in this authorization bill was a vitally needed hurrican flood control project for Stamford. Many hours of combined effort and hard work went into this particular project before it was finally authorized. It took close coordination, cooperation, and teamwork on the part of Stamford city officials, and interested industrial and civilian parties, operating in conjunction with my office, to get the project approved. Congratulations are due Mayor Walter Kennedy, Flood and Erosion Control Board Chairman Al Kanzler, and others for sticking with this matter until it finally was included in the bill. Much credit must go, too, to people like Stamford Finance Commissioner Norm Gluss; Dean Brossman, executive vice president for the Stamford-Greenwich management council; Gil Brooks, Dom Del Guidice, and Ed Bankowski, among numerous others. The fight is not finished, though—it will resume in January when efforts must be made to get the necessary funds appropriated. Assuming I am reelected, I shall, of course, continue to do everything in my power to have the funds appropriated for the project.

Better labeling bill: Overlooked and often ignored in the heavy publicity and news coverage given controversial measures are many noncontroversial, so-called unimportant bills. Yet these little-known laws frequently do great public good. A case in point is the better labeling law requiring far more prominent warnings on hazardous and poisonous materials brought into the average home daily. Hereafter, labels on these items (including cleansers, dyes, disinfectants, and polishes) must clearly state: "Keep out of the reach of children." Also, every package must henceforth display prominently first-aid antidotes for the misuse of such products. Why is this such an important piece of legislation? Every year some 600,000 youngsters swallow dangerous preparations and, of these, more than 500 die.

STILL AWAITING ACTION

The Senate has already returned after the recess. The Senate, with more pending business on its calendar, resumed sessions in advance of the House which must wait for the Senate disposition of various bills before it can take action on them. I anticipate the House sessions will be fairly short, perhaps of but 2 or 3 weeks' duration. I do not think there will be any major squabbling because there is a definite job to do and we will want to get it done.

The mass transportation bill: Of major importance from my personal viewpoint is what I hope and expect will be final House action on the Senate-approved bill sponsored by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey to provide loans and grants to ease the mass transportation problem. This bill, a companion to one I introduced in the House, is vital to the ultimate solution of the commuter situation in Fairfield County. Incidentally, I have expressed strong dissatisfaction over the action of the Interstate Commerce Commission in permitting another 10 percent boost in New Haven railroad fares even before the ICC's investigation of the line was concluded. It appeared to me that the proper action would have been to refuse the fare increase until public hearings were completed.

Bridgeport Harbor appropriation: Another item I expect favorable action on in the remaining days of the session is an appropriation bill before the Senate containing $750,000 to inaugurate improvements of the Bridgeport Harbor during the coming fiscal year. The amount, contained in the President's budget, nearly got sidetracked by a House subcommittee recently but fortunately I was able to convince the subcommittee to retain the allocation because of the tremendous importance of the project to Fairfield County. Eventually the harbor improvements will cost more than $6 million. Had the subcommittee knocked out the allocation, work could not have been started this year. Thanks to the support of two of my New England colleagues I was able to convince the subcommittee the Bridgeport Harbor is a distribution point for southwestern Connecticut where commerce is increasing, and that deepening and widening of the channel would eliminate tidal delays to existing commercial traffic and permit the use of larger vessels with substantial transportation savings.

Also on the calendar for further action are the following:

Health insurance for the aged: High on the priority list for consideration when Congress reconvenes is the extremely controversial bill providing health insurance for the aged. The House has already passed legislation providing increased social security benefits and a moderate, State-option, health benefits program. The Senate Finance Committee held hearings on this legislation before the recess started, but took no further action. Incidentally, I did not consider the House-passed bill adequate in the area of health benefits for the aged.

Federal aid to education: This is a bill snarled in controversy and parliamentary wrangling and I hope that definite action can be taken before final adjournment, though I am far from hopeful on this possibility. The Senate, early in the session, passed a bill providing $1.8 billion over 2 years for school construction and teachers' salaries. Late in May, the House passed a bill authorizing $1.3 billion over 4 years for construction only.

Minimum wage bill: Another bill passed by the House just before the recess was a minimum wage bill raising the minimum wage to $1.15 an hour for workers previously covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act and extending a $1-an-hour minimum, without overtime protection, to an estimated 1.4 million workers in the interstate retail chains. The Senate is still to act on the legislation.

Omnibus housing: Also lodged in the House Rules Committee is an omnibus housing bill providing funds for Federal housing programs. This bill, reported favorably by the House Banking and Currency Committee, would, it is hoped, revitalize housing production which dropped sharply over the past year.

Foreign investments: I am hoping for Senate action on H.R. 5, a tax-incentive measure to spur U.S. private investment in underdeveloped countries. This is a bill I supported when it passed the House.

Self-employed retirement: This is H.R. 10, the Keogh-Simpson bill which would permit self-employed to defer taxes on portions of their income set aside for retirement purposes. I voted for it when it passed the House, and regard it as forward-looking legislation which I would like to see enacted into law. Indications are, however, that the bill may encounter opposition in Senate floor debate.

VIEWS ON THE NATIONAL CONVENTIONS

I attended the Democratic convention in Los Angeles as a delegate. I was satisfied both with the choice of the ticket and the platform adopted there. I also watched the Republican convention in Chicago and was encouraged by developments there, too. Of particular note, in my opinion, was the adaptation of Vice President NIXON to a new posture concerning the issues before the Nation in the light of developments of the last year. For an interesting view of the Republican platform, I suggest you read the editorial on page 120 of the July 30 issue of Business Week magazine.

MY BACKGROUND TO JUDGE CUBA

In my last newsletter, I commented about the Cuban crisis, United States-Cuban relations, the Castro government, etc. My comments were based partly on a personal trip I made to Cuba in March. Several letters I received questioned my authority to judge Cuba on the basis of such a brief visit. I would like to say this, in the event others also wondered about my remarks in which I said I was convinced a poor job of administering Cuba by the Castro government would in itself bring serious economic troubles to that country in the near future. True, my visit to Cuba was brief, but for the benefit of those unaware of it, my knowledge of Spanish-speaking nations is extensive. For one thing, I was born and raised in Argentina, where I attended public school. My father worked for Swift & Co. in Argentina and in fact is still employed by that company although now residing, with my two sisters and my brother, in Brazil. Besides this background, I also was an instruc-

tor in Spanish at Yale College and at Hotchkiss School in Lakeville, Conn. Developments since my comments appear to be bearing out the views I expressed regarding Cuba. Castro has grown weaker and seems to be losing his hold, particularly with important and influential groups. They're talking out against him now, warning of economic collapse. There are some sources in our own Government who think Castro will fall by year's end. Incidentally, you might also be interested in knowing that for some months now I have been making weekly Voice of America broadcasts in Spanish which are aired into Latin American countries. Usually these broadcasts are made jointly with Representative JOSEPH MONTOYA, of New Mexico, and we feel they are playing an important role in improving and strengthening our Latin American relations. Similar programs are broadcast as panel discussions whenever visiting Latin American legislators are in Washington.

Charles Nutter Takes the Rust Off the Iron Curtain in a Most Informative and Penetrating Analysis of the Real Threat of the Soviet Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am bringing to the attention of the House one of the most informative and penetrating analyses of the real Communist threat that has ever come to my attention.

Charles Nutter is managing director of the famed International House of New Orleans. Before coming to that important post he was one of the outstanding reporters for the Associated Press and among other duties which he had when connected with that great news-gathering organization was bureau chief of the Association Press in New Orleans. It was in that capacity that I first came to know him more than 20 years ago and shortly after he had returned from an Association Press assignment in Moscow.

Recently he headed a New Orleans businessmen's delegation behind the Iron Curtain countries. His observations are the result of a skilled and trained mind. There is nothing brash or extreme in these observations. They are firm and well grounded. I suggest Mr. Nutter's piece on Russia must reading.

(By Charles Nutter)

NEW ORLEANS.—The Associated Press, in its wisdom, recently distributed a story saying that around 15,000 Americans will crack the Iron Curtain and visit the Soviet Union this year. This number may be even greater if hotels and travel agencies can handle the influx. What Khrushchev and Eisenhower think of each other has not blighted the tourist crop to Russia this year.

These visitors will spend a week, a month or two hitting the tourist spots in Russia and will come home with a curious confusion of impressions which they will pass along from amateur lecture platforms all over America for the next year or so.

Get ready to hear these scarcely new facts about the Soviet Union: There are some churches open but not many; antireligious museums are hard to enter; posted prices on foodstuffs and clothing are sky high; there are very few automobiles and many pedestrians; lots of new housing is being built; Russian kids like gum and know a little English; women work at everything including day labor; hotels are adequate, but not luxurious; photographic restrictions seem to have disappeared.

Now and then some traveler will regale his listeners with an exciting story, mostly imaginary, of difficulty with the police, losing his passport, or another spicy account of hidden dangers he faced and mastered there beyond Minsk.

These bits of chit-chat will be passed along to Americans who have not seen Russia. They would be harmless enough if the visitors accounts stopped there, or if they dug deeper into the real meaning of the Soviet Union and Communist International which you don't see or read from a hotel window or taxicab.

But unfortunately there will be many otherwise astute observers return with a belief that because of its frontier appearance, high prices and scarcities and lack of many comforts and luxuries, that this is a backward nation and is no economic threat to the United States because it has several generations to go before it catches up with capitalism.

International House of New Orleans recently conducted its 40th trade and travel mission abroad in 15 years; and this time we took 85 persons to Russia, Czechoslovakia, and Poland, being behind the Iron Curtain for 2 weeks and in Red Square in Moscow on May Day at the very time that the U–2 incident occurred.

I conducted this trip on behalf of International House and I am as convinced that few trade contacts or opportunities were uncovered as I am that very few of our traveling members grasped or understood the economic facts and threat of communism as we glimpsed it in our brief mission.

The Soviet experiment, now 43 years old, is so vast, so different, so thought provoking and so startlingly successful at last that the Kremlin feels no fear in letting in large numbers of Americans to see their country and openly boasts of its economic plans for us all in the full belief that we cannot comprehend the facts and the danger.

A year or so ago Nikita Khrushchev told us over television that our grandchildren would live under socialism (a sugar-coated word for communism which is used frequently so as not to alarm people too much), and he further declared that "we declare war upon you in the peaceful field of trade. We declare war and we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system."

Adolf Hitler in his celebrated book Mein Kampf never was more specific in the plans he had for the world than the Communists are and constantly have been for about a century since Karl Marx dreamed in the British museum in London. So long as these plans were just dreams we could afford to pay little attention; now they are dreams backed by a billion captive people who have become, against their will or approval, economic serfs under an industrial empire which would engulf the world.

The recent trip to the Soviet Union was my second visit there. In 1936–37, at the height of the great purges, I was a foreign correspondent there and saw Russia beginning to emerge from agricultural serfdom into an industrial state. Today, despite a great and disastrous war, the transition is far advanced, and the industrial power of Russia is beginning to roll and menace the world.

This visit to Russia left me with the very definite belief that the real Soviet threat is economic, not military. The Communists, by dint of clever planning, hard work and forced or virtual slave labor of their entire populace, have created an industrial power second only to the United States. In full view of the world but without its realization or alarm, the Kremlin has adapted outlawed and outdated malpractices of capitalism to establish a supreme state monopoly under state capitalism. It is called communism.

The fruits of a labor force which is larger than in the United States and which is surprisingly efficient in many areas and fields doesn't go to improve or help the people; it goes into a gigantic fund for use of the Kremlin, ample financing indeed for world revolution.

Communism in Russia is not communism at all, and probably never was. Today the Soviet Union is one gigantic trust in which the people are and have been exploited beyond the wildest dreams of capitalism in this or any other country. Everything and everybody belongs to the state and move and operate at the whim of the state. The state owns every job and every means of making a living, and it owns every living area, every bit of production, all land and factories, and resources, developed and unexploited.

The state controls all wages and salaries and it also controls the cost of living or rather it fixes both. It can raise or lower either overnight, closing or widening the gap without consultation or law, for some 210 million people. It does so, of course, by holding wages down and raising living costs, particularly clothing or food, so that a whole family, including the wife and mother, has to work to make ends meet.

It looked to me as if the Soviet system, communism or so-called socialism in Russia today, economically speaking is a colossal distortion of the company, the company town, and the company store, all monopolies, as we used to know them in the United States, but which have disappeared. The profits of this great all-embracing monopoly, which is nationwide, do not reach the people; they are used instead by the state for political purposes, national and international; ample financing indeed for the worldwide conquest plans which communism espouses.

It is necessary to know and remember that profits and the profit motive didn't disappear in Russia, the government just took them over and gave them new names that are deceptive and misleading as always.

Profit is a dirty capitalistic word in Russia, something reserved for blasting the capitalistic world. Capitalism also is a dirty word, reserved for enemies of the Soviet Union. Yet there are profits beyond the wildest dream of anyone in the Soviet Union today, and a degree of capitalism that surpasses anything in the free world.

The difference in that under state capitalism, Kremlin style, profits are not distributed to many private owners, the profits go to the sole owner of everything—the state. And this is by no means the workers paradise, for the worker has nothing whatever to say about what goes on.

The high prices which we saw quoted in good stores in Moscow and Leningrad are not necessary or realistic. They are, instead, a subtle form of taxation to drain off any surplus a worker might accumulate. In a monopolistic economic state, prices have no relationship to costs necessarily; prices are not geared to cost but are fixed by political decisions taken in the Kremlin. Shoes need not cost several weeks' salary, for they could be sold for a day's salary or issued free, if

desired. But this might leave the individual with cash in hand which the state dislikes. Private accumulation is the first step toward private capitalism.

The worker is left drained dry at all times. He must exert his maximum effort to make ends meet, and this work effort, multiplied by a hundred million souls, goes to enrich the parent corporation, which uses the labor force's productivity for capital expenditures and goods, for propaganda, for sabotage, espionage, and subversion, for education, for military preparation and adventures, for sputnik and lunik, for training of Communists to work in other countries all over the world, and for any other purpose it sees fit.

Better housing, food and clothing for the proletariat comes into this scale at whatever level the leader decides. Usually it is near the tail end. It is correct to say though that food and living conditions are improving and are vastly better than they were in the thirties.

The important thing also to remember about Soviet economics is that despite 10 million slogans and claims to the contrary, the workers or proletariat have nothing whatever to say about what goes on; they are as voiceless actually as slaves because there is no way they can make their voices felt or heard.

The proletariat does not control, they comply. There are no real unions, no strikes, no sitdowns, slowdowns, complaints; nothing but obedience or disaster. The world's greatest private corporations never approached this system in power or in numbers of workers. The Soviet Union has complete and absolute mastery over a work force of more than 100 million workers. The proletariat hasn't one thing to say about what jobs they hold, their wages, their rents or food costs, or any like factor. Russia has a dictatorship of state capitalism, big business beyond the wildest dreams of the hated trusts which the Soviet press and leaders are always denouncing.

Behind the curtain and always ready for action against a sullen or unresponsive worker or a troublesome one, is compulsion. He might lose his work card, or his assigned room to live in, or he might be ordered to a new job thousands of miles distant. Finally there is the secret police and terror. The Soviets have killed more people for economic reasons in trying to uproot humanity and change its habits than they lost in World War II.

Under Secretary of State Dillon, wise to the ways of the Soviets, recently said that "in the thirties the Communists procured foreign capital equipment by exporting grain at prices below an already depressed world market—despite the fact that millions of Russians and Ukranian peasants were dying of starvation." The graves of tens of millions of workers in the so-called workers paradise are the foundation for present industrial successes, and more will suffer and die as necessary to build this success higher.

This is the face of the enemy and the economic war in which we find ourselves. No day passes in Russia, or presumably in China, without millions of printed words exhorting greater production, greater efforts, greater sacrifices so that capitalism and particularly the United States may be surpassed, and then destroyed.

Big Business as above-explained now is working well in Russia after more than 40 years, and is moving along rapidly. The people who make it possible, albeit perhaps reluctantly, are not unhappy actually for they are better off than they have been before and feel that their lot and living conditions have improved. This is the important thing always to remember about Russia; not that the people are not as well off as we are, but that they are better off than at any time previously. Things are improving for them and they are satisfied with this.

They really do not know of better things in the world. Ninety percent of the present population grew up under so-called Socialism or Bolshevism, know little of the outside world, and are victims and believe in the Soviet's clever, well-planned, monopolistic and universal propaganda.

No longer is it useful to dream that in educating the people the Kremlin will create a frankenstein to rise and destroy the master. The Soviets have sold the people on the system, and the alleged danger and threat from the outside, particularly the United States. It is safe to say that the Russian people, naurally friendly and broadminded, have been taught to fear and distrust the United States. They believe that the United States is a grave peace threat to the world, and that it would destroy Russia if possible.

Absurd as this may seem to Americans, it loses its absurdity and becomes a menacing fact when it is realized that this is a genuine fear help deeply in the hearts of people who lost 20 million dead and saw a third of their country laid waste only a generation ago.

Summarizing a little on this phase the sad fact for us is that the average Russian may not be very well off by our standards, but he doesn't know it and he thinks he is doing better by his standards. And he has actually been taught to believe that America endangers Russia's frontiers and he must work and sacrifice to prevent this.

The average Russian also has no idea the extent of subversion and meddling in world affairs engaged in by the Kremlin, nor of the seriousness of the Communist International plans for world conquest. He is, in other words, providing the sinews and the financing for world conquest without knowing that this is the master plan of Communist planners.

Russia has always been imperialistic to a certain extent but the Russians themselves are not conquest minded. This, though, makes no difference because they have not nor will they be asked their views; here again they are the foils of communism, and they obey.

Meanwhile we are confronted with an inexorable desire by the heads of the Communist International for taking over the world. The important aspect of Soviet foreign economic policies which must never be forgotten is their determination and powerful drive to penetrate and eventually capture the newly developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America through trade and aid techniques. Economic warfare was developed and is thoroughly understood by the Soviet Union; to us it is largely a nuisance well remembered from World War II of which we'd like no more.

Khrushchev has told us openly and repeatedly that the Communists shall fill the needs of backward peoples better than the Americans and consequently shall win their minds, control of their lands, their resources and themselves. We do not seem to understand such language. We understood Pearl Harbor and we finally understood Hitler's Nazi Germany; but we do not seem to gather any alarm from a more determined, more resourceful, better financed and better planned threat from Communism.

Under Secretary Dillon once said that "in their offensive economic weapons have been cleverly blended with military assistance, propaganda and diplomatic moves, to inflame local passions and to create and aggravate situations of crisis. The long rnge aim is to create climates and attitudes in the newly-emerging areas conducive to eventual Communist take-over."

If Soviet penetration, economic subversion or trade succeeds in extending Communist rule in Asia, Africa, the Near East and Latin America the cost to the Kremlin is nothing compared to the results. Police power will be used to hold the people in line, and to hold control over immense wealth in the world's vital minerals.

Americans have been reluctant to grasp the awful significance of Soviet totalitarian plans, design and action. We'd rather relax and enjoy an economy that could be toppled by Soviet plans. We cannot or rather we have not understand that human beings can think, act and work from a set of motives and reasons completely the reverse of our own.

Last year President Eisenhower told the Congress in his State of the Nation speech that "we have learned the bitter lesson that international agreements, historically considered by us as sacred, are disregarded in Communist doctrine and in practice as mere scraps of paper. The demonstrated disregard of the Communists "of their own pledges is one of the greatest obstacles to success in substituting the rule of law for rule by force.".

There can be no doubt that the Communists live by the law of the jungle; stealing, lying, killing, and destroying are virtues when done for the state. They dishonor their own word, their firmest commitments are meaningless. And this is the movement that teaches that Russia keeps its pledges but the United States does not; that Russia wants peace and we want war; that all powers are warmongers except the Communist powers.

For almost 40 years the Soviets have been training nationals of every country in the world in revolutionary tactics; how to destroy and create chaos, how to inflame and arouse peoples against their rulers and leaders. They also have been dumping trade goods into desired areas of the world at giveaway or at extremely low prices. They know how to attack America's export market by dumping of their own goods. And they have the will to do this when they see fit. They also have the financial ability, thanks to very long and successful planning.

The industrial output of the Soviet Union today is very impressive, and is very menacing. Factories still are not as neat, well built, and imposing as American factories but in many cases they are as productive; the Soviet workman has become a skilled workman. His productivity can and does rise as high as the American workman. Need is sparked by fear to drive him ever forward.

When we were in Europe Premier Khrushchev announced Russian abolition of income taxes over a 5-year period, starting next year. He made much of the fact that Russia could abolish income taxes while the United States very largely lived on such high taxes. Here is distortion and misrepresentation that takes keen analysis. The Kremlin can in fact abolish all income taxes without losing a single ruble of revenue; it shifts the emphasis to higher priced consumer goods or rents, and collects just as much as ever. But in the remote areas of the world they can brag to an unsophisticated people that they alone can live without income taxes; bane of the capitalistic world (their language).

The Soviet Premier said: "The abolition of taxes on workers and employees in our country is an impressive social gain for the peoples. One cannot speak of it without pride and emotion. This is an enormous gain, dear friends.

"Look at what is happening in the capitalist countries, where taxes are perpetually rising, unemployment reigns and prices are spiraling upwards. The insecurity of the working people lies like a heavy weight on the masses.

"When people all over the world see that the living standard in the Soviet Union is regularly improving, that wages and pension benefits are rising, that taxation is being

abolished and that the network of free medical, cultural and welfare facilities is expanding, they come to the clear realization that socialism is solving the most urgent problems and is showing the right way to get rid of exploitation, unemployment, and poverty."

This kind of talk is for the export trade, not for home consumption since Khrushchev doesn't really care a fig for public opinion at home—that is already captive. He is trying to influence public opinion in the non-committed countries.

This is "black is white, white is black" at its pinnacle. But this is not the picture the American tourist will bring home. This is the reason that it is dangerous to accept at face value the impressions of tourists traveling in the Soviet Union and the reason that permitting 15,000 or more Americans to travel there this year is in reality part of the master plan to confuse and confound the world. Facts are not always facts in Russia and what you see with your own eyes or hear with your own ears may mean something wholly different than you think.

Travelers going to Russia therefore won't necessarily bring home the truth about that country, and often are dangerously misleading in their reports.

Russia has been called a puzzle, enigma, and a riddle but it is none of these. Its purposes and plans are well advertised. It is of course difficult to understand how human beings can become so dedicated to a cruel, inhuman system which feeds on destruction—even of its own architects—but we must recognize there are several million such dedicated Communists in Russia and China.

Our job is to take the economic offensive and prove that the capitalistic system is a superior one to theirs.

Monroe Doctrine and Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr Speaker, the Congress now has under consideration a number of measures that would reaffirm one of our basic hemispheric policies: the Monroe Doctrine.

Among the recent contributions to the cumulating literature on that key subject is a thoughtful article in the July 25, 1960, issue of the U.S. News & World Report, which summarizes the 1947 Rio Pact, the 1948 Bogota Resolution and the 1954 Caracas Declaration in relation to enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine.

The indicated article follows:

JUST WHAT ARE U.S. RIGHTS IN CUBA?

If the Communists force a showdown over Cuba, what can the United States do about it, legally? The answer: Plenty.

United States has the means to move to protect its interests. Pacts with the Latin-American Republics set a course of action.

Behind them is the Monroe Doctrine—scorned by Khrushchev, but still a U.S. weapon, ready for use if necessary.

Nikita Khrushchev, on July 12, brusquely informed the United States that the Monroe Doctrine—after 137 years—is "dead," and that Communism is on the way to the Western Hemisphere.

The Soviet dictator was saying, in effect, that he would do what the czars before him had failed to do: challenge the United States and enter this hemisphere.

James Monroe, fifth President of the United States, proclaimed on December 2, 1823—when the U.S. Government was only 34 years old—that any attempt by European powers "to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere" would be considered "dangerous to our peace and safety."

In brief: The United States was prepared to resist with force, if necessary, the incursion of a European power into affairs of the Western Hemisphere.

AN EXPANDED DOCTRINE

In recent years the Monroe Doctrine has been expanded, by treaties, into a policy that is binding on all the American republics.

On July 9, 1960—in the 137th year of the Monroe Doctrine—President Eisenhower asserted flatly that the principle of the Doctrine would continue to be enforced.

Said the President, in a warning to Khrushchev:

"I affirm in the most emphatic terms that the United States will not be deterred from its responsibilities (to prevent interference in hemisphere affairs by an outside power) by the threats Mr. Khrushchev is making. Nor will the United States, in conformity with its treaty obligations, permit the establishment of a regime dominated by internatitonal Communism in the Western Hemisphere."

Nikita Khrushchev 3 days later, on July 12, challenged the President. Khrushchev declared the Monroe Doctrine "has died a natural death." Earlier, he threatened the United States with attack by intercontinental missiles if it moved to interfere with communism's spread in Cuba.

The United States came back on July 1 to declare "the principles of the Monroe Doctrine are as valid today" as ever. It said these principles are upheld not only by the United States, but they "represent, through solemn agreements, the views of the American community as a whole."

What United States can do. Thus raised is the question of U.S. rights and U.S. agreements related to the invasion of the hemisphere by communism—through either force or subversion.

The Rio Pact: Under this treaty of 1947, the American republics are pledged to a "common defense" if the "political independence of any American state" is endangered by an outside power. It authorizes the use of armed force for the common defense of the Americas.

The Bogotá Resolution: Under a resolution passed by the Ninth Inter-American Conference, at Bogotá in 1948, the American Republics condemn "the action of international communism or any other totalitarian doctrine." That conference also adopted the Charter of the Organization of American States, which reaffirms the commitment made in the Rio Pact to act jointly against a threat from outside the Western Hemisphere.

The Caracas Resolution: Under this declaration of 1954, the domination or control "of any American states by the international Communist movement" becomes a threat to peace. In such event, the resolution calls for consultation for "appropriate action."

Beyond these are U.S. rights under international law. If American lives are endangered in Cuba, for example, the United States can send in troops under an international right of self-defense. The same applies to wholesale seizures of American property without "prompt and adequate" compensation, if such action is felt by the United States to be a threat to peace and if the Organization of American States fails to act.

United front? Privately, almost every responsible leader in Latin America is fed up with Fidel Castro and his ties with Moscow. There were signs that hemisphere allies were beginning to rally around the United States.

At Peru's request, the Council of the OAS met on July 16 to take up the Red threat. Before that, Argentina called on Cuba to denounce Khrushchev's "statements which may be construed as interference."

At some point, joint action could come to check Castro and the Reds. The Monroe Doctrine, far from dead, looked stronger than ever.

The Changing Face of American Cities—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been introducing in the RECORD a series of insertions, "The Changing Face of American Cities," and under permission previously granted include the following excerpt from Forum magazine's two-part survey, "The New Urbanites." The excerpt:

THE INFLUX OF NONWHITES IS COMPOUNDING THE BIG CITIES' SLUM PROBLEMS AND FOCUSING ATTENTION ON THE INADEQUACIES OF THE NATION'S PUBLIC HOUSING AND RENEWAL PROGRAMS

Three-quarters of the estimated 13-million substandard housing units in U.S. city slums are occupied by Negroes and other nonwhite racial groups, most of them recently migrated from rural areas. Last month, Forum examined the sources of this new urbanite population, and the economic, ethnic, and social forces causing it to huddle in teeming and growing slums. This month, Forum considers the major necessity without which the integration, urbanization, and free advancement of this new group of city dwellers cannot begin to be solved, which is decent housing. And, although the record to date is bleak, there are some real stirrings toward a more hopeful future.

The housing market for Negroes has traditionally been a trickle-down market, but only in the past decade or so has the trickle amounted to much. Though Negroes have expanded into formerly white residential areas, their chances of moving on, outside the city limits in the wake of families with the same economic and social characteristics and ambitions, are slim at best. Thus the middle-income Negro is blocked off from becoming truly middle class in terms of housing, for he is banned from that great oasis of middle-class mores, the suburb. The case of Grosse Pointe, Mich., an upper-income suburb of Detroit, exemplifies the smug exclusiveness that has intensified the minority housing problem. That community has devised a system of ratings for potential home buyers, who are investigated by a detective and screened by a special panel. The ratings are based on ethnic background, accent, clothes, and other important measures of desirability. Negroes, however, do not get rated at all. The furor over this bit of nonsense has already prompted State officials to consider legislative action to bar any further employment of such ratings scales.

Government has attacked the problem of the slum ghettos with two basic weapons—slum clearance and public housing. Both seem sound in principle. Certainly the worst

slums should be destroyed, and ideally they should be rebuilt with new, healthy housing, available on an open-occupancy basis to low-income groups. However, neither Federal urban renewal nor public housing has come close to solving the overall problem of slum proliferation and misery. In many respects, they have intensified the problems.

THE FAILURE OF FEDERAL SOLUTIONS

The Federal public housing program has just about ground to a halt. Last year, only 21,427 units were completed, and this year less than that will be built. Five years ago, when the program was cut to 35,000 units per year, its advocates howled, but the sad fact is that even this is much more than the cities can digest. Several weeks ago, acting Public Housing Commissioner Lawrence Davern was asked by a Senate committee why cities were no longer requesting Federal aid for public housing, and he replied that northern cities, in particular, were not requesting more aid, despite demonstrated shortages in low-income housing, because of integration problems. City officials, Davern maintained, are unwilling to approve sites where neighbors might object to public housing (which must have open occupancy in almost all northern cities, although Federal law does not require it), or where integration might prove difficult.

Many cities are gravely concerned about the heavy concentrations of Negroes in public housing projects. Chicago public housing is 88 percent Negro, Washington over 90 percent, and New York City 39 percent. Yet it is the Negro families that need housing most, and they can hardly be restricted by quotas or any other such artificial means as long as they are least privileged in housing choice. It has been estimated that average Negro income for the Nation as a whole is only 60 percent that of whites, and that three out of every four families dislocated by slum clearance in cities are Negro families with incomes under $4,000 per year.

The fact that what little public housing there is has been increasingly Negro does not enhance its popularity, and the overpublicity given to the antisocial behavior of a few problem families in public housing sours many cities' taste for more. Much of the blame for the failure of the program must be laid directly to the local authorities and to the PHA itself (Forum, June 1957). Unrealistic income and building cost ceilings, unworkable regulations, too few large dwelling units, and other failings have all been charged at various times, in various cities, but none of these is as important as the misguided notion that public housing could be used to create new neighborhoods, isolated from the rest of the community. From this misconception grew the goliath developments that cover block upon block of New York, Chicago, and other cities, unfriendly monstrosities that are never referred to by their inhabitants as anything but "the project." Problem families are indeed a problem, and always will be, but problem buildings need not be duplicated year after year.

Philadelphia and Baltimore, among other cities, have discovered that new neighborhoods cannot be created by public housing, and that the effort is likely to result only in the exchange of new blight for old. These two cities have pioneered a more sensible approach to the problems of housing low-income families, based on upgrading their housing and neighborhoods by judicious rehabilitation of single units, accompanied by vigorous social work to educate the new urbanites in the ways of urban living. They have successfully attempted scattered site and conversion programs, and have encouraged new design concepts. The settlement-house approach, wherein the newcomers are drawn into a neighborhood rather than walled off from it, has worked and is being refined. In Baltimore, the usual 1-year in-city residence rule has even been waived in public housing, and it has not led to any rush of new urbanite families, but rather made it possible for the authority better to serve those families which are most in need of help.

In New York City, the biggest public housing program of all has fallen short in many respects. Planner Raymond Vernon, author of "Anatomy of a Metropolis," perhaps summed it up best when he observed that "the redevelopment of neighborhoods through the subsidized construction of low-income housing has generally not greatly altered the density or distribution of population." Thus, despite 26 years of effort and a total of 110,000 units built, New York's public housing, though it has greatly augmented the supply and quality of housing for the least privileged, has hardly made a dent in the cruel pattern of segregated, congested slums.

Of course, the greatest failure of public housing has simply been its insufficiency. Every big city in the Nation has a long waiting list for public housing, and relocation agencies have long decried the lack of it for eligible families uprooted from slums by Government action of one sort or another. There are currently 326,000 units in active planning or under construction, but this can hardly meet the challenge of 13 million substandard dwelling units occupied by more than 13 million families due to doubling up.

GILDING THE GHETTO

If public housing has not helped low-income families, particularly minorities, by dint of its insufficiency, poor design, and administrative shortcomings, the urban renewal program has, indeed, been a real obstacle for these families. In the first place, though it is, like public housing, a slum-clearance program, urban renewal was never designed to provide housing for the slum families it must, of necessity, dislocate. Its purpose has been to draw middle-income families back into the central city with attractive new housing. No one argued with this notion back in 1949, when the urban renewal program was passed, because no one then foresaw the utter collapse of public housing, with a consequent loss of housing opportunity for those families uprooted. As a result, low-income families are constantly being ousted from their slums, and shifted to other slums, unless they can get into public housing. This not only adds to the congestion of the already crowded slums, but propagates and intensifies the slum ghetto, for the majority of dislocated families are usually forced into Negro slums not very different from those being cleared.

Urban renewal, like public housing, attempts to create new neighborhoods, but it seems to have a better chance of succeeding. For one thing, urban renewal can operate on a vaster scale. Philadelphia's Eastwick area, for instance, will eventually be rebuilt with 10,000 units of new housing, selling for $10,000 to $12,000. As Development Coordinator William Rafsky says: "This will be the first large supply of new housing available to Negroes in Philadelphia and it may become the first large-scale integrated area of the city."

Most cities say their renewal programs are not far enough along yet to gage fairly the final result. But it is already apparent from progress in New York City, Chicago, and several other large cities that most projects with not accomplish much more than clearing patches of slums and substituting new housing. By and large it is housing that will not accommodate those living in the replaced slum or the surrounding neighborhood, so in effect, it must attract a different breed of city dwellers, usually older, well-to-do couples without children, or professionals who have long spurned the suburbs. Moreover, though urban renewal housing is thought of as open-occupancy housing, it is for whites only. This is due simply to high rents, too prohibitive for any but the tiniest minority of high-income, Negro professional families. One New York housing expert, when asked his opinion of the effect of housing white families in Harlem title I projects, scornfully characterized such integration as "gilding the ghetto." Neither public housing nor urban renewal has done much to solve the basic problem of housing the vast number of Negro families, new and old urbanities, in central cities. Basically, this has been because neither program has been big enough to solve the housing shortage which underlies the whole problem. In New York, scene of the Nation's biggest urban renewal and public housing programs and its biggest private apartment boom, a total of 380,000 housing units has been produced in the past decade; yet, according to a recent analysis by J. Anthony Panuch, the city today has the same basic housing shortage it had 10 years ago. It still lacks 430,000 units in meeting its needs, and this was exactly the deficiency in 1950. Thus 38,000 units a year on the average (25,000 of them new) are only enough to keep New York standing still. At this pace, it will be 20 years before the city pulls abreast of today's needs.

Coal Wins Over New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Boston Herald on August 16, 1960:

COAL WINS OVER NEW ENGLAND

On Saturday we warned that the soft coal interests were seeking to hold down imports of residual oil to 400,000 barrels daily for the last quarter of the year. The New England Council, keenly aware of the importance of residual in this area's economy, asked for 560,000 barrels a day.

We said that what the Interior Department decided as to the quota would show whether coal was retaining its dictatorship over New England.

The dictatorship of coal has now been reaffirmed. The Department of the Interior, while not going quite down to the level sought by the coal interests, has set the import quota at 415,000 barrels a day. This is so close to coal's demands that it marks a clear victory.

Why is the Department of the Interior thus playing coal's game? There is nothing in the Presidential proclamation setting up the oil import quota program that mentions coal. The declared purpose was the preservation of "a vigorous, healthy petroleum industry in the United States."

Residual oil is unimportant to the petroleum industry, and unlimited imports of this product would not disturb the domestic oil companies. The President's proclamation was aimed at crude oil and other products.

But residual oil does compete with coal. The coal industry would like to see the price of residual so high that users of oil equipment convertible to coal will turn to coal, and new customers will choose coal over residual.

What then is the intent of the Interior Department? Has it secretly determined what share of the market coal should have and will it now arrange import quotas ac-

cordingly? Or is it merely bending to the superior strength of the coal lobby as against the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation, the New England Council and the New England delegation in Congress?

The New England Council calls for a tougher fight to protect New England's interests. We join them.

Monroe Doctrine at Full Cycle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, students of history have long since recognized the cyclic nature of foreign policies of great nations. This tendency is well illustrated in the case of the Monroe Doctrine.

An informative editorial on this doctrine by Robert Akerman in the July 25, 1960, issue of the Richmond (Va.) News Leader will be of interest to every Member of the Congress.

The editorial follows:

RUSSIA FIRST FOE OF MONROE DOCTRINE

(By Robert Akerman)

With Nikita Khrushchev's shocking defiance, the Monroe Doctrine comes back where it started.

Russia was its first target, the first enemy of the principle which it embodies, the first nation to be warned by the United States against further colonization in the New World.

A widespread impression is that the Monroe Doctrine of 1823 involved protecting South America against Spanish attempts to regain her former colonies. However, that's only part of the story—and not the first part, either.

Since 1741, when Vitus Bering discovered Alaska, Russia had claimed territory on the Pacific coast of North America. These claims were followed up by Russian settlements in Alaska before the end of the century.

No one could object to Russian activity in Alaska, as international law recognized the rights of a discovering nation. But Russia began to make bigger plans. Talk started in czarist circles about converting the Pacific into a "Russian lake," by extending settlement from Alaska into the Oregon territory and even into California—areas which she had not discovered.

Acting on this idea, in 1811 the Russians set up a trading post in California, only 48 miles north of the present site of San Francisco. More than 100 colonizers established themselves there, even though Spain actually owned California. Nikolai Rezanof, the Czar's chamberlain, viewed this move as a step in making California a Russian possession.

J. B. Prevost, a U.S. naval officer in the area, sent warnings to Washington of what was happening. He wrote: "Surely the growth of a race on these shores, scarcely emerged from the savage state, guided by a chief who seeks not to emancipate but to enthrall, is an event to be deprecated—an event, the mere apprehension of which ought to excite the jealousies of the United States."

Meanwhile, in negotiations with England and Spain, the United States has strengthened its claims to portions of the Oregon Territory. Because it was between the legitimate Russian colony in Alaska and the illegitimate infiltration in California, this Oregon foothold gained in importance.

In 1821 the Czar issued a decree declaring a large portion of the north Pacific closed to trade or navigation except for Russian vessels. This brought Russian imperialism out in the open. Secretary of State John Quincy Adams moved vigorously to oppose it. Discussions were held with the Russians over their intentions. In his diary for July 17, 1823, Adams records the decisive conference with the Russian envoy, Baron Tuyl:

"I told him specially that we should contest the right of Russia to any territorial establishment on this continent, and that we should assume distinctly the principle that the American continents are no longer subjects for any new European colonial establishments."

That was 6 months before the formal announcement of the same principle in President Monroe's famous message to Congress. The first part of the subsequent Monroe message was clearly framed as a warning to Russia.

In another 6 months Russia backed down from her grandiose ambitions, signing a treaty with the United States setting the present southern boundary of Alaska as the limits of her territorial claims.

Eventually the United States acquired California from Spain and Alaska from Russia, changing the Pacific picture entirely. The Russian decision to give up Alaska in the 1860's, incidentally, was partly owing to this earlier failure to make it the nucleus of a North American empire, though Russian weakness revealed in the Crimean War of the 1850's was a more immediate factor.

Thus, in both a general and a particular way, reactionary Russia was a foe of the Monroe Doctrine—its very first foe. So today Communist Russia is following in the footsteps of a czarist imperialism it pretends to have killed.

Renewal of Bill Which Brought Books to 30 Million Is Urged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HCUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I submit a timely and appealing article appearing in the Washington Start of last Sunday in support of the library services bill, captioned "Renewal of Bill Which Brought Books to 30 Million Is Urged":

RENEWAL OF BILL WHICH BROUGHT BOOKS TO 30 MILLION IS URGED

(By Mary McGrory)

Lovers of libraries are hoping that the special session of Congress will do something special for the library service bill, which will expire next June unless the program is extended.

The renewal of the program which brought books within reach to some 30 million readers in the past 5 years, passed the Senate without any trouble. But in the House it has been stalled in the Rules Committee.

The library services bill started some 200 bookmobiles chugging around the backroads of the United States, added 5 million books to the bookshelves of the Nation under a cooperative Federal-State scheme.

APPRECIATIVE READERS

The reservations entertained by the Rules Committee about its efficacy and necessity are not echoed by the patrons of the 5-year-old service.

An old man in Texas, enjoying the first public library patronage of his life, wrote in to say this: "It is almost too much for me. When I look at all these books of knowledge and adventure at my fingertips and think of how much I've missed in the past, I'm just desperate to know where to begin."

The wife of a New Mexico forest ranger put the hunger for books more starkly: "This bookmobile is a bright spot in our lives. We live for the times it comes; we need the reading to keep us sane. It's lonely out here."

Housing Glut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial in the Chicago Daily Tribune should be of particular interest to us at this point, and I hereby insert it into the RECORD without further comment:

HOUSING GLUT

Last Sunday the Tribune printed 33 columns of want ads offering houses and apartments for rent in and about Chicago. Yet on June 16 the Democratic-controlled Senate passed a $1.2 billion omnibus housing bill which provided, among other things, for an additional 25,000 public housing units. A similar measure has been reported by the House Banking and Currency Committee, but the Rules Committee has refused to clear it for floor action.

In its platform the Democratic Party moans, "Today our rate of home building is less than 10 years ago. A healthy expanding economy will enable us to build 2 million homes a year, in wholesome neighborhoods, for people of all incomes. Republican policies have led to a decline of the home-building industry and the production of fewer homes.

"We support a housing goal of more than 2 million homes a year. * * * Our housing programs will provide for rental as well as sales housing. * * * Even with this new and flexible approach, there will still be need for a substantial low-rent public housing program authorizing as many units as local communities require and are prepared to build."

The only question is: Who will occupy all this housing? The weekly Labor Forecast and Review reports, "Members of Congress at this special session of Congress will consider a bill for an expanding housing program. Many observers, including labor union leaders, try to place the 17-percent lag this year in homebuilding on a shortage of housing credits. But a new Federal survey of housing vacancies shows evidence that the supply of existing dwelling space already is well above demand.

"The high rate of rental vacancies, coupled with reports of large inventories of unsold new homes, indicates many people are unable or unwilling to enter the market for a new place to live. * * * Yet this congressional session will be pressured to provide more cheap housing money to further glut an oversupplied market."

The other day we cited a survey which showed small demand among elderly people for Federal medical handouts and as little need for such intervention. Housing seems to be another instance where the Democrats

insist on spending when the need is nonexistent. How much more of the Democratic program consists, not of what the people need, but of what the politicians insist on forcing on them at their own expense?

Sound Bases for Federal Aid to Catholic Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a most comprehensive article on Federal aid to education as written by Rt. Rev. Timothy F. O'Leary, superintendent of schools for the archdiocese of Boston and which appeared in the Pilot, Boston, Mass., on August 20, 1960:

SOUND BASES FOR FEDERAL AID TO CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

(Monsignor O'Leary, superintendent of schools for the archdiocese of Boston, has recently been appointed area editor in the field of philosophy of education for the preparation of the new Catholic Encyclopedia. The following article is reprinted from the September issue of the Catholic Educator.)

(By Rt. Rev. Timothy F. O'Leary)

The relationship between Government aid to education and the broad topic of "Catholic Social Philosophy" is not difficult to ascertain. For Federal aid legislation is at once a current social problem and a subject within the legitimate scope of Catholic social philosophy.

As a social problem, it is concerned with the laudable objective of equalizing educational opportunity and advantage in America. The need of such equalization is readily conceded.

As a subject for application of Catholic social philsophy, it furnishes occasion for the restatement of some of the fundamental postulates upon which the Catholic position toward Federal aid is based.

For the purposes of the present discussion, these fundamentals may be succinctly stated:

(a) If the concept of Federal aid includes the idea of Federal or any other kind of governmental control which would destroy the antecedent educational rights of the family or the supernatural educational rights of the church, then such aid is to be rejected upon well-established social, moral, constitutional, and traditional grounds:

(b) If the concept of Federal aid excludes children in nonpublic schools as the legitimate beneficiaries of social services and economic advantages to which they are entitled by virtue of their status as part of the body politic, then it is to be rejected as discriminatory.

These two propositions, in turn, are based upon the Catholic philosophical ideas, respectively, of social justice and distributive justice.

RIGHTS

Social justice, grounded upon the norm of social ethics, and buttressed in this Nation by constitutional sanction, holds that the primary right of education inheres in the parents of the educable being, the child.

Distributive justice, so well expressed in our pledge of allegiance as "liberty and justice for all," requires that the benefits of the general government, as well as its burdens and obligations, be parceled out without discrimination by reason of race, creed, color, or national origin.

It is in the light of this philosophical background that the Catholic position on Federal aid must be understood and analyzed.

No one will deny, I think, that the theory behind any form of governmental aid to education revolves around the principle of aiding and encouraging parents in fulfilling their obligation to provide instruction and character formation for their children. The secondary motive behind governmental aid, and one of equal importance, is the production of an alert, intelligent and informed citizenry.

If we subscribe to this theory, then we must logically hold that all parents without exception should receive the same kind and degree of aid and encouragement. Consequently, if the parents may, as the Supreme Court has held they might, fulfill the duty to educate by enrolling the child in a school of their choice, it would be illogical to say that the government cannot or should not render assistance to the parents because the school chosen is nonpublic in character.

To me, this logic appears irrefutable and it firmly supports the Catholic position in opposition to any Federal aid to education legislation which does not include school children in private and parochial schools as distributees of Federal funds expended for auxiliary school services.

CHILDREN

Catholic education, as a distinct but coordinate system in the larger scheme of American education does not ask for either Federal or State funds to underwrite construction or repair of parochial schools, to subsidize maintenance of them, or to pay teachers' salaries.

It does demand, however, that its subjects, as the offspring of present taxpayers and as future citizens themselves, participate in whatever benefits and advantages may accrue to the school population generally from the distribution of Federal funds for payment of auxiliary services. Frankly, this means that we will compete under present fiscal arrangements in the domain of the three R's and continue to stress the importance of the fourth R without outside assistance, but if subsidiary, auxiliary and complementary services are to be made available from the general treasury, then we can conceive of no reason based upon equity or justice why the Catholic school child should be penalized because his parents have decided that secularism is not a good educational philosophy.

An example in point is the National School Lunch Act. It is impossible, objectively speaking, to conceive of any valid reason why a child in a private or parochial school should be deprived of a hot lunch or a bottle of milk paid by Federal subsidy when the national legislation providing therefor is predicated upon the proposition that the lunch and milk are nutritional aids to the general welfare of the entire body of our future citizens.

By the same token, bus transportation as a safety measure, nonreligious textbooks as educational aids, health examinations and innoculations as contributions to physical welfare, visual and audio aids as supplementary teaching equipment and all other similar auxiliary educational devices which are of direct service to the child, if federally subsidized at all, should be made available to all school children without discrimination.

EQUALITY

The boundaries of the area covered by the constitutional phrase "equal protection of the laws" may be rather nebulous, but if its sanction is transgressed by withholding aid and encouragement of Federal assistance from Catholic school children, then we are faced with a proposition which is tantamount to a declaration that there exists in this country a catageory of second class citizens. Obviously, deprivation of such assistance would result in grave educational and economic disadvantage to the child attending the nonpublic school. If the latter is omitted from consideration and if the Federal Government should decide to eliminate all aid to Catholic schools, then general welfare, becomes partial welfare, and a minority is stigmatized by exclusion from common benefits solely because of the exercise of the right of free choice in education.

What I have said is nothing more or less than a reiteration of the words of Pope Pius XI in his encyclical on the Christian education of youth:

"It is clear that in all these ways of promoting education and instruction, both public and private, the state should respect the inherent rights of the church and of the family concerning Christian education, and moreover, have regard for distributive justice. Accordingly, unjust and unlawful is any monopoly, educational or scholastic, which, physically or morally, forces families to make use of government schools, contrary to the dictates of their Christian conscience, or contrary even to their legitimate preferences."

In relation to the educational rights and duties of parents and government, the encyclical on the Christian education of youth is in harmony with American law as construed by American courts. Unfortunately, the whole issue of Federal aid to private and parochial schools has been beclouded by serious misunderstanding as to the true meaning of the Jeffersonian concept of the "wall of separation" between church and state.

Misconstruction of this doctrine has tended to foster the notion that schools which supplement secular education with religious instruction are inimical to the idea of separation of church and state. This, in turn, tends to confirm the fallacious reasoning which contends that education of the youth in the land is properly a state or government monopoly and that sectarian schools exist only by government sufferance. In the argument in the Supreme Court case which upheld bus transportation for nonpublic schoolchildren, this reasoning was carried to its logical conclusion in the form of a contention that sending of children to a private school was merely an excuse for not utilizing the public facilities afforded by the state.

Until the decision by that Court in the Illinois religious instruction case, we had cause to believe that such invidious philosophy would find little support in American constitutional interpretation. The Oregon school case, and the New Jersey schoolbus case had previously led to the belief that the State as parens patriae could legally and constitutionally provide social benefits to all its children without regard to the type of school attended. Then, however, the wall of separation between church and state was enormously heightened into an impregnable barrier between public education and any attempt to leaven its secularism with religious or moral instruction.

Sound social, legal, and educational thought rejects the idea that the Jeffersonian concept of church-state separation means what the Supreme Court said it does in the Illinois case. Such rejection is based upon the premise that the common welfare of both the individual man and the state is intimately related to their correspondence with the supreme scale of values ordained by Almighty God—and cannot be attained if such values are ignored or denied. What the Supreme Court overlooked or intentionally disregarded was the simple but ultimate fact that the sanctity of law itself,

based as it is on the higher norms of the moral law, is denuded when separated from religion.

Law, morality, and religion are the forces which cement society together. The constitutions of 19 States expressly refer to the moral training of children. The courts of the country are unanimous on the necessity of moral training. The state needs morality and religion as much as the individual for purposes of social integrity.

The sweeping generalizations of the McCollum decision were fortunately modified by the 6–3 ruling in the Zorach opinion of 1952. In this case the constitutionality of released time off the school premises was tested. This arrangement was sustained by all the New York courts as well as by the U.S. Supreme Court.

CHURCH AND STATE

The full meaning of the Zorach opinion is still a matter of some speculation. From 1952 until at least early 1960 the U.S. Supreme Court has not granted review to any important church-state matter. As a result, it is not certain to what extent Zorach would condemn various church-state practices which are now in litigation. In any event, Zorach is significant for the following reason:

(a) The opinion contains the often cited phrase by Justice Douglas who wrote for the majority of six: "We are a religious people whose institutions presuppose the existence of a supreme being."

(b) The decision does not even mention the "wall of separation" adverted to in the McCollum opinion.

(c) The ruling, while stating that it does not set aside McCollum, nonetheless affirms that the separation of church and state is not an absolute and that the state may accommodate its schedules to serve the spiritual needs of its people.

The groups which sponsored the Zorach litigation (the American Jewish Congress and the American Civil Liberties Union) have consistently tried to minimize the retreat of Zorach from McCollum. The fact remains, however, that Zorach stands as a major qualification, a substantial gloss, on the wild and sweeping generalizations included in the McCollum opinion.

Religionists and those interested in the parental right to educate should be completely familiar with the language and interpretations of the Zorach opinion since it is the actual law on church-state relations in this country at this time. These same groups should similarly be very cognizant of the force of the three-man dissent in Zorach. These opinions represent the views of these innumerable citizens and organizations which are opposed to virtually any form of cooperation between public education and organized religious bodies.

THE WALL

If extension of Federal aid to nonpublic schools, particularly to Catholic schools, should founder upon interpretations currently fashionable as to the meaning of the wall of separation between church and state—interpretations, by the way, which would probably amaze, if not shock, the author of the phrase—then a nonlegal phrase taken out of context will become a constitutional norm superseding the narrowest interpretations of the general welfare and equal protection clauses of the Constitution itself.

The "wall of separation" argument is used today as a means of denying parental rights conferred by the first amendment of the U.S. Constitution, e.g., through attempts to make it difficult for the parent who wishes his children to get a Christian education by denying rights of transportation, free lunches, schools, and through endeavors to drive the Catholic schools out of business by taxation as attempted recently in California.

Thus, the enemies of the Catholic schools discriminate against Catholic parents and children on the sole ground that they are Catholics. Both are penalized by the very fact of their religion.

The "wall of separation" works, indeed, against the welfare of state and nation. As Edwin S. Corwin has pointed out in his criticism of the McCollum case, a democracy presupposes, if it is to work at all, a people or citizenry morally responsible, and there can be no real moral training unless it is based on religion. In this statement Professor Corwin has given an excellent summary of judicial thinking on the subject in America. Therefore, when separationists oppose schools where religion is taught, they are denying state and nation of the very thing government requires for its existence.

In the States, and in Federal provisions where they affect the schools of the Nation, discrimination results from legislation which treats matters of general welfare as exclusively public school matters, as in school adjustment counselors, free lunches, etc.

In this whole matter we may recall the words of Leo XIII in the Encyclical entitled "Rerum Novarum." "No man may with impunity outrage that human dignity which God Himself treats with reverence; nor stand in the way of that higher life which is the preparation for the eternal life in Heaven."

Proposed Citation for Contempt of Congress by House of Representatives of Officials of the Port of New York Authority

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, late today a telegram came to one of my colleagues from New York in the House of Representatives. Apparently it was sent to all Members of the House by the incumbent Governor of New York, Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, and the three preceding Governors of New York, Hon. W. Averell Harriman, Hon. Thomas E. Dewey, and Hon. Herbert H. Lehman. The telegram is with relation to a matter which will be before the House of Representatives tomorrow concerning certain citations for contempt involving three officials of the Port of New York Authority. This agency is a bistate agency.

The telegram makes an urgent plea which otherwise might not be available to all Members of the House tomorrow, because of their not having received a telegram or through other failures of delivery. Therefore, in fairness to my colleague, Representative LINDSAY, who has asked that this matter be placed in the Record, I ask unanimous consent, at the request of Representative JOHN LINDSAY, of New York, that the text of the telegram be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, where it will be readily available to all Members of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 22, 1960.

Telegram to all Congressmen:

We join together in our respective capacities as Governor of the State of New York and as his immediate predecessors in that great State office to express our concern over the recommendation to be made to the House of Representatives tomorrow that the House cite three respected officers of this State and the State of New Jersey for contempt of Congress. One of these officers is serving our State, on successive appointments by Governor Dewey and Governor Harriman, as the nonsalaried chairman of the Port of New York Authority.

To the best of our information and belief such precipitate and unhappy action would mark the first time in the history of the United States that the Congress ever voted to instigate criminal prosecution for contempt against State officers serving a State agency in a matter that concerns the proper exercise of their official State duties. What is more they will have been cited for carrying out the express and written instructions of the Governors of New York and New Jersey, based on the conclusion of the two Governors that "the furnishing of the internal records now requested, in the opinion of (the Governors') legal advisers, would represent a serious infringement of the rights of the States under the Constitution and could constitute a dangerous precedent as recognition of Federal authority in an area of State responsibility."

Prior to the issuance of these instructions the three officers had made available to the Congress great volumes of materials amply sufficient to supply all the information with which the Congress could have any proper concern in the pursuance of its legislative functions.

Since last April the Governors of New York and New Jersey, as well as many former Governors, had asked to be heard in opposition to the bill introduced by Congressman EMANUEL CELLER (H.J. Res. 615) which would require that all future projects of our port agency here in New York be conditioned upon the approval of the Congress and the President of the United States, and which would provide also for a continuous right of inspection, review and approval by the Congress of all books, records, and papers of the port authority. The hearings on this bill have been repeatedly and now indefinitely adjourned by Congressman CELLER with the result that both the two Governors and former Governors of New York and New Jersey have been denied any opportunity to be heard in opposition to this destructive legislation.

Furthermore, the appeal of Governor Rockefeller and Governor Meyner to be heard by Mr. Celler's committee before any action was taken by his committee on the contempt citations was also rejected by Congressman Celler.

We are therefore faced with an assertion of Federal power to control State and municipal agencies which would wrench our system of government from its established foundations. As Governor Rockefeller and Governor Meyner put it in their joint directives of June 25, 1960, to the port authority the subpena at issue appeared to us and our legal advisers to constitute a novel intrusion by the Federal Government into areas reserved by the Constitution to our respective States and to constitute a precedent which could subject various agencies of State government throughout the Nation to be similarly answerable to Federal authority.

There has thus been precipitated a clash between the Congress on the one hand and the constitutional rights of the people of the States to administer their own governments on the other which can and should be

avoided. We respectfully request you support our position.

NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER.
W. AVERELL HARRIMAN.
THOMAS DEWEY.
HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it was my hope that this matter could be discussed at some length in the Senate today. There is great concern throughout the country over the proposed action in the House of Representatives. Not only are the Governors of New York and New Jersey concerned about the development; but we have had some expressions of concern from many Governors. Furthermore, there are 36 bistate agencies which are looking with interest, some with alarm, but all with concern, at this development.

Mr. President, I have prepared a statement which I thought might be timely for the discussion in the Senate today. However, the hour is late, so I ask unanimous consent that my statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY

I have refrained from public comment on the dispute between the Port of New York Authority and Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee because I do not wish to interfere in a matter now directly under House consideration. Since, however, the subject has been raised here today, I would like to give a brief statement on my reasons for hoping that the subcommittee will not press for a contempt citation.

Thirty-six interstate agencies throughout the Nation now await the outcome of this dispute. Grave concern has been expressed by the directors of those agencies, by several Governors, by legislators, and by newspaper editors and others who have studied the relationship of State and Federal Government.

Already, several of the New Jersey representatives who asked for the original House subcommittee inquiry into port authority operations have said that the demands made by the subcommittee go further than anything they asked for. Gov. Robert Meyner has found considerable agreement from other Governors on his stand against the investigation of records describing internal operations.

Undoubtedly, there are many general questions about the Port of New York Authority that warrant the attention of legislators here and all those concerned about the powers of such agencies elsewhere throughout the Nation. How, for instance, are metropolitan regions of the future to work cooperatively with such agencies to settle mutual problems? But I personally doubt that the issuance of subpoenas will lead to little more than protracted court test and general confusion about the purposes of the original House subcommittee inquiry.

I think that Governor Meyner, in a letter to New Jersey representatives on August 19, suggested a wise and workable alternative. First he wrote that he objected only to the subcommittee for material relating to internal management of the agency, not to requests for any documents necessary to help the Congress in its study of whether the agency is operating within the scope of its authority. Then he wrote:

"There is a simple, quick, and efficient means by which the issue could be resolved in court if the committee were willing to permit it. The Attorney General of the United States is fully empowered to bring an action against the port authority for a declaratory judgment as to the respective rights of the Federal and State Governments. *United States* v. *California* (332 U.S. 19 (1947)).

"I would be pleased to have a court test if Congress wishes to question the sanctity of confidential internal memoranda of an executive arm of State government. Indeed, I have requested such a court test. But I believe it would ill befit the importance of this principle of Federal-State relations to try the issue in a criminal proceeding against three eminent, reputable State officials who acted in conscientious obedience to the instructions of the elected chief executives of their States."

It may well be that, after nearly 40 years of operation under a novel method of authorization, the Port of New York Authority will require a legislative reassessment of some of its policies. Any such reassessment can be done most thoroughly, I believe, at a State level, while Congress lives up to its more general responsibilities.

I hope, therefore, that a more satisfactory way will be found for the subcommittee to continue its inquiry, if it is decided that the inquiry must be continued. Unless we do find a more satisfactory way, we shall find ourselves increasingly involved in side issues rather than in obtaining a more thorough understanding of the questions raised by the overall impact of interstate agencies on the Nation today.

Public Laws 592 to and Including 620

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, since the convening of the 2d session of the 86th Congress until the time of our adjourning for the recess, a total of 293 public laws were enacted. In the 1st session of the 86th Congress 383 public laws were enacted, hence the numbering for the 2d session starts with 384. In my reports to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois I have given a digest of all the new legislation, both major and minor.

Thinking that this digest might be of interest to my colleagues, and of some use for easy reference, I extended my remarks on page A5956, A5957, A5958, A5962, A5963, A5964, A5966, A5967, A5968, A5972, A5973, A5977, A5978, and A5979 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 15, 1960, to include the digest of Public Laws 384 to and including 591. The large number of letters I have received from readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD in all parts of the country has encouraged me further to extend my remarks to include Public Laws 592 to and including 620, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 592

H.R. 12311: Sugar quotas

Public Law 592 (1) extends the Sugar Act of 1948, which had been extended in 1952 and in 1956 for 4-year periods, for a period of only 3 months, and (2) empowers the President to determine Cuba's quota for the balance of the current year and until March 31, 1961, "as he shall find from time to time to be in the national interest."

On the rule of national unity in matters of immediacy in international relationships, the House voted to the President the power he regarded as essential in the existing situation in Cuba. The vote was 395 to 0.

In my remarks I said: "I trust that the power the President has asked will be administered without punitive design and in sole consideration of what in his judgment is just, wise, and necessary for the nations of the American Hemisphere, including our own."

The squabble over where Cuba's quota, if terminated, would go almost tied up the adjournment for the recess. It will be renewed when the Congress reconvenes on August 15.

PUBLIC LAW 593

Air Force is building up its own traditions. Public Law 593 helps along by changing the designation of "Distinguished Service Cross" and "Soldier's Medal," which are Army terms, to "Air Force Cross" and "Airman's Medal."

PUBLIC LAW 594

Public Law 594 removes the 4-year limitation on the $400,000 total income tax deduction for expenditures on explorations for ore or minerals (not gas or oil). Purpose is to benefit small operators whose limited capital requires them to take more time.

PUBLIC LAW 595

Public Law 595 adds to the national parks of our Nation the Arkansas Post National Memorial at the site of a fur trading post set up in 1686 by Henry de Tonty, a lieutenant of La Salle's, that figured in the "Mississippi Bubble" scheme, was a military post from 1730 on and once was the capital of Arkansas Territory.

PUBLIC LAW 596

Public Law 596 is of interest to conservationists. It ends the scandals in California and the Southwest arising from raids by sharp operators on the lands of the national parks under a defect in the "lieu lands" provision in the Act of 1897 as amended. It corrects the defect, disqualifies heirs and assigns and makes compensation to clear title.

PUBLIC LAW 597

In 1959 the Air Force gave flight instructions to 1,663 ROTC cadets at 159 schools, the Army to 643 cadets at 66 schools. This qualifies the cadets for FAA private pilot certificates. Public Law 597 extends the program for Army, Navy and Air Force another 4 years.

PUBLIC LAW 598

Public Law 598 provides the furnishing of needed services of optometrists to veterans having service-connected eye conditions. It adds "optometrists services" to VA's medical duties. This is in addition to the eyeglasses given to veterans, 30,774 pair in 1959. I am happy to report to many constituents who wrote me that I cast your vote for Public Law 598.

PUBLIC LAW 599

Coal industry, hard hit by oil and gas, is in a bad way. Public Law 599 authorizes a $2 million coal research program to open new ways.

PUBLIC LAW 600

Since 1820, when Yankee Captain Nathaniel Palmer landed on the shores of Antarctica, Americans have been exploring into the frozen realms. Public Law 600 creates a special commemorative medal to be presented persons (military and civilian) who have served on Antarctica expeditions.

PUBLIC LAW 601

H.R. 11998: Defense appropriations

Public Law 601 appropriates $39,996,608,000 for the Department of Defense for fiscal 1961. That is slightly under $40 billion, and $661,608,000 above the budget, in part due

to an increase in the number of Polaris nuclear submarines, in general to girding of defenses in a worsening world climate and to meet the challenge of Soviet missiles. The House passed the bill, 377 to 3. Your vote was aye.

PUBLIC LAW 602

This permits the Navy to swap some land in South Boston, no longer needed, for another piece of land owned by the Massachusetts Port Authority. It couldn't be done without the approval by Congress.

PUBLIC LAW 603

Public Law 603(1) eliminates requirement of physical examination every 4 years for members of the Standby Reserve, and (2) authorizes officers of the National Guard on inactive duty to issue orders to active duty for training and perform similar chores when designated by proper authority.

PUBLIC LAW 604

Former Members of Congress when they work for the Federal Government forfeit their civil service retirement annuities. Public Law 604 exempts them from such forfeiture when they work without compensation. This protects them from being penalized for rendering, gratuitously, a public service.

PUBLIC LAW 605

H.R. 12263: Dam on the Rio Grande

Public Law 605 authorizes agreements with Mexico for the joint construction and maintenance of a second major international storage dam, with water generating facilities (to be known as the Amistad Dam) on the Rio Grande River. The first major dam (the Falcon, 75 miles downstream from Laredo) under the 1944 Water Treaty with Mexico was completed in 1953.

Your representative, as a member of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs, attended many days of public hearings in the processing of this measure. It is refreshing and strengthening to have two neighboring nations working together in friendly cooperation in joint undertakings for a common benefit.

PUBLIC LAW 606

Public Law 606 extends until June 30, 1961, the present suspension of duty on metal scrap.

PUBLIC LAW 607

H.R. 10644: Merchant marine

Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is credited with building up a hard-core American-flag merchant fleet by construction and operating differential subsidies to bridge the gap between costs here and abroad. Nevertheless, rising costs here have caused the American ship building industry to drop from first to eighth place among the nations of the free world. Hence Public Law 607 raises the permissable construction differential subsidy from 50 to 55 percent.

PUBLIC LAW 608

In 1935 Congress cooperated with the cities in their street-widening programs by authorizing gift to municipalities of portions of Federal lands needed to widen streets. Public Law 608 extends this to States, counties, and other political subdivisions. It sometimes happens that a Federal Building is in a city but adjacent to a State or country highway.

PUBLIC LAW 609

Public Law 609 legalizes and admits to polite communications society the humble antenna booster stations that have been the sole means of extending TV entertainment to small, remote communities. Here is how the booster, now legalized works: (1) an ordinary rooftop antenna strategically located to get a usable signal from a distant station, (2) a shielded cable connected to a small amplifier and running to a second rooftop antenna, and (3) everybody happy, the second rooftop antenna beams the signal to the whole community.

PUBLIC LAW 610

Public Law 610 I place high on the achievements of the 86th Congress. It authorizes the President, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Surgeon General to conduct an international cooperative program in health research, training and planning. It envisions a scientist-to-scientist relationship on an international basis, the mobilization of the medical researchers of the world in an assault upon all the dread diseases that plague mankind. This, I would say, is along the road to peace, progress and universal goodwill. You may be sure your vote was aye.

PUBLIC LAW 611

S. 747: Des Plaines conservation

Public Law 611 gives to the State of Illinois for wildlife, conservation and recreation some 2,200 acres at Des Plaines formerly part of the Joliet Arsenal Military Reservation, 946 acres at a consideration of $303 an acre (total, $286,638), 1,500 acres directly contiguous thereto as an outright gift, subject to use by the Government in event of emergency. I received many letters from conservationists and sportsmen, introduced in the House a companion bill to Senator DOUGLAS' and appeared at committee hearings. While we were unsuccessful in getting the exact land we wished, due to the adamant position of the Defense Department, the compromise at least served the general purpose of protecting much of the surplus area from private encroachment and turning it over to all the people as part of their outdoors domain.

PUBLIC LAW 612

At present there are 496 retired Foreign Service officers and 118 widows receiving annuities. Public Law 612 boosts the annuities 10 percent.

PUBLIC LAW 613

S. 1233: Protection of children from poisoning

In one year there are 200,000 poisonings in the United States, with 5,000 deaths, from common household products, such as polishers, bleaches and cleaners. An estimated 600,000 children under 15 annually swallow poisonous substances. Illinois is one of eight States that have enacted State legislation requiring warning labeling of all hazardous substances for household use. Public Law 613 requires and regulates the labeling of such products in interstate commerce. Of course, your vote was aye.

PUBLIC LAW 614

United States has participated in the International Bureau for the Protection of Industrial Property since 1887. Chief work of the bureau is in the field of patents and trademarks. Public Law 614 (introduced by Congressman LIBONATI of Chicago) authorizes a back payment of $10,514 and an annual payment of $7,500 as Uncle Sam's contribution to the bureau.

PUBLIC LAW 615

This grants "grandfather rights" to motor carriers, freight forwarders and water carriers in Alaska. That means they can continue operation of transportation services on the accustomed lines.

PUBLIC LAW 616

Public Law 616 (1) permits Army and Air Force involuntarily to retire permanent colonels and lieutenant colonels who have three or more times failed of promotion, and (2) provides boards to separate officers for moral, professional, or security dereliction. Armed Services Committee states purpose was to improve officer quality, not create vacancies.

PULIC LAW 617

Public Law 617 increases from $250,000 to $500,000 the authorization for the appropriation for the Gorgas Memorial Laboratory in Panama to construct new facilities. This will make possible long-range studies of insects and the malaria, yellow fever and virus (among others) diseases they transmit. The laboratory is under American auspices, our chief such center in tropical America.

PUBLIC LAW 618

Protection of the health of the American people is the constant concern of the Congress. We like color in everything, including our foods, drugs, and cosmetics, where danger can lurk. Public Law 618 permits the use of suitable color additives but only after they have complied with rigid regulations (including maximum tolerances) and have been declared safe. Your vote always has supported health legislation.

PUBLIC LAW 619

This merely makes uniform the law fixing the terms of office of members of regulatory agencies of the Government.

PUBLIC LAW 620

Alaska University has 100,000 acres of land granted by the former territory. Public Law 620 permits its sale or lease by sealed competitive bids.

How Ripe Is United States for Plucking?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, in another place in today's RECORD, I have inserted Mr. Leslie Gould's article on the outflow of gold from the United States.

On Sunday, August 21, the following article by Mr. Robert W. Stoddard appeared in the New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Stoddard shows us very plainly the road we are following, whether through stupidity or conviction, or both.

It is the road envisaged for us by Lenin and Marx, and both big business and big labor—typified by the bosses who are now all-powerful—will be equally to blame if they lead us into the infero of inflation, from which there is little possibility of salvation.

The article follows:

HOW RIPE IS UNITED STATES FOR PLUCKING?

(By Robert W. Stoddard)

More than 35 years ago, Lenin outlined the Communist plan for taking over the world, as follows: "First, we will take Eastern Europe, then the masses of Asia; then we will encircle the United States, which will be the last bastion of capitalism. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands."

Lenin also said: "The way to destroy capitalism is to debauch the currency. Through a continuing process of inflation, the govern ment can quietly and unobservedly confiscate the wealth of its citizens."

A few years later, the principal Socialist paper, "The New Leader," was urging its followers to appreciate the fact that they could not expect a Socialist revolution in America but that socialism could be effectively promoted by gradually increasing the size of the government and its control over business. This program was labeled "Encroaching Control."

Norman Thomas, for years the acknowledged leader of American Socialists and their perennial candidate for President, has said many times in recent years that most of the basic principles and hopes of the Socialist Party of 25 years ago have already been

adopted by both of the leading political parties in our country.

HANGOVER IDEAS

And just 4 years ago, Dr. Charles Schottland, then Commissioner of Social Security, appointed by President Eisenhower, made this incredible statement in the course of a speech: "Saving for the rainy day of old age and the cultural beliefs about individual responsibility are hangover ideas of an earlier economic era which hinder the fullest use of social legislation."

As a businessman expected to write a column having to do with industry or finance, I find it extremely difficult to concentrate on these problems as I become more and more concerned as to just how ripe we have become and when we shall fall.

The current political show affords a good opportunity to look at the record of the last third of a century, and when we review this objectively, all at one time, we cannot help but be shocked at how it coincides with the Communist-Socialist objectives.

As an industrialist, I am forced to admit that the business world must shoulder a lot of blame. Our sins have not been so much those of commission as those of omission; those of failure to resist, with the lame excuse that it is inevitable, rather than take a firm positive stand for the maintenance of fundamental business principles. Too many times we are willing to accept the opportunistic solution, looking to our balance sheets and profit-and-loss statements at the end of the year, rather than to consider the problems we are creating for our successors a few years hence, or what we are doing to the national economy as a whole.

LABOR'S POWER GROWS

The most powerful single group in our country today is organized labor. It is utterly unrealistic to expect that this power will be used judiciously and fairly or that it will be voluntarily given up. Excessive power in the hands of any group has always been abused. It was abused by business when it enjoyed unbridled power, and that power had to be taken away by means of legislation. When that power was taken away, it did not kill business, it provided new opportunities for the development of all business, large and small.

Similarly, the removal of the unwarranted power of labor unions today, the hysterical cries of labor officials to the contrary notwithstanding, is not with any purpose of killing the labor movement. It is merely an attempt to give equal freedom and protection to all citizens, individuals or groups, by whatever names they call themselves.

It is my philosophy that all individuals and all groups, be they business groups or labor groups, professional groups, racial groups, religious groups, or what not, should all enjoy the same privileges and be subject to the same obligations. The laws on our statute books should apply equally to all. There should be special privilege for none.

There are some labor officials whose avowed goal is the creation of a Socialist America and their efforts, of course, are clearly in that direction. There are other honest union leaders who claim not to be Socialists and who proclaim the virtues of our free economy, and yet they give evidence to the fact that, if they care, they simply do not understand the fundamental economic principles which originally built our economy into the greatest in the world and provided their own membership with the highest standards ever enjoyed by mankind anywhere.

The political platforms of both parties give us cause for continuing concern. There are some differences, but they seem to be minor and are more differences in degree than in principle. Neither offers any hope of an honest attempt to solve the labor problem.

The continued increase in governmental power, which can be expected regardless of who is elected, through continuing Federal aid to all groups of people in all parts of the land can result only in a further increase in the size of the Federal bureaucracy and a continuing extension of its control over the daily lives of all citizens.

We know that most of our leaders are not Communists or Socialists and yet it is absolutely incredible how the pieces of the puzzle which we have been putting together for the last 30 years all seem to fall into place and coincide with the program advocated for so long by those who would destroy us.

And so I say to those of us interested in business and financial affairs, if we do not concern ourselves seriously and actively with the trend of our economy and if we do not have the courage to stand forthrighty for the fundamental economic principles which our business experience tells us are sound, we will indeed fall like the overripe fruit that Lenin predicted, and we will have to accept more of the blame for that tragedy than probably any other segment of our economy.

It was Lenin who also said that the capitalist would sell his soul for a profit. I hope we may yet prove how wrong he was.

Police Science and Administration Curriculum Established at Temple University's Community College

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, in the field of law enforcement, the first curriculum in police science and administration has been established at Temple University's Community College. The announcement and the program may interest many Members of Congress. I have therefore included the announcement and the summary of the conference so that the Members can examine the material which may lead to better law observance and law enforcement at least in those communities which are making an effort to improve the situation:

POLICE SCIENCE AND ADMINISTRATION CURRICULUM ESTABLISHED AT TEMPLE

A curriculum in police science and administration, the first of its kind in this area, has been established at Temple University's Community College.

The announcement was made jointly by Dr. Millard E. Gladfelter, president of Temple University; Mr. Harry D. Shargel, chairman of the Federal Bar Association's Law Observance Committee; Dr. Allen H. Wetter, superintendent of schools; Philadelphia Police Commissioner Thomas J. Gibbons; Mr. Dennis W. Gealer, president of the Delaware Valley Association of Professional Police Officials; and Superintendent Francis C. Deegan, Fairmount Park Police.

Beginning in September, courses in police supervision and leadership, criminal investigation, criminal law and procedure, and social aspects of police administration will be offered in the evening by the university's Community College. A full curriculum will be offered in February 1961.

Students successfully completing eight courses in the curriculum will be eligible for a professional certificate in police science and administration. An associate degree will be awarded to those who complete 60 semester hours of combined professional and academic courses. Plans are being made for a baccalaureate degree program in police science and administration for students with associate degrees who continue their education.

The idea for the curriculum was suggested by law enforcement officials at a Federal Bar Association law observance conference last May. A committee of local education and law enforcement officials drafted the plans for the new curriculum. Members of the committee are: Mr. Shargel, chairman; Lt. Col. Henry Bassetti, provost marshal of the Philadelphia Quartermaster Center; Detective Capt. Joseph Bonner, secretary, Delaware Valley Association of Professional Police Officials; Capt. Philip J. Cella, Fairmount Park Police; Mr. Dalibor W. Kralovec, Philadelphia Board of Education; Staff Inspector James McNamee, Philadelphia Police Department; William A. Schrag, dean of the Community College and Technical Institute of Temple University; and Staff Inspector Edwin S. Schriver, Philadelphia Police Department.

SUMMARY OF CONFERENCE REGARDING ESTABLISHMENT OF POLICE SCIENCE AND ADMINISTRATION COURSE

Present: Lt. Col. Henry Bassetti, provost marshal, Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot; Capt. Joseph Bonner, Philadelphia Police Department, North Central Detective Division and secretary, Delaware Valley Association of Professional Police Officials; Capt. Philip J. Cella, Fairmount Park Police; Mr. Dalibor W. Kralovec, Philadelphia Board of Education; Staff Inspector James J. McNamee, Philadelphia Police Department; Dean William A. Schrag, Community College and Technical Institute, Temple University; Staff Inspector Edwin S. Schriver, Philadelphia Police Department; Harry D. Shargel, Esq., chairman, Law Observance Committee, Federal Bar Association.

Date and time: July 1, 1960, 12 noon.

Location: M.C. & T.S.A., Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, 2800 South 20th Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

The conferees agreed on the attached list of courses.

Four courses will be given initially commencing September 1960, as follows: Police supervision and leadership, criminal investigation, criminal law and procedure, social aspects of police administration (ethics, community relations, racial characteristics and environment).

However, in February of 1961, the entire program will be made available.

Approximately 20 students will be required for each course and the cost will be $23 per credit. The completion of eight of the police science and administration courses will entitle the student to a professional certificate in police science and administration. An associate degree in police science and administration will be awarded to those who complete 60 semester hours of combined professional and academic courses. The courses taken under the certificate program would be applicable for credit towards the associate degree. A baccalaureate degree in police science and administration will be available to those who finish their associate degree program and complete the last 2 years of a 4-year program.

The police members of the committee will immediately furnish additional description of the scope of each course and determine the sequence in which the courses are to be taken. The police will also immediately nominate instructors for all professional police courses. As soon as the police have completed the description of the courses and nominated the instructors, the university

will appoint the instructors and publish a brochure. The police members of the committee will publicize the courses among law enforcement agencies and all professional police associations in the area. The Federal Bar Association will publicize the courses among the attorneys. The Federal Bar Association will endeavor to interest public officials in promoting the program.

The board of education will publicize the courses to the high school students both as an available program of study and as a career field. Mr. Kralovec will also secure nominees from the board of education as instructors in the professional courses. The board of education will also afford general publicity for the program.

Mr. Shargel will act as temporary chairman of a scholarship committee. The other members of the committee are Mr. Dalibor W. Kralovec, Inspector Schriver, and William M. Gillin, personnel development adviser, personnel department, city of Philadelphia. Additional members will be added as they become available.

Dean Schrag was appointed chairman of an advisory committee to be formed for the purpose of advising the university in the development of the police science and administration program.

Mr. Shargel was authorized to issue a press release representing a joint announcement under the names of the following: Dr. Millard E. Gladfelter, president, Temple University; Dennis W. Gealer, president of the Delaware Valley Association of Professional Police Officials; Thomas J. Gibbons, police commissioner of Philadelphia; and Francis C. Deegan, superintendent, Fairmount Park Police.

POLICE SCIENCE AND ADMINISTRATION

Leading to an associate degree in police science and administration.

Elect eight of the following professional courses:

Police science—police supervision and leadership.

Police science—criminal investigation.

Police science—criminal law and procedure.

Police science—social aspects of police administration (ethics, community relations, racial characteristics, and environment).

Police science—general administration of justice.

Police science—police organization and administration.

Police science—juvenile crime and delinquency.

Police science—introduction to criminology.

Police science—vice control, narcotic control.

Police science—evidence and court procedure.

Police science—traffic control and laws.

Police science—probation and parole administration.

Business—business organization and management.

Business—workshop in business management.

Business—personal finance.

Business—mathematics of business.

Business—law of business contracts.

Business—law of negotiable instruments.

English—written communications (two courses).

English—public speaking.

English—periodical literature.

Psychology—personal psychology.

Psychology—human relations in business.

Secretarial—elementary typing.

Social science—American political institutions.

Social science—contemporary social problems.

Electives[1] (12 credit hours).

[1] Any academic or professional course offered by Community College. Each course except personal psychology involves 2 credit hours. Personal psychology involves 4 credit hours.

Second-Class Citizens?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BECKER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I insert herewith an editorial appearing in the well-known Catholic publication, the Tablet, in its issue of Saturday, August 20. I am also inserting an article in the same issue dealing with the subject of "Federal Aid to Education."

Both the editorial and the article pointed out very clearly the arguments that aid to private schools must and should be a part of any Federal aid to education legislation for public schools.

I commend this to the reading and study of all Members of Congress during this particular session:

[From the Tablet, Aug. 20, 1960]

NEARLY 6,800,000 SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS

The eyes of the Nation are trained on Washington where our legislators are convened in a special session filled with import for the future of the country. A series of bills covering basic national issues have been introduced and each party is maneuvering fiercely to pass its list of "must" legislation.

One of the most important areas is in the Federal aid to education bills which seem to have a good chance of passage for the first time since Federal funds for school aid were originally sought by educators 90 years ago.

The Murray-Metcalf bill would provide Federal funds for teachers' salaries as well as for school construction. The Monroney amendment to the McNamara bill, which was approved by the Senate, allows each State $20 per year for every child of school age (5 to 17 years). All children residing in a State will count but Federal funds will be divided among public schools only, resulting in the ridiculous paradox of giving more Federal aid to public schools where more of the community's children attend the independent schools.

Where did this idea to steal from one American child to give to another originate? Is the basic idea not only to secure an additional source of funds but to drive all Protestant, Catholic, Jewish and private schools out of existence? Is it a desire for a single, monolithic structure of education, governed only by the State as it is in totalitarian countries, which will brook no competition? One can only speculate.

The Federal Government has under a variety of educational programs subsidized millions of American students of all faiths in the schools of their choice. The GI bills after World War II and the Korean war, the War Orphans Education Act and sections of the National Defense Education Act are cases in point. The current situation therefore results in a tragic step backward on the Federal level. There are about 6,800,000 children attending the Nation's independent schools who would in effect be made second-class students by these proposed bills, 1 out of every 6 on the elementary level. And, according to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the nonpublic schools are growing at a fantastic 21 percent faster pace than the public schools.

We are told by proponents of the bills that sound educational standards are now necessary for national survival and that therefore money is needed. How then in the name of logic can they argue against applying this same yardstick to the child who attends the independent school? Haven't they seen the annual list of State scholarship winners that are so well sprinkled with the names of children from the nonpublic schools? Would they possibly argue against the insanity of such a monstrous waste of our most important natural resource at a time when the very future of the Republic is gravely threatened?

The means to correct this grave inequity are readily at hand. The Congress could, if it must pass Federal aid at all, establish a system of grants comparable to that given under the GI bill of rights which would go to the child, not to the school. Or, as the President's Committee on Education beyond the High School, in urging support of the tax credit plan (one form of personal subsidy) said, the plan could be adopted "without raising the issue of church-State relations."

Politicians are practical people; they have to be. Certainly they are familiar with the way the people rose in their wrath in both Maine and Connecticut recently when their children, attending the independent schools, could not even get transportation. Certainly they know by what overwhelming majorities of both parties the New York State Legislature approved the Speno-Brennan transportation bill. If a mighty wave of communications from an army of outraged parents reaches our Congressmen and Senators immediately this grave injustice can still be righted.

It is fitting to remember the famous precept uttered by the great Chief Justice Marshall early in the days of the Republic: "The power to tax is the power to destroy." Let's not sit fiddling while our educational house burns down.

[From the Tablet, Aug. 20, 1960]

PRIVATE SCHOOL GROWTH EXCEEDS PUBLIC SCHOOLS—BUT CHILDREN AT INDEPENDENT SCHOOLS BEING IGNORED BY SENATE AND HOUSE—IN FEDERAL AID BILLS—CATHOLIC SCHOOL ENROLLMENT PUT AT OVER 5,500,000 FOR SEPTEMBER TERM

While Congress is considering Federal aid to education bills which discriminate against children in nonpublic schools, the U.S. Education Commissioner has released statistics which show that independent schools are growing 21 percent faster than public schools.

Those opponents of the Federal aid measure who claim that it is aimed, consciously or not, to hamper nonpublic schools, point out that the latter have an estimated September enrollment of 6,800,000 on the elementary and secondary levels.

SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS?

They will become 6,800,000 second-class citizens if the Federal-aid legislation is passed in its present form.

While the public schools naturally show a much larger increase, 1,400,000 to 300,000

for the independent schools, the public school of growth is only 3.8 percent compared to 4.6 percent for the nonpublic schools.

More than one of every nine secondary school pupils attend a nonpublic school (11.6 percent this fall, a jump from the 11.4 of 1959 and the 11.2 of 1958) and almost one out of six on the elementary level (16.2 this year, as contrasted with 16.1 in 1959 and 15.8 in 1958.)

About 5,539,750 students will enroll in U.S. Catholic colleges, high schools and elementary schools this fall, setting another record high total.

The totals estimated in a report made here are:

Grade schools: 4,389,963, an increase of 127,863 over last year.

High schools: 849,850, an increase of 24,753.

Colleges and universities: 299,937 in regular sessions, an increase of 14,283.

These estimates were released here by the Department of Education of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. The department will issue an actual count of October enrollment next spring.

THIRTEEN PERCENT OF U.S. PUPILS

The estimated total of 5,239,813 students to enroll in Catholic elementary and secondary schools indicates these youngsters will account for about 13 percent of all students in the United States between the ages of 5 and 17 years.

Public schools this fall, from kindergarten through grade 12, will enroll an estimated 37,600,000 students, according to a report from the United States Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Federal education office estimated that 6,800,000 children will be in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools. Its report does not break this down into the number attending Catholic schools and the number in other independent educational institutions.

In April of this year, the NCWC department reported that for the first time, the combined total enrollment in Catholic grade and high schools had passed the 5 million mark, a total of 5,087,197.

This total and the expected increase this fall represents continuation of an enrollment trend in Catholic schools that has been especially strong since 1945, the year marked unofficially as the beginning of the current "enrollment boom."

This past academic year, grade schools marked a 100-percent increase in enrollment since the end of World War II. High schools undoubtedly will achieve the same distinction this school year. They need an enrollment of 841,414 to double since 1945 and the fall estimate is 849,850.

NEARLY 166,330 SCHOOLS

No estimates on new teachers or school buildings or additions were made in the NCWC department's statement of enrollment estimates.

However, in the department's 1959 "Summary of Catholic Education," a booklet of school statistics, it reports that in October 1959, there were 10,278 Catholic grade schools staffed by 102,622 teachers. The number includes 77,172 religious and 24,450 lay teachers.

In the same summary, the department reports 2,390 secondary schools staffed by 40,708 teachers, of whom 31,280 are religious and 9,428 are lay teachers.

The department counted 231 universities and colleges in 1959. The total number of teachers was set at 23,000 of which 8,557 are religious and 14,443 are lay people.

The department's summary sells for $1 a copy. The publisher's address is NCWC Department of Education, 1321 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A Minimum Wage Law Does Not Square With Our U.S. Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, several years ago when the bill that placed the minimum wage at $1 per hour was voted on in the House, I voted for it, but after observing the operation of that law I have come to the conclusion I made a mistake in so doing.

The other body has recently passed a bill to raise the minimum to $1.25 per hour by degrees and to cover, under the law, some 4 million additional employees in private industry of most every nature, all of which in my studied opinion does not square with our free competitive private enterprise system.

From early boyhood and until I was elected to Congress, I worked for wages—as a farmhand, a muleskinner on a bridge building gang, a pearl button cutter, a tile ditch digger with a spade, a grocery clerk, a lumberyard man, and as manager of a retail lumberyard. Yes, and as a soldier for Uncle Sam, and since 46 years of age as a hired man in Congress for the people of the Seventh Iowa District and the Nation.

I know something about working for wages, so it is very natural that in the acid test, you will always find me in the hard working wage earner's corner.

Mr. Speaker, I learned early in life that there was no substitute for work, and that the only right and sure way to get a pay raise was to do a little more each day than the boss expected me to do. This holds true today, just as it has from the signing of our U.S. Constitution, which established our free competitive enterprise system, for not only the boss but for the hired man as well, and which made it possible for all men to be the masters of their own destiny—free to work and progress and enjoy the blessings of liberty; yes, or even to idle, go broke and suffer mental anguish, but not at the expense of the other fellow.

Let us not forget that when we place a floor under wages, by that very act we place a ceiling on wages for millions of employees who deserve more pay, especially in small businesses.

Many, many employers will be forced to make a choice under this new minimum wage law of either laying off the necessary number of lowest paid and lowest producers, or reduce the wages of the highest paid and highest producing employees in order to hold overhead down to the necessary point of enabling them to stay in business or, of course, he has the third choice of closing shop. Even that is still one of our American privileges.

Mr. Speaker, before the conference report on the wage hour bill comes back to the House for a vote, I invite all of my colleagues to ask one or a hundred wage earners who are now getting over $1.25 per hour, and they are in the great majority, if they would be willing to have their wages reduced in order to raise the pay of others now getting less than $1.25 per hour.

Remember, most every American wants to win his own spurs.

"King of the Aviators"—In Life and in Death John Bevins Moisant Achieved Historic Aviation First Half a Century Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, the great International Airport in New Orleans is named after a most extraordinary man—John Bevins Moisant who died on the site of the airport which bears his name.

Moisant was an extraordinary adventurer and man of many talents; he was successively a farmer, a revolutionary, a banker, a mechanic, a designer, but most of all he was—"King of the Aviators."

Jerry Hopkins, a staff reporter for the New Orleans Times-Picayune, has written a most entertaining piece about Moisant. The author is a journalism graduate of Washington and Lee University and Columbia University. He also worked on newspapers in Virginia, North Carolina, and New York, covering everything from politics to the DAR.

Here is his story on Moisant:

[From the Air Force magazine, August 1960]

Fifty years ago last month, an American aviator named John Bevins Moisant presented himself in Paris and requested permission to compete in the Circuit de l'Est, a major air show being held there.

"How long have you been flying?" an official asked.

Smiling, Moisant replied that he had been up only twice. The application was denied.

Then came the day of the show. A large crowd arrived early and waited impatiently through what seemed an interminable period of preparation and engine warming.

Suddenly, a shout rose.

Just as the contestants were climbing into their kitelike flying machines, a small Bleriot monoplane appeared above the Parisian rooftops. Closer and closer it came, then eased down to a graceful landing at the center of the field. Out stepped Moisant.

The young American beamed and clasped his hands above his head. Then a passenger emerged from the craft. The crowd let out a tremendous roar. In that era, the carrying of aerial passengers was most unusual. His third time in the air, Moisant had become the first aviator to fly a passenger over a city. He had, in fact, staged a characteristic entrance into the field of aviation—with daring and bold imagination.

Here was a man of many parts—a 20th-century renaissance character. He was a designer and mechanic as well as a brash pilot. Before coming to Paris, he had spent months in Cannes developing his own steel

and aluminum monoplane. When he was finished, he had what amounted to a racing plane—a rather advanced model in view of the fact that he was yet to take his first flight. That came next.

"When I left the ground, my machine shot upward so fast I lost control," Moisant recalled of that initial experience. "So I just cut off the motor and let her drop. I figured it was better to fall 90 feet than 300 or 400 feet."

He also decided at that point to learn how to fly a slower airplane before again trying his metal racer.

Shortly after stunning Parisans at the Circuit de l'Est Moisant again flew over the French capital in his Bleroit. This time he took Flier Roland Garros along. This was the second time a pilot had flown a passenger over a city.

Next, Moisant became the first man to fly from Paris to London by compass. His seventh time in the air, he made this historic flight guided by a glycerine-floated compass he had borrowed. The instrument was balanced on Moisant's knee during the 200-mile trip. His mechanic accompanied him on the flight. It was the first crossing of the channel with a passenger.

Moisant was born to French-Canadian parents in Kankakee, Ill., in 1873. At 19, he left home for California, where he and his three brothers purchased a farm. Then they drifted to Latin America, acquiring a sugar plantation near San Salvador. While there, he designed a cheap irrigation system that enabled him and his brothers to prosper and expand their holding to several thousand acres.

Then in 1907, government troops swooped into the plantation ranchhouse and confiscated 17 rifles. Two of his brothers were thrown into jail on charges of inciting revolution. Moisant escaped, however, and appealed to the U.S. State Department. Dissatisfied with the answers from Washington, he concluded that as long as he had the name, he might as well play the game. He joined the rebels.

In his first action, he led 100 of the Nicaraguan Army and 200 Indian natives in an amphibious attack on the government strong point. Following debarkation from a gunboat, Moisant and his force, in 5 minutes of battle, captured a well-fortified garrison, took the commander prisoner, and recruited 100 more rebels from the government troops.

Moisant then went up to San Francisco, possibly to seek funds, friends, or firearms. Whatever the outcome of this venture, we next find him in the banking business in Guatemala, once more in partnership with his brothers; the two who had been jailed were now out.

Meanwhile, Moisant remained in contact with revolutionary friends in Nicaragua. In 1910, he went to France on their behalf to look into the possibility of buying airplanes for use in another revolt. Latin American political affairs seemed forgotten, however, when he arrived in Cannes and began experimenting with his own plane. Next stop, as we have seen, was Paris.

After his startling flying successes in Paris, Moisant returned to the United States. An aviation competition was scheduled that fall at Belmont Park race track on Long Island. On the first day of competition, October 29, 1910, Moisant crashed. Helped from his damaged plane, he shook off the dust and said, "Hurt? No, not at all. Nothing ever happens to anybody flying."

The next day, Belmont scheduled the "Most Colossal Race of the Decade." An industrialist-millionaire had put up $10,000 for the flier who clocked the best time in a 36-mile round trip between the field and the Statue of Liberty out in New York Bay.

First, there were to be several warmup flights. Moisant was one of the first in the air, piloting his hastily repaired Bleriot. He crashed again. Miraculously, again he was unhurt. But it appeared, with his craft once more smashed up, he would miss the Statue of Liberty race.

Moisant tried desperately to find another machine. He went from plane to plane on the field, trying to find one available for his immediate use.

The race started. Claude Grahame-White of Britain and Count Jacques deLesseps of France soared into the air. The Englishman took the lead. Moisant was still on the ground. Then, in a Perils of Pauline turn of events, Moisant found a plane, jumped aboard, and took off after them.

He knew he couldn't overtake the Briton and Frenchman in a straight race. So he tried to outwit them. As the others headed south to follow the Long Island shoreline, Moisant selected a different route. He flew west over Brooklyn, then over the East River and the Battery at the southernmost tip of Manhattan Island. He rounded the statue, turned, and headed for home—then got momentarily lost. He had confused elevated subway tracks for the Long Island Railroad. Now he found the Long Island Railroad and followed its tracks back to Belmont Park.

The race judges calculated elapsed time. As Moisant thawed from the cold, the announcement came that he had beaten the Englishman by a mere 43 seconds, covering the 36 miles in 34 minutes, 38.4 seconds. He also had set a new straightaway airspeed record, the last 3½ miles at 104.2 miles an hour.

Shortly afterward, Moisant left New York and started a cross-country tour. In December he was in Memphis, Tenn., setting a 2.4-second record for turning a full circle in the air. He turned so sharply his wings pointed almost vertically. René Simon, a Frenchman whose aerial antics had earned him the sobriquet "the fool flyer," ran into a hangar, refusing to watch.

On December 8, Moisant, by then himself dubbed "king of the aviators," challenged the U.S. Navy to a duel. After flying directly over the U.S. gunboat *Aphitrite*, anchored on the Mississippi River, he openly declared:

"As I swung over the warship, I could look down on her decks very distinctly. How easy it would have been to have dropped a detonating explosive on that big expanse. I have often said that a passenger-carrying, bomb-dropping airplane would put a warship out of commission 10 minutes after sighting it. From my own observations, I am perfectly willing to take my chances any day if they'll take theirs—that is, they can shoot at me all they want to if they'll let me retaliate and drop a bomb on them."

The Navy declined the offer.

Soon after that, Moisant was on his way to New Orleans for an international competition with aviators from the United States, France, Switzerland, and Ireland. The day before the show was to begin, a California group offered Moisant $100,000 to stage a rival flying show in San Francisco. New Orleans was offering only $10,000, but Moisant kept his word. He flew to Louisiana—and the end of his spectacular career.

On December 24, Moisant took off from New Orleans' City Park racetrack. He headed over the city, circling the business district four times. On the streets below, throngs of Christmas shoppers looked up and saw him. When Moisant returned to the field, with just 3 pints of gas left in the tank, his 46-minute flight was hailed as the longest sustained flight over a major city. Also, it was his 14th cross-city flight, a greater number than had been flown by any other two aviators of the era combined.

The next 5 days Moisant raced his plane against small automobiles, performed a daring glide from 9,000 feet, braved a 60-mile-an-hour gale, and tuned his 50-horsepower engine for a contest with a 150-horsepower Fiat racing car. On December 30, he lost a 5-mile race with the high-powered Fiat by a hair. Then he took time out for an interview with a local newspaper reporter.

"Don't you worry about getting killed when you try those crazy stunts?" he was asked.

"I do not expect to die in an airplane," Moisant was quoted in reply.

On December 31, Moisant and four other pilots competed for the $4,000 Michelin Prize, to be awarded to the pilot who stayed in the air longest. The world's record was 7 hours, 45 minutes. Moisant figured he could stay aloft for 8 hours.

Moisant passed up the red-painted monoplane he had designed in Cannes and had his mechanics roll out the Bleriot he had crashed twice in New York. The craft had been completely reworked and was in top flying condition. An extra 35-gallon gas tank had been installed under the frame.

Moisant took off in midmorning. Waving to the spectators who lined the city park field, he headed for another field just outside New Orleans on a practice hop.

He circled the practice field three times at a 200-foot altitude and prepared to land. But rough air at 25 feet caused the plane to dip sharply. It almost stood on its nose. Moisant was thrown from the cockpit. He landed in a clump of bushes, his back broken. Within minutes the man they called the "King of the Aviators" was dead.

Ironically, even in death Moisant set a mark in flying. Scientific American magazine reported that he was the first aviator to be thrown from his plane in such a fatal accident.

In New Orleans, where he died 50 years ago, Moisant has not been forgotten. In 1946, the city opened a new airport not far from the scene of Moisant's death. The field is called Moisant International Airport. Jimmy Doolittle was present for the dedication ceremonies. He unveiled a monument which reads:

"In commemoration of a pioneer in aviation, John Bevins Moisant, who lost his life in an airplane accident near this site December 31, 1910. He was the first pilot to carry a passenger across the English Channel, inventor of the early all-metal airplane, a man of lovable character whose tragic death was a great loss to aviation."

In This Time of Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time of challenge in the world, with its demand for increased education, more and more attention is focused on the means for providing this education, with the emphasis generally on physical facilities. It is heartening to see that attention is also paid to another vital aspect of education and that is its leadership. An example of this was provided in an editorial in the New York Times of August 10 which commented on the appointment of Thomas Henry Carroll as new president of George Washington University. The comments will serve to underscore the fact that able, qualified and experienced leadership is being provided.

The editorial:

G.W.'s NEW PRESIDENT

George Washington University has a new president. The qualifications of Thomas Henry Carroll make him one of the most outstanding and certainly one of the most capable citizens to head this university. Upon hearing of his unanimous appointment, Dr. Carroll welcomed the "distinctive challenge of a university serving the Nation's Capital."

But G.W., as it is called by Washingtonians, is more than a university serving the Nation's Capital. It is a leading institution serving, through its graduates, a world filled with complex and certainly disorderly problems. The university is well known for both its law and medical schools. A great number of its graduates have become famous lawmakers, as evidenced by the many esteemed Senators and Congressmen with degrees from George Washington.

Dr. Carroll is the thirteenth president of this university. His credentials point up an outstanding career as an authority in furthering economic programs for the Ford Foundation, of which he is now vice president. His academic background, as dean at Syracuse University and the University of North Carolina, has given him diverse experience with what students of today face in a challenging world.

Let Us Be Helpful To Our Mentally Retarded Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I am pleased to include a report of the midwestern regional workshop section on mental retardation on special education and rehabilitation which explains the urgent need for additional facilities and teachers for our mentally retarded children. I commend James C. Purkhiser, the director of education and training of the Glenwood State School for Retarded Children at Glenwood, Iowa, for this splendid report and for setting out the need for these unfortunate Americans.

Surely we can and must assist them in every way we possibly can and by so doing Almighty God will bless our good works:

GLENWOOD, STATE SCHOOL,
Glenwood, Iowa, August 2, 1960.

BEN F. JENSEN,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. JENSEN: Received your letter containing the public laws. Thank you so much.

I am enclosing a copy of the report which I made to the board of control, on the congressional subcommittee meeting, which I attended in Chicago. Sorry to be so long getting it mailed to you.

Sincerely yours,
JAMES C. PURKHISER,
Director, Education and Training.

REPORT OF THE MIDWESTERN REGIONAL WORKSHOP SECTION ON MENTAL RETARDATION ON SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION, MAY 11–12, 1960, AT CHICAGO, ILL.

First, we who attended this section (approximately 300—25 in special education) expressed our thanks and commended Congress for allowing us to relate our ideas to them and paid special tribute to Public Law 565 and Public Law 85–926, which has, in a relatively short time, had a marked effect upon improving the quality and quantity of professional personnel for services to the mentally retarded throughout the United States. Our section gave consideration only to the problems which we felt should be considered by Congress. These are:

1. Shortage of professional personnel.
2. Consultant services within and to the States.
3. Out-of-school programs.
4. Research.

1. SHORTAGE OF PROFESSIONAL PERSONNEL

A major problem deterring the development of programs for the mentally retarded is the procurement of an adequate supply of professional personnel.

This shortage of personnel is evidenced by the following fact: Kansas and Michigan are now serving only approximately 20 percent of their mentally retarded. Illinois is serving 7 percent of their trainable mentally retarded and 25 percent of their educable mentally retarded. Many more could be served if qualified teachers were available.

Although Public Law 85–926 provides for the training of personnel at the leadership level, it does not provide for the training of teachers of the mentally retarded.

It is recommended that Public Law 85–926 be amended and interpreted to include the training of teachers at both the undergraduate and graduate levels.

2. CONSULTANT SERVICES WITHIN AND TO THE STATES

A major problem accompanying the growth of educational programs for the mentally retarded is in providing supervisory and consultant services at the State level. Many communities experience considerable difficulty in establishing and maintaining these programs. These programs might be more efficient and effective if consultant services were provided them through State educational agencies.

Kansas has only one consultant in this area. Michigan has one part-time consultant serving the entire State; Illinois has two and Wisconsin has three consultants.

It is recommended that Congress provide funds to the States to provide consultant services through State educational agencies. These funds should be available for a limited number of years to the States to serve as an incentive to provide there own consultant staffs.

At present the limited staff of the Office of Education is unable to meet the demands and requests made from the States for information and consultant service in the area of mental retardation.

In order to increase the effectiveness of the Office of Education it is recommended that Congress provide funds to increase the consultant service available. Additional staff would assist in increasing the effectiveness of State and local programs for the mentally retarded.

3. OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAMS

It has been demonstrated in a number of community programs throughout the Nation that in order to effectively and economically habilitate or rehabilitate the mentally retarded so that they can become independent and productive citizens, vocational rehabilitation services must be provided to them prior to their leaving school.

Under present programs less than 10 percent of the mentally retarded are now receiving services through the vocational rehabilitation programs. Current laws and regulations do not presently permit the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to extend its program or services to the mentally retarded under 16 years of age or if they are still in school attendance.

It is recommended that Congress provide, through appropriate legislation, the regulations which would permit the Office of Education and the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to serve the mentally retarded at whatever age is most suitable to meet the needs of the mentally retarded. The services and programs to be provided under this recommendation would be similar to those now available to out-of-school individuals or those over 16 years of age.

Excluded from these two programs and services are a significant number of mentally retarded individuals who can profit by specialized programs. These programs are designed to delay or eliminate the need for institutionalization. It permits the families to retain their mentally retarded child at home.

In many cases sheltered workshops are able to make the mentally retarded individual at least partially self-supporting. Recreational activities can assist the individual in making a more satisfactory home and community adjustment.

It is recommended that Congress provide funds for the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation to conduct day care centers, sheltered workshops, independent living services, and recreational facilities for these mentally retarded individuals who have been excluded from public school programs and do not meet the feasibility requirements of vocational rehabilitation and are over 16 years of age. These funds should support personnel, materials, supplies, and equipment for such programs.

4. RESEARCH

It is recognized that Congress has in recent years actively supported research in the biological and behavioral aspects of mental retardation through its various constituents in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is the opinion of this workshop section that the major obstacle to the extension of research in vocational rehabilitation and special education in mental retardation falls into two general area: (1) the shortage of qualified research personnel in vocational rehabilitation and special education in mental retardation, and (2) the shortage of facilities to conduct research in the behaviroal aspects of mental retardation.

Public Law 85–926 now provides fellowship grants for the training of college teachers and supervisors for educational programs in mental retardation.

It is recommended that Congress amend Public Law 85–926 to include fellowship grants for the training of research personnel in the behavioral aspects of mental retardation. This would assist in increasing the number of research personnel in this area.

Many State-supported residential institutions for the mentally retarded have presently available personnel and populations which could be effectively utilized to facilitate and augment research and the training of professional personnel in the area of vocational rehabilitation and special education.

State residential institutions for the mentally retarded, with few exceptions, are now located considerable distances from centers of higher learning. This has been a distinct handicap and a deterrent to conducting research and the training of professional personnel in this area.

It is unlikely that this situation will be altered within the next century unless the Federal Government provides incentives to the States through facilities—construction grants to build new facilities for the mentally retarded adjacent to those centers of higher learning which have programs in research and training of professional personnel in vocational rehabilitation and in special education in mental retardation.

It is recommended that the Hill-Burton Hospital Construction Act be amended and an appropriation be made to assist the States in the construction of residential facilities for the mentally retarded adjacent to qualified institutions of higher learning for the purpose of stimulating and facilitating research and the training of professional personnel in these areas.

CONCLUSION

The workship section on mental retardation wishes to express its deep appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the workshop and being afforded the opportunity to present its conclusions to the Subcommittee on Special Education and Rehabilitation.

Monroe Doctrine Remains Basic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a succession of addresses to the House dealing with the Caribbean situation now converging on the Panama Canal as its key objective, I have repeatedly stressed the necessity for reaffirmation and extension of the Monroe Doctrine to include subversion.

To this end, on January 6, 1960, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 445, 86th Congress, and on May 3, 1960, an identical measure, House Resolution 515, both of which are still in committee.

Though the Congress has not acted, it has been gratifying to note an awakening among the people to the true situation now confronting us.

Among the recent contributions is a thoughtful editorial by John V. Horner in the July 17, 1960, edition of the Sunday Star, Washington, D.C.:

MONROE DOCTRINE REMAINS BASIC

(By John V. Horner)

Both Russia and Cuba were directly involved in the events that led to the proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine 137 years ago, just as both were involved last week, when the United States reaffirmed this basic policy. The nature of involvement, however, was different.

The doctrine enunciated by James Monroe, fifth President of the United States, made clear that this country would tolerate no colonization and no interference in Western Hemisphere affairs by the nations of Europe.

Over the years the words "Monroe Doctrine" have had various meanings. But generally the term is accepted to mean there must be no intervention by governments in the Americas and no exercise of preponderant influence in Latin America.

Before the American Revolution, all of the colonial areas in Central America, the Caribbean and South America were simply possessions of their European suzerains. They shared the religion, the law, the institutions and foreign policies of their mother countries.

The Revolution resulted in the creation here of the first independent American State. This inspired the other colonies to seek freedom. Gradually they began dropping away from the mother countries, notably Spain and Portugal.

The people of the United States felt a natural interest in this movement and enjoyed the exhiliration of having pioneered in the democratic way of life and a new kind of independent government. The new nations demanded and received recognition by Washington.

After the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the "Holy Alliance"—czarist Russia, Austria, and Prussia—with the support of France openly made plans to preserve the colonial status quo in Latin America.

INTERVENTION FEARED

The United States feared France would claim Cuba, securing a foothold in America and giving that European nation the rich island just off our mainland.

About the same time, Russia was claiming rights along the northwest coastline of North America from Alaska to California. The czar also asserted a right to keep vessels of other powers out of the northern Pacific.

The United States had long followed a policy of isolation laid down by George Washington, Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson, John Adams and others. This country was taking no part in European politics or European wars and wanted Europeans to stay out of the Western Hemisphere.

On the urging of John Quincy Adams, then Secretary of State, President Monroe sent a message to Congress in December 1823, which enunciated the Monroe Doctrine. Succeeding Presidents and various Secretaries of State have given different interpretations to the basic policy, which has stood up very well down through the years.

The United States even saw to the inclusion in the Covenant of the League of Nations a clause which seemed to bind the signatories to the doctrine. This clause read as follows:

"The Covenant does not affect the validity of international engagements such as treaties or arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace."

In developing the inter-American system during the 20th century, the United States has sought to implement the doctrine.

The Rio Treaty, adopted in 1947, condemns war and the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the Charter of the United Nations. It pledges the American countries to try to settle all disputes between themselves by peaceful means, before referring the disputes to the U.N.

IGNORED BY CUBA

The latter provision is one that Cuba ignored last week in asking the U.N. Security Council to take up a charge that the United States has interfered in its internal affairs and has committed economic aggression.

Under the Rio Treaty, the 21 American Republics agreed on a joint defense of any of these states which is attacked in its own territory.

In 1954, the American governments adopted the Caracas Resolution proposed by the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles. This deals specifically with the threat of international communism to the Western Hemisphere. The resolution condemned activities of the international Communist movement and declared specifically that:

"International communism, by its undemocratic nature and its interventionist tendency, is incompatible with the concept of American freedom."

The governments declared that Communist control or domination of any of the American states would constitute a threat to their sovereignty and political independence, endangering peace. In the face of any such threat, the governments agreed, they would call a meeting of consultation of foreign ministers to adopt appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties.

Congressman Levering Holds Conferences in District

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of my service in Congress, I have tried in every way possible to maintain a close contact with the people of the 17th Congressional District of Ohio, who elected me to represent them.

From the first days of the 86th Congress, I have made regular radio speeches to my people, filling them in on the problems of government from week to week. I have circulated a weekly newsletter to the newspapers of my district so that the editors and the people would be able to understand the issues and the many views relating to them. I have had personal contact with thousands of members of the public from my district. I have corresponded with other thousands.

Last year I sat down with my constituents in every county of our district and listened to their views on national and international problems, as well as those of a personal nature. Because these grassroots conferences were so highly successful, I am again arranging a series of meetings in the courthouses of the seven counties of the district and I am urging members of the public to come to these meetings and to talk over any and all subjects they choose. I am convinced that only by personally contacting the people I serve, can I do the best possible job for them in the Congress of the United States.

I will be in the courthouses from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. on the dates and at the places set forth in the following schedule:

Tuesday, September 6, Millersburg, Holmes County.

Wednesday, September 7, Ashland, Ashland County.

Thursday, September 8, Coshocton, Coshocton, County.

Friday, September 9, Mount Vernon, Knox County.

Monday, September 12, Delaware, Delaware County.

Tuesday, September 27, Newark, Licking County.

Thursday, September 29, Mansfield, Richland County.

I not only welcome visitors at these conferences, I urge individuals, regardless of political party or how they may have voted in the past, to come to see me. I am striving to represent all the people of the 17th District, regardless of their beliefs about any political or legislative issue, and I know that it is a great

help for a Congressman to talk over personal, national and international problems with the people at home—problems on which he must make decisions from day to day that affect the lives of every person in our country.

I also invite the many fine young men throughout my district, who are interested in entering the various service academies, to call on me in order that I might have the opportunity to know them and to discuss their qualifications for appointment to the academy of their choice.

No appointments are necessary. I hope to see a large number of persons. The discussions can help me to serve them better and it can help them to understand my problems in striving to do the best possible job for all of the people in my district.

Problems of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 years my research team at the University of Iowa, under the direction of Dr. Russell Ross, has conducted a study on the problems of small business. This study has been very interesting and worthwhile. This study has pointed up a need for certain legislation that will materially help resolve some of their problems about which I should like to comment briefly today.

Our study also reveals and it should be noted that American small business has grown, prospered, and gained more strength in 7 years of the Eisenhower administration than at any time during the previous 20 years. Today there are 4,666,000 businesses in the United States, an alltime high, and 95 percent of them are small enterprises.

This Republican administration recognizes that little businesses are the red corpuscles of the American free enterprise system. It has acted effectively to foster them. They must be kept healthy and vigorous and they must grow in numbers commensurate with the national growth.

To assist owners and managers of small firms improve their management techniques, the Small Business Administration cosponsors management extension courses with universities and colleges across the country. These courses are carried on at virtually no expense to the taxpayers, and to date about 700 courses have been conducted at 275 or more educational institutions. More than 22,000 students have attended.

Also as part of its management assistance activities, SBA publishes three series of leaflets for the benefit of small businessmen. These are titled "Management Aids for Small Manufacturers," "Technical Aids for Small Manufacturers" and "Small Marketers Aids." Distribution of SBA's aid leaflets has exceeded the 7-million mark.

Although much has been accomplished during the Eisenhower administration to foster and encourage small business enterprise and keep the doors of opportunity open to new businesses, there is urgent need for additional Government action directed at aiding small business firms to successfully solve their management problems in this age of rapid change and keen competition.

The need for such action is clearly demonstrated by the results of private surveys which time after time indicate that 9 out of 10 business failures in this country are attributable to incompetent or inexperienced management.

Let us examine for a moment the business failures record during 1959.

More than 95 percent of the 4.7 million businesses in operation in the United States are small. Yet it is among this group that most failures occur, and where the financial burden of loss is most severe. In 1959 the bulk of the failures was found in those business activities where small businesses are concentrated. For example, 39.6 percent of the failures occurred among the following industry groups:

Rank by number of failures:

Industry group:	*Number of failures*
1. Eating and drinking places	1,334
2. Retail food and liquor group	1,113
3. Retail automotive group	1,015
4. Retail apparel and accessories	1,011
5. Lumber and lumber products—manufacturing	503
6. Textile mill products and apparel—manufacturing	420
7. Food and kindred products—manufacturing	176

More than 28 percent of the total money loss was suffered by investors in these unsuccessful firms.

Recent Dun & Bradstreet reports with respect to the business failure experience of the American economy reveal that in 1959 approximately 14,053 businesses failed with a $692,808,000 loss to creditors. Thus, of every 10,000 businesses in operation in 1959, 52 failed, with a consequent average loss of $49,300 each. More than 60 percent of these failures had liabilities of less than $25,000, a relatively small amount in this land of multimillion-dollar corporations.

In the aggregate small business suffers by comparison with large and medium sized business when sales and profits are considered. Even at this time, when sales volumes generally are up, profits are down.

Since 1947 the annual rate of earnings on stockholders' equity has been consistently lower for manufacturing corporations with assets under $1 million than it has been for the larger ones. This may be attributed partly to the fact that industries in which small manufacturing corporations predominate, such as the textile, apparel, lumber and food groups, are characterized by relatively lower earnings. On the other hand, groups noted for large corporations, such as aircraft, electrical machinery, instruments, chemicals and drugs, and automobile manufacture, are characterized by relatively higher earnings. Nevertheless, when industry as a whole is considered, the earnings position of small manufacturing corporations has declined in the past decade. For these smaller corporations earnings before taxes in 1951 amounted to $2,027 million compared to $1,527 million last year—a drop of almost 25 percent. During the same period manufacturing corporations with over $1 million in assets increased their earnings from $25,592 million to $28,167 million, a 10-percent gain. Obviously, as the bigs get bigger, the smalls have to struggle harder and harder just to stay even.

Despite the danger of failure or the prospect of small profit, the desire of thousands of men and women to enter the competitive busines field is as strong as ever. This is reflected in the vigorous growth of our business population in recent months. During 1959 over 70,000 businesses were added to our growing business population. Virtually all of these were small with the greatest number of entries being made in the retail, service, and contract construction fields which are particularly characteristic of the small firm. Because Dun & Bradstreet tells us that over 57 percent of the firms which fail do so in the first 5 years, it is of paramount importance that these firms receive assistance.

The program that I have presented in H.R. 13039 is designed to provide such assistance.

Just what is the problem?

A simple answer to this question is difficult to state. But the general objective we are trying to achieve is to make it possible for a small enterpriser to establish a business and operate it profitably, without fear of being squeezed out of the market. We must provide the small businessman the help he wants and needs.

What does the small businessman need?

Management help, aid, and assistance is a primary need of our small businessman today. Dun & Bradstreet tells us that over 44 percent of the business failures in 1959 can be attributed directly to the incompetence of management. Lack of sufficient, balanced managerial experience accounts for an additional 35 percent of the failures, while unfamiliarity with the product line adds another 12 percent to the record. Thus, over 90 percent of the failures in 1959 can be attributed to one or more phases of management incompetency or inexperience.

Despite efforts on the part of Small Business Administration officials and employees, which have produced substantive results, much remains to be done. General Government experts can do only so much, and there are not enough of them to put more than a dent in a problem of such magnitude.

My bill will alleviate this problem. Small business advisers operating out of the business centers in the United States will be immediately available to the small businessman for on-the-spot consultation whenever problems arise. This adviser, using his skill, experience, and know-how, will provide sound man-

agement advice and technical assistance to any small businessman who seeks it. He will have at his beck-and-call—on a when-actually-employed basis—the literally hundreds of retired, successful businessmen who are concerned with the economic prosperity of their local communities, and who would be willing and anxious to assist the adviser when he is faced with problems beyond his comprehension or competence. These retired men have been owners, managers, production specialists and technicians who can give the technological aid so necessary for efficient operation of a plant or store; they have been financial specialists or operators who know how to raise and manage capital and operating funds; they have been marketing and distribution men who already have solved many of the mysteries of that important phase of business operation. Advisers, moreover, will have an intimate knowledge of Federal Government publications, technical bulletins and management aids, and sources of technical data. They will be able to help the small businessman exploit the almost limitless information resources already available, but of which he is presently unaware.

In our enterprising Nation where such rapid advances in science and technology are being made, new products and processes appear almost daily. Of course, this leads to increased obsolescence of plants, equipment, and products. Unfortunately, the small businessman is unable to enjoy the fruits of this research and development. He cannot afford to undertake a research and development program on his own account. He has neither the time nor the ability to evaluate the profit potential of a product or process discovered and developed by someone else. In this regard he cannot hope to compete with a large concern. Here the small business adviser will be most helpful. He will direct the attention of the small businessman to new developments affecting that businessman's field of operations. He will make available information with respect to new products and processes that can be manufactured or employed by the businessman.

These small business advisers will be performing an important and useful service and eventually, I know, will become dependable, invaluable cogs in the machine we call our economy. Small business will benefit, and the American people as a whole will profit.

Public Laws 621 to and Including 642

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include a digest of Public Laws 621 to and including 642 as reported by me to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois, as follows:

PUBLIC LAW 621

Bankruptcy lawyers, take note. False financial statement no longer is grounds for denial of discharge to a nonbusiness bankrupt. Public Law 621 provides, however, that obligations incurred by its use will not be discharged.

PUBLIC LAW 622

This exempts from future retirement contribution by civil service employees who remain with the Government after they have put in enough years to retire with an annuity of 80 percent of their salaries.

PUBLIC LAW 623

This is bigger news in Crawford in Nebraska than it is in Chicago. It permits sale of some land for $500 to the village of Crawford. It could not have been done without an act of Congress.

PUBLIC LAW 624

Public Law 624 is the Hawaii omnibus measure making complete and perfect the admission of Hawaii into the Union. It gathers up the loose ends of transition from territorial status to statehood, in many acts of Congress changes "Territory of Hawaii" to "State of Hawaii," in others includes the new state in grants-in-aid and other programs. Just a housekeeping job of rearranging the furniture.

PUBLIC LAW 625

In 1888 the Federal Government started contributing to the support of State homes for veterans. It gave $100 a year for each veteran. Now there are 33 State homes in 28 States and VA has been paying $700 annually for each veteran. Public Law 625 changes the rate from $700 a year to $2.50 a day, a 30 percent boost.

PUBLIC LAW 626

H.R. 11776: Independent offices appropriations

Public Law 626 is the annual appropriation act for the independent executive bureaus and agencies among which are the Veterans' Administration, National Science Foundation, Housing and Home Finance Agency and many others. It carries total appropriations for fiscal 1961 of $8,307,964,900, or about $109 million under the budget estimate.

PUBLIC LAW 627

Public Law 627 permits air carriers to give free or reduced rates transportation to (1) employees, present and retired, and their families, (2) widows and minor children of employees who died in air duty, (3) persons injured in air crashes, families, doctors and others in connection with the crashes, and (4) persons giving relief in times of pestilence or similar emergency.

PUBLIC LAW 628

H.R. 12232: 1961 legislative appropriations

Public Law 628 appropriates $129,470,410 for fiscal 1961 for the legislative department. This is $3,943,075 under the budget.

PUBLIC LAW 629

H.R. 1157: Ryukyu Islands

Our relationship with the Ryukyu Islands is unique in the history of the United States. I think you will share my interest in Public Law 629, which resulted from the studies of Congressman MELVIN PRICE, of Illinois, and bears his name, the Price Act. MEL was a buck private when we were at war with Japan, now is a veteran member of the Armed Services Committee.

Okinawa is the largest of 63 islands in the Ryukyu group, about midway between Tokyo and Manila. It is the base of our Pacific defense. Under the peace treaty with Japan the United States exercises all powers of administration, legislation, and jurisdiction. Yet the islands are not American possessions, eligible to share in what we do for our own. Neither are they foreign territory, eligible under our foreign aid program.

Problem is to build up the welfare and well-being of the Ryukyuan people with the objective of making them self-sustaining. Population density is among the world's highest, 1,000 persons per square mile.

Public Law 629 (1) authorizes an annual appropriation of $6 million (about equal to Japan's subsidy in pre-war years), and (2) turns over to the government of the Ryukyu Islands receipts from taxes and other sources much as is done with our own Guam and our own Virgin Islands.

PUBLIC LAW 630

H.R. 12231: Military construction appropriation

Public Law 630 carries fiscal 1961 appropriations for military construction, at home and overseas, housing, hospitals, missile, and other facilities of all military kinds. They total $994,855,000. This is $193,145,000 under the budget.

PUBLIC LAW 631

Chapter XIII of the Bankruptcy Act concerns only wage earners. Public Law 631 reduces the number of reports to the Treasury Department required of other bankrupts to a single notice to the regional internal revenue office of the first meeting of creditors.

PUBLIC LAW 632

Public Law 632 clarifies and strengths reemployment rights under the Reserve and Universal Military Training Acts. Among other things it specifies National Guardsmen are included. Employers, inductees, reservists, and others affected probably will wish to familiarize themselves with the provisions.

PUBLIC LAW 633

Court-Martial Manual automatically reduces to lowest pay grade an enlisted service person when convicted by court-martial. Court of Military Justice in the Sampson case said this held only when pay reduction was ordered by the court. Comptroller General, controlling the purse strings, sided with the manual. Congress quiets the confusion with Public Law 633. It (1) reduces pay to grade E–1 on conviction, and (2) restores former pay if court-martial sentence is set aside or pay reduction is not specifically included in the sentence.

PUBLIC LAW 634

Public Law 634 is another evidence of the amends the Congress is making for past trespasses upon the rights and dignity of the American Indian. It prohibits (1) the defacing or destruction of boundary markers on Indian reservations, and (2) the hunting, trapping, or fishing on Indian lands without permit. Penalties of both fine and imprisonment are provided.

PUBLIC LAW 635

Very important to our defense are the Polaris nuclear submarines. They are operated on a 2-crew plan, under which the crews rotate between sea duty and rehabilitation and training ashore. Public Law 635 extends extra incentive pay to the period both at sea and ashore.

PUBLIC LAW 636

Public Law 636 turns over to the Navajo Indian Tribe the irrigation project on its reservation in New Mexico. The Government will train tribal personnel and assist in operating project until trained tribesmen can take over.

PUBLIC LAW 637

In April of 1960 the Comptroller General reported a sampling of 13 oversea shipments by commercial air of household goods of officers of the armed services that cost the Federal Government $125,470 whereas the

cost by water would have been $23,000. Two months later Public Law 637 had been drawn, passed by the Congress and signed by the President. It provides that hereafter no shipments, except in emergencies, shall be made by air if the cost is greater than by water or other means.

PUBLIC LAW 638

Public Law 638 puts reserve officers retiring after 8 years' service on the same basis as regular officers as regards travel pay to the places they have selected as their new homes.

PUBLIC LAW 639

Public Law 639 permits VA to furnish medical services for a non-service-connected disability, (1) in preparation for admission to hospital, and (2) in completion of treatment after leaving hospital. It is expected to accelerate patient turnover rate, partially check growing waiting lines as veteran population ages.

PUBLIC LAW 640

Grand Valley project in Colorado is one of the oldest and most successful of the Federal reclamation developments in the West. Public Law 640 permits the use (after operating expenses and payments to the Federal Government) of its revenues from power to meet its obligations for rehabilitation and improvements.

PUBLIC LAW 641

When a member of the armed services dies without a will (15 percent of the cases), settlement of his accrued pay cannot be made without approval of the General Accounting Office. That means a long delay, often pretty hard on a family with current bills to meet. Public Law 641 sensibly does away with reference to GA, except in unusual cases.

PUBLIC LAW 642

H.R. 11389: Executive Office appropriations

Public Law 642 appropriates $10,872,500 for fiscal 1961 for the Executive Office. The President is given $2,398,500 for personnel and expenses of the White House office, $1,500,000 for special staff assistants, $505,000 for upkeep of the White House itself, and $100,000 for White House repairs and furnishings.

Has Congress the Power To Investigate the Port of New York Authority?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, August 14, 1960, I had the privilege of being a panelist on the program "Metropolitan Probe"—WNEW-TV, channel 5, 7:30 to 8 p.m.—with Gov. Robert B. Meyner; Councilman Stanley Isaacs, representative of New York; and the moderator, William Peer. We discussed the question of the authority of Congress to investigate the activities of the Port of New York Authority and the justification for its investigation.

This matter will be considered by the Congress, in view of the fact that the full House Committee on the Judiciary has voted to cite three members of the authority for contempt for refusing to produce the records of the Port of New York Authority.

The Port of New York Authority was created in 1921 with the consent of Congress. Without the consent of Congress, this bistate agency could not have come into being or into operation. This was the first bistate agency in the United States. Since then many other bistate agencies have come into being. These agencies operate in a manner which affects interstate commerce and, consequently, would be encroaching upon Federal authority if Congress had not approved the compact and the scope of its activities. The original compact of 1921, approved by the 67th Congress in chapter 77 of session 1, set forth the port authority's purposes, its scope, its powers. The resolution of Congress granted consent to the agreement for the creation of the port of New York district and for the establishment of the Port of New York Authority for the comprehensive development of the port of New York.

The Congress in its approving resolution declared as follows:

That the consent of Congress is hereby given to the said Government, and to each and every part and article thereof: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed as impairing or in any manner affecting any right or jurisdiction of the United States in and over the region which forms the subject of said agreement.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

Approved August 23, 1921.

Again in 1922 when the 67th Congress, 2d session, granted consent and authority to the Port of New York Authority to execute the comprehensive plan approved by the States of New York and New Jersey by chapter 43, Laws of New York, 1922, and chapter 9, Laws of New Jersey, 1922, it stated in section 2:

That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

This matter shortly coming before Congress is a very important one. It is fundamental and far reaching. I am attaching a copy of the TV broadcast in which I was a panelist. This broadcast will provide certain information to my colleagues, and I trust it will to a certain extent be helpful to them in arriving at a correct decision on the question whether the port authority representatives are in contempt of Congress.

The broadcast follows:

PEER. Good evening. This is Bill Peer with another session of "Metropolitan Probe." Tonight another inquiry into the way our most powerful leaders fulfill the responsibilities that necessarily go with power. Our guest tonight is a distinguished visitor from across the Hudson River, Gov. Robert Meyner, of New Jersey. Governor Meyner is in the middle of a hot dispute over a current congressional investigation of the Port of New York Authority, the agency which handles the operation of port facilities on both sides of the river and the huge airfields that serve the metropolitan area. Tonight we probe into Governor Meyner's reasons for opposing this investigation, commuter problems of New York and New Jersey, and Governor Meyner's own political future. Our panelists for this evening, on my right, Councilman Stanley Isaacs, of Manhattan, the only Republican in the city council. And on my left, Congressman ALFRED SANTANGELO, Democrat, of Manhattan. Councilman Isaacs, I believe the first question this evening is yours.

ISAACS. Governor Meyner, I understand that in connection with this controversy that Mr. Peer has mentioned, you wrote a letter to the various Governors of the States and Members of Congress, asking their support in your dispute with Congressman CELLER Can you tell me why so few have responded?

MEYNER. Well I might say, Councilman Isaacs, that practically every Governor feels favorable to the proposition. I was out at Glacier National Park at the national Governors conference, and it was there that a resolution was presented which in essence opposes the very thing Congress is trying to do. This resolution was passed unanimously. Now to date I have probably had about six Governors answer me personally and not one has taken the side of the congressional leaders. And quite a number of Congressmen have replied and many of those are favorable. Of course Congress hasn't gotten back to Washington and many of the replies are coming from secretaries, saying, "When the Congressman comes in I am sure he will give serious consideration to your letter." I think the response has been excellent. I know that practically all of the governors are opposed to the proposition of probing into the internal records. I want to make it clear that we are not trying to prevent Congress from looking into the areas Congress is expected to look into. What we are objecting to is that they look at the internal records. For instance, we might as a port authority look into the question of whether a contractor is fit to do business. Look into his financial responsibility. Get a lot of internal confidential information. I don't think that should be available. We might check the employment record of a person who is to be employed or promoted. We don't think that should be the subject of a record. As a matter of fact when the subpena was issued aaginst the three people from the port authority they took seven packing cases of information down there. And apparently the subcommittee was more interested at the moment in establishing a record to hold these people in contempt. Even the Congressmen who might be favorable to a probe in the sense that they want some of these internal records, say that there ought to be some method by which we ought to determine this controversy without holding reputable citizens in criminal contempt.

ISAACS. You do feel that Congress of course has general power over interstate commerce and foreign commerce and is interested in the substance of what the port authority does. Is there anything in the original act which gave you and the Governor of the State of New York the power to organize this commission originally? And to continue to appoint its members? Is there anything in that act that gives Congress continued supervision over its details?

MEYNER. Congress takes the attitude that they do have this continuing supervision. We say it is not supervision. We say that they have the power to give consent. Now I think what happened was originally when the Constitution was formed, the Thirteen States didn't want two or three States developing a competing sort of government. To that extent this limitation was put in the Constitution that said, "No contract between the States can be entered into without the consent of Congress." I think what the framers were thinking "Well we don't want these two or three States developing a competing form of government." Now I say if they—if the Government gives us money for airways or for airport they can come in and check our records to see that we use the money properly. If we are engaged in some type of enterprise by which commerce is affected they can come in and look at that. But I don't think that they can come in and look into the internal administration of the port authority. The port authority is carrying on functions that

a city or a State could be carrying on. For instance, New York City has a marine division where they build piers and rent them.

We don't think Congress will come in and say to them "Now let's look at all of your detailed records in this area." And by the same token when we are doing something that is properly a State function and which we think can be done better with the two States through the port authority that this power of infinitesimal investigation should go on.

ISAACS. I see.

PEER. Congressman SANTANGELO.

SANTANGELO. Governor, I am glad to see that you feel that Congress has the power to investigate the port authority if the conditions warrant. Your position apparently is diametrically opposite to that taken by the attorney general of the State of New York who has sent letters and briefs to the Congressmen to the position, to the effect, that Congress does not have the power to investigate the port authority, and that it is a bistate agency. And so I am very happy to see that you feel that we have the right if conditions warrant.

MEYNER. I don't think I am in disagreement with the attorney general of New York. I think that this particular investigation is a fishing expedition. After all I don't see any resolution of Congress on the record saying that we want to check this phase of interstate commerce, or we want to check customs, or we want to check the aviation problems. They want a staff study by which they are going into all ramifications. There is no pending resolution before Congress, as I see it, which says that there is some problem here we've got to look into. I think it is a fishing expedition that they are interested in right now.

SANTANGELO. Well of course we haven't heard from the Congress in the full House the reasons why the investigation is wanted. But it is a fact, is it not that since 1921 when the compact between the State of New York and the State of New Jersey was entered into with the consent of the Congress of the United States that not one investigation, or one inquiry, into the inner workings of the port authority has taken place.

MEYNER. I can't say that that is a fact.

SANTANGELO. I know that in 1954 when I was in the State Senate I introduced a resolution to the effect that we should investigate the exploitation of the motorists who were compelled to pay 50 cents for crossing the bridges and the tunnels when the original bonds which had constructed these had been paid off. And it was at that time the port authority approached me and said that this was a bistate investigation, or a congressional investigation and therefore should not be done by one particular State, or one particular legislature. Now the question is whether or not this investigation should take place. Not whether or not Congress has the power because in the compact of 1921 Congress reserved unto itself the right to repeal, alter or modify the compact.

MEYNER. It reserved the right to withdraw its consent. I fully believe that consent is a lot different from having power. It is my feeling that most of the activity in the port authority is in the area that can be normally done by a State or a municipality or authorized by a State. These are functions that are ordinarily done by we'll say a port like Norfolk or Mobile or New Orleans. It happens that this port is in two States and because it is in two States we get together and do it by compact. And the Constitution only says "consent." It doesn't say a power. It doesn't say you run the thing. And I think it is very much like this. I don't think Congress can go into the President's office and get his records, or into a Cabinet member's office and get his records. If conservation and economic developments are engaged in some program that effects navigable streams they can come in and look at it and we'll give them all the information. But to look any time at general records it seems to me is going a bit too far.

PEER. Governor, the point that Congressman SANTANGELO made about the continuing tolls on the facilities operated by the authorities, tolls not being reduced despite the fact that the original bonds have been retired, do you feel that some of these tolls should be reduced?

MEYNER. I don't see how under existing conditions they can be reduced. For instance, Holland Tunnel has been paid off many years ago. But the revenues that they get from the Holland Tunnel will enable them to build piers.

PEER. The motorist is paying for the piers. That hardly seems fair. Don't you think the motorist is entitled to some relief? We have been told that the authorities have large surpluses for various purposes. Why should they continue to soak the motorist with a 50-cent toll because they want to build piers? That doesn't make a great deal of sense.

MEYNER. Well, I should like to point out to you for instance that if the third tube of the Lincoln Tunnel had to pay its way the charge would be a dollar—a dollar and 10 cents. Now they are building a second deck on the George Washington Bridge out of the 50 cents. Now it may take present day costs, they are going to spend for double decking for approaches on the New York and New Jersey side the cost wouldn't be 50 cents for going across but it would be $1 or $1.25. Now the fact that they have these facilities which were built at a lower cost enable them to pledge that revenue to raise more money to take care of additional facilities. And by the same token if they didn't build these modern piers we'd be losing our traffic, or very vital international traffic to some other ports along the eastern seaboard or maybe to the St. Lawrence Seaway. This is vital. Maybe we wouldn't have any jobs to drive to in an automobile. If we didn't develop the New York port—the New York and New Jersey port. I might say in this connection that when we build them we pledge this revenue. We build them and we get money back that pays for them, but this enables us to finance, the port authority through New Jersey and New York has no power, for instance, to levy a tax against the citizens of New York and New Jersey. All they have is this revenue. It is a billion-dollar corporation. But I don't know how the job would be done by the respective States if we didn't have this agency and I might say that it is a bipartisan agency. It was started out by Alfred E. Smith and Walter Edge, a Democratic and Republican Governor of the respective States. It subsisted even though we've had Republican Governors and Democratic Governors in New York and New Jersey, and Republican and Democratic legislators. And any time it is not being operated properly it is subject to investigation by the Legislatures of New York and New Jersey. I am sure, Congressman, that at times it resisted some investigation but the power is always there for the Governor to ask for any information and on the part of both branches of the State legislature to do it, and I don't see any overwhelming sentiment of Congress to do it. Of course, you are a Congressman, you may encounter different sentiment.

PEER. Councilman Isaacs.

ISAACS. I'd like to bring up a different subject. You mentioned the George Washington Bridge and the new level being built. When that was originally designed as I understand it it was intended for rapid transit at least in part. But that has been abandoned. And of course you are interested in all your residents whether they work in New York or not. Here people arrive at the other side of the river by all of the railroads or they have no connection today in most cases with New York City where they want to work. So far too many people, from my point of view, come in by bus and by cars. That is encouraged and everything else seems to be excluded today by the port authority. That is true of the Narrows bid in their proposal. Isn't it time that someone persuaded the port authority—I'll put it that way—to build an underground railroad connecting all the railroads in New Jersey at their terminals and swinging in either through the Hudson tube or through the Narrows Bridge or the George Washington Bridge or what have you, carrying them by rail into our city. It is infinitely better for us to have people come in underground and connect with our local transit than it is to have our streets flooded with busses and automobiles.

MEYNER. I couldn't agree with you more, Councilman Isaacs, but I am afraid that you put the cart before the horse. Before we persuade the port authority I think we've got to persuade the traveling public. The traveling public somehow would much rather jump in a car parked outside of their respective apartment or home and travel into a crowded, congested city and pay the costs of parking. By the same token because a bus carries fewer passengers but gives more frequent service we want to use the busses. I think something must be done to counter this trend because I think if it continues we'll have nothing but chaos. And we try to counter it by setting up a division of transportation in our highway department so that we say to the highway builders "Well now look at Rapid Transit. The port authority whether you want to criticize them rightly or wrongly have merely followed this public trend of people getting into cars and busses and they furnishing the facilities for those people who want to go into cars and busses.

ISAACS. But they have encouraged the trend.

MEYNER. Well, on the other hand, on the other hand, any of these propositions that have been developed cost money—$400 million, $600 million, and there isn't in any of those studies any indication that you can make them pay for themselves. It may be that we can ask the port authority to be sensible about this thing and get the public to support them to subsidize this rail transportation which is much more efficient. You can travel and occupy much less space but how to sell the public on this? Places like Los Angeles where I think 60 percent of the downtown section is occupied by parking lots or streets are just clogged, all you have to do is get one or two cars stuck and everybody is jammed up for an hour or two especially at the rush hour. They are looking for something that we got and we should retain. I agree with you that there ought to be some method but first we've got to sell the public on using these facilities.

SANTANGELO. Governor, the purpose of the port authority was to enhance the transportation facilities of interstate commerce between States and between nations and also to aid in the general mass transportation. Since the last 10 years the port authority or the business in the port of New York which includes New Jersey and New York has been falling down and you may recall within the last 2 years in New York, the New Jersey Legislature the port authority opposed the bills that had been proposed in the New Jersey Legislature to have them take over transit facilities and cooperate in trying to streamline the transportation between the States. Now why is it that the port authority which has as its purpose improving the transportation facilities, encouraging transportation, comes into New

Jersey and opposes aiding in the transit facilities of railroads and other transit facilities and at the same time their major objective, to increase the travel and cargo shipments out of the port of New York has been falling off? For example within the last several months we have heard through Governor Rockefeller that the wheat shipments through the port of New York have dropped to the lowest point since 1953. The port authority seems to be going into all other businesses. It has been labeled an octopus extending its tentacles throughout the State of New York. It has gone into Newburgh, 90 miles from the port of New York, and opened up a hotel. It is running a bowling alley. It is doing every other thing in real estate. Much of its business is going into areas unrelated to transportation, unrelated to the motorist, unrelated to the port. Do you think, Governor, that all this extension into areas which are not their primary concern and which prevent them from reducing the toll of the motorists who are financing and paying for the port authority revenue is fair? And should something be done about this? And don't you think an investigation by the Congress of the United States should inquire into this area to see whether they are applying their funds for the purposes of transportation into State commerce and don't you think that Congressman CELLER's resolution to investigate along these lines is appropriate?

MEYNER. Does that question really call for an answer?

SANTANGELO. It certainly does.

MEYNER. It is the kind of question that starts off like "When did you last beat your wife." No I think you have got to differentiate here. I think obviously that originally it was thought that rail transportation would become important and that the port authority would move in this area. But I call your attention to the fact that in Boston, in Los Angeles, in San Francisco in Chicago, transportation by rail became a rather difficult kind of thing because people couldn't make money at it. People were leaving rail transportation and going to bus or to motor vehicle. Now the port authority representing the view of the public—the public wanted these facilities. I didn't hear any objection to building an extra tube on the Lincoln Tunnel or building a Lincoln Tunnel or any of the bridges that have been built. I haven't heard one. The public wanted them. They were responding to it. If any objection can be made of the port authority it is that it is conducted as a successful business. They always look for the successful projects rather than for those which would be subsidized. I think what they are worried about and remember you have got six reputable citizens in New Jersey, six from New York, and these people realize that they can only exist and build new projects which they feel will serve both States, if those projects will be paying propositions. Now if they have too many on the subsidy side they are going to be in difficulty. I think we found out long ago in transportation in New York City that it is a losing proposition. And they have been reluctant to take over. The Governor of New Jersey and the Governor of New York are interested in trying to get them to take some of these facilities over. I think we are making progress in that direction, but we can't saddle too much of a burden on them. Now with respect to these independent enterprises it has been—there are cases where they own airports and where they have to control the land which is the flight of the plane, the actual runway. Now they have leased some of that to private enterprise. They say they are leasing it as comparable rates charged other people. And the money they get from that enables them to maintain the services. Now this was written in their original constitution—their original laws. The legislature of New Jersey and New York can withdraw this authority to build a hotel out at an airport or to maintain piers. They can withdraw that. As I say we might have to furnish them the money somewhere else to replace what revenue they get there.

SANTANGELO. That's $5 million for the hotel over in Idlewild and there is a bowling alley that they are operating and also a plan on the part of them to take over with $300 million all the East Side of New York. Don't forget this is a tax-exempt corporation. It pays no taxes. Interest on the bonds are tax exempt.

MEYNER. By the same token we don't take any of our revenues from the State of New Jersey or New York to appropriate them to the port authority to maintain bridges and piers.

PEER. Now, Governor Meyner, to get away from the——

MEYNER. I brought piers in here too often.

PEER. You know several of them. To get away from the port authority for a little while, let's get around to Gov. Robert Meyner. There was some criticism of you, you probably have suspected or heard, at the Los Angeles convention for keeping your delegates to what appeared to be a commitment to go along with you as a favorite son. What do you feel that has done to your political future?

MEYNER. I don't know what it has done to my political future.

PEER. What is your political future?

MEYNER. The political leaders in New Jersey decided early in January in 1960 that they wanted me to be a favorite son. The delegates were elected on that basis. We went to the convention on that basis. I assured all of the contenders that it looked to me as though I would be the favorite son on the first ballot. And KENNEDY would get most of the votes on the second ballot. We lived up to the assurances we gave to everybody. We gave any of those people who felt they had an opportunity after the first ballot to get their bandwagon rolling. We lived up to what we said to all of the delegates was going to happen. We didn't change at the last minute.

PEER. Now, Governor, under the New Jersey law you cannot succeed yourself as governor, can you?

MEYNER. I cannot.

PEER. What are your political plans from here on in?

MEYNER. I plan to be as strong a voice as I can present for the Democratic Party in New Jersey. I have given, or will have given 8 years of my life to State government. And we have tried to establish integrity in government. We have tried to establish a 21-county party. We have tried to make our politics synonymous with good government. I am going to try to exercise what influence I have—little or great—for the future to keep that kind of a party and that kind of government in New Jersey.

PEER. If the Democratic ticket is successful in November, do you feel that you may be a member of the Cabinet of the incoming President?

MEYNER. I won't be in a position to accept any job openings until January 1962.

PEER. Until 1962?

MEYNER. That's right. I go a year beyond——

PEER. I see. Well then is there any possibility that you may run for the Senate?

MEYNER. I have always found that jobs are available when you don't seek them too fervently.

PEER. And that is your position at this time? You are not seeking fervently but you sort of hope that it comes along?

MEYNER. Well I love public life. It gives more satisfaction, I think, than having a lot of money or being an outstanding person in your profession, or running a successful business.

PEER. Governor, I wish we had more time to go into a great many aspects of our discussion, but that is all the time we have on this session of "Metropolitan Probe." Thank you, Governor Meyner.

Cuba, Down the Red Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial broadcast over WDSU–TV and WDSU radio on August 9, 1960:

CUBA, DOWN THE RED ROAD

(Editorial was broadcast over WDSU–TV and WDSU radio on Aug. 9, 1960)

Cuba is still marching down the road toward communism. Under the guise of retaliating against the United States, the Government continues to seize private property. Under the guise of protecting a revolution that once flew the banner of democracy, the Government continues to rule at the point of a rifle, choking off all liberties, keeping hundreds of political prisoners waiting in crowded cells for an uncertain fate.

Every comment about the United States by a Cuban official is bitter. Every word about Russia drips with affection. Moscow and Havana join in threatening the United States with Soviet rockets.

Like other Iron Curtain countries, Cuba today is a place lovers of freedom have to escape from—the latest, Dr. Raul Chibas, one of the early leaders of the Castro movement. We wonder how many people would flee Cuba if it didn't have to be done by plane or boat.

The situation grows grimmer with the secrecy shrouded illness of Fidel Castro, raising the possibility that control may pass to two more violent radicals, his 29-year-old brother Raul and the Argentine-born Che Guevara, both foaming-at-the-mouth haters of this country. Raul runs the army. Guevara runs the so-called people's militia. Both in recent months have been moving their men into more and more areas of Cuban life—labor, education, mass communications, among others.

What to do about this revolution which has been kidnaped by the Communists and delivered to Khrushchev? Treaties and good sense and regard for the opinion of our Latin neighbors all argue that we avoid muscling into Cuba and taking over.

There are factors working against the Cuban regime. One is the apparent physical decline of Fidel Castro, the popular idol of the revolution. The Catholic church is another. Economic troubles are a third.

In the opinion of this station, the only role for the United States is to continue to expose Cuba's Communist affiliation * * * to move with other American countries toward the isolation of Cuba * * * and to prevent Communist contagion by working with Latin neighbors toward more democracy and higher living standards in this hemisphere.

Military Action in Cuba—When?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, for many months, in and out of Congress, I have endeavored to alert the Nation and the Congress to the growing threat to the south of us, with particular reference to the Caribbean area and the necessity for remedial action.

Even though these efforts have not yet led to the decisive measures required, it has been gratifying to recognize a growing public understanding in the form of thoughtful articles in the press. This causes thoughtful persons to inquire why the Congress does not take the lead in the trying situation and not wait for the public to enforce congressional action?

A recent contribution by David Lawrence in the July 8, 1960, issue of the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., entitled, "Military Action in Cuba—When?" is most timely. It quotes significant passages of the 1954 Declaration of Caracas and cites other precedents.

The indicated article, which is commended for reading by all concerned with the security of the United States, follows:

MILITARY ACTION IN CUBA—WHEN?—UNITED STATES SEEN OBLIGATED TO PROTECT RIGHTS OF ITS OWN AND OTHER FOREIGN CITIZENS

(By David Lawrence)

The time for action on the Cuban problem has come. The patience of the U.S. Government is not unlimited.

Dealing with an erratic individual like Fidel Castro requires precautionary measures. So Americans are rapidly getting out of Cuba. In a little while they may all have been evacuated, though no formal warning to leave Cuba has as yet been issued by the Department of State here. Out of the 6,000 Americans living there, nearly 3,000 have already departed with their families.

Is all this the forerunner of military action? Not unless Castro provokes such a crisis. But if he does, he will find no hesitation on the part of the United States to employ its military power to protect the lives and properties of its citizens.

The Castro Government has confiscated the property of Americans, British, and other Europeans involving hundreds of millions of dollars, and threatens more seizures. Confiscation in itself is not a basis for military action, but, if the property is actually stolen and nothing but worthless notes are issued in exchange, the American Government is justified in taking over the properties and retaining possession until such time as a free government comes into office which will respect the rights of Americans and other foreign citizens in Cuba.

The U.S. Government has an obligation not only to its own citizens, but to those of other governments. For ever since the Monroe Doctrine was proclaimed in the early days of our Republic, the United States has acted as a trustee for the citizens of other countries. The doctrine was deisgned as a warning to European governments not to seek to establish a foothold in this hemisphere by annexing or dominating territory not previously colonized by them. The Soviet Government, by gaining control of the Castro regime, is today flagrantly disregarding the Monroe Doctrine.

In recent years the Monroe Doctrine has been accepted as an international obligation of all the Pan American States. In 1954 at Caracas, Venezuela, the 10th Inter-American Conference, attended by members of the Organization of American States, adopted a resolution which declared:

"That the domination or control of the political institutions of any American State by the international Communist movement, extending to this hemisphere the political system of an extra continental power, would constitute a threat to the sovereignty and political independence of the American States, endangering the peace of America, and would call for a meeting of consultation to consider the adoption of appropriate action in accordance with existing treaties."

Such a consultation does not require unanimous action. Indeed, it may be just an intermediate step before a decision is made by the United States, along with several other countries, to use military force as authorized under article 51 of the United Nations Charter. The only requirement is that the United Nations Security Council be given proper notice of the steps taken.

It will be recalled that back in June, 1940, there was a threat of Nazi conquest of the French, British, and Dutch possessions in this hemisphere. President Franklin D. Roosevelt secured the adoption by Congress of a joint resolution implementing a document previously signed by the foreign ministers of the American Republics. Congress served notice then that no such transfer of sovereignty would be recognized and declared that, if such transfer seemed likely, the United States "in addition to other measures" would consult with the American Republics "to determine on the steps which should be taken to safeguard their common interests."

Inasmuch as this is a campaign year, it is quite possible that President Eisenhower will feel impelled to ask Congress for a joint resolution authorizing him to take certain steps to prevent the Soviets from getting a foothold in Cuba. The possible shipment of Soviet arms to Cuba has already been reported. It was precisely to avoid a similar situation in 1914 that President Wilson ordered a ship carrying German arms to Mexico to be halted and turned back to its point of origin. To accomplish this, the customs house at Vera Cruz was seized by U.S. Marines.

The United States is not anxious to become involved in a military way in Cuba, but there have been hints by the Castro government of possible seizure of the U.S. naval base at Guantanamo, which is maintained under a Cuban-American treaty of many years' standing. Certainly any attempt to interfere with the operation of that naval base would be resisted by U.S. forces.

Castro can have peace and he can do what he pleases internally. But the moment he confiscates foreign properties, does not pay for them and threatens the safety of foreign citizens, the United States will not hesitate to use force to secure redress and protection, not only for its citizens, but for those of Britain and other countries whose lives and property have also been threatened.

The Plight of Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter gives a very clear picture of the plight of small business in this country today, of the harassments to which they are subjected by Government, of the bureaucratic redtape that strangles them, of the price squeezes that finally ruin them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the big corporations and the big money can cope with all this and get by, but the small businessman, who up to now has been the backbone of American business, is being ruined by these methods. True, he cannot deliver a big vote, like the big labor bosses who work for the large corporations, nor can he buy elections—and that can also be done in this day and age.

Are these to be the "American way of the future?"

The letter follows:

As a small subcontractor who has been trying to make a decent living doing defense work for the past 16 years, I want to ask you to please vote against the Senate amendments to H.R. 11207.

I don't understand much about politics, but I do know that if the Small Business Administration gets control of subcontracting, this isn't going to help us any. There is already so much redtape doing business as a subcontractor, that any more of it will be more than we can take.

The prime contractors get our quotations, but they tell us our prices have to be just as low as some incompetent junk shop which gets half of its work rejected. When you work 16 years to build up a company with skilled workers and quality control, you at least expect to get enough for your work to cover your honest costs—and not have to chisel your price. If we have to keep bidding against the cheapest outfit in town, you know we would have to cheapen the quality of work we do ourselves. How they expect to make better airplanes and missiles that way is beyond me.

Every competent small subcontractor I know around here is in the same boat. The less work there is to do, the more we are told that Congress keeps insisting that they have to give the work to the lowest bidder. I read where one of you people in Congress said this was the American way. Well, if it is American to always buy the cheapest thing, then something has gone wrong with America.

We don't want any handouts. We just want to go back to doing business where the buyer is permitted to use his intelligence where a man's quality means something. A businessman understands these things—I sure hope you do, because a lot of your friends in Congress don't seem to.

Should Foreign Imports Be Permitted To Ruin American Industry?—Eliminate Jobs for U.S. Citizens?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds of small industries in this country that are being injured by a flood of imports that are the products of cheap labor. I am submitting herewith a statement by Alfred E. McMillan, secretary-treasurer of the Tile Council of America made before the U.S. Tariff Commission conducting a peril point in-

vestigation. It is an excellent account of how one small industry—and there are many others—must fight to keep their domestic markets in the face of these cheap foreign imports. Mr. McMillan's remarks reveal in detail how the ceramic mosaic tile manufacturers have created a market for their products through a cooperative effort, only to see it threatened by a flood of cheap imports.

Mr. McMillan's remarks deserve the careful consideration of all Members of Congress and citizens generally. His statement follows:

My name is Alfred E. McMillan, and I am secretary-treasurer of the Tile Council of America. The Tile Council is a trade association of ceramic tile manufacturers who produce most of the ceramic floor and wall tile in this country. With your permission, I would like to explain in some detail the function of this unusual organization, because it has a significant bearing on the case which we are developing here today.

The Tile Council was formed in 1945 as World War II drew to a close. Its formation and the programs that the domestic manufacturers have developed and supported in the ensuing years forms the backdrop against which our case should be viewed. It is the objective of the Tile Council, and, therefore, the domestic industry, to create, expand, and maintain the market for ceramic tile in this country. Now, that's not an unusual objective for a trade association; there are hundreds of associations in this country that espouse the same objectives. What we want to emphasize here is that ours has been a unique effort in the field of building products. The market we are discussing is a created market. It was developed, expanded, and nurtured through the expenditure of the time and treasure of the domestic tile manufacturers, working together and individually. It was created and expanded by a far-seeing, comprehensive campaign undertaken 15 years ago by the domestic industry.

When I say that we created the market in this country it is literally true. Granted, ceramic mosaic tile was sold in the United States before the founding of the Tile Council of America. Before World War II, however, ceramic tile was available in only a limited number of shapes and colors. It was generally considered a bathroom surfacing material—its application was limited.

Since World War II, and the formation of the Tile Council, ceramic tile is being used creatively in many other sections of the home, commercial buildings and public buildings—on exteriors as well as interiors. It is now available in many colors and shapes and in an infinite number of design patterns.

This new and expanded market for ceramic tile didn't just happen by accident, gentlemen, it was made to happen. And therein lies the story of the domestic ceramic mosaic tile industry and the market it created. And, likewise, therein lies the reason we highly resent the disruptive intrusion into this market by the products of cheap foreign labor. It is one of the basic reasons we vigorously oppose the flood of products into this market from sources that have not made one single contribution to its creation, its expansion or its maintenance. As a matter of fact, just the reverse is true. The major contribution of these foreign producers to this created market has been a destructive one. They participate on the basis of price, alone, because of their supply of cheap labor. They reap, but they do not sow; they consume, but they do not contribute; they carry off a growing share of the market, but bear none of its burden. We resent this as a matter of justice, and I shall attempt here to outline the underlying reasons for our resentment.

The foregoing should not be construed as a negative attitude by the domestic industry, for ours has always been a positive program. If it were not positive, there would be no created market; either for ourselves or the foreign producers. These programs, which have created, expanded and maintained the market, fall into three general categories: architectural, advertising and promotion, and research. All of them have been supported by the domestic producers, alone.

Our architectural program, for both present and future architects, is unique in the building products industry. We concern ourselves, for example, not only with the practicing architect, of today, but also the architect of tomorrow through our scholarship program. Twenty-seven leading institutions have so far been recipients of our scholarship grants. The funds are extended on a rotating basis. Each school administers its own program, choosing its own scholarship students. A portion of the funds are employed to improve teaching facilities in courses on building materials. Another portion is in direct aid to outstanding students of architecture according to the program developed by the individual schools. The Tile Council hopes that eventually every school of architecture in the country will someday participate in the program. It is believed that our project is the only one of its kind to be conducted by an industrywide building material group for architectural students.

As an aid to the practicing architect, and at the same time to lend stability to the industry, the domestic manufacturers, through the Tile Council, have taken the lead in developing standard specifications for the use of ceramic mosaic tile. A great deal of time-consuming effort and expense were required before the standard specifications were approved by the American Standards Association. The standards are of immense help to the busy architect, but, at the same time, they permit him to use ceramic tile in new and creative designs. And, in doing so, he automatically expands the market for ceramic tile in this country. Our service to the architect does not end there, however. The Tile Council maintains an architectural inquiry service. By mail, telephone, and sometimes in person, answers—authoritative answers—are given to a multitude of questions coming in from the field. They may be questions dealing with a skyscraper or a swimming pool; they are all answered. We likewise promote the architectural profession itself through our advertising and promotion activities, and I'll say more about that later. In short, we care about the architectural profession in this country.

One of the programs in which the domestic industry takes great pride is its activities in basic research. For many years we conducted our research program at the School of Ceramics at Rutgers University. In 1958, however, we opened our half-a-million-dollar research center at Princeton, N.J. It is from the scientists at the research center that have come many of the new ideas which have so improved the installation methods and new uses for ceramic mosaic tile. Since its inception in 1952, the domestic industry—as a cooperative effort—has spent more than $2 million on this research program. One of the latest developments has been the thin-set dry curing mortars. These new mortars have served to reduce the time and cost of both interior and exterior applications. While these mortars are still relatively new, it is estimated that more than 50 million square feet of tile was set with them last year—a dramatic example of how basic research has paid off on the jobsite. We are currently conducting research on new grouting materials—the cement used to fill the joints between the individual tiles. Should this research be successful, and we now believe it will be, it will open up even more new areas to the use of this colorful building product. The specifications which I mentioned previously owe much to the research center activities, and our scientists are constantly seeking new and better ways to use ceramic mosaic tile. It must be added that all of the developments that have taken place in our industry in the last 15 years have been made through the efforts of the domestic industry. Not one single advancement in the application of ceramic mosaic tile has come from abroad. They have copied well, but they have not created.

Another example of creativity in the domestic ceramic mosaic industry is the new back-mounting process. For many years ceramic mosaics have been face-mounted on sheets of paper, approximately 1 foot by 2 feet, to facilitate installation. After the tiles are installed, the paper is wetted and stripped away. However, the domestic ceramic mosaic producers have now developed a method for mounting the tiles on the back, thereby reducing the installation operations and at the same time giving a better appearing installation, since the tile mechanic can make adjustments in the sheets immediately. It is just one example of how the domestic ceramic mosaic producers are constantly seeking better ways and less expensive methods for installing their material. So far, none of the foreign producers have figured out how to copy this new back-mounting method. I expect it is something we can look forward to.

If a market is to be created, and then expanded, an essential ingredient is advertising and promotion. Before a building product can gain universal acceptance, it must be brought to the attention of the consuming public; be it an architect, a builder or a homeowner. An advertising and promotion campaign generally has a number of objectives, and these objectives must include acquainting the consumer with the product and at the same time create a desire in him to acquire it. Since its inception the Tile Council has carried on a comprehensive campaign of national advertising and promotion. This, perhaps, is the key to the expanded created market for ceramic mosaic tile in this country.

At the present time the domestic industry, through the Tile Council, is spending at the rate of nearly a quarter of a million dollars a year on its national advertising program. We believe ours is a unique program in the field of building products for institutional advertising. The designs created for our advertising bear some of the brightest names in American architecture. Such world famous architects as Welton Becket, Marcel Breuer, Charles Goodman, Walter Gropius, George Nelson, Perkins & Will, and Edward D. Stone, to name just a few, have created original designs for our advertising program—all featuring ceramic tile. Our ads have appeared in all of the leading shelter magazines, builder publications, and architectural journals.

We are presenting for the Commission's inspection samples of the Tile Council's national advertising program. These are a part of the campaign supported on an industrywide basis.

Since its inception, the council has expended more than $8 million on its advertising and promotional programs. I think you will agree that this is a considerable sum for an industry with the limited resources of ours.

Our promotional campaign has been the envy of the entire building products industry for many years. Last year, for example, there were more than 125,000 stories about

ceramic tile printed in the Nation's newspapers, from the largest metropolitan daily to the smallest country weekly. Stories about tile were printed in 125 magazine articles, and it was talked about on radio and television. This has been a continuing promotional campaign dating back to the very beginning of the Tile Council. It is the wants created by this comprehensive and hard-hitting campaign that constitute the market for ceramic mosaics in this country. As I said before, this expanded market did not happen just by accident, it was made to happen. It was made to happen because through the promotional efforts of the Tile Council national magazines that never considered ceramic mosaic tile as a worthwhile subject suddenly found that new and dramatic creations were being devised with this old and respected building product. Editors were made aware that something exciting was being done with what had once been considered a pedestrian, unexciting material. The result? The readers of the mass circulation publications soon were becoming aware of the design, decorative and other qualities of ceramic mosaic tile. That, gentlemen, is how a market is created. It is done through the day-in, day-out efforts of the domestic manufacturers over a period of years. It is a campaign that is both qualitative and quantitative.

And our programs do not end there. We have produced a bookshelf full of brochures that have been made available to all of the consuming public. We have produced filmstrips that have been viewed by school board members, public officials, architects, students, tile contractors, and the general public. The average cost and distribution of a single filmstrip is approximately $10,000. These, too, help us create and expand a market. I can't help but ask, How many filmstrips have been produced for the American consumer in Japan, in Mexico, or in Italy? The answer, of course, is "None." The domestic industry, individually and through the Tile Council, has worked closely with the Nation's tile contractors and their organizations. We have kept them abreast of the latest developments in the industry, assisted them in their promotions on the local level, prepared programs for them; yes, we've even helped them write their speeches—all in the interest of maintaining, promoting, and expanding a ceramic mosaic tile market in this country.

What has been the contribution of our foreign competitors to this program? The answer is one word—"cheap," cheap tile that is the product of cheap labor. They have one program, and one program only: to pour as many feet of cheap ceramic mosaic tile into our created market as they possibly can. We care about our market, because we created it; they do not. Their method of nurturing this carefully developed market has been to destroy the entire competitive price structure. Their service to the architectural profession has been to offer only one thing: a cheap price. Their method of expanding the market is to pirate up an ever-increasing share of the market we developed—driving us into this chair before you today. It is indeed distressing to me that a proud, progressive United States industry must plead for succor with its own Government to continue its existence.

To a degree, our present plight stems from two contrasting characteristics of the American people: our supreme ability to wage war and our magnificent benevolence in peace. In the case of Japan, our Air Force obliterated the obsolescence of their factories in World War II. In the years since, through the largess of our Department of State and the courtesy of the American taxpayers we have assisted them in building new and modern ceramic tile plants and provided them with the technical know-how of production. The net result has been a flood of their cheap products that threatens to inundate an established, useful domestic industry.

Our previous speaker, Mr. Phillips, could tell you of an experience he had involving this strange concept devised by the Department of State. In 1958, Mr. Phillips received a request from an agency of the International Cooperation Administration asking if a group of Japanese industrial experts could visit his plant to learn the know-how of quality control in the manufacture of ceramic mosaics. Here we have a picture of a Government agency asking a company in an industry that is fighting to survive to divulge its most precious secrets to its foreign competition. We have seen other cases of Government-sponsored trade missions advising the Japanese on how to sell in our markets. What an inspiration for other small industries seeking to follow the pattern of the domestic ceramic tile industry by developing new markets. We are constrained to ask the question: Are all small industries to go on the choppingblock of foreign trade? Is there no longer a place in this country for small industry? We have heard much in recent months about our national growth rates. If the present policies are allowed to remain in effect, we will be "grown" to death.

The import threat has even reached the point in our industry where State Department pressure is applied upon authorities within the Federal Housing Administration. This is not hearsay.

The fact is that recently we were informed by FHA authorities themselves that they were advised by the State Department to ignore FHA's own quality standards in order to allow the use of grossly inferior imported ceramic mosaics in FHA projects.

The ability of our foreign competitors to copy our colors and designs are well known; they copy while our industry innovates. We had a situation last year where a tile contractor in Texas offered U.S. Naval construction authorities samples of domestic ceramic mosaics for color selection. However, when the tile for the floors showed up on the job, they were of Japanese manufacture. But, the construction superintendent couldn't tell the difference; the Japanese tile was identical in color and pattern. We have seen case after case, throughout the country, where our so-called bread and butter colors and patterns have been duplicated by the Japanese.

The appetites of our foreign competitors for our markets are voracious. Every economic signpost points out that they will not be satisfied until they have consumed our entire market and driven our domestic companies from the industrial scene.

Ceramic mosaic imports were once largely confined to areas in and around ports of entry. This is no longer the case. We find them in Dallas and Des Moines, in Boise and Buffalo. They move freely in the channels of distribution throughout the United States. What are the objectives of the foreign producer with his supply of low-cost labor? We have seen previously what the trend has been by Mr. Phillips' statement and the charts. I think we can gain another insight from a statement recently published in Oriental America magazine, a magazine published in Japan and widely circulated on our Pacific coast. On page 16 of the April 1960 issue the editor, in conducting a survey, reports this quote from a Japanese exporter to the United States:

"Since it is now claimed that Japanese products are quality at a low price we suggest that the United States and Canada refrain from producing merchandise that is made in Japan."

This Japanese exporter apparently feels that the North American Continent is some sort of private marketing grounds where the products of their cheap labor can be dumped with impunity. If we made a similar recommendation to the Japanese, we would probably be greeted with the familiar "Yankee, go home," with the cheering section led by a member of our own State Department.

As we see it, it is the obvious intent of the foreign ceramic mosaic producers to engulf our entire market; to wipe out the domestic industry. We cannot, on the basis of both the facts and our experiences, come to any other conclusion. Nowhere does the record indicate that the foreign producers show any regard to the conditions in the marketplace. I must emphasize again that they see only one commodity: price. Price based on some of the cheapest labor in the world.

It should be apparent by now that the domestic ceramic tile producers have a strong sense of responsibility to the market they have created. They are constantly seeking new ways to make the products more usable and more desirable to the building industry. This is as it should be. But, gentlemen, this is a futile effort if they continue to see their market swallowed by their foreign competitors who contribute nothing but a cheap price.

The Tile Council this year is operating with an advertising and promotion budget below that of 1959. It appears now that the budget will be further reduced in 1961, and there is no doubt that this unfortunate trend can be traced directly to the flood of cheap imports.

The service performed to the building industry and the consuming public—the many constructive programs I have outlined in the foregoing—cannot be maintained and strengthened by a dying industry. This is stating the obvious; the conclusion is inescapable. Permit me to state the obvious, because I think the results would be tragic: If this domestic industry is destroyed there will be no more service to architects; scholarship programs for the architects of the future, basic research, advertising and promotion, and assistance to the tile contractors. These will be wiped out, just as sure as I'm sitting here. They will pass into oblivion, with nothing to take their place, because we are just as positive that the foreign producers have no inclination to institute the programs and functions now performed by the Tile Council of America.

We must remember that when we see vast wall areas in schools and hospitals surfaced with colorful ceramic mosaic tile, when we see beautiful new buildings rising with ceramic mosaics on the exterior we must remember that this did not happen by accident; it was made to happen. We believe it would be tragedy of the first magnitude if the created market of the domestic ceramic mosaic industry is turned over to the foreign producer purely because of his ability to employ cheap labor. We believe, and we think you believe, that this tragedy should not be permitted to happen.

Camp Wigwam for Boys—A Half Century of Service to the Youth of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LUDWIG TELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. TELLER. Mr. Speaker, with the close of the 1960 camping season, Camp Wigwam for Boys, located in Harrison, Maine, will have completed a half century of service to the youth of America. Established in 1910 by Arnold M. Leh-

man and Abraham Mandelstam, this outstanding camp is still piloted under the direction of its founders, and it has deservedly gained an enviable nationwide reputation as one of the leading private camps of our country. The engaging and implementing talents, characteristics, and abilities of "Pop" Lehman and "Mandy" have been sources of delightful jibe and playful comment by Wigwam staff members and generations of Wigwam campers, who have come away from their experience at Wigwam with lifelong respect for these two great educators and the ideas which they have put to work at their renowned Camp Wigwam. I served as a staff member at Wigwam for several years in the 1930's, and I recall my association with the camp as a worthful and many-faceted experience.

By the early introduction of cultural and artistic interests to go hand in hand with the physical and recreational aspects of the camping experience, Camp Wigwam has proved to be in the fullest and truest sense a pioneer that has now grown to be a tremendously important phase in the life of America's youth. It has blazed trails where there were once no trails at all, thus laying the foundation for a movement of national proportions in the field of education. It has taught the importance of active and democratic participation in community affairs. It has encouraged the development of leadership qualities, and it has thereby contributed to the greatness of our Nation and its freedom loving people.

Almost every State in the Union is today represented by the Camp Wigwam's alumni. Included among many others are such persons as Richard Rogers, composer and producer; Frank Loesser, librettist, composer, lyricist, and producer; William Zeckendorf, Sr., of the real estate firm of Webb and Knapp; Arthur Loesser, head of the Cleveland Conservatory of Music; and U.S. District Court Judge Charles Wyzanski, of Boston.

Among Camp Wigwam's staff members have been Mortimer Adler, educator and author; Dr. Leon J. Saul, author and internationally prominent psychiatrist; the late Clyde Fisher, curator in chief of the American Museum of Natural History; and Prof. Richard B. Morris, head of the History Department, Columbia University, and editor of the Encyclopedia of American History. Among the distinguished individuals who have spent entire seasons as honored guests at Camp Wigwam are the late Leopold Godowsky, composer and pianist; the late Josef Hofmann, world famous pianist. Another distinguished person who has visited at Camp Wigwam is former Premier Mendes-France of France. The two mentioned last entrusted their children to Camp Wigwam as campers.

Founded at a time when psychologists such as Freud, Jung, and Adler were drawing attention to the significance of emotional factors in the education of youth and in the moulding of healthy and well integrated personalities, Camp Wigwam has been among the first camps, if not the very first one, harmoniously to balance a boy's physical activities against his need for appropriate aesthetic outlets and educational interests. This has been accomplished partly through the introduction of art, music, theater, and other means of aesthetic stimulation. In the rustic setting of Camp Wigwam, its founders and directors have been able to inculcate young people with a more sensitive appreciation of those finer values which lead to an integrated life. At the same time, it has provided them with abundant opportunities for thriving physically in a wholesome atmosphere stimulated by closeness to nature. By being fortunate enough to get youngsters at the formative stage of their intellectual and emotional development, Camp Wigwam has been able to guide them into healthy adulthood and to infuse them with a sense of belonging and of sound democratic citizenship. In this manner, it has constantly furthered a tremendously worthwhile national camping movement that today is invested with a broad cultural and educational rather than solely recreational significance, geared to the needs of the individual youngster and his adjustment to conditions prevailing in an ever changing world.

Comments of Paul H. Robbins, Executive Director, National Society of Professional Engineers, in Regard to the Reader's Digest Article "Our Great Big Highway Bungle"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, as I have pointed out before, there has been a considerable amount of disagreement about the article of Karl Detzer's on "Our Great Big Highway Bungle." Mr. Paul H. Robbins has pointed out some well worth knowing facts in disagreement with Mr. Detzer's article.

Under unanimous consent I insert these remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD for study by my colleagues:

In the implementation of the vast and ambitious public works programs initiated by the Federal Government in recent years, the National Society of Professional Engineers has consistently maintained that the highest quality and most economical design and construction can only result from the proper utilization of the highly qualified members of the engineering profession in all applicable branches of professional endeavor, both in governmental service and in private practice. The NSPE board of directors has recently adopted a policy statement pertinent to this subject:

"NSPE advocates and supports the practice of high-quality engineering services in both Government and private practice, and maintains that engineering services should be under the direction of registered professional engineers. Professional engineers in Government employ should perform the highest quality engineering services for preliminary study, preplanning and budgeting, and essential supervisory management and control of governmentally funded activities. Governmental agencies should contract for engineering services with highly qualified private engineering consultants to the extent consistent with national security, proper continuity of governmental programs and the public interest. NSPE further reaffirms its traditionally stated position that engineers in Government and private practice recognize a need for engineering activities of a complementary nature."

In this light, we are concerned with some of the statements in the July 1960 Reader's Digest article, "Our Great Big Highway Bungle," by Mr. Karl Detzer. The author states in part:

"Mismanagement is evident, too, in the extravagant use of private engineering consultants, instead of State highway employees in designing projects. Such practice is in violation of Federal policy, and it runs into money. The General Accounting Office has found that the costs of Pennsylvania's contracts with private consultants for preliminary engineering alone have been averaging $1 million a month. In New Jersey, in less than 4 years, eight engineering firms have received $8,219,967 in consultant fees for Interstate projects. In Maryland consultants have received more than $24 million on federally aided highways since 1954.

"Usually a consultant is paid a percentage of the cost of the project on which he works. He has a great deal to do with deciding whether the job will be an expensive one or a frugal one. Thus, only a highly developed sense of ethics stand between him and temptation. While rich old Uncle Sam is tossing money around, the temptation to cash in on a large scale is frequently great and sometimes irresistible."

The use of consulting engineers by State highway departments throughout the Nation has been with the full consent, approval, and close scrutiny of State highway engineering departments and the Bureau of Public Roads. The use of private engineers, as well as other elements of private enterprise in the design and construction of public works projects, has proven to be an economical method of doing business. Published facts prove this point without question.

Federal policy, contrary to Mr. Detzer, strongly favors the use of private services when appropriate and available through ordinary business channels.

The statement by Mr. Detzer completely ignores the general governmental policy favoring the use of private enterprise and the authorization for the use of private consulting engineers in the highway program set forth in the regulations of the Bureau of Public Roads, based on the Highway Act. A specific statement in the 1958 Highway Act declares it to be in the public interest to utilize small business enterprises to the fullest extent possible in the construction of the Interstate Highway System.

The engineers of the Bureau of Public Roads and various State highway departments as well as consulting engineers are slandered in the article by innuendos and implications intended to leave the impression that these professional personnel have been negligent or deficient in the performance of their duties. Such sweeping generalizations based on isolated instances in the most massive public works project of history are unjustified. The National Society of Professional Engineers insists that engineers in public service as a group are competent and dedicated professional personnel who perform a vital function in the public interest. Both private consultants and Federal and State engineering employees are an essential element in the planning and execution of the highway program. Inflammatory articles citing only the few bad examples in a program and completely ignor-

ing the overwhelmingly successful portion of the operation can only be harmful to the public by destroying confidence in a much needed program.

Mr. Detzer calls attention to large fees paid to consulting engineers for Interstate Highway projects, but presents no information to indicate the cost and scope of the services required of the consultant to earn those fees. Nor is there any indication regarding the large amount of future construction work which was designed for the fees.

A recently completed factual report prepared by an NSPE task force shows that a total of $72,131,478 was paid to consultants for designing 325 highway projects where total construction cost will be approximately $2,030,665,000. The $72 million in fees is a lot of money, but represents only 3½ percent of the total construction cost, and anyone acquainted with the work involved would know this to be a very equitable reimbursement for engineering effort and expenses involved.

With respect to Mr. Detzer's statements on consulting engineers being subject to the temptation of overdesign in order to increase the fee, many consulting engineers have long objected to contracts for engineering services where engineering fees are based upon a percentage of construction cost, and greatly resent any inference that the ethics of the profession mean little to the average engineer. If a "bad apple" exists in the national reservoir of private or public engineering forces, let him be exposed and let the engineering profession and the courts deal with him. Professional ethics, though played down by Mr. Detzer, is a real force that can and will deal with cases of this nature.

In any program involving such huge outlay of funds as the interstate highway program there are bound to be some cases of misuse of funds and other skulduggery. However, any inference that a few isolated cases prove that the entire program is rotten with recklessness, extravagance, special privilege, thievery, etc., is a great disservice to the great majority of sincere and honest individuals and firms involved in the work, and should be so recognized by the American public.

The Russian Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks by Charles Nutter, managing director of International House:

NEW ORLEANS.—The Associated Press, in its wisdom, recently distributed a story saying that around 15,000 Americans will crack the Iron Curtain and visit the Soviet Union this year. This number may be even greater if hotels and travel agencies can handle the influx. What Khrushchev and Eisenhower think of each other has not blighted the tourist crop to Russia this year.

These visitors will spend a week, a month or 2 hitting the tourist spots in Russia and will come home with a curious confusion of impressions which they will pass along from amateur lecture platforms all over America for the next year or so.

Get ready to hear these scarcely new facts about the Soviet Union: There are some churches open but not many; antireligious museums are hard to enter; posted prices on foodstuffs and clothing are sky high; there are very few automobiles and many pedestrians; lots of new housing is being built; Russian kids like gum and know a little English; women work at everything including day labor; hotels are adequate, but not luxurious; photographic restrictions seem to have disappeared.

Now and then some traveler will regale his listeners with an exciting story, mostly imaginary, of difficulty with the police, losing his passport, or another spicy account of hidden dangers he faced and mastered there beyond Minsk.

These bits of chit-chat will be passed along to Americans who have not seen Russia. They would be harmless enough if the visitors accounts stopped there, or if they dug deeper into the real meaning of the Soviet Union and Communist international which you don't see or read from a hotel window or taxicab.

But unfortunately there will be many otherwise astute observers return with a belief that because of its frontier appearance, high prices and scarcities and lack of many comforts and luxuries, that this is a backward nation and is no economic threat to the United States because it has several generations to go before it catches up with capitalism.

International House of New Orleans recently conducted its 40th Trade and Travel Mission abroad in 15 years; and this time we took 85 persons to Russia, Czechoslovakia and Poland, being behind the Iron Curtain for 2 weeks and in Red Square in Moscow on May Day at the very time that the U–2 incident occurred.

I conducted this trip on behalf of International House and I am as convinced that few trade contacts or opportunities were uncovered as I am that very few of our traveling members grasped or understood the economic facts and threat of communism as we glimpsed it in our brief mission.

The Soviet experiment, now 43 years old, is so vast, so different, so thought provoking and so startlingly successful at last that the Kremlin feels no fear in letting in large numbers of Americans to see their country and openly boasts of its economic plans for us all in the full belief that we cannot comprehend the facts and the danger.

A year or so ago Nikita Khrushchev told us over television that our grandchildren would live under socialism (a sugar-coated word for communism which is used frequently so as not to alarm people too much), and he further declared that "we declare war upon you in the peaceful field of trade. We declare war and we will win over the United States. The threat to the United States is not the ICBM, but in the field of peaceful production. We are relentless in this and it will prove the superiority of our system."

Adolph Hitler in his celebrated book "Mein Kampf" never was more specific in the plans he had for the world than the Communists are and constantly have been for about a century since Karl Marx dreamed in the British Museum in London. So long as these plans were just dreams we could afford to pay little attention; now they are dreams backed by a billion captive people who have become, against their will or approval, economic serfs under an industrial empire which would engulf the world.

The recent trip to the Soviet Union was my second visit there. In 1936–37, at the height of the great purges, I was a foreign correspondent there and saw Russia beginning to emerge from agricultural serfdom into an industrial state. Today, despite a great and disastrous war, the transition is far advanced, and the industrial power of Russia is beginning to roll and menace the world.

This visit to Russia left me with the very definite belief that the real Soviet threat is economic, not military. The Communists, by dint of clever planning, hard work and virtual slave or forced labor of their entire populace, have created an industrial power second only to the United States. In full view of the world but without its realization or alarm, the Kremlin has adapted outlawed and outdated malpractices of capitalism to establish a supreme state monopoly under state capitalism. It is called communism.

The fruits of a labor force which is larger than in the United States and which is surprisingly efficient in many areas and fields doesn't go to improve or help the people; it goes into a gigantic fund for use of the Kremlin, ample financing indeed for world revolution.

Communism in Russia is not communism at all, and probably never was. Today the Soviet Union is one gigantic trust in which the people are and have been exploited beyond the wildest dreams of capitalism in this or any other country. Everything and everybody belong to the state and move and operate at the whim of the state. The state owns every job and every means of making a living, and it owns every living area, every bit of production, all land and factories, and resources, developed and unexploited.

The state controls all wages and salaries and it also controls the cost of living or rather it fixes both. It can raise or lower either overnight, closing or widening the gap without consultation or law, for some 210 million people. It does so, of course, by holding wages down and raising living costs, particularly clothing or food, so that a whole family, including the wife and mother, has to work to make ends meet.

It looked to me as if the Soviet system, communism or so-called socialism in Russia today, economically speaking is a colossal distortion of the company, the company town, and the company store, all monopolies, as we used to know them in the United States, but which have disappeared. The profits of this great all-embracing monopoly, which is nationwide, do not reach the people; they are used instead by the state for political purposes, national and international; ample financing indeed for the worldwide conquest plans which communism espouses.

It is necessary to know and remember that profits and the profit motive didn't disappear in Russia; the Government just took them over and gave them new names that are deceptive and misleading as always.

Profit is a dirty capitalistic word in Russia, something reserved for blasting the capitalistic world. Capitalism also is a dirty word, reserved for enemies of the Soviet Union. Yet there are profits beyond the wildest dream of anyone in the Soviet Union today, and a degree of capitalism that surpasses anything in the free world.

The difference is that under state capitalism, Kremlin style, profits are not distributed to many private owners, the profits go to the sole owner of everything—the state. And this is by no means the workers paradise, for the worker has nothing whatever to say about what goes on.

The high prices which we saw quoted in good stores in Moscow and Leningrad are not necessary or realistic. They are, instead, a subtle form of taxation to drain off any surplus a worker might accumulate. In a monopolistic economic state, prices have no relationship to costs necessarily; prices are not geared to cost but are fixed by political decisions taken in the Kremlin. Shoes need not cost several weeks' salary, for they could be sold for a day's salary or issued free, if desired. But this might leave the individual with cash in hand which the state dislikes. Private accumulation is the first step toward private capitalism.

The worker is left drained dry at all times. He must exert his maximum effort to make ends meet, and this work effort, multiplied

by a hundred million souls, goes to enrich the parent corporation, which uses the labor force's productivity for capital expenditures and goods, for propaganda, for sabotage, espionage, and subversion, for education, for military preparation and adventures, for sputnik and lunik, for training of Communists to work in other countries all over the world, and for any other purpose it sees fit.

Better housing, food, and clothing for the proletariat comes into this scale at whatever level the leader decides. Usually it is near the tail end. It is correct to say though that food and living conditions are improving and are vastly better than they were in the thirties.

The important thing also to remember about Soviet economics is that despite 10 million slogans and claims to the contrary, the workers or proletariat have nothing whatever to say about what goes on; they are as voiceless actually as slaves because there is no way they can make their voices felt or heard.

The proletariat does not control, they comply. There are no real unions, no strikes, no sitdowns, slowdowns, complaints; nothing but obedience or disaster. The world's greatest private corporations never approached this system in power or in numbers of workers. The Soviet Union has complete and absolute mastery over a work force of more than 100 million workers. The proletariat hasn't one thing to say about what jobs they hold, their wages, their rents or food costs, or any like factor. Russia has a dictatorship of state capitalism, big business beyond the wildest dreams of the hated trusts which the Soviet press and leaders are always denouncing.

Behind the curtain and always ready for action against a sullen or unresponsive worker, or a troublesome one, is compulsion. He might lose his work card, or his assigned room to live in, or he might be ordered to a new job thousands of miles distant. Finally there is the secret police and terror. The Soviets have killed more people for economic reasons in trying to uproot humanity and change its habits than they lost in World War II.

Under Secretary of State Dillon, wise to the ways of the Soviets, recently said that "in the thirties the Communists procured foreign capital equipment by exporting grain at prices below an already depressed world market—despite the fact that millions of Russians and Ukranian peasants were dying of starvation." The graves of tens of millions of workers in the so-called workers paradise are the foundation for present industrial successes, and more will suffer and die as necessary to build this success higher.

This is the face of the enemy and the economic war in which we find ourselves. No day passes in Russia, or presumably in China, without millions of printed words exhorting greater production, greater efforts, greater sacrifices so that capitalism and particularly the United States may be surpassed, and then destroyed.

Big business as above-explained now is working well in Russia after more than 40 years, and is moving along rapidly. The people who make it possible, albeit perhaps reluctantly, are not unhappy actually for they are better off than they have been before and feel that their lot and living conditions have improved. This is the important thing always to remember about Russia; not that the people are not as well off as we are, but that they are better off than at any time previously. Things are improving for them and they are satisfied with this.

They really do not know of better things in the world. Ninety percent of the present population grew up under so-called socialism or Bolshevism, know little of the outside world, and are victims and believe in the Soviet's clever, well planned, monopolistic and universal propaganda.

No longer is it useful to dream that in educating the people the Kremlin will create a frankenstein to rise and destroy the master. The Soviets have sold the people on the system, and the alleged danger and threat from the outside, particularly the United States. It is safe to say that the Russian people, naturally friendly and broadminded, have been taught to fear and distrust the United States. They believe that the United States is a grave peace threat to the world, and that it would dstroy Russia if possible.

Absurd as this may seem to Americans, it loses its absurdity and becomes a menacing fact when it is realized that this a genuine fear held deeply in the hearts of people who lost 20 million dead and saw a third of their country laid waste only a generation ago.

Summarizing a little on this phase, the sad fact for us is that the average Russian may not be very well off by our standards, but he doesn't know it and he thinks he is doing better by his standards. And he has actually been taught to believe that America endangers Russia's frontiers and he must work and sacrifice to prevent this.

The average Russian also has no idea the extent of subversion and meddling in world affairs engaged in by the Kremlin, nor of the seriousness of the Communist International plans for world conquest. He is, in other words, providing the sinews and the financing for world conquest without knowing that this is the master plan of Communist planners.

Russia has always been imperialistic to a certain extent but the Russians themselves are not conquest minded. This, though, makes no difference because they have not nor will they be asked their views; here again they are the foils of communism, and they obey.

Meanwhile we are confronted with an inexorable desire by the heads of the Communist International for taking over the world. The important aspect of Soviet foreign economic policies which must never be forgotten is their determination and powerful drive to penetrate and eventually capture the newly developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America through trade and aid techniques. Economic warfare was developed and is thoroughly understood by the Soviet Union; to us it is largely a nuisance well remembered from World War II of which we'd like no more.

Khrushchev has told us openly and repeatedly that the Communists shall fill the needs of backward peoples better than the Americans and consequently shall win their minds, control their lands, their resources, and themselves. We do not seem to understand such language. We understood Pearl Harbor and we finally understood Hitler's Nazi Germany; but we do not seem to gather any alarm from a more determined, more resourceful, better financed and better planned threat from communism.

Under Secretary Dillon once said that "in their offensive economic weapons have been cleverly blended with military assistance, propaganda, and diplomatic moves, to inflame local passions and to create and aggravate situations of crisis. The long range aim is to create climates and attitudes in the newly emerging areas conducive to eventual Communist takeover."

If Soviet penetration, economic subversion or trade succeeds in extending Communist rule in Asia, Africa, the Near East, and Latin America the cost to the Kremlin is nothing compared to the results. Police power will be used to hold the people in line, and to hold control over immense wealth in the world's vital minerals.

Americans have been reluctant to grasp the awful significance of Soviet totalitarian plans, design, and action. We'd rather relax and enjoy an economy that could be toppled by Soviet plans. We cannot or rather we have not understood that human beings can think, act, and work from a set of motives and reasons completely the reverse of our own.

Last year President Eisenhower told the Congress in his state of the Union speech that "We have learned the bitter lesson that international agreements, historically considered by us as sacred, are disregarded in Communist doctrine and in practice as mere scraps of paper. * * * The demonstrated disregard of the Communists "of their own pledges is one of the greatest obstacles to success in substituting the rule of law for rule by force."

There can be no doubt that the Communists live by the law of the jungle; stealing, lying, killing, and destroying are virtues when done for the state. They dishonor their own word their firmest commitments are meaningless. And this is the movement that teaches that Russia keeps its pledges but the United States does not; that Russia wants peace and we want war; that all powers are warmongers except the Communist powers.

For almost 40 years the Soviets have been training nationals of every country in the world in revolutionary tactics; how to destroy and create chaos, how to inflame and arouse peoples against their rulers and leaders. They also have been dumping trade goods into desired areas of the world at giveaway or at extremely low prices. They know how to attack America's export market by dumping of their own goods. And they have the will to do this when they see fit. They also have the financial ability, thanks to very long and successful planning.

The industrial output of the Soviet Union today is very impressive, and is very menacing. Factories still are not as neat, well built and imposing as American factories but in many cases they are as productive; the Soviet workman has become a skilled workman. His productivity can and does rise as high as the American workman. Need is sparked by fear to drive him ever forward.

When we were in Europe Premier Khrushchev announced Russian abolition of income taxes over a 5-year period, starting next year. He made much of the fact that Russia could abolish income taxes while the United States very largely lived on such high taxes. Here is distortion and misrepresentation that takes keen analysis. The Kremlin can in fact abolish all income taxes without losing a single ruble of revenue; it shifts the emphasis to higher priced consumer goods or rents, and collects just as much as ever. But in the remote areas of the world they can brag to an unsophisticated people that they alone can live without income taxes; bane of the capitalistic world (their language).

The Soviet Premier said: "The abolition of taxes on workers and employees in our country is an impressive social gain for the peoples. One cannot speak of it without pride and emotion. This is an enormous gain, dear friends.

"Look at what is happening in the capitalist countries, where taxes are perpetually rising, unemployment reigns and prices are spiraling upward. The insecurity of the working people lies like a heavy weight on the masses.

"When people all over the world see that the living standard in the Soviet Union is regularly improving, that wages and pension benefits are rising, that taxation is being abolished and that the network of free medical, cultural and welfare facilities is expanding, they come to the clear realization that socialism is solving the most urgent problems and is showing the right way to get rid of exploitation, unemployment and poverty."

This kind of talk is for the export trade, not for home consumption since Khrushchev doesn't really care a fig for public opinion at home—that is already captive. He is trying to influence public opinion in the noncommitted countries.

This is "black is white, white is black" at its pinnacle. But this is not the picture the American tourist will bring home. This is the reason that it is dangerous to accept at face value the impressions of tourists traveling in the Soviet Union and the reason that permitting 15,000 or more Americans to travel there this year is in reality part of the master plan to confuse and confound the world. Facts are not always facts in Russia and what you see with your own eyes or hear with your own ears may mean something wholly different than you think.

Travelers going to Russia therefore won't necessarily bring home the truth about that country, and often are dangerously misleading in their reports.

Russia has been called a puzzle, enigma and a riddle but it is none of these. Its purposes and plans are well advertised. It is of course difficult to understand how human beings can become so dedicated to a cruel, inhuman system which feeds on destruction—even of its own architects—but we must recognize there are several million such dedicated Communists in Russia and China.

Our job is to take the economic offensive and prove that the capitalistic system is a superior one to theirs.

Billion in the Black

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am happy to include an editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of July 22, 1960. It is my hope that this editorial, significant for sound thinking and deep realization of the need for fiscal responsibility, will receive the widespread reading that it merits. It follows:

BILLION IN THE BLACK

President Eisenhower's announcement of a budget in the black furnishes welcome contrast to the red ink platform drawn up last week by the Democrats.

For the past year, the Eisenhower administration has managed to keep Government spending down. This, and some lucky breaks, made income exceed outgo by $1,100 million. The economy effort required cooperation all the way down the line—21 out of the 26 major agencies of Government spent less than their budgets allowed.

Treasury Secretary Anderson has evinced a healthy regard for the people's money and how it is used. Last year, the Eisenhower administration suffered the largest deficit ($12 billion) since 1946. Most of this was due to the recession that cut down Government income. A large part was due to high farm subsidies. The recovery to a budget surplus this year should be compared to the objective of the Democratic platform. The Democrats are promising to jack spending in every department.

The Democratic program gives the impression that the country is in the midst of a terrible depression and that billions of Federal dollars are needed to put the Nation back on its feet. The fact is the Nation is enjoying an extremely high level of consumer spending and is growing economically at a rate greater than the 5 percent the Democrats say it ought to grow. This is a time for Government thrift, not a time for pouring out a flood of new Federal money.

The Democratic program offers pie in the sky. The Republican accomplishment helps keep a sound dollar in the worker's pocket.

Running the Government Treasury as a big handout station would require one of two things: Either a raise in taxes or a raise in the national debt. (It costs $9 billion a year now for interest on the debt). Senator KENNEDY has made it clear on many occasions in the last few years he would raise taxes, if necessary, to pay for his program. But Congress might be reluctant to do so, if KENNEDY became President.

In that event, the Government would have to operate in the red and every dollar in every paycheck would be cheapened through inflation.

The Republican program of a sound dollar may not have as much glamour as a Democratic program of something for everyone. But everyone who has a dollar in a bank, an insurance policy or a pension program—and that includes virtually every worker in today's prosperous America—should be concerned about keeping it sound.

Between 1944 and 1952, the net spendable average weekly earnings of a worker with three dependents went up from $44.06 to $63.62. But inflation gave him a net loss. His actual buying power went down $2.54.

During President Eisenhower's administration, earnings have gone up to $81.05 (Mar. 1960). Actual buying power has gone up $8.43. Industry has been able to keep paychecks ahead of rising costs.

A continuation of sound dollar policies will continue healthy paychecks. This is the best argument Republicans can make in their platform to counter the Democratic giveaway program.

National Defense in the Nuclear Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to address the July 21 session of the 1960 Pennsylvania State Convention of the American Legion Auxiliary at Philadelphia, Pa., presided over by department president, Mrs. Mary W. Dague, wife of Representative PAUL B. DAGUE of the Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania. The convention was well attended and reflected the fine leadership furnished by Mrs. Dague in the role of department president.

My address, titled "National Defense in the Nuclear Age," follows:

NATIONAL DEFENSE IN THE NUCLEAR AGE

(Address delivered by Representative JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, Member of Congress, of the 20th District of Pennsylvania, at the Pennsylvania State Convention of the American Legion Auxiliary, Philadelphia, Pa., on July 21)

It gives me great pleasure to participate in your 1960 convention and to speak to you on a problem in which we are all vitally interested.

As many of you know I have long been active in organized veterandom with the result that I am conscious of the great work which you do to keep shining and bright the ideals and objectives of the American Legion.

They are ideals for which so many of our brethren have given all they could offer at freedom's shrine—their lives.

The efforts of all of us have been directed toward the creation of a better world for all the peoples of the earth.

Here in this decade of 1960—just begun—we have vast horizons before us—horizons of great hope—and horizons of just as great fear and dread.

It used to be—not so very long ago in time—although far distant in space—that we of America knew no such great fears for our future.

We were able to isolate ourselves from the troubles of the rest of the world.

At that time it appeared to be of no immediate concern to us if European nations were devastating each other—or that whites were enslaving blacks in Africa.

We were above the common herd—shielded from the sounds of battle by our great ocean barriers.

We found more time to work out our own domestic problems, to build our Nation, to dream of the future.

Many of you here tonight saw the first sign that our impenetrable defenses were no longer able to assure us safety in 1917.

Residents of this eastern seaboard of the United States could look out and see ships burning—ships sunk by enemy U-boats at our very doorsteps.

Modern technology had breached the walls of "fortress America."

But it took us longer to learn the lessons that "the war to end wars" could teach.

It even took a war far more devastating, catastrophic, and universal, a war that even more of us remember only to well.

World War II witnessed the deaths of 30 million people and great damage to civilization.

But it really took a bright flash of atomic light at Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, to tell us that, like the French Maginot line, our impregnable defenses were now no more useful than a suit of armor against a bazooka. The nuclear age had dawned, with the horizons of new advances for all mankind.

But we also know that as many people as have been killed in all wars that man has undergone for thousands of years now could be turned back into dust and ashes in the time that it takes to hear a sound, look into the sky, and start to pray.

The atom is a substance of such worth and value to a strife-torn world.

But, in the wrong hands it is a weapon that could truly end all wars because there might no longer be anyone alive to fight.

The advent of nuclear weapons in combination with the fact that aggression, conquest, and war were not ended with the destruction of Berlin and the annihilation of Hiroshima and Nagasaki have kept us from retreating back into our shell.

The job of guarding liberty and freedom for all mankind has been placed irrevocably on our shoulders.

There is no turning back.

As the guardian of freemen everywhere we have witnessed with dismay the Red tide that since World War II has engulfed its neighbors, turned them from freemen into slaves, and found one-third of the world behind the curtains of communism.

We are all familiar with Korea, Indochina, Laos, Tibet, Hungary, Berlin, and many more outrages that have been committed in the name of Marxism.

Since Stalin the pace of outright and brawling aggression has slowed a bit because new tactics have been tried.

Premier Khrushchev has posed as the friend of peace but it has been only a shield

behind which the plan of world conquest is just as much of a reality as ever.

We have seen this same Premier Khrushchev deliberately wreck the summit meeting when he knew he could get no concessions from the free world in his efforts to trample on the rights and freedoms of men in Berlin.

We can see right now the efforts of Mao Tse-Tung to forestall any chance of real peace in the Far East.

We can see Communist rioting against the freely elected Government of Japan using student grievances and the desire for peace for Communist purposes.

And right at our doorstep we can view the Cuban revolution gone astray, opening wide its arms to the so-called blessings of Communist dictatorship.

We know that our own defense is permanently tied to the defense of our allies; a danger to one of us is a danger to us all.

The attacks of communism are coming thick and fast and in a variety of shapes and forms.

In the days of Stalin the threats were more readily recognizable.

His imperialism was not nearly as subtle as that of the present Red leadership.

Instead of outright aggression and subversion we now have so-called volunteers, aid programs, trade agreements, technical assistance, defense pacts, and insidious propaganda, all these besides old military and espionage activities.

We have learned that in order to achieve the final victory we must meet the challenge on thousands of military, economic, and psychological battlefields at home and abroad.

Now we come to the question of the specific threats that Red aggression presents to the security of this Nation.

First of all we must be prepared to meet the Russians on every level and in every form of large-scale thermonuclear warfare.

The full-scale world wars that may come in the future will not be fought with bayonets and machineguns, foxholes, and tanks.

Numerical superiority of manpower will not be of decisive importance in determining the outcome of such a war.

Instead, I can see these future global wars—if the come to us—being fought from continent to continent with ICBM's and from mobile bases in the seas to targets in the enemy lands.

I can see the cities of our world being laid waste by a single flash on a beautiful morning.

The whole world will be the battlefield and every human being, whether soldier or civilian, whether combatant or neutral, whether man, woman, or child, will be the potential victim.

The Soviet Union always keeping before it the vision of world conquest through nuclear warfare has bent every effort to the task of srupassing the United States in thermonuclear capability.

These nuclear weapons possess for aggressors like the Soviets many advantages not found in conventional methods of warfare.

From a few mobile and stationary bases it is possible to cover the entire globe.

There is a great ability to shift rapidly from one target to another.

Because there are degrees in levels of nuclear power there is great flexibility in the adaptation of weapons to meet specific strategic requirements.

The use of nuclear weapons offers the potentiality of complete surprise, destroying a nation's defenses before it is able to retaliate.

The use of nuclear weapons also has a great psychological impact upon the potential or actual victims of such a disaster.

And, last but not least, nuclear weapons offer the allurement of cheap world conquest.

The Soviets understand very well how nuclear weapons fit into their plans for world conquest.

They have been building fixed missile bases in the Soviet Union and the satellite countries.

Their recent tests in the Pacific show the potential range of their intercontinental ballistic missiles.

At the same time the Soviets have been continually modernizing and augmenting their air force.

But, most importantly of all, the Russians have been equipping a submarine fleet whose missiles point like daggers at every strategic area in the United States.

In order to guarantee our national survival we must be able to control not only the sea but the world beneath the surface of the sea.

The Reds have more than 450 submarines, 10 times the number of German U-boats which devastated allied transport in World War II.

They have launched a nuclear submarine program, with at least five under construction.

Just a few of these subs, equipped with missiles comparable to our Polaris, will place most of our Nation in danger of complete devastation in the event of war.

We must remember that we are far more vulnerable than the Russians to such a full-scale nuclear attack.

Our industries are far more concentrated—43 of our 50 largest cities and 85 percent of our industrial might is located within 500 miles of our coasts.

The Russians, on the other hand, have dispersed their industry from Minsk to Vladivostok, besides the fact that most of their big cities are located in inland locations far removed from the sea.

The ballistics missile has thus added a new dimension to the threat of submarine warfare.

Not only could attack submarines cripple our Navy and merchant marine, but these new missile subs possess the capacity to launch attacks upon our cities at will.

There is no doubt that America is greatly endangered by this ability of the Russians to launch a full-scale nuclear war at the slightest whim of the Soviet dictatorship.

The Communists know that the rest of the free world will surrender automatically if the United States is conquered; they would have no other choice.

What keeps the Russians from starting such a war?

The only defense we at present possess is our ability to retaliate.

The Russians possess far more freedom of decision than we have.

Our Defense Department cannot just blithely push a button and start a war without any responsibility to the millions of people in the United States whom this act might doom.

We must show the Russians that they would gain no advantage from attacking us.

We cannot be sure that it will do any good to appeal to them on the grounds of the Russian lives that will be lost, we must demonstrate that our retaliation would destroy their power.

The Red Chinese, in particular, have never shown the slightest regard for human lives.

Mao Tse-tung has even boasted that even if 300 million Chinese were to be killed in a nuclear war there would be 300 million left.

The leaders of Red China, without any scruples or regard for human beings, actually regard nuclear war as an advantage.

With the atomic weapons that they will almost certainly develop within the next few years the Red Chinese could very easily initiate the destruction of all mankind in order to satisfy their own lust for power.

Besides the dangers of deliberate aggression there is the danger of accidental warfare.

Marshal Malinovsky, the very conspicuous companion of Khrushchev in Paris, has announced that Soviet missile bases will immediately strike with nuclear missiles at any foreign base sending planes over the Soviet Union.

This means that any trigger-happy Russian enlisted man could conceivably be able to start our destruction merely by pushing a button in a moment of panic.

These dangers are great and the United States must demonstrate that nuclear war would destroy the Communist world as readily as the free.

To prepare our defenses against nuclear war does not mean the abandonment of conventional arms.

We must also be prepared to meet the threats of communism on the level of limited warfare.

Every one of the conflicts, wars, and revolutions instigated by the Communists since World War II has been fought entirely by soldiers with conventional nonnuclear weapons.

Whatever the reasons up to this time the Russians have wished no more than we to turn Korea, Indochina, or any other area of conflict into the site for a nuclear holocaust.

Furthermore, as the Russians increase their arsenal of thermonuclear weapons, and as there is an increasing gradation of weapons power they will be able to take advantage of an increasing number of strategic options.

We must remember that the vaunted reduction of manpower taken by the Russion Army, which has been dictated largely by economic, not strategic, reasons will still leave the communist bloc with a marked numerical superiority in manpower over the armies of the free world.

The Reds have more than 11 million men ready to be used for any size or type of war that may be desired by their leaders.

The satellites, especially China, may be used for limited "safe" wars as in Korea, Indochina, Laos, and Tibet.

We have seen how the Russians have used "volunteers" in the past, the success of such tactics virtually assures that they will be utilized even more extensively in the future.

These armies may not even have to be used their threat could be enough to blackmail smaller powers on the Soviet periphery.

As the fear of nuclear power grows, as the nuclear race becomes more deadlocked, such small-scale aggressions grow ever more likely.

Therefore—we need to maintain our dual capability—it is imperative that we have armed forces with the most modern of conventional weapons that can meet the challenge of communist aggression anywhere in the world.

This, then, is the challenge—a challenge of great power in the hands of unscrupulous tyrants—a challenge that we can and must meet.

What have we done and what should we do?

Congress this year voted an appropriations bill for the Defense Department of more than $40 billion.

Included in this is $17,157 million for the Air Force; $12,109 million for the Navy and Marines; and $9,537 million for the Army.

We have attempted to meet all the complex needs of our national defense through these appropriations.

Included in this was $293 million for an aircraft carrier.

This new carrier—in combination with others that have been or are being built—will provide mobile overseas bases for our planes and missiles.

With fixed oversea bases becoming ever more vulnerable to enemy attack, these carriers, in combination with our submarine fleet, will be able to provide a far-reaching line of defense for our Nation.

Also included was $394 million for the construction of five submarines, with partial funds for starts on seven others.

I introduced a bill in 1958 to provide for the construction of 100 nuclear-powered attack submarines during a 5-year period.

This bill was unfortunately defeated, but we are doing some development of nuclear submarines.

At the same time the Navy has been conducting a highly successful series of Polaris missile tests.

When the United States possesses nuclear submarines capable of cruising under the arctic ice, as our *Skate* and *Nautilus* have already done, and able to fire missiles at the heart of Russia, the United States will have obtained a greater deterrent power.

In this bill was also included $190 million more than the administration request for development of the B–70.

The U–2 flights demonstrated the extreme vulnerability of Soviet defenses at heights over 50,000 feet.

The development of the B–70, which would cruise at 80,000 feet, would give us a full range of power.

In combination with our missile program this development will give us a deterrent power not readily ignored by the Soviets.

The B–70 will strengthen the power of our Strategic Air Command, which at the present is the first line of our air defense.

Congress has also considered the need for armed forces capable of fighting in limited wars.

Included in the appropriations bill was $1,537 million for modernization of the Army.

The Russians are equipping their army to fight both conventional and tactical nuclear wars.

We are at the present time equipping our troops with a wide range of the most modern conventional and tactical atomic weapons.

Research and development of new weapons are being continually carried on.

We have also voted funds for the acceleration of the Midas-Samos satellite programs.

It has long been evident that the United States depends greatly upon our intelligence services.

The Central Intelligence Agency has done a fine job of obtaining information from a nation closed to outsiders.

There is no doubt that the Soviet intelligence service has a far easier time of obtaining our vital secrets in our open society.

As our ambassador to the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge has said: "The Russians have spied at heights far les than 70,000 feet."

It take little effort of the memory to recall Alger Hiss, the Rosenbergs, Klaus Fuchs, or many others.

The Russians have used our freedoms to steal our secrets, subvert members of our society, turn our friends and allies against us, and overthrow our own free government by force.

Then to see the Communists don the veil of injured innocence would be almost comical if it were not such a serious matter.

The U–2 incident gave more emphasis to our need for accurate information if we are to survive as a free society.

Its usefulness is probably ended now but we need new sources of information.

The Midas and Samos satellites, equipped with all kinds of detection equipment, will not only help our intelligence, but will point to future uses in inspection of a possible disarmament program.

By these means we will be able to strengthen our Armed Forces for the struggle against communism wherever it may come.

We must be able to deter any type of attack.

For this task it is imperative that we possess the optimum in flexibility.

Therefore, we need a military organization which will be able to shift and maneuver to meet every strategic situation.

I introduced legislation to streamline the Defense Department and better coordinate its policies and practices.

For the organization must match in efficiency and modernity the weapons it dispatches and the men it controls.

The spectacle of Mr. K. at the summit, the ending of the disarmament talks by the Soviet walkout, demonstrate how important all of this is.

The world needs peace, the world needs disarmament.

But an agreement that we can be sure of must include the international control and inspection that the Soviets have thus far refused to concede.

We have had all too often examples of the bad faith and hypocrisy of the Communists in the past few months to accept their word that they have disarmed.

Until the Reds back up talk with constructive action toward peace we can only know them as the totalitarian aggressors—devoted to the task of world conquest—that they have always been.

But this is not all of our task.

It would be too easy to leave the whole job to the 2,800,000 boys in uniform and confine ourselves to remembering the wars in which we fought.

We must press forward the battle against communism on all fronts.

Military action must be augmented by action in other areas as well.

Just as our military power must be one of active deterrence so must we meet the threats of communism in the economic, ideological, and psychological spheres.

This is not the job for any one group but for all of us.

What we do will determine the future course of all mankind.

A great burden has been placed on our shoulders, the burden of billions of free people throughout the world.

We did not ask for it but it has come to us.

We are not defending our Nation alone but all men everywhere.

We cannot rest until there is peace, and happiness, and freedom for everyone.

For only then will we be really free from fear.

Yes, it was a long, long time ago, it seems, that America could go its own way in peace.

So much has happened since then to change the world.

We have seen it happen.

We saw the beginning of the struggle between communism and liberty and freedom but how will it end?

God grant that it does not end in a nuclear holocaust in which there might no longer be men to be either free or enslaved.

Let us dedicate ourselves in this decade of the 1960's to the horizons of hope that lie before us.

We must be ever vigilant until freemen can once again be free of fear.

We can be, we must be, we will be strong.

It is through spiritual and material strength that we can preserve and protect not only our cherished ideals of liberty and freedom but aid in restoring them to many freedom-loving nations now in exile.

Therefore let us dedicate ourselves to America's awesome task hopeful that the day is not too distant when the atom's flash will bring light, not darkness, to the ends of the earth.

Public Laws 643–676

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this completes my digest of all the public laws of the 2d session of the 86th Congress enacted up to this time as given in my reports to my constituents in the Second District of Illinois:

BARRATT O'HARA'S REPORT FROM CONGRESS

PUBLIC LAW 643

Some 2,000 Americans owe Uncle Sam on notes for money for food and shelter when stranded in the Far East in the war years. Trouble is the notes are in foreign currencies. Example: One note for 16,800 Japanese central reserve bank dollars our GA says has a real American dollar value of $16.80. Public Law 643 enables Uncle Sam's debtors to settle on a realistic formula worked out by the General Accounting Office.

PUBLIC LAW 644

This clarifies special postal rates for educational, cultural and library books and materials. For instance, changes the term "phonograph records" to "sound recordings."

PUBLIC LAW 645

Public Law 645 authorizes $1.5 billion public works projects on rivers and harbors for flood control and improvement of navigation. CalSag, with $5,240,000, is among the approved projects.

Corps of Army Engineers at congressional direction has been a big factor in development and economic growth of the Nation. Our country now has 23,000 miles of navigable river, moving 115 billion ton-miles of traffic a year, 300 flood-protection projects, 32 multiple-purpose projects supplying 20 percent of all the hydroelectric power generated in the United States, 18 large reservoirs that supply 400 billion gallons of water annually for municipalities and industries, 6.1 million acre-feet of water for irrigation.

Congressman JOHN KLUCZYNSKI, of Chicago, with his seniority of five terms, is one of the high ranking and certainly one of the most popular and influential members of the important Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC LAW 646

Public Law 646 removes the escape clause in the conveyance some years ago of land, no longer needed, to the city of Little Rock in Arkansas. This will enable Little Rock to float bonds for the improvement of its municipal airfield.

PUBLIC LAW 647

Public Law 647 "authorizes" and "requests" the President to issue a proclamation inviting foreign nations to participate in the Pacific Festival at San Francisco September 9 to 18, 1960. Please note the quoted verbs. Congress cannot direct or order the President.

PUBLIC LAW 648

House Joint Resolution 397, refugee resettlement

Since the end of World War II over 2 million refugees have been resettled in the countries of the free world, 711,212 in the

United States, which has only 6 percent of the world's land area.

Public Law 648 marks the participation of the United States in the drive of all free world countries to find new homes for the remaining unsettled refugees. It admits into the United States additional refugees under U.N. mandate in number predicated by the number admitted by cooperating nations. Hope is that refugee camps, after 15 years of exitence, may be closed and brighter horizons of opportunity and contentment opened.

PUBLIC LAW 649

Management of the vast public domain is a big business. Public Law 649 gives to the Bureau of Land Management a greater flexibility of authority in fixing fees (now totaling $1 million annually) to meet inflated costs and use of revenues in expansion and maintenance of roads and forest trails. Logging operators, making heavy use of forest roads, are required to share in cost of preventing deterioration.

PUBLIC LAW 650

Public Law 650 creates a commission to prepare plans for a national celebration of the 175th anniversary of the formation of the Constitution of the United States. Surely an anniversary that all the world will note.

PUBLIC LAW 651

H.R. 12740, supplemental appropriations

Public Law 651 makes supplemental appropriations for fiscal 1961 that total $138,293,740. Among items: (1) $1,500,000 for research to control insects, including the screw worm that causes annual damage to crops estimated between $25 and $125 million, (2) $73,666,700 subscription to International Development Association, (3) $5 million to purchase land near Capitol for new Library building, (4) $2,953,000 for Jefferson Memorial at St. Louis, and (5) $12 million additional for public housing.

PUBLIC LAW 652

St. Augustine in Florida is booming, needs more schools. Public Law 652 permits land conveyed to the city for a park to be used as site of a new schoolhouse.

PUBLIC LAW 653

Public Law 653 confers a Federal charter on the Blue Star Mothers of America, Inc. Membership is limited to mothers, adopted mothers and stepmothers of sons and daughters who served in World War II or in the Korea hostilities or are presently serving with the Armed Forces.

PUBLIC LAW 654

Public Law 654 (1) denies to the District of Columbia the defense of governmental immunity in auto accident claims, and (2) relieves employees of the District from personal liability.

PUBLIC LAW 655

Harpers Ferry in West Virginia was the site of John Brown's famous raid in 1859, was captured by Stonewall Jackson in the Antietam campaign of 1862, and after the Civil War emerged a ghost town, its mills and armory all destroyed. Public Law 655 authorizes an expansion of the Harpers Ferry National Monument to take in John Brown's "Fort" and other lands.

PUBLIC LAW 656

Public Law 656 is another tribute to the immortal memory of the four chaplains who chose to die together on the troopship *Dorchester* that others to whom they gave their lifebelts could live. There is no greater epic of heroism and self-sacrifice in recorded history. Your vote, as I know you devotedly would have willed, was cast for an award posthumously of Congressional Medals to Chaplains George L. Fox, Alexander D. Goode, Clark V. Poling, and John P. Washington.

PUBLIC LAW 657

Public Law 657 authorizes $1 billion a year for fiscal 1962 and 1963 in Federal aid for primary and secondary highway systems and their urban extensions. At present A–B–C highways embrace 790,000 miles and carry 48 percent of the highway traffic of the Nation.

PUBLIC LAW 658

System of land-grant colleges and universities was established in 1862, since 1890 they have received direct Federal appropriations for teaching basic and applied subjects related to agriculture and engineering. These include chemistry, physics, botany, zoology, mathematics, basic English, veterinary medicine, and other subjects. Public Law 658 increases to $11,950,000 the Federal contribution to the land-grant colleges for teaching.

PUBLIC LAW 659

In 1959 Uncle Sam sold some land to the city of Keosauqua in Iowa for a sewage disposal plant and park. Keosauqua is shy of ready cash. So Public Law 659 helps out a good cause by providing 20-year installment payments, with interest.

PUBLIC LAW 660

Motorists, watch your step and test your breath. Public Law 660 establishes with the Secretary of Commerce a national register of names of all persons whose licenses have been revoked for drunken driving or who have been convicted of driving involving loss of life anywhere in the United States of America, including Puerto Rico, District of Columbia, Guam, the Virgin Islands, and the Canal Zone.

George Stewart, of the National Safety Council of Chicago, and Bernard R. Caldwell, of Northwestern's Traffic Institute, were among advocates at House committee hearings. Motor deaths run about 40,000 annually, with 5 million persons injured and property loss of $7 billion.

PUBLIC LAW 661

Public Law 661 is stop-gap legislation authorizing the Civil Aeronautics Board to permit 25 supplemental air carriers (nonscheduled airlines) to conduct limited operations for 12 months, pending further congressional study.

PUBLIC LAW 662

Public Law 662 makes the order of a referee in bankruptcy final unless a petition for review is filed within 10 days.

PUBLIC LAW 663

Public Law 663 increases from $225 to $265 monthly the rate of disability compensation to service-connected veterans who are totally disabled, or permanently housebound. It spells out that he does not necessarily have to require regular aid and attendance.

PUBLIC LAW 664

H.R. 10997, Guam

Pasco de Susana is the site of a public park in the city of Agana in Guam, the farmost territory of the American Union. Part of the area is land filled in by the dumping into Agana Bay of large quantities of debris resulting from the fighting in Agana in the liberation of the island from the Japanese. Public Law 664 turns title to this submerged or filled-in land over to the Government of Guam.

Congressman LEO O'BRIEN, who engineered the admission of Hawaii and Alaska to the Union and is confident that early in the 87th Congress Guam will be voted territorial representation in the House, was the author of Public Law 664. He tells me that favorable action on the measure was helped by Speaker Won Pat, Speaker of the Legislature of Guam, the most far flung legislative body under the Stars and Stripes. Speaker Won Pat is very popular on Capitol Hill. He has done an outstanding job in selling to the Congress that the United States will be judged in the far Pacific area by the warmth of the relationship between continental United States and Guam, its far away sister. With that I am in agreement.

PUBLIC LAW 665

This extends for 2 years the veterans guaranteed and direct loan program and requires that payments and deposits made by veterans shall be held in a trust fund to safeguard against claims of creditors of the seller.

PUBLIC LAW 666

Hydrofoil vessels, faster than vessels of conventional type, are not manufactured in the United States, therefore do not qualify under the law restricting commerce between American ports to American-built vessels. Public Law 666 makes an exception in the case of two hydrofoil vessels upon which the mainland of Puerto Rico depends for quick transportation with the off-lying island of Vieques.

PUBLIC LAW 667

Public Law 667 provides a new exempt category for income tax payments on trusts providing supplemental unemployment compensation benefits.

PUBLIC LAW 668

This relates only to the District of Columbia. It amends the District Narcotic Act to prevent too much dihydrocodeinone getting into a cough sirup to turn it from a medicine to a narcotic drug.

PUBLIC LAW 669

Public Law 669 establishes a National Capitol Transportation Agency for a coordinated system of rail transit, bus service and expanded highway and freeway networks, including portions of Maryland and Virginia, in the Washington metropolitan area.

PUBLIC LAW 670

Public Law 670 affects only veterans of the Indian wars and the War with Spain. My advice to my Spanish War comrades is to look sharply before they leap. It permits them to get as much as $170 a month under Public Law 211 of the first session if helpless or blind to the extent of requiring the regular care and attendance of another person. Rub is that choice once made is irrevocable. If Spanish War vet remains permanently helpless he has made a good deal. But if his helplessness is temporary he cannot on recovery go back to his old Spanish War pension of $101.59 a month, paid regardless of his physical condition.

PUBLIC LAW 671

Public Law 671 is the first substantive change in assessments on banks under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act since 1950 when your representative was a member of the Banking and Currency Committee and carried the burnt of the fight for an extension of the coverage to $10,000 for the protection of bank depositors. Not a cent has been lost by any depositor and the reserve fund is now over $2 billion, will reach an estimated 3 billion by 1968. Former Congressman Wolcott, in 1950, the ranking minority member and later the chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, is now the head of FIDC.

Public Law 671 simplifies procedures in determining bank assessments and slightly increases FIDC's refund to the banks from net income. The House passed the measure by voice.

PUBLIC LAW 672

Most of the surviving persons who worked for the Government in the digging of the Panama Canal (now 55 to 80 years old) live in poverty on pensions ranging from $15 to $45 a month, graded by years of service, 10 to 30. Public Law 672 increases the pension $10 a month.

PUBLIC LAW 673

Public Law 673 is intended to strengthen the Government's hand in excluding obscene

and fraudulent matter from the mails. It provides for a court order, on showing of reasonable cause by the Postmaster General. The order would tie up the defendant's mail until the investigation is completed.

PUBLIC LAW 674

This reduces from 1 year to 6 months time for filing caveat to a will in the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC LAW 675

Public Law 675 waives the zoning laws to permit the National Society, Daughters of American Colonists to establish its national headquarters at the desired site in Washington.

PUBLIC LAW 676

Another evidence of the intensifying fight against obscenity and pornography. Public Law 676 creates a judicial officer for the Post Office Department to act in all such cases. Congresswoman GRANAHAN whose fight against obscenity has made her name well-known in American homes, including many in our district, is the author.

Properties Abroad Need Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the August 5 issue of the Chicago Tribune, an outstanding newspaper in the Nation, is, I believe, a most thought provoking commentary on a subject of great concern to all, and I am including it in the RECORD for the consideration of the Members of Congress:

PROPERTIES ABROAD NEED PROTECTION

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—After all the big talk at the two national political conventions about the need for a firm foreign policy, Congress next week has an opportunity to do something concrete to protect the lives and properties of American citizens abroad.

There's little sense in appropriating billions for "foreign aid" or for assisting the United Nations to protect the lives of foreigners in such areas as the Congo, when no provision is being made to protect the properties of citizens who already have built their homes and businesses abroad.

Why should American companies be encouraged now or hereafter by our Government to invest capital in foreign countries when, as in the case of Cuba, for instance, such properties are confiscated without satisfactory arrangements for adequate compensation?

The United States is being asked to assist the new Government of the Congo. Yet, in the face of firsthand testimony to the contrary, the Congo Prime Minister says it's a lie that foreign women have been mistreated.

American taxpayers are footing the bill for supplies being sent to the Congo through the United Nations, but there is no sign of any recognition by the Congo Government of its responsibilities to the foreigners.

Indeed, the new Prime Minister, Patrice Lumumba, who was wined and dined only a few days ago in Washington, has just approved an order by his Cabinet whereby all properties abandoned by the Belgians when they fled from the Congo will be grabbed by the Government unless reclaimed within 8 days.

This is a plain case of thievery. It is a result of the action of the Congo Government's own troops, who engaged in the very atrocities which directly cause the flight of thousands of Belgians.

Businessmen in the United States are being importuned nowadays by their Government to invest private capital in the underdeveloped areas, so that the burden of direct aid will be lessened. But American capital is not likely to venture into lands where there is no respect for the rules of international law.

Instead of depending on a World Court to secure protection for the legal rights of American citizens, it would be far better to enter into bilateral agreements with the governments of individual countries that seek American aid, and to require a written understanding that, if disputes arise over confiscation or "nationalization" of businesses, there would come into operation judicial machinery that had been set up in advance.

Failure to abide by such decisions should give the United States, or other countries which follow the same course, the right, granted by treaty beforehand, to use their armed forces to take over any properties confiscated by a foreign government where no proper system of compensation has been established.

If the United Nations, for instance, is to send in joint military forces to police troubled areas, it can use them also to protect property rights.

The President Should Tell Perez-Jimenez What the American People Think of Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, Marcos Perez-Jimenez was a corrupt and cruel dictator of Venezuela for almost 10 years. He now lives in the United States, first in Florida and now he is visiting in Hawaii, spending money he stole from the Venezuelan people.

How wonderful it would be if the President would make a public statement declaring that Perez-Jimenez was not at all welcome in the United States and that the American people despised him and his type of tyrant.

An article about this man follows:

EX-DICTATOR'S DOUBLETALK

Marcos Perez-Jimenez, visiting in Hawaii, would have us believe that in Latin America dictators are just what the people need and want.

"In our country (of Venezuela) the word 'dictator' has a different meaning than it does in the United States," he says.

That's strange, since after 9 years and 2 months of Perez-Jimenez' tyranny, the oppressed people of Venezuela forced him in January 1958 to flee for his life.

He landed in Dominican Republic, where another dictator, Trujillo, operates an equally rough police state, and then came to the United States. Our Government is trying to deport him, but the Venezuelans don't want him back.

That's understandable—for life in Venezuela under this strong man was pretty miserable. While he and his army buddies lived like kings on Maracaibo oil money, there was—and still is—general poverty.

There was no liberty. The secret police were all powerful and the political prisons were packed.

A U.S. visitor during Perez-Jimenez' rule might have been a bit dazzled by the skyscrapers of Caracas until he saw acre after acre of hovels on the hills.

He would have been "frisked" for weapons if he went to a sports spectacle and he would have had to show his passport if he wanted to fly from one Venezuelan place to another.

He would have found the air heavy with apprehension and anxiety and resentment—as it must be in any land where men and women are muzzled, with graft and corruption rampant at the top.

No, Perez-Jimenez, to the Venezuelans the word "dictator" means just what it does to us. Which is why, after taking your strong-arm tactics for as long as they could, they revolted and threw you out.

Paul Cunningham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, it is with sorrow that I call the attention of the distinguished members of this House to the death on August 14 of Mr. Paul Cunningham, well-known songwriter and author, past president of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers (ASCAP) and at the time of his death ASCAP's director of public affairs. As a citizen who has long been interested in the musical arts, and as a strong supporter of the rights of all creators of music, serious and popular, I should like to express my profound sorrow at the loss of this courageous and sincere fighter for the rights of musically creative people.

It was a privilege of many Members of the Congress to have known Paul Cunningham personally over the more than a generation during which he championed the rights of composers, authors, and publishers to the fruits of their creative endeavors in the marketplace. I am sure that I reflect the sentiment of a great many of the Members of the Congress, when I pledge to the memory of Paul Cunningham, and the society which he so ably represented, that the efforts he made for the protection of creative musical property shall nto be lost.

A native New Yorker, Mr. Cunningham became interested in songwriting and the theater while attending Manhattan College. With a bachelor of arts degree and experience in staging college shows behind him, he joined the songwriting staff of the Harry Von Tilzer Co. in 1914—the year ASCAP was founded.

In the period immediately following, Mr. Cunningham became an active, triple-threat man—as a singer, songwriter, and song plugger. He collaborated with Mr. Von Tilzer himself on a number of songs, including selections for "The Ziegfeld Follies."

He then began what proved to be a long association with the music-publishing firm of M. Witmark & Sons. During this period, Mr. Cunningham and his wife formed the headline vaudeville act of Cunningham and Bennett.

For several years Mr. and Mrs. Cunningham played the famed Keith circuit, both as performers and as writers. During their days in vaudeville the Cunninghams found themselves called upon to produce and direct stage presentations as well.

In 1928 the duo played the music halls of England and toured the Continent, and Mr. Cunningham wrote some additional material for the English public.

Among the popular songs with a Cunningham credit are "I Am an American," "Please Take a Letter, Miss Brown," "Men of Steel"—(official song of the United Steel Workers of America), "The Shores of Tripoli," "You Can't Make a Fool Out of Me," "Dakota," "Every Night When You Say a Prayer," and "From the Vine Came the Grape."

Among his composer-collaborators he lists Sigmund Romberg, Ernest R. Ball, James Monaco, Joe Burke, Peter DeRose, Earl Carroll, Vaughn Monroe, and Ira Schuster.

Mr. Cunningham became a member of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers in 1921. He was elected a director of the society in 1945, and served as secretary from 1951 to 1953, as president 1956–59, and as director of public affairs 1959–60. He was responsible for producing many of the shows ASCAP members have presented before various organizations, including an ASCAP oversea unit which toured military installations abroad. As a professional entertainer with a bright sense of humor and a gift for song, he was frequently called upon as an emcee and performer himself. Warm-hearted, simple in habits, with boundless sympathy for the less fortunate of the musical world, Paul Cunningham's example will long remain in the hearts and minds of all of us who believe that the worker in the creative vineyard is entitled to his just rewards.

Steady Gold Loss Proves Uncle Sam Is No Longer "Rich Uncle"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Mr. Leslie Gould, financial editor of the New York Journal American, appeared in the August 21 issue of this great paper.

At a time when squandor mania seems to have gripped the Congress and a part of the Nation, it may be superfluous to call attention to the steady loss of gold that is going on continuously under our very noses. We are no longer so rich, even if we think we are, and it is time for us to heed the words of widsom and the signs and portents before it is too late.

The above-mentioned article follows:

[From the New York Journal American, Aug. 21, 1960]

STEADY GOLD LOSS PROVES UNCLE SAM IS NO LONGER RICH UNCLE

(By Leslie Gould)

The United States is losing gold again. Stock of the metal are now the lowest since prewar days.

So far this year the gold loss is $424 million, of which $290 million has been in the last 6 weeks.

This is on top of a slightly more than $1 billion loss last year, nearly $2¼ billion in 1958.

From the alltime high of $24,608 million reached in August of 1949, the United States has lost $5,576 million in gold.

The loss last year and in 1958 was due to an unfavorable American balance of payments running at the rate of $3 to $4 billion a year. This resulted from higher imports and declining exports and continued heavy handouts to foreign countries from the U.S. Treasury.

FUNDS SEEK HIGHER RATES

The current loss is due to a flow of American funds to Europe, attracted by much higher interest rates there. The foreign banks in turn are converting the dollar balances so received into gold.

While the surface causes of the two outward gold movements are different, underneath there is the same doubt in foreign minds as to the soundness of the dollar.

EXPORTS OFFSET GIVEAWAYS

The balance-of-payments picture has improved some, with an expansion of American exports. For the first 6 months this year exports have exceeded imports by $2 billion while for the full year 1959 the export surplus was only $1.1 billion.

In prior years the United States had a large export surplus—enough to offset the giveaways. The surplus in 1958 was $3.5 billion and in 1957 $6.5 billion. Ten years ago it was $5.3 billion.

Right after the war and up to 1958, the United States had had little competition in the world markets. The Communist countries were only talking of an economic war, and the former enemy countries—now allies—had yet to build up their industrial potential.

That picture has changed. The Communist world is able to compete in certain markets—oil being the latest. Japan and West Germany have become industrial powerhouses. There are no shortages.

High American wages add to the problem, and partly to offset this more and more American firms are establishing foreign factories. While some may find benefits from such migration illusionary, it is a factor in the unfavorable balance of payments.

DOLLAR VULNERABLE TO RUNS

While there is no "run" on the dollar as of now, one could develop. The U.S. dollar is vulnerable. The so-called gold backing is more a myth than a fact.

Under the present Federal Reserve regulations there must be a reserve of gold equal to 25 percent of the outstanding Federal Reserve banknotes and the deposits at the 12 Reserve banks.

Thus roughly $12 billion in gold must be held for this purpose. That leaves about $7 billion in so-called free gold to meet demands of foreign sources.

DEFICIT IN GOLD SUPPLY

The foreign claims that can be made against this "free" gold are now around $20 billion—these are short-term foreign balances here, foreign holdings of U.S. Government bonds and other short-term paper and obligations. Ten years ago these short-term or liquid dollar asset holdings of foreign sources were less than $10 billion.

In this same period "free" gold has dropped from $13 billion. Ten years ago, the "free" gold exceeded these foreign claims by more than $3 billion. Today there is a deficit of around $13 billion.

The truth of the matter is that the United States is no longer that "rich uncle" with an unlimited bank account.

Sam Reeve, a Remarkable Small Businessman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, may I urge my colleagues to read a remarkable success story about a remarkable friend of mine who lives in Oakland County, Mich., the congressional district I represent here in Washington.

Mr. Sam Reeve lives a life of giving, not with the thought of receiving, but for givings' sake alone. He has unbounded faith in his fellow human beings, in their fairness, in their judgment and in their ablity to handle their own problems in their own way.

To Sam Reeve, security is not a thing we plan for. It is a state of mind, a way of life lived by the Bible and the passage, "Give, and it shall be given unto you."

Sam Reeve's story appeared in the July edition of Guideposts magazine, and it reads as follows:

ANYONE COULD DO IT—BUT HE DID

(By Semon E. Knudsen)

Last year, after every snowstorm, Sam Reeve plowed out hundreds of his neighbors' driveways—free of charge. I know that he will babysit with a child, or even with a cat; he will pick up your grocery order, get you some ice cream, meet your unexpected guests at the airport 40 miles away, turn on your house lights after dark when you're out of town, and not charge a cent.

Every now and then I like to drop in on this middle-aged, white-haired man who runs a service station here in Birmingham, Mich., just to see what services Sam is giving away now.

Over the years Sam and I have become pretty good friends. I like to pull into his 12-pump station just to watch the activity. Before my car comes to a stop, three men are at work on it. One is wiping the windshield, another is poking around beneath the hood, and the third eventually gets around to asking how much gasoline I would like.

"Fill it up, Mr. Knudsen?"

I am always called by name at Sam Reeve's, even when there is a new man on the pumps. This used to puzzle me until I discovered that Sam has attached a little green tag to my rear license plate. The tag has a code number on it so that in a matter of seconds anyone on the pumps can look up my name. Sam calls each of his 1,500 charge customers by name, particularly meaningful coming from Same Reeve because he doesn't remember names easily. (Not even his own incidentally. His name is Reeve, without an "s," but I've heard him refer to himself as Sam Reeves.)

Once, a few months ago, Sam was asked by President Eisenhower to come to Washington for a conference of small businessmen. The President invited him because he'd heard that Sam had started with nothing (he came to Detroit 22 years ago with $1.50) and that he'd done spectacularly well in the face of grueling competition. Just consider how competitive Sam's business actually is: running out of Detroit is a highway known as Telegraph Road. In a distance of 25 miles there are more than 300 filling stations, all of them selling comparable gasoline. Right at Sam's own intersection there are four of these stations. All are large, bright and efficient, and all carry quality products. Yet in the face of this competition, last year Sam pumped 1,186,477 gallons of gas (as compared to the national average of 20,000 gallons per station) which not only puts him way ahead of his neighbors, but makes him one of the largest Standard Oil dealers in Michigan.

The President wanted to know how Sam did it. Sam paused a long time, and then he gave an answer which is deceptively simple. "I just tried to give away more than my competitors," he said.

When Sam gives, he pays no attention to the profit potential. In fact he thinks nothing of taking a good loss in order to give a customer better service.

"Do you know why I do this?" Sam asked me one day. He pointed his thumb to an old, torn, much scotchtaped Bible which he keeps on his cluttered desk. "That Bible belonged to my dad," he said. "I run this station by this passage." And he read Luke 6: 38: "Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed down, and shaken together, and running over, shall men give into your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be measured to you again."

Sam said the difficulty with this passage, in his experience, was that it was far too easy to "skip over the give part and read with care the part about getting. But I try to solve this problem. I try to find my pleasure in giving, and let the getting part take care of itself."

Being able to "let the getting part take care of itself," was unusually difficult for Sam. He was raised on an Indiana farm which was so poor, that Sam never wore a suit until the day he graduated from high school. He determined to get off the farm as soon as he could. He wanted a different kind of security. He tried to find it by working in the mines. He determined to become the best paid producer in the company, and he almost succeeded until one day a foreman caught him trying to make a coupling on the fly. Sam would dart between two coal cars while they were still moving toward each other, and at just the right moment, he would slip in the coupling pin and jump back out of the way. It speeded up production no end, but there was a certain risk that he might lose his life in the process. The foreman, who had taken a liking to Sam, ran up to him literally with tears in his eyes.

"You get out of the mines, Sam," he said, angrily. "You get out and stay out."

Sam did. He drew his pay, $3, headed North that same day, still looking for security. He arrived in Detroit with $1.50 left in his pocket.

He was bewildered and a bit frightened, but within a few days got a job in one of Detroit's automobile factories. His job paid well, $99 every 2 weeks. This certainly should supply a wonderful security. Sam's room and board cost him $7 a week, and the balance he secreted away in a sock in the bottom of the bureau in his room. He held on, in a pinching fashion, to every penny he could save until he had built up a fund of over $400. This was more cash than he could ever remember his father possessing.

Why was it, then, that he didn't feel secure? He was still thinking about money; he was unable to enjoy the money he did have.

It was right at this point in Sam's life that he made a most interesting discovery, one which, I think, penetrates the real secret of security. Sam had been raised "a good old hardshell Baptist, with lots of church and lots of Bible reading." Away from home he kept his habits, and one evening while he was pondering the Bible he became transfixed by the passage, "Give, and it shall be given unto you."

The answer seemed so clear: "The whole trick in feeling secure," said Sam, "is to enjoy today and not to worry about tomorrow. That's what security is, and you find it by giving, not by receiving. Because when you think about receiving you tend to think about tomorrow, and when you think about giving you tend to think about today. I asked myself what would happen if I started giving today and not worrying about tomorrow. After all, there is the Biblical promise that when you give, it shall be given unto you."

As soon as he could, Sam quit his job at the factory, pulled his savings out of his sock, and bought a half interest in a run-down gasoline station. He was so sure that his future was going to work out all right that he sent off to Indiana, asking his girl friend if she'd come and be his wife. (Cleo says today that her mother was a little dubious about this proposition. "How do I know Sam Reeve's really going to marry you, way up there in that big city?" Cleo came all right, but she arrived with her sister, too. Just to make sure.)

Almost from the day Sam went into business, he began to experiment in giving. He walked across the street and offered a group of Sears, Roebuck employees free parking and free up-to-the-door car delivery in bad weather.

"What's the catch?" the employees wanted to know.

"No catch," said Sam.

"But at least we have to buy our gas from you."

"No," said Sam. "No strings attached."

Many years, and many moves later, Sam was still giving away free service "no strings attached."

In this way, by deliberately giving more service than he will be paid for, Sam sees to it that his giving is never tied up in his mind with receiving. "If you want to know what real security is," says Sam, "try living by Luke 6: 38. Give, and then assume that your needs will be taken care of. Enjoy the present and don't worry about the future. What better definition of security could you find?"

What better definition indeed. I think there is a lesson for businesses, for individuals and even for nations in the tall, white-haired man, with the strong handshake and the inability to remember names, who runs a corner gas station at Maple and Telegraph here in my hometown.

The Changing Face of American Cities—No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, this is the last in a series of insertions I have been making in the RECORD on "The Changing Face of American Cities," and I am including, pursuant to permission previously granted, an excerpt from Forum magazine's survey, "The New Urbanites":

A HOPEFUL AUGURY

Urban experts agree that the future of the slums depends in large measure on the slum dwellers themselves—largely, the new urbanites. Yet, the fate of the new urbanites is in turn tied to the progress of the older generations of Negro city dwellers. In housing, both groups suffer equally from the patterns of residential segregation which have operated for years to compress the poorest racial minorities into the poorest housing in central city slums. No single factor has limited the drive to establish a stable Negro middle class more than residential segregation. Yet there is now real hope that a completely free housing market, which city officials in every northern and western city see as indispensable to Negro progress, is attainable and indeed may become a reality within a generation.

This hopeful augury comes from two directions: (1) The growing experience of builders with interracial housing and coincident dispelling of many of the myths that formerly limited such building, and (2) the growing inclination of governments at all levels to insure more carefully the extension of democratic rights to all persons. The latter is of even more recent vintage than the former although the first privately developed interracial development is less than a quarter century old. Since the Supreme Court made restrictive covenants unenforcible in 1948, government has slowly moved toward recognition of the full constitutional rights of racial minorities, and has even devised legal means of insuring them. New York has been a pioneer in this regard. The State, several years ago, passed a law banning discrimination in the sale or rental of publicly subsidized housing (13 other States have since passed similar legislation), and New York City recently passed the Nation's first law banning discrimination in the sale or rental of private housing. (Pittsburgh has since followed this lead.) Although New York officials admit that such laws have not obliterated bias in one fell swoop, they maintain that they are a critical factor in diminishing discrimination.

Another vital governmental action, since the 1948 decision, has been the elimination of bias in federally insured housing by the Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration. This is a significant reversal of FHA policy, which for years supported the notions of the real estate and homebuilding lobbies that racially integrated neighborhoods were by definition unstable and contributed to declining property values. While FHA has not been so vigorous as many civil rights exponents would like in the prosecution of its no-bias dictum, it is at least in step with the progressive action being taken by many cities and States.

Equally important as these bias-curbing actions by Government has been the building of interracial housing itself. In the postwar years, about 10,000 units (an admittedly small part of the 12-million total) have been built as interracial housing by private developers. Many of these have been sponsored by social-religious groups such as the American Friends Service Committee, and most of the others have been put up with less regard for profit than for social purpose. Still, the profit record of almost all of the 50 interracial projects erected in the United States in the past 2 decades is good, according to a recently published survey "Privately Developed Interracial Housing," by George and Eunice Grier. More important, these projects have laid to rest some closely held myths of the building business:

Whites have bought housing knowing that Negroes would be their neighbors. (Half of

the projects built involved home ownership, 32 percent were cooperatives, and 18 percent were for rental.) In fact, 30 percent of the projects are stabilized with over 59 percent of the units occupied by nonwhites, a much higher percentage of nonwhites than is generally considered feasible.

It is possible, though difficult, to get financing for interracial projects, and in the past year or so, large lenders have become more receptive to such projects in certain northern and west coast areas.

It is possible, though difficult, to find sites which will be attractive not only to nonwhites, whose housing choice is limited, but to whites who have much wider choice. The caliber of housing in an interracial project must generally be higher than in white-only housing at the same price, sometimes to compensate for fewer desirable sites available for such housing.

There has been almost no friction in such interracial projects once occupancy was stabilized. When all occupants are selected strictly in terms of character and credit, the results are no different than those in all-white developments.

It is possible for a development that was once all-Negro to become integrated, without public aid. Hillview, a California rental project with 316 units, once a predominantly Negro neighborhood, now has a majority of white families. In fact, the project was never successful financially until it became interracial.

Probably the best-known builder of interracial housing today is Morris Milgram, president of Modern Community Developers, Inc., in Princeton, N.J. With initial backing from wealthy Philadelphia Quakers, Milgram built several interracial developments near Philadelphia, and has since branched out into the suburbs of other cities. His most famous project is in Deerfield, Ill., near Chicago, where his recent efforts to erect 51 units of high-priced homes to be sold on an interracial basis have met with angry local opposition. Recently, the district court determined that the town of Deerfield was within its constitutional rights in condemning Milgram's land, to be used ostensibly as a town park. Meanwhile, Milgram is continuing with plans to build interracial homes in suburbs of Washington, Wilmington, Del., Waterbury, Conn., and Princeton.

Another myth that has been laid to rest, though some realtors are still fighting a holding action to protect it, is that the entry of nonwhites into white neighborhoods will depress values. Early this year, a pioneer work appeared, called "Property Values and Race," by Luigi Laurenti. Like the Griers' book, this one was issued by the Commission on Race & Housing, a private organization backed by the Fund for the Republic. After studying housing experience in seven different cities, Laurenti concluded that rather than depressing values in areas of racial transition, the entry of nonwhites usually results in a long-term strengthening of property values.

NEEDED: FULL PARTICIPATION

Despite the work of the Griers and Laurenti, and the steadfast willingness of a handful of builders to demonstrate painfully that interracial housing can be profitable, the great majority of businessmen and government officials in the construction industry, those who could solve the critical dilemma of equal housing opportunities for all, still seem unconvinced. In a democratic society, the building industry, or indeed the white majority as a whole, cannot be forced to adhere to democratic principles. But there is growing hope that, even if the building industry cannot devise means or muster the effort to build enough housing to meet the most critical shortages, it can be induced to make its wares available to all comers on a fully equitable basis. This must start in the cities, of course, and indeed it has been in the cities, under the impetus of urban renewal and public housing open-occupancy rules, that a free housing market is already developing. But, as long as the mobility of racial minorities is restricted to central city housing, there can be no ultimate solution, either for the fast-growing Negro middle-income groups, or for the new urbanites who are striving to attain that status.

Negroes themselves are the first to deny that open occupancy in suburban housing would lead to a flood of Negro families to the suburbs. Those families that could afford such housing are generally those that are happily housed in the finest residential areas of the city. There are few Negro families, regardless of how high their incomes or status might be, who would care to face the uncertainty of living in what would most likely be—at least at first—an inimical environment.

The growth pattern of the great metropolitan areas is coalescing the city and the suburbs, and within this framework the role of the new urbanites becomes more meaningful. As the influx of new urbanites slows down, and it already has in most cities, the housing situation in central cities will become more stable. As housing opportunities are opened up, and they are already opening up, middle-income Negroes and other racial minorities will be able to participate fully in the cultural and economic development of the U.S. community. Such participation is not only badly needed today to counterbalance the dangerous tendency toward homogeneity of thought and action in the American community, but it is also vitally needed for the fullest proliferation of the democratic dynamic.

The new urbanite of today, like the European immigrant of half a century ago, seeks in the city that opportunity which is unavailable in his old land. He comes for freedoms formerly denied. That he is at first not discouraged by his environment, the slum, and its inevitable social desolation is only a mark of the sturdiness of his expectations. Aside from all the readily evident evils coincident to the slum ghetto and its perpetuation is the other greater evil that befalls the newcomer whose aspirations become strangled by ignorance and poverty of principle. He can see in his plight only the final tragedy, the negation of the American dream.

For God and Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Harry H. Schlacht for the East Side News, a local publication with wide circulation in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. This editorial was written to salute the Jewish War Veterans of the United States who are presently convening in Miami, Fla. It follows:

FOR GOD AND COUNTRY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

America salutes the Jewish War Veterans of the United States now holding a convention in Miami.

The convention is being staged in the cavalcade of patriotic splendor.

It is unfolding the scroll of the fighting Jews for America.

The Jewish War Veterans are dedicated—to maintain true allegiance to the United States of America, to foster and perpetuate the principles of Americanism, to combat bigotry and instill the love of God and country, to honor the memory of patriotic service of men of Jewish faith, to inculcate the doctrines of liberty, equal rights and justice to all.

Who does not know the stirring saga of that ancient race of God, Whose immemorial feet the grapes of wrath have trod? When has there ever been, When will there ever be again, An epic having equal power to stir the impulses of men?

The Jews are an ancient people whose spiritual riches were deposited in a literature in the form of the old Bible, revered the world over as an ageless repository of devine inspiration, and of the purest philosophy and wisdom.

They have nurtured a Moses and a Christ.

They were born in freedom, and weaned on the teachings of the Ten Commandments.

They were comforted and sustained by the psalmists, and disciplined by the seers.

They were the couriers of the ethics of Abraham, the songs of David, and the prophecies of Jeremiah to all mankind.

The Jews have been a stalwart people, and their exhibitions of military valor and individual courage have won for them the world's plaudits.

The songs of Deborah burst fourth with martial music.

The battle of Gideon is the battle of heroes.

The dauntlessness of Saul, Jonathan, and David testifies abundantly to the gallantry of the ancient sons of Israel.

They are intertwined with the evolution of civilization.

They have been sturdy champions of liberty in every age and in every clime.

They have enriched the world's literature and sciences.

They have never neglected any standard of principle, any mode of thought or any concepts of philosophy in their grand march of achievements through the centuries.

Yet theirs has been a lonely river in the ocean of mankind.

All the mighty floods of human suffering have never caused it to overflow.

All the fires of cruelty in the furnace of bigotry have never caused it to dry up.

Its waves have rolled crimson for ages with the blood of its martyrs.

It is singularly refreshing to recall that the Jews greatly aided Columbus in the discovery of America.

His caravels were outfitted by Luis de Santangel and his astronomical maps were drawn by Abraham Zacuta.

His ships' physician and surgeon were Bernal and Marco, and his interpreter was Louis de Torres, who was the first to tread American soil.

The Jews have played a glorious role in the development of American history since the birth of the Nation.

They were identified with our colonial growth, and helped finance the Revolution.

They bore a gallant part under the leadership of Gen. George Washington.

They have fought in all the wars of the Republic.

Yes, they have won the highest commendation from every President of our country.

Let us call with pride the roll of those gallant defenders in our Nation's holy cause.

We see the Jews at Valley Forge when the spirit of the American people hung low and only the stout of heart stood fast and constant by Washington.

Of the 3,000 Jews in all the Colonies, 4 of them were lieutenant colonels, 3 majors, 6 captains, and many in the ranks.

Be it noted that Lt. Col. Isaac Frank was aide-de-camp to General Washington.

Hyam Solomon dedicated his entire fortune of $640,000 to the young republic and later died impoverished.

We see them in the War of 1812.

It is inspiring to note that Uriah P. Levy, commander of the brig-o'-war *Argus*, ran the British blockade and destroyed 21 British merchantmen.

With tongue and pen he succeeded in effecting the abolition of bodily punishment in the U.S. Navy, and died a commodore, then the Navy's highest rank.

We see them in the Mexican War—the fight for Texas, and in the Seminole wars.

Again the fighting Jew in action.

Again the healing Jew, in the person of Surg. Gen. David Deleon.

We see them rallying under the inspiration of Abraham Lincoln during the Civil War.

Of the 200,000 Jews in the United States, 10,000 saw active military service and 7 received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Frederick Knefler, of Indiana, rose to the rank of major general, and Edward S. S. Solomon was brigadier general.

It is interesting to observe that Lincoln named Leopold Newman, of New York, brigadier general while he lay dying of battle wounds received at Chancellorsville.

We see them also with William McKinley Striking the shackles of bondage from a neighboring people and bringing forth an island republic.

America accepted the challenge of Spanish tyranny.

"Remember the *Maine*." Fifteen Jews were on that ill-fated battleship, and Sgt. Maurice Joost, of California, was the first to fall in the attack on Manila.

Five thousand intrepid Jewish volunteers gladly answered the call of their President.

We see these gallant warriors with Woodrow Wilson—fighting to make the world safe for democracy.

Two hundred and fifty thousand Jews were in uniform, constituting 5 percent of the fighting forces.

Ten thousand Jews held commissioned rank, and 1,100 Jews were cited for valor in action.

The greatest epic of courage ever to come out of that war—the exploits of the "Lost Battalion"—was a demonstration of conspicuous bravery.

We see them once more with Franklin Delano Roosevelt—fighting to make democracy safe for the world.

First American penetration of German soil was made by the Third Armored Division, commanded by Maj. Gen. Maurice Rose, of Denver, who gave his life for his country.

First American assault boat to hit the shore of France on D-day was commanded by Lt. Abe Condiotti, of Brooklyn.

The first Japanese battleship sunk in the war was the *Haruna*, sent to the bottom by a plane piloted by Capt. Colin Kelly whose bombardier was Sgt. Meyer Levin.

First American officer killed in the Philippines was Lt. Henry D. Mark of Los Angeles.

First four-medal winner in the American Army in World War II was Lt. Morris Berenson, of Garfield, N.J.

And there are scores of Americans of Jewish faith whose names will live forever in the archives of our Government.

Travel where you may through American cemeteries on a thousand battlefields.

Travel where the delicate poppies carpet the earth with their rich red blossoms or in the glistening white stones rising above the flower-strewn mounds.

There you will see, side by side, one beneath the cross of Christianity and one beneath the star of David.

Jew and Christian pillowed in eternal glory.

Yes, they have fought, bled, worshiped and died together.

May the spirit of America be quickened and renewed.

May the strength that cometh from the hills descend upon us and guide us forever.

"America. America.
God shed his grace on thee,
And crown thy good with brotherhood,
From sea to shiny sea."

Soviet Pattern of Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, more and more people in the United States are becoming cognizant of the many and varied facets of Communist operations and techniques throughout the world. This greater awareness has resulted, in part at least, because distinguished citizens like Julius Fleischmann, of Cincinnati, Ohio, have seen fit to take time and energy to disseminate among key people material dealing with Communist techniques and strategy.

One of Mr. Fleischmann's recent mailings is a letter to the London Times from Mr. William Sargant of the Department of Psychological Medicine, at St. Thomas' Hospital, entitled "Soviet Pattern of Propaganda." It is my feeling that every Member of Congress should have the benefit of this particular phase of Communist propaganda techniques. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I am asking your permission to insert the letter in the RECORD.

A LESSON FROM PAVLOV—SOVIET PATTERN OF PROPAGANDA

To the EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

SIR: With the summit conference now upon us, and because of the state of disturbed judgment to which Mr. Khrushchev's propaganda exploitation of the recent air spy incident reduced at least some sections of both the public and the press in Britain and America alike, it is becoming more and more important that we should all start to get a better understanding of Russian methods of psychological warfare; otherwise the battle for men's minds being waged so intensively at the present time will result in a resounding defeat for the Western Nations, and this could be far more devastating in its subsequent effects than the outcome of the present race for rocket supremacy.

Obviously, Russian propaganda methods, like others, are based to a large extent on past experience of what works, but, if any expert advice is taken on methods of psychological warfare, it has to come in Russia from scientists versed in Pavlovian theory and practice. This is because in general medicine, and especially in psychological medicine, no other scientific approach is generally considered valid, apart from a Pavlovian one. And it has also, after all, paid some very valuable dividends in recent years in the political field.

Now, Pavlov showed long ago—and this work has been confirmed time and again since—that one of the surest ways of breaking down the nervous stability of the dog and of other animals, and producing in them states of uncontrolled neurotic excitement, which may later lead on to hysterical and submissive behavior, and finally even to depressive apathy, is to give a trained, cooperative but anxious animal a random series of positive and negative conditioned stimuli or signals. A hungry, tense animal, for instance, who has been used to an orderly laboratory existence, in which certain given signals are followed by food, and others by no food, can quickly become neurotic and confused when he tries to sort out a sequence of positive and negative food signals, followed indiscriminately by food or no food, which do not, and were never intended to, make sense to him from the beginning.

This quite simple physiological technique, taken from Pavlov's laboratory, has been found just as applicable to man and has been repeatedly used on British and American politicians, press, and public alike in recent years. For instance, when the original sputnik was launched amidst world excitement, we were first of all told that it had no military significance and was merely an interesting scientific experiment. Then, soon afterwards, we were reminded that it meant that any part of the United States could be wiped off the face of the earth at will. Again we were quickly reassured of its purely pacific intent, and yet later again of the devastating effects of this development on any future war.

Then a dog was dramatically sent up in another sputnik to keep tension at a high level. We were told that it would live, then that it would die, then it was going to live again, and so on alternately for days on end until its death was finally announced. These positive and negative signals were applied with such precision and skill that some of the British and American press and public alike became, temporarily, just as bewildered, confused, and suggestible as did Pavlov's dogs in the presence of a similar barrage of their own special conditioning signals. Numerous other examples could be given of the same technique being used in recent years, and it is unlikely that these have all been just accidental happenings.

Again, before the summit conference, we saw the same sort of method being put into action and we have fallen for it yet again. We know perfectly well that every country uses spies of all sorts, and that there is nothing very abnormal about this. Sensibly, Mr. Khrushchev again chose a particularly violent and dramatic form of positive rocket signal to fire off his present psychological cannonade, and we were afterward also quickly informed of the dire consequences to future cooperation between East and West of this particular air spy happening.

Soon, however, we were told that it need not affect in any way the approaching summit conference. The following day we were again being warned that nations who harbor such American spy bases would be violently attacked. Then again we were told not to worry, but almost immediately afterward warned about atom bombs which could rain on America. And we can quite confidently expect, right through the summit conference and afterward, a series of such positive and negative conditioning signals to be put out quite indiscriminately, which are simply not meant to make any sense at all to those who will vainly try to understand them.

There is one way to avoid neurotic breakdown, the inevitable disturbances of judgment, the increase in hysterical suggestibility which can result from the skilled use of these powerful physiological processes on the nervous systems of either man or animals. This is to deliberately ignore the signals and stop trying to make any sense of them. Pavlov could not break down dogs who took no notice at all of all the experimental flashing lights specially provided for their undoing; it was only the dog who did his best to cooperate with the experimenter and tried to sort

out the signals who was so easily broken down. Unfortunately, the press of both our countries has to relay all these confusing and alternating signals, without also explaining what may really be happening, thus tending unwittingly to play the Russian propaganda game for them.

It is probable that Mr. Macmillan was warned about these techniques before he last visited Russia, for he wisely ignored all the deliberately alternating attitudes adopted by Mr. Khrushchev, who, during the whole of this visit, was blowing so violently hot and cold in a way that must have seemed absolutely bewildering to the Pavlovian uninitiated. But by just ignoring the whole thing, Mr. Macmillan won the day. Let us hope that, with a greater understanding of what is happening, the public, the press and politicians alike will also now try to follow his example.

Yours faithfully,

WILLIAM SARGANT.

People's Success Story: The Eisenhower Era Made Possible the Much Greater Achievements of the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, as the Members of this body know, I seldom utilize space in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to include extraneous matter. But the editorial appearing in the August 1 issue of Life magazine struck me as being such a valuable summation of the Eisenhower administration to date that I thought it should be given the widest possible circulation.

I am confident that every American, Democrat or Republican, will find this editorial to be factual, penetrating, and thought provoking. It is my pleasure to cause this republication:

PEOPLE'S SUCCESS STORY: THE EISENHOWER ERA MADE POSSIBLE THE MUCH GREATER ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE PEOPLE

In Chicago, where he won it from Bob Taft in the acrid battle of 1952, Dwight D. Eisenhower this week surrenders the leadership of the Republican Party. The record of his administration may be only one major campaign issue, since both NIXON and KENNEDY are bound to emphasize new goals and policies for a new age. But Eisenhower's record is well worth inspection.

Of the many flaws the Democrats will find in it, historians will probably agree at least on one. There is some substance to the charge that Ike has rather reigned than ruled. He has tended to assume, as you can in the Army but not in the White House, that an order once given is self-executing; a certain lack of followthrough has marred some of his best intentions, notably the rejuvenation of the Republican Party. He has been an easy boss. But that is not to echo the commoner (and mistaken) charge that he does not make decisions. Ike has made plenty of decisions. And most of them were right.

The duty he saw in taking office was to heal the wounds of 20 years of highly partisan Government and chronic emergency. It was his genius to give the latent unity and goodwill of the American people a chance to recover and grow. He has been the least "divisive" of modern Presidents—and the most widely beloved.

Reinhold Niebuhr, no conservative, said Ike "rebuilt American conservatism into a viable political instrument." He gave a suspicious generation the reassuring experience of living safely and prosperously under a Republican government again—salutary for the people and for the Republican Party, too.

Such a government had to do more correcting than innovating. In our foreign alliances, Ike's long suit, he has preserved and developed previous lines of U.S. policy, but to them he has made two contributions of enormous importance.

The first was to modernize and strengthen our military posture and bring it into the the missile era on a "long-pull" basis—i.e., no more crash emergency programs or budgetary zigs and zags. Though there is room for marginal argument, the essential truth is that when Ike leaves office America will still be, as he found it, the strongest military power in the world.

President Eisenhower's second contribution was to rob the Communists of their most insidious propaganda weapon, Khrushchev's pretended guardianship of world peace. Ike personally shot down that phony Picasso peace dove. He did it by his personal dedication to peace, by his atoms-for-peace offer to the U.N., by his dramatic open-skies proposal at Geneva in 1955, by stopping the Suez war, by his serious pursuit of disarmament, and by his good will travels. He has made the cause of peace so much his own that Jim Farley, only the other day, could accuse him of "peace-at-any-price leadership." That charge won't wash. Ike has twice faced down Communist threats of war in the Formosa Strait. He has not flinched under Russian pressure on Berlin. He took bold action in the Middle East. He has kept the peace without surrendering any point of strength. The Russian Empire is no larger than it was in 1952 (in fact smaller by eastern Austria). The Chinese Empire, though larger by North Vietnam and Tibet, is surrounded by stronger and more alert free neighbors than it was before Ike and John Foster Dulles took charge.

Ike used to be called a lucky President. His luck has run out lately at Sverdlovsk, Paris, and Tokyo. But let not these setbacks be confused with flaws in the solid structure of allied political, military, and economic strength built in the Eisenhower era.

The economic performance has been especially spectacular. Abroad, the Eisenhower policies have encouraged a rebirth of private trade and investment that has lifted the whole Western World and parts of Asia to amazing levels of prosperity. Europe has never been in healthier shape. We still need a new approach to the underdeveloped Southern Hemisphere, but even Latin America has improved politically, if not economically, in Ike's time.

At home the case is open and shut. The Eisenhower economic policy has been virtually a textbook model of how to befriend and stimulate a free-market system. He and his aides have handled two recessions with precise skill. Real wages and consumption have risen steadily, and profits and savings have remained healthy. He has led a tireless war on excessive Government spending which has at last brought inflation under control. The $1.1 billion surplus announced last week is a symbol of this victory for a sound dollar.

Ike's government has helped finance the building industry while it set an alltime record of 8 million new homes in less than 8 years. It has launched a whole new highway system, 23 space satellites and 20 atomic submarines. It has expanded the Union by two new States and created seaports on the Great Lakes.

Ike's government has maintained, not without difficulty, a high standard of integrity in Federal officeholders. His Cabinet has seen some stellar performers (Dulles, Brownell, Rogers, Anderson, Mitchell, et al.) and even the unfortunate Benson deserves respect for his persistent attack on Congress' scandalous farm policy.

Ike's government has appointed more scores of good judges than any previous one. This great improvement in the judiciary, essential to the Nation, is the kind of achievement to which voters and political writers give too little heed.

Ike's government has shifted the rate of Negro political and economic progress into high gear.

But all these achievements are only part of the great story of progress in the Eisenhower era. In a nation with a constitutional government, where freedom to act is left to individuals and unofficial groups, a full evaluation must include credit or blame for how the nation as a whole behaves. The greatest deeds of his era are what the people, responsive to their renewed liberty, have done for and by themselves.

Democrats charge that Ike's preoccupation with the budget has "starved" our public services. Yet total public spending—Federal, State, and local—is nearly twice what it was in Truman's time and most of the increase has been in welfare (nondefense) services. Of our school system, so rightly under scrutiny, an impressive fact is how it has grown in teachers, classrooms, and students, with little Federal aid. But even more important: Scholastic standards have risen sharply.

Not Federal but private and local spending have changed our urban skylines these last 8 years; and distributed more books and music than ever; and produced more goods and services of every kind. The Federal Government did not develop automation, nor discover the Salk vaccine, nor make American architecture a new wonder of the world; nor cause more Americans to travel abroad than ever before; nor double the annual gifts to higher education; nor raise our birth rate to a record height. The American people did all these—and more. They did them under the benign and permissive Eisenhower sun.

A certain dissatisfaction has crept into the last months of the Eisenhower era—the anti-tailfin syndrome, the Puritan nostalgia, the hunger for new national purpose. And that is healthy, for it shows that Americans have not been entirely corrupted by their own success. But let's face it: It is success, not failure, that causes our unease. Ike leaves us reunited, rested, self-enriched, and newly appreciative of our liberty. As a people we are (or should be) firmly prepared for our next testing. The Kennedy or Nixon era will be different. It may be grim or it may be great. It can scarcely be more sunny or fruitful than these Eisenhower years, in which so many age-old visions of the good life first became real.

Dedication of Nation Ford Historical Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, July 30, 1960, it was my privilege to participate in a magnificent program at Red River, S.C., near Rock Hill, in my district, at the dedication of the

Nation Ford Historical Park. This is one of the most historic spots in York County, S.C. At Nation Ford, on the Catawba River, the Indians and traders crossed as early as 1650. This site is also the traditional site of the battle of Liberty Hill, or Turkey Hill, last conflict between the Catawba and Cherokee Indians. Gen. Thomas Sumter, famed Revolutionary leader of South Carolina, known as the "Gamecock," camped at the spot in July of 1780. Lord Cornwallis, leader of the British forces in the Revolution attempted to cross in October 1780, but the waters were too high.

Here one of the last skirmishes of the War Between the States occurred on April 19, 1865. Confederate President Jefferson and his party crossed April 27, 1865, on his way to find safety west of the Mississippi.

The trestle of the railroad which crosses at this point and which was known as the Charlotte and South Carolina Railroad—now Southern Railway—was completed in 1852. It was burned by Union soldiers on April 19, 1865.

It was fitting that we gathered to pay tribute to this spot and the peoples whose paths have crossed.

Nation Ford Historical Park was established through the cooperation of the York County Historical Commission and the York County Historical Society. I give great credit to Chairman Harper Gault and the members of the York County Historical Commission for establishing this and other parks commemorating great places and evidence in York County, S.C. I also commend President Sam B. Mendenhall, Vice President Neely and the members of the York County Historical Society for their magnificent work. The program was as follows:

Presiding: Col. F. Murray Mack, Fort Mill, S.C., vice chairman, York County Historical Commission.

Invocation: Rev. Olin L. Martin, pastor, Church of God, Red River, S.C.

RECOGNITION OF SPECIAL GUESTS

Acknowledgment of assistance in establishing Nation Ford Park.

Greetings from Fifth Congressional District: Congressman ROBERT W. HEMPHILL, Chester, S.C.

Greetings from Southern Railway: Mr. R. H. Snyder, Columbia, S.C., superintendent of Southern Railway system.

Historical significance of Nation Ford area: Mr. Sam B. Mendenhall, president, New York County Historical Society.

Benediction: Rev. Carl W. Lambert, pastor, Temple Baptist Church, Red River, S.C.

On this occasion all of us were stirred, intrigued, and inspired by the speech made by the Honorable Sam B. Mendenhall, president of the York County Historical Society. I include as part of my remarks that speech which is attached:

SPEECH OF MR. SAM B. MENDENHALL

We have met here this afternoon to dedicate this park which marks one of the most historic spots in York County—Nation Ford. I want to touch briefly on the events which make this place the historic spot that it is.

Nation Ford takes its name from the fact that the Catawba Nation lived nearby. How long the Catawbas have been here, no one knows; however, they were encountered here as early as 1566 by the Spanish explorer, Juan Pardo.

Here at Nation Ford the great western trading path, or Catawba trading path, crossed the river. The origin of this prehistoric trail is lost in the sands of time; but it is known that traders crossed as early as 1650. This trail started in Virginia and came down through North Carolina to the Catawba where it crossed and then forked—one trail going to the Cherokee towns in the northwestern part of this State, the other passing on to the Indian villages near Augusta, Ga. The entire length was about 500 miles.

Here is the traditional site of the Battle of Liberty Hill, or Turkey Hill, as it is sometimes called, the last conflict between the Catawba and Cherokee Indians. According to tradition, the Catawba and the Cherokee had a great battle, each side losing about 1,000 men. After the battle was over, they decided that such fighting was foolish; so they made an agreement that they should fight no more; and that the Catawbas should stay on the east side of the Catawba River, and the Cherokee should stay on the west side of the Broad River, and the territory in between should be no man's land.

In the summer of 1780, when it appeared that the American Revolution in the South was over, and, indeed, the British so boasted, Gen. Thomas Sumter, the "Gamecock," and the band of patriots whom he led, made their camp here. We know that these brave men checked the advance of the British, and through their determined efforts others were moved to rally to the American cause; and the Revolution, which could have easily ended with a British victory, was won by the Colonies.

After the defeat of the British at King's Mountain on October 7, 1780, Cornwallis, who was then in Charlotte, decided to retreat to Winnsboro. He came down to Nation Ford; but when he arrived the river was so swollen that he could not cross. Therefore, he camped nearby at Thomas Spratt's plantation. At least one attempt was made to ford; but finally they had to go down to Landsford to cross.

In 1846, work was begun on the Charlotte & South Carolina Railroad which ran from Charlotte to Augusta. This is now a part of the Southern Railway System. It was decided that the trestle across the Catawba River should be at Nation Ford. This trestle has been described as a "magnificent structure, 1,127 feet long and towering 50 feet above the water." We are told that railroad follows almost identically the Indian Trading Path from Charlotte to Augusta. The railroad was completed in 1852, and in June of that year the first train came through. It is said that all the people from Fort Mill and the surrounding countryside met, had a picnic lunch, and waited to see for the first time the "iron horse." One old countryman, who was a little late in arriving, parked his wagon on the track itself. He was warned by one of his neighbors to move it because the train would not get out of his way. So the man proceeded to do so. But about this time the train, which was then approaching, let out a loud toot on its whistle which scared the man so he jumped from the wagon and left it to the destruction of the train.

At the Cross Roads, near here, where the road from Herron's Ferry to the Saluda Road running to Chester crossed the road running from Nation Ford to Yorkville, the headman of the Catawba Nation, broken in spirit and depleted in numbers, met with representatives of the State of South Carolina in 1840, and ceded to South Carolina their land amounting to 144,000 acres.

Here on April 19, 1865, one of the last battles of the War Between the States was fought. Ten days after Lee's surrender, and 7 days before Johnston's surrender, Maj. E. C. Moderwell, who was then at Lincolnton, was sent with a detachment of Yankee cavalry to burn the railroad bridge across the Catawba River. The bridge was defended by a garrison of about 60 Confederates who had 2 cannon and a number of small arms. The Yankees captured the picket and surprised the guard and the bridge fell without a fight. The Yankees set it afire, one account says by pouring gunpowder and lampoil on it. The whole structure burned in 30 minutes. Aunt Rhoda, one of Mr. Alexander Fewell's slaves, said this about the burning of the bridge: "At first we thought God had sent down de sun on top o' dat bridge; but twain't long fo' we found out dat it be nothing' but de deviltry of dem Yankees ablazing dat bridge."

As soon as the bridge had been set afire, a command of Confederate cavalry came down from Charlotte for the purpose of defending the bridge; but they were too late. However, a spirited engagement took place, the Confederate on the north side, and the Yankees on the South. It is said that the Yankees mounted the captured cannon on the hill overlooking the river. After a fight of about 2 hours, the Yankees left and returned to Dallas, N.C. The Confederates began fording the river to pursue them. When about half had crossed, the other half were in the process of crossing, a locomotive arrived from Charlotte with a Confederate officer carrying a white flag who told them that an armistice had been declared between Johnston and Sherman; so the Yankees were not pursued. Lossing, the northern historian, describes this as "one of the most gallant little exploits of the war."

It is said that when Jim Williams, the Negro, who ran Herron's Ferry, heard the Yankees were coming, he was so overawed by the prospect of being eaten alive by these creatures, that he abandoned the ferry and hid on Mobley's Hill, near the river, from which he watched the battle.

On April 27, 1865, President Jefferson Davis and his party crossed under the charred ruins of the bridge in their "flight into oblivion." Tradition says that he reviewed his troops for the last time at the Cross Roads.

It is said that Gen. Wade Hampton one moonlit night swam his horse across the ford seeking to overtake his fallen leader and persuade him not to give up the Southern cause.

I am sure that there are some present who remember the great flood of 1916. The railroad trestle was again destroyed, this time being washed away on July 17, 1916. It was rebuilt in its present form thereafter.

Nation Ford, abandoned since 1911, can easily be located. On the south side it starts a short distance up river from the trestle, passes under it diagonally, and meets the north side a short distance down river from the trestle.

Here has passed—each in his day—the buffalo, the Indian warrior, the Spanish explorer, the English trader, the pioneer in his oxcart, the stagecoach driver, and the railroad engineer. Modern man no longer needs or uses the place, and the old roads immediately leading to it have fallen again into the stillness of the primeval forest.

Who'll Pay the Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the tax-free status of cooperatives presents two very serious problems to our economy.

First, the loss of corporate income tax revenue resulting from the expansion of co-ops using capital that has been amassed under their tax-free status; and, second, the destruction of many small businesses resulting from unfair competition from nontaxpaying cooperatives.

The National Small Businessmen's Association has been making a continuing study of this growing problem. The Association, through its officers has advised me that in many parts of the country small businessmen are faced with extinction unless something is done by Congress to protect them from this competition. The rapidly increasing loss of Federal taxes from these tax exempt operations must also be given careful consideration by Congress.

An editorial in the Minneapolis Star of August 5, 1960, points up the problem very clearly. I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

WHO'LL PAY THE TAXES?

What is reported to be the largest soybean processing plant in the United States has just been purchased by the Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association, grain marketing cooperative with headquarters in St. Paul. GTA paid in excess of $6 million for the presumably profitable Honeymead Products mill at Mankato. It was an attractive deal for Honeymead, that company's president reported.

Three years ago GTA bought the elevator and feed business of the McCabe Co., Minneapolis, for $5 million. There have been reports of GTA negotiating with another private grain company for another string of country elevators.

Why these sales of privately owned facilities? Does a co-op have some advantages which enable it to operate a business which a private corporation feels compelled to sell? What about taxes?

Both the co-op and the private firm pay the same property taxes. But the private firm pays a 52-percent corporate income tax to the Federal Government. It also pays a 9.3-percent income tax to the State. However, each of these tax payments may be deducted as an expense before paying the other tax. The co-op does not pay a corporate income tax because it distributes its earnings to its members.

The co-op people point out that any business could do the same and without earnings wouldn't be obligated to pay income taxes. But a private company could hardly continue to exist or expand without earnings. The co-op can claim not to have earnings and still have money to expand by giving its members an I O U for their share of the profits and then retaining the money for a number of years.

Some people think this is an unfair advantage over private business. A bill was proposed to Congress last year which would put a tax on retained co-op earnings after 3 years. Such an outcry arose that Congress dropped the subject.

The co-ops point out that the members pay individual income taxes on the earnings returned to them. Even if all of them reported the earnings faithfully, the rate in almost all cases would be much less than the corporate income tax rate.

The corporate income tax accounts for a big share of both Federal and State revenue. But if all corporations became co-ops those billions of dollars would disappear from governmental treasuries. Who would make up the difference? It's an interesting situation to ponder.

Nasser Talking Like Khrushchev

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER HOLTZMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to include herewith an article which appeared in the summer issue of "Prevent World War III," published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., and entitled "Nasser Talking Like Khrushchev":

NASSER TALKING LIKE KHRUSHCHEV

It is significant that Nasser's tirades against imperialism are a carbon copy of Khrushchev's fulminations against the West.

On May 7, 1960, Egypt's President Nasser spoke at a public rally in Al-Mansurah commemorating the battle against the crusaders in 1250. He seized the occasion to deliver a violent attack against the West in general and the United States in particular. President Nasser did not speak as a responsible leader of his people but as an unscrupulous demagogue employing every kind of trick to poison the minds of his listeners against the Western democracies. His incitement to hate and his deliberate distortion of facts gives clear indication that Nasser is a dedicated opponent of all efforts to reduce tensions in the Middle East and to create an atmosphere of good will and mutual understanding conductive to peace.

It is noteworthy that, while Nasser insulted the United States and cast aspersions on the integrity of the U.S. Senate(he was receiving U.S. assistance running into the tens of millions of dollars. In this year 1960, Egypt is receiving from us $9 million in surplus foods as a gift and many millions as gifts is special asistance, technical cooperation, etc. It was the United States which prodded the World Bank to agree to a loan of more than $56 million to the UAR. It was the United States which supplied the UAR with $12 million for the building of Egypt's first television station. It was the United States which has entered into an agreement whereby U.S. wheat and other agricultural commodities will be sold to Egypt for $120 million payable in Egyptian currency—a currency which is among the softest in the world. It is the United States which contemplates the granting of additional free assistance the value of which runs into the tens of millions of dollars.

Let there be no illusion about President Nasser's vilification of the United States at Al-Mansurah. It was not a temporary emotional outburst. On the contrary, it reflected Nasser's deep-seated hostility toward the United States and its democratic institutions. Unfortunately, the American public at large is unfamiliar with Nasser's real opinions of the United States. As a matter of fact, we doubt whether most Members of Congress are aware of Nasser's speech at Al-Mansurah. In this connection, we must state that the press has failed to publicize Nasser's views adequately. We hope that our readers and Members of Congress will carefully study this speech. We hope that they will bear it in mind when they are told by some of our policymakers that it "pays to be nice to Nasser." Pertinent passages of Nasser's talk are reprinted below:

"Imperialism has always and at all times sought to destroy Arab nationalism, to dominate, and oppress.

"After World War I, the name of democracy was used to deceive the people.

"Today we envisage a great battle in which we are defending our fate, our existence, our freedom, and our nationalism. In this battle we are facing the imperialist states, which are using and arming Israel so that Israel can aggress against you and destroy your nationalism. This is the new means by which they are trying to crush our freedom.

"America has refused to give us any arms since 1952, because it knows that by means of these arms we defend our independence.

"Today, brother citizens, when we see the United States arming Israel, we can never forget under any circumstance that the aim is the same—the aim is our freedom, our will, our nationalism, and our independence.

"I ask these people in the American Senate: Where is the freedom of the peoples? Where is the freedom of Algeria? Where is the freedom of Palestine? Where is the freedom of Oman? Where is the freedom of the South African peoples? These people who spoke in the American Senate and who dressed themselves in thieves' attire and leveled accusations against all Arabs and against the UAR have been deceiving the American people under the pretext of the freedom of navigation.

"Zionism in America is trying to enslave the American people, dominate America, and appoint itself as a power above the American Constitution.

"This is the American Senate, whose Members, or some of whose Members, direct insults against us and who pretend that freedom has touched their consciences and hearts. All the world exposes them, because if they truly spoke of freedom, they should discuss the freedom of all peoples everywhere. We know that the fight against Algeria depends on American weapons and that the killing of the Algerian people is a killing by American weapons.

"The Suez Canal is an Arab canal passing through Arab territory, according to all international treaties and all the agreements dealing with the freedom of navigation through the Suez Canal. All these agreements say that the Suez Canal is an Arab canal and that it is part of the Arab land, and that we have the right to adopt all necessary measures to safeguard its security.

"This, brother citizens, is our reply to the Zionist agents in America, and to these Senators who insulted and threatened us, and whose consciences were touched by Zionist money and Zionist tactics, and who thus rose to threaten us and insult us—we say to them: If you really mean to speak about freedom, we want to hear you in your Senate speak of freedom throughout the world.

"We, brother citizens, say to these people and these Senators in their country: If Israel and Zionism dominate the Senate in America, and if the American people allow themselves to submit to Zionist pressure—because Zionism relies on temptation and bribes, because Zionism controls their livelihood and necks, and because Zionism sets up Zionist organizations in their country—if the American people, who are rich, allow themselves to yield to Zionism, we here, we the Arab people, say to them: We the poor people refuse to submit to America and refuse to submit to Zionism under any circumstance, because we know that we have dignity to defend, that we have freedom for which we shed blood to defend, and that we are ready to shed our blood and souls to liberate our country.

"Zionism in America in 1948 not only dominated the Congress but also dominated the American President, who was at the time the biggest imperialist agent. We all know that. The American people too know this. Some American writers write about it.

"We tell those who talk about withholding aid that we are sorry, but we do not accept aid. We pay the price of the wheat which we take and which we buy from America to the last mil. We buy it with our money. We do not take wheat from America as charity or as aid, but we purchase this wheat for which we pay in local currency. After this, they give us half of this amount as a loan in accordance with an agreement. But this loan, O brethren, is also not charity, because it is a loan which we will settle over 30 years at an interest of 4 percent—according to the methods of Cohen. This means we pay for the wheat and then pay them as much again as the price of the wheat through the interest. This means that we take the wheat for more than its price. If these people think that they have found a means to dominate us, we tell them to remember the lessons of the past. It is impossible for us in any case to accept conditional aid. We have honor and dignity because when we take the wheat we pay its price with our money.

"We feel that the friendship which has brought together the Soviet and the Arab peoples is a firm and strong friendship. It can by no means be shaken by the clouds which appear over the relations between the two countries because of the differences over social and political principles.

"In every Arab's view Israel is the first issue: It is the dagger in the breast of the Arab Nation. Any hand assisting this dagger shares the responsibility. Time is on the side of the Arabs, and not on that of America."

Control Goes With Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM K. VAN PELT
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. VAN PELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from Life Lines.

Life Lines is a triweekly publication of Life Line, Inc., Washington, D.C. The publication has become one of the most outspoken advocates of stirring, pro-American information that is presently available in this country.

Much of the material in the publication is used in the daily radio program Life Line which is broadcast over more than 130 stations across the Nation. The speaker for the broadcasts is Wayne Poucher.

The Life Line Foundation is an educational, religious, and patriotic organization. Its broadcasts and publications are worthy of attention by Americans who are concerned about saving freedom in the world. A recent article is of particular interest at this time.

CONTROL GOES WITH AID

Just a century ago a President of the United States, James Buchanan, observed, "Should the time ever come when the State governments shall look to the Federal Treasury for the means of supporting themselves and maintaining their systems of education and internal policy, the character of both governments will be greatly deteriorated."

The practical truth of that statement is today being demonstrated by the increasingly frequent requests from the States for Federal financial assistance. But just how much do the States really gain from aid of this kind?

When the States ask for or accept Federal aid, they are, in effect, asking for Federal control—of education, public improvements, and all the other matters that should be handled on a State or local level. And, besides that, when the Federal Government doles out money to States, it is not exercising any remarkable amount of generosity. After all, the Federal Government has no money of its own. Every cent it hands out belongs to American taxpayers, who also happen to be citizens of the States.

Under such circumstances, as President Buchanan said, the character of both Federal and State Governments becomes greatly deteriorated. Also, to get right down to cases, the taxpayer is being played for a sucker, because substantial deductions are made in Washington for administration and the cost of bureaucracy before his own money is sent back to his State.

These are facts for informed patriots to help spread among the people.

Port of New York Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am in complete agreement with the distinguished Representative from New York [JOHN H. RAY], who in his minority report holds that the majority of the Judiciary Committee is in error in recommending that contempt citations be issued against the chairman, S. Sloan Colt; the executive director, Austin J. Tobin; and the secretary, Joseph G. Carty, of the Port of New York Authority.

I agree with Congressman RAY that the action recommended by the majority of the Judiciary Committee would be unprecedented and unwise as a matter of Federal and State relations, as it is not sanctioned by law and might well be held unconstitutional.

The Port of New York Authority, which was created by the States of New York and New Jersey in keeping with an agreement validated by special legislation of each of those States, has been a great boon to the city of New York and to the surrounding metropolitan area. I mention this not because it affects the legality of the actions of the Port of New York Authority officials, but merely to indicate that the accomplishments of the port authority in solving the complex transport problems of a great city have been most effective.

The three men who are being considered for contempt citations by the Congress are extraordinarily outstanding citizens.

S. Sloan Colt not only has behind him a record of success in business enterprises, but has contributed immeasurably to the well-being of the city by his civic work in a number of areas. He works without compensation for the Port of New York Authority.

Austin J. Tobin, who has been with the Port of New York Authority for many years and is perhaps its most indispensable official, is a man of fine intellect and rare talent. His capacity for business administration is most unusual. His vision and imagination have done much to implement the objectives of the port authority, and New York is a better city because of his presence in it.

I do not know Joseph G. Carty personally, but it is fair to presume that, since he is an official of the port authority, he is a man of fine character and integrity.

When one recalls that Congress did not initiate or create the port authority, but merely gave its consent to the making of the compact, it appears that the Congress is stretching its authority in trying to supervise or regulate the activities of this bi-State agency.

Congress did reserve the right to amend, alter or repeal its resolution consenting to the compact, but it must be remembered that the compact itself can be altered only at the instance of the two States involved.

It must be remembered, too, that the three officials mentioned above appeared before the Judiciary Committee and delivered to that body all the minutes, financial reports, records, et cetera, authorizing official action. It was on the instructions of the Governors of the two States, New York and New Jersey, that the port authority officials declined to furnish the working papers and other internal studies which the committee requested. The Governors were acting in their lawful capacity as heads of two sovereign States.

It appears to me that the action recommended by the Judiciary Committee is in contradiction of the constitutional rights of the States concerned, and the committee therefore appears to be in error.

Commonwealth Club Vote Favors Emergency Legislation To Admit Refugees, but, 12 to 4, Would Limit Total Number

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article taken from the August 12 issue of the Commonwealth, a publication by the Commonwealth Club of California:

COMMONWEALTH CLUB VOTE FAVORS EMERGENCY LEGISLATION TO ADMIT REFUGEES, BUT 12 TO 4, WOULD LIMIT TOTAL NUMBER

Here's how our club members have voted on refugee immigration after reading club's recent published study report on the subject as prepared by our immigration section (Bruce G. Barber, chairman):

1. Should Congress make any provision for admitting into the United States refugees who cannot now be admitted because of immigration quota limitations? Yes, 1,006; no, 737.

2. (a) Should the United States admit refugees only within existing immigration

quotas[1] established for each nation under the general immigration statute? Yes, 759; no, 923.

(b) If this is done, should refugees be accorded any preference within existing immigration quotas?[1] Yes, 567; no, 765.

3. Should any special refugee legislation limit the total number of refugees who may be admitted? Yes, 1,235; no, 423.

4. (a) Assuming refugee legislation is enacted, should it deal with the refugee problem as a continuing one? (719); or

(b) Should such legislation be of an emergency nature dealing with the problems that exist today? (969).

5. Except as to quota limitations, should all refugees admitted to the United States be subject to the same security checks and other qualifications now required of all immigrants? Yes, 1,661; no, 80.

6. Should any refugee legislation enacted by Congress include a provision to accept a specified number of refugees now barred because aged, ill, or otherwise unable to become self-supporting? Yes, 758; no, 938.

[1] Under the present quota system, immigration each year from countries outside the Western Hemisphere is limited to one-sixth of 1 percent of the number of natives of that country who were residing in the United States according to the census of 1920. Existing U.S. immigration quota limits as of January 1, 1960, prescribed by the McCarran-Walter Act are 100 per year for each nation outside the Western Hemisphere except the following: (a) quotas currently available to applicants—Belgium, 1,297; Germany, 25,814; Great Britain, 65,361; Ireland, 17,756; Sweden, 3,295; (d) quotas oversubscribed—Austria, 1,405; Czechoslovakia, 2,859; Denmark, 1,175; Estonia, 115; Finland, 566; France, 3,069; Greece, 308; Hungary, 865; Italy, 5,666; Latvia, 235; Lithuania, 384; Netherlands, 3,136; Norway, 2,364; Poland, 6,488; Portugal, 438; Rumania, 289; Spain, 250; Switzerland, 1,698; Turkey, 255; U.S.S.R. 2,697; Yugoslavia, 942.

The Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON H. SCHERER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, there is some effort being made to again bring about the repeal of the Connally amendment during this session of the Congress. To do so would be disastrous for many reasons.

The Cincinnati Enquirer in an editorial on Friday, August 12 and its able and discerning writer, Forrest Davis, in a series of articles, discuss not only the hisory of the Connally amendment but the dire consequences of its repeal to the United States. I believe that all Members of Congress should have the benefit of this keen analysis of the various facets involved in the question of repeal.

The editorial and articles follow:

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Aug. 12, 1960]

CONNALLY AMENDMENT AGAIN

There is reason to suspect that one of the items to be called up for consideration during the renewed session of Congress will be Senate bill 94 whose aim is the repeal of the Connally amendment and the end of the reservations to the U.S. participation in the World Court.

First proposed by Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, during his service as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Connally amendment exempts from the jurisdiction of the World Court any matter that the United States may regard as internal in character.

Ever since its adoption as an amendment to the measure through which the United States subscribed to the World Court, there has been a vigorous campaign for its elimination—a campaign that has been renewed in recent weeks as Congress prepared to resume its work.

There is one crucial difference, we think, between the World Court, on the one hand, and the various domestic courts with which Americans are familiar, on the other. That difference is this: At all levels in the United States, there is a clearly existing body of law for the courts to interpret. In most cases, the law was created first, the court second. On the international level, by way of contrast, there is no unquestioned body of law. Whatever international law the World Court would be called upon to interpret and apply to the solution of specific problems, consequently, would largely be law of its own making.

That consideration—combined with the wholly political manner in which World Court judges are elected—makes it unwise, we think, for the United States to choose this particular moment for giving the World Court unreserved powers in cases in which the United States is a party. The case for the Connally amendment's retention seems doubly strong in view of the fact that the Soviet Union insists upon similar reservations.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Aug. 12, 1960]

CONNALLY'S "SIX LITTLE WORDS" AND THE WORLD COURT

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—The prophets of the Republic's decay would do well to lift their sights from fin-tailed, two-toned jalopies to a tendency corrosive not only of the national will but of the traditional good sense of the American people. I refer to the substitution among the liberal enlightenment of cliche, or slogan, phrasemaking for cool, ad hoc reasoning on political issues as they evolve week by week, month by month.

The argument by cliche is especially obfuscating in foreign affairs, which, while vital to every man, woman, and chick, may only be seen by nonprofessionals through a glass darkly on account of geography, the bewildering cultural differences among races, peoples, and systems, and the obscurity frequently veiling the interests involved.

The Congo affair looms at the moment as a terrible judgment on the light-minded democratic fetish of one head, one vote. What a caricature of the liberal dogmas of self-determination, the "rights" of all peoples everywhere to enjoy political freedom via the ballot box irrespective of what the process visits in the way of rapine, social disintegration, bankruptcy, and hunger upon the innocent in suddenly liberated areas and their neighbors.

The transcendence of slogans over judgment is no new thing with us. Witness "making the world safe for democracy," under which banner we fought World War I. Witness the stupefying nonsense of Wendell Willkie's proclamation of one-worldism. Consider the persistent fallacy that the United States must negotiate with Moscow, whenever Moscow bids, despite the bleak record of successive retreats into which the council table has ushered us since Pearl Harbor. The operative slogan here is that "it is better to talk than to fight," a piece of casuistry flying in the face of the record; a record demonstrating that our defeats at the hand of the Soviet Empire have all resulted from talk.

Specifically, I am concerned with the current attempt to cozen and delude the public into a delivery of our liberties to an exotic World Court in the name of such cliches as "universal justice" and "world order under law." Underpinning these chimerical slogans is the extraordinary delusion that permanent peace will come about if, as, and when the United States shows the way to the Communist empire by "trusting" the Court at The Hague with complete jurisdiction over its justiciable affairs, domestic as well as foreign.

Should our Senate waive the Connally amendment, the pitch goes, all other states will gladly yield their own sovereignties, the cold war will dissolve as Nikita S. Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung refer their ambitions in Berlin, the Middle East, Latin America, Tibet, the Straits of Formosa, Korea, etc., to quiet adjudication by the Court of International Justice.

The fact that Moscow contemptuously declines to recognize the Court's jurisdiction whatsoever does not discourage the newly sprung but powerful lobby agitating for repeal of the Connally amendment. The fact that the Connally reservation does not deny the Court's jurisdiction in litigation over issues truly international, merely safeguarding Americans from the Court's intrusion into our domestic concerns, is steadily minimized by advocates of repeal.

What is the Connally amendment? It is a brief addendum, six little words, to a resolution introduced by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Democrat of Oregon, binding the United States to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. The six little words conclude the amendment, which stipulates that acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction "shall not apply to disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the jurisdiction of the United States, as determined by the United States."

Former Senator Tom Connally, Democrat of Texas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, introduced the reservation. As amended the resolution carried by 51–12 votes on August 3, 1946, the minority agreeing with MORSE that the United States cede to a new, untested court exclusive determination over its competence to hear any or all cases brought against us at whatever cost to our sovereignty.

Because the questions opened in this debate are so vital to the preservation of the American constitutional system, so varied, so affected by the determination of the United Nations bureaucracy to create a universal state, they call for far more extensive discussion than the space of one column affords. The great questions, such as whether the World Court is in fact a court or merely a political arm of the U.N., are to be ventilated hereafter.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Aug. 15, 1960]

WHAT MAKES THE WORLD COURT LOBBY RUN?

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—The coincidence of Nikita S. Khrushchev's rancorous renewal of the cold war and the emergence of a powerful lobby in behalf of repeal of the Connally reservation and total submission of the United States to the International Court of Justice at The Hague (the World Court) is perhaps purely fortuitous. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, of Minnesota, scarcely could have foreseen Khrushchev's squalidly profane provocation at the May summit, when last December, he introduced his resolution for repeal of the Connally amendment of 1946 reserving to the United

States determination of whether matters raised against it at The Hague were of domestic or international import.

Nor could Charles S. Rhyne have been aware that the implacable rift between the two worlds of Washington and Moscow would be so dramatically disclosed in 1960 when he began his lobbying activity for "world peace through law." Mr. Rhyne, an energetic, youngish Washington attorney, a former president of the American Bar Association, is chairman of a special committee of the bar association functioning under the foregoing title.

Operating munificently under grants of $375,000 from the Ford Foundation and $225,000 from the International Cooperation Administration, Chairman Rhyne has made of his committee an influential force on public opinion. Mr. Rhyne's promise, that lawful settlements of international disputes beat war is fairly unassailable. As president of the bar association in 1958, Mr. Rhyne procured the designation of May 1 each year as Law Day. The purpose of the nationwide observance is to inculcate a new public understanding of and respect for the central function of the law to a civilized community.

It is when Mr. Rhyne, his coadjutors, allies and disciples, attempt to apply the precedent of the United States, where recourse to the courts and an accepted body of law are habitual, to a grievously divided, revolutionary and anarchic world, that his counsel degenerates into sheer nonsense. The ideal of a world court founded on a universal concept of law, commanding the trust of all human societies and deciding issues with urbane objectivity, is one which in the obvious nature of things must be long deferred.

The ideal inspires the casual adherence of all men of good will. President Eisenhower, former President Truman, Vice President Richard M. Nixon, many other public men, eminent jurists and the academic and communicating intelligentsia subscribe to that ideal. The trouble arises when Rhyne and others attempt the impossible leap from aspiration to here-and-now fulfillment.

Rhyne goes so far as to assert that, but for the Connally amendment, the World Court could now function as a keeper of the peace among nations. That amendment, limiting the U.S. submission to the compulsory jurisdiction of an untested arm of the United Nations, speaking with many tongues out of widely contrasted legal systems, Rhyne describes as a "sham." Thoughtful analysts of Rhyne's exaggerated naievete suspect that it is his refusal to acknowledge the simple facts pertaining to the World Court which constitutes a "sham" before the American people.

The lobby failed last winter in the Senate. Hearings called by Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of the Foreign Relations Committee on the Humphrey repealer produced such intelligently adverse testimony that the committee failed to act. FULBRIGHT, who swallows every nostrum put forward as a palliative for the cruel malignity of the world struggle, announced the committee's refusal to report with regret.

Yet we may expect a new assault on the amendment in the next Senate. The campaign, abetted by the New York Times, the Washington Post and other liberal journals characteristically mistaking ends for means, is being stepped up. A committee, to which the venerable and respected Judge Learned Hand lends his name, has moved into the field.

What makes the World Court lobby run? What circumstances have arisen changing the Senate's objections to a Court for which a power-hungry U.N. bureaucracy is the sole legislature? In succeeding articles I shall endeavor to cite those objections and present the contra arguments of the lobby.

[From the Cincinnati Enquirer, Aug. 16, 1960]

THE OBJECTIONS TO AN ALL-POWERFUL WORLD COURT

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—The Court of International Justice, established as an annex to the United Nations in the charter promulgated at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, posed no overt threat to American institutions and historic liberties. According to chapter XIV of the charter, the World Court was to have no compulsory jurisdiction. It was, further, excluded from jurisdiction over purely domestic matters in the member states. Members, indeed, although all could refer internatioal differences to the Court, were ceded the right to specify the extent to which they wished to acknowledge the Court's competence by means of formal declarations of acceptance.

The Connally amendment to the United States declaration of acceptance, reserving to this Government the say as to what issues were international, which domestic, grew out of two major objections to compulsory jurisdictions. The first was general, the second specifically alarming.

As to the second, the U.N. itself through the General Assembly alerted the Senate in February of 1946 to a tendency toward power-grabbing at the expense of member states. The assembly successively adopted conventions conferring immunities on the U.N. and its agencies. It thereupon provided for enforcement of these immunities through the World Court. As the Court had been set up it could deal only with disputes between or among states. Moreover, it had no enforcement arm. The Security Council, hedged by the veto, could not enforce Court decisions and, in any case, the idea of mandatory action by the U.N. or the Court outside of narrow limits was repugnant to the text and spirit of the charter.

There was a provision for advisory opinions, meaning just that, from the Court. But the Assembly, seeking to strengthen itself and its agencies, legislated that in case of a dispute between itself and a member, either side could request an advisory opinion which when given, should "be accepted as decisive by the parties." This, of course, established a form of compulsory jurisdiction through the back door over all sorts of unpredictable differences between the ambitious agencies and members.

The factor weighed with the Senate in August of 1946. The Senate had adopted the U.N. charter in 1945 with only two dissenting votes. In July of 1946, the Foreign Relations Committee, still taking the charter at face value, recommended passage of a declaration of acceptance moved by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, without reservation. In floor debate, however a more prudent counsel made its appearance and the Senate finally, by 51 to 12, accepted the amendment offered by Chairman Tom Connally, Democrat, of Texas, of the Foreign Relations Committee. Most of the committee had reconsidered.

A more compelling factor, however, was a growing dubiety about the nature and competence of the Court itself. The Court, although consisting of 15 judges politically pointed as to region and bloc, should base its decisions upon a recognized body of law. International law, diffusive and organic, had no constitutional nor statutory warrant. It was, in effect, Western law, evolving through the centuries from treaties, conventions, declarations and scholarly assertions. That was the law of consent to which the International Court at The Hague before and after World War I had deferred.

But the U.N. Court contained among its judges two from Communist countries, the U.S.S.R. and Poland, bound to reject all Western jurisprudence as "bourgeois." Two judges were from Moslem lands, Egypt and Pakistan, where Islamic law prevails. Four judges were Latin American, one Chinese, one each from France, Greece, and Norway.

Only three of the judges derived from British common law countries: The United States, Great Britain, and Australia.

The question confronting the Senate then and now is whose law will the World Court administer? Additionally, after adoption of the Connally amendment, the U.N.'s agencies launched on a course of enacting international law by treaty, much of which powerfully cut across American concepts and vested liberties. This process we shall examine in the next installment.

Chester Koch Makes Patriotism His Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, by leave previously obtained, I insert in the RECORD an article which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on May 30, regarding my very good friend, Chester Koch, who is the steadfast, faithful, abiding friend of all war veterans. I know of no one in whom the flame of patriotism burns more constantly than in Chester Koch. He is a veteran of World War I whose prime mission in life appears to be to do an act of kindness for someone else, and especially for men who have served their country in time of conflict. Chester Koch is a distinguished citizen of Cleveland and of Ohio. He is held in high esteem in Cleveland and beloved by all veterans, particularly those who have come to him with their problems and whose difficulties he has helped to resolve. He has worked long and untiringly for adequate hospital facilities for veterans, and he has been an inspiration to veterans groups in working out plans for patriotic celebrations. Veterans in Cleveland, and in Ohio, as well as many other parts of the United States, will agree that—Chester Koch makes patriotism his life.

The article follows:

CHESTER KOCH MAKES PATRIOTISM HIS LIFE

(By Don Sabath)

When Chester J. Koch urges everyone to stay home over Memorial Day he is not making a pitch for traffic safety.

He is promoting patriotism.

For Koch reasons that if nobody goes out of town, everybody will go downtown and pack public music hall for the Memorial Day pageant.

He is the city's coordinator of patriotic activities. Not only that, but he is the only one in the world.

Koch also holds office in or is a member of 33 organizations of veterans and is even an honorary member of the Navy Mothers Clubs of America.

FULL-TIME JOB

He devotes every moment of his time to patriotism, service men and women and veterans—often at his own expense.

His reason: "I guess it just runs in your blood."

At the start of induction preceding World War II, Koch, a clerk at the city's division street pumping station, saw a group of draftees trudging gloomily and unnoticed to the railroad station.

Then and there he decided that all should be given a proper farewell.

In March, 1941, city council recognized the importance of what he was doing and created his present post. Later the job was made full time and he was moved to room 44 in city hall. He has been there ever since.

SAW 400,000 OFF

Koch estimates he has helped send off more than 400,000 men to training camps since the beginning of World War II.

"I still visit the induction center in the Standard Building," he added, "but there are not too many men leaving because of smaller draft quotas."

One day Koch accompanied a group of draftees to Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind. He almost didn't return.

A young draftee asked him to call his mother before the train departed a small Indiana town. Koch did. But he forgot his overcoat in the train. It was January and cold.

FORTY MILES ON OUTSIDE

When Koch returned to the coach for his coat the train began to pull out of the station. He grabbed an outside railing, but the door was locked. He could not get in.

He rode the train, holding onto the icy railing, for 40 miles until someone noticed him standing on the step.

"Boy, was I cold," he said.

During World War II, Koch arranged gifts for servicemen, set up a canteen on Public Square, and answered every request from servicemen.

Mementoes of the work he has done are piled high in his office at city hall. Clippings and other information are everywhere.

ONE THOUSAND HOURS AT CRILE

But he does not spend much time in his office. He is usually attending a veterans' meeting or dinner or some other military function. He has been awarded a 1,000-hour voluntary pin from Crile Veterans' Administration Hospital.

Koch estimates he spends 25 percent of his salary for veteran activities. He has no expense account or secretary.

Since he is constantly traveling about the State and country, he keeps his suitcases packed with basic, essential items. He has to add only shirts and personal items.

On a recent trip to a Nike demonstration at Fort Bliss, Tex., he unloaded his odds and ends from a suitcase.

PINS AND STRING

Included were such vital items as extra pairs of shoelaces, wads of string, and safety pins.

"Never know when I'll have to tie a package for someone," he said.

One safety pin that he carries in his lapel pocket dates back to World War I. It is from a gas mask canister.

"I've lent that pin to people all over the country for assorted reasons," he said. "It always returns."

Partial to dark blue or gray suits, Koch usually wears a blue tie with a red stickpin. On his lapel are four service pins: left to right, from the American Legion, Catholic War Veterans, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and Army-Navy Union.

Perennial chief of staff or marshal of parades, he cannot begin to estimate the number of parades he has organized and led. He is usually seen riding on the back seat of a police motorcycle up and down the parade route.

When someone wants a question answered about the American flag, he is the one to answer it. He seems to be a walking encyclopedia on the flag.

Another part of his equipment is a white oversea cap, decked with tiny medals. It signifies he is national press officer for the Army-Navy Union. He carries it in his briefcase.

HE'LL BE 70 IN 1962

Koch lives with his son, Ray, in an apartment in Lakewood. He has a daughter, Mrs. Robert Hutter, and four grandchildren. His wife, Mary Irene, died in 1952.

Koch was born in Louisville 68 years ago. He is looking forward to 2 more years of work in his position.

"I reach 70 in 1962," he said, "and then it will be up to the mayor to decide if I should continue. I'm not going to worry about it. I'm just going to keep doing my job."

Koch entered service early in 1918 with the 308th Motor Supply Train of Ohio's 83d Infantry Division, and went to France that spring as a mess sergeant.

When he is dining out with friends he often comments that he ran the best mess in France.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great amount of interest in pending legislation dealing with the question of medical care for the aged, I ask that the following newspaper article by my old friend and top-flight newspaperman, John H. Baer who is staff writer for the Patriot, be printed in the RECORD.

The story on Pennsylvania's program of medical care for the aged under a joint Federal-State financed program will give the Members of Congress a preview of the kind of care and treatment the aged will receive if this Republican administration's medical program is given support by this Congress.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the administration's program is even worse since it will force every participant in the medicare program to pay yearly dues of $24 as well as the first $250 of the medical expenses.

The story shows that the average amount spent for medical care and other aids for the aged in Pennsylvania amount to about $160 per year. This then proves what we have been saying all along and that the administration's medicare plan won't help anyone who really needs help, but will in fact, add millions of dollars in general fund taxes for an army of Government employees whose main job will be to keep the needy and sick from getting the aid we're paying for.

Following is the complete text of John H. Baer's story as it appeared in the Harrisburg Patriot on August 15, 1960.

STATE NOW PAYING $5 MILLION YEARLY IN MEDICAL BENEFITS

(By John H. Baer)

Pennsylvania is paying about $5 million a year in medical care and nursing home benefits for its aged needy while Congress debates—with an overtone of politics—the issue of Federal medical aid to old persons.

MOSTLY SUBSIDIZED

Approximately 61 percent of the State's medical relief program for the aged comes from Federal subsidies.

The needy aged can also get artificial limbs, braces, crutches, special shoes, and similar aids to normal living for the handicapped.

Hearing aids used to be given, but the high cost of relief forced the State to abandon this phase of the program several years ago. In some cases, however, the county board of assistance have been able to provide reconditioned aids.

Eyeglasses are available free to the aged only if their sight is so critical as to put them into the "blind" category.

DENTAL SERVICE

Free dental service is available for the oldsters on relief—if they can find a dentist participating in the plan. Only about 700 of some 6,300 practicing dentists in the State are active in the aid program.

The complaint of the dental profession, according to Ray Cobaugh, executive secretary of the Pennsylvania Dental Association, is the fixed fees paid for dentures. The dentists say they have no control over the laboratory fees they must pay for making the plates.

MAXIMUM FEES

For a full upper or lower denture, for instance, the relief program puts up a maximum of $50. Laboratory costs alone are at least $30 and may run as high as $45, the dentists say.

Other dental fees fixed by the State include: first tooth pulled on each visit, $2, plus $1 for each additional yank; a single silver filling, $2; a synthetic porcelain filling, $3.

Biggest complaint on dental fees allowed is the $7 for repairing a broken denture. The dentists say the lab fee equals or exceeds this amount.

Nursing and clinical services also are available to the old people on relief. So is ambulance service, up to $40 a trip, at the rate of 40 cents a mile.

FEW LIKE IT

But to get this aid they must virtually take a pauper's oath and put any real estate they own into hock with the Commonwealth. Their insurance is limited, and every effort is made to have close relatives contribute to their support.

Few people—except the genuine needy in the old age brackets—are enthusiastic about the program.

For one thing, only 20 percent of the doctors are participating. Within this limitation the patient has a "free choice" of his own physician. This is because the $1.50 per office call and $2.50 per house call allowed under the relief program "does not pay the overhead of the physician" a spokesman for the Pennsylvania Medical Society said.

Druggists, who get a 50-percent markup on the cost of relief prescriptions, or 90 percent of the list price—whichever is less—now get about half of the total amount spent for medical relief. They also would like to see some adjustments in the program.

MEDICAL PHASE

About one-fourth of the 50,000 persons 65 and over on relief also benefit at any one time from the medical phase of the public aid program, the Department of Public Welfare said.

Usually, when a person in this age bracket goes on public assistance it's for life, and the State aid program includes limited burial costs. The aid plan has been in existence since 1934, with Federal help since 1936.

Average annual cost of State medical care for the aged, with one fourth of the relief clients in this category receiving benefits was put at $160 per person, compared to $177 a year in medical expenses for the average oldster, and $84 a year spent by the average American on medical care.

For nursing home care the Commonwealth will pay from $100 to $165 a month—plus $5 for personal items—depending on the type of care required and whether it is administered by practical or registered nurses.

In homes where practical nurses take care of patients, a needy aged person able to get around on his own and requiring a minimum of attention will get $100 a month from the State—plus the $5 for incidentals. Those requiring more care get $125.

Nursing home patients under the care of registered nurses will have their bills paid at $150 a month for normal care and at $165 for around-the-clock close supervisory nursing.

If a nursing home resident needs doctor's care or drugs this is provided as an extra item in addition to the care cost at the home.

Medical care is not limited to the aged. Last year it cost $3.4 million for all types of medical relief classifications. This included more than $2 million for the aged; old people in nursing homes, on the basis of 1958 figures—the latest available—drew $2,900,000 for maintenance and medical care.

For the aged on relief and unable to pay hospital bills, free care is provided in a State-owned or State-aided hospital.

DRUG RULES

Bills for drugs and most other items in the medical relief program costing $10 or more require approval of the county assistance office. If the item exceeds $25, the State office of public assistance must approve it.

Visiting nurse service is paid for by the State at a maximum of $2 for a home visit and 50 cents for an office visit. Such nursing care must be prescribed by the attending physician.

To get the wide range of care offered needy old people, the individual must give the Commonwealth a lien on any real estate he owns; cannot have more than $500 in life insurance, for burial purposes; not hold personal property in excess of such household furniture required for daily living.

He may have $500 on deposit at a bank, in lieu of life insurance, on condition that its use is restricted to his burial.

KIN'S LIABILITY

Money received from relatives is charged against relief allocations as income. Children are liable for support of their parents under State support laws, on a scale established by the State. For instance, a man making between $410 and $429 a month, with a wife and child of his own to support, is expected to contribute $20 a month for the support of a parent not living with him.

This phase of the relief law is admittedly difficult to enforce. Court orders can be obtained, but irresponsible individuals can also find ways to duck them, officials point out.

In this day of personal transportation emphasis, the person on relief is allowed to keep a car if it is 5 years old or older and not worth more than $500. Those going to relief with better cars are given 6 months to get rid of them.

DILL FAILED

An effort to blanket the medically needy into the relief program under a purchase-of-care plan failed enactment in the 1959 legislature.

At present, outside of the relief plan, the legislature has allocated $28 million for the 1959–61 biennium to 187 hospitals at the rate of $10 a day per patient for free care on a subsidy.

The legislation proposed by the merger committee which mapped consolidation of the old departments of welfare and public assistance into a department of public welfare would have discontinued the subsidy system and substituted the purchase-of-care plan.

Although only 3,500 of the 16,000 physicians in Pennsylvania participated in the medical relief program, many more doctors give free treatment to the needy. A move to increase the physician fee rates is now underway—coupled with a program to get more appropriations for this service.

WANTS SURVEY

"We realize this is a special category of medical care," a representative of the medical society said, "and want the program evaluated," including another look at physician fees not changed since 1948.

From the start of the medical care program in 1934 until 1945, physicians were paid indirectly from relief allocation made to those on aid for the cost of this care.

In 1945 provisions were made for direct payments to the medical arts practitioners. Another revision in 1948 reimbursed doctors for the actual cost of medication dispensed at the home of the relief patient or in the office.

Pennsylvania and 41 other States will spend about $290 million to help oldsters medically this year, it is estimated, compared to some $230 million in 1959.

SOME ABUSE IT

There have been some abuses of the program in Pennsylvania. Recently a Philadelphia doctor and a druggist were banned from further participation in the plan after investigators found them operating a prescription mill.

Rows of unopened bottles of medicine and pills were found in the homes of relief clients in the area—all prescribed from a small doctor's office over the drugstore involved.

Under present State law drugs prescribed by brand name must be compounded that way, unless the doctor gives his permission for a generic substitution, using the same drug put out under another brand name.

The State is looking into the possibility of designating drugs by their generic rather than trade names in the relief program, but the healing arts people—divided on the issue—have not yet agreed with the department on this big economy move.

The medical aid program in the State of Washington allows most drugs to be prescribed by their generic designations. California is experimenting along the same lines.

One California authority contends that 100 tablets of a drug can be obtained under its generic designation for as little as 80 cents, while big-selling trade-named tablets of the same quality and quantity cost as much as $4.50.

During winter months some drugstores write in excess of $2,000 worth of relief prescriptions in a 30-day period, but this covers the entire program, not just the aged.

Of the $8,404,674.51 spent from the medical fund last year, pharmacists received $4,426,208.82; physicians, $1,995,694.13; dentists, $1,167,489.55; clinics, $592,343.84; nurses, $213,335.32 and ambulance services, $9,512.85.

Foreign Imports and the American Carpet Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include herein a very able statement recently made by Mr. Paul M. Jones, president of the American Carpet Institute, Inc., before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

Mr. Jones' argument that foreign imports are destroying the American carpet industry is unanswerable and I do not see how any fairminded person could deny, let alone challenge, his basic claims for an equitable solution to the problems of this great American industry.

It should be said—and most vehemently—that the carpet industry is but one of many basic American industries threatened with extinction by trade policies directly antagonistic and inimical to the interests of the American economy and the American people. When will this Nation and this Congress awaken to these great dangers to our way of life, prosperity, and well-being?

STATEMENT BY PAUL M. JONES, PRESIDENT OF AMERICAN CARPET INSTITUTE, INC., BEFORE THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION, JULY 22, 1960

Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to make a brief oral statement on the application of the domestic Wilton and velvet carpet industry for withdrawal of present tariff concessions on imported Wilton and velvet carpets as permitted by article XXVIII of GATT.

We have summarized in a small leaflet the basic information relating to the very serious import problem this industry faces, copies of which have been given you.

You can readily see from chart No. 1 on the front page of this leaflet that we have a gravely serious problem facing us. Despite our making full use of the peril point procedures, rates of duty on Wilton and velvet carpets have been successively lowered over the years. Following each reduction the volume of imports has risen sharply.

The increased imports have been the direct result of the low prices at which imported carpets can be sold in this country. At the present time, the average per square yard invoice value of imported Wilton and velvet carpet is $3.42, to which approximately $1 is added to cover handling and duty for a total of $4.42 per square yard. The average invoice value of Japanese imports is $2.95 per square yard and the average for Belgian imports is $3.80 per square yard. These carpets compete with domestic carpets having an average wholesale per square yard value of $7, a difference of about $2.60 per yard.

The reason for lower prices on imported carpets is primarily one of lower labor costs, which apply not only to the direct manufacture of carpet, but to indirect costs, such as buildings, supplies, raw materials, transportation within the exporting country, taxes, fringe benefits, and many other factors which are essential in arriving at the total cost of manufacturing.

All the carpet wool and most of the backing material used by the domestic industry are imported. The importation of finished carpets is therefore principally an importation of foreign labor at the expense of the domestic labor force.

Neither the Belgian nor Japanese industry has made any contribution to product development or product styling. Both industries are producing the best selling styles, colors, and textures established by the American industry. This is another reason why the effects of the import competition have been so pernicious.

Prior to World War II the duty was 60 percent ad valorem. At that time less than 200,000 square yards of Wilton and velvet carpet were imported into this country.

Based on actual imports during the first 5 months of this year, 10 million square yards will come into our market this year. This volume of low-priced imports has seriously depressed carpet prices in most major markets, thus intensifying the serious injury caused by the direct loss of a large portion of the domestic market to imports.

Chart No. 2 shows that Belgium and Japan are the chief exporters to this country. Neither of these nations depended upon our American market prior to World War II. Belgium had a carpet industry prewar, but it has grown significantly during the past several years. Up until World War II there was no Wilton and velvet industry in Japan.

I point this out to you so that you can fully appreciate the fact that Wilton and velvet carpet imports are a new commercial development and do not rest upon an historical industrial pattern in world commerce. It is significant to note in this respect the current emergence of the Japanese industry.

I quote briefly from a consular report, a copy of which is available for you if you would like it. It is dated September 22, 1958.

"The Wilton and velvet carpet industry of Japan obtained its start from orders placed by U.S. forces stationed in Japan after World War II. Exports to the United States were undertaken with the departure of the troops, beginning in 1955, and have grown 270 square feet in that year to over 3,500,000 square feet * * * in 1957."

The same report also stated that the Japanese producers, under the administrative guidance of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry * * * have voluntarily agreed not to increase their productive capacity for Wilton and velvet carpeting."

Testimony before the Tariff Commission in 1958 also indicated that the Japanese industry would not grow beyond its then capacity. Events since that time have proven such representations to be utterly without foundation. Japanese imports increased 230 percent in 1959 and continue to grow at a phenomenal rate this year.

In 1958, when imports has reached 12 percent of domestic production and there seemed to be absolutely no limiting factors on the horizon to halt, or slow down, the rate of import growth, the industry instituted action under the escape clause provision of the Reciprocal Trade Act. After extensive investigations by the Tariff Commission and week-long public hearings, the industry was denied relief by a vote of three to two. Apparently the majority of the Commission felt that the industry was not being seriously injured at that time, nor was it "threatened" with serious injury. Two members of the Commission believed the industry was suffering injury with imports at 12 percent of domestic shipments.

You will note that in the short space of 1 year since the Tariff Commission decision imports have grown from 12 percent of domestic shipments to 23 percent of domestic shipments. During 1959 imports rose 52 percent; during the first quarter of 1960 they rose 60 percent over 1959, and the figures for the last 2 months reflect a continuance of this trend.

It now has become unmistakably clear to our industry that we must have relief from import competition or, simply stated, we are doomed to extinction.

Article XXVIII of GATT, under which we are seeking relief, permits any GATT participant to modify or withdraw previously made concessions before the expiration of any 3-year period, beginning on January 1, 1958. The current period of so-called firm validity expires December 31 this year. We believe this is a proper means by which our Government can afford some relief to our industry. It is certainly the best means for immediate correction of an intolerable situation.

If article XXVIII of the GATT agreement means what it says, it would seem our industry would present a classic case for the application of this article.

The concessions made by our Government were made when Belgium was the only major exporting country. Belgium labor costs average approximately 39 cents an hour, which compare with an average labor rate in our industry of $1.75 per hour. Japan is now a major factor in this situation, and their average wage rate is 19 cents an hour.

The volume of imports in yards and dollars and the volume of imports in relation to domestic production all have drastically changed since the last concessions were made, and it is now evident that a 21 percent duty gives no protection to the domestic industry.

We believe that our industry is entitled to the following:

Imports, at the current 21 percent ad valorem rate, should be limited to 5 percent of domestic shipments.

On imports above 5 percent, a duty of 40 percent ad valorem should be imposed.

If it is felt desirable that the initial 5 percent should be allocated among exporting countries, our industry has no objection to this being done.

We feel this is an equitable solution to our problem which will enable the domestic industry to grow and prosper, will not deny a fair share of the market to importers, and will allow importers to participate in the growth of the domestic market.

This concludes my statement. Thank you.

The Eleventh Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following article by Chester Lauck, of Houston, Tex., entitled "The Eleventh Hour," which appeared in August 1960 issue of the Journal of the Iowa State Medical Society:

THE ELEVENTH HOUR
(By Chester Lauck)

At the Second World Medical Association meeting in Switzerland in 1948, an Irishman said in substance, "When an individual is indoctrinated with the philosophy that he no longer has a responsibility to himself or his family, you are striking at the very roots of democracy. When you turn to government for everything, free enterprise is lost. If you accept this philosophy, then you must change your religious concepts. You can no longer believe in a God-made heaven in the hereafter; you must believe in a man-made heaven here on earth and let me admonish you to be very, very sure that the guardian angels in the man-made heaven don't turn out to be the secret police." We must learn that there is not such thing as something for nothing. There seems to be a widespread delusion existing today that money coming from Washington, for some strange reason, doesn't cost anybody anything.

America is riding the crest of a wave of prosperity never before dreamed of on this earth. Although we represent about 6 percent of the world's population and 7 percent of the world's land area, we produce and consume over one-third of the world's goods and services. We manufacture nearly one-half of the world's products.

Yet, in spite of this prosperity, we suddenly find ourselves $295 billion in debt. We owe more money in this country than all the other nations on earth put together. Why? Simply because we have been spending more than our income. We have become involved in a deficit spending program for a number of years because people will not realize that the Government does not have a stockpile of funds back in Washington which they can dispense or distribute at will.

Thomas Jefferson, in 1816, said, "I place economy among the first and most important of Republican virtues and public debt as the greatest of the dangers to be feared."

Andrew Jackson said in 1824, "If a national debt is considered a national blessing, then we can get on by borrowing, but, as I believe, it is a national curse. My vow would be to pay the national debt."

In 1932, Franklin Delano Roosevelt said, "Let us have the courage to stop borrowing to meet continuing deficits. Stop the deficit."

Mr. Khrushchev has declared that the Soviet Union no longer expects to defeat the United States on the battlefield of the military but rather has elected to destroy us on the battlefield of economy. The Russians are aiming directly at the strength and stability of our American dollar. It is their hope that we will spend ourselves into bankruptcy and if we continue our deficit spending program, we are aiding and abetting their cause.

WE, OURSELVES, ARE TO BLAME

Washington is not entirely at fault. Let's put the blame where it belongs—on ourselves. We have not assumed our responsibility of citizenship. We asked for it. Every project we undertake—whether it is for a rural community, a village, city, county, or State, or whether the project be an overpass, underpass, bridge, airport, or even urban renewal—the first question usually asked is, "How much government aid can we get?" It is generally asked without any regard or consideration as to where the funds might be coming from.

We have forgotten how to do things for ourselves. We forgot that with grants-in-aid come government controls, and with government controls we cannot embrace the free and competitive enterprise system—the system that brought about this prosperity and made America so outstandingly great. William Graham Sumner said it: "He who depends upon the state for protection, must pay for it by limitations on liberty. By every new demand when he makes upon his government, he increases its function and the burden of it on himself."

Last year we spent $83 billion, including $43 billion on national defense. We want national defense at any cost—even with the waste. But let's talk about the other $40 billion. Ten years ago, in 1948, it cost $23 billion to administer our Government. That is an increase of $17 billion, nearly double the cost in 10 years.

Early in the present administration, Herbert Hoover was called out of retirement and asked to head a committee to make a thorough study of the administration of our Government and determine whether some savings could be effected. This committee was known as the Hoover Commission. The group made an exhaustive study at a cost of several million dollars to the taxpayers. The result of its findings, as made in its report and recommendations, showed that by eliminating unnecessary bureaus and agencies, a colossal $7½ billion could be saved annually.

This Hoover Commission report was made nearly 7 years ago. If the recommendations

had been adopted, we could have reduced our national debt by some $50 billion. Instead, we have increased our debt over $30 billion during that same period of time. Last year more than 30 million people received checks from our Government. One dollar out of every $5 spent in the United States for both services and goods was spent by either Federal, State, or local government agencies.

Someone recently said, "We have been living mighty high on the hog, but it 'ain't' our hog—it belongs to our children." Are we just going to drop this $295 billion debt in their laps and ask them to scramble out from under it the best way they can? Our children and future generations are entitled to inherit this Republic as we found it—with freedom and opportunity, intact and unmortgaged.

WE HAVE BEEN ADEQUATELY WARNED

Down through the annals of history, for 7,000 years nations have risen to great heights of prosperity and then have crumbled and fallen—not from marching legions but from internal decay, complacency, and too much government. Because of their prosperity, the people grew a little fat. And when they got fat, they got lazy. When they got lazy, they said "Let the government do it." And their government got bigger and bigger and the people got smaller and smaller, and finally the people were almost nothing at all. Read the history of China, of the great Roman Empire, of Greece, or of France. Remember what happened in Germany only a few years ago. That country was a highly industrialized and prosperous nation operating under a constitutional government. And recall how suddenly she collapsed. Is there any reason to believe that it cannot happen to us? Let's not wait and try to read the handwriting on the wall after we have our backs to it.

Some economists say we are beyond the point of no return. This is hard to believe. We must realize, however, that this is the eleventh hour. We must realize the direction toward which we are drifting and do something about it now. We have got to concern ourselves with government matters—to get into politics. Too many for too long have been saying, "I don't know anything about politics; I leave that up to the politicians." The result is that a handful of people have been running this country. And our $295 billion debt, socialistic welfare programs, and the present threat against our free and competitive enterprise system indicate quite clearly how they have been running it.

ALL OF US MUST TAKE A HAND IN POLITICS

We must begin at the grassroots. Attend your local precinct meetings. Find out what candidates for office stand for—not whether they are Democrats or Republicans, but what kind of Democrats, what kind of Republicans. We have too many Democratic Congressmen and too many Republican Congressmen in Washington and not enough U.S. Congressmen.

It is not too late to put the love of our country above partisanship interests by selecting conservative candidates for office and then supporting them with all our strength and influence. In this way, and only in this way, can we hope to preserve our Constitution and the American way of life. There are enough conservative members in both parties if they would but assert themselves and assume leadership.

We can and must select men for office who will think of the next generation rather than the next election—men who will dedicate themselves to the preservation of our Constitution and our individual freedom—freedom of every man to stand on his own feet and be himself and become, God willing, whatever thing his vision, his manhood, and his faith can combine to make him.

When considering the problem of founding a new government, the American patriots who had been in the forefront of the Revolutionary War to separate the colonies from Great Britain, warned against creating a central government which, under the pretense of helping the people, might use the substance of the people to enslave them. It would be interesting to know what our forefathers must think of us and the way we have dissipated our inheritance—those pioneers who came to these shores only a few generations ago and carved this civilization out of a wilderness. They came here seeking freedom and opportunity. They did not ask for old-age pensions, workmen's compensation, social security, unemployment insurance, minimum hours, maximum wages. Come to think about it, they didn't ask for anything.

They realized that their future and the future of their families were their own responsibility and not that of their government. And with nothing more than a crooked stick for a plow, they rolled up their sleeves and, looking toward Heaven, said, "Thank you God; I'll take it from here."

These were our forefathers from whom we descended, the freedom-loving folks who founded this great Nation of ours. Now we must prove that we are of that same sturdy stock by assuming the responsibility of preserving the heritage they willed us. This is the 11th hour.

PHYSICIANS HAVE A SPECIAL RESPONSIBILITY

The doctors who go to make up the American Medical Association are dedicated men, highly regarded in their respective communities. Their counsel and advice is quite often sought. Thus the doctors of America have a great opportunity to persuade its citizens to think and realize the direction toward which we are drifting and to stop this trend which can only lead to our destruction. We are facing a crisis. It is the only real threat to our economic security we have ever experienced. The members of the American Medical Association as individuals must stand up and be counted and exercise the influence which their position in their communities places upon them, and the American Medical Association must stand as a body to defend our free enterprise system and to ward off the threat of socialized medicine.

There are two things with which we need to be concerned. We need roots to hold us firm and we need sky to hold us up, and in between, a living process. Because, out of our beliefs we perform deeds, and out of our deeds we form habits, and from our habits grow our character, and on our character we build our destiny.

Resolution by Virginia Pharmaceutical Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, one of the legislative matters now pending before the Congress is the so-called Federal-aid-to-the-aged legislation. This is a politically inspired proposal and is one of several measures wherein certain groups hope to induce various segments of our society to support for public office those who offer the most by way of public welfare statism.

Many elements of our society are striving mightily to have the Government supplant private enterprise and take over the control and care of our citizens from the cradle to the grave. This group is engaged in an all-out effort to socialize our Nation and make the Government responsible for the welfare of our citizens. At the same time, however, they would siphon off all individual initiative along with channeling all wealth into the Government Treasury, thereby making the Government the master and the people its slaves.

We are rapidly moving into welfare statism, with the people becoming more and more dependent upon the Government and less willing to support themselves. The spirit of paternalism will soon destroy our great private enterprise system unless a halt is called in the near future to our race toward welfare statism.

Because of this I oppose socialized medicine in any form. I opposed the Forand Bill as well as the bill that was passed recently by the House of Representatives. The house of delegates of the Virginia Pharmaceutical Association at its 79th annual convention, held recently at Virginia Beach, adopted a resolution which points out cogently the issues facing the Nation today, the importance of preserving the free enterprise system that has made America great and the evil of socialism. Because of the great principles involved, the timeliness of the resolution, as well as the truths pointed out therein, I hereby include with my remarks the resolution adopted by the house of representatives of the Virginia Pharmaceutical Association which is as follows:

Whereas the free enterprise system has been the keystone of our Republic and of our way of life is today under constant attack;

Whereas the institution of a welfare state is the true goal of many who profess concern for the welfare of one group or another in today's society;

Whereas both major political parties are currently advcoating socialistic plans designed to make the Federal Government responsible for the health and hospital care of citizens over the age of 65;

Whereas all such proposals substitute the principles of socialism for the principles of individual responsibility and self-determination, and inherent within them are the seeds of destruction that will ultimately affect all our freedoms;

Whereas the statutory recognition of groups and classes of citizens for the purpose of bestowing special benefits from tax revenues is contrary to our precepts of government and anti-American in its basic tenets; and

Whereas whatever problems of medical care that may exist among the aged population can best be met, adequately and without recourse to socialistic concepts, by adherence to two historic American principles; namely, free enterprise and State and local responsibility for indigent persons: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Virginia Pharmaceutical Association hereby records its unalterable opposition to any and all socialistic schemes for the solution of health care problems and urges upon Members of the Congress that they remember, in this important matter as in all matters coming before them, that their primary responsibility is to preserve and de-

fend the great Republic created by our Constitution; and also be it

Resolved, That our fellow Virginians, and all Americans who would resist the continued encroachment of paternal federalism on our rights and liberties, are urged to lend their support to the solving of the problems of the aged, the indigent, or any other of our citizens, within the framework of our constitutional Republic and without recourse to divisive class legislation or other socialistic ideologies; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be printed and distributed to all Members of the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives.

Edwin Popp: Faithful Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include for the RECORD a very moving tribute by the distinguished Rev. Howard P. Davis at the funeral of my dear and late lamented friend, Edwin Popp, for many years rural carrier at Bolton, Mass., in my district.

Reverend Davis has so completely encompassed the qualities and contributions of Eddie Popp that I would not presume to add to his eloquent eulogy. Eddie Popp was a neighbor and boyhood friend of mine, and I have never known a finer human being, a more devoted husband, a more loyal friend or a more faithful public servant. He was the epitome of kindness, thoughtfulness and consideration for others, and a legion of friends mourn his loss.

Serious, painstaking and conscientious in the performance of his duties, he was possessed of a deep, friendly interest in people and an exceptional impulse to help them with their problems. His official service was not only of the highest order of efficiency and capability, but was performed cheerfully and without stint or reservation. Eddie Popp could not do too much for the people he so devotedly served.

He was a man of broad interests, a citizen of highest patriotism. His contributions went far beyond his job to civic, fraternal and patriotic activities, for which he was truly distinguished.

His sudden passing at the full height of his powers came as a great shock to his beloved wife, Alice, his postal associates and his many friends and it leaves a great void in the public service and in the lives and hearts of many people that can never be filled.

To his loving, devoted wife, Alice, his inspiring helpmate throughout the years, and to his bereaved family, I tender my most heartfelt sympathy and expressions of condolence. I hope and pray that they may be strengthened by their trust in the Almighty to bear their irreparable loss with courage, resignation and fortitude.

And may our beloved Eddie Popp find eternal rest and peace in his heavenly home.

Reverend Davis' tribute follows:

One of the first stories we were ever taught from the Bible was the story of Moses and the burning bush. Here was a man who was dutifully engaged tending the flocks of his father-in-law on a mountain side when his attention was suddenly arrested by an unusual spectacle; the spectacle of a flaming bush. The most unusual aspect of the phenomenon was the fact that while it was indeed on fire, it was not consumed. It did not burn up. So, we are told, Moses turned aside to see why the bush was not consumed. It took an unusual event to cause Moses to turn away from his routine duty, but the burning bush was sufficiently unusual to do it.

The tempo of our world is much faster than that in which Moses lived. Furthermore, few of us are engaged in as peaceful a pursuit as was Moses. We still have the same capacity for curiosity at the unusual, but so many unpredictable things have happened in our century on both a small and large scale, that nothing seems very unusual, and there isn't much that makes us turn aside from what we do day to day. When we do turn aside, it is a matter of twisting a dial and listening to a broadcast or a telecast for 5 minutes or so to catch up on the latest unpredictable but not unusual events around the world.

There is still one event, however, that makes us turn aside from everything which is routine and gaze into the mysteries of the unknown. This is death. Death is not unusual as a general human experience, but it happens only once to each of us, and none of us escapes, and it is often unpredictable, and never precisely predictable.

Sometimes death is like a streak of lightning which comes knifing its way down from the upper air without warning and strikes an object with its devastating power, so near us as to shock us even to the point of making us tremble. This was the nature of death's approach to those who were engaged with Ed Popp in the handling of the U.S. mail which came into the town of Bolton last Saturday morning. He came to work with usual punctuality and vigor. He had always exuded strength and vitality. His disciplined body and clear mind marked him off as one of great strength; of body, mind, and will. Nobody was ever impelled to think of him and death at the same time. But the lightning struck, and much to the consternation of those around him, he was seized by death's advance agent—pain—and within a matter of an hour, death had claimed him.

So we, like Moses, have turned aside to contemplate what has happened. A happy marital voyage has been terminated; a small community has lost a strong citizen; a congenial group of postal workers has lost the companionship of a stimulating personality; a fraternal order has lost a faithful brother, and a host of people have lost a friend.

There is nothing we can do about it. It is an accomplished fact in the cosmic scheme of things which cannot be undone, or recalled. Here is something which modern man in all his wisdom has to confront with all the cards stacked against him, man may reach for the moon and make it, but when death stalks a town and reaches for one of its number we must all stand to one side and accept it. But we can think; we can ponder; we can wonder, and we should.

The vacancy left by the departure of a person can never be filled, no matter who he may be. There is only one of each of us. But it is permissible to seek for compensatory reflections and in this case there are many. His suffering, as he passed through the gate was reduced to the minimum. His widow will not be left in want. The memories of those who loved him can never be destroyed. His name is not yoked with dishonor.

But there is something yet more wonderful to think upon. The God who took him is the God of life and love. Death is the human term for God's mechanism of transfer. A man who lived fully, happily, and well, has vacated his earthly tenement and has taken a mysterious journey to an unknown country. But he is in the care of the Eternal Shepherd who will some day come our way, and take us by the hand and lead us through the wilderness of death to the sunlit areas of a larger life.

We share the sorrow of his loved ones, but both they and we must carry on, doing the things we are assigned to do, with the faithfulness and the efficiency so characteristic of Ed Popp, buoyed and strengthened by the faith that though life may be a transient thing here, it is as permanent in the geography of God's kingdom as the life of God Himself.

Alas for him who never sees
The stars shine through his cypress trees;
Who hopeless lays his dead away
And never sees the breaking day
Across the mournful marble play.
Who hath not learned in hours of faith
That truth to sense and flesh unknown,
That life is ever Lord of death,
And love can never lose its own.

U.S. Coast Guard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the East Side News, a publication with wide circulation in the congressional district, which I have the honor to represent, commemorating the 170th anniversary of the founding of the U.S. Coast Guard:

HAIL TO THE U.S. COAST GUARD
(By Harry H. Schlacht)

"So here's the Coast Guard battle song.
We fight on land and sea
Through howling gale and shot and shell
To win our victory.

"Semper Paratus is our guide,
Our pledge, our motto, too.
We're always ready, to do or die.
Aye! Coast Guard, we fight for you.

"Aye, we're been always ready
To do, fight or die,
Write glory to the shield we wear
In letters to the sky.

"To sink the foe or save the maimed
Our mission and our pride.
We'll carry on 'til kingdom come
Ideals for which we've died.

"From North and South and East and West
The Coast Guard is in the fight
Busting subs and landing troops
The Axis feels our might.

"For we're the first invaders
On every fighting field,
From Arctic zone to tropic shore
You'll find our silver shield.

"So here's the Coast Guard marching song,
Through surf and storm and howling gale,
High shall our purpose be.

"Semper Paratus is our guide,
Our fame, our glory, too.
To fight, to save or fight and die.
Aye! Coast Guard, we are for you."

This week America salutes the U.S. Coast Guard. We commemorate the 170th anniversary of its founding by Alexander Hamilton, our first Secretary of Treasury. The U.S. Coast Guard serves in times of peace under the Treasury Department, and in time of war as part of the U.S. Navy.

We congratulate the wearers of the silver shield. We celebrate their gallant record in the service of our country. We are eternally grateful, for America is a monument to their eternal spirit.

The Coast Guard was born at the birth of our Nation. It was nursed in the arms of lovers of Liberty. It was destined to play a brilliant role in our history.

The Coast Guard's endurance has been tested by suffering and hardship. Its patriotic self-sacrifice has reached its noblest manifestation. Its historic road has been marked with great and gallant milestones in the cause of our Nation. Its patriotism is the most beautiful picture that hangs in the galleries of our memories.

The Coast Guard has been endowed with a glorious tradition. It is an epic of adventure and drama of the sea. It has a unique record of selflessness. It has served with distinction, in peace and war, all humanity.

The Coast Guard has played a valiant role in the wars of our country. It has been the emergency arm of the Navy. It has participated in all the landings—in the Pacific from Guadalcanal to Okinawa, in Africa, Sicily, Italy, and Normandy.

Heroes and heroines of humanity, guardians of the sea, you have never failed to inspire us. You have served America nobly.

What are the stirring words of the Coast Guard marching song? It is "Semper Paratus"—"Always Ready." It is their official anthem. It is known 'round the world.

It was composed by Capt. Francis S. Van Boskerck, U.S.C.G. It captures all the glory, honor, and tradition of the service. It speaks of the ideals and heritage for which every guardsman lives and fights, to make men free.

U.S. Coast Guard: America marches forward with thee under the inspiration of your marching melody, on this, your glorious anniversary, guided by freedom's holy light for a nobler humanity.

Monuments of stone and bronze will be erected to perpetuate your valorous deeds to humanity. But after the last of these shall have crumpled into dust and eroded to nothingness, your contributions to mankind will remain imperishables as long as men love liberty.

Joyce Epic on the Great Bill Cunningham

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include therein a very touching and impressive poem entitled, "Coronach for Bill Cunningham," by the great American writer and newspaperman, my esteemed and dear friend, Patrick Joyce, of the knowledgeable Chicago newspaper, Southtown Economist.

It is appropriate indeed that Mr. Joyce's gifted pen should write this real epic honoring the great and beloved Bill Cunningham, who left us all a precious legacy of Americanism, achievement, and courage:

CORONACH FOR BILL CUNNINGHAM
(By Patrick Joyce)

Blow softly, bugles, now, blow soft and low.
Blow for the tears they feel but cannot show.
Blow for the stalwart men who cannot weep
For one they loved called to eternal sleep.
Bugles that blew when life was young and strong
Loud notes and clear as for a battle song,
Blaring the brazen challenge of the brave:
Blow softly now your tears across his grave.
Blow softly, bugles, for his voice is stilled
Whose trumpet tones rang of the strong and skilled.
Men of high heart who found upon a field
Measure of a manhood nothing else could yield.
Blow softly, softly, bugles, soft and low,
For he has gone the road all men must go.
Herald of heroes, bravest of the brave:
Blow softly now your tears across his grave.

The Consumer Always Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert an editorial from the Peoria Journal Star of August 19, 1960:

THE CONSUMER ALWAYS PAYS

The gasoline industry published an ad recently pointing out that the tax you pay on 10 gallons of gas is 90 cents, that gas taxes are in fact a 50 percent sales tax, and that this is more tax than is charged on a mink coat or other luxuries.

For the average person, they point out, this means $70 a year paid in gas taxes alone—and they protest that they are tired of collecting taxes for the Government when they feel the tax is far too high.

Bravo.

This is only one such item.

The plain fact is that the greatest standing trick of modern government is to invent taxes that are collected by somebody else—thus the middleman can take the public dissatisfaction and the politician who is responsible for the abuse can dodge while grabbing credit for the programs for which the money is spent.

Every sensible man knows, of course, that every tax is paid by Mr. Average Man, the consumer, and the notion that it is being paid by some company or corporation or other middleman is purely a political bit of slight of hand, and pure nonsense.

Every tax on business is simply added to the total cost of doing business and hence by the simple laws of economics is forced to be a part of the pricing structure of that business whether it be selling Caterpillar tractors or penny matchboxes.

The tax money added to costs is simply money that either cannot be paid out in wages or that must be brought in by higher prices.

Excise taxes are a prime example. Franchise taxes are another. Every spending spree, no matter how it is billed, winds up coming out of the pockets of the consumers of the Nation—all of us.

Sales tax is simply more direct and honest than others in this regard, and that was a political accident. The politicians expected taxes to be figured into price and not charged separately. It made no difference in the cash loss to you, but they preferred that you did not realize it was for them.

We need to quit falling for trick taxes and start worrying about the real source of trouble—irresponsible spending.

As it stands, the tragic fact is that public resistance centers on direct taxes—the least offender of all—and cripples the most important basic functions of government and those most intimate. Schools, law enforcement, fire protection, and sewage sanitation do not keep pace with modern needs, while a variety of hair-brained schemes aimed at vote catching are financed by millions and billions sneaked out of our pocketbooks by trickery.

When they get done with the inroads on take-home pay and direct taxes, they've only started. Then come the real thieves of buying power.

Every time you wonder, "Where did the money go?" take time to answer the question. It went, usually, in a very large part to those twin thieves of inflation and indirect taxes.

C. L. DANCEY.

Robert H. Goddard: First Great Wayfarer on the Fateful Seas of Space

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD some biographical data concerning the great pioneer rocket scientist and inventor, that illustrious man of genius, Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard.

This data which was prepared in part by his loving wife, Mrs. Esther C. Goddard of Worcester, Mass., is a statement in tabular form of his experiences and explorations. It supplements some of the material appearing in previous addresses which I have made regarding Dr. Goddard and the epochal significance of his illustrious career.

Perhaps because of her closeness to this great man, Mrs. Goddard has been pardonably modest and humble about his exploits. Since I am under no restraint in this direction but am merely interested in presenting the facts I desire once again to hail and salute this first of all real space adventurers who blazed a trail that will lead to the planets and wend its spatial way as the beacon light of civilization in the ages to come.

Not long ago, the Congress passed the bill which I introduced providing for the striking of a gold medal in honor of this great scientific explorer. The design of the medal has been completed and the medal itself will shortly be finished. I am hoping sincerely that it can be arranged to have the President present this medal to his wife, Mrs. Goddard, who was so much a part of his great work, and I hope that suitable exercises can be arranged as an additional mark of honor to the great Dr. Goddard.

The country has alas all too long ignored and overlooked the ageless and

vital contributions of the great American, Robert H. Goddard. It is greatly to be deplored that there has been such ghastly failure on the part of American officialdom and particularly American service officialdom to realize the true meaning of his experiments and thus implement them for the benefit of our national defense as well as for space exploration. At last the country is waking up to Professor Goddard's greatness and the least we can do is to admit our mistakes in not recognizing him before as we move to pay fitting tribute and honor to this first great wayfarer on the fateful seas of space.

The bigraphical data follow:

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA ON DR. ROBERT HUTCHINGS GODDARD, AMERICAN PHYSICIST, PIONEER OF MODERN ROCKETRY AND SPACE FLIGHT (1882–1945)

Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, American physicist and engineer, was the pioneer scientist and engineer who laid down the technical foundations for most of today's prodigious developments in long-range rockets, missiles, earth satellites, and space flight. He founded a whole new field of science and engineering, now grown into a multibillion-dollar industry.

In th course of his pioneering work, Dr. Goddard—

1. Was first to develop a rocket motor using liquid propellants (liquid oxygen and gasoline) (1920–25).

2. Was first to develop and launch a liquid-fuel rocket (March 16, 1926, at Auburn, Mass.).

3. Was first to launching a liquid-fuel rocket which attained a speed greater than that of sound (mach 1) (1935, near Roswell, N. Mex.).

4. First developed gyro stabilization apparatus for rockets (1932).

5. First used deflector vanes in the blast of the rocket motor as a method of stabilizing and guiding rockets (1932).

6. Received the first U.S. patent on the idea of multistage rockets (1914).

7. First explored mathematically the practicality of using rocket power to reach high altitudes and escape velocity (1912).

8. Was first to publish in the United States a basic mathematical theory underlying rocket propulsion and rocket flight (1919).

9. First proved experimentally that a rocket will provide thrust in a vacuum (1915).

10. Developed and demonstrated the basic idea of the bazooka during World War I (1918), though his plans lay unused in the U.S. Army files until they were put to use in World War II.

11. First developed pumps suitable for rocket fuels, self-cooling rocket motors, variable-thrust rocket motors, practical rocket landing devices, and forecast jet-driven airplanes, rocket-borne mail and express, and travel in space.

At his rocket proving range near Roswell, N. Mex., Dr. Goddard developed during the 1930's large and successful rockets which anticipated many features of the later German V–2 rockets, including gyroscopic control, steering by means of vanes in the jet stream of the rocket motor, gimbal-steering, power-driven propellant pumps and other devices.

A crowning irony is that if his countrymen had listened to Dr. Goddard, the United States today would be far ahead of its present position in the international space race. There might, in fact, have been no race. Several times in his career, and especially in 1940, he tried to interest our Armed Forces in the potential of rockets, but met only with courteous inaction.

Dr. Goddard began his pioneer experiments in rocketry long before other scientists or engineers in the United States or Europe had perceived the full value and promise of the rocket. He continued until his death in 1945, at which time he was engaged in developing jet-assisted takeoff and variable thrust liquid propellant rocket motors for the U.S. Navy.

Dr. Goddard was born in Worcester, Mass., on October 5, 1882. He was graduated from Worcester Polytechnic Institute in 1908. Upon graduation he obtained a position as an instructor of physics at W.P.I., and at the same time began graduate work at Clark University. He received his M.A. from Clark in 1910, his Ph. D. in 1911. He was a research fellow in physics at Princeton University in 1912–13, and the following year joined the faculty of Clark University, where he became a full professor in 1919.

He began his interest in rockets at the age of 17, in 1899. As early as 1908 he carried out static tests with small solid-fuel rockets at Worcester Polytechnic Institute. In 1912 he worked out the detailed mathematical theory of rocket propulsion, and showed that the rocket, because it needs no air to push against, could be sent to the moon or into space, provided an efficient motor could be developed.

Upon returning to Clark University in 1914, he began to experiment with larger rockets. By 1916, he had reached the limit of what he could do on his own resources. The Smithsonian Institution came to his aid, and with this help he was able not only to continue his work on solid-propellant rockets, but to begin the development of liquid-propellant rockets as well.

After the entry of the United States into the first World War in 1917, Dr. Goddard volunteered his services to the Nation, and was set by the U.S. Signal Corps to the task of exploring the military possibilities of rockets.

He succeeded in developing several types of solid-propellent rockets intended to be fired at tanks or other military objectives, from a launching tube held in the hands or steadied by two short legs—devices similar in many respects to the bazooka of World War II. These developments he successfully demonstrated at Aberdeen Proving Grounds a few days before the close of the First World War. They were the basis of the great U.S. developments in solid-propellent rockets in the Second World War.

In 1919 he summarized his mathematical explorations, the results of his solid propellent research, and some of his space flight ideas, in a classic paper entitled "A Method of Reaching Extreme Altitudes," published by the Smithsonian Institution. That paper today is one of the basic documents in technical rocket and jet propulsion literature, and the source of numerous developments that have come about since its appearance.

In the following two decades he produced a number of large liquid-propellent rockets at his shop and rocket range at Roswell, N. Mex. These rockets are now in the National Air Museum, Washington, D.C. Other early components are displayed at the museum at Roswell, N. Mex.

This research work was made possible by financial assistance from the Smithsonian Institution, Daniel Guggenheim, and the Daniel and Florence Guggenheim Foundation. In the mid–1930's he reported on the progress of his liquid propellent work in "Liquid Propellant Rocket Development," published by the Smithsonian Institution in 1936. The work in New Mexico was described in further detail in 1948 in a book edited posthumously from Dr. Goddard's notes, and published by Prentice-Hall, Inc., under the title "Rocket Development."

He again offered his services in the Second World War, and was assigned by the U.S. Navy to the development of practical jet-assisted takeoff, and liquid propellent rocket motors capable of variable thrust. In both areas he was successful, and demonstrated the resulting devices in tests at Annapolis. The work continued until his death in 1945.

Dr. Goddard was the first modern scientist who both perceived the possibilities of rockets and space flight, and undertook the enormous work of bringing them to practical realization. He lived to see his dream of rocket power come to fruition. His idea of the ultimate in rocket development—flight into space—has now become a reality. His contributions are recognized as among the most important technical achievements of modern times, marking as they do a turning point in the history of mankind.

Medical Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Insurance Newsletter of August 8, editor, Mr. Al Goldsmith, are my remarks on the outlook for medical-care-for-the-aged legislation in the rump session of this Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this portion of Mr. Goldsmith's newsletter:

OUTLOOK FOR MEDICAL CARE FOR THE AGED LEGISLATION OF THE RUMP SESSION OF THE 86TH CONGRESS

(By Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri)

There is the usual flurry of predictions of what the Congress will do about health care for the aged when it reconvenes for its August rump session. They do not vary greatly from the predictions that were extant during the months of April, May, and June.

There is nothing fundamental about these predictions because they are all based upon a cynical approach to the subject. The presumption is that the entire matter will be decided upon the basis of what will get the most votes in the November election. The question of what might be best for the aged, their families, and our society as a whole does not enter into the discussions.

There is no question that some politicians in both political parties are treating the matter of health care for the aged in this fashion. Nonetheless, this is not the complete story.

There is a strong body of political opinion in both political parties that the question of health care for the aged should be decided upon what is best for the aged and our society as a whole, and not upon momentary political advantage.

Nor does this approach stem from a group of legislators who have taken a stand-pat position on the problems of the aged or, indeed, on the problems of our people in any area, in the past. It is headed by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Social Security Subcommittee of the House Ways and Means Committee. They believe that nothing should be done in this area in 1960.

Here are the background facts about the 1960 amendments to the Social Security Act which passed the House before the July recess and included a program of increased Federal participation in health care for the aged.

In the fall of 1959, the Social Security Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee held extensive public hearings on the subject of proposed amendments to the Social Security Act. This subcommittee went into the whole broad field of social security except for one specific area, health care for the aged.

The reason this area was set aside was because the Congress, in 1958, passed the Fogarty resolution requiring the executive branch of the Government to conduct extensive studies into the entire field of the problems of the aged. Under the resolution, the White House Conference for the Aging had been set up and its work scheduled, with a conference to consider these studies and make recommendations for courses of action to be held in January 1961.

The Social Security Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee made a unanimous report to the Ways and Means Committee, based upon its studies. In conjunction with the unanimous report, a bill was introduced by the chairman of the subcommitte which embodied the recommendations of the subcommittee for extensive and broad amendments to the Social Security Act. These amendments correct many inequities, liberalize and extend many of the programs, and improve their administration.

The full Ways and Means Committee held executive sessions on the subcommittee's report and bill and, within a week or 10 days, had agreed to almost every proposal. There were some additional proposals made for amending the act which met with the unanimous approval of the subcommittee and the full committee. The subcommittee's work and its additional proposals became the basis of H.R. 12580.

At this point, however, the highly controversial subject of health care for the aged was injected into the full committee's executive sessions. It was the view of the majority of the committee that the subject of health care for the aged should not be interjected into the comprehensive bill for social security amendments which had received unanimous approval.

However, due to pressures from outside the committee proceeded without the benefit of public hearings in executive session to consider various proposals for health care for the aged.

The Forand bill, as one proposal in this area, was early rejected by a vote of 17 to 8. It was rejected by the same vote several times later in the executive sessions. Other proposals, including the one finally recommended by the administration, were likewise voted down from time to time.

Throughout these executive sessions, which lasted almost 3 months, not one witness outside the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was called to give the committee information, on any phase of the subject. Time and again, the witnesses for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare admitted that they just did not have the data or information requested by members of the committee relating to the points under consideration. Time and again, requests were made by members of the committee to obtain additional information, much of which was available.

It was quite clear throughout these executive sessions that the real question was not what program might be good for the aged and our society, but rather, what the political heat would be if this or that bill on health care for the aged were passed out, or no bill at all.

In other words, this performance was not one of a legislative committee at work. It was an example of legislating under outside pressures based upon ignorance, not knowledge.

Who indeed can predict what a servile Congress will do? One which does not base its decisions upon committee studies, public hearings, honest executive sessions, honest committee reports and forthright debate on the floor of the House and Senate, but rather, upon outside pressures?

There is no point to go to the legislators and the legislative halls to make predictions of what such legislative bodies will or will not do. Go to the source, to those who are wielding the political pressures to find out what decisions they have made.

Will the Senate of the United States pass out without hearings or study or meaningful debate a health care for the aged bill tied to the social security "insurance" system?

Will the House conferees accept the Senate version?

Then the question becomes, Will the President veto the bill containing all the good and the unanimously approved amendments to the Social Security program, in order to block the ill-conceived health care for the aged features in the bill?

Will the decision be made upon the impact on the coming election or upon the balanced consideration of what is best for our people?

We reached a point of servility in the Congress of the United States on several issues in 1960, not just the issue of health care for the aged. Once it is established that votes can be bought for daily bread in a society, and the power of those legislators who wish to preserve an independent Congress is insufficient to stand against this protestation, the day of the Caesars cannot be far away.

Vice President Nixon's Acceptance Speech in Chicago on July 28, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in extension of my remarks I include the outstanding acceptance speech of Vice President NIXON at the Republican Convention in Chicago:

Mr. Chairman, delegates to this convention, my fellow Americans, I have made many speeches in my life, and never have I found it more difficult to find the words adequate to express what I feel, as I find them tonight.

To stand here before this great convention, to hear your expression of affection for me, for Pat, for our daughters, for my mother, for all of us who are representing our party, is, of course, the greatest moment of my life.

And I just want you to know that my only prayer as I stand here is that in the months ahead I may be in some way worthy of the affection and the trust which you have presented to me on this occasion, in everything that I say, in everything that I do, in everything that I think in this campaign and afterwards.

PROUD OF PARTY

May I also say that I have been wanting to come to this convention, but because of the protocol that makes it necessary for a candidate not to attend the convention until the nominations are over, I have had to watch it on television. And I want all of you to know that I have never been so proud of my party as I have been in these last 3 days as I compared this convention, the conduct of our delegates and our speakers, with what went on in my native State of California, just 2 weeks ago. I congratulate Chairman HALLECK and Chairman MORTON and all of those who have helped to make this convention one that will stand in the annals of our party forever as one of the finest we have ever held.

Have you ever stopped to think of the memories you will take away from this convention? The things that run through my mind are these: That first day, with the magnificent speeches—Mr. Hoover with his great lessons for the American people; WALTER JUDD, with one of the most outstanding keynote addresses in either party in history and last night our beloved, fighting President, making the greatest speech I ever heard him make, before this convention.

Your platform and its magnificent presentation by Chuck Percy, the chairman. For these and for so many other things I want to congratulate you tonight and to thank you from the bottom of my heart and on behalf of Americans—not just Republicans, but Americans—everywhere for making us proud of our country and of our two-party system for what you have done.

WORLD STATESMAN

Tonight, too, I particularly want to thank this convention for nominating as my running mate a world statesman of the first rank, my friend and colleague, Henry Cabot Lodge of Massachusetts. In refreshing contrast to what happened in Los Angeles you nominated a man who shares my views on the great issues and who will work with me and not against me in carrying out our magnificent platform.

And, may I say that during this week we Republicans with strong convictions about our party and about our country had our differences—but as the speech by Senator GOLDWATER indicated yesterday, and the elegant and gracious remarks of my friend, Nelson Rockefeller, indicated tonight, we know that the differences that divided us were infinitesimal compared to the gulf between us and what the Democrats would put upon us as a result of what they did at Los Angeles during their convention 2 weeks ago.

It was only 8 years ago that I stood in this very place after you had nominated as our candidate for the President one of the great men of our century; and I say to you tonight that for generations to come Americans, regardless of party, will gratefully remember Dwight Eisenhower as the man who brought peace to America, as the man under whose leadership Americans enjoyed the greatest progress and prosperity in history. Above all, they will remember him as the man who restored honesty, integrity and dignity to the conduct of Government in the highest office of this land.

NEW PROBLEMS

And, my fellow Americans, I know now that you will understand what I am about to say, because the next President of the United States will have Dwight Eisenhower's great example to follow in confronting new and challenging world problems of utmost gravity. This truly is the time for greatness in America's leadership.

I am sure you will understand why I do not say tonight that I alone am the man who can furnish that leadership. That question is not for me to decide, but for you—and I only ask that the thousands in this hall and the millions listening to me on television make that decision in the most thoughtful way you possibly can, because what you decide this November will not only affect your lives and your future, it will affect the future of millions throughout the world. I urge you to study the records of the candidates, to listen to my speeches and my opponent's and Mr. Lodge's and his opponent's, and then, after you have studied our records and listened to our speeches, decide. Decide on the basis of what we say and what we believe who is best qualified to lead America and the free world in this critical period.

To help you make this decision I would like to discuss tonight some of the great problems which will confront the next President of the United States and the policies that I believe should be adopted to meet them.

QUESTION OF SURVIVAL

One hundred years ago, in this very city, Abraham Lincoln was nominated for President of the United States. The problems which will confront our next President will be even greater than those that confronted Lincoln. The question then was freedom for the slaves and survival of the Nation. The question now is freedom for all mankind and the survival of civilizations, and the choice that each of you listening to me makes this November can affect the answer to that question.

What should your choice be? Well, let us first examine what our opponents offered in Los Angeles 2 weeks ago. They claimed theirs was a new program, but you know what it was. It was simply the same old proposition that a political party should be all things to all men, and nothing more than that, and they promised everything to everybody with one exception: they didn't promise to pay the bill.

And I say tonight that with their convention, their platform, and their ticket, they composed a symphony of political cynicism which is out of harmony with our times today.

DISASTROUS PROGRAM

Now, we come to the key question, What should our answer be? And some might say to do as they do—out-promise them because that is the only way to win. And I want to tell you my answer. I happen to believe that their program would be disastrous for America, that it would wreck our economy, and that it would dash our people's high hopes for a better life. And I serve notice here and now that whatever the political consequences, we are not going to try to out-promise our opponents in this campaign.

We are not going to make promises we cannot and should not keep, and we are not going to try to buy the people's votes with their own money. And to those who say that this position will mean political defeat, my answer is this: We have more faith than that in the good sense of the American people, provided the people know the facts, and here is where we come in.

I pledge to you tonight that we will bring the facts home to the American people, and we will do it with a campaign such as this country has never seen before.

I have been asked all week long by the newsmen sitting on my right and left, "When is this campaign going to begin, Mr. Vice President? On Labor Day or one of the other traditional starting dates?" And this is my answer: This campaign begins tonight, here and now, and this campaign will continue from now until November 8 without any letup.

CAMPAIGN EVERYWHERE

I have also been asked by my friends in the press, "Mr. Vice President, where are you going to concentrate? What States are you going to visit?" And this is my answer: In this campaign we are going to take no States for granted, and we are not going to concede any States to the opposition.

I announce to you tonight, and I pledge to you, that I personally will carry this campaign into every one of the 50 States of this Nation between now and November 8. And in this campaign I make a prediction—I say that just as in 1952 and 1956 millions of Democrats will join us, not because they are deserting their party, but because their party deserted them at Los Angeles 2 weeks ago.

Now, I have suggested to you what our friends of the opposition offered to the American people. What do we offer? First, we are proud to offer the best 8-year record of any administration in the history of this country. But, my fellow Americans, that isn't all and that isn't enough, because we happen to believe that a record is not something to stand on, but something to build on; and in building on the record of this administration we shall build a better America, we shall build an America in which we shall see the realization of the dreams of millions of people not only in America but throughout the world for a fuller, freer, richer life than men have ever known in the history of mankind.

Let me tell you something of the goals of this better America toward which we will strive. In this America, our older citizens shall not only have adequate protection against the hazards of ill health, but a greater opportunity to lead a useful and productive life by participating to the extent they are able in the Nation's exciting work rather than sitting on the sidelines. And in the better America, young Americans shall not only have the best basic education in America, but every boy and girl of ability, regardless of his financial circumstances, shall have the opportunity to develop his intellectual capabilities to the full. Our wage earners shall enjoy increasingly higher wages in honest dollars, with better protection against the hazards of unemployment and old age. And, for those millions of Americans who are still denied equality of rights and opportunity, I say there shall be the greatest progress in human rights since the days of Lincoln 100 years ago.

WILL HELP FARMERS

And America's farmers, to whose hard work and almost incredible efficiency we owe the fact that we are the best fed, best clothed people in the world, I say America's farmers must and will receive what they do not have today, and what they deserve—a fair share of America's ever-increasing prosperity. To accomplish these things we will develop to the full the untapped natural resources, our water, our minerals, our power with which we are so fortunate to be blessed in this rich land of ours. And we shall provide for our scientists the support they need for the research that will open exciting new highways into a future in which we shall have progress which we cannot even dream of today. Above all, in this decade of decision and progress we will witness the continued revitalization of America's moral and spiritual strength, with a renewed faith in the eternal ideals of freedom and justice under God which are our priceless heritage as a people.

Now, I am sure that many of you in this hall, and many of you watching on television, might well ask, "But Mr. NIXON, don't our opponents favor just such goals as this?" And my answer is, Yes, of course. All Americans regardless of party want a better life for our people. What is the difference then? I will tell you what it is. The difference is in the way we propose to reach these goals, and the record shows that our way works and theirs doesn't and we are going to prove it in this campaign.

We produce on the promises that they make. We succeed where they fail.

Do you know why? Because, as Governor Rockefeller said in his remarks, we put our primary reliance not upon government but upon people for progress in America. That is why we will succeed.

We must never forget that the strength of America is not in its Government, but in its people. And we say tonight there is no limit to the goals America can reach, provided we stay true to the great American traditions.

GOVERNMENT HAS ROLE

A government has a role, and a very important one, but the role of government is not to take responsibility from people, but to put responsibility on them. It is not to dictate to people, but to encourage and stimulate the creative productivity of 180 million free Americans. That is the way to progress in America.

In other words, we have faith in the people, and because our programs for progress are based on that faith, we shall succeed where our opponents will fail, in building the better America that I have described.

But if these goals are to be reached, the next President of the United States must have the wisdom to choose between the things government should and should not do. He must have the courage to stand against the pressures of the few for the good of the many. And he must have the vision to press forward on all fronts for the better life our people want.

Now, I have spoken to you of the responsibilities of our next President at home. Those which he will face abroad will be infinitely greater. But before I look to the future, let me say a word about the past.

At Los Angeles 2 weeks ago, we heard the United States, our Government, blamed for Mr. Khrushchev's sabotage of the Paris Conference. We heard the United States blamed for the actions of Communist-led mobs in Caracas and Tokyo. We heard that American education and American scientists are inferior. We heard that America militarily and economically is a second-rate country We heard that American prestige is at an alltime low.

This is my answer: I say that at a time the Communists are running us down abroad, it is time to speak up for America at home.

CRITICISM ESSENTIAL

And my friends, let us recognize that America has its weaknesses, and constructive criticism of those weaknesses is essential—essential so that we can correct our weaknesses in the best traditions of our democratic process.

But let us also recognize this: While it is dangerous to see nothing wrong in America, it is just as wrong to refuse to recognize what is right about America.

And tonight I say to you no criticism should be allowed to obscure the truth either at home or abroad that today America is the strongest nation militarily, economically, ideologically in the world; and we have the will and the stamina and the resources to maintain that strength in the years ahead.

Now, turning to the future. We must recognize that the foreign policy problems of the 1960's will be different and they will be vastly more difficult than those of the 1950's through which we have just passed.

We are in a race tonight, my fellow Americans, a race for survival in which our lives, our fortunes, our liberties are at stake. We are ahead now, but the only way to stay ahead in a race is to move ahead; and the next President will make decisions which will determine whether we win or whether we lose this race.

What must he do? These things I believe: he must resolve first and above all that the United States must never settle for second best in anything.

Let us look at the specifics. Militarily, the security of the United States must be put before all other considerations. Why? Not only because this is necessary to deter aggression, but becaues we must make sure that we are never in a poistion at the conference table where Mr. Khrushchev or his successor is able to coerce an American President because of his strength and our weakness.

MUST BE FIRM

Diplomatically, let us look at what the problem is. Diplomatically, our next President must be firm—firm on principles; but he must never be belligerent, he must never

engage in a war of words which might heat up the international climate to the igniting point of nuclear catastrophe.

But while he must never answer insults in kind, he must leave no doubt at any time that in Berlin or in Cuba or anywhere else in the world, America will not tolerate being pushed around by anybody, because we have already paid a terrible price in lives and resources to learn that appeasement leads not to peace but to war. It will indeed take great leadership to steer us through these years, avoiding the extremes of belligerency on the one hand, and appeasement on the other.

Now, Mr. KENNEDY has suggested that what the world needs is young leadership; and, understandably this has great appeal, because it is true that youth does bring boldness and imagination and drive to leadership, and we need all those things. But I think most people will agree with me tonight when I say that President De Gaulle, Prime Minister Macmillan, and Chancellor Adenauer may not be young men—but we are indeed fortunate in that we have their wisdom and their experience and their courage on our side in the struggle for freedom today in the world.

And I might suggest that as we consider the relative merits of youth and age it is only fair to point out that it was not Mr. De Gaulle or Mr. Macmillan, Mr. Adenauer, but Mr. KENNEDY who made the rash and impulsive suggestion that President Eisenhower could have apologized or sent regrets to Mr. Khrushchev for the U–2 flights which the President had ordered to save our country from surprise attack.

But formidable as will be the diplomatic and military problems confronting the next President, far more difficult and critical will be the decisions he must make to meet and defeat the enemies of freedom in an entirely different kind of struggle. And here I want to speak to you of another kind of aggression, aggression without war, where the aggressor comes not as a conqueror, but as a champion of peace, of freedom, offering progress and plenty and hope to the unfortunates of the earth.

A DIFFICULT ASSIGNMENT

I say tonight that the major problem confronting the next President of the United States will be to inform the people of the character of this kind of aggression, to arouse the people to the mortal danger it presents, and to inspire the people to meet that danger. And he must develop a brand-new strategy which will win the battle for freedom for all men and win it without a war. That is the great task of the next President of the United States. And this will be a difficult task, difficult because at times our next President must tell the people, not what they want to hear, but what they need to hear. Why, for example, it may be just as essential to the national interest to build a dam in India as in California.

It will be difficult, too, because, you know, we Americans have always been able to see and understand the danger presented by missiles and airplanes and bombs; but we have found it hard to recognize the even more deadly danger of the propaganda that warps the mind, the economic offensive that softens a nation, the subversion that destroys the will of a people to resist tyranny.

And yet, I say tonight that while this threat is, as I believe it to be, the greatest danger we have ever confronted, this is no reason for lack of confidence in the outcome.

Do you know why? Because there is one great theme that runs through our history as a Nation: "Americans are always at their best when the challenge is greatest."

And I say tonight that we Americans shall rise to our greatest heights in this decade of the sixties as we mount the offensive to meet those forces which threaten the peace and the rights of freemen everywhere.

But there are some things we can do and some things we must do, and I would like to list them for you tonight:

First, we must take the necessary steps which will assure that the American economy grows at a maximum rate so that we can maintain our present massive lead over the Communist bloc. How do we do this? There isn't any magic formula by which government in a free nation can bring this about. The way to assure maximum growth in America is not by expanding the functions of government, but by increasing the opportunities for investment and creative enterprise for millions of individual Americans.

WON'T TURN TOWARD REDS

And at a time when the Communists have found it necessary to turn to decentralization of their economy and to turn to the use of individual incentives to increase productivity—at a time, in other words, when they are turning our way—I say we must and we will not make the mistake of turning their way.

There is another step that we must take: our Government activities must be reorganized, reorganized to take the initiative from the Communists and to develop and carry out a worldwide strategy and offensive for peace and freedom.

The complex of agencies which have grown up through the years for exchange of persons, for technical assistance, for information, for loans and grants—all these must be welded together into one powerful economic and ideological striking force under the direct supervision and leadership of the United States.

Because what we must do, you see, is to wage the battles for peace and freedom with the same unified direction and dedication with which we wage battles in war. And if these activities are to succeed, we must develop a better training program for the men and women who will represent our country at home and abroad. What we need are men with a broad knowledge of the intricacies and techniques of the strategies of the Communists, with the keen knowledge of the great principles for which free people stand, and, above all, men who with a zeal and dedication which the Communists cannot match will outthink, outwork and outlast the enemies of freedom wherever they meet them anywhere in the world. This is the kind of men we must train.

NEED ALL FREE PEOPLE

And we must recognize that government cannot do this job alone. The most effective proponents of freedom are not governments, but free people; and this means that every American—every one of you listening tonight—who works or travels abroad, must represent his country at its best in everything that he does.

The United States, big as it is, strong as it is, cannot do this job alone. The best brains, the fullest resources of free nations, which have as great a stake in freedom as we have, must be mobilized to participate with us in this task to the extent they are able.

But do you know what is most important of all? Above all, we must recognize that the greatest economic strength that we can imagine, and the finest government organization—all this will fail if we are not united and inspired by a great idea, an idea which will be a battle cry for a grand offensive to win the minds and the hearts and the souls of men. Do we have such an idea?

The Communists proclaim over and over again that their aim is the victory of communism throughout the world. It is not enough for us to reply that our aim is to contain communism, to defend the free world against communism, to hold the line against communism; the only answer to a strategy of victory for the Communist world is a strategy of victory for the free world.

But let the victory we seek be not victory over any other nation or any other people. Let it be the victory of freedom over tyranny, of plenty over hunger, of health over disease, in every country of the world.

When Mr. Khrushchev says our grandchildren will live under communism, let us say his grandchildren will live in freedom. When Mr. Khrushchev says the Monroe Doctrine is dead in the Americas, we say the doctrine of freedom applies everywhere in the world.

WELCOME CHALLENGE

And I say tonight let us welcome Mr. Khrushchev's challenge to peaceful competition of our systems; but let us reply, "Let us compete in the Communist world as well as in the free world," because Communist dictators must not be allowed the privileged sanctuary from which to launch their guerilla attacks on the citadels of freedom.

And, we say further, extend this competition, extend it to include not only food and factories as he has suggested but extend it to include the great spiritual and moral values which characterize our civilization.

Also, my friends, let us welcome the challenge, not be disconcerted by it nor fail to meet it, but welcome the challenge presented by the revolution of peaceful peoples' aspirations in South America, in Africa.

We cannot fail in this mission. We cannot fail to assist them in finding a way to progress with freedom so that they will be faced with the terrible alternative of turning to communism with its promise of progress at the cost of freedom.

Let us make it clear to them that our aim in helping them is not merely to stop communism, but that in the great American tradition of concern for those less fortunate than we are that we welcome the opportunity to work with people everywhere in helping them to achieve their aspirations for a life of human dignity. And this means that our primary aim must be not to help governments but to help people, to help people attain the life they deserve.

In essence, what I am saying tonight is that our answer to the threat of the Communist revolution is renewed devotion to the great ideals of the American Revolution, ideals that caught the imagination of the world 180 years ago and that still live in the minds and hearts of people everywhere.

I could tell you tonight that all you need to do to bring about these things that I have just described is to elect the right man as President of this country and leave these tasks to him. But, my fellow Americans, America demands more than that of me and of you.

ALL MUST WORK

When I visited the Soviet Union, in every factory there was a huge sign which read, "Work for the victory of communism," and what America needs today is not just a President, not just a few leaders, but millions of Americans working for the victory of freedom. Each American must make a personal and total commitment to the cause of freedom and all it stands for. It means wage earners and employers making an extra effort to increase the productivity of our factories. It means our students in schools striving for increasing excellence rather than adjusting to mediocrity.

It means supporting and encouraging our scientists to explore the unknown, not just for what we can get but for what we can learn, and it means each American assuming a personal responsibility to make this country which we love a proud example of freedom for all the world; each of us for example, doing our part in ending the prejudice which 100 years after Lincoln, to our shame, still embarrasses us abroad and saps our strength at home; each of us participat-

ing in this and other political campaigns not just by going to the polls and voting but working for the candidate of your choice. And, my fellow Americans, it means sacrifice—not the grim sacrifice of desperation but the rewarding sacrifice of choice which lifts us out of the humdrum life in which we live and gives us the supreme satisfaction which comes from working together in a cause greater than ourselves, greater than our Nation, as great as the whole world itself.

What I propose tonight is not new, it is as old as America, and as young at America, because America will never grow old. You will remember that Thomas Jefferson said, "We act not for ourselves alone, but for the whole human race." Lincoln said, "In giving freedom to these slaves we assure freedom to the free. We shall nobly save or meanly loose the last best hope of the earth." And Teddy Roosevelt said, "Our first duty as citizens of the Nation is owed to the United States, but if we are true to our principles we must also think of serving the interests of mankind at large." And Woodrow Wilson said, "A patriotic American is never so proud of the flag under which he lives as when it comes to mean to others, as well as himself, a symbol of hope and liberty."

We say today that a young America shall fulfill her destiny by helping to build a new world in which men can live together in peace and justice and freedom with each other. But there is a difference today, an exciting difference, and the difference is because of the dramatic breakthrough in science for the first time in human history. We have the resources, the resources to wage a winning war against poverty, misery and disease wherever it exists in the world.

BELIEVES IN AMERICA

And upon the next President of the United States will rest the responsibility to inspire and to lead the forces of freedom toward this goal.

I am sure now that you understand why I said at the beginning that it would be difficult for any man to say that he was qualified to provide this kind of leadership. I can only say to you tonight that I believe in the American dream because I have seen it come true in my own life. I know something of the threat which confronts us and I know something of the effort which will be needed to meet it. I have seen hate for America, not only in the Kremlin, but in the eyes of Communists in our own country, and on the ugly face of a mob in Caracas.

I have heard doubts about America expressed, not just by Communists, but by sincere students and labor leaders in other countries searching for the way to a better life and wondering if we had lost the way. And I have also seen love for America in countries throughout the world, in a crowd in Chicago, in Bogota, in the heart of Siberia, and in Warsaw—250,000 people on the streets on a Sunday afternoon singing, crying with tear running down their cheeks and shouting "Niech Zyje America"—Long live the United States.

And my fellow Americans, I know that we must resist the hate, we must remove the doubts, but above all we must be worthy of the love and the trust of millions on this earth for whom America is the hope of the world.

A hundred years ago, Abraham Lincoln was asked during the dark days of the tragic War Between the States whether he thought God was on his side. His answer was, "My concern is not whether God is on our side, but whether we are on God's side." My fellow Americans, may that ever be our prayer for our country. And in that spirit, with faith in America, with faith in her ideals and in her people, I accept your nomination for President of the United States.

Thirtieth Anniversary of the Establishment of the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, personnel of the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Altoona, Pa., under the leadership of Mr. Bernard E. Leighton, manager of the hospital, celebrated the 30th anniversary of the establishment of the Veterans' Administration at an enjoyable outing held at Lakemont Park, July 21, 1960, at 6:30 p.m.

During the fine program, it was my privilege to deliver the following address in keeping with the anniversary celebration:

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, IN CELEBRATION OF THE 30TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION, JULY 21, 1960, 6:30 P.M., LAKEMONT PARK, ALTOONA, PA.

Thirty years have passed since the founding of the Veterans' Administration, and these three decades provide a record rich in human service.

For this reason, it gives me the greatest pleasure to appear before you today and to add my praise to those of many others throughout the country for the splendid accomplishments of the Veterans' Administration.

Before the Executive order was issued July 21, 1930, establishing the Veterans' Administration—many of us will recall the cumbersome manner in which veterans' laws were administered because of the lack of one central agency.

It was apparent after the armistice in 1918 that some means should be found to meet the growing needs of American veterans whose ranks were increased by the 4,744,000 veterans who—according to records of the Veterans' Administration—served in World War I.

From the close of World War I until 1930 there were numerous bureaus and agencies concerned in the administration of laws providing benefits for veterans.

The Executive order of July 21, 1930, was the result of the act of July 3, 1930, which authorized the President to consolidate and coordinate the Federal agencies especially created for or concerned with the administration of veterans' laws.

As a result, the Veterans' Administration was born for the purpose of placing the administration of veterans affairs "under one roof."

To those of us who recall the operation of the old agencies such as the Pension Bureau, the National Home for Volunteer Soldiers, and the Veterans Bureau, the creation of the Veterans' Administration was a master stroke for efficiency and service.

It would be difficult indeed to pick one program of the many sponsored by the Veterans' Administration as the most valuable or most successful.

If, for the sake of discussion, I were to single out one activity, however, I think few would quarrel with my choosing the hospital and medical care program of the Veterans' Administration, as one of the most essential.

We in Altoona have had good occasion to experience first hand the importance of the Veterans' Administration hospital program.

We are fortunate to have an excellent Veterans' Administration hospital in our community under the management of Mr. Bernard E. Leighton, who is recognized as one of the finest hospital managers among Veterans' Administration personnel.

The excellent medical care obtained at the Altoona Veterans' Administration hospital is due to the personal interest taken by Manager Leighton and the highly trained and efficient medical and nursing staffs and hospital personnel.

We are also deeply aware of the vital role a Veterans' Administration hospital can play in raising the health standards of the entire community.

This it does in two ways:

First of all, the Veterans' Administration hospitals and the medical care program take care of those service-connected disabilities incurred by former members of the Armed Forces.

It would be difficult—if not impossible in many cases—for veterans to obtain and finance care for these ailments in any other way.

The number of veterans in this country now stands at more than 22 million.

As the percentage of this group aged 65 and over has continued to grow—their health problems have become increasingly severe.

It is clearly to the advantage of the entire community that certain of the medical problems of this group be treated in special facilities at Government expense.

A second major advantage to the community of the Veterans' Administration hospital program lies in the inevitable interdependence of all the facets of a community's health services.

The excellence of each component contributes to the excellence of the whole.

Thus—many communities now boast improved hospital facilities as a partial result of the high level of care in Veterans' Administration hospitals.

Since the veteran is eligible for medical and dental care for service-connected disabilities from private physicians and dentists on a fee-for-service basis—the medical program of the Veterans' Administration is further integrated into that of the rest of the community through private practitioners.

The Veterans' Administration also authorizes care in other public and private hospitals and homes when this is necessary.

We can view the improvement in medical care for veterans as part of a larger picture—the tremendous advance in hospital care for the entire population.

We know that some provision has been made for the medical care of former members of the Armed Forces as far back as—and before—Civil War days.

We read of the founding of sanitary commission homes for sick and disabled soldiers and sailors in 1861.

But when we investigate the hospital conditions of that time, we can be more grateful than ever for Veterans' Administration and other hospitals of today.

Apparently a popular saying a century ago was—"Be born at home and die at home."

Hospitals of that era were a combination of pest houses and almshouses with a tremendously high death rate.

The mortality from amputations in the hospital hovered between the figure of 40 and 60 percent—a much higher number than those performed in private homes.

In addition—the lack of paying patients meant that hospitals faced a constant struggle to keep their doors open.

I understand that during the Civil War the Government stepped in to pay 94 cents a day per soldier patient.

A mere rundown of advances since that time makes my head swim.

There have been major revolutions in every conceivable facet of hospital operation

from personnel to equipment—to methods of treatment.

Veterans' Administration hospitals account for about eight percent of the Nation's average daily patient load and hospital beds.

This significant segment of the Nation's hospital plant has become the center for the world's most remarkable and advanced medical care—along with the rest of the hospitals of this country.

The evolution of the modern hospital is vividly described in a report presented to the House Committee on Ways and Means in April 1959—by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, on the subject of hospitalization insurance for social security beneficiaries.

The report states in part:

"The hospital of today is as unlike the hospital of 20 or 30 years ago as the 1958 automobile is unlike the model T.

"You pay more but also get more.

"The hospital of today stands for the oxygen tent—the blood bank—the operating room—and the other instruments through which modern medicine demonstrates its ability to save life.

"It is also where the laboratory and radiographic procedures and radioactive elements are available for diagnostic procedures.

"It is a complicated organization of services most of which must be available for use on a moment's notice."

When we focus our attention specifically on the medical program of the Veterans' Administration—we note an amazing capacity for growth in excellence even in its development occurred shortly after World War II when the Department of Medicine and Surgery was first organized.

An aspect of the changed procedures which interests me particularly is the organization at that time of a sysem of cooperation between Veterans' Administration hospitals and the rest of the medical community.

Based on the assumption that the finest of medical practice can be found in an atmosphere of teaching and research—committees composed of deans and the heads of major departments in participating medical schools give advice in staffing—education and research to the managers and staffs of Veterans' Administration hospitals.

There have been two vitally important by-products of this system.

One is the high level of care in Veterans' Administration hospitals made possible by access to the most enlightened and advanced medical opinion.

The other is the atmosphere of acceptance and understanding between practicing and teaching physicians and Veterans' Administration personnel.

Both groups are aware that they are working toward the same goal of better medical care for all the people of this great Nation.

In the field of medical research, too—collaboration with other Government agencies and private groups has resulted in a vital, successful Veterans' Administration program.

Many medical specialists have been attracted to the staffs of Veterans' Administration hospitals by the opportunity for research—and this has worked to the benefit of patients in these hospitals.

In addition—the program has yielded many worthwhile results—such as the development of a successful plan for the treatment of tuberculosis by chemotherapy.

This revolutionary development has shortened the period of hospitalization for tubercular patients and has substantially reduced the morbidity and mortality from this disease.

There is yet another aspect of the development of the Veterans' Administration hospital program which I find particularly encouraging.

This is the solution recently settled upon by the President—on request from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs—to the problem of regulating the overall total of Veterans' Administration hospital beds.

The President set the total for Veterans' Administration beds at 125,000 and—at the same time—provided that—within the limit—beds could be shifted from one use to another or from one geographical area to another depending on medical needs.

This decision resolved two difficult questions in the Veterans' Administration hospital program.

First it removed the possibility that the total number of beds would continue to expand responding to pressures of all kinds—regardless of the number of unused or little used beds in certain areas.

The fixed total requires the most responsible kind of constant and continued evaluation to determine where and how Veterans' Administration beds may be most profitably used.

The resulting administrative stability will lead to better medical care.

Secondly, this policy decision clarified the issue of how much care would be available for veterans with non-service-connected illnesses.

It had previously been understood that such veterans could receive care if they were unable to pay for it otherwise—and if a bed were available.

But the possibility of demands for this type of care constantly expanding the total number of Veterans' Administration beds was not a pleasant one.

It is now clear that there will be an upper limit to the number of non-service-connected cases which can be cared for at Government expense after that.

In addition to constant improvement of its hospital care program—the Veterans' Administration has continued to meet the changing demands in medical problems of the veteran population.

Significant changes in medical practice have made it possible to increase the use of outpatient services and thereby to reduce hospitalization.

As the number of veterans suffering from permanent or chronic disabilities continues to grow—the domiciliary program becomes increasingly important.

Great advances in rehabilitation have opened up new possibilities for extending the productive life of disabled veterans.

We see in the medical program of the Veterans' Administration a living example of the gratitude of an enlightened society to those men who gave up valuable years of their lives and often their health to the service of their country.

We see not a grudging dole or a fixed pension—as if this debt could be repaid in any set dollar amount—but a changing, flexible program suited to meet the most urgent needs of the veteran.

We can also see a healthy attitude of self-evaluation on the part of the Veterans' Administration—A recognition that the problems of the veteran must be matched against the problems of other members of our society—that the requirements of the veteran are subject to continual change—and that this change must be reflected in the Veterans' Administration program.

In 1929 President Hoover commented in his state of the Union message on the advantages of a strong—unified agency to administer veterans' benefits.

He stated: "I am convinced that we will gain in efficiency—economy—and more uniform administration and better definition of national policies—if the Pension Bureau—The National Home for Volunteer Soldiers—and the Veterans Bureau are brought together in a single agency."

Thirty years have—I believe—confirmed his predictions.

Whether it is the veterans' hospital in our own community of Altoona—or the assistance to a disabled veteran or the home loan program of the Veterans' Administration—we are struck by the vigor and responsible attitude of a program designed to serve the veteran and the Nation.

Therefore, in concluding my remarks on this happy occasion, I wish to commend against Manager Bernard E. Leighton and the doctors, nurses, and professional employees—as well as all other hospital personnel—for the part they have played in maintaining the high standards of the Altoona Veterans' Administration Hospital.

In this connection, let it be remembered that all employees of the Altoona Veterans' Administration Hospital, regardless of the type of their employment, share in the credit being given for a well-staffed and efficiently operated hospital.

For that reason, all of you can "take a bow" because your contribution added to those of your fellow-employees, making it possible for the Altoona Veterans' Administration Hospital to maintain such a fine rating for efficient service, and excellent medical and hospital care.

It is my sincere hope that continued success will be the result of such highly dedicated service in the constant effort to alleviate human suffering and to restore peace and contentment to troubled minds.

What Gallup Left Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, there are polls and polls. Some are rigged, some are just poorly conducted. Others are just badly analyzed. Without further comment, I am pleased to call attention to a good review of a bad poll. It was written by Joseph Alsop and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 22, 1960:

WHAT GALLUP LEFT OUT

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—In the newspaper trade, it is usually considered bad form for one wretched scribbler to make remarks in print about the work of another. Yet an exception seems to be justified in the case of the inquiring Dr. George Gallup's important first poll after the national conventions. What is left out needs to be put back in.

The political community was both excited and amazed by this poll, showing 50 percent of the decided pollees choosing Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, 44 percent of the decided choosing Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, and 6 percent of the pollees undecided. NIXON'S lead caused the excitement. The almost incredibly low percentage of undecided voters caused the amazement.

But the voters so positively described as decided by Dr. Gallup were by no means unanimously decided in the true sense of that word. In the total sample, 6 percent of the pollees specifically stated they were undecided about their votes, but later admitted or indicated that they were leaning to one candidate or another. These leaners—a familiar phenomenon to every doorbell ringer—were somewhat oddly lumped in with the truly decided in the published poll.

According to Paul Perry, chief statistician of the Gallup organization, this undisclosed disposition of the "leaners" benefited the Democrats. He said that the Kennedy-

Johnson ticket got approximately 54 percent of all the leaners.

The Democrats rather conspicuously failed to benefit, however, by two other unseen dispositions made by Dr. Gallup and his staff. The first and most remarkable was the simple cancellation of about 20 percent of all the ballots collected by Dr. Gallup's field-workers.

Apparently this winnowing of goats from sheep is standard Gallup practice. Suspected nonvoters are spotted by such indicators as failure to vote last time, failure to register thus far, and so on. The suspects' ballots are then thrown out of the sample—which is the other half of the secret of Dr. Gallup's amazingly low percentage of undecided voters.

Statistician Perry stated that he "did not have" the actual split of the suspects thrown out of the recently published poll; but he added that the discarded ballots were "regularly more Democratic." In addition, important numbers of Democratic votes were apparently light weighted by Dr. Gallup's special system of synthesizing his national percentage figures.

Like the throwout of suspected nonvoters, this synthetic character of Dr. Gallup's published national percentages may well be known to sociologists and other students. Statistician Perry made no bones about it, when questioned. But it is certainly unknown in the political community, where the Gallup results are therefore misunderstood.

Briefly, then, every Gallup poll is divided into four regions—eastern, midwestern, southern, and western. Voting habits in the regions differ. The aim is to forecast, not the victor in the election, but the popular vote. Thus the polling samples from each region are given a "weight" proportional to that region's contribution to the popular vote in 1956. The national averages are then synthesized from the weighted samples.

The region that suffers from this system is the South, where the popular vote is always low in national elections. The 13 States in Dr. Gallup's southern region have just under a quarter of the population of the United States. More important, they have 27.2 percent of the electoral college votes, which decide the presidential choice. But in Dr. Gallup's percentage synthesis, the 1956 yardstick gave the South a "weight" of only 16.6 percent. Thus every southerner in Dr. Gallup's recent sample got only about three-fifths of a vote in the final count.

Although Dr. Gallup frequently publishes regional breakdowns, he is not doing so this time. Hence statistician Perry refused to disclose the split of the latest southern sample. Rather hesitantly, he merely said that the Republicans were doing better in the South than they have done in the past, "except in 1928, 1952, and 1956"—which were the only years when the Republicans got to first base in the South.

It seems likely, therefore, that the Gallup sample from the southern region showed a small but significant Democratic majority, which was then downgraded by the "weighting" system. Add the probable Democratic majority among the thrown out ballots of suspected nonvoters. It then seems a fair bet that the Democrats actually had a modest overall majority in Dr. Gallup's unprocessed ballots.

A handful of votes would produce such a majority, because of the narrow base of Dr. Gallup's famous percentages. In the last poll, the nationwide sample was about 1,600 ballots. About 20 percent were thrown out, and the final sample was under 1,300 ballots. A single Gallup percentage point would, therefore, represent not more than 13 votes. And the mere transfer of 39 votes either way would have altered Dr. Gallup's nationwide percentages, to show Kennedy running dead-even with Nixon, or to show Nixon leading Kennedy, 53–41.

All this is not intended to suggest that Dr. Gallup has been cooking his poll. He has not been doing anything of the sort. Yet the facts have to be faced that this poll has become a fairly major, extra-legal institution of American politics. For this reason, such things as unannounced transformations of "leaners" into "decideds" do not serve the public interest.

Dr. Gallup's industrial and commercial clients may be best served by facts carefully processed and homogenized in the undoubtedly expert Gallup manner, but the public interest demands something more when Dr. Gallup puts on his political-institutional hat. In this role, Dr. Gallup also ought to provide all the unprocessed facts. Indeed, he might start this time.

Impact of Foreign Imports on American Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as a follow-up on my presentation to this House on the practices of buy American and the injurious affect upon the American economy of this administration's policies, I present the following correspondence and information that, in my opinion, is both timely and apropos.

The time is running out for our American dollar, our American worker, our American main street businessman and in fact, for our America as an industrial giant amongst the production nations.

The following material and information is of utmost importance to all of us:

UNION INSTRUMENT CORP.,
Plainfield, N.J., June 27, 1960.

Congressman JOHN DENT,
House of Representatives, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DENT: Congressman SANTANGELO has sent me a copy of his letter to the Small Business Administration protesting their proposed changes in regulations to allow foreign products on preferential small business set-aside procurements, for which I am grateful. This letter states that this matter was discussed with you and Congressman ABRAHAM MULTER.

On June 16, 1960, my counsel, Arthur Chodosh, and I attended the hearing held by the U.S. Senate Committee on Small Business, "on the impact of foreign imports on American small business." We were invited to submit a statement for the hearing record, a copy of which we enclose, containing our opinions on the effects of foreign imports.

We were shocked by the callous attitude of some members of the committee, in telling several manufacturers suffering seriously from foreign imports, that the work of their factories must be sacrificed to foreign imports, in the interest of foreign policy. Note my comments in our statement on pages 7 and 8.

Congresswoman FLORENCE DWYER and Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR., have also taken interest in this matter and have registered objections with the Small Business Administration to their proposed changes.

I remember my conversation with you on my visit to Washington. This information is being furnished to you with the hope that you can find time to bring this matter to the attention of other members of the House before adjournment.

We are enclosing some typical articles on the matter of foreign imports, indicating the serious proportions of this subject.

Your interest in small business manufacturers in the United States is greatly appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

UNION INSTRUMENT CORP.
S. SCAVUZZO, *President.*

STATEMENT TO U.S. SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE HEARING, JUNE 16, 1960, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Our company is engaged in the manufacture of precision mathematical and engineering instruments. We have suffered a loss of about 60 percent of our sales by reason of foreign imports on the principal items which we sell to the commercial trade, which consists of metal T-squares, straight edges, protractors, proportional dividers, and triangles. Not only has the dollar volume of our business on these items shrunk drastically, but the remaining business which we have accepted to keep these facilities open, are taken at much lower prices than 10 years ago, although our production costs have risen at least 25 percent. We have had to drop many items. All these conditions have been caused by the impact of foreign imports.

The history of the drawing instrument manufacturers in our industry well illustrates the impact of foreign imports. There were more than 12 such manufacturers in 1945, now only 2 remain. A number have gone out of business entirely. The others have ceased manufacturing drawing instruments and are now importing. The two remaining manufacturers are still in business because they manufacture instruments of an unusual character and quality, not of interest to foreign producers. The foreign producers, through their agents, now control more than 95 percent of this market. This has resulted from the lowering of the protective tariff from 45 to 19½ percent and reduction of the "Buy American Act" preferential provision from 25 to 6 percent.

Our company has been able to survive because we have been able to develop items for the Department of Defense and in that connection, the protection received through the Small Business Act, has been of substantial aid. This protection and aid are now being seriously threatened by a trend to relax the original intent of the Small Business Act, and the set-aside procurement regulations.

Our company recently submitted a bid on a Defense Department invitation, which contained in part the following conditions:

"NOTICE OF SMALL BUSINESS SET-ASIDE"

"Bids or proposals under this procurement are solicited from small business concerns only * * *. This action * * * is in the interest of maintaining or mobilizing the Nation's full productive capacity, in the interest of war or national defense programs, * * * a manufacturer or a regular dealer submitting bids or proposals in its own name must agree to furnish in the performance of the contract, supplies manufactured or produced in the United States * * * by small concerns."

Despite the clarity of the foregoing conditions, requiring a manufacturer or dealer to furnish supplies manufactured or produced in the United States, the Small Business Administration has ruled that the proposal of an importer who intends to furnish supplies which are to be almost wholly fabricated in a foreign countrry, complies with the conditions referred to.

As a manufacturer submitting the lowest bid for furnishing products produced and manufactured in the United States, we protested this ruling. An official of the Small

Business Administration cited the following small business set-aside interpretations in explaining their action in our case:

"(a) A bidder offered to furnish a quantity of cable to the U.S. Government. The only work to be done on this cable in the United States was to add a tip, representing 4 percent of the value of the finished product. The Small Business Administration qualified this product as being produced in the United States.

"(b) A hypothetical example was offered that a broker could import foreign-made pencils, and they could qualify as having been produced in the United States by simply sharpening the points."

Existing Small Business Administration regulation, section 121.3–8(b)(2): "Definition of small business nonmanufacture," provides that "In the case of Government procurement, reserved for or involving the preferential treatment of small business * * *, such nonmanufacturer shall furnish in the performance of the contract, the products of a small business or producer, which products are manufactured or produced in the United States."

While this requirement clearly specifies the restrictions applicable to a nonmanufacturer, requiring a nonmanufacturer to furnish products manufactured or produced in the United States, nothing specific is spelled out in the Small Business Administration regulations with respect to the manufacturer or producer who proposes to furnish products to the Government directly. If nonmanufacturers are required to furnish products of a small business manufacturer or producer, which are manufactured in the United States, it certainly follows that the same restrictions apply with equal force to manufacturers furnishing products directly to the U.S. Government.

Congress in passing the Small Business Act, declared it to be the policy that the Government should aid, assist, and protect small business concerns, and that a fair proportion of Government purchases should be set aside for concerns falling into the small business category.

Section 127.15 of the rules and regulations issued under the Small Business Act, reads in part as follows:

"SEC. 15. * * * To effectuate the purposes of this act, small business concerns * * * shall receive any award * * * as to which it is determined * * * (1) to be in the interest of maintaining or mobilizing the Nation's full protective capacity, (2) to be in the interest of war or national defense programs."

In advancement of the purposes of the Small Business Act, and the rules and regulations issued under the act, the Small Business Administration and the armed services have until very recently reserved procurements of supplies to products manufactured or produced by small business concerns in the United States.

In a proposed amendment to the definition of small business concerns (Federal Register, p. 33411.13 CFR, pt. 121, Apr. 16, 1960), the Small Business Administration recommends the addition to existing regulations of a paragraph defining a "domestic product" as one in which the cost of foreign materials or components does not exceed 50 percent of the cost of all materials used in such products.

Such changes in the small business setasides regulations will result in a tremendous increase in the volume of foreign-produced items being purchased by the U.S. Government, and will further reduce the volume of manufactured goods of the American producer, which will inevitably cause many concerns to go out of business, with resultant unemployment. This defeats the intent of Congress to maintain the Nation's productive capacity for security reasons, and the purpose of the Small Business Act, which was established to assist and protect small manufacturers in the United States.

Even the proposed change to limit the allowable percentage of foreign materials to 50 percent will not place American manufacturers in a position to successfully compete on Government procurements of products which are partially manufactured in a foreign country, where labor costs are approximately 20 percent of American labor costs.

The relaxation of the protection of the small business set-aside procurement regulations can only result in greater distress to manufacturers in the United States, already hardpressed by foreign imports. We feel the original purpose of the Small Business Act to aid and protect small business, and maintain small production facilities in the United States, are being defeated by these actions. If the regulations are to be changed, they should be changed in favor of small American business manufacturers, in order to carry out the original purposes of the Small Business Act, and to enable the small American manufacturer to continue in business.

Importers, brokers, and foreign manufacturers have enjoyed advantages because of the large reductions in import customs tariffs, and the reduction in preferential treatment under the buy American provisions. By reason of this, great inroads have been made in the volume of goods manufactured in the United States. The present expanding economic and production booms in foreign lands, particularly Germany, certainly reveals that further concessions to foreign-made products are unnecessary.

The last remaining protection to manufacturers through small business set-aside program is now being weakened. The volume of set-aside procurements is a small part of the defense spending, and the small manufacturer and worker in the United State who pay their share of all defense spending, should be entitled to a full measure of preference in order to perpetuate the original purposes of the Small Business Act.

An authoritative source in discussing small business, stated that there were 15,000 small business failures in 1958, the greatest number since 1939. Certainly a great number of these failures can be attributed to foreign imports. Changes tending to further favor the import of foreign merchandise should be halted. The American manufacturer does not ask for advantages over foreign competition but it wants to eliminate the several disadvantages under which it must work.

This statement has been revised since the writer's attendance at the hearing on June 16. We therefore wish to comment on facts presented at that time.

It was emphasized at the hearing, that the United States expects to export $18 billion while it will import $16 billion in 1960. It was stated that we must increase imports to equal exports, in the interest of the philosophy of our present foreign policy.

Measured in volume of goods, rather than in dollars, imports far exceed exports since goods produced in foreign lands are manufactured at labor cost of 10 to 20 percent of the labor costs in the United States.

At the hearing, several small manufacturers were told to use their ingenuity to develop new products for their factories, to replace the productions of products lost to foreign imports. All this was based on the theory that our foreign policy required these sacrifices to be made. Some of the heads of the manufacturing firms presenting their plights, resulting from foreign imports, likely devoted most of their lives in developing their small plants and businesses.

The process of inventing and developing, transforming the facilities of their factories and finding markets for these products are enormous and beyond the means and capabilities of most small business firms.

Insofar as small businesses are concerned, this suggestion is not a practical solution to the problem of competing with low priced imports.

Your committee requested of several speakers their suggestions of a solution to the problems presented. Our suggestions to aid the small business manufacturers is to adhere to the purposes and intent of Congress in establishing the Small Business Act, which reads in part:

"It is the declared policy of the Congress that the Government should aid, counsel, assist and protect insofar as is possible, the interests of small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprises to insure that a fair portion of the total purchases and contracts for property and services for the Government * * * be placed with small business enterprises, to insure that a fair proportion of the total sales of Government property be made to such enterprises, and to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the Nation."

The intent and purposes of this act can be carried out by requiring the Small Business Administration and the procuring agencies of the Government to promulgate and to interpret and define its regulations under the small business set-aside provisions so that such procurements are restricted to products manufactured wholly by small business concerns in the United States, wherever possible.

We have discussed the foregoing matters with others in our industry, and in presenting this statement, we feel certain our position is not unique, but represents the position of thousands of other small manufacturers in the United States.

Your committee is requested to consider the above facts.

Respectfully yours,

UNION INSTRUMENT CORP.,
S. SCAUVZZO, *President.*

Postal Reappraisal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER M. MUMMA
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. MUMMA. Mr. Speaker, I have always been interested and have taken my stand in support of fiscal responsibility in government.

Recently, there appeared two editorials—one in the Patriot of July 7, 1960, and one in the Evening News of July 4, 1960, both Harrisburg, Pa., newspapers. Now these are directly related to the cost of government and particularly the Post Office Department.

Postmaster General Summerfield has modernized postal activities and reorganized to exact greater efficiency and economy. However, it is through no fault of his own that the postal books do not balance. Instead of diminishing the deficit it has increased from the former million-dollar-a-day deficit, this despite the President's veto.

These newspapers rightly call for a reappraisal of the postal situation.

Here are the two editorials to which I refer:

[From the Patriot, July 1, 1960]

POST OFFICE DEFICIT IS YET TO BE LICKED

President Eisenhower's proposals to square away the financing of the postal service, like so much else, have wound up in the dead letter office.

This election year Congress not only has refused to go along on the administration's postal rate increase proposal, it has made the Post Office Department deficit worse—for what's left of the Eisenhower era and for the start of a new administration next January.

Unlike 2 years ago, when another election year Congress matched a major pay raise for postal workers with the new revenue to pay for it, this House and Senate have just rammed through another big pay raise, overriding the President's veto; but refused to consider the need for new revenue.

This new spending will send the annual Post Office deficit on its way toward the $1 billion mark. And this will come on top of a postal deficit that has climbed to $6.8 billion since the end of World War II.

At a time in history when the United States is called up to maintain a defense establishment on a par with wartime and at the same time maintain its traditional civilian services and face up to the towering new needs of an exploding population—for education, for health, for so very much else—there just isn't enough Government money to go around. Because there isn't, too little or nothing is being done on too many fronts.

In the face of this stern fiscal reality, the concept of the Post Office Department as a public service which does not require a balanced budget demands reappraisal. The billion dollars a year now going out of the General Treasury, as subsidy paid by all taxpayers to the users of the mails, could go a long way toward meeting the needs of schools, slum clearance, health care for the aged. Somehow and someway, these needs inevitably must be met. To get at least a part of the financing required for them, the postal deficit should be wiped out and the Post Office Department should pay its own way.

But that is not about to come to pass when the Congress returns from the presidential conventions to close out so very much legislation still hanging fire. A House committee has completed hearings on the administration proposals for postal rate increases to bring in another $550 million a year—now not enough to balance the books. But it has refused to clear the proposal for floor action, and there isn't a chance that it will in the political circus atmosphere that will prevail. The Representatives and Senators aren't about to raise the price of stamps in an election campaign year.

Yet most of them seeking reelection and the two presidential candidates will be pledging their support to new spending for various worthy causes and programs. They also should be counting on an annual postal deficit approaching $1 billion a year. Do they think new spending in this amount should be postponed, or new taxes imposed, or mail rates increased to balance the postal books? This is a good question even if many politicians and most candidates won't answer it.

[From the Evening News, July 4, 1960]

PLAYING IT POLITICALLY SAFE

When President Eisenhower vetoed the Federal pay raise bill he characterized it as "indefensible and irresponsible legislation."

Congress now has compounded its "irresponsible actions" by going over the President's head to make the pay raise law.

There is no valid argument that Federal employees should not have received some increase in pay, but there is valid argument against the loose manner in which the bill was drawn, passed, and put through over the President's veto in a shameful exhibition of congressional cave-in in the face of a riptide of pressure in a political year.

The bill did not make an equitable distribution of money to the Federal employees, one of the chief points in the President's message of veto. These were the President's words:

"The bill totally ignores the recognized precept that the only sound basis for setting Federal salaries is reasonable comparability to rates paid for similar work in private industry. * * * There is reason to believe * * * that a number of Federal salaries already exceed private rates of pay for similar work and, conversely, that other Federal salaries are below corresponding private compensation. H.R. 9983 in no respect addresses itself to these disparities and, in fact, perpetuates and intensifies them. * * * The inequities already present in our Federal pay structure would be sharply accentuated by H.R. 9083."

This is not all the President had to say, but it is the nub of the reasoning that brought him to the decision to veto the bill. Whether the modest increase proposed by the President was enough is not now at issue, but the fact remains that it followed his line of reasoning that, whatever increase was given, it should eliminate the disparity to which he referred in his veto message.

It is all too obvious that Congress voted with an eye on the ballot box. Every House Member and half the Senators face the electorate this year, and they want to keep as many of them thinking kind thoughts of their legislators as possible. But if it is the popular way, it also is the cowardly approach.

Two of our own Congressmen, WALTER MUMMA and HERMAN SCHNEEBELI, joined those supporting the President. Their courage will cost them votes, and in SCHNEEBELI's case may bring defeat in the November election. He barely squeezed through in the special election in April. As for Pennsylvania's junior Senator, who faces no election test for 4 years, he played it safe.

That's politics.

Bernard Baruch at 90

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, August 19, America's elder statesman, Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, observed his 90th birthday anniversary, receiving congratulatory messages from his host of friends throughout the world.

During my many years in the Congress, both in periods of war and peace, I have on numerous occasions called on Mr. Baruch for his advice and he always gave it to me most promptly and helpfully.

Mr. Baruch is a very dear friend of Mr. Harry B. Haines, publisher of the Paterson (N.J.) Evening News, and whenever I visit Mr. Haines in his editorial sanctum I note some striking picture of Mr. Baruch hanging on the wall along with some personally autographed messages.

The Paterson Evening News last Friday carried the following editorial tribute to Mr. Baruch:

BERNARD BARUCH AT 90

Park-bench sage, adviser to Presidents, financier, bon vivant, philanthropist, sportsman, industrialist—Bernard M. Baruch, has appeared before the 20th Century America in so many roles that it is impossible to subject the man to definition except as All-American. Much is being made these days of public images; if one were inclined to choose for the elder statesman who celebrates his 90th birthday today, it certainly would be that of the astute and kindly uncle.

"Some men and women start out early in life knowing what they want to be, and their lives become tales of how they made their ambitions come true," he tells us in his memoirs. "That, plainly, has not been true of my career. In my personal ambitions I have been constantly beset by conflicting desires. The turns my life took have been determined as much as anything by the rush of events."

The story starts in Camden, S.C., when young Bernard was born on August 19, 1870, the son of a German Jew who had migrated from Posen and who had served in the Civil War as a Confederate surgeon. The first 11 years of Bernard's life were spent in South Carolina; he maintains a luxurious estate there today. The family moved because the father hoped to find wider opportunities in New York.

Bernard Baruch was graduated from the College of the City of New York at the age of 19. He soon found his way to Wall Street; stock speculation made him a multimillionaire by the time he was 31.

The details of his career as speculator—a title he still proudly clings to—are spelled out in the memoirs and in loving detail in a biography, but the more important story of Baruch the public man began when he met President Woodrow Wilson.

The financier at first aided in the quest of the new freedom with advice and financial contributions. Came World War I and—at 47—he was called to public service as a member and later chairman of the War Industries Board.

Since then Mr. Baruch has given advice to every succeeding President, advice more often than not neglected. Most notably he was a senior consultant—though not a confidant—of Franklin D. Roosevelt. His most significant official policy contribution probably was the 1946 Baruch plan for international control of atomic energy. This won U.N. General Assembly endorsement but was not acceptable to Moscow. If it had been, the world would have been on the path to peace instead of present day perils.

Baruch in 1948 refused to serve as chairman of the Democratic National Finance Committee, and thereafter his relations with President Truman were strained. Four years later he switched parties to support General Eisenhower. But Eisenhower as President refused to be influenced by Baruch's repeated advocacy of standby economic controls for war.

The years, meanwhile, have been kind to Baruch. A favorite avocation is watching the horses, and his beloved Saratoga has named a stakes race for him. In honor of his birthday, his favorite bench in Lafayette Park—across from the White House—was this week marked with a bronze plaque designating it as the "Bernard Baruch Bench of Inspiration." As for Baruch the hard-headed philosopher, he'd probably stand on a last line from the first volume of the memoirs: "I believe in reason not because of the wisdom that men have demonstrated in the past but because it remains man's best tool for governing himself."

Happy birthday from all of us to one who typifies Mr. American Citizen No. 1.

The New York Times editorialized last Friday as follows:

NINETY USEFUL YEARS

Reaching the age of 90 in reasonably good health and spirits is an achievement all by itself. We doubt, however, that Bernard M. Baruch, whose 90th birthday falls today, ever gave much thought to living to a grand old age. His ambition, we suspect, was to be active in mind and body and to get useful work done. In this he has succeeded.

Mr. Baruch did well enough in his private business in his earlier years to enable him to give most of his later years to the service of his country. He would be remembered for his achievements as head of the War Industries Board during the First World War, but he did countless useful things between the two World Wars and after the Second World War and down to this very day.

Whether or not he likes to be associated with the old tradition of the bench on which he sat and to which eminent persons came to seek his advice we are not sure. We do know that his advice was always based on intelligence, experience, and goodwill. When he disagreed with anybody he said so and when he agreed he said so. He went part of the way but not all of the way with President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as with other Presidents before and since.

We wish this were Mr. Baruch's 50th or 60th birthday rather than his 90th. But we hope the physical constituion he inherited from his good physician father, Simon B. Baruch, will permit him to be with us and to give us good advice in years to come.

Port of New York Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives has under consideration a contempt citation of certain officials of the Port of New York Authority. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD two news stories and an editorial on the subject which appeared in the Newark (N.J.) Star-Ledger, of August 11 and 12, 1960:

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Aug. 11, 1960]

CONGRESSMAN REBUKES CELLER ON PORT AUTHORITY PROBE

Representative DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Democrat, 14th District, said yesterday the New Jersey congressional delegation never asked for a sweeping investigation of the Port of New York Authority.

The Jersey City Congressman repudiated the statement of Representative EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, New York, chairman of a House Judiciary Subcommittee, that the current probe of the port authority was launched at the request of the entire New Jersey congressional delegation.

DANIELS said the delegation merely asked for a congressional study of the port authority's power to build its proposed jetport in Morris County.

He also joined four other members of the New Jersey delegation in opposing the CELLER subcommittee's recommendation that three port authority officials be cited for contempt of Congress for refusing, on instructions of Governors Meyner and Rockefeller, to turn over all its records to the subcommittee. The others are Senators CASE and WILLIAMS and Representatives FRANK THOMSON and FRANK OSMERS.

"It has been stated that the judiciary committee's investigation into the internal affairs of the port authority resulted from a request of the entire New Jersey congressional delegation that it be conducted," DANIELS said in a statement without mentioning CELLER's name.

"So far as I am concerned that statement is not accurate. New Jersey Members of Congress have expressed concern as to the authority's study of a potential jetport in Morris County.

"In that connection they suggested the House Judiciary Committee conduct a staff study of the power of the port authority with respect to the construction of a jetport in Morris County.

"It is obvious that a request for such a study is no justification for a broadside blanket investigation of all the activities of the port authority nor for the subpenaing of practically all the files of the port authority covering the period for the last 15 years.

"I have never suggested and I am firmly opposed to the idea that port authority officials should be subjected to criminal prosecution for complying with the instructions of the Governors of the States, who are their superior officers."

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Aug. 12, 1960]

PORT AUTHORITY PROBE GOING FURTHER THAN WANTED: WIDNALL

Representative WILLIAM B. WIDNALL, Republican, Saddle River, said yesterday the current House investigation of the port authority has gone further than the New Jersey congressional delegation wanted.

"As I recall, WIDNALL said, "the delegation voted unanimously to ask the House Judiciary Committee to conduct a staff study to fix the scope of the port authority's jurisdiction.

"We were interested in finding out if the port authority was exceeding its jurisdiction in doing things like erecting commercial buildings at Teterboro Airport and planning a jetport on Morris County land outside the boundary lines of the port district.

"We were not, as I recall, interested in either the internal affairs of the port authority or its handling of matters which are obviously within its scope and jurisdiction.

WIDNALL added, however, that he was certain the House was within its constitutional rights in investigating the agency.

As far as his vote on contempt citations pending against three top officials of the port authority, WIDNALL said he would vote in line with the original purpose of the New Jersey delegation.

"If a study of the subpenas indicates the investigators were after records concerned with setting the scope of the port authority, I would support the contempt recommendations. If the subpenas appeared to be in the nature of a fishing expedition, I would vote against them," WIDNALL said.

WIDNALL became the fifth member of the State's 14-member House to take issue with Judiciary Committee Chairman EMANUEL CELLER's statement that he was pursuing the investigation at the request of the New Jersey delegation.

WIDNALL, FRANK OSMERS, Jr., Republican, of Tenafly, CORNELIUS GALLAGHER, Democrat, of Bayonne, FRANK THOMPSON, Jr., Democrat, of Trenton, and DOMINICK DANIELS, Democrat, of Jersey City, are those opposed to the "sweeping" inquiry now underway.

[From the Newark Star-Ledger, Aug. 12, 1960]

MORE THAN THEY BARGAINED FOR

The New Jersey congressional delegation, in asking for a congressional investigation of the port authority, stand to get much more than they asked for—and at least some Congressmen are disturbed by the prospect.

The request for Congress to look into the port authority came in the wake of the port authority proposal for a jetport in Morris County. Perhaps it was a reflex action for Congressmen to ask for a probe.

What they intended, some of them now say, was an investigation into the port authority's action in connection with the jetport proposal. What they apparently had in mind was the fact that the port authority was asking for a facility which was located outside its jurisdiction.

What they got from Representative CELLER, who is conducting the probe, is a full-scale war on the port authority. And CELLER has armed himself with broadened subpena powers by which to try and get all port authority records from the inception of the authority. Certainly these records would not be needed for an investigation limited to the jetport proposal.

The prospect now is for a broadside, fired by the congressional committee, which could have damaging effects on the port authority and its future usefulness to the metropolitan area. If that happens, it would be tragic for everyone concerned—principally for the millions of persons in the area who benefit from facilities developed by the port authority.

The Congressmen are rightfully worried about this prospect. Governors Meyner and Rockefeller, also worried about the same prospect, have been warning of the dangers. The Governors' warnings have had little effect on CELLER. But the fact that his investigation is being virtually repudiated by some of the Congressmen who asked for a probe should help put it in its proper perspective.

"Woes of the Atlas"; Magazine Article Points Up Great Lag in Missile Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the frightening lag in our missile program is cause for extremely serious concern.

We need missiles—operational missiles—and we need them quickly. We will not get them if the administration is content with only "pep talks," such as the one the Secretary of Defense delivered recently to the defense contractors who are building the Atlas missile and constructing the launching sites. At this meeting the Secretary conceded that our missile program is far behind schedule, but he gave no indication of the sense of urgency which alone will give us missiles instead of words.

To get the missiles and the launching sites that are required, there must be an end to the "business as usual" approach of the administration. There must be a unified program, not just transfers of authority from one unit to another as the Secretary of Defense has been doing.

With our very security at stake, I say we should establish 24-hour-a-day working schedules if necessary. We can negotiate with the Soviet Union only from a position of strength, and just as long as the administration is content with second place in the missile race the

Russians will continue to hold the initiative in world affairs.

The extent of the U.S. missile lag is brought out in an article in the current issue of Time magazine, which reports that we now have only six operational Atlas intercontinental ballistic missiles, although the schedule which the Department of Defense told the country would be faithfully followed called for 18 missiles by this time according to Time magazine.

Later this year, says Time, there will be 12 Atlases operational, but the schedule calls for 30.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that these ominous figures mean that more than "pep talks" by administration spokesmen are needed.

I bring to the attention of the House the text of the article on the missile lag in Time:

WOES OF THE ATLAS

The biggest bottleneck in the U.S. missile program is not the development or testing of the giant birds—which have been firing successfully—but construction of the bases that would be needed to send them winging against an enemy. The United States now has 6 operational Atlas intercontinental ballistic missiles—and by schedule should now have 18. Later this year 12 Atlases will be operational, whereas there should be more than 30. Last week 56 top executives of companies that make the Atlas and its launching sites returned home from Washington after a rousing pep talk from Defense Secretary Thomas S. Gates, Jr., urging them to get the Atlas back on schedule. The chief problem, conceded Air Force Brig. Gen. William E. Leonhard, a deputy commander of the Ballistic Missile Division, is "the difficulties of doing a wartime task under peacetime conditions and authority."

LIKE BUILDING DAMS?

The Atlas' woes show that it takes more than a big budget and brainy scientists to win the missile race. One of the chief difficulties has been the lack of central direction. The Air Force Ballistic Missile Division, after approving the plans of the prime contractor, turns the job of letting construction contracts over to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The Air Force and the Army Engineers each blame the other for the delays. The Army charges that the Air Force makes imposible demands, frequently changes its mind; the Air Force replies that the Army Engineers are trying to build bases as they build dams.

Both the Army and the Air Force give the contractors poor marks. The Convair division of General Dynamics Corp., one of the prime contractors for the Atlas, has come under criticism for placing so much stress on test shots at Cape Canaveral that it has not put enough effort into preparing missile bases. Construction contractors selected by the Corps of Engineers often farmed the work to subcontractors who underestimated the task, sometimes buckled under the pressure. At Offutt Air Force Base near Omaha, where Atlas launching sites are 3 months behind schedule, New York's Malan-Grove Construction Co. gave 90 percent of the work to 46 subcontractors. Two of them ran into financial difficulties and are now being operated by bonding companies. At the Offutt launching sites, nine concrete pedestals intended for support of liquid-oxygen lines had to be replaced because they had inadequate supporting steel. Warren Air Force Base in Cheyenne, Wyo., scheduled to be the first operational tactical missile base by last spring, will not be ready until fall, largely because contractors could not fulfill their commitments.

NO READY MIX

For their part, the contractors complain bitterly that they are often not paid on time for their work, are burdened by the complexity of the new sites (some 4,000 miles of wire and 25,000 connections) and by whole chains of changes that are set off when something new is discovered during a missile firing. The changes are necessary if the United States is to keep its bases as sophisticated as its developing missiles, but they can play hob with schedules. At Offutt Base, more than 50 site changes have been ordered, ranging from "a few dollars to more than a million dollars." The Warren Base, originally scheduled to cost $65 million, is now expected to cost $100 million because of numerous modifications.

Also contributing to the slowdowns are labor unions which have squabbled with the military, the contractors, and among themselves. In the past 2 years there have been 22 labor disputes at Warren, ranging from cement masons and plasterers striking against the use of ready-mix concrete to ironworkers protesting because spot welding was done by other unions. Jurisdictional disputes and strikes have cost the Atlas program 20,370 man-days in the first 6 months of 1960 alone at Warren, Offutt, and Vandenberg Air Force Bases.

To bring the Atlas back on schedule, Secretary Gates has transferred the missile-site command from the Air Force Research and Development Command to the Air Materiel Command, placed the Army engineers under one nationwide project officer instead of under district engineers. Both the Army and the Air Force have been warned to be more selective in letting base building contracts and the Labor Department is drawing up a list of standards to determine what kind of workers should be used on specific missile-base jobs. The goal: more than 100 operational Atlases by 1962.

Jane Addams and World Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, at this time when the Nation and the world are yearning for peace and many of us are fervently dedicated to that cherished end, it is appropriate to dwell thoughtfully on the great contributions of the famous humantarian, Jane Addams.

I will not here detail the brilliant career of this great woman, but would like to bring to the attention of the House by way of a reminder her heroic efforts for world peace.

As long ago as 1904 at the convention of the National Peace Societies held at Boston in my home State, Jane Addams spoke and worked for universal peace between nations.

In her "Newer Ideals of Peace" published in 1907 she sought and urged moral substitutes for war.

During World War I she worked to try to prevent the spread of that great conflict and the provoking of the most primitive antagonisms associated with it.

Her efforts to secure a conference of neutrals many leaders had urged were sustained with the same vigor and ability that typified her activities in conserving the food supply, in distributing food to allay hunger, suffering, and privation.

Jane Addams was a nonconformist in the sense that she possessed the courage to differ with the main stream of public opinion whenever she thought it wise or in the interests of the Nation to do so.

She was a controversial figure to be sure, because she spoke her own mind—and it was a great mind—and because she set her judgment against that of statesmen and other leaders who were more concerned about waging war than in trying to prevent it before it started, or end it when it had commenced.

One of her last comments on war ranks with her best:

> The worst thing about war is not the poison gas which wipes out lives and destroys cities, but the poison it spreads in the minds of men. * * * We must be ready not only with political institutions but with an educated public opinion which shall fight this poison's spread. Only thus—

She wrote—

> will people be able to come into friendly relationships with ever larger and larger groups, and to live constantly a more extended life.

It was inevitable that catch phrases, labels, and even epithets should be applied to those who were seeking peace while the Nation was at war. An incited and patriotic public was inclined to sweep away as unworthy and base every utterance or gesture for peace. It cannot be denied, of course, that when the Nation was fighting for its survival against cruel and ruthless aggressors that it could ill afford time to debate the merits of peace, let alone permit spies and traitors to weaken the national purpose by conspiring against the preparedness and readiness of our fighting forces to defend our liberties and win the war.

Notwithstanding that fact, it is clear that peace is not only a sacred goal, but it is a dire necessity, if freedom and civilization are to be sustained.

No campaign of terrorism appealing to fainthearted people and urging national helplessness and fostering doctrines of appeasement can successfully becloud the fact that while the American people mean to preserve their free heritage and will never surrender it, they are nevertheless willing to stand courageously for every practicable measure to lessen international tensions and promote international control of nuclear substances and weapons, effective disarmament and enduring peace.

While the goal has not changed since Jane Addams' day, it has become infinitely more desirable and critical. To reach it, wholehearted international efforts are imperative. Every nation must join earnestly and wholeheartedly in the quest for the sacred grail of peace.

To the extent that some nations are refusing to abandon their oft-expressed ambition to suppress freedom and dominate the world this problem becomes more difficult, if not impossible of accomplishment, until those nations have a change of heart. But that fact must never deter us from fighting as fiercely in the moral sense as we would fight a war to protect our shores and our homes

and our liberties, for a just consideration and a just resolution of the problems that must be solved before peace can become a reality in this cruelly divided world.

Let not despair possess us, nor courage forsake us, in this fight. If the price of peace is loss of our freedom and a form of serfdom more abominable than death itself then by all means let us die in a fiery holocaust of destruction before we forfeit or surrender our God-given rights to be free men and women. But let us strive prayerfully and courageously for universal peace.

Among rational people, if there be such in the Communist world, there is no necessity for such a choice. The people of the world can and should make the choice now before they are engulfed by nuclear conflict, and they should never tolerate the machinations of communism, or any other ideology or bloc, to thwart the progress, freedom and security of man.

Jane Addams accomplished many things in her long, useful, life, and her work for peace was not the least of these. We can well recall today her thesis that consent should be substituted for coercion and a will to peace for a belief in war—that justice and love of humanity, brotherhood and devotion to the living God should prevail in the world.

Wrong Schooling Emphasis, by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, quite understandably, there is always a vigorous debate on what should be taught in our public schools.

Because of my own interest in the subject matter, I have introduced a resolution (H.J. Res. 395) urging that a commission be established to determine what our standards of education should be.

One of the most outspoken Americans in the field of education is Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover. In the Newark Sunday News for August 21, 1960, a very challenging article by Admiral Rickover appeared. Under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WRONG SCHOOLING EMPHASIS

(By Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover)

We and we alone among all modern democracies have devalued our educational currency.

We have downgraded the high school diploma to a point where it does not even promise competence in elementary subjects. Witness the many college freshmen who have to take remedial courses in reading, writing and arithmetic. Abroad these courses are mastered in the first 8 years of schooling.

Russia's real threat to us will come through their educational and not through their military processes. Military systems and techniques are transitory—they now change every few years. An intelligent and well-educated body of citizens is something you will have forever.

VALUE RECOGNIZED

This is where the Russians are smarter than we. They have recognized the full value of a good education and they are hellbent on giving it to as many of their youngsters as they can coax into taking it.

This is about the best comparison I can make; almost half of Russia's children, graduating at 17 after but 10 years of schooling, do as well—by the record—as many of our children after 14 years of schooling, two of them in college.

Neither I nor other critics have ever recommended that we take over the Russian educational system. We do urge that we consider Russian educational achievements as the minimum standard for our own educational objectives.

SUICIDAL

We warn it would be suicidal if we allowed scholastic levels in our schools permanently to drop below this minimum standard. We flatly reject the claim that since ours is mass education it must, therefore, be mediocre, or that democratic education can never be as good as education in an authoritarian state.

What I have said about Russia applies even more so to the Western European nations.

Abroad, a liberal education comparing favorably with what Americans acquire in 16 years of school and college takes from 12 to 13 years. Europeans are by that much ahead of Americans when they begin to study for a learned profession, such as medicine or law.

NOT UNDEMOCRATIC

We seem bemused by the claims of the educationists that it is undemocratic for other Western nations to separate their children after elementary school, and to put them into different types of secondary schools according to their mental abilities and vocational aims.

We do not say it is undemocratic that nurses go to nursing school and doctors to medical school, and that each obtains a different diploma. Nor do we send enlisted personnel to the same schools as officers.

Why do we get angry at Europeans for weeding out the dullards from the talented children and sending them to separate secondary schools? What good would it do the dullards to be admitted to a school where they would just sit around and understand nothing?

What is democratic about penalizing God-given talent by letting it go to waste so average children won't feel a sense of inferiority?

BEGUILING, PERHAPS

It may be beguiling in theory to think of all our children going to school together. But will it really serve their best interests to send them to schools where the child with an IQ of 70 sits beside one with an IQ of 170, and where the morally weak child freely associates with the child who has been carefully raised to distinguish right from wrong and to conduct himself responsibly?

To say this is advocating that only an elite shall be well educated while the rest of our children receive an inferior education, making them forever hewers of wood and carriers of water, is highly irresponsible demagoguery.

To me there is nothing more important than to change our educational system in such a manner that it will provide the best possible education for every child: slow, average, and talented.

At present, few get a really good public education.

SPECIFICATIONS NEEDED

As an engineer would say the first thing we must do is set up specifications: what we want our high school graduates to know when they finish at the age of 18. The minute you do that, you put courses in etiquette and baton twirling in their proper place; you begin to see that perhaps you ought not to pay an athletic coach a higher salary than a teacher of trigonometry.

There is nothing in our form of government to prevent Congress from setting up some sort of commission or council and giving it the task of working out different sets of educational goals for our public schools.

The schools could disregard them if they so wished, and if the parents in the community did not force them to pay attention. But, by having a national set of standards, everyone could judge where the local school stood.

We could get a statement of policy: "This is what we think is a good education." Such a statement would give the parents a yardstick by which to measure what their children should learn and have learned in school.

EDUCATION OR TRAINING

This would give an enormous advantage to parents who are really interested in having their children educated in contrast to having them merely trained.

To allow a child to choose typewriting instead of physics, or machine shop instead of history or a foreign language, is to let a minor make a decision which will effect the whole course of his future life, a decision he is too young to make intelligently.

How can we expect children to choose higher mathematics when their classmates are having fun learning how to play canasta, cook or find a mate? Why should an eighth grader tacke a hard subject when next door the kids are happily whizzing through a course in home and family living? Why should he take tough examinations, when others get promoted on the basis of true-false tests posing such difficult problems as "should boys use deodorants?" or "can one use cake soap for shampooing?"

In other modern democracies, vocational subjects are to some slight extent taught in schools attended by children who are not academically talented, but they are never considered a substitute for general education. In this country we stop teaching basic subjets to slow learners too soon, we shift them too early from education into training.

What has happened in America is that many parents have abdicated their responsibilities and have let the schools assume them.

The schools are trying to do everything, and they do nothing well. They are trying to perform the functions of the church and the home, as well as their own.

To become educated takes sustained effort, hard work, excellent instruction by teachers who themselves are excellently educated and who know their subjects thoroughly.

American educationists keep assuring us that our schools are the best in the world. The evidence at hand shows all too clearly that this is an illusion. Nothing prevents us from changing this illusion into a reality.

Doctors' Committee for Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the Nassau County Medical Society, after thorough consideration of the 1960 plat-

forms of our two great parties, and of the records made by the candidates of both, has announced its support of RICHARD M. NIXON and Henry Cabot Lodge for President and Vice President of the United States.

I am very proud to submit for the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives the position of the Nassau County Medical Society as presented by Ralph S. Emerson, M.D.:

WAKE UP, DOCTOR

The elections in November 1960 will have a profound effect and determine in a large measure the future of American medicine. Doctors have traditionally shunned partisan politics and find it distasteful, but times have changed. The survival of the freedom of medical practice is in jeopardy. Even though doctors, as individuals, and are not prone to run with the flock, they will fight when their country or their profession is in jeopardy.

For the first time in our history the issues of medical care are spelled out in each party's platform. It behooves every physician to be cognizant of the differences and the subsequent effect on medicine. The Republicans endorsed a medical care plan for the aged embracing both private and State participation. However, they would not use the compulsory social security system. It would be voluntary and apply only when the financial need exists. The Democrats bowed to organized labor and approved a compulsory social security plan to finance, through higher taxes, health care benefits for the aged whether they were in financial need or not. Senator JOHN KENNEDY has pledged an all-out fight for the social security health plan. The AMA and the New York State Medical Society have opposed the Democratic plan. Our combined voices apparently do not carry sufficient political weight in an election year when pressure voting blocs are all important.

It is indeed disturbing that the Democratic Party has plotted the course of medical care along the socialistic road via social security. Fortunately there are many fine Democrats who do not believe their party platform is right in this regard and have the courage to stand up for their convictions even in an election year. We hope this coalition of Democrats and Republicans will be sufficient to uphold the traditional ideals of medical practice.

If history is any lesson in Government maneuvers, we can be sure this effort is merely the beginning of a frustrating battle for the doctors against the Government's expanding intrusion in the field of medical care. We have seen the end results in England, France, Belgium, Austria, New Zealand, etc., to name only a few. At the present time our colleagues in Canada are experiencing an advanced stage of Government planning in medical care. The outlook is dismal unless we wake up to this fact and do something to counteract this trend. We must be in politics, whether we like it or not.

The stake in this election is so great that it transcends all other considerations except national defense. Fortunately, experience and capability in foreign affairs and defense are the strongest forte in the Republican ticket and further justifies our wholehearted support of the free enterprise concept of the Republican Party, as opposed to the expanding centralized Government control of the dominant forces of the Democratic Party.

It is lamentable that large factions of the Democratic Party have strayed so far from the true Jeffersonian Democratic philosophy. Today we have new power blocs which control the regime, and not one of them is friendly to medical freedom. The blueprint of the future medical care program of the Democratic Party is one of expanding third party control by Government agencies, with a powerful assist from organized labor. Unfortunately, our profession is on the trading block, being a pawn in the game of power politics at the public's expense.

When a crisis such as this confronts us, we must rise and be counted as a unit, fighting not only to save medicine but our patient's welfare. Many of us in the past have voted Democratic or have been independent. Previous political affiliation is not the issue this time. The domestic issue is whether medicine will remain free or go down the drain. The doctor's united effort can make the difference as an independent voting bloc. Do you realize a few thousand votes have decided presidential elections in the past? New York State is a key State, and the independent vote of the doctors and our patients can turn the tide to a Republican victory. The Nassau County Medical Society polled the local candidates regarding the Forand bill, which is the best indicator of a person's philosophy. The local Democratic candidates were either for the bill or responded with doubletalk. The local Republican candidates were unanimously against the Forand bill. Vice President RICHARD NIXON is a staunch and avid opponent of the Forand bill, while Senator JACK KENNEDY is for the bill.

Gentlemen, the lineup this year is clear cut. We know who will support us, and we also know who will emasculate us, if given the chance. We must have friends in Congress and the State legislature. Every physician must be a nucleus of support to elect our friends. We need their help during the next 4 years, and the only way they can help us is to be successful in the November election. Politics is a two-way street, and now is the time to support them. They need our help not only in votes but in financial assistance in their political campaigns. If every physician and his wife would convert 20 independent voters to vote Republican in November, we could turn the tide in our favor. This is no time to be sitting on our hands and giving lip service. We should be talking to our patients, service organization, church groups, and at social gatherings to get out the vote.

Gentlemen, in 1949 Truman proposed a compulsory health program. At that time only 20 percent of the aged 65 years and over had voluntary health insurance, while today 65 percent of the aged have some coverage. It is also predicted in 5 years 80 percent of the aged will not only have voluntary health insurance, but they will have more comprehensive coverage. There will be even less need for compulsory health insurance under social security in 1965, and that is one of the reasons the pressure groups are working so frantically to have it enacted now. They know they will have to win by 1965.

In 1949 the doctors went to work on the Truman proposal, and it didn't even get to a vote in Congress. This year we have the hysteria, confusion, and doubletalk of elections which cloud the real issue. Therefore, it behooves every physician to go right to the grassroots and convince our patients not to buy this pig-in-a-poke program and to vote against the Democrats who are sponsoring it. We did it once, we can do it again.

Whenever a crisis develops which adversely affects the doctors, we are bombarded with the question "Why doesn't the medical society do something about it?" You as an individual are the medical society, and here is an opportunity for you to do something about it. We have presented the facts as they affect medicine, and now it is up to you to carry the ball.

Join the Doctors' Committee for NIXON. Vote Republican.

Mr. William Robert Fuoss of Tyrone, Pa., Speaking as a Jeffersonian Democrat Warmly Praises Former President Herbert Clark Hoover for His Depth of Character and His Many Outstanding Qualities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the recent celebration by former President Herbert C. Hoover of the 86th anniversary of his birth resulted in an avalanche of verbal and written tributes to one of America's most distinguished citizens. Editorials in numerous newspapers and periodicals acclaimed the qualities and virtues of the former President of the United States who during and after his tenure of office has conducted himself with the dignity befitting the great office he had the honor to occupy for a term of four years and during his long career in the service of the Federal Government.

On August 10 on the floor of the U.S. Senate there were many fine tributes to former President Hoover by members of both major political parties. Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, Democrat, of Montana, and majority whip of the Senate, said:

Everyone knows that for a great many years Herbert Hoover was a favorite target of the Democrats. He was blamed for many things for which he was not responsible. He is now looked upon as a revered elder statesman; and we are delighted that he is continuing to make so many fine contributions to the welfare of his country and that he is remaining so active during the declining years of his life. In the light of history I believe he was a great President; and I think future historians will bear out that statement.

Among the many fine tributes tendered former President Hoover none of them excel in warmth and sincerity the well-earned expressions from the pen of William Robert Fuoss of Tyrone, Pa. Mr. Fuoss is a former newspaperman in the Keystone State where he also enjoys the reputation of being a forceful and convincing orator. As an ardent admirer of former President Thomas Jefferson, Mr. Fuoss is dedicated to the highest ideals of good government and proudly proclaims the fact that his political philosophy is that of a Jeffersonian Democrat. Prominent in the affairs of the American Legion at the State and National levels, Mr. Fuoss is dedicated to preserving the American form of government and is always in the forefront of the titanic struggle against foreign isms that seek to destroy every vestige of our liberty and freedom.

Mr. Fuoss who is in great demand as a public speaker in Pennsylvania selected the Altoona Mirror, one of the popular daily newspapers in the Keystone State as the medium to express

his great respect and admiration of former President Hoover.

Mr. Fuoss' fine tribute appeared in the August 1 issue of the Altoona Mirror and is as follows:

IN PRAISE OF HOOVER

(By William Robert Fuoss)

EDITOR OF THE ALTOONA MIRROR:

No matter what anybody's preference may be in the election, like millions of my fellow Americans, I listened intently to ex-President Hoover's notable address at the Republican Convention and at the age of 85 he still commands attention of all people, regardless of party.

His voice may be less strong, and his step a little less sure but his heart was in what he said and his reasoning was sound.

Here, after all these years, is the one remaining link with the glorious past, a link that, despite his many years, is still filled with faith, love, and devotion for not alone this great Nation but every single institution that comes under it. Here, in my belief, is a profound and dedicated man and the impressions he leaves are as unfading as time itself. He is the youngest old man in American history and his ideas are as applicable to today as are those who, seeking the highest office in the land, dare speak of new frontiers and new eras. Herbert Hoover is an old institution in a new age, old in the physical sense, young and vibrant and dynamic in the modern age of science and technology. He has grown with the times, risen even greater than the times.

The Hoover speeches, and they are not ghost-written, are as extraordinary, incisive and penetrating as is the Hoover personality. Here is one man who refuses to grow old mentally and spiritually. He is the busiest octogenarian of our time, far surpassing either Winston Churchill or Konrad Adenauer. So great is his output that eight secretaries are required to take his dictation. His literary output rivals that of some of our youngest and ablest writers, scholars, and educators. Like Charles Elliot of Harvard, he is one man who is consulted for what he knows and loved for what he can do. I need not speak of what this great man has done for that would far surpass the space limits of your valued paper.

Mr. Hoover packs in a single paragraph more solid sense than most men of culture and learning do in a half-dozen pages of single-spaced copy. His reading is extensive, almost voluminous. His touch with world affairs, those who know him intimately tell us, "is beyond the grasp of most men of high caliber and, of course, far, far beyond the comprehension of lesser men." Others speak of new horizons, new ideas and new visions. Herbert Clark Hoover is everything they speak of, dare even allude to. He is versatile and cosmopolitan, possibly the nearest approach in American history to Thomas Jefferson and no one dares question Mr. Jefferson's eminence. Trained under Woodrow Wilson, Herbert Clark Hoover enjoys the added distinction of having risen higher than Mr. Wilson in matters of tolerance, faith and works.

I no longer thrill to long-winded speeches. Staged and time-consuming demonstrations have departed me. The cheap publicity sought by favorite sons, so-called, belong to yesterday. Today is timed of action, businesslike action. The world is in no condition to allow of normal things, circuslike stunts minus horsesense, for it will require only an accidental match to inflame it and all then is lost.

Mr. Hoover was never a politician. That possibly explains why he shared so badly in this thing we call politics. The true stature of the man, this quiet and dignified gentleman, is to be seen and felt in the years that have gone since he served as our President. He has grown with the years and today, despite his age, Mr. Hoover ranks among the great of this universe. Here is, in truth, the matured statesman, the one man whom I shall not nominate for the highest honor of his party but, rather, for the highest honor of the universe. Pardon me, this honor has already been suggested for Mr. Hoover by men far wiser than I. Shall I but second the nomination?

Among my prized possessions is a letter had from Mr. Hoover, written in 1937. I had spoken of my displeasure at Mr. Roosevelt's attempts to purge Senators who differed with him. Yes, I even went so far as to disapprove of the attacks upon the Supreme Court as "nine weary old man." I told him, moreover, I had worked and voted against him. He replied, in his own handwriting, "It took rare courage to write me as you have written and I sincerely thank you for what you have said." He is a sincerely kindly man, as all great men are. Many letters have been exchanged since then and, among them are friendly little hints as to how I might improve upon my own ideas as given to the press from time to time. I am the better for these exchanges. I believe I know Mr. Hoover and, believing so, I genuinely esteem him.

His contemporaries are gone, either by death or the choice of a free people. He alone remains. It is fortunate for our people that he retains the vigor and the depth of sincerity to convey to us once more what rests so deeply in his great heart and abundant soul.

Cold War in Fayette County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Ebony magazine, September 1960]

COLD WAR IN FAYETTE COUNTY—A WHITE MINORITY USES HARSH ECONOMIC POWER IN DESPERATE ATTEMPT TO DRIVE OUT MILITANT NEGRO LEADERS

In Moscow, Tenn., and in nearby Somerville, the seat of Fayette County, men are divided by race, writs, and arithmetic.

A racial cold war has split the county into two warring factions. A white minority, backed against the wall by Federal court writs, is pitting its political know-how and economic power against the hungry hopes and dreams of the black majority. The battle revolves around a simple matter of arithmetic Negroes outnumber whites in Fayette County by a margin of about 7,000. There are 4,600 whites of voting age as compared to 8,990 Negroes. Fortified by the magic of numbers, Fayette County Negroes are pushing a relentless voter registration campaign. If it succeeds they will be in a position to elect black mayors and sheriffs.

In a frantic effort to forestall this possibility, whites have countered with an economic boycott and a crash farm mechanization campaign which they hope will drive out about 1,000 Negro ringleaders. The key instrument in this struggle is the registered voters list. A blacklist of all Negro registered voters has been circulated among merchants in the town by the White Citizens Council. Persons whose names appear on the list cannot buy gasoline for their farm machinery, food for their tables, or medicine for their children. Nor can they negotiate crop loans which are as necessary to the marginal southern farmer as seed.

This strange war, which has attracted national attention is fought out in grocery stores, in banks and at gas stations. Both sides are adamant. Says J. L. Howse, a white Somerville grocer: "We don't care what nobody else out there thinks. There's nobody can help us and nobody can hurt us." John McFerren, a grocer who leads the opposition, is equally firm. "I was born and raised in Fayette County. It was 18 years before I was taken into the army and before I even knowed I had a country, I came back here and made a home. I think it is as important for me to fight a war here as it was for me to go over there and fight. This war is just as important as World War II."

The little war in Fayette County is complicated by ominous facts. Both sides are determined. Both sides are led by proud, independent men who "do not intend to be pushed around." And both sides intend, as one man said, "to see the end."

The determination of the Negro citizens came through one day recently when the doors of the Chancery Court were thrown open for voter registration. Not many Negroes were expected. It was as clear as the Christian Cross on the Somerville water tower that any Negro who attempted to register would find himself in hot water. As a matter of fact, 24 hours before the registration began, the Memphis NAACP had found it necessary to truck in food and clothes for the beleaguered families of registered voters. Under these circumstances, the whites were understandably optimistic. But, at 7 a.m. on registration day, before the sun peeped over the water tower, little knots of Negroes began to gather in the courthouse square. Five hours later, at high noon, some 400 (a conservative estimate) stood quietly in a line that serpentined around one side of the courthouse.

It would be pleasant to report that they were registered. But that would not be true. Fayette County Negroes are opposed by formidable adversaries. At the end of the day, a reported 21 Negroes had been registered.

John McFerren, the grocer who heads the fight as chairman of the Fayette County Civic and Welfare League, does not underestimate the skill of the white leaders of the county. He says, however, that he will try, try again. He is confident that in America a majority will prevail.

"Three Fayette families," he says, "have been operating this county for the last 40 years. They are pressuring some of the other white men to do what they have to do. The whites know that Negroes are not trying to take over this county. But the high supreme ring, which has run this county for 40 years and is still running it, will be broken. The big men are killing the little man in this county, Negroes and whites. Oh, yes, the little white man is being taken, too. I think that when enough Negroes are registered, we've got enough liberal whites in this county to break the ring."

Dr. John W Morris, the largest landowner in the county, makes a different analysis of the situation. "Only about 400 or 500 out of the 15,000 niggers around here are stirred up," he said. "The rest deplore the situation. One man came to me and he said it was scandalous the things he was told in church. Scandalous, that's the word he used."

He sighed and shrugged his shoulders. "Niggers around here have always voted, a few anyways. Most of them just haven't been interested in politics. But an extra couple of hundred votes around here don't matter much, one way or the other. There hasn't been any boycott. This is a matter of credit being withdrawn from undesirable risks at a time when all credit must be tightened up. • • • Signing up to register

don't have anything to do with it, but it got some of us to thinking how maybe they weren't happy around here with things the way they were."

But W. B. Wigglestone, manager of the local bank, admits that there is a blacklist.

"Both my girls out there," he told a free-lance white reporter, "they have copies of it. The men on that list, I won't even talk to, unless they already owe us money and are coming in to pay it off."

NEGROES PLAN COUNTERATTACK

Will the cold war get hot?

This question troubles many men. John McFerren says frankly that he does not know. He points out that the Fayette County Civic and Welfare League is committed to a policy of nonviolence. "If any violence starts," he says, "the whites will start it first and the results—nobody knows."

Close observers of the Fayette scene believe the whites will avoid a violent incident. The white leaders, it is said, believe they can attain their objectives by economic means. Another deterrent in the situation is the fact that the FBI and other Federal agencies are watching the county. Still another deterrent is the fact that whites are outnumbered in a county where many Negroes own land and are prepared to protect themselves.

It seems, therefore, that economics will dominate the struggle which has been going on now for a year. It began, if social conflicts can be said to have a beginning, last August 1. Actually, the conflict had been building up for many years. McFerren says, "There had been no fairness and the way they handled problems in the courthouse I didn't go along with and also a lot of others didn't go along with."

The main problem, McFerren and others say, was law enforcement. Negro citizens, therefore, decided to take a hand in the election for sheriff held August 1, 1959. There were, at that time, about 600 Negro voters, most of whom were backing a liberal white farmer and storekeeper, L. T. Redfearn. On election day, Negroes were barred from the polls. Subsequently, a suit was filed under the Civil Rights Act.

Last April, a consent decree was entered in the Federal Court in Memphis.

The real fight began, with signals being called by the White Citizens Council which meets, reportedly, in the courthouse. At a meeting there last April, the blacklist was drawn up. A dozen Negro leaders were used as a basic list and others were added as they registered to vote. Redfearn says he was the first white man placed on the list. Now, it appears, there are at least a dozen white men being boycotted, along with about 400 Negroes.

"In this county," says Redfearn, "running for office means bucking candidates who have been hand picked by two or three big men. It's a kinfolk deal. Because I went against them, and because I would probably have got into the run-offs if the Negroes had been allowed to register and vote, they're down on me * * * Merchants in all parts of the county have turned down my business, either for cash or credit—men I've been doing business with for years. I couldn't get a tire fixed, I couldn't get my equipment repaired—finally I got the word and I just don't go into Somerville anymore * * * You can't expect a man to extend credit to everybody, but I don't see why a man won't honor the dollar."

Scott Charlie Franklin, who has been subjected to a similar boycott, is a grocer and president of the Fayette County League. He is being boycotted by gas dealers, soft drink distributors, candy salesmen and butchers in Fayette County, Shelby (Memphis) County, and northern Mississippi. Sitting in front of his little store, about 2 miles from the Mississippi border, he said: "Wouldn't a white who knows me look at me if he passed here. People who own stores who wouldn't sell me 10 cents worth, used to come to my place and drink beer for hours at a time, four or five pints, and laugh and talk, and now they won't even speak to me. Men who used to borrow my tractor parts and I would borrow theirs pass me on the street without looking at me."

The Negro in the South, he says, is facing a fight for survival. "There is not but one route of escape for the Negro in the South and that is to get together. Had Negroes in the South with money been thinking they wouldn't have choked us out. We would have had wholesale houses and gas outlets and we could have gone to them."

Franklin revealed that Fayette County Negroes are planning a counterattack. In about 90 days, he said, a counterboycott will be launched. This possibility is feared by Somerville merchants. That it would wreak disaster on the town's economy was admitted by Isaac P. Yancey, mayor and auto dealer.

We sell to both niggers and white folks," he said. "There are more niggers in this county than whites and we just have to do business with them or we aren't in business. What we're afraid of is some unscrupulous politician getting the majority group together and upsetting the welfare of our county—electing a nigger law-enforcement officer, for example."

True Magazine Article by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson on U–2 Flight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the September issue of True magazine contains an article by Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson which is called "Inside Story of Pilot Powers and His Secret U–2 Spy Flight."

I hope that this article, which the magazine says is based on official Air Force documents and secret reports, will be widely read. I hope especially that it will receive the careful attention of the Members of Congress.

Aside from its revelations about the Powers flight and other U–2 flights, the True article makes a most significant statement on the relationship between the U–2 flights and the administration's defense budget.

Say Mr. Pearson and his associate:

The defense budget of the Eisenhower administration was based on these U–2 flights.

They claim that on the basis of aerial photographs taken on U–2 flights "the administration told Congress we were not too far behind Russia, could afford to cut the budget."

Mr. Speaker, this raises a most serious question. I trust it will be explored fully by the Congress.

Under unanimous consent I present the text of the True magazine article by Messrs. Pearson and Anderson on the U–2 flights:

[From True magazine, September 1960]

INSIDE STORY OF PILOT POWERS AND HIS SECRET U–2 SPY FLIGHT—OFFICIAL AIR FORCE DOCUMENTS AND SECRET REPORTS REVEAL FOR THE FIRST TIME THE TRUE FACTS BEHIND THE SPY-IN-THE-SKY MISSIONS

(By Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson)

All the world knows the broad outline of the U–2 story, the strangest spy story in history. Most of what has been written on it, however, is only intelligent speculation.

Now for the first time, based on official Air Force reports, can be told the inside story of the U–2 missions and how Francis Gary Powers came to be captured, thereby wrecking the most important international conference in this decade. The story is based on secret reports of the monitoring stations which tracked Powers' plane all the way up the backbone of Russia and listened to Russian conversations as they struck at him. From this, plus the tell-tale wreckage which the Russians put on display at Gorki Park, plus the secret instructions given Powers before he departed, intelligence experts have put together a remarkably detailed account of the fateful flight.

Powers left his home at Incirlik, Turkey, near Adana, on April 27 and landed at Peshawar, Pakistan, the famous British fortress city which guards the Khyber Pass to Afghanistan. In Peshawar he waited for good weather. Shortly after dawn on May 1, he filed a routine flight plan giving a course back to Incirlik, Turkey. As far as the Pakistan Government knew this was where he was going—but across his knees in the cockpit there was a startlingly different course.

Other spy planes had penetrated deep into Russia, one sneaking within a few miles of Moscow. But Powers was to be the first to cross the vast Soviet land mass from the Aral to the Barents Seas. His main checkpoints:

1. Tyura Tam, the great Soviet missile center in the desert east of the Aral Sea.
2. The Sverdlovsk rocket sites.
3. The Soviet air and submarine bases at Archangel and Murmansk.

His touchdown on friendly soil would be at Bodo, Norway.

It was known that a monster missile, twice the size of America's 107-foot Atlas, was poised on a launching pad at Tyura Tam. The Central Intelligence Agency desperately wanted photographs of the new missile. They suspected it might be used for a long-hinted May Day space spectacular.

Little did Powers guess that he himself would provide the spectacular, and that his secret mission would become the most publicized flight since Lindbergh flew the Atlantic.

Powers gunned the U-2. As it rushed down the runway, the outrigger wheels supporting the long, drooping wings dropped away. The graceful, glider-like plane climbed quickly, its wings flapping noticeably like those of a great black seagull gaining altitude. Above the ceiling of fighters and bombers, the U-2 soared. An aerodynamic dream, its thin, straight wings, bullet shape, and tall, razor tail made the U-2 a mistress of the skies. Even the rivets were sunk flush to reduce friction drag. At 65,000 feet, Powers leveled off and headed for the Russian border.

The weather on May Day was perfect, either for picnicking or U-2 spying. The sky over Russia had to be cloudless to give the cameras a clear view, and the upper atmosphere had to be dry so the plane would not form giveaway contrails. If the weather had not been ideal, Powers would not have made the May Day flight. Nor would any other flights across Russia have been attempted until President Eisenhower had completed his visit to Russia in mid-June. May 2 had been set as the beginning of a moratorium on

such aerial espionage, and for at least 6 weeks there would be no more.

Powers was not piloting the only U–2 in the air that day. Simultaneously, another U–2 had taken off from Incirlik to fly conspicuously along the Soviet border as a decoy. The pilot deliberately sent meaningless messages over his radio to attract attention and to lure Soviet radar and monitoring stations into following him while Powers slipped into Russia unnoticed. The decoy would continue over Pakistan, then return to Incirlik. The Pakistan authorities, who knew nothing of Powers' secret mission, would be notified that a U–2 had arrived and they would assume it was Powers.

It soon became clear, however, that the Russians had not been fooled by the decoy. American listening and watching stations picked up the frustrated comments of the Soviet defenders who had discovered Powers but were unable to do anything about him.

Soviet jets leaped and snarled at the spy plane which hovered high out of their reach. For a tantalizing moment one interceptor managed to reach the intruder's level. Our monitors could hear the Russian screaming like a banshee with the fury of his efforts. But the short wings could not hold the heavy machine in the thin air.

At the controls of the sleek, dark U–2, Ace Pilot Powers knew he was safe both from the Russian fighters swarming beneath, and from the vaunted Russian antiaircraft rockets peeping through white domes on the outskirts of Sverdlovsk below. His altimeter showed 70,000 feet and neither fighters nor rockets could hurt him at this altitude.

To those daring young men who flew the U–2's, a flight over Sverdlovsk was pretty much a milk run. They called the network of domed rocket launchers below the "House of David."

Powers checked his inertial guidance gear which permitted him to navigate without external radio aids, then swung the U–2's blunt nose toward Murmansk. Suddenly the faint murmur of his J–75 turbojet engine faded away. A glance at the r.p.m. indicator showed the engine was slowing. Anxiously he checked the tailpipe temperature. It was cooling rapidly. He knew his engine was dead. He also knew the only way to start it again would be to swoop deep into the heavier atmosphere where the Soviet fighters were still swarming.

Powers switched off the fuel to keep the engine from flooding, then snapped on his command radio, turned to the emergency "G" channel and barked tersely: "Flameout! Flameout!" These words were heard across the Turkish border 1,200 miles away where a handful of Americans were watching the drama helplessly on radar screens and listening by high-powered radio monitors.

First indication that the Russians were back on the attack came from an excited Russian voice: "He's turning left." Then: "He's coming lower!"

Powers spiraled down to 40,000 feet, then tilted the nose upward to drain the tailpipe and began flipping his air-start ignition switch in a desperate effort to ignite the flame. Nothing happened. At 37,000 feet the Soviet fighters caught up with him, formed a canopy over his head and began forcing him to the ground.

For years to come, arguments will rage around Powers. The spy's code is never to be taken alive, to do the utmost to destroy his equipment. If he is captured, then he must expect neither help nor recognition from his government.

Powers must have pondered all this in the split seconds before he bailed out. He must have pondered the reception awaiting him and whether to use the suicide needle in his escape kit. Grabbing the kit—containing a pistol, currency, gold coins, watches, rings, and that deadly needle—he bailed out.

Graceful to the last, the U–2 fluttered down, mothlike, to make its own belly landing. The air-speed indicator jarred stuck at 340 knots.

The experts aren't quite certain whether Powers tried to destroy his plane or not. Damage in the center section of the wreckage could have been caused by a small dynamite blast he set off. But the experts could tell from the state of the wreckage shown in Gorki Park that the U–2 made a belly landing with its engine dead. The turbine blades were bent backward; they would have been sheared off if the engine had been functioning at the time of the crash. The damage to the underside indicated the plane had scraped along the ground.

Should Powers have used the suicide needle as he floated down? Did he do everything possible to destroy his plane and the incriminating equipment? Should he have confessed so freely to the Russians? Although trained in the espionage trade, Powers was much more a pilot than a spy. His instruments were the real spies. His orders did not require him to commit suicide in the event of failure or imminent capture. The Russians tried his death needle on a dog which died in 30 seconds. But this means of quick death had been included in Powers' escape kit only to avoid torture.

As for keeping his lip buttoned, Powers' instructions in case of capture were to admit promptly what the Russians were bound to find out anyway. His superiors reasoned that sophisticated third-degree methods could force any prisoner into far more damaging statements than the simple truth.

There can be no argument about the need for espionage flights across the Iron Curtain. The Strategic Air Command had to be ready, should war break out, to blast key targets in the Soviet Union. But how could SAC locate the targets?

At first the only information available to SAC came from captured German aerial pictures taken during World War II. The face of Russia was changing rapidly, however. New cities, new industries, new military installations were springing up in the secret heartland. How could these be pinpointed?

All sorts of efforts were made before the high-flying U–2 was produced. The Air Force sent bombers, heavily loaded with cameras and electronic gear, around the rim of Russia to peer over the Communist transom. This began around 1949, despite President Truman's statement that no spy flights were undertaken in his administration. Of 17 shooting incidents along the Soviet border, most involved spy planes trying to photograph what lay across the border.

In addition B–47's and B–57's were sent on hit-and-run reconnaissance raids a few miles inside the border, usually over satellite countries. For these daring observation raids, the pilots were awarded secret medals.

Even camera-carrying balloons were tried. They were launched in Europe when the wind was favorable, to drift across Russia to the Pacific where they could be picked up. However, they came back with more film of Siberian scenery than of military installations. Eventually, the Russians spotted these silent, ghostly snoopers and raised such an international ruckus that the program was dropped.

The continued use of bombers eventually caused a new anxiety. They could be mistaken for hostile warplanes, perhaps carrying H-bombs, thus might trigger a war. To prevent this, the CIA went to Lockheed Aircraft in 1954 with a secret assignment. The cloak-and-dagger agency wanted a civilian plane which could not possibly be mistaken for a bomber but which could penetrate deep into Russia. It must be able to carry heavy electronic, infrared camera equipment at heights which would put it beyond the reach of interceptors or antiaircraft fire. Lockheed got busy. Within 1 year the remarkable U–2 was ready for its first test flights.

By 1956, Lockheed was operating 10 U–2's, ostensibly for the Nation's civilian space agency as gatherers of weather information. Actually the pilots got their orders from the CIA. The space agency received its weather data all right. But this was merely a by-product. The real product was vital pictures from deep in Russia which were sent direct to CIA.

For the first penetration of Soviet territory, trusted foreign pilots were used in case the flights should fail. Reason: if a foreign pilot were forced down in an unmarked plane, it would be difficult to pin the deed upon the United States. But the loyalty program in Congress demanded clean-cut, all-American boys who could pass a rigid security clearance and be able to swear that their grandparents were born in this country.

Lockheed set up a pilot training unit supposedly for high altitude weather research. But the handpicked pilots were given rigorous training in the techniques of modern espionage. Lockheed executives made it a point never to ask questions about the daredevil young men in their school. It was run by close-lipped Clarence "Kelly" Johnson, the company's vice president in charge of advanced development projects.

Not since the first U–2 spread its wings over Russia have the CIA chiefs had any reason to underestimate the risks involved. Any single engine plane flying in lofty loneliness above 65,000 feet is hazard with wings. Flight conditions in the thin air at that altitude are less than ideal. The U–2's special kerosene fuel, refined for high altitude cruising, is particularly difficult to reignite in case of flameout.

Emergencies downed at least four U–2s before Powers finally was forced down in the wrong place at the wrong time. As early as February 1956, a U–2 crashed in Arizona after fire broke out in the cockpit. Pilot Robert J. Everett, like Powers officially on Lockheed's payroll, bailed out at 30,000 feet. Seven months later, another U–2 hit the dirt near Kaiserslautern, West Germany. The pilot, Howard Carey, was also a Lockheed man. The following April, another U–2 crashed in a desolate corner of northwestern Nevada, killing the Lockheed pilot, Robert L. Sieker.

Then on September 24, 1959, a U–2 based at Atsugi, near Tokyo, drifted down for an emergency belly landing at Fugisawa airstrip. As a rescue team rushed to his aid, the pilot remained in his cockpit. Not until a U.S. helicopter disgorged a squad of Americans in civilian clothes did the pilot pull back his canopy and shout, "I'm okay." Curious Japanese noted that the blue-black plane bore no markings; neither did the pilot's flight suit, though he carried a revolver on his hip. The rescue squad drew pistols to keep the Japanese back, which aroused even more curiosity.

Since the flights began in early 1956, U–2s are known to have operated out of Alaska, Japan, Okinawa, the Philippines, England, Germany, Turkey and Pakistan. One of the first U–2 flights over Russia penetrated as far as Kiev, 200 miles inside the Soviet Union, during the first week of July, 1956. Russian defenders spotted the plane but could not knock it down. Their antiaircraft rockets fell short at 60,000 feet—which in itself was valuable information. The Soviet fighters could not hang on at the U–2's cruising level.

Thereafter, U–2 overflights became increasingly frequent until they were going into Russia about once a month. Most U–2s sneaked in and out without detection. One got within 70 miles of Moscow to photograph defense installations at Kolomna.

Before Powers' fateful flight, there had been at least two missions aimed at Sverdlovsk. The first went only half way, then turned back because the clouds made photography difficult. The second

soared all the way to the "House of David" at 65,000 feet and came back at 70,000 feet—completely unseen. The last penetration before the Powers mission was on April 9. The spy plane flew over the Tyura Tam missile center, then hurried back with important photographs. This flight was picked up by frustrated Russian defenders, who were all set for Powers when he showed up on May 1.

Word has leaked out that the Russians, now aware of the full extent of U–2 espionage, are desperately transplanting their missile sites in the greatest military switch since they moved whole industries behind the Urals in World War II.

They are even putting missiles on trains so they will no longer be stationary targets for American bombers. Knowing that we have pictures of their most important installations the Kremlin is making sure, as swiftly as possible, that those photos will be out of date.

With the U–2 now grounded for all flights over Russia, how will the Pentagon keep track of this movement of men, rockets and materiel? This is the most difficult problem facing both our military planners and the airmen who remain on the alert 24 hours a day ready to pilot medium and heavy bombers loaded with nuclear bombs to key targets in the heart of Russia. But with those targets now switched, and with no new photos to show where they have been moved, the 24-hour alert becomes ineffective, eventually almost futile.

Furthermore, the defense budget of the the Eisenhower administration was based on these U–2 flights. The photos showed that Russia had not gone all-out to produce the first generation ICBM in large numbers. The photos showed Russia putting great effort into the second-generation solid-fuel missile similar to our Minuteman, and having developed a liquid-fueled cluster of rockets (similar to our unlaunched Saturn) which has been able to send their giant spaceships into orbit. It was on the basis of these photos that the administration told Congress we were not too far behind Russia, could afford to cut the budget. Now we are not sure where we are. The U–2 photos are out of date.

One day, Samos, the reconnaissance satellite, will circle the earth and send back pictures. But Samos is at least 3 years away. The TV views sent back from Tiros, the experimental weather satellites, are not good enough for military reconnaissance. They were vague and fuzzy. As a stop-gap measure, perhaps cameras can be loaded aboard earlier satellites, and perhaps the films can be dropped back to earth.

Whatever the solution, the age of satellite spying will come. But will it come soon enough? The hope is that it will arrive before the U–2 pictures of Russia are too far out of date. Otherwise, and even worse tragedy may result from our May Day disaster.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided,* That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Only the Strong Can Be Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on August 8, 9, and 10 the Association of the U.S. Army held its annual meeting here in the city of Washington. At the conclusion of this meeting the association adopted a set of resolutions which constitute a concise and lucid statement of the views of this patriotic organization. I commend these resolutions to the attention of my colleagues as a thought-provoking view of many of the problems which confront our Nation today in the field of national defense.

Under unanimous consent I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

ONLY THE STRONG CAN BE FREE—RESOLUTIONS, 1960 ANNUAL MEETING, ASSOCIATION OF THE U.S. ARMY, AUGUST 10, 1960

In his message to the Congress on August 8, 1960, President Eisenhower reported "an intensification of Communist truculence." Our response to this, he said, must be vigilance. "Continuing strength, military, economic, spiritual, must remain our reliance. Our basic objective—to secure a permanent peace—is yet to be won."

This continuing danger is of real and vital interest to the Association of the U.S. Army. It is the reason for existence of the association at this time in our national history. To put the events of these times and AUSA's part in them into perspective a review of the cataclysmic events of this century is in order.

The first half of this century was a time of great global wars and revolutions which saw the overthrow of powerful autocracies and the breakup of world-girdling empires built on colonialism.

Submerged races and peoples have risen out of the wreckage to form new nations that are strong in numbers, in undeveloped resources and, most importantly in aspirations and pride.

Out of the carnage of war and revolution has arisen a counterrevolutionary force: the Communist empires of Soviet Russia and Red China. Fervently committed to the overthrow of the rest of the world, these aggressive, ruthless dictatorships have thrown into the effort all of their considerable and growing resources.

Also in this century man has made great scientific advances which have immense peaceful potentialities. Unfortunately these same advances have made possible weapons that evil men could use to destroy the world.

THE RESPONSIBILITIES OF LEADERSHIP

The leadership of the nations opposed to Communist tyranny has been thrust upon the United States. In its strength and in love of freedom the United States has never sought to aggrandize its position at the expense of other peoples.

This leadership is a challenge of utmost magnitude.

To meet it the people of the United States must demonstrate that a free people is able to maintain its freedom while harnessing its great energies and diverse talents in unflagging opposition to tyranny.

Of all the immense responsibilities thrust upon us none is more critical than the obligation to provide for the common defense with armies, navies and air forces capable, with the help of allies, of deterring Communist military aggression.

THE MILITARY PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED STATES

We of the Association of the United States Army hold that the security of the United States and the nations allied with us is fundamental.

We believe that this security is attainable. We can afford it.

The strategy of deterrence and containment through forward deployed forces is essential to free world security, but this strategy does not provide for retaliation if the deterrent fails. In such a case we must be prepared to carry the war to the enemy after the first nuclear strikes and to bring the war to a rapid and successful conclusion.

The 1960's may be the decade of decision in this century of revolution and war. Premier Khrushchev continually indicates his belief that the Soviet Union is militarily superior to the United States and that he can, through threats of annihilation, have his way. If he believes the Communist nations are able to defeat the free nations in war, the chances of war are markedly increased.

We must disabuse him of his idea. Militant communism will be deterred only if it has the certain knowledge that against a strong America it cannot win.

So we must be strong for only the strong can be free.

If we are to leave this planet a place on which our children can work out their own destinies freely, we must be willing to meet the challenges of this fateful century with the same courage, sacrifice, and patriotic belief as those who gave us our way of life.

The Association reaffirms its support of the programs adopted at the preceding annual meetings:

To urge the adoption of career incentives for officers and enlisted personnel to increase the effectiveness of the Army, and to improve the morale and esprit of the members of the Army and their families. These include such matters as: adequate family housing, medical and dental care for dependents, and adequate retired pay;

To continue efforts to increase the number and quality of young men applying for appointment to the U.S. Military Academy;

To proceed with the U.S. Army's memorial at its birthplace in Independence Hall in Philadelphia.

(The Association further pledges itself to continue to work for the best interests of the Army and the Nation. To guide our endeavors we have adopted the following resolutions.)

No. 1. ARMY MANPOWER

Whereas with the continuing threat to the security of the United States and to peace within the free world, it is essential that the United States maintain Army forces in numbers sufficient to provide a deterrent force and to serve as a base for timely mobilization; and

Whereas there can be no reliable assurance that present Army forces as vital elements of a total defense program are sufficient in number to provide an effective deterrent to aggression; and

Whereas such present Army forces would afford an obviously inadequate basis for prompt mobilization to resist an actual attack and thereupon to prosecute any resulting war to a successful conclusion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army advocates:

1. An active U.S. Army of not less than 1 million men; and

2. A U.S. Army Reserve of a paid drill strength of not less than 300,000, exclusive of 6-month trainees; and

3. An Army National Guard of a paid drill strength of not less than 400,000, exclusive of 6-month trainees.

No. 2. MODERNIZATION OF THE ARMY

Whereas a high percentage of the weapons and equipment currently in use by the Army is still of World War II design; and

Whereas through technological advances in the intervening years great strides have been made in the development of new and improved weapons and equipment designed to afford the possessor a position of tactical superiority with reduced losses in men; and

Whereas except as such new weapons and equipment are produced and procured by the U.S. Army, the enemy—and not the United States—will have this advantage: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army advocates that the U.S. Army be immediately modernized by replacing all present obsolete and obsolescent weapons and equipment with new weapons and equipment of the latest design for purposes of immediate training and use, and that there be promptly procured and stockpiled sufficient quantities of such new weapons and equipment to assure U.S. ground forces superiority over any foreseeable enemy.

No. 3. AIRLIFT

Whereas recent public disclosures have demonstrated that the U.S. Army is not assured an airlift which is vital for the movement and initial support of the Army's strategic and tactical forces and for logistical requirements of the Army; and

Whereas any failure to correct this critical shortage by providing an assured availability of such airlift on a committed basis and with modern aircraft and equipment will preclude effective strategic training and could have a crippling effect on U.S. Army operations in the event of national emergency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army advocates that there be provided for immediate and assured availability to the U.S. Army sufficient airlift utilizing modern aircraft preallocated on a top priority basis to enable the Army to accomplish its assigned national defense mission.

No. 4. REMOVAL OF COMBAT LIMITATIONS

Whereas the advisability of the removal or modification of existing weight limitations on Army aircraft and limitations on the range and employment of missile systems by Army field commanders has been the subject

of detailed study and consideration within the Department of Defense; and

Whereas there has not yet evolved a definitive program which, giving due weight to all of the factors necessarily to be evaluated, permits full utilization of the Army's mobility and other capabilities in support of the Army's mission in national defense: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army continues to advocate that the Army be immediately freed of existing weight limitations on Army aircraft and limitations on the range and employment of missile systems.

No. 5. Defense Against Ballistic Missiles

Whereas the threat of ballistic missile attack against continental United States is becoming increasingly a reality; and

Whereas the retaliatory power of our military strength could be in jeopardy in the event of such an attack; and

Whereas the loss of lives and destruction to the American economy that might result from such an attack could be tragically enormous; and

Whereas the development of an active defense system has reached an advanced stage in the form of the Nike-Zeus which is this country's only antimissile defense development now in the hardware stage; and

Whereas the production problems of such a defense system are of such magnitude and complexity that they involve long leadtime factors demanding an immediate initiation of production, but which initiation has continually been delayed pending proof of the design and development effort, thus delaying an effective deployment date: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army urgently recommends that the development, production, and deployment of the Nike-Zeus antimissile missile system be placed on a national crash basis, and that production and procurement be immediately authorized even though the demonstration of the development results is not fully completed.

No. 6. A Vigorous Army ROTC Program

Whereas the Regular Army, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserve depend on the ROTC program as a principal source of commissioned officers in both war and peace and as a broad mobilization base in event of war expansion; and

Whereas the ROTC program is vital to the continuing availability of high-caliber officers to meet the qualitative and quantitative leadership requirements of the Army; and

Whereas the training under the ROTC program in high schools and universities is essential to national defense, and also contributes to our national welfare and to the development of leadership, citizenship, and patriotism in young men; and

Whereas the continuing effectiveness and value of the ROTC program requires that it keep apace of the growing population and consequent economic burdens of our educational institutions: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army recommends that the ROTC program be sustained and strengthened by the continuance of mandatory ROTC training in those institutions currently required to do so, and further by providing adequate Federal assistance for all Army ROTC programs.

No. 7. Mutual Security and Military Assistance Programs

Whereas national security in this era is necessarily dependent in substantial part on the strength of our allies; and

Whereas the mutual security and military assistance programs are vital factors in increasing the strength of our allies, and thus of our own position; and

Whereas the mutual security and military assistance programs are, in effect, our frontline in defense of our freedoms and way of life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army fully supports the objectives of the mutual security and military assistance programs, and urges that these programs be sustained with the funds required for adequate support.

No. 8. Coordination of Military and Civil Defense

Whereas the potential aggressor has the capability of launching a devastating missile attack agains the United States; and

Whereas the military forces will operate within the same environment as the civil defense forces and will rely on the civil defense forces, the civilian population, and civilian productive capacities for sustaining military operations; and

Whereas the essential interdependence of civil and military defense requires advance planning and an understanding that military participation in recovery from nuclear attack must not interfere with the combat missions of the Armed Forces: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Department of Defense and the Office of Civil Defense Mobilization encourage local civil defense authorities and local military authorities to confer and plan together the form of mutual assistance which may be required in the event of attack.

No. 9. Protection Against Chemical and Biological Warfare

Whereas major emphasis on nuclear weapons has overshadowed great military advancements in the development of chemical and biological weapons; and

Whereas chemical and biological weapons can bring about physical and mental incapacitation without necessarily causing death, but possibly causing widespread panic: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army do all in its power to make the people of the United States aware of the necessity for and unique characteristics of chemical and biological weapons so that they and our forces may be better prepared to protect and defend themselves in the event these chemical and biological weapons are used against us.

No. 10. One Army

Whereas the one-Army conference called by the Secretary of the Army in October 1959 developed objectives for increasing the peacetime spirit of cooperation and coordination among the Active Army, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserve; and

Whereas a comprehensive and intensive program in support of one-Army objectives has contributed to higher esprit and closer undertsanding among the three components of the U.S. Army; and

Whereas tactical exercises conducted to include the three components have been a means of increasing the integration of these components into a single battle team and in consequence the one-Army program has been instrumental in substantially increasing the combat readiness of the whole U.S. Army: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army continue to support in every possible way the objectives of the one-Army program and commends the Active Army, the Army National Guard, and the Army Reserve for their significant achievements under the one-Army program.

No. 11. Peaceful Contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States

Whereas the peaceful contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States are seldom heralded or appreciated, the Association of the U.S. Army calls especially to the attention of the American people these contributions of the Armed Forces of the United States during the past 12 months:

The prompt rendering of aid to the earthquake victims of Chile by the Army, Navy, and Air Force, and especially the work of the Army's Medical Corps and Corps of Engineers in carrying out vital missions of mercy with efficiency and dedication;

The contribution to peace of the Armed Forces of the United States and other nations in transporting troops, supplies, and equipment to the Congo in the service of the United Nations;

The continuing contributions of the Armed Forces to the peaceful exploration of space, and especially the smoothness and efficiency with which the Army transferred, in the national good, the unsurpassed team of space scientists and engineers of the Army Ballistic Missile Agency to the National Aeronautics and Space Agency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army commends the armed services of the United States for their contributions to the peaceful progress of the world during the past year and directs that copies of this resolution be presented to the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

No. 12. Political Party Platforms

Whereas the Democratic and Republican Parties in their platforms recognized that national defense forces to preserve our national security are the first charge upon our Nation's resources; and

Whereas these party planks call for mobile forces and weapons of sufficient strength "to deter both limited and general aggression" and "to deter or check local aggressions and 'brush fire wars' ": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army calls upon both political parties to help develop the Army strength in manpower, mobility, and modernization to carry out the full sense of their party platforms.

No. 13. Commendation of Secretary Brucker

Whereas the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker has given over 5 years of dedicated service to his country as Secretary of the Army; and

Whereas he has shown calm wisdom, understanding statesmanship, and indefatigable energy in meeting the many problems that have confronted him in performing the duties of this high position of responsibility; and

Whereas he has fought unceasingly that the real role of the Army in our national defense program be properly recognized, and

Whereas we the members of the Association of the U.S. Army, in convention assembled in Washington, D.C., this 10th day of August, 1960, wish to take note of the contributions made by him to our country's welfare, both as Secretary of the Army and otherwise: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we convey to the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker our sincere thanks, and as a token of our high esteem make this resolution a part of our permanent record and forward a copy of it to him.

No. 14. Pershing Centennial

Whereas September 13 of this year will be the 100th anniversary of the birth of Gen. John J. Pershing; and

Whereas General Pershing earned the esteem of past, present, and future generations of American citizens through his devoted service to his country over a period of 66 years, during which time he repeatedly demonstrated that he was equal to the formidable tasks which confronted him; and

Whereas General Pershing was tendered the rank of General of the Armies—the only officer of this country to hold that designa-

tion—reflecting the highest honor on his lifelong service; and

Whereas by joint resolution approved June 1, 1960, the Congress of the United States requested the President to proclaim September 13, 1960, as a day on which Americans should pay respect to the memory of General Pershing and the men who served under him; and

Whereas the President of the United States issued such a proclamation on June 3, 1960: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army supports the observance of a day commemorating the birth of this gallant soldier and does enjoin its members to give their enthusiastic support to local ceremonies and observances of General of the Armies John J. Pershing Day on September 13, 1960.

No. 15. ENLISTED RETIRED PAY

Whereas retirement pay for enlisted personnel is now computed on the basis of Federal active duty only; and

Whereas retirement pay for commissioned officers is computed on the basis of total years of service including both active and inactive duty; and

Whereas legislation has been introduced which would give enlisted men retirement credit for service on the same basis as commissioned officers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army urges the equalization of the method of computation of retirement pay between enlisted and commissioned personnel of the U.S. Army.

No. 16. EQUALIZATION OF RETIRED PAY

Whereas prior to the enactment of Public Law 85–422 of May 20, 1958, retired personnel of the Armed Forces received pay based on rates in direct relationship to active duty pay; and

Whereas Public Law 85–422 provided for an increase in pay rates for active duty personnel, and for personnel retiring subsequent to passage of the law, but not similarly applicable to personnel retired prior to passage of the law; and

Whereas the President of the United States, the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of Defense have recognized this inequity and recommended that legislation be enacted to correct it; and

Whereas this legislation would be of significant value in terms of increasing the morale, efficiency, and effectiveness of our active duty career personnel as well as avoiding discrimination against retired personnel who have served their country faithfully and well: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Association of the U.S. Army continues to urge the reestablishment of the traditional relationship between active pay and retired pay.

American Investments Overseas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STYLES BRIDGES

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement delivered to the Republican National Convention Platform Committee by Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, of Chicago, Ill., a distinguished citizen, who served as delegate at large at the Republican National Convention in Chicago last month.

The subject of General Klein's statement was the vital importance of Government action to protect and encourage private investment abroad. I believe this statement, which was proposed as a policy position in the Republican Party platform, reflects a widespread conviction on the part of our citizenry that the Government must take action without further delay to insure that investments by American business overseas are protected against expropriation by dictators of the Nasser-Castro stripe.

Unfortunately, however, 15 years after the end of World War II, the United States continues to freeze the assets of foreign countries which, although they were enemies at that time, are now among our stanchest free world allies in the present cold war. How can there be mutual understanding between us and them when we continue to refuse to return to them assets which are theirs?

Mr. President, General Klein's statement warrants the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT TO THE PLATFORM COMMITTEE ON MEASURES TO SAFEGUARD PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES, BY MAJ. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN (RETIRED), DELEGATE FROM ILLINOIS TO THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Julius Klein. I am a member of the Illinois delegation to this convention. In addition to service in two World Wars, I have had the privilege of serving committees of the U.S. Senate on European study missions relating to our country's military and economic policies abroad.

I am preparing as a founder and member of the Council for Private International Development, an organization that has concerned itself with the formulation of proposals for assuring the safety of private foreign investment. The council has been in communication on this matter with the distinguished chairman of the platform committee, Mr. Charles H. Percy. Gen. Kenneth Buchanan, military secretary for Gen. George C. Marshall during World War II, is secretary of the council and in that capacity forwarded a resolution on this subject to Mr. Percy. The council recommends that this resolution be included in the platform of the Republican National Convention.

I have given careful study to this expression and I fully endorse its objectives. It has been apparent for some time now that private American foreign investment has a crucial role to play in our Government's efforts to match and outstrip the Soviets in the economic challenge they have hurled at us. The basic character of this challenge is a contest between the principles of free economic enterprise and the Marxist doctrine of State-owned and controlled economies. The relationship between how a country conducts its economic life and how it orients its political philosophies is abundantly clear. To win acceptance among the less developed and newly emerging nations of the world of our concepts of private enterprise is to meet and overcome the challenge the Soviets have posed. And to achieve this goal, it is vital that we give practical meaning and worth to President Eisenhower's repeated call for a restoration of the rule of law in relations among the peoples of the world.

There is ample evidence to show that private capital can play an enormously effective role in our country's aid programs to countries in need of capital imports. Unfortunately, there is an equal weight of evidence to demonstrate why American investors hesitate to undertake such commitments. Nasser's grab of the Suez Canal and Castro's expropriations of American- and European-owned enterprises in Cuba are but two of the most recent explanations for the hesitation of venture capital to undertake new risks.

There is a background to this. And, unhappily, our own Government's policies in the past have provided an example we did not foresee.

In its efforts to advance the principle of sanctity of private property throughout the free world, the Council for Private International Development has been confronted with the question: "If the United States is opposed to illegal seizure of private property, why does it still retain properties taken from German and Japanese private citizens and firms during World War II?"

I should like to emphasize that settlement of the war assets problem is not an objective of the council. But the problem does exist and it serves to negate principles we have been urging on others. Nasser in Egypt and Castro in Cuba have taken their cue from this contradiction and have used it to justify their own acts. They have even gone so far as to contend that they have exercised much more moderation than we have in that they have promised restitution in some form while they argue that we have promised none.

They are wrong, of course. The United States has promised restitution on an equitable basis. That pledge was contained in a statement made by President Eisenhower on July 31, 1957. A copy of the President's statement is attached. Unfortunately, no concrete action followed the President's assurance. Executive departments have made halting attempts to carry out the President's wishes and the issue has been a subject of seemingly endless debate in the legislative branch. But the efforts of both branches have been nonproductive until now.

I strongly believe in the adoption by the nations of the free world of adequate measures to provide protection for private foreign investments. The gravity of this problem is underscored by the recent action of the National Foreign Trade Council. This highly reputable and responsible organization has taken sufficient note of the peril to private foreign investment to establish for the first time in its history a special committee to deal exclusively with this subject. It can be expected that in due course the Foreign Trade Council will urge a variety of measures to assure adequate safeguards for private investment rights. I believe our party would serve the Nation well, by showing its awareness of the problem now, so demonstrating the leadership that the country and the world has come to expect of us.

It seems to me imperative for the United States to take the lead in adopting an effective system of international security for private property rights. This is especially justified at a time when we are calling upon our western allies to contribute to the aid programs necessary to assist in raising living standards among less developed nations whose political destinies are still in the making.

It must be admitted that there is a need to resolve the contradiction posed by our present policy with respect to the vested German and Japanese assets. Germany and Japan are two of the nations upon whom we have called to join us in expanding the free world's aid to new and economically weak nations. It seems to me that they are entitled to know from us whether we are prepared to accord those of their nationals whose property is still held here the same degree of justice we ask for our own private investors abroad. I believe we must face up to the issue of the vested assets and re-

solve it at the earliest moment. I would consider this to be an indispensable prelude to a vigorous program under which we would take the lead in mobilizing the economic resources of the free world to meet and overcome the challenge thrown to us by Mr. Khrushchev.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
July 31, 1957.

For some time the administration has been deeply concerned over the unresolved problems relating to the vesting, the liquidation, and the disposition of enemy assets seized as a result of World War II.

The problem of German vested assets and of the claims of American nationals against Germany arising out of World War II has ben a longstanding source of controversy. An increase since June of 1955 in the amount of funds available and, which it is expected will be realized from the liquidation of vested assets, should facilitate an equitable and final solution of these problems.

Consequently, in order to reflect the historic American policy of maintaining the sanctity of private property even in wartime, the administration intends as a matter of priority to submit to the Congress, early in the coming session, a supplementary plan.

It is contemplated that this plan would provide for the payment in full of all legitimate war claims of Americans against Germany and would permit, as an act of grace, an equitable monetary return to former owners of vested assets. Subject to the applicable provisions of law, the present program of liquidating vested assets will be completed at the earliest possible time.

It is hoped that it will also be possible to work out a final solution of the Japanese vested assets problem for presentation to the next session of Congress.

Ease Tax Burden of Sergeant York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a letter Mr. Ira J. Looney, 145 Haverford, Nashville, Tenn., wrote the editor of the Nashville Tennessean, concerning the tax burden of Sgt. Alvin C. York, one of America's heroes in World War I.

Sergeant York, according to the Government, owes $85,000 in back taxes, which he is unable to pay. He is now confined to a wheel chair.

To the people of Tennessee it is unthinkable that this great country of ours would let this man, who has been a symbol of courage for so many years, spend the remainder of his life with this indebtedness hanging over his head. Mr. Looney's leter expresses the sentiments of the people of our State, and I hope all of you will read it. The letter follows:

EASE TAX BURDEN OF SERGEANT YORK

To the EDITOR:

One would think, looking down into the melodiously named "Valley of the Three Forks of the Wolf" that it had never known care. One would think, as they crossed the three forks of the Wolf River, before it settled into one deep and gentle stream, that here people were born, reared, and died without ever a ripple being cast on the sea of the vast reaches of the earth about it.

But this was not to be the lot of this valley nestling in the high hills of Tennessee.

Once here a boy had pushed his way through overhanging willows to fish; climbed the hills to hunt.

This boy, when faced with a great problem, climbed the highest hill, looked at his valley, and prayed. Here, the boy became the man. This youth had been an objector to violence, yet World War I had come and his country called.

This youth, once his duty called, became a mighty fury. General Pershing declared him to be America's greatest hero. I as a child faintly remember seeing this great man when he returned to the hoarse cheers of thousands. He was modest, even shy.

Recently I made a pilgrimage to his valley. Nearby rolls his beloved Wolf River, but this great Congressional Medal of Honor winner can neither paint the house nor wet a fishing line. He is confined to a wheelchair.

I did not intrude on "the Sergeant" as he is known by his neighbors, but I stood before his modest home. Not a shack, to be sure, but a house that should have been painted last year, or, perhaps, 2 or 3 years ago.

In some manner Alvin York accumulated an income indebtedness of $85,000. One look at the modest circumstances of this hero and the austere life he has always led leads me to conclude "the Sergeant" never had such funds. If he did, it is gone. His greatest vice was philanthropy, so far as I can learn.

Be that as it may, many people such as Joe Louis were given waivers by the Government.

Before this great hero goes from this valley, let our Government ease York's mind by waiver of his taxes. At $500 per prisoner York captured, the debt is ours, not his.

IRA J. LOONEY.

NASHVILLE.

Death of Leon Swirbul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, on Tuesday, June 28, 1960, just a few days before the 2d session of the 86th Congress was recessed, America and American industry lost a great leader, a patriot, a dedicated citizen and a beloved ex-U.S. Marine. I speak of Leon A. Swirbul, the late president of Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp. at Bethpage, Long Island, N.Y. I first became aware of Grumman production methods and air combat equipment while serving with the Marine Corps in the South Pacific during World War II. The Grumman-made Navy Wildcats, F-4F; Hellcats, F-5F; and Avengers, TBF, earned a glorious place in Navy and Marine Corps battle history in those grim days. Later, in 1951, I became acquainted with Jake Swirbul when his company established a branch operation at Stuart, Fla. I am sure that all of us who knew Jake Swirbul extend our deepest sympathy to his family.

At this time I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the New York Times report of June 30, 1960, on the passing of this great Marine veteran and builder of American fighting power. Undoubtedly, he has made a great contribution to the defense structure of the United States and the free world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEON SWIRBUL, 62, OF GRUMMAN DIES—CO-FOUNDER OF THE AIRCRAFT CONCERN, WAS ITS PRESIDENT—SPURRED OUTPUT IN WAR

Leon A. Swirbul, president of the Grumman Aircraft Engineering Corp., of Bethpage, Long Island, died Tuesday night in Memorial Hospital. He was 62 years old and lived in Brookville, Long Island.

He helped to found Grumman in 1929 along with Leroy R. Grumman, for whom the organization is named; William T. Schwendler and several others.

With Mr. Grumman he shared the companys' top posts through its three decades of growth. Mr. Swirbul was vice president and general manager from 1929 to 1946, when he succeeded Mr. Grumman as president—the latter retaining his position as chairman of the board.

While Mr. Swirbul assumed chief responsibility over the years for production and employee relations, Mr. Grumman oversaw design, engineering, and financial aspects of the operation.

Production records set by the Grumman plant during World War II were attributed in large measure to programs and policies laid down by Mr. Swirbul. By V–J Day the company had turned out more than 17,000 planes for the Armed Forces.

His production methods called for a simplified design with a minimum of changes and redtape. Part of his formula was high employee morale. He established one of the industry's first incentive bonus plans based on production rates. He instituted, during the war, an employee service for repairing workers' automobiles and running household errands to combat absenteeism.

COMPANY WON NAVY E

The Grumman company won in 1942 the industry's first Navy E for excellence in war production. In March 1945 the company turned out an industry record of 664 planes in 1 month. Former President Harry S. Truman awarded Messrs. Grumman and Swirbul in 1946 the Presidential Medal for Merit for the plant's war performance.

Much of Grumman's war output was Navy F–4F Wildcat and F–6F Hellcat fighters and Navy TBF Avenger torpedo bombers, planes that figured prominently in Pacific air battles.

One day a Navy official rushed to the Grumman plant to tell the company to expand for Hellcat production.

"We are," announced Mr. Swirbul, pulling a sheaf of blueprints from his desk. When the officer said he would place a rush priority for building steel, Mr. Swirbul replied he already had steel—obtained from the razed Second Avenue elevated structure.

Gregarious, Mr. Swirbul maintained an informal approach to employe relation. His door was open to an employe with a complaint. To Grumman workers—numbering as many as 25,000 in World War II—he preferred to be known as "Jake."

One of his beliefs was that a happy worker was an efficient one. He built baseball fields at his plants, and encouraged employe participation in bowling and basketball as well.

Mr. Swirbul was born in Brooklyn and spent his boyhood in Sag Harbor, Long Island. He studied engineering at Cornell

University, earning money at a small aircraft plant near Ithaca. In 1917 he left college to join the Marines. Subsequently he became an inspector of Army aircraft.

JOINED LOENING AFTER WAR

Shortly after the war he joined the Loening Aeronautical Engineering Corp. in this city, eventually becoming works manager. Mr. Grumman, a former Navy flier, was general manager. Mr. Schwendler was a designer. When the Loening company was merged with another corporation, the three left to form their own organization.

They set up shop in a garage in Baldwin, Long Island, repairing sportsmen's planes and building truck bodies. In 1930 they obtained their first contract from the Navy—for aluminum floats for amphibian planes.

In 1931, in new quarters in Valley Stream, Long Island, they began work on an experimental Navy fighter—the XFF-1. Twenty-seven were ordered. Shortly afterward the plant was moved to its present site at Bethpage. It is now engaged in production of Navy jet fighters and trainers, antisubmarine warfare craft and guided missiles, among others.

Mr. Swirbul leaves his wife, the former Estelle Stephens, and two sons by a previous marriage, Phillip of Bay Shore, Long Island, and William A. Swirbul of Landsdale, Pa.

For Us To Remember

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Talladega Daily Home, an outstanding newspaper in the Fourth Alabama District, recently carried an editorial which I believe all of us from all parts of the country will read with interest.

It concerns the Civil War, as I understand officials North and South have formally agreed to call the war of 1861–65, and when an editorial on this subject can touch the heartstrings of any citizen of this great land, I think it bears reprinting.

Therefore, under unanimous consent, I insert the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

FOR US TO REMEMBER

The forthcoming observance of the Civil War Centennial will be a national thing and we won't have any major part in it because nothing of great historical importance happened here.

But we would all do well to use the years of the centennial as a time for remembering the virtues of our forefathers who fought and of trying to bring about their rebirth in our own lands.

We almost wrote "our forefathers who wore the gray," but actually we can't say that any more because as Talladega has grown it has become cosmopolitan and many of our fine citizens now hail originally from the North.

However, the qualities we're talking about were common to the good soldiers of both armies and our heritage grows more and more into a common thing as the years bury the old bitterness.

Actually, there was an amazing lack of personal animosity between these soldiers, South and North, who fought each other to a frazzle on so many storied fields.

Most of that came later with the shame of Reconstruction, but during the war it was mostly a case of "They fit us; we fit them," as one ragged Confederate put it.

But whatever the uniform, the shoddy blue of the Yank or the tatterdemalion outfit of the Johnny Reb, the hearts beneath were stout and devoted.

There was a willingness to suffer and to die for principle. There was conviction that a man had better be dead than to be shamed or pushed around.

There was a simple, unquestioning patriotism, expressed not in words, for they were often caustically critical, but in deeds.

And the deeds included such things as Pickett's gray charge at Gettysburg, Stonewall's onslaught at Chancellorsville or the blue charges at Fredericksburg when men kept advancing into almost certain death even though they walked more on the bodies of their fallen comrades than on the ground.

The time will come when we will need these things again. They have been largely forgotten. They should be restored to our lives and characters.

A West Virginia Girl, Carroll Barte Kincaid, Speaks of Arms Control in Significant Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, it is heartening that our youth should be not only thinking seriously about such a penetrating subject as disarmament, but, indeed, are doing studious research, forthright writing, and forceful speaking about it of their own volition.

A case in point, and one which I am happy and privileged to call to the attention of my colleagues, is a speech by Carroll Barte Kincaid, 17, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Hugh A. Kincaid of Huntington, W. Va. Miss Kincaid chose the subject, "Arms Control and Limitation," for discussion as her contribution to the freshman class in public speaking at Ohio University recently.

This young lady will enroll in September at Marshall College in her home city, where her father is a successful businessman and a member of the West Virginia State Legislature, and where her mother is active in community social and civic affairs. I am delighted to note, too, that the mother—a native of my home city of Elkins, W. Va.—was named Democratic Woman of the Year in our State.

When Carroll reached the conclusion and announced to her speech class that "we must control and limit arms," she was not simply borrowing a thought. A reading of the remarks she prepared and delivered will indicate that she truly believes what she wrote and said, and that she embraced this belief through reading, study, and thought.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a merited reward for an academic mission well performed and as a reflection of the thought of a typical young American who is concerned about a most pressing world problem—disarmament.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMS CONTROL AND LIMITATION

(By Carroll Barte Kincaid)

Hiroshima is a name which will resound fear in men's minds throughout history, for it was that city which proved to be the testing grounds for the atomic bomb. According to the book, "Government by the People," 60,000 people were killed in 1 minute and later 31,000 died. A total of 91,000 men, women, and children were killed by this single bomb; tens of thousands were injured and maimed. This was a small bomb.

Seven years later in the Central Pacific, a deserted island was destroyed by a fusion-type bomb—the hydrogen bomb. With its ability to destroy, the hydrogen bomb was as much an advancement over the atomic bomb as the atomic bomb was over the more conventional bombs. The age of absolute weapons is here.

As stated by Lt. Gen. James M. Gavin, "We live in a world in which literally hundreds of millions could be killed in a single night." Something must be done about this situation.

We, the United States of America, as a world leader, must make the first big step in control and limitation of absolute weapons.

The fact that men are able to destroy their fellow men brings various reactions from different people. Some hope that man will be wise enough not to try such a foolish act, while other people believe that our civilization is doomed.

If you are an extreme optimist, perhaps you will agree with the first opinion. However, there is one fact which cannot be ignored. The pushbutton weapon systems which are based on instant response, are capable of both mechanical and human error. It could take only one event, such as the recent U–2 incident, to set off a push-button war.

Imagine the world in the year 1965, and that every country has its own nuclear bombs. Since tension rises with the arms race, every country is alerted for surprise attack by its enemy. A man in Burma, looking at the radar screen, sees what could be an enemy's missile. Knowing that if he waits a second too long his country might be destroyed, he pushes a little button. This sets off a chain reaction as countries panic and push button after button. Then there is silence, for there is no one left to push the next button.

This may sound fantastic, but it is very possible, for today every country lives in constant fear that even though it puts forth its best efforts, its survival may be jeopardized by another advancement in the arms race on the part of its opponent. Thus, each time an advantage is achieved in this race, there is a powerful incentive to exploit it. So the arms race goes on and on, as both our arsenal and Russia's grow, and new countries of dubious stability join the "atomic club." During all of this, the grave chance of a nuclear holocaust increases.

Sir Winston Churchill has warned us that it may no longer be possible "for nations to fight each other and survive as nations, or even for armies to fight a battle and have at the end of it enough men on either side to fight another."

In the book, "World War III," a novel about a fictitious but possible war, it states that the first of three major reasons for the war was preparation for it. At the present

time, we continually produce weapons that we dare not use.

According to the June issue of the "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists," it is estimated that the world's nuclear stockpile today contains 30 billion tons of TNT; this is about 10 tons of TNT for every human on the globe. Is this necessary for peace? I do not see how it could possibly be so. Surely this must come to an end before we destroy all mankind.

In the next few years, we may have our last opportunity to stabilize the arms race. Perhaps Soviet stubbornness will block our most earnest efforts, but it would be most unforgivable if we failed because we did not try. We must control and limit arms.

Address by Hon. Allen W. Dulles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Allen W. Dulles:

ADDRESS BY ALLEN W. DULLES, DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE, TO THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS, DETROIT, MICH., AUGUST 22, 1960

I am deeply grateful to you for your action in awarding to me the Veterans of Foreign Wars-Bernard Baruch Gold Medal, an award given because you have judged that the recipient has made a contribution to world peace and to American security.

As a young man at the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, over 40 years ago, I had my first opportunity to know and to appreciate Bernard Baruch, an American who himself over the years has made an outstanding contribution to these great aims. I feel honored to be among the privileged few to whom you have given this award which bears the name of your organization and that of Bernard Baruch whom we salute as he passes his 90th birthday.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars have worked for more than 50 years in promoting patriotic objectives and in extending the institutions of American freedom. It is natural that you should devote special attention to the twin objectives of world peace and American security.

In your announcement of this evening's meeting and of your speaker tonight, you describe me as a man who knows more about Communist techniques and intrigue than any man in the world.

This is a bold assertion. It would be immodest of me to claim that it is true.

But I do admit that I have devoted many years of my life to the study of Communist theory and practice, and during the last 10 years since I have been with the Central Intelligence Agency, a mountain of hard evidence on Communist intrigue has passed over my desk.

The Communists have a blueprint for conquest. It is not a rigid plan detailing exactly when and where every nail will be driven. It is, rather, a flexible plan permitting the Communists to adjust realistically to changing conditions in the world. In any event, they think they know what the edifice of the future will look like. It is a Communist house in which they say our grandchildren will all live.

Their ambitions are not those inherited from the old czarist regime. They seek much more than access to warm water ports and to extend their national boundaries. They are aiming at nothing less than domination of the world.

The United States is today their major target. And yet, though I believe this is patently demonstrable, there is a dangerously complacent attitude among many people in our country. Too many, motivated by wishful thinking, grasp at every Soviet whim—their every call for coexistence, their grandiose and impracticable schemes for universal disarmament and emotional pleas to ban the bomb.

Too many jump to the conclusion that the Communist leaders have changed their spots, and that they really want to settle down to live in peace with us.

All our past relations with the Communists belie any such interpretation. Their plans, their statements, and their actions show that they have no real faith in coexistence.

It is well to look at the record.

The origins of the Communist movement go back to Marx and the Manifesto of 1848. But, we have had only about 40 years' experience in a world where Communist principles controlled the actions of the leaders of a major power with great human and material resources.

Then for a decade or more after the Communist revolution of 1917, the power of the Soviet leaders was limited. They were occupied with consolidating the Communist position inside Russia itself and applying Communist theory to the practical task of ruling the peoples within the U.S.S.R. who have never been given the opportunity to choose for themselves.

I was a member of the American delegation to the Paris Conference in 1919 when the peace to end World War I was being negotiated. Then the Communist movement was regarded as a nuisance, but not as a serious threat outside of the borders of the U.S.S.R. Even then, however, Lenin was preaching the doctrine of worldwide communism. He predicted an eventual clash between the Communist world and the free world—or the capitalist world as he chose to call it—the eventual collapse of capitalism and the fratricidal struggles among capitalist countries.

The outbreak of World War II seemed to bear out the accuracy of this last prediction. However, the Soviet Union, despite its effort to stand aside—as, for example, through the disgraceful agreement with Hitler for the partition of Poland—was eventually attacked and drawn into the conflict.

Stalin sought and received the maximum of aid from us in the common fight against Hitler, but he never cooperated fully during World War II. As the war drew toward a close, Moscow's main preoccupation was preparing the ground for Communist takeover of the greatest possible areas in Central Europe and in the Far East rather than in bringing the war to a quick conclusion.

The most tragic example of this was when Soviet armies sat idly by on the outskirts of Warsaw and allowed the bitter struggle between the Poles and the Nazi to decimate the leaders of the Polish resistance.

Commuist actions in these closing days of the war revealed that they had not abandoned their long-term objectives. While this began to alert us to Communist objectives, we were still far too slow in realizing the full implications of their policy.

For the second time in recent history, we have had an antagonist tell us in advance both by words and by action what he proposes to do. Hitler in "Mein Kampf" gave the world a clear picture of his intentions. We paid little attention to it until too late and he had moved on to the attack. We cannot afford to ignore the present and even more precise warnings which the Communists have been giving us.

Over the past 15 years since the end of World War II, we have had many an opportunity to learn the lessons of Communist purposes, particularly during the days which immediately preceded and followed the loss of mainland China to communism.

During these years Stalin's policy of military pressure and adventurism continued. He probed our resistance and our determination in Greece and Turkey and Iran, at Berlin during the days of the blockade and the airlift, and, in league with the Chinese Communists, in Korea. We held the line against this type of Communist attack, and we learned a great deal about Communist techniques.

Then, in 1955, Khrushchev took over the effective leadership of the Soviet Union. He had the same objectives, the same philosophy of the worldwide mission of communism as his predecessors, but he proposed different techniques to accomplish these objectives.

As soon as he had firmly consolidated his position, Khrushchev proceeded to denounce Stalin and all his works. He repudiated Stalinist methods and in effect asked the rest of the world to forget the tyranny and the cruelty of Stalin in domestic affairs and his aggressive foreign policy in threatening the free world from Berlin to Korea.

Khrushchev let his people know that he was shocked that, during a time when the United States had overwhelming superiority in nuclear power, Stalin had engaged in dangerous foreign adventures. In a thoroughgoing repudiation of Stalin's policies, Khrushchev tried to delude us into believing that a new era was at hand.

What are the basic elements of Khrushchev's present policy?

First of all, he proposes to build up Soviet military might based on ballistic missiles. His main target has always been the United States. Intercontinental missiles would give him an effective weapon for direct attack on the United States. During the missile buildup, he will maintain an intercontinental threat with his bomber forces.

Second. Khrushchev proposes to build up Soviet industry, the base of Soviet military power, by completing the ambitious 7-year plan which covers the period through 1965. This will still leave him well behind the United States in overall industrial production. But Khrushchev believes that he can devote to military and world power aims a far greater percentage of his industrial production than we are likely to do. He expects to satisfy his people with a far more modest share of the consumer goods and luxuries that have seemingly become for us so essential a part of our own much higher living standard. Whether he will succeed in deluding his people, who today have far greater knowledge of the outside world than during Stalin's days, remains to be seen.

Third. He is supporting all elements of extreme, rabid, nationalism in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. At the XXI Party Congress held in February 1959, as well-documented reports in our hands established, the leaders of Communist parties from these areas were specifically instructed to play down the link with Moscow and with the Communist movement and to stress nationalism and hostility to the nations of the non-Communist bloc, the United States in particular. He is working for chaos in countries from Cuba to the Congo. And chaos breeds communism.

Fourth. He is targeting economic and technical aid to certain critical countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America where the Communists believe they can make the most headway.

Fifth. Khrushchev has put into high gear his worldwide subversive apparatus consisting of local Communist parties, underground and overt, Communist fronts, and all the espionage and agitprop assets of Moscow and

its satellite allies. This apparatus is very active today from Cuba to central Africa and to southeast Asia, and indeed throughout the world.

Sixth. Khrushchev is directing the greatest propaganda machine the world has ever known. One voice of Moscow goes abroad to try to seduce the newly emerging countries by citing the Soviet example of rapid industrial and military growth and of the aid which awaits them if they turn to Moscow. Behind the Iron Curtain, quite another voice is aimed at the people of the Communist bloc to reassure them that all is going well.

And Seventh. The Kremlin is jealously guarding the physical security of great areas of the Soviet Union where it is building up in secrecy its formidable military weapons. The Soviets have repeatedly refused to accept a meaningful form of inspection, the best guarantee that disarmament can be honest.

To protect their security the spy phobia is being exploited by the Soviets with attacks on our planes and harassments of our tourists. Well-publicized trials and the imprisonment of our RB–47 airmen are all calculated in Khrushchev's view to bring pressures to bear to help preserve the secrecy of military preparations.

By these tactics Khrushchev hopes to prevent the free world from gaining the knowledge which may be essential to our own security. Behind this shield, rejecting the President's proposals for adequate inspection and open skies, the Kremlin believes that it is free to prepare for a surprise attack on the free world in relative security.

This, in brief, is Khrushchev's program. It is vigorously supported by Communist China despite growing ideological differences and political disputes between the two on the homefront. These are the tactics which Khrushchev is using to help along what he describes as the inevitable trend of history; the victory of communism.

This is how he explained his often quoted phrase, "We will bury you," when he was talking to the National Press Club in Washington last September:

"Social systems change as society develops.

"There was the feudal system. It was superseded by capitalism.

"Capitalism was more progressive than feudalism. Capitalism created better conditions than feudalism for the development of the productive forces.

"But capitalism engendered irreconcilable contradictions.

"Every system gives birth to its successors. Capitalism, as Marx, Engels, and Lenin have proved, will be succeeded by communism."

In saying this, Khrushchev would have us believe that this evolution to communism will be a peaceful, painless process if only we will let him carry out his many-sided program to "bury us."

I am convinced that we can do far more to meet the threat if the people of this country truly understand the nature and purposes of communism, its objectives, and the means the Communist leaders are using to accomplish their aims.

For too long, and by too many, subversive communism has been viewed as just another international danger like those which we have faced before from the ambitions of malevolent dictators or the thrusts for power by foreign potentates and rulers. We have assumed that if we remain strong at home, the danger will in time disappear.

We are still too prone to believe that the Communist movement is no more than an international danger like those which we ested solely in their own power. If this were true, I should feel more easy in my mind. A conspiracy can be defeated by effective police work. The citizen understands this, and will support it.

But the situation is not that simple. The threat is far greater, and the defense far more difficult.

The threat is greater, first, because many Communists are not mere conspirators but fanatically dedicated men. True, there are innumerable time-servers in the movement, and many who are corrupt, self-interested, or ineffective. True also, there are indications that revolutionary fervor is diminishing in some important circles in the U.S.S.R. and giving way to more practical considerations.

Nevertheless, throughout the world there are still thousands of dangerously rabid Communists. Many of them believe that they are working for the progress of mankind as they see it. Many of them—perhaps most of them—are willing to sacrifice themselves to the cause. They are ready to work and struggle with little material reward, and with comparatively little of the sense of power which their bosses may enjoy. Many of them are highly trained and extremely competent. We have to deal not with mere conspiracy, but with genuine revolutionary fervor.

These men disseminate ideas, and ideas must be met by sounder and more satisfying ideals, not merely by force.

The threat is greater than mere conspiracy, secondly, because the Communists seem to offer what much of the world—the underdeveloped world particularly—is striving for. The underdeveloped countries are seized with a passion for rapid economic growth and social advance.

We know from history, and from our own experience, that economic growth is not achieved easily. It involves discipline, self-sacrifice and a great deal of hard work. The Soviets promise to deliver it on a platter.

Moreover, Communists know the techniques for enforcing the most ruthless discipline upon their own and other peoples. They are masters of organization. Also, as they have demonstrated their ability to achieve rapid economic growth, and quickly to develop national power, they can advertise their accomplishments. Peoples in the underdeveloped countries tend to see only the achievements of communism; they overlook its cost in terms of human dignity and political freedom.

If we could offer a prospect of economic development without pain or sacrifice, we should doubtless triumph fairly easily over the Communist adversary in underdeveloped countries. But we cannot do so. We know better than to try to do so. We refrain from making false promises. The Communists have no such inhibitions.

We as a people have never given to the study of communism, as I have described it, the depth and breadth of effort sufficient to understand it adequately and to gird to meet it. It cannot be done merely by the setting up of new machinery of government or the creating of cold war executive, or such measures.

We need far and wide in this country more education on the whole history of the Communist movement.

In our schools and colleges we can find many courses in ancient history, in philosophy, courses on the great movements of the past, the conquests of ancient times from Alexander the Great to Napoleon. Courses on Communist theory and practices are few and far between.

Yet, today we are face to face with a revolution which since 1917 has absorbed almost a billion people; a movement which boasts blatantly and openly that it will destroy us and all the institutions which we hold essential to our freedom and to our growth, spiritually and materially.

There is a vast body of readily available and useful literature descriptive of Communist policies, ambitions, and successes. Our press, radio, and television are doing a fine job in current reporting and analysis. There are ample biographies of Communist leaders and plenty of case histories of their actions in Berlin, Korea, and Hungary. We know a great deal, and can tell a great deal, about the secret apparatus which has promoted its revolution.

By and large, however, in our educational institutions, except in the graduate field or in specialized schools and seminars, these subjects are not generally taught.

I have reviewed the curriculums of many of our universities and colleges and, despite a considerable advance in recent years our students are not yet afforded a broad opportunity to gain the essential background knowledge of Communist history and policy. And we should start this education in our secondary schools.

It is only the very few who have read about Marx, the titular father of the system. Here was one of the meanest, least admirable characters in his relations with other human beings who ever existed. He was an unoriginal theoretical thinker. His economic writings were outmoded even when they appeared. Even the Communists themselves are beginning to admit that he is not a completely reliable guide for political action.

Such an educational program should not be approached in any spirit of propaganda or trying to make a case or sell a thesis. The history of the communism movement should be taught objectively, recognizing, as appropriate, scientific, technical, and other accomplishments of the peoples who have been absorbed by it.

We should not be afraid to teach the subject. A history of communism and of all its works would bear its own indictment of the system.

Let the facts speak for themselves.

There is a real urgency to build up our knowledge on the entire background of the Communist thrust against our civilization.

During the years immediately ahead it seems more likely that the immediate danger we will be facing, and on a worldwide basis, will be Communist political, economic, and subversive action and penetration; not a hot or nuclear war.

In general, we and the other peoples in the free world have a relatively good understanding of the nature of the Soviet military threat. In this country a major effort in money, manpower and research has been and is being devoted to meet it. People may differ here and there whether it is adequate but certainly it is massive and there is broad agreement that no effort should be spared in the military sector. We must maintain our military strength. I believe we will do so.

The Soviet Union today has a healthy respect for our military and retaliatory power and we must see to it that they continue to have this respect. They realize that the devastation they would receive in the event of nuclear war would be unacceptable.

Hence, I conclude that the Soviet are not now planning primarily for military attack, although they will use the military threat, they will rattle their ballistic missiles and may exercise military pressure on the periphery of the Communist bloc.

Given adequate defense on our part, the military threat is not our most immediate pressing danger. Where then does the danger to us lie? One thing is sure: we must conclude, without peradventure of a doubt, that the Communists will move against us on every front where they consider action to be effective and for the time being they will move primarily on the "short of war" fronts.

Are we ready, if instead of attacking us militarily, Khrushchev should direct his major thrust to subverting other countries in the free world by secret, disguised and undercover means?

By blackmailing the leaders in the newly emerging, the shaky countries, to follow his lead.

By luring them with promises, and with the actual delivery, of large quantities of arms and economic aid and of considerable quantities of flashy but sometimes rather

second-rate goods and equipment; and of the services of many skilled technicians.

By taking control of revolutions which may have started out with sound motives, but which have been perverted and turned from their original course into the Communist pattern.

In this way he will try to turn into Communist or communizing tools the regimes in many countries which today are free, but which tomorrow, under the pressure of Communist techniques might become slave.

Maybe many people in this country will be taught a new lesson in communism because Khrushchev, right at our doorstep, is applying his methods and techniques. He is perverting a revolutionary movement which initially had the support of some estimable people but which now is in the throes of a Communist take-over. Cuba is not the only country, though it is the one nearest to us, where such a process is underway.

Are we alerted fully to this kind of danger, and are we prepared to do all that we can to see that this development does not occur in a dozen or more countries elsewhere in the world?

This, today, is the major element of the Soviet scheme for world domination. We must understand it. We must analyze it, and through a well-coordinated program of education and of action, protect ourselves against it.

The people of this country are and will continue to be basically opposed to communism in general. This opposition is based more on instincts than on knowledge. This is not enough. Our people should be sufficiently educated in all of the ramifications of communistic intrigues and its historical background, its purposes and programs adequately to contribute toward an effective answer.

The initiative for new knowledge comes more often from those of us who want to learn than from those who teach. But let us also call on our educators, and on those in authority who have influence over the development of our educational system to begin to expand the realistic teaching of the history and policies of communism.

We must do this with an eye to the future and to the coming generations who will be living in a world of continuing Communist challenge.

Today, it is relatively easy to get the manpower and the money for the vital needs of military defense. This is as it should be. But it is desperately difficult to get the tools and the funds that the Government needs to meet the present and threatening danger of nonmilitary Soviet penetration and subversion; the corruption by communism of vast areas of the free world.

I hope that your great organization with its high ideals and patriotic membership will help to build up an understanding and an educated public opinion to enable this country effectively to meet this grave danger we face today. This is a cause worthy of the best efforts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Library Services Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the pleasure of supporting extension of the Library Services Act, and I am happy that this House approved the continuance of this most valuable program. The people in my district in Connecticut have long appreciation the importance of the Library Services Act. Their support for this legislation was reflected in an editorial published by the New Haven Register on August 13. I ask that this statement of the Register be included in the RECORD at this point:

LIBRARY SERVICES ACT

Among the items of legislation caught in the preconvention logjam in Congress was a library services bill which gets its last chance for passage in the next few weeks.

The bill would extend for another 5 years the Library Services Act of 1956, which has helped immeasurably to expand the availability of books to the rural populations of the United States. Since the law was passed, according to the American Library Association, about 30 million Americans have gained new or improved library service, State funds for the development of rural libraries have increased 54 percent, local appropriations have increased 45 percent, and there have been other substantial advances in the enlargement of public library services.

Here in Connecticut, libraries in communities of under 10,000 population have been given many kinds of professional and consultant services. Workshops have been held for volunteers. And a new vigor has been brought to suburban and rural library projects which were often withering in many ways.

All of these services, National and State, may be discontinued or curtailed if the Library Services Act is not renewed. At a time when the "pursuit of excellence" and the development of individual learning is so importantly regarded, it is obviously negligent to permit our community libraries to retrogress—as they certainly will without the continued attention of all concerned citizens.

The Library Services Act has helped to bolster the individual strength of many a smalltown Connecticut library. Connecticut Congressmen and Senators should be reminded of this as H.R. 12125 languishes in the anterooms of Congress.

Violation of Law by Post Office Officials—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I called attention yesterday to illegal lobbying activities being carried on by Post Office Department officials.

This illegal lobbying also came to the attention of a newspaper editor in New Hampshire, the editor of the Journal-Transcript, published in Franklin, N.H.

The editorial reaction follows. It is entitled "The Post Office—And the Sap Works":

THE POST OFFICE—AND THE SAP WORKS

On our editorial desk we have been staring all week at a classic example of how Government bureaucracy can get so fat and blowsy that it tries to "take over the whole sap works" as they say back in the woods.

It came in the form of an official press release from the Post Office Department, dropped off at our office in the routine course of his duties by Postmaster Warren Metcalf of Tilton. (What we have to say about it here is not directed at Mr. Metcalf, for it involves policy far over the heads of operating postal officials—they only carry out orders.)

This particular release told how sometimes the department put 4-cent letter mail on airlines to the extent that airspace is available, instead of carrying these bags by rail. The Post Office release went on to say that the so-called Cunningham bill, H.R. 12595, which passed the House of Representatives last July, would prohibit this practice if it should pass the Senate "and escape or overcome the presidential veto."

Then came the payoff from the Post Office Department:

"We urge all those who are interested in providing quicker and better mail service to communicate with their Senators in opposition to the passage of the Cunningham bill, H.R. 12595."

Now we have no objection to any citizen urging his Senator to vote any way he wants to vote on any matter. But it strikes us as being little short of outrageous for any agency of the U.S. Government to use its position and its public funds to promote a public claque to pressure the Congress in the direction the Department wants to go.

As to the merits of the Cunningham bill, we don't happen to know, for there seems to be no Government agency using the taxpayer's money to shill the other side of the question. The Post Office release presents only the arguments on its own side of the question. But the fact that more than half the U.S. House of Representatives voted for it would indicate that there must be something to be said for the bill.

We do know that if the Post Office has so much money that it can use its men and facilities to tell the common voters how to run things, it might get to work doing a better job delivering the mails. If you're in any doubt that there's need for improvement, you might make note that the service in West Franklin has been reduced in the past 2 weeks—just one small example.

The real point, however, is that to put it simply, the essence of the American democratic system is that the people will tell the Government and Congress how to run things. When a Government agency, the Post Office or any other, presumes to use its position and the money it receives from the taxpayers to tell the people—and Congress—how to run things, it is a complete reversal of sound democratic procedures. That's the first step toward putting into effect "the Government knows best" idea, and we're against it.

Air Force Academy Good Investment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Selma Times-Journal, an outstanding daily newspaper in the Fourth Alabama District, recently made a trip to the Air Force Academy in Colorado.

Edward B. Field draws on his long experience in journalism and public service to tell the informative story of

that tour in an editorial which appeared recently in his newspaper.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this editorial:

AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The U.S. Air Force currently is in the process of giving as many representative citizens as possible a firsthand view of its new Service Academy near Colorado Springs. This is being accomplished by sponsored tours of 2- or 3-day duration, which acquaint selected groups with purposes of the Academy, what has been accomplished and what is hoped to be accomplished in the future.

These tours cannot be regarded in any respect as junkets at the expense of the taxpayers, as the Air Force furnishes only transportation, usually in planes already available and manned by officers who are required to maintain flying time by one means or another. It is true that accommodations furnished are provided at minimum costs, but the facilities are there and use of them by tour groups serves largely to increase revenue.

Because the American people have heard a great many reports of Federal extravagance in establishment of the Air Force Academy, these tours represent sound policy, especially as few individuals who see this great installation leave dissatisfied with returns from the large sums of money invested.

As one impressed observer remarked "the Air Force Academy already has become a national monument."

Nestled at the foot of the Rampart Range of the Rocky Mountains, the Air Force Academy is as breath catching in its scope and planning as is the altitude at which it was located. It is this scope and planning which some day will make the issue of costs forgotten, because a century from now the Academy will be just as efficient and functional as it will be at completion within the next 2 years.

The site of the Academy was chosen by a congressional committee, after considering offers of 400 locations in 44 States, largely because the 17,000 acres of land required could not be found anywhere else where climate was regarded as favorable.

And the climate is favorable, because sleeping under blankets is usual in summer and air conditioning is not necessary except in buildings sealed against sound. Only one unit of the Air Academy is air-conditioned, and that is the Academic building, which has no windows, as a means of improving concentration. In fact, only a few establishments in Colorado Springs are air conditioned, and if there is any agency there peddling these facilities, they do not make themselves known.

Altitude, of course, is a major factor for casual visitors, but experience has demonstrated that those who remain long enough at the Air Academy not only become accustomed to this, they soon develop chest and lung capacities which give them an advantage over residents of the lowlands.

This has been proven in the past by athletic teams of the Air Academy and it will be proven time and again when foreign teams invade the great stadium now only in the planning stage.

While the Air Academy accepts the plebe system of West Point and Annapolis to apply rigid discipline to its new classes, such as constant double time and squaring corners in all cadet areas, it has departed from the usual plan of concentration of scientific study courses.

At the Air Force Academy, the humanities, such as English, geography, social sciences, psychology, and foreign languages, hold almost equal status with mathematics, sciences, aeronautics, astronautics, and mechanics.

This is because the Air Force Academy is dedicated to production of officers and leaders rather than airplane pilots. While Academy graduates are ready for training as key pilots, they also are ready for transition to the age of missilry. In fact, the Air Force Academy can be converted to missilry on very short notice, because that was the way it was planned, and that, in large extent, explains the tremendous expense involved.

Now about costs:

Congress initially appropriated $138,779,000 for establishment of the Academy. Off that sum, $137,400,000 has been spent on construction. In addition, an additional appropriation allowed expenditure of $22 million for equipment.

For the 17,000 acres of land purchased, which wiped out numerous private operations, the cost was $5 million, to which the State of Colorado contributed $1 million.

These figures, of course, are tremendous and rightly give cause to the people of this Nation to think concerning returns gained.

But the returns are there and sooner or later all our people will become convinced that a sound and long-paying investment has been made in the Air Force Academy.

Oil Price Rises Despite Glut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely article by John Harriman written for the August 18, 1960, issue of the Boston Globe:

OIL PRICE RISES DESPITE GLUT—BOOST IN RESIDUAL HITS NEW ENGLAND HARD—WORLD SITUATION IGNORED BY U.S. POLICY

(By John Harriman)

The situation in residual fuel oil, well illustrates what may yet turn out to be the Achilles' heel of the American economy.

What we see is this: an increase in prices here—15 cents a barrel along the coast, which will cost New England industry alone $10 million—and a general world-wide softening in all oil prices.

Firms in India have slashed prices. Middle Eastern crude is down 14 cents a barrel. Oil is being marked down in Europe.

Yet here in the United States oil is headed upwards, due to Government interference with a free market, and largely because of political pressure exerted by the coal industry and the domestic oil producers of Texas and the Southwest.

Oil today is in world oversupply.

There are two hugely important new producing areas being brought in: The French Sahara and the even more important fields in Lybia, where reserves are said to be on the order of those in the Middle East.

In addition, new techniques are making the recovery of oil from older wells more feasible. And in the future is a not unlikely possibility that a process may be found practical which will allow the recovery of crude from the much-advertised and almost inexhaustible reserves in Canada's "oil sand."

Finally—a project of the U.S. Bureau of Mines itself—there is the possibility of tapping our own supplies of oil shale.

What we are seeing, actually, is an era beginning to open in which fuel costs will probably be a good deal cheaper. This means lower cost electric power—energy, which in a sense is wealth in the modern world.

It is simply inconceivable that in such a situation—and simply to alleviate competition for domestic oil and coal producers—that we should arbitrarily saddle ourselves with a high-price structure in fuels which will still further weaken our competitive position in this fiercely competitive age.

The cut in the imports of residual oil by 20,000 barrels below last year's level for this same quarter is serious, not only for New England, but for the whole country.

In doing this we offend and injure economically our oversea suppliers, particularly Venezuela. We serve notice on the Mideast that we are in fact establishing a two-price system in oil: One for the United States and a lower price for the rest of the world.

But, above all, this path that we seem to be treading in oil is but one more example of our seeming helplessness in fitting ourselves into a world economy that is growing and strengthening on all sides.

Such moves, and the attitude of which they are an expression, are bringing us toward a very great danger * * * that we may find ourselves more and more isolated in a world in which we need other nations as much as they need us * * * in an economic isolation of our own making.

Teenage Journalists To Visit U.N. This Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the youth of today—the leaders of tomorrow—need to be especially educated to the new world of the 1960's.

The advent of space, the technological, social and economic revolutions, the new relationships among nations, ever greater responsibility of our Nation as a world leader: All of these factors emphasize the need for providing our youth with the knowledge, understanding and perspective to deal with the increasingly complex problems which will be facing them in the years ahead.

Recently, the Milwaukee Committee for the Observance of United Nations Day, in cooperation with the Milwaukee Journal, set up a program for picking 10 Milwaukee high school journalists for an expense-paid, 3-day trip to the United Nations headquarters. The purpose of the tour is to provide these students—chosen among student journalists for the quality of their newspapers—with a better knowledge of the functions and responsibilities of the United Nations.

Over the years, the U.N.—now just 15 years old—has assumed larger and larger responsibility in international affairs. This civic-spirited effort to educate our young people on the operations of this international agency is, I believe, a most commendable endeavor.

Recently, the Milwaukee Journal carried an informative article, entitled, "Teenage Journalists To Visit U.N. This Fall." Reflecting the kind of civicly

sponsored programs that can do much to better enable our youth to meet the problems of tomorrow, I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEENAGE JOURNALISTS TO VISIT U.N. THIS FALL—PUPILS TO BE PICKED AT 10 HIGH SCHOOLS WITH NEWSPAPERS OF TOP QUALITY

Ten Milwaukee high school journalists will be chosen for an expense paid, 3-day trip to United Nations headquarters in New York City this fall.

The project is being sponsored by the Milwaukee Committee for the Observance of United Nations Day, in cooperation with the Milwaukee Journal.

Leonard S. Zubrensky, chairman of the Milwaukee U.N. committee, said judges would pick five public and five private high schools from which the pupils would be named. The schools will be selected on the quality of their newspapers, he said.

FIVE JUDGES AT WORK

Copies of high school papers are now in the hands of judges Garold L. Bartness, of the University of Wisconsin—Milwaukee journalism department; Robert A. Kidera, public relations director of Marquette University and three executives of the Journal—Arville Schaleben, managing editor; Harvey W. Schwandner, assistant managing editor, and Harry L. Sonneborn, city editor.

Zubrenksy said winning high schools would be announced by September 1. Each principal then will be asked to choose a pupil by September 15 to join the tour. Zubrensky said editors or staff members of the winning high school papers were the most likely to be selected.

Accompanied by Zubrensky and a teacher as chaperones, the pupils will be in New York October 13–15. After they return, they will report their impressions October 24 as part of the third annual observance here of United Nations Day.

Last year, a speech by former New York Gov. W. Averell Harriman highlighted the U.N. Day ceremony. In 1958, the U.N. committee presented Sir Carl August Berendsen, former New Zealand Ambassador to the United States and a former delegate to the U.N.

Zubrensky said the pupils would leave Milwaukee at 8:30 a.m. October 13, and arrive in New York at noon. They will stay at the Beekman Tower Hotel. The first day will include a boat ride around Manhattan, a visit to the Statue of Liberty, the top of the Empire State Building, a television show, and an automat.

The major events of the trip will come on October 24. The pupils will receive a briefing by a member of the United States mission to the U.N. on the organization and functions of the international body and participate with other visitors at the World Affairs Center in an informal discussion and question period with government specialists.

WILL OBSERVE ASSEMBLY

At noon they will attend a reception and luncheon at the center given by members of the United States and other U.N. staffs for U.N. visitors, and Friday afternoon they will observe the U.N. General Assembly or its committees in action. The teenagers will return to Milwaukee Saturday.

After their return, they will participate in a discussion and evaluation session on their trip with editors of the Journal, and will appear on television, radio and high school convocation programs to describe their experiences.

Address by Senator Wiley Over Radio Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the East-West struggle—despite best efforts of the West to resolve the differences, and establish a solid foundation for peace—promises to be a long, arduous, trying contest between two ideologies, freedom and communism.

By experience, we have learned that the Soviets use every possible tactic: ethical and unethical, legal or illegal, right or wrong, to forward their cause.

Recognizing the great stakes in the struggle, I believe we need to explore every known avenue—and search for new ones—not only to counter the Soviet offensive, but to establish conditions under which ultimately peace, order, and law can be a normal process of life in the world, and such things as the Iron and Bamboo Curtains can be rolled back, to give the people in bondage a voice in self-determination.

As one way of "getting through" to the people behind the Iron Curtain, I was recently privileged to broadcast to the Soviet Union over Radio Liberty.

Personally, I feel that getting the facts to the peoples themselves, to provide them with the truth, and to offset the propaganda of the Kremlin-controlled press and other information media, will serve us well in the long struggle ahead against this infamous ideology.

At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the broadcast reviewing factors of the U–2 flight and the RB–47 case printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS PREPARED FOR DELIVERY BY HON. ALEXANDER WILEY, REPUBLICAN, OF WISCONSIN, SENIOR REPUBLICAN OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE, TO THE PEOPLE OF THE SOVIET UNION OVER RADIO LIBERTY

NEEDED: MORE EMPHASIS ON MUTUAL INTERESTS THAN DIFFERENCES

As citizens of great world powers, we have a great many mutual interests, together with mankind, around the globe. Fundamentally, I believe, we all want to attempt to create a better world in which to live.

Instead of quarreling about our differences, we would do better to expand areas of agreement and, as possible, to cooperate in support of programs that would achieve a better, safer life for all of us.

We would welcome the opportunity to channel the vast efforts, manpower, and resources going into armaments, in the United States and, yes, in the Soviet Union, as well as other nations, for things which would improve, not threaten to destroy, life on the globe. These resources could be used to produce more and better homes, schools, food, clothing, and other things that contribute to a good life.

NEEDED: GREATER EXCHANGES OF TRUTH

In a world weary of tensions, but full of promise for a better life, I believe there is a need for greater exchanges of truth between the people of our two great countries.

How can this be done? Through radio, television, newspapers and magazines opening the doors—that is, lifting the Iron Curtain for better neighbor-to-neighbor relations.

What would more exchange of ideas accomplish? Among other things, it would eliminate the fears, often born of untruths, that we as a nation want war; or that you, the people of the Soviet Union, want war; and also reaffirm our common dedication to peace; to a desire to channel our resources and the wonderful human ingenuity of our two great peoples to building a better life.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN UNITED STATES AND SOVIET SYSTEM

Now, let's be realistic: There are differences in East-West ideology, between the political systems under which we live. From long experience, we have learned that these differences will not easily be eliminated.

However, the differing ideological beliefs should not obscure the reality that you and ourselves—in common with all other people of earth—want, wish for, and are willing to sacrifice to attain—peace.

Ultimately, we can hope for the great ground swell of free public opinion from the common people of the world to provide the strength and wisdom to direct the affairs of men and governments in all nations toward the goal of peace.

In the cycle of international events, regrettably, there continue to be problems—sometimes, we feel, deliberately created—to stir up tensions, distort the truth, create misunderstandings and alienate our people from each other. In such circumstances, we recognize, of course, that there are always two points of view.

Now, I'd like to review with you some of the current problems and our ideas on them so that you, the people of the Soviet Union, may better know how we feel about them.

To prevent the possibility of sneak attacks against any nation and thus eliminate one of the great fears in the hearts of the people of the world, for example, our Nation, in the past, has proposed open skies and mutual inspection of armament installations.

Despite President Eisenhower's effort to get open skies, Mr. Khrushchev, unfortunately, has not been willing to make such an arrangement.

As a people dedicated to peace, we have asked the question: Why? If the Kremlin, as it claims, is dedicated to peace, then why would it not open its doors as we would do to inspect armament installations, to prevent surprise attacks by any nation?

Had Mr. Khrushchev been willing to agree to an open skies proposal as recommended by President Eisenhower, or to work in a really constructive way to establish peace, the U–2 flight, for example, would not, I believe, have occurred at all.

In considering this flight, it's important to take into account the following factors:

1. The plane was not armed, instead it carried only cameras.

2. The U–2 flights occurring for 4 years have at no time committed any act of aggression against the people of the Soviet Union.

3. The information obtained from such flights has never been used for any aggressive acts against the Soviet Union, and

4. As yet, there have been no international agreements as to how high a nation's rights extend into aid space. Consequently, there is serious question as to whether or not there was any real violation of inter-

national law with the plane flying at 60,000 or 70,000 feet. As you recall, for example, the Soviet Union launched the first Satellite, Sputnik I. However, nobody attempted to shoot it down. If the U–2 violated air space, then perhaps the sputnik also violated the same interests of other nations.

RB–47 FLIGHT DID NOT VIOLATE SOVIET AIRSPACE

Now, let's look at another case. You will recall that recently, the Soviet armed forces shot down a U.S. plane over international waters. Then, charges were made against the United States in the U.N. that the RB–47 violated Soviet air space. Following the charges, the Security Council considered the case.

In effect, the U.N. threw the case out of court. Why? The charges were not based upon truth. To the contrary, it appears there has been a violation of international law by Mr. Khrushchev. How is this? Because the U.S. plane was flying over international waters at the time it was shot down. According to the evidence presented at the U.N., and substantiated on a scientific basis by other nations, the U.S. plane at no time flew closer than 30 miles to your country.

Consequently, the RB–47 incident has put the Soviet Government in a strangely unfavorable light. Why? First of all, it was a violation of international law; a needless killing of men; and an act that could result in grave consequences for world peace.

Secondly, the Soviet Government has been carrying on information-collecting activities near the United States. For example, a Soviet ship, equipped with radio-radar and other devices for information collecting, anchored 13 miles off our coast. If the United States employed Mr. Khrushchev's tactics, we would have sunk the ship, and killed or imprisoned the persons aboard.

Did we do this? No. Instead, we merely took pictures, photographing the vessel, to prove that it was on an information-gathering mission.

At the U.N., the United States also proposed an impartial investigation of the facts of the RB–47 flight. Unfortunately, the Soviet Government refused to submit to such an investigation.

Why? From experience, we have learned that anyone, if he is right, is not likely to turn down an impartial investigation; in all likelihood, this would only provide greater evidence for his case.

Basically, we believe that the shooting down of the RB–47 flight was a violation of law, and of good conduct by nations. The actions of the Soviet Government, also, have resulted in the needless death of several persons aboard the RB–47, as well as illegally retaining custody of two of the fliers, Lt. John R. McKone and Lt. Freeman B. Olmstead in violation of international law.

With a long history of fairness and greatness, however, I feel that you, the people of the Soviet Union, would like to know both sides of the story including what we feel is the truth.

Why Not Use Our Farm Surplus?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] has long been a champion and strong exponent of developing an effective research program so as to increase industrial utilization of our agricultural abundance.

The Senator from South Dakota, who serves so ably on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, has long held the conviction that the development of new markets for our farm products both at home and abroad can provide one of the solutions to the difficulties which now confront American agriculture:

That the Senator is recognized as one of the eminent authorities in this field is without question, for we all have followed with interest the dedicated efforts he has made and continues to make for the American farmer.

This week on the newstands of America, the distinguished Senator once again makes a strong case for this program to utilize farm products. An article written by Senator KARL MUNDT is appearing in the September issue of Mechanix Illustrated, entitled "A Senator Says—Let's Abolish Our $1,000-a-Minute Farm Surplus."

Not only does Karl Mundt's article make good reading, it makes good sense, and I deem it a privilege to bring this article to the attention of my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENATOR SAYS LET'S ABOLISH OUR $1,000-A-MINUTE FARM SURPLUS

(By Senator KARL E. MUNDT)

In the past 26 years the American taxpayer has paid more than $40 billion for farm programs. This year alone the American taxpayer will pay more than $4 billion for farm supports; more than $1,500,000 a day—more than $1,000 a minute—to store farm commodities in surplus.

The American taxpayer pays $6,000 a day to store peanuts; $131 a day to store honey; $238 a day to store tobacco. Flaxseed and rye cost $7,000 a day in storage fees; oats, $15,000 a day. Rice costs $17,000; soybeans, $23,000 a day; milk and butter fats, $29,000; barley, $65,000 a day; and cotton, $76,000.

When the taxpayer reaches into his pocket to pay storage costs on more vital items in surplus, he pays $262,000 a day to store grain sorghums; $44,000 a day to store corn; $579,000 a day to pay wheat storage costs.

And these reported warehousing costs do not include miscellaneous charges such as acquisition costs, financing, supervision, and the salaries of needed administrative employees in the Department of Agriculture.

This entire support program, growing yearly in size, can collapse of its own weight at any time. As more than one of my colleagues in the Senate has asked—When are we going to get the American taxpayer out of the farm business?

American taxpayers have paid for farm programs that called for plowing under corn, killing pigs, subsidizing exports. During one 4-year period of the farm support program, the U.S. Government—meaning the American taxpayer—owned a total of 235 million pounds of surplus cheese and more than 1 billion pounds of surplus tobacco.

Yet the U.S. Government can solve the expanding farm surplus problem and relieve the American taxpayer. It can do for the agricultural industry the same type of job the so-called Manhattan project accomplished in the atomic field. With a stepped-up program of farm-product and farm-marketing research on a crash basis, we could channel our increasing farm output into an expanding market right here at home.

We are living in an industrial age. American people are using more products, more materials, more equipment of all kinds than ever before, and that use is increasing daily. Many of the products, equipment, and materials can be supplied from raw materials grown on American farms.

For instance, we can, as many European countries do, use alcohol extracted from grain as a blend with gasoline for our automobiles and farm tractors.

We are the greatest consumers of motor fuel in the world. If we blend only 5 percent of grain alcohol with gasoline, we will conserve precious supplies of petroleum that are now being exhausted. The Indianapolis Speedway drivers use alcohol in their fuel because it gives more propulsion, more speed, more efficiency. Expanding this one use alone would get the American taxpayer out of the farm business.

We could, as we did during World War II, make our synthetic rubber supplies of grain alcohol. The Department of Commerce predicts a doubling of synthetic rubber requirements by 1975. If we were to reopen the eight Government synthetic rubber plants closed after World War II, they would consume approximately 100 million bushels of grain annually.

This would mean we could use corn and wheat now in storage (that must be reaching a stage unfit for human consumption) in a productive fashion rather than adding to the tax burden.

We can divide a bushel of wheat, use the starch for alcohol and develop new markets for the protein that is the residue. We can make a K-ration, rich in vitamins and minerals, and pack it in a wheat carton to supplement our school lunch program and help the needy here at home who are on relief status.

The American petroleum industry now spends over $3 billion a year in research. The result is obvious in the flood of new products from petroleum. This compares with the figure of about one-twentieth of 1 percent of the gross sales of our agricultural output devoted to the search for new uses for agricultural products.

But we have found that everything made today from petrochemicals can also be made from grain; the molecules are interchangeable. Grain alcohol can be used to make not only motor fuel and synthetic rubber but new, more pliable plastics; solvents; surface coatings to repair the 700,000 miles of roads that need repairing. It can be used for explosives, insecticides, lubricants. It can serve our missiles, turbojets, and rockets.

We can relieve the newsprint shortage by making newsprint from wheat straw. We can make paper from surplus wheat and corn. If we simply add grain starch to wood pulp in paper production, this one use alone would consume 100 million added bushels of corn yearly.

We could absorb the vast farm surplus; we could add new products from what we now consider waste. A few years ago, driving through South Dakota, one would see the horizon dotted by colorful piles of burning straw. Now we know this straw we once burned can be used to make much needed newsprint and strawboard.

We can use wheat and corn starches as coating agents for textiles. We already produce a corn fiber called vicara for the manufacture of clothes. With intensification of our agricultural research, we would see buildings constructed of corncob concrete. We will wear clothes made of a luxurious corn fiber similar to cashmere. We may soon wear rainproof coats made from corn. Some are already made from lard.

We must recognize that one of the strongest contributing factors to the food surplus

problem exists in the very nature of farming. Our 6 million farmers have had little opportunity, due to the independent nature of farming, to apply the modern techniques of merchandising and research that have been the dynamic forces for growth in American industrial life.

If we but use the brains of some of our jet-age scientists in an agricultural Manhattan project that includes both creative and marketing research, we can bring to American homes a flood of new products that will stagger the imagination.

To spark this grain-chemical revolution, to organize this agricultural Manhattan project, we need to establish a separate agency of Government with funds and authority to apply modern techniques of research, marketing, and merchandising.

This new agency would have the authority to let contracts to industrial organizations with laboratories; it would have the authority to put scientists to work.

It would have the authority to seek out new ways to utilize the knowledge found in these laboratories; authority to develop markets, to help finance early production of new products from farm commodities. It would apply modern techniques to create a real consumer demand for these products. It would offer scholarships to young people to study farm-product science.

Some have suggested that the problem can be solved merely by shipping all our surplus food overseas to the needy peoples of other lands. We have shipped food overseas to many areas but to attempt to solve our gigantic surplus problem in this manner is to assume additional costs and burdens of transportation with little assurance the food will reach deserving peoples. We can ship the food to ports of underdeveloped nations but distribution facilities to the remote villages of the world are poor or lacking entirely. And we must also remember that to try to solve our surplus food problem by foreign giveaways is to antagonize friendly allies who have surpluses of their own.

We must recognize that to find a realistic solution to these surpluses, and ultimate relief for the taxpayer, we must create additional farm-product markets at home. These markets can only be created by the research program suggested here and by industrial application of our farm products.

Established on a crash basis, this new project would not only move the giant surpluses out of the warehouses onto the American markets, it would create new jobs. It would spur merchandising, advertising, transportation—all retail progress. It would spark a new, higher standard of living throughout the entire American economy. It would mean a fair price for a full crop for farmers.

And it would end, once and for all, the crushing burden on the American taxpayer: $1,000-a-minute for the storage of farm surplus that should and must be put to productive use for the benefit of all.

You're Doing Fine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ALBERT

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, last week was the most impressive one to date in the annals of our Nation's space achievements. Oklahoma had an important share in the realization of these long-sought objectives and we are proud of our contribution. Under unanimous consent, I wish to insert in the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in the Tulsa (Okla.) Tribune on August 15, 1960:

YOU'RE DOING FINE

Amid all the back slapping about the Nation's rocket successes last week, Oklahoma can be proud that:

Tulsa employees of Douglas Aircraft helped build two of the three stages of the mighty rocket which thrust the 10-story balloon—the Echo satellite—into orbit.

It was a Rush Springs, Okla., boy the previous day who helped haul out of the Pacific the first manmade object to be successfully returned to earth from another satellite.

To this we may add that:

It was an ex-Oklahoma Citian, Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., who pushed through the submarine-launched Polaris missile project so brilliantly vindicated this month and last.

How on earth (or in space) would they manage without Oklahomans.

Champion of Plain Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, while looking through an issue of Reader's Digest of August 1955, I noticed and read a splendid article about a close and valued friend of mine, Theodore Granik, founder and moderator of the popular radio-TV programs, "American Forum of the Air" and "Youth Wants To Know," entitled "Champion of Plain Talk" and written by Lois Mattox Miller.

The article written about Theodore Granik is one which he richly deserves. The entire life of Theodore Granik is dedicated to constructive service and in consistently fighting for progressive causes. Theodore Granik is a firm believer that under democratic institutions of government people should be as widely informed as is possible, and for the past 30 years he has certainly done everything within his power through the medium of his informative and constructive programs to obtain and give to the American people the fullest information possible on all problems confronting them, and particularly in the field of public service where information by the people is so necessary and needed in order to form for the American people, individually, a sound public opinion.

Theodore Granik is one of the outstanding leaders in this respect. He is also a dedicated American. As one who has been a strong admirer of his for years because of his nobility of character and constructive mind, it is a pleasure for me to insert in my remarks the article written by Lois Mattox Miller, and which appeared in the Reader's Digest of August 1955.

CHAMPION OF PLAIN TALK

(By Lois Mattox Miller)

Three years ago, Theodore Granik, founder and moderator of the popular radio-TV programs, "American Forum of the Air" and "Youth Wants To Know," was stricken by a heart attack. He was then 45 and still had a lot of things he wanted to do in life.

After a spell in the hospital, he went to Florida. His law partners and broadcast associates were sure he was in the first stages of retirement. But he fooled them. The next thing they knew, he had teamed up with local businessmen and started a television station in West Palm Beach. Then the memos and phone calls began to pour into Washington and New York, and Ted was on the way back.

Today he is going stronger than ever. In addition to his two weekly forums and his TV station in Florida he has started three new programs. He is a successful Washington attorney and the friend and confidant of Government leaders.

"When I was flat on my back," says Granik, "I found wisdom in the doctors' bromide that a coronary is the greatest lifesaver of middle-aged men. I've learned to conserve energy and make it produce more than ever before."

Theodore Granik is a sturdy man with thinning sandy hair, an engaging smile and a mission in life that won't let him sit still. He got into radio on the ground floor in 1925, and for the past 30 years he has been the champion of plain talk on the air.

While still in law school, he was hired as secretary to Lee Adam Gimbel, of the famous New York department store. To lure customers to bargain sales, Gimble's had just set up a new radio station, WGBS. Granik was given the chore of keeping the station on the air between commercials with poetry readings and newscasts. Broadcasting fascinated him. He sensed its enormous educational possibilities. "There were so many things people ought to know," he says, "and no one was telling them."

He set out to remedy that by arranging a program called "Law for the Layman." With himself as interrogator, he lured his professors from St. John's Law School to the microphone to inform the public about wills, leases, contracts, debts, alimony.

When WGBS was sold in 1928, Granik was invited to bring "Law for the Layman" to station WOR. Prohibition was then a controversial issue; and Congressman EMANUEL CELLER of New York was scheduled to speak against the 18th amendment. The Women's Christian Temperance Union demanded equal time for its representative to defend the amendment.

"Let's put them both on my show at the same time," Ted suggested. "Then we can present both sides of the issue."

That broadcast made radio history. Facing her angry opponent at the microphone, the temperance lady let loose the charge that, in Washington, underground passages connected Government buildings with nearby speakeasies. The press took it from there, and next morning the Nation was aware of a new type of broadcasting.

Granik convinced the broadcasters that there was a place for controversy on the air so long as the proceedings were kept under control by an impartial moderator. The program became "The American Forum of the Air"; its shelf of transcripts represents a lively history of the past 27 years.

Arranging and moderating the weekly forum could have been a full-time job. Granik managed it in his spare moments—with the help of his wife, Hannah. Then, with a sheaf of glowing letters from members of the bar, he applied for the post of assistant district attorney of New York County and got the job.

In 1937, when he was appointed counsel of the U.S. Housing Authority, he took the forum with him to Washington, where it became a network feature. With the New Deal controversies raging and a war brewing in Europe, Granik was able to bring to the

microphone an increasing number of Congressmen and Cabinet officers who were willing to speak out on everything from social security and farm policy to neutrality and armed intervention. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprinted the proceedings, and the program became known as the "Unofficial Congress of the United States."

Sometimes the debates taxed Granik's adroitness as moderator. Once the late Gen. Hugh S. Johnson, an irascible ex-New Dealer, tried to beat Senator Claude Pepper over the head with a table microphone. During the bitter wrangles between the isolationists and interventionists in 1940–41, the American Forum was also the scene of some dramatic conversions. Clarence Streit, founder of Union Now, converted an isolationist Senator in the course of the broadcast. On another forum, Mrs. Irving Berlin, an ardent interventionist, persuaded her opponent to resign publicly from the America First Committee.

Granik retired from the U.S. Housing Authority in 1941 to enter private practice. But his impulse to give friends in Government a hand with their problems left little time for his clients. He helped Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey launch the selective service program. When Mario Giannini, president of the Bank of America, told him of the problems small businessmen of California were having getting war contracts, Granik went to California and organized scores of little firms into subcontractors' pools that became models for the entire Nation. This job so impressed the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency that he was retained to help draft the Smaller War Plants Corporation Act. Meanwhile, the American Forum served a vital purpose in wartime information and morale.

After the war, Granik's friends tried to persuade him to forget public service and concentrate on his law practice. Nearly 20 years of broadcasting had been carried on at a personal financial loss; his out-of-pocket expenses represent a fabulous sum. Ted rejoined, "Can't a man have a hobby?"

For a few years he concentrated on the law and the American Forum. Then in 1951 he had another broadcasting idea. When lining up speakers for the Forum, he was frequently accompanied by his teenage son, Bill. Often he was amazed by the clarity and directness of Bill's questions and the respect with which they were answered.

The result was "Youth Wants To Know," which made its debut on the NBC radio and TV networks in 1951. On the first broadcast Senator Robert A. Taft faced an audience of Washington teenagers who asked searching questions about the coming presidential campaign, General MacArthur's recall from the Far East, and the liberal-conservative struggle within the Republican Party. After the broadcast, switchboards were swamped with calls from enthusiastic listeners. Senator Taft remained in the studio with the kids for 2 hours. Later the Senator told Granik: "I've never been questioned so intelligently in my entire public life."

The youth program gives Granik more satisfaction than anything else in his career. The youngsters' questions go directly—sometimes ruthlessly—to the crux of the matter. They are quick to spot evasions. One lad stopped a famous public relations expert: "Please, sir, quit filibustering."

This year "Youth Wants To Know" attracted a sponsor, the General Dynamics Corp., which is considering sending it on a nationwide tour, enabling youngsters in many cities to participate.

With State Department blessing, Granik is planning a TV program which will take the public to a party in a different Washington embassy each week. He has another program planned with the Overseas Press Club, in which leading journalists will talk things over with foreign statesmen.

Last year Granik logged 100,000 miles of air travel, and 15,000 more by sea. Yet he seems calm and never in a hurry. The doctors say that he never has been in better shape.

Little Lost Sheep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Little Lost Sheep," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of today, August 23, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LITTLE LOST SHEEP

In the Life magazine series of articles, Senator KENNEDY has joined those who decry America's loss of national purpose.

One of the more interesting things about this series is the contributors' assumption that we have in fact lost our purpose. Almost none of the writers questions this; they just say it's so. After several hundred years of organized society on this continent we suddenly, overnight, mislaid our purpose, lost our way, got off the track. No need to argue the matter; everybody at home and abroad, it seems, can see our plight as plain as day.

By what nationwide poll, it might be asked, or by what process of psychic osmosis, have the learned gentlemen discovered this astounding loss? They have apparently managed to discover it by limiting their search to what is, beneath all the rhetoric, a very peculiar definition of purpose. They have decided that Americans are not working in unison, harmoniously and enthusiastically, for the promotion of specific Government programs or proposals. Ergo, no purpose.

In that sense they are of course right. But when, aside from wars, did America have a national purpose in that sense?

One period commonly mentioned is the great continental expansion in the last century. That, though, was by and large not a Government project at all. It was the sum total of millions of individuals availing themselves of opportunities, and risking dangers, for the purpose of building a better life for themselves, their families, and their descendants as individuals.

Another period that comes to mind is the relatively brief fling with imperialism starting around the turn of the century. This, if you wish, was Government purpose, though there was plenty of confusion about it within the Government. And many Americans may have been temporarily thrilled by it, though we may be sure their main concerns were individualistic. In any case, other Americans were so far from thrilled with imperialism that they ceaselessly denounced it and in due course this phase passed.

Let us go a bit further. What is Britain's national purpose? France's? Quickly now, what?

Or, even more to the point, what is the national purpose of the Soviet peoples? That one sounds easy; we all know it is to win the world for communism. But that is the Soviet government's purpose, which is another matter. No one who has taken a serious look at the Soviet Union can believe the Russian people as a whole are working might and main, with fanatical fervor, toward that aim. On the contrary, they are rather pathetically confused and hag-ridden by their government's oppressive purposes and practices.

There is, to come back home, only one abiding national purpose throughout America's history since independence, and that is the preservation and perfection of individual liberty within a framework of order. No American should despise that purpose; it was a tremendous intellectual as well as political feat for the founders to put together liberty and order. It is still a tremendous challenge to keep it and improve on it.

By definition, however, that kind of purpose doesn't fit with national purpose in the sense of Government direction. Individual liberty within a framework of order contradicts the concept of Government-imposed togetherness.

And just as no one should despise the framework, so no one should despair of its efficacy. Individual liberty within order continues to work, bringing as byproducts sensational economic benefits for all. It will, if we let it, work to meet all the challenges we are supposedly confronted with.

The men who decry our loss of national purpose are the despairers of our real purpose. Only if we ever let Government decree a "purpose" which we must follow like sheep—only then will we have lost our way.

Self-Employed Individuals Retirement Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks concerning H.R. 10, the Keogh bill:

SELF-EMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS RETIREMENT ACT

Most of us in Congress agree that the problems of our present aged population deserve our most urgent consideration. No less pressing, however, is the problem of our aged of the future. The question of how the needs of this growing segment of our population will be met may soon assume critical proportions if we continue to neglect seeking the answers.

One answer to this many-faceted question is found, I believe, in H.R. 10, the Keogh bill, which would help millions of our self-employed people provide for their retirement years. These people—workers in agriculture, forestry, fishing, small businesses and the professions—would be allowed to deduct from their Federal income tax up to 10 percent of their annual net earnings, or $2,500 (whichever is less), in order to put this money into their own retirement program as specified in the bill. Under this legislation, the self-employed would finally have the tax advantage on their retirement savings similar to that which employees covered by employer-financed pension plans have had for some time.

The spirit of individuality which the self-employed exemplify is basic to our national heritage and to our economy. To fail to encourage it through removing legislative inequities is economic and social folly.

Our men and women must be given the opportunity to use their years of productivity to prepare for less prosperous days. For the self-employed, H.R. 10 is a just means to this important end.

Eloy Alfaro Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT R. BARRY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked to insert highlights of the proceedings of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, on the occasion of the decoration ceremony at the Hotel Astor, New York City, in honor of the Right Honorable Earl Anglin James, D.D., Kt., Abp., of Toronto, Canada.

Dr. Herbert Holt, distinguished psychiatrist, and American Deputy Provost, read a letter from the Honorable Olmedo Alfaro, secretary general of the foundation, authorizing the ceremony at the Hotel Astor, New York City, and then introduced Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American Provost, who outlined the background of the foundation. Dr. Bayern said, in part:

The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation was organized to perpetuate and further the political and moral values of the Americas by General Alfaro, for whom the organization was named, and who from 1895 to 1901 and from 1906 to 1911 was President of Ecuador. The philosophy of General Alfaro, known as the Abraham Lincoln of South America, was based principally on service to his fellow human beings all over the world and to the cause of international peace. The public and private activities of the Right Honorable Earl Anglin James, D.D., Kt., Abp., of Toronto, Canada, particularly his extraordinary achievements and accomplishments, comes within the framework of the services rendered by him to his fellow human beings and to the cause of international peace. In recognition of this fact, the board of dignitaries grants Bishop James it highest honor—the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

Following additional remarks, Dr. Bayern called on Dr. Herbert Holt, who in conferring the Eloy Alfaro grand cross and diploma, said:

I am very happy, indeed, to have the honor of conferring this award on you, my dear Bishop James, in recognition of your outstanding work in behalf of humanity all over the civilized world as a dynamic religious leader and a great humanitarian, and your outstanding effort to bring about international peace, through prayer to divine providence.

You know, my dear Bishop James, you now join an elite and goodly company of distinguished persons, who have been similarly honored in the past. They include, President Eisenhower, former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Herbert Hoover, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, Senator Lyndon Johnson, Governors Rockefeller and Averell Harriman, Generals MacArthur, Crittenberger, Devers, and the Rt. Rev. Benjamin C. Eckardt, of Canada, who typify the caliber of men who hold this high honor.

On behalf of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, it is my rare privilege and honor to confer this diploma, and the Eloy Alfaro grand cross, upon the outstanding religious leader of the world, the Right Honorable Earl Anglin James, D.D., Kt., Abp., of Toronto, Canada.

ADDRESS OF THE RIGHT HONORABLE EARL ANGLIN JAMES, ON PRESENTATION OF THE ELOY ALFARO AWARD

I am overwhelmed and deeply appreciative of receiving this high honor and join such an elite and distinguished company of outstanding personalities.

As a member of the clergy, I have always tried to live up to the very highest ideals and principles of ecumenual thought. My constant endeavor has been for peace and cooperation among all religious groups of the world. I know that the major concern to the Eloy Alfaro Foundation is the advancement of the moral aim of the Americas. Morally, the Americas—North and South—and, of course, Canada—have much to teach the world. Especially can the religious forces of the Americas serve as examples of the Judeo-Christian tradition, which is the fountainhead of the morality of the Western Hemisphere.

It is within the compass of the religious of the Western Hemisphere to supply the leadership for transforming the spiritual standards of the world. Basic to the task is the vision required to join their efforts.

Religious groups in the Americas will, however, find their efforts severely curtailed until such time as they achieve peace and cooperation among themselves. Religious tensions, no less than political riftings, jeopardize the strivings of men of good will to achieve the realization of a united world. I urge that substantial measure of cooperation among religious groups which had been achieved in the United States and Canada be increased in order to further the moral objectives of the Americas.

Happily, we of the New World have initiated a program of interreligious amity that has reversed the pattern of religious friction that has marred the history of the Old World. Our task should be the broadening of the scope of our cooperation and the progressive lessening of the root causes of misunderstanding and distrust.

This major contribution on the part of the spiritual leadership of the Americas will inevitably exert a tremendous influence in bettering human relations and ushering in a more harmonious society for the blessing of mankind.

To be the recipient is indeed a high honor, and I shall regard it as an inspiration to accelerate my efforts to carrying out the high ideals and principles of Gen. Eloy Alfaro, for which General Alfaro laid down his life. I shall be glad to continue my efforts to promote world peace throughout the civilized world through prayer to the Great Spirit. I note that the Eloy Alfaro decoration is awarded to "men in the field of education and religion who dedicate their lives to eternal vigilance over human rights—sacred patrimony of mankind."

I wish to again express my personal appreciation and gratitude for your kindness and generosity in conferring this high honor on me, and I hope and pray that we may have peace in our time. May I conclude with the blessing that comes to us from the Old Testament in asking God to send us peace. May the Lord bless us and keep us. May the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be generous unto us. May the Lord lift up His countenance upon us and give us, in this country and all over the world, peace, forevermore. Amen.

The Congressman From Hawaii: The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, a distinguished war hero and a Territorial Senator named DAN K. INOUYE was overwhelmingly elected by the greatest number of votes recorded by any candidate in the history of Hawaiian politics to represent the new and sovereign State of Hawaii in the Congress of the United States. A brand-new State and a freshman Congressman—a combination that portended a hard challenge ahead.

The heavy mantle of responsibility for the young State of Hawaii was thrown upon the young shoulders of DAN K. INOUYE. The congressional records bear immutable evidence that the young State and the young Congressman met the challenge well. The same qualities which Hawaii saw in DAN won him the love and respect of seasoned legislative veterans and leaders of the Washington scene.

His parental ancestry, in combination with this thoroughly American-as-apple-pie personality, provided a cold war weapon which Congress and our Nation were quick to recognize and utilize. During the past year DAN has been sent to the Pacific Trust Territories, Okinawa, Korea, Japan, Formosa, the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong and the Philippines, functioning as a veritable one-man East-West center. A few months ago the young legislator was appointed as an American delegate to the conference of the Interparliamentary Union in Tokyo, Japan. DAN is the first freshman Member of Congress to represent the United States in the entire 80-year history of this the oldest international legislative organization. DAN was recently appointed cochairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the President's people-to-people program in charge of East-Asian activities. The Nation has recognized DAN's outstanding legislative and diplomatic talents.

As an experienced legislator, whose courage and love for his country are beyond question Hawaii's first U.S. Congressman has written an eloquent paragraph for peace in today's stormy chapter of international affairs. DAN has brought great credit and prestige for the people of Hawaii.

The brilliance of DAN's international and national accomplishments is matched by his assiduous and devoted attention to the immediate, practical needs of the people who elected him. In a short period of 11 months DAN has astounded Washington observers by his legislative know-how in guiding and as-

sisting in the passage of the following measures:

Establishment of the East-West Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange in Hawaii—H.R. 7500.

Assistance for the economic development of the Ryukyu Islands—H.R. 1157.

Construction of an enlarged turning basin in Kahului Harbor, $944,500—H.R. 7634.

Lifting of ceilings on loans administered by the Federal National Mortgage Association for the State of Hawaii—H.R. 10213.

Authorization to use Federal highway funds for the construction of approach roads to ferry terminal facilities and also for the construction of ferry terminal facilities—H.R. 10495.

Granting of the sum of $6 million to the college of agriculture at the University of Hawaii—H.R. 11602.

Granting of certain tariff and tax exemptions for Hawaii west coast shipping lines—H.R. 11748.

Provision for the permanent airlift of Hawaii's first-class mail—H.R. 12595.

Inclusion of Hawaii in the Interstate Defense Highway System, $12.5 million—H.R. 11602.

Provision for the presentation of the first U.S. flag with 50 stars to be flown over the U.S. Capitol to the honored dead now resting in Punchbowl National Cemetery—House Joint Resolution 546.

Appropriations of $10 million for the first year and $20 million for the following 2 years for the East-West Cultural Center—H.R. 11666.

Appropriations for feasibility studies by the Army Corps of Engineers—$10,000 for Honolulu Harbor project; $50,000 for Barbers Point Harbor project; $6,000 for Waikiki Beach erosion project; and $5,000 for the Kawainui Swamp project—H.R. 7634.

Authorization for the Army Corps of Engineers to make preliminary surveys and studies of the following projects—H.R. 7634: Kahoma Stream flood control, Maui; Kahaluu Harbor project, Oahu; Maalaea Bay deep sea harbor, Maui; lava flow barrier, Hawaii.

Authorization of a new Federal building in Honolulu, $23.5 million; authorization for a public health clinic and quarantine station in Honolulu—$1,887,000.

Increases in Federal grants to the State of Hawaii—over $400,000.

Authorization to conduct a feasibility study on the construction of a Hilo Harbor seawall or protective barrier—H.R. 7634.

Pay raises for Federal Government employees—H.R. 9883.

Hawaii has left an indelible mark of distinction in its first year of statehood. It has shared in the rewards of first-class citizenship. It has contributed its material and human assets to our Nation. And one of its proudest contributions has been Hawaii's first U.S. Congressman, the Honorable DAN K. INOUYE.

General Lee's Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, Ralph McGill has written a discerning article, which appeared in yesterday's Evening Star, on the distinguishing features which spell out the real leadership of the immortal general, Robert E. Lee, and our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower. I submit it for the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the attention of the Members of the Congress:

[From the Evening Star, Aug. 22, 1960]

PRESIDENT'S TRIBUTE TO GENERAL LEE—IMPRESSED BY HIS INTEGRITY, LOYALTY, POST-WAR DEVOTION TO UNION, YOUTH

(By Ralph McGill)

A dental surgeon in New Rochelle, N.Y., giving ear to President Eisenhower's speech at the Chicago convention, brooded a few days over a part of it and then wrote a letter requesting an explanation.

Mr. Eisenhower had mentioned that he had on the walls of his office the pictures of four great Americans—George Washington, Ben Franklin, Abraham Lincoln and Robert E. Lee. The gentleman in New Rochelle was firmly indignant about this. He demanded to know why the picture of a man who had tried to destroy the Union was on the walls of the office of the President of the United States.

Mr. Eisenhower's answer was an eloquent, moving tribute to Robert Edward Lee. The President has long been impressed by the "selflessness" of General Lee and by the fact that he was ever "unfailing in his faith in God." It is the revealed character of Lee which has made so enduring an impression on Mr. Eisenhower. It was this constant, inner integrity which made General Lee "a poised and inspiring leader" and one "unfailing in the trust imposed in him by his fellow citizens."

Another aspect of General Lee's character which the President likes was his conduct after the Civil War ended. Those who have read the life of the noble Virginian are aware, with Mr. Eisenhower, that in the postwar years left to him he strove with all his might to "help heal the Nation's wounds."

"These qualities of Lee," the President wrote, "are worth emulating today, especially by young Americans." To do so, Mr. Eisenhower thinks, would strengthen us as citizens and further sustain our love of freedom.

In a historical sense it is a rare sort of letter. It comes fittingly as the Nation prepares to commemorate the 100th anniversary of the Civil War which forever perpetuated the Union.

We learn from it something about Mr. Eisenhower himself. We sense what qualities of character he views as most necessary. We feel, too, since he mentions young Americans, that here is a sound, old-fashioned bit of advice on values to teenagers. It is quite apparent he feels that this generation, especially the young leadership, is called upon to end the present divisive controversies and, in a time of grave danger, strengthen the Union and its ideals of common liberty and freedom.

It is true, as the President says, that General Lee devoted the years left to him to teaching and instructing the young men in the South.

Time after time, by word and example, he taught love of country and of the Union. He made his life a symbol of obedience to civil authority.

He had never wanted secession. He did not believe in slavery. One of his letters to his family said: "I am not pleased with the course of the 'Cotton States,' as they term themselves. In addition to their selfish, dictatorial bearing, the threats they throw out at the Border States argue little for the benefit of peace for Virginia should she determine to coalesce with them."

But after a night of prayer he determined, if Virginia withdrew, to join his State and fight in defense of it.

He wanted no dealings with hotheads or fools, the strident screamers and shouters. He would, we may be sure, have contempt and distrust of those who fill those roles in our time. The President seems to say as much if one reads between the lines of his letter.

We Want Medical Insurance, Not a "Giveaway"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, in view of the administration's long-shouted claims that the budget takes precedence over everything else, it is astonishing to find the President supporting a plan for direct subsidies that could cost the U.S. Treasury $1.7 billion a year. Were the program to have other sponsorship, I am sure that the very spokesmen who advocate it would be calling it a giveaway.

As for the means test requirements of the administration plan, should we move backward in our social thinking to the days of the poorhouse and the county farm?

Instead of the subsidy and charity proposals of the administration, I believe the American people would much prefer the pay-as-you-go, self-supporting medical care proposed in Forand-type legislation.

None of us and particularly the senior citizens of the United States want any Federal handouts; we don't want any Federal charity. We want a workable insurance program that will give us protection against the costs of illness when we reach retirement age.

We have an efficient social security system already operating, which could easily handle the administration of a medical care program. There is no need for the establishment of a costly new agency.

The administration's handling of this whole question has been incomprehensible. First it told us there was no need for any medical care program for the elderly. As the election approached, the

administration took another look at the mass of incontrovertible evidence and suddenly espoused the cause of medical care for the elderly. But, instead of an insurance program under which our citizens would pay during their working years for protection in their older years, the administration advanced it subsidy-charity program.

I urge that we bury forever the charity concept in social programs. Let us allow each American to preserve his dignity as a free citizen; let us reject the anachronistic thinking whereby the administration would have us deal with our own senior citizens in terms of treasury handouts and public charity.

Resolution Grasshopper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, one of the great weaknesses of the soil bank program is that no provision was made in the contracts to control grasshoppers and other insect infestation on soil bank land. This has become a real menace to other farmers living near soil bank land.

It is being proposed by both political parties that the soil bank program be extended. I think that a resolution which has been adopted by a number of boards of county commissioners in North Dakota and which has recently been forwarded to me should be of great interest to all Members of Congress.

I am therefore asking unanimous consent to have "Resolution Grasshopper" printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This resolution was first forwarded to me by Mr. O. Woolfrey, county auditor of Divide County, N. Dak., and was cosigned by Mr. Claude Christianson, chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Divide County; Mr. Cornwall Holm and Mr. Fred Heuer, members of the Divide County Commissioners, Crosby, N. Dak. I have also received identical resolutions from Mae Classon, county auditor of Cass County, N. Dak., and cosigned by Mr. Ray Kasowski, chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Cass County; Mr. Lewis Sutton, Mr. Ingolf Sandbeck, and Mr. Laurence Yunker, members of the Cass County Commissioners, Fargo, N. Dak.; Gladys C. Pederson, county auditor of Ward County, N. Dak., and cosigned by Mr. B. O. Dahl, chairman of the Board of County Commissioners of Ward County; Mr. Paul Walker, Mr. Harold Haner, Mr. John W. Howe, and Mr. O. E. Sandberg, members of the Ward County Commissioners, Minot, N. Dak.; Dorthy Laird, county auditor of Mountrail County, N. Dak., and cosigned by Mr. Ray S. Ashley, Mr. L. G. Larson, and Mr. Harry Olaf, members of the Mountrail County Commissioners, Stanley, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION GRASSHOPPER

Whereas great areas of Divide County, N. Dak., have been placed in the soil bank; and

Whereas these large areas have become infested with noxious weeds and breed grounds for the great hordes of grasshoppers; and

Whereas the spread of noxious weeds and great infestation of grasshoppers from the areas are creating a difficult hardship on those farmers still on their farms and engaged in the occupation of farming; and

Whereas present regulations formulated by the U.S. Department of Agriculture are inadequate to correct this situation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of County Commissioners, Divide County, N. Dak., That the North Dakota congressional delegation, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and all interested persons are hereby urged and requested to support legislation or a change of regulations whereby landowners who have placed their land in the soil bank be required to control noxious weeds and grasshopper infestation thereon, and that a system of inspection be instituted to insure compliance therewith; be it further

Resolved, That the county auditor of Divide County, N. Dak., is to forward copies of this resolution to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, to the North Dakota congressional delegation, and to all other interested persons.

Dated at Crosby, N. Dak., this 2d day of August 1960.

CLAUDE CHRISTIANSON,
Chairman of the Board.
CORNWALL HOLM,
Member of the Board.
FRED HEUER,
Member of the Board.

Robert Frost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today the House Committee on Banking and Currency reported out a bill authorizing the President of the United States of America to present a gold medal to Robert Frost, a New England poet. Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL of Massachusetts filed the original bill and the Honorable EDWARD P. BOLAND and I filed companion bills asking for due recognition for Robert Frost:

ROBERT FROST

One of the happiest aspects of the present times in America is that Robert Frost has lived long enough to have achieved something like his due in critical and public recognition. It is good that this sensitive and skilled poet, who spent the first 40 years of his life in obscurity and neglect, should now, in his eighties, be given his due need of praise and admiration. Perhaps it matters more, though, that we, the people of America, are granted the rare privilege of seeing and recognizing greatness in a living man. Vast numbers of Americans have been able to see Robert Frost, to hear him read, to hear his speech which is as beautifully phrased, as packed with feeling, as earnest and as witty as his verse. Through his spoken or recorded word, through his expressive countenance, whether seen directly or in photographs, through the warmth of his personality as brought to us in these ways and in his printed poetry, we of America have learned to know and love the man, and feel the impact of his greatness.

In the early years of his life, however, Robert Frost was little noticed or regarded. He was born in San Francisco, Calif., on March 26, 1874, the son of a New England man of Confederate sympathies, William Prescott Frost, and named for the Confederate general, Robert E. Lee. When the boy, Robert, was 11, his father died of tuberculosis, leaving nothing to his widow, his son, and his daughter, Jeanie, but the request that he be buried in his native New England. Enough money remained in the family supply to carry out this last request, but then the widow, with her two children, found herself in New Hampshire without the money to return to California. She taught in the school in Salem, N.H., which Robert and Jeanie attended. Robert Frost responded differently to different schools. In this grammar school, he was apparently lethargic and uninterested, refusing to read any book by himself until he was 12. But in the next school he attended, Lawrence High School, he semed to take fire with enthusiasm, and was graduated, in 1892, as valedictorian and class poet. In Dartmouth, something went wrong, either in Robert Frost's personal life or in the college, and he left early in his freshman year. Except for a brief period as a special student in Harvard, from 1897 to 1899, he has not since been enrolled in any college as a student.

Frost wrote and published a few poems between 1894 and 1899, but he was mainly trying to find a way of life, and a way of making his living. He worked in mills in Lawrence, held a job as a newspaper reporter, and taught school. After his marriage to Elinor White, in 1895, he helped his mother manage a small private school in Lawrence for more than 2 years. In 1899 he entered upon a career of raising hens and selling eggs, and in 1900 moved to a farm in Derry, N.H., to carry on this business. He continued in this business, though with little success, until 1909. In 1906, however, he tried to make up for the deficiencies of the poultry business by undertaking to teach English at Pinkerton Academy, in Derry, which he continued to do until 1911. In 1911–12 he taught psychology at the State Normal School, Plymouth, N.H.

The year 1912 marked the turning point in Frost's life, for in that year he and his wife decided to stake their future on his poetry, rather than on farming or school teaching. Selling the farm in Derry, and encouraged by the receipt of a legacy from his grandfather, Robert Frost set sail with his wife and four children for England, where they rented a house in Beaconsfield, Buckinghamshire, in which Frost was free to devote his time to writing.

Here he put together his first book of poems, "A Boy's Will," and shyly offered it for publication to the firm of David Nutt, in London. It happened that the head of the firm, David Nutt, had just died, and the book was taken for consideration, and then accepted, by the publisher's widow. The enthusiastic support of Ezra Pound, who brought the book immediately to the attention of a wide literary circle in England, and wrote favorably and perceptively of it in "Poetry: a Magazine of Verse," helped it at once to reach a wide audience, particularly among poets and critics. This first success was followed by the publication of "North of Boston," a book of dramatic dialogs, in 1914. By 1915, when the Frosts returned to America, both books had been published here by Henry Holt, the first that has remained Robert Frost's American publisher ever since.

Though Robert Frost had abandoned farming as a means of livelihood, he apparently still preferred a New England farm as a place to live, for he soon purchased a small farm in Franconia, N.H., and established his family there. For the support of six people, the income from his writings alone proved insufficient, and he began, in 1916, the way of life that he has followed, in general, ever since: teaching in colleges for certain periods, traveling from one end of the country to the other to speak his poetry to varied audiences, and always returning to a New England farm, whether for rest or for a restoration of vigor and renewed contact with reality. In 1919 he moved his family from the farm in Franconia to one in South Shaftsbury, Vt.

In 1916 Frost published "Mountain Interval," read the Phi Beta Kappa poem at Harvard, and became professor of English at Amherst, holding that position until 1920. He was poet in residence at the University of Michigan from 1921 to 1923, taught at Amherst again until 1925, served as fellow in letters at the University of Michigan, 1925–26, and returned to the position in Amherst until 1938. In 1920, he helped to found the Bread Loaf School of English, Middlebury College, where he has since been an annual lecturer. In 1923 he published "New Hampshire," in 1928 "West-Running Brook," and in 1936 "A Further Range." In 1933 he was made associate fellow of Pierson College, Yale, and in 1936 he was Charles Eliot Norton professor of poetry at Harvard University. Since 1933, he has been George Ticknor fellow in humanities and visiting lecturer in humanities at Dartmouth College, and Simpson lecturer in literature at Amherst. At Harvard he was member of the board of overseers for 1938–39, Ralph Waldo Emerson fellow for 1939–41, fellow in American civilization for 1941–42, and honorary Ralph Waldo Emerson fellow for 1942–43. In 1936, on doctor's orders, Frost began spending the most severe winter months in Florida, a custom he has kept up ever since. In 1938 Mrs. Frost died. In 1940, Robert Frost built himself a New England bungalow on the outskirts of Coral Gables, Fla., in which he has since spent much of the winters. He spends his summers on an upland farm in Ripton, Vt.

Frost's later books are "A Witness Tree" (1942), "A Masque of Reason" (1945), "Steeple Bush" (1947), and "A Masque of Mercy" (1947). Since 1947, there have been few poems, published individually as Christmas cards, or appearing in magazines, but among these few poems are some of the most popular in Frost's programs of spoken poetry, and some of the most important, in the opinion of critical commentators on his work. It is to be hoped that the compilation issued in 1949, with the now misleading title, "Complete Poems," will soon be reissued with the addition of such poems as "One More Brevity," "Kitty Hawk," "Away," and "A-Wishing Well."

In 1958–59, Robert Frost was consultant in English poetry at the Library of Congress, and on the expiration of this term he was appointed honorary consultant in the humanities for a 3-year period. He has been a member of the National Institute of Arts and Letters since 1916, and of the American Academy of Arts and Letters since 1930. In 1940, he was given the permanent post of honorary president of the Poetry Society of America.

Though many books have been written about Robert Frost, all are studies of his work, or of some aspect of it, rather than full biographies. John F. Lynen's book, "The Pastoral Art of Robert Frost," one of the three books on Frost to be published in the past few months, contains a bibliography listing seven earlier studies of Frost and his poetry. Much biographical material is incorporated in "Robert Frost, The Trial by Existence," by Elizabeth Shepley Sergeant, and a "selective chronology" of Frost's life is appended to that recent book. The other very recent book, "Human Values in the Poetry of Robert Frost," by George W. Nitchie, is a critical and philosophical discussion, with no biographical information. Lawrence Thompson published, in 1959, a biographical pamphlet on Robert Frost, as No. 2 of the series of "University of Minnesota Pamphlets on American Writers." In a preliminary note in this pamphlet, it is stated that Thompson is preparing a biography of Robert Frost.

Among honors that have been bestowed upon Robert Frost up to now are a large number of honorary degrees, of which no definitive list has been compiled as yet. The number is probably in excess of 40, though the fullest list at present available comprises 34. Frost has been awarded the Pulitzer Prize for Poetry four times, in 1924, 1931, 1937, and 1943. The only major award for literary achievement that has not been bestowed upon him is the Nobel Prize for Literature—and it is difficult to understand the fact that he has not been selected for this honor. Tufts College, as early as 1915, made him its Phi Beta Kappa poet, and such organizations as the Academy of American Poets, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the Poetry Society of America, the Huntington Hartford Foundation, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, and the New England Poetry Club have given to him their fellowships and cash awards, their gold medals and other decorations. The Senate of the United States gave him its official greetings on the occasion of his birthday in 1950, and again in 1959. A bill (S. 3439) providing that a gold medal be presented to Robert Frost by the President, in the name of the Congress, has passed the Senate, and is awaiting action by the House of Representatives.

It is to be hoped that Robert Frost will live long and prosper, in the enjoyment of the acclaim which he has so amply earned, and continues to earn, by the high qualities of his poetry, by the charm and force of his personality, by the sharpness of his perception, and by the integrity of his character. In my few remarks, I have tried to indicate the esteem in which he is held, I know, by the people of the United States generally, and most deeply by the people of his native New England.

The Big Political "If"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, through the editorial columns of his fine weekly newspaper, the Piedmont (Ala.) Journal, Publisher Austin Johnson often strikes chords which are consonant with the sentiments of a large segment of the South.

This, I think, he has done in an editorial entitled, simply, "If," which I would like to include at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Piedmont Journal, Aug. 12, 1960]

"IF"

Some States rightists, along with the self-appointed political Moses Gessner T. McCorvey, are at it again—engaging in their typical wishful thinking, political bickering, fantastic haranguing, and "ifie" agitation, urging another 1948 political debacle—to the extent of finding a sufficient number of States' rightists to ditch the election of a President by the electoral college process and throw the election into the House of Representatives.

The whole scheme—as proposed by an agitative folder issued by McCorvey and broadcast to the press—is fantastic and "ifie" to Kthe *n*th degree. For example (according to folder):

"If neither the Democratic nor Republican nominee of the national convention has a majority of electoral votes * * * (then) * * * If we can throw the election into the House * * * etc."

(Then) "If the election is thrown into the House I (McCorvey) feel confident that many States, including some Northern and Western States, will cast their votes for a great statesman of the type I have mentioned—Byrd (Virginia), Senator James F. Byrnes, or Strom Thurmond (South Carolina); Senator Dick Russell (Georgia); Senator Eastland (Mississippi) for President—if neither John Kennedy nor Dick Nixon got a majority in the electoral college * * * etc., etc."

And again "if" such a scheme were to work by some wild stretch of the imagination, and the election were to be thrown into the House—woe be unto an Alabama or southern Senator or Congressman who had the effrontery to "* * * vote for an integrationist and antisegregationist political leader like JOHN KENNEDY * * *" rather than THURMOND, RUSSELL, EASTLAND, or the rest of rightists' hopefuls.

And "if" the Alabama or southern Senators and Representatives did vote for the villains—JACK or DICK—then the following paragraph as to what would befall them: "* * * I think I (McCorvey) can safely say that henceforth the guilty party could not be elected to any office in Alabama. Can you imagine the indignation of our people if any one of our Congressmen, having such an opportunity, should be traitor enough to his people, and enough of a "Quisling" to support a man who is avowedly trying to wreck our traditions and our civilization?"

Of all tommyrot, wishful thinking, crackpot scheming and shadowboxing, this must be it. As obnoxious as the civil rights phase of the Democrats' platform is, as detestable as is the integration attitude of non-Southern States in the party, where else can southern Democrats go?

True we can sulk. But sulk alone. We are not ready to "take our little ball and go home." We must stay in there like the real McCoy—and fight back and keep on fighting—if we ever expect to get anywhere—if we continue to have a friend at court. As bad as the civil rights dose is, the mess might be a lot worse if we stomped on the party and quit.

What about the splinter party? You answer that. It's been tried over and over. It's like talking a squirrel out of a tree. It won't work.

So, all the objectionable features of the Democratic platform notwithstanding, it is the feeling of this paper that good Democrats will be smart to rally to the ticket, pull the lever and vote it straight under the rooster, come the November general election.

And, it's our considered opinion, they will.

The Issue at Stake in Port Authority Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues

the following article by George E. Sokolsky as it appeared in the New York Journal-American of August 12, 1960:

THE ISSUE AT STAKE IN PORT AUTHORITY CONTROVERSY

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Consistency in thought and action is rare and to politicians not too important. For instance, Governor Meyner of New Jersey and Governor Rockefeller of New York do not believe in the kind of States rights that Governor Faubus of Arkansas believes in. Governor Faubus holds that with regard to all matters which are not literally and verbally delegated to the Federal Government by the Constitution, the Federal Government should mind its own business.

The Governors of New York and New Jersey would hold that the 14th and 15th amendments forbid the designation of any American citizen as lesser than any other American citizen, but when it comes to the constitutional provision that the States shall make no compacts without the consent of Congress, they raise the issue of States rights just as the Governor of Arkansas raises the same issue with regard to the management of the schools of his State.

This is no new issue in American history and over it the only civil war in our history was fought. The war did not settle the basic quarrel over federalism because men's minds were diverted to the question of slavery. What the war did settle was that no State could secede from the Union and that the Congress of the United States could pass social legislation. It also settled the matter of States making compacts among themselves. The Confederacy was such a compact and when the Confederacy was defeated, that settled the question of compacts and treaties between States without the consent of Congress.

On the other hand, the daily business of the United States is such that States have to engage in joint enterprises. The Port of New York Authority is such an enterprise. There are many such enterprises in the United States. In some instances, such as the TVA, the Federal Government organizes its own management body. The forms vary, but in every instance that requires a joint operation in more than one State, the consent of Congress must be obtained. And the operation is forever subject to congressional scrutiny, because what Congress grants, it can revoke.

This issue is so important that in the Port of New York Authority's controversy with the House Judiciary Committee, appeal has now been made by both sides to the Governors of all the States and to each Member of the House of Representatives. Undoubtedly, before it is over the question will go to the courts because at stake are two congressional rights: the right to amend or revoke a consent to a compact between States and the right of the Congress to investigate the operations of public bodies existing by congressional consent. The Congress will not give up either of these rights.

If States may enter into a compact for a good purpose, they may enter into a compact for any purpose. It is for this reason that the Constitution specifically forbade such compacts without the consent of Congress. At issue is this: If Congress has once granted consent to a compact, is the consent eternal and unalterable or may Congress from time to time investigate the compact to discover whether it is still in the interest of the United States and whether it is performing the task for which the compact was permitted by Congress, or is producing an excess of power.

It does not matter that the compact serves a good cause or that those who supervise the compact are reputable men. Today men are reputable; tomorrow others take their places who serve their own purposes. It is a fallacy to base a judgment on the virtue of men; it is essential that the law be correct and that the law be obeyed.

In the present Port of New York Authority controversy, the virtue of the individuals is not questioned; what is questioned is the right of a congressional committee to inquire into the activities of a public body which exists by a compact between two States and a consent by the Congress. The contention of one side is that the public body, in this instance, the Port of New York Authority, needs to report only to the Governors of the States in the compact; the contention of the congressional committee is that the right of investigation is inherent and that a consent once granted may be revoked.

It is a tricky subject and out of it could come decisions of far-reaching effect.

The Brass Roots for Nixon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of an article published recently in the New Republic. The author of the article is Lloyd R. Winburn, administrative assistant to State Senator Hugo Fisher of San Diego County, Calif.

In his article "The Brass Roots for NIXON," Mr. Winburn discusses some very interesting aspects of the Nixon campaign in California before the recent national conventions of both parties, and the people who are spearheading that campaign. The article reads as follows:

THE BRASS ROOTS FOR NIXON

(By Lloyd R. Winburn)

Being press agent for any unopposed candidate for public office is a hard job, and it's no easier if the candidate happens to be the inevitable Republican nominee for the Presidency. To work off his frustrations, Herbert Klein, aide to Richard Nixon, recently called a press conference to report, though no one had asked him, that "The Vice President's bandwagon is rolling and rolling hard at the grassroots level."

Which makes it proper to inquire: How deep grow the roots?

In California, where the last of the Nation's presidential primaries will be held on June 7, the Vice President will be competing in a popularity contest with a Democratic slate headed by Gov. Pat Brown as a favorite son, but including delegates who favor other candidates. Brown has made a point of the fact that the Vice President has retained two public relations agencies in the State to cultivate those "Grass Rooters for Nixon." But actually there are not two, there are five, and the digging and sprinkling has been going on since September 1959.

Nixon clubs are organized regionally—in northern California, the Los Angeles area, Orange County and San Diego County—mainly because those are where the Nixon-employed ad firms are located. The Whitaker & Baxter agency in the Flood Building, San Francisco, is the address of the "Nixon in '60 Committee of Northern California." Baus & Ross, 2796 West Eighth Street, Los Angeles, is also the address of the "Richard M. Nixon for President Committee," and the "Orange County Committee of 10,000, Richard M. Nixon for President," is at 2133 W. Chapman Avenue in Orange, the same address as the agency known as Robert Geier Associates. The Orange Daily News has listed Robert Geier as the Nixon club campaign director.

Although there is a separate Nixon Committee headquarters in San Diego at 1072 Second Avenue, this was not opened until January after two agencies, Armstrong, Fenton & Vinson, and Champ, Wilson & Slocum, organized the first Nixon clubs in the country. Releases of the "Nixon in '60 Committee of Northern California" carry the Whitaker & Baxter masthead with the names of Clem Whitaker, Jr., James Dorais, and Newton Stearns. The Nixon committee San Francisco telephone number, Sutter 1-3751, is the Whitaker & Baxter telephone number. A Los Angeles release of the Nixon for President Club carries the notation, "Represented by Baus & Ross Co., 2796 West Eighth Street, Dunkirk 8-1107." Dunkirk 8-1107 is also the telephone number of the Nixon for President Committee which lists William B. Ross of Baus & Ross as campaign director.

California men on the Nixon staff who are behind "Grass Rooters for Dick" are Robert Finch, Nixon's administrative assistant and former chairman of the Los Angeles Republican Committee, and Mr. Klein, who is editor-on-leave from the San Diego Union. A scattering of California Republican Congressmen are helping, led by Representative BOB WILSON of San Diego, who is the only member of an advertising firm to sit in Congress. (He is a partner in the Champ Wilson & Slocum Agency which is working with Armstrong, Fenton & Vinson to organize Nixon clubs in San Diego County.)

The first Nixon clubs in the State were organized in September by Baus & Ross in Yorba Linda, Nixon's birthplace, and Whittier, where the Vice President grew up; and on October 11 the Los Angeles Times in three-column headlines and photo reported, "Nixon for President Club Aims To Get 10,000 Here." The story began, "Los Angeles citizens have joined the Nixon for President Club drive—a grassroots movement which has boomed since its inception in Vice President NIXON's home-town area of Whittier-Yorba Linda." Thomas P. Pike, head of the grassroots club, stressed the "absolutely nonpartisan" aspect of the drive and said, according to the Times, "Democrats, Republicans, and independents alike are joining the Nixon for President Club parade." Pike is a former assistant to President Eisenhower and a former Assistant Secretary of Defense, and thereafter his name appeared prominently in Nixon campaign material and press releases issued by Baus & Ross. Committee members of the grassroots movement listed by the Times included Alphonso E. Bell, Finch's successor as Los Angeles chairman; advertising man Don Belding, Walt Disney, Irene Dunne, Mrs. Bernard Giannini, Herbert Hoover, Jr., George Murphy, Harry Buffum, Zazu Pitts, Dick Powell, Edward S. Shattuck, Republican national committeeman; Jack Warner, Robert Warner, Jack Wrather, owner of numerous radio and TV stations and of the luxurious Knoa Kai Club in San Diego, and Dr. Arnold O. Beckman of Beckman Industries, who later accepted the chairmanship of the Orange County "Neighbors for Nixon" which has been set up by the Geier firm.

A set of instructions for organizing the grassroots, sent out by Baus & Ross in October states: "The Nixon problem is to be elected President of the United States—not to gain the Republican nomination. * * * Those who campaign for NIXON's nomination actually do him a disservice by lowering him from the exalted political position he now occupies—the obvious favorite of the present President of the United States.

"Our job now is to set up an organization for winning the November election—an or-

ganization attractive to voters of both major parties and the independents. When we succeed in organizing this broad support, it will be apparent to every delegate at the GOP convention that Vice President NIXON, the trained and handpicked successor to President Eisenhower, is the only Republican who can be elected in November of 1960."

Baus & Ross subsequently issued a more elaborate pamphlet entitled, "How To Organize a NIXON for President Committee in Your Community," which opened with the statement: "For the first time in history a man has been trained to be President of the United States." On the same page is the paragraph: "Despite the President's uncompromising attitude of neutrality in the election of his successor, Vice President NIXON obviously occupies the unassailable position of Eisenhower's trusted lieutenant and trained successor—head and shoulders above all other contenders. Other hopefuls will be heard from (they may add to the ticket and the forthcoming Nixon administration) but NIXON, as the handpicked successor to President Eisenhower, is the only Republican who can be elected President in November of 1960."

In San Francisco on November 18, Whitaker & Baxter released an announcement by John W. Dinkelspiel and Caspar W. Weinberger of the formation of a volunteer NIXON for President Committee of northern California citizens. Dinkelspiel is a former chairman of the San Mateo County Republican Central Committee, and Weinberger is a former Republican member of the legislature. The release listed, on five legal-sheets, double spaced, names of Nixon Committee members in 46 nbrthern counties. Almost all are well-known registered Republicans, including, in Santa Clara County, the GOP State chairman, George W. Milias, Jr., of Gilroy.

NIXON has made many visits to California since "Grass Rooters for DICK" got underway. Each visit is fringed with a sectional tour and a round of nonpolitical appearances, and the agency men are invariably present to help with arrangements. In December NIXON saw Ross and Pike in Los Angeles, then went to Newport Beach where he saw Armstrong and Representative Wilson, as well as San Diego and Orange County leaders. In February he was back in Los Angeles for conferences at the Statler Hotel with representatives of the five ad agencies and State Nixon club leaders.

California newspapers have reported the existence of about 250 clubs, but these are no more than paper organizations in such places as Broderick, Lemon Cove, Hollister, Llano, and Potrero. In the larger cities there are meetings, luncheons, and dinners—but the clubs, if they ever existed in the small towns and villages, are dormant. In February Pike was quoted, in a Baus & Ross release, as saying there were 55 clubs with more than 15,000 members in the Los Angeles area. This averages about 275 members per club. I have not seen a single newspaper account of a Nixon club meeting which reported more than 40 members in attendance, and according to many of the newspaper stories, attendance ranges from 10 to 20.

Newsletters and press releases from both the San Diego committee and the Armstrong agency stress the need of wide backing for NIXON. One newsletter dated February 11 and signed by Clair W. Burgener reports that "* * * DICK NIXON feels that nonpartisan membership should be the keynote in any NIXON for President group formed." In San Diego, an Armstrong agency release dated November 25, 1959, announced the formation of Young Men for NIXON with Chairman Laurie Flood saying he thought the movement would spread to other cities in California and across the Nation. As of now, Young Men for NIXON is still operating only in San Diego.

The press releases of the NIXON clubs in northern California, although ostensibly emanating from various communities, reveal a sameness in form, content, and mechanical duplication which suggests a common agency origin. Melville E. Willson of Fresno, is quoted as saying: "As a truly working Vice President he has proved himself an able and qualified leader." Whitaker & Baxter had earlier written that line for Dinkelspiel and Weinberger this way: "As the first truly working Vice President."

Although there is no central direction of the "Grass Rooters for DICK" movement in California, outside of NIXON's own office in Washington, the agencies apparently work closely with each other. George E. Taylor of 4494 30th Street, San Diego, wrote to a Mrs. Enid K. James that he wanted to form a NIXON group in San Diego. Mrs. James passed the letter to Baus & Ross in Los Angeles and Ross wrote to Taylor on October 30: "My understanding is that this work is currently being headed up by Mr. Tom Armstrong of the Armstrong, Fenton & Vinson Agency. I would suggest that you check in with him immediately in order that there be no duplication of activities. Meanwhile, I am sending you our 'How to Organize' folder."

"What DICK NIXON has in California," a San Francisco advertising man said some weeks ago, "is a Madison Avenue stretching 1,580 miles from Yreka in the north to San Ysidro on the Mexican border."

Winds of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and newspaper articles:

G-M LOCAL 1097, UAW,
Rochester, N.Y., July 21, 1960.

HON. ADAM CLAYTON POWELL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR HONORABLE POWELL: In this critical election year of 1960 our Local Union 1097 of the United Automobile Workers of America, is deeply concerned about the future of our Nation both at home and abroad. The civil rights platform recently adopted by the Democratic Party assembled in Los Angeles for its quadrennial convention has filled our hearts with new hope and inspired us to think and work diligently for this success at the polls in November for the candidates sworn to push for a strong civil rights platform.

My committee is primarily concerned with securing full equality for all of the citizens of the Rochester area regardless of race, color, or creed. As you are well aware, the minority groups have long suffered from uninterested parties and the inequities resulting therefrom, imposed upon our Negro citizens by the ultraconservative party now in power and which has controlled the Government in this area for many years.

Recently two distinguished journalists of the staff of one of our local papers, the Times-Union, made a survey of minority group problems in our community. They have published the results of this study in a series of excellent articles under the title of "Winds of Change." These articles constitute an essentially accurate portrayal of the intolerable discriminatory conditions which hamper their lives and progress. I am enclosing reprints of these articles for your careful study.

The UAW believes that our efforts in the field of human rights would be rendered immeasurably more effective if the disgraceful record of this community in the area of civil rights could be exposed to the whole of New York and the entire Nation. We believe also the exposure of these discriminatory practices will aid significantly the cause in November of the candidates sworn to push for a strong civil rights platform.

These considerations have led us to request that you use your good office to introduce these articles in whole or in part into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We should appreciate, therefore, any effort that you find it possible to make in our behalf in our efforts to achieve full equality for all our citizens and a resounding victory in the fall for those candidates who have pledged themselves to enact a sound reliable civil rights program.

Very truly yours,

CLARENCE LOVE,
President, Local 1097 UAW.
JOHN C. MITCHELL,
Chairman, Fair Practices Committee and FEPC.

WINDS OF CHANGE—CITY IS CAUGHT IN U.S. DILEMMA OF RACE RELATIONS—THE "NEW NEGRO" IS DRIVING HARDER FOR ACCEPTANCE

(By Desmond Stone and Jack Germond)

From Africa, the South, and the urban North, winds of change have blown into Rochester and caught a proud city largely unawares. What was for so long an essentially local problem in race relations has become part of the wider problem of the colored man's struggle for equality around the world.

It was bound to happen sooner or later. No man is an island, and in a quickly-shrinking world, neither is any city.

It has happened today rather than yesterday because conditions in Rochester are riper for change than they were.

The Negro community has been stung into a greater awareness by the controversy over the proposed establishment of a Rochester office of the State Commission Against Discrimination.

A new middle-class Negro has begun to shed his inhibitions.

A close political balance in the city has made the parties newly sensitive to Negro demands.

The transformation is untidy, sometimes confused. The Rochester Negro's identification with the Negro in Ghana, in Biloxi and in Detroit is still incomplete even in middle-class circles. But though the winds of change do not blow steady, or all to the same effect, the sighs are unmistakable.

A Negro research chemist spreads a pile of recent newspapers from Nigeria across the floor of his dining room and says: "At first the American Negro looked on Africa as a dark and savage place. Now he sees the time when the Negro in Africa will be free. But will he be free here in the land of freedom?"

A teenager at Hanover Houses, talking to a white acquaintance, brings the name of Dr. Kwame Nkrumah, the prime minister of Ghana, down out of the blue.

A well-educated woman member of the Delta Ressic Club, a Negro group that originated in the Baden Street Settlement, relates an incident that occurred during the Montgomery (Ala.) bus strike.

"My father was a patient in one of our hospitals. He heard the nurse say to a young Negro helper, 'Go sweep that room.' He also

heard the boy say to the nurse, 'Haven't you read this morning's paper?' "

These portents are not peculiar to Rochester. Unless it be in the intellectual darkness of big city slums or in the remoteness of a cotton field, few Negro communities anywhere are unaffected any longer by events outside.

But more than some cities, Rochester has been taken by surprise. It has mistaken the Negro's new vocalism for the cry of the local malcontent. It has not caught the overtones of the Negro emergent in Africa and elsewhere.

There are reasons for this. Traditionally, Rochester has preferred to solve its problems at the local level.

Now, however, the Negro problem is suddenly in danger of slipping out of its grasp.

Events in the South have led to picketing of local Woolworth stores.

Pressure is on for an office of the State Commission Against Discrimination.

Housing bias here and elsewhere has become a primary target for statewide action by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. Roy Wilkins, executive secretary in New York City for NAACP, made this point when he addressed the recent 24th annual meeting in Rochester of the State conference of NAACP branches.

DEMANDS CANNOT BE ISOLATED

Having depended on the local approach for so long—and, more important, having failed to remedy conditions in time—Rochester today finds itself caught up in the American Dilemma. And not appreciating the full implications, the community at large is puzzled, confused, resentful.

"I ask you, What does it all mean?" cries an employment official as he waves a newspaper clipping telling of the Episcopalian resolution backing a local SCAD office. "What's the fuss? Why's everyone jumping on the bandwagon?"

"Why," asks the man in the street, "must they picket our Woolworth stores when the lunch counters here are freely available to all Negroes? Why should we suffer for something we haven't done?"

But whether considered just or unjust, the demands and actions of the local Negro community cannot now be either isolated or ignored.

"You can no longer sweep us under the rug," declares a new leader, "because what you sweep under the rug is potential dynamite."

Encouraged by the words of men like Rabbi Philip S. Bernstein, Negro pressure for acceptance is today at a new high in Rochester. And though this pressure is coincidental with the controversy over SCAD and the awakening of the Negro everywhere, it is obviously not accidental. The SCAD issue supplies spontaneity and adds fuel, but a new, more militant leadership supplies the planning.

More than any other leader of recent times, the Rev. Quintin E. Primo, Jr., president of the local NAACP and minister of St. Simon's Episcopal Church, has begun to speak out bluntly, sometimes angrily, on behalf of his people.

Publicly, he says: "The posthumous granting of human rights to those Negro citizens who are our neighbors today is unacceptable; therefore, immediate effective action is necessary."

Privately, he spells this out strongly in terms of Negro deprivations.

"We want representation," he says.

As the NAACP leadership has changed, so have both the nature of the organization and the composition of its board.

"Let's face it," explains a white board member, "NAACP was once a slumbering body, its policy strongly influenced by non-Negro members. Some were genuinely devoted to the Negro cause. Others sat there either to make perfunctory gestures or to keep NAACP in its place."

Today the policymaking board of NAACP is dominated by Negroes. Five years ago only some 35 percent of members were Negroes; today the percentage of a larger board is more like 60.

Two things helped bring this about.

Some of the whites dropped out because they feared and resented the new militancy, both here and in places like Little Rock.

Others have been discouraged by Negro members less willing to work alongside white colleagues. In fact, some Negro members make no bones about it—they would prefer an all-Negro NAACP.

This change at least is regretted by the Reverend Mr. Primo. "We should be able to work as an integrated group."

Desirable or undesirable, the change is symptomatic of NAACP's new determination to force the pace.

The Negro community is still a long way short of standing as one man behind the Reverend Mr. Primo.

The NAACP continues to scratch for members as it has always done.

The middle-class Negro finds himself torn at times between the desire to help his people and the need to establish himself downtown.

Among the low-income Negroes are many who know little or nothing of the issues at stake.

(These splits in the Negro community are not peculiar to Rochester. An advertisement in a recent issue of Crisis, the official organ of the NAACP, poses this question: "Who says our businesmen and professionals are slackers?")

THE NAACP'S NEW DRIVE

What is undoubtedly true, however, is that the Reverend Mr. Primo has been able to find more support than any other recent NAACP leader.

As a man of the church, and as an articulate, educated man, he commands respect from both upper and lower class Negroes. Thirteen years in Rochester have changed his original diffidence into forcefulness, his naivete into sophistication. He speaks, moreover, out of his own bitter experience. He does not forget that in spite of his church affiliation he looked at 75 houses before he was able to buy the home he lives in at 128 Empire Boulevard.

As NAACP head, the Reverend Mr. Primo's demand for a SCAD office has drawn a significant response. "Wherever I go, I find my people asking about SCAD and congratulating us on our stand—people you would not suspect of caring."

Behind the NAACP's new drive lie several significant factors.

The first is the increase in numbers. Although the Negro population remains small at some 5 percent of the city total, it jumped from 8,247 in the 1950 census to the some 16,000 reliably estimated by SCAD in 1957. Today it may stand at 18,000.

Better opportunities for education—including the college training offered veterans under the GI bill of rights—have made the Negro more conscious of the gains he still has to win and put him more closely in touch with the march toward independence in Africa.

Barriers to employment have become progressively lower. The Negro's economic status has improved vastly.

A key factor has been the closing of the political gap. Republicans held an 8 to 1 majority on the city council as recently as 3 years ago, but last fall control of the city administration turned on 52 votes. And there are perhaps 3,000 Negroes eligible to vote now in the city and potentially as many as 5,000—in short, a balance of power if organized into a bloc.

The Negro leadership is aware of this situation, as are the parties' county chairmen. This has been reflected already in several ways—perhaps most conspicuously in the GOP's belated endorsement of the SCAD office.

The Negro's political muscle will be felt more and more in the future. Already the NAACP is planning an educational campaign next fall that will look into the records and concerns of the candidates. The Reverend Mr. Primo concedes that this is quite likely to lead to tacit endorsements of Democratic candidates, despite the NAACP's nonpartison status.

"You don't think we're going to vote for Conway (John Conway, Republican candidate for district attorney) after his stand on SCAD, do you?" the Reverend Mr. Primo asks. (He himself is an enrolled Republican.)

Finally, there has emerged in Rochester a larger group of young, middle-class Negro professionals and technicians. Professionals do not represent a substantial proportion of the total Negro population, but they are a growing group, and the newcomers are making their presence felt by their attitudes and their actions.

"If you act colored, you get treated colored."

"Uncle Sam doesn't tell me that because I'm a Negro I can pay less tax. He doesn't exempt me from war service. So if I have all the obligations of a citizen, why should I not have the privileges too?"

This new Negro does not submit to indignities. If he feels himself insulted at a restaurant, he makes a point of speaking with the owner.

Taunted by the cry of "nigger" from a neighbor's child, he seeks out the father of the child.

Between the new and the old Negro lies a gap that explains much of what is happening in Rochester today.

X is a Negro who moved several years ago with his family to a predominantly white neighborhood on the city's outskirts. He has been in Rochester more than 20 years and has a steady, unprofessional job with one of the large industries.

Because he is an essentially kindly and quiet man, X would not be altogether different in his behavior if he were white instead of Negro. The love of gardening that prompts him to supply cut flowers to his white neighbors, to arrange these flowers in vases for an invalid lady, reflects a passion that cuts through creed and color.

He is a complex man, representative in a sense of the split in the Negro community. Simply by choosing to live in a predominantly white neighborhood, he allies himself with the new Negro.

In other ways, however, X typifies the more submissive Negro who has lived in Rochester a long time and has made his compromise with the city's racial customs.

Thus, when he and his wife arrived in their new home, they were careful to observe that most of their neighbors did not hang out the wash in the yard. "So we too decided to dry our clothes in the basement. We felt we shouldn't be the first to establish a new backyard pattern."

Because he is a gardener, X is a little troubled when the newsboy walks across his lawn instead of using the path. So he is putting in a strategically placed hedge of young shrubs (to serve also as shelter). "This seems to me a nicer way of keeping the newsboy off the lawn. If I spoke to him, he might resent it."

A white visitor arrives unexpectedly and is shown through the house. "You see how neat and clean my wife keeps the rooms. And she didn't know you were coming this morning."

A STUDY IN CONTRASTS

In the same general neighborhood lives Y, a younger Negro, a lawyer, who points up the contrast between the new and the

old. The comparison is not wholly valid, for one is a professional and the other is not. And one man's character is different from the other's. Yet over and above these things, they do reflect something of the changing times.

Y, who came to Rochester some half-dozen years ago from another eastern city, feels with X that house and property maintenance is a prime requirement. But beyond this he declines to go.

He takes and leaves his neighbors as he finds them.

If his wife wanted to put out her wash, he would tell her to go ahead.

If the newsboy walked across his lawn, and if this annoyed him, he would not hesitate to speak to him.

If the rooms happened to be neat and clean, he would draw no special attention to this, thus avoiding the implication that this should be found surprising in a Negro household. On the contrary, he would probably conclude that this was none of the visitor's business.

Y belongs in the general company of the educated middle-class Negroes who are providing the push for acceptance. They are all saying in effect: "Our frustrations are greater than you know. We want our rights, not as Negroes, but as citizens."

The expressed demands and dissatisfactions of the new Negro leadership run directly contrary in some cases to the feelings of the older Negroes who have lived most of their days in Rochester. The result is a complex of status patterns in the Negro community.

Dr. Charles T. Lunsford, a physician, offers the best example. Less than 2 years ago, he said publicly that Rochester was "tops in the Nation" in racial understanding. "Bad as it is, Rochester is the best in this country. * * * In other places they will bomb you, or whole neighborhoods will move out when a Negro moves in. We haven't had that situation here."

The Rochester community at large, respecting Dr. Lunsford as a longtime resident, contrasts his estimate of conditions with the ratings given Rochester by Negroes like the Reverend Mr. Primo and another leader, Loftus C. Carson, and is frankly puzzled.

Very often, preferring the pleasant to the unpleasant, and knowing Dr. Lunsford better, they have taken the older man's word.

Yet this contradiction is more apparent than real. It is all a matter of the perspective of time.

HE SAW A "REVOLUTION"

Dr. Lunsford came to Rochester some 40 years ago as the first Negro professional in the city. Fighting virtually alone, he had to contend with conditions few Negroes today would find endurable.

"This has been a revolution—not evolution, but a revolution," he says of the progress out of his own experience.

From his point of view, the local situation—partly through his own efforts—has improved out of sight. If he says Rochester is relatively fortunate, it is mainly because he has lived through the changes.

The sad thing is that because he is now repudiated by the new professionals, he is placed in the position of having to justify his views. Yet Dr. Lunsford has espoused the Negro cause all his life.

City Historian Blake McKelvey said of his activities in 1938: "He blasted the University of Rochester for refusing to admit Negroes into the school of medicine; he declared that the public schools employed but one Negro teacher * * *"

Many of the conditions Dr. Lunsford railed against in earlier days have since been remedied. But the new Negroes take little account of this. And this, too, is understandable. The younger professionals, looking from a different standpoint in time, see not the gains achieved but the gains still to be wrested.

In pressing for more progress, they show an aggressiveness alarming to those members of the white community who have grown up with Dr. Lunsford and others like him.

The Reverend Mr. Primo appears as a radical when he tells the city council: "The frustrations experienced by our Negro citizens in areas of unemployment and housing * * * are fast becoming unbearable. The manner in which these seething resentments to continuing indignities may manifest itself is frightening to envisage."

Loftus Carson (an NAACP executive committee member and a high school teacher) looks like an alarmist when he tells an NAACP-sponsored rally: "Rochester has a growing Negro population. All evidence indicates it will continue to grow. With it, its race relations problem will continue unabated until this community is faced with a serious crisis."

In reality, the Reverend Mr. Primo, Carson and leaders like Dr. Walter Cooper and Dr. William J. Knox are responsible men. Bitter, yes, and impatient. But in general their militancy is of a responsible kind. It is based on legal methods and traditional applications of pressure.

EXTREMISTS OR CHAMPIONS?

It is not, however, unequivocally approved by the Negro community. There are those who want to set a faster pace. Rochester would dub them extremists perhaps, but the Negroes would call them merely more ardent champions.

They exist here and there inside NAACP, and some would not be loath to see the organization become all-Negro.

But in the main they can be found in the open on the outside—students in colleges or fresh out of it; young married couples who have received enough education to be keenly aware of their deprivations and yet not enough to qualify them for the professional jobs that would improve their lot.

These people want sterner action and quicker results.

They look with favor on sympathetic economic boycotting of stores.

They would extend picketing to absentee slum landlords who may live in Brighton or Greece, and to real estate agencies reluctant to sell houses to Negroes outside defined Negro areas.

The real extremists, however, are the black hate groups that exist at a subterranean level, as much detested and feared by responsible Negroes as by whites. These are the Negroes who would buy black, think black and live black. They turn away from all that is worthwhile about life.

These organizations have operated on the fringe since the days of Marcus Garvey, the first prominent black nationalist leader, 40 years ago. In some cities, New York and Chicago, well-established units of the so-called black Muslim movement, the Temple of Islam, have flourished for years.

There is evidence that some followers of this wing exist also in Rochester, though not in substantial numbers, and make periodic trips to the temple at Buffalo.

One prominent Negro housewife tells of being approached by two representatives of such a group.

"But I couldn't join," she says, "I don't believe in hate."

THE PRESSURES ARE THERE

The present NAACP leadership is not seriously challenged by any of these groups. But the pressures are there and they can be expected to wax or wane with the success or failure of the Reverend Mr. Primo's drive for Negro acceptance.

Repeated failures could give rise to a less reasoned approach, for there is no question that emotional promises and shows of great militancy have a strong appeal for the least sophisticated members of the Negro community.

This was shown quite dramatically during the 1958 political campaign when the Reverend ADAM CLAYTON POWELL drew a crowd to a Negro church that matched anything attracted by the two gubernatorial candidates in their appearances here.

Despite the general quickening of pressures, there has as yet been no single fusing of the various Negro groups.

The consciousness of the low-income, low-class Negro has been pricked, but not fully penetrated. The stoop laborer from the South lacks the education to understand the issues at stake, and it is often enough for him to live 1 day at a time.

The Rochester-born Negro knows the issues but is not ready to be caught up in them. To him, both the young professional and the migrant laborer are disturbing influences.

The new leadership berates him for braking progress, calls him an Uncle Tom, a flunky, or a "handkerchief head" (an allusion to the old Negro servant).

The migrant drags down the status of the oldtime resident through low cultural habits ingrained by years in the South, and often crowds him out of his quarters.

But it would be unwise to ignore the susceptibilities to change of either the migrant or the oldtime resident. The children of the beanpicker are already in school. And the Rochester-born Negro, though long resigned to accepting the role society has given him, may not always stand on the sideline.

"I keep thinking of those old Negro servant women during the Montgomery bus strike," says a young professional Negro now 6 years in Rochester. "If they could be wakened out of bondage to the point where they were ready to walk rather than take the bus, I see no reason to despair of the old Negro community in Rochester."

A TIME OF RESTLESSNESS

Because Rochester is so much better than Montgomery, there has been no single gathering together of Negro forces. And this day may never come, nor need to come.

But the times, together with the local Negro's lot, have generated restlessness and galvanized NAACP into action that meets increasing Negro approval.

The day is not in sight when Rochester tensions will cease altogether. A little equality for the Negro is bound to become a lot of equality. A victory in one area will become the signal for new demands in another.

Some resistance is inevitable. It is the degree of it that may be crucial. What must be acknowledged is that the Negro is enduring conditions worse here than most persons know, and worse than they need be.

WINDS OF CHANGE—BETTER HOUSING IS THE NEGRO'S STRONGEST CRY—GHETTO CONDITIONS EXPOSE MANY TO EXPLOITATION

(By Desmond Stone and Jack Germond)

The crux and core of Negro dissatisfaction in Rochester is housing. Although the problem is different for different groups, the lack of any real freedom of choice is a universal cry.

"We're not asking for favors," the Negro says. "We're seeking only those things available to everyone else—the right to housing compatible with economic status, a choice of neighborhoods, the option of buying or renting within the regular limits of supply and demand."

These are the Negro's most impassioned demands. They are also the demands that put the greatest strain on racial tolerance. Having a Negro next door is an acid test comparatively few people in the city and its environs have been able to pass well.

The newly arrived, low-income Negro must, as a matter of course, go into the ghettos.

The Negro who wants to move out of the ghettos, but who has not enough money to buy, finds good rental accommodation almost unobtainable.

The young professional or technician new to town is up against the same problem. Outside of the defined Negro districts, almost no one will rent him an apartment.

The middle-class Negro who has the money to buy must search long and hard before edging into a white community. And when he is in, he must brace himself for a hostile reception.

There are exceptions all along the line. But the substantial facts are hardly in doubt. The pressures of discrimination, many of them subtle and complex, greatly reduce the Negro's freedom of choice in housing.

THE HIGH RENT DOLLAR

Enforced segregation is not, however, the only factor in keeping so many Negroes massed together around the peripheries of Baden-Ormond, and in the Troup-Clarissa area.

Poverty pens many of them. And others huddle together for shelter and protection. Because the Negroes in general are so much poorer and less educated than the urban whites, the ghettos would not disappear overnight even if there were no residential segregation.

But one undeniable result of this concentration—and a cause of it as well—is economic exploitation of the Negro. Limited though his resources often are, he pays a high rent dollar. Even where he does not pay more rent than a white tenant, he gets much less for his money.

It is a familiar pattern. As a rule, the Negro settles into a neighborhood only after it hae deteriorated, after white groups have begun to move out. Yet he is expected to pay as much, frequently more, for these dilapidated quarters.

A construction worker with eight children pays $16 a week (about $66 a month) for three small, shabby, unfurnished rooms on Scio Street.

A mother, her husband and child pay $17.50 a week (about $72 a month) for a small kitchen and one all-purpose room which does not measure more than 12 by 10. They share the bathroom with another family of five. Utilities are included and the apartment is furnished, but $20 would cover the cost of the furniture.

Whites leave a third ward apartment where they have been paying $50 month, and incoming Negroes pay $80.

The examples could be many times multiplied but they all tell essentially the same story. More families keep crowding into a street already down at the heels, big old homes are cut up into apartments and single rooms with communal kitchens and bathrooms.

THE WAY OF SLUMS EVERYWHERE

Sometimes the Negro himself is caught up in the squeeze. He takes a lease of a property under a land contract and pays the owner so many dollars a month. To cover his debt, and to make his own profit, he, too, chops up the house into smaller pieces.

This is the way of the slums and blighted areas everywhere. Homeowners give way to absentee landlords who can be controlled up to a point through building ordinances. But when it comes to rents, the sky is the limit.

The process of decay is hard to resist even without speculation and exploitation.

The ravages of time alone make repairs costly and rents high.

The cobblestone basement of an old third ward home crumbles without any assistance from neglect, and rats become a problem.

Helping to speed the deterioration is the migrant from the rural South to whom a bathtub may be a place for storing and peeling vegetables. He has not been taught the ways of the urban North. He does not understand that an old sofa tossed out in front of the house is a bad mark against him and his race.

At best, the effort to stop the deterioration of an aging neighborhood can only be a holding action. The spot checks of the rehabilitation commission, the enforcement of building ordinances, the attack on vermin, the work of the settlement houses and neighborhood councils and social workers in general in encouraging pride of property—all these things have helped.

But they do not go to the root of the trouble—the growing density of population in these areas caused by the rental and housing shortage. In Philander Street, for example, a street less than one quarter of a mile long, there are 124 children between the ages of 6 and 16.

WHAT CITY HAS DONE

There are a number of things Rochester has done well. The Baden-Ormond clearance project is generally, although not universally, recognized as a praiseworthy effect to cut out the worst of the canker.

The project eventually will involve the relocation of 800 families, more than 400 of whom already have left the area. Half these have been moved by the commission; the others have fled on their own, often in confusion, misunderstanding and panic. The vast majority are Negroes.

The immediate effect of the flight has been to heighten the housing pressures in other section of the ghetto and to expand its limits. In the 16th ward, neighborhoods long dominated by Italian-American families now have become predominantly Negro. The classic pattern of deterioration, rent gouging and white flight is being repeated.

Many of those from the Baden-Ormond site have gone across town to the third ward, frequently crowding three families where there had been two. And this pressure from the bottom has in turn driven some Negroes with the means into new areas on the fringe of the 19th ward.

The rehabilitation commission has made a genuine attempt, as it is required to do, to find adequate, sanitary housing for the displaced. But there is no question it has not been successful in many instances, for it can offer housing but it cannot force its acceptance.

It is a measure of the lack of interracial trust and good will in the community that some Negro leaders have become critical of the commission for its failures and have overlooked its successes.

For the long pull, perhaps the most significant development has been the use of section 221 of the Federal Housing Act to permit displaced Negroes to buy their first homes. The program offers FHA-insured full mortgages up to $9,000.

So far only 30 have been finally approved, but there is a potential for many more. And the important thing is that the 30 probably represent families who in most instances could never have bought a home.

For many an unsophisticated ghetto dweller, homeownership is something beyond imagining. He often has no idea how to go about it, and if he does, the thought of gathering together a downpayment is out of the question. And beyond this, where do you look for a house?

The crucial thing in the 221 program is its value as an example. The 30 or 40 or 50 Negroes who buy homes through it will be watched by their former neighbors and their experiences recounted over and over through the Negro community.

"What we hope," says the rehabilitation commission director, John A. Dale, "is that the yearning for homeownership will become contagious."

The key to the success of the program has been the cooperation of the banks, who have always been prime targets for the criticism of the Negro leadership—not just in Rochester but everywhere in the North. It is, in fact, axiomatic among Negro that they cannot get a mortgage that would be approved for the white man in the same circumstances.

But in this case, seven banks and two savings and loan associations have joined in the program, each agreeing informally to set aside a percentage of its mortgage portfolio for the 221 loans. They have agreed to accept 120 mortgages already, and some have indicated they will go further if the demand warrants it.

The program is a sound one for the banker, because the mortgage is guaranteed and because the rehabilitation commission does much of the leg work in arranging the transaction.

But most significant perhaps is the value it can have in breaking down the walls of suspicion that stand between the Negro and the banks today.

NEW PROBLEMS CREATED

But slum clearance—when it is added to the effect of highway construction and new commercial development—creates problems as well as solves them. Many fewer Negro families will go back into the Baden-Ormond area than are coming out of it. The Chatham Gardens middle-income housing, planned in the cleared area, will accommodate only 252 families.

More low-rent public housing is one obvious answer, but there is no conspicuous evidence that Rochester's longstanding antipathy toward such projects has been lessened. And the only example, Hanover Houses, probably has done as much to increase the prejudice against the program as it has to solve the Negro's housing problem.

Hanover Houses was born in controversy, a concession from a powerful, antipublic-housing Republican city administration to the demands of social workers and to the realities of the slum's squalor.

Virtually everyone close to the situation agrees now that it was built in the wrong place and in the wrong way and that it was badly neglected by those responsible for it during the formative years.

The result is that it has been a failure as a sales device. In fact, the original bias has been strengthened in many quarters.

In the absence of any effective program to school the rural migrant in urban living, shocking squalor developed in the project within a year. And although many white families were involved in this neglect, the Negro took the brunt of the public's resentment. The old stereotype of him as a man who takes the slums with him wherever he goes was freshened by new evidence.

Now, the project, which was originally half white, is 70 to 80 percent Negro-occupied. And under a new management, it is in better condition physically and as a community of individuals than at any time in its history.

But this improvement has not been well enough established in the community consciousness to remove the stigma. Nor is it likely that those who have noted the improvement credit the preponderance of Negro tenants for any part of it.

NEVER A SUBSTITUTE

Hanover Houses and the Baden-Ormond project also have done a disservice to the Negro in another way—by persuading the casual observer in the white community that the problem is being solved for the slum dweller.

"Why can't they find a place? There's the project, isn't there?" the uninformed ask.

"We're really taking care of those slums," a cab driver boasts to a fare.

Manuel D. Goldman, chairman of the Rochester Housing Authority, has pointed out:

"The Baden-Ormond redevelopment program is needed, but was never intended as a substitute for low income public housing. Chatham Gardens with its proposed 252 units is for middle-income families whose rents will begin at $85 per month, which puts it completely out of reach of low-income families."

The desirability or otherwise of public housing as a means of relieving the housing pressures is another question again. The point to be emphasized is that more low-cost accommodation would contribute to better Negro housing.

The alternative seems to be a hastening of the process of blight around the crumbling edges of Baden-Ormond, in the Hudson-Clifford and Troup-Clarissa areas. Conditions are not yet irretrievably bad. All is not misery in these areas. And compared with the slum sections of the big cities, Rochester's areas of blight are small.

But with more Negroes moving into the community, the danger is there.

"If you've ever seen the colored sections of Detroit," a new Negro has said, "you'll realize how many more people can be packed into the third ward, for instance."

NO EASY TASK

It is unrealistic to expect Rochester to rid itself of seedy, deteriorated areas altogether. This is more than any other community of the same age has been able to do.

Some of these areas are essentially transient rooming districts where Negro artisans stay a little while before moving on to Buffalo and elsewhere. The turnover is extremely high, as school records confirm.

It must be acknowledged, too, that many of the ghetto dwellers long ago lost a desire for better conditions, or at least enough desire to take the steps that are required. They are no longer willing to fight against odds, and they have no confidence in the tenders of hope from agencies like the rehabilitation commission.

If, however, more low-cost housing can be provided, the worst of the pressures may be relieved, population density kept in check and the proverty-ridden, low-status Negro protected from the harsher forms of exploitation.

Whatever is done will not come easily. Anything that smacks of a new ghetto will be rejected by the new Negro leadership. And there is no evidence that enough whites will accept the Negro to permit genuine integration—at least until they are convinced that real estate values do not automatically drop when a Negro moves in.

WINDS OF CHANGE—HOUSING BIAS HITS HARD AT EDUCATED NEGRO—NO REAL FREEDOM OF CHOICE IS MAIN COMPLAINT

(By Desmond Stone and Jack Germond)

The full weight of racial discrimination falls on the middle-class Negro in search of a home.

His financial situation, his professional attainments, his social skills—all count for little against his black skin.

In the slums, the Negro is a victim of discrimination to the extent that he is confined to a particular tract. But there are other forces—simple economics, for example—that contribute to his segregation.

The frustration of the middle-class Negro, by contrast, is solely a product of discrimination.

And whereas the bias partly responsible for the ghettos is imposed by the community generally, the middle-class Negro receives it at the hands of individuals. Discrimination is for him a much more naked, more personal affair, and his resentment is correspondingly greater.

The educated Negro who wants to leave the orange peel of the ghetto behind, and the young professional who comes into town to take a job, find apartments in good housing areas almost impossible to rent. Doors are constantly being shut on them.

A SCIENTIST SEEKS A HOME

Dr. X, a scientist, could find no living quarters near the University of Rochester when he came here half-a-dozen years ago as a student. After he married, he and his wife looked at 67 rental accommodations without gaining admittance.

"Many and wonderful were the excuses mustered on the doorstep. Some people suddenly had relations coming to stay, or said they had decided not to renew the lease."

Dr. Y more recently had much the same experience. Though he searched for several weeks from early morning to late at night, he could find no rental quarters. He was prepared to pay up to $200 a month, though $150 was his preferred maximum. Some landlords told him bluntly they were not renting to Negroes.

Others said the apartments had already been occupied. By phoning these landlords later, Dr. Y was able to prove this was a subterfuge. The same persons who had told him as a Negro on the doorstep that the apartment had just been taken said, in response to his anonymous phone inquiry, "yes, there's a vacancy."

• • • • •

So the young middle-class Negro, simply because he is a Negro, does not have the choice that is open to most young marrieds. Instead of being able to choose his own time for buying, he very often has to buy prematurely.

In some special cases, the necessity to buy can make a Negro a captive.

Red Wing pitched Dick Ricketts is a case in point. The college-educated athlete, a native of Pennsylvania, came to Rochester only to play ball. Like most in his trade, he sought an apartment and the mobility it would give him should he be called to the major leagues or sold to another club.

But Rickets, despite his background and his modest fame as a ballplayer, could find nothing, so he bought a house in the 19th ward. If he's sold to Denver tomorrow, he will remain a Rochesterian.

The necessity of buying might not be such a severe penaly if houses were freely available—if, for instance a young Negro technician could buy in a new tract of relatively cheap homes where the down payment is small.

But Dr. Y did not waste his time even looking at tracts. He knew from the exeprience of others that tracts were out of the question—that the fear of property depreciation was too powerful to buck.

THE TWO RESTRICTED CHOICES

One or two Negro families have been able to move into rural-type tracts in Monroe County. But it is safe to say that no Negro is able to buy into the average tract in the city and towns.

Once having confirmed this for himself, the newly arrived professional, or the Negro trying to flee the ghettos, has only two alternatives, both restricted.

One is to move along the perimeter of the predominantly Negro districts and buy on a street where three or four Negro families have broken the worst of the barriers.

The other is to plunge into a white community—not because it is white but because it is a desirable residential area.

The first course was taken by Dr. Y, who settled in an area of the 19th Ward below Genesee Street. It is not an ideal location and not where he would have gone had he been able to exercise a choice, but the home itself is a good one.

Dr. X, the professional who looked at 67 rental accommodations before he found a temporary place, chose the second course. By judicious saving, he and his wife had accumulated $7,000, enough to assure any white family an easy passage into a home. But money is not the price of admission for a Negro, as Dr. X found out over several bitter months.

"I wanted to locate near an A–1 school. We looked all around Monroe Avenue and Pinnacle Road. We tried 40 places near Winton Road north and south, east of the Twelve Corners, and in several Brighton tracts.

"But everywhere it was the same. No one wanted a Negro next door. Builders and real estate men avoided me where they could. Those I was able to corner would tell me that even if they accepted my purchase offer, the banks wouldn't give me a mortgage.

"They also told me I wouldn't be happy there, that I wouldn't like it. This I resented. No man has the right to determine where I'm to live or die. I said to them: 'Here I am, an individual of good repute, economically responsible, with no jail record, not even a parking fine, and yet you say you can't sell to me. If this is so, then it comes down to the color of my skin.' "

Dr. X was finally able to locate in a house some 10 miles out of the city, where the country is close at hand and the houses spaced out. "I didn't want to buy here. It's too far from my work. But I was desperate and my wife was with child at the time."

His experience has eaten deeply into Dr. X. "I regard myself as an American first and a Negro second. But people treat me the other way round. It's like being a graduate student, except it's more crucial. When the time comes to make a contribution to a fund drive, the student is classified with faculty. But in the matter of parking privileges, he quickly reverts to his student status."

To the extent that he had to move far from the city into a house unseen by his wife, Dr. X did not succeed in getting into a wholly desirable area. But his experience in trying to locate a house is fairly typical.

HOW THEY ARE KEPT OUT

The pressures to keep the Negro out run all the way from subtle blackmail against the person proposing the sale to a sudden jump in the price of the house.

In some cases, the established residents collect money among themselves and offer it as a premium to the seller if he reneges on his plan to sell to a Negro.

Negroes have no hesitation in accusing real estate interests of conspiracy. Specific charges are often hard to prove or disprove. But there is no doubt that real estate agents dealing with good housing areas shy away from the Negro as a purchaser.

"Let's face it," comments one. "I'm not fighting any battle for integration. I'm a hardheaded businessman. And it makes no sense for me to throw scares into people by showing a Negro buyer round all my best properties."

The real estate agent is the man in the firing line rather than the only villain in the piece. And since he stands to be more injured by the shots fired by white property owners, he will usually acquiesce rather than battle, and indeed sometimes he will run a mile.

A prominent realty man in Rochester sold a house on a desirable street in good faith to a white purchaser. But the purchaser turned out to be a "strawman" (one acting as a front for a Negro buyer) and promptly resold the house to a Negro family.

The shock of the discovery sent the street into a turmoil. One of the neighbors, a big powerful man, marched into the office of the realty man breathing fury.

"He threatened to punch me on the nose," recalls the agent, himself a rather small man, "and I thought he was going to for a moment."

This incident obviously shook the agent and so anxious was he to establish that he himself had not been a party to the deal that he made 100 photostatic copies of the original purchase agreement and had them distributed in the neighborhood.

The real estate interests point out that as middlemen they do not more than reflect the wishes of their customers. Negroes, however, maintain that they anticipate the feelings of the community and assume discrimination where it may not always exist.

This may be true in some cases. Judging, however, by the storms that have broken out when Negroes have moved into all-white areas, the realty men are not very far astray in their estimation of people's feelings.

Negroes say it is particularly galling to find that some of the same agents who block them are the first to seek a profit from them once the move has been accomplished.

They tell with great bitterness of a "block-busting" real estate broker going among their new white neighbors to find those anxious to sell and then going into the Negro community to find purchasers. In one case, a real estate man actually solicited the Negro newcomer for the names of others of his race who might want to follow him.

GROUPS SEEKING TO HELP

It would be wrong to suggest that nothing has been done to help the educated Negro to get better housing or to create a more favorable climate of opinion.

The Women's Human Relations Council, the Presbyterian and Baptist Churches, and other organizations have been active for some time with open-housing covenants.

Many hundreds of persons (a thousand among the Presbyterians alone) have signed statements agreeing to welcome all families into their neighborhoods regardless of race, creed, or nationality.

The Negro is rather skeptical of these covenants. "We think these things must come from the heart and not from signed pledges."

This may be true enough. Yet at least the act of affixing their signatures has persuaded many persons to think about a problem too often ignored.

Dr. Robert France, chairman of the NAACP housing committee and a U. of R. professor, gives some credit for action on housing to the citizens' committee that grew out of the covenant movement. The committee, though it has no direct church affiliation, is composed largely of active church-workers and has collaborated with real estate interests and with NAACP's committee on housing. Where white property owners have been found willing to sell to Negroes, the NAACP committee has been advised.

"Admittedly it hasn't worked out ideally," says Dr. France. "Not all Negroes are aware of this channel. Some are reluctant to work through it lest too many persons should become involved in a house deal. And the committee of citizens has never had a wide variety of homes available, probably not more than six at a time. But it has, I feel, been doing a sincere job."

Perhaps the very existence of such a committee points up the housing problem as few other things could do. The fact remains that, in spite of the good work being done here and there, no Negro moves into a white area without difficulty.

WHAT HAPPENS WHEN HE MOVES

The initial outburst of hostility is sharp, though very rarely does it take the form of violence. Seldom are rocks thrown through windows. The methods employed usually are more subtle, stopping short of lawbreaking that can be easily detected.

A tottering four-household mailbox stand is taken down and left to lie on the Negro property owner's frontage; and the new stand put up by the neighbors has only three boxes, though, significantly, space is left for a fourth.

Silence to the newcomers is almost universal, and in some cases whites with a disposition towards friendliness are warned that they will be ostracized themselves if they welcome the Negro.

Petitions also are universally employed, although it is difficult to understand to what authority the circulators hope to appeal. In some cases, the petition is simply addressed to the Negro, urging him to get out of the neighborhood, perhaps offering him a profit if he will sell.

Usually, however, the petition never actually reaches the Negro—which may reflect the guilt that runs below the surface in even the most hostile situations.

THE CASE OF THE HARRISONS

Once over the first hump, once it is realized that the Negro family has arrived to stay, the street settles down into some kind of acceptance, grudging though it may be.

The case of the Harrisons (the name is fictitious) is not untypical, though worse than some.

The Harrisons, a Negro couple, met in Rochester some 6 years ago as college graduates who came originally from the South.

They married and were able to buy a home in a white community within the city. Although first antagonism was sharp—stones were thrown through a picture window before they moved in—the street came to know and like them and the Harrisons improved their property until it was one of the best in the neighborhood.

After 5 years or so, the Harrisons decided to sell. Their home was on a main thoroughfare and they wanted a quieter area and a larger house, preferably in the suburbs.

Although they had much to commend them as intelligent, responsible citizens, they went through the usual discouraging experience of being refused wherever they turned. But they had a white friend who was willing to act as a blind, and last fall they located a house falling vacant on a substantial, tree-lined street in one of the towns.

The decision to use a front man is often a hard one for the Negro to make. It starts him on the worst possible footing with his neighbors, and he will sometimes decline to use this subterfuge on principle.

"Do you know what it does to a man's dignity to have to do this?" a Harvard-educated chemist asks.

"On the other hand," the Negro will more often say, "if we do not buy this way, we often cannot buy at all. There's no such thing as educating people gradually to your arrival. The only way out is a fait accompli."

AT 12:30 SUNDAY MORNING

When Harrison made his first visit to the home after getting possession, he took along some cleaning gear in his car. Some of the neighbors assumed from this that he had come to clean the house for the new owners. Perhaps it was wishful thinking. But it also fitted the stereotype of the Negro as a worker at menial jobs.

The following day the Harrisons drove up ahead of the carting company. The news that a Negro family had come to stay flashed through the street like a lightning bolt. Little knots of people started to gather in front of their homes.

At 12:30 a.m. on the first Sunday after they moved in, the Harrisons' phone rang and a voice warned them, "Nigger, go home." That was the start of an incredibly sustained barrage. From 12:30 a.m. Sunday until 2 p.m. Tuesday, the phone rang at almost regular quarter-hourly intervals—through the day and through the night.

The voices were different but the message was always the same—"Nigger, go back where you belong." Harrison, sorely tried, took one of his callers up on this.

"Go back to Baden-Ormond where all niggers belong," he was told.

"And this," he recalls sadly today, "happened on World Communion Sunday."

Harrison had expected hostility but not a campaign so vicious. Alarmed, he went to the town police. He was advised to get an unlisted phone. He was also told that he could expect the trouble to die down within a week or two, but that, if it were needed, he could rely on the protection that was available to all the town residents.

Almost every trick in the book was tried during these first weeks of eruption.

When the Harrisons got a new unlisted phone number, threatening anonymous calls continued to pester Mrs. Harrison at her place of work for 2 or 3 weeks until all incoming calls had to be screened by a secretary.

Efforts were made to get up a petition and to find some ground for nullifying the sale.

One neighbor went to Harrison's lawyer and alleged that the house was to be used for vice.

Another sought out the old Harrison home to see what it was like and to find out why they had moved.

Yet another checked Harrison's character through a friend at his place of employment.

SUPPORT FOR THE HARRISONS

Not all the street was up in arms during those first hard weeks. Violent opposition, based mainly on property depreciation fears, was probably confined to four or five families. Most of the remainder, though generally unsympathetic, took little denunciatory action.

There were, however, a few forces working actively for the Harrisons as well as against them.

One woman in particular conducted a stout verbal battle on their behalf. She declared herself early by sending one of her children down to the Harrisons at the height of the storm to inquire if they had children her girl could play with.

The town police passed the word down the street that the troublemakers would be wise to desist.

One minister with a number of parish families on the street appealed for tolerance from the pulpit and made a personal call on all his parishioners. He also contacted other churches, and altogether in the first few weeks five ministers were making calls in an effort to improve the climate of opinion.

Today the street is quiet again.

The Harrisons have met some of their neighbors and have been invited to their homes. They were tricked and treated by one or two at Halloween. Even though it contributed to Mrs. Harrison's ill health at the time, the experience has not made them bitter, though it has left them sadder.

Diehard opposition is confined now to a very few, though it is likely to remain. And even among those younger families whole tolerance tends to stretch further, there is still some evidence of the unconscious prejudice found in so many minds.

"I still can't understand," says one pleasant young housewife, "why the Harrisons should have chosen to move here when they were already integrated in a white neighborhood."

UNDER STRONG SCRUTINY

The white property owner's motives are questioned by no one when he decides to shift, but the Negro has many hoops to jump through.

The Harrisons' property has already been improved in the short time they have been there and the chances are it will soon have one of the best appearances on the street.

This is a point about the educated, middle-class Negro many white persons have not yet come to understand. With a few exceptions, he can be depended upon to improve both home and grounds, and will often keep a better property than his white neighbors.

Unfortunately, this fact is not easily demonstrable, for Negroes in the suburbs are few and far between.

The Negro property owner is, of course, under a strong scrutiny and a silent compulsion. "We Negroes do not get a second chance," explains one newly established professional in the suburbs. "One lapse and we're put back on the Baden-Ormond level."

This is true for the Harrisons and nearly all other Negro middle-class families. A noisy house party, careless tooting of horns, are luxuries they normally cannot afford. They must be constantly on their guard.

The neighbors who exact these standards are often far from unblemished themselves, and they are usually of inferior education.

Even when he moves into a white community, the middle-class Negro will seldom find himself among equals, intellectually or otherwise. A Ph. D. will live on a street where most of the residents have not advanced beyond high school.

This is a bitter pill for the educated Negro to swallow. He strongly resents being placed on trial by persons he considers his intellectual inferiors.

No case is better known among the Negro community than that of a Negro professional who was hostilely received when he bought a suburban home formerly occupied by a white man convicted of a morals charge.

Perhaps the strongest resistance to the Negro comes from those families newly arrived at economic security in the suburbs. They have invested every cent in their new home and have a great deal at stake. They have fulfilled a dream and they do not want it broken.

Not all middle-income Negroes fare as unhappily as the Harrisons. Even if they only prove the rule, the exceptions ought to be noted.

ENCOURAGING SIGNS

There are encouraging signs in almost every situation. In almost every neighborhood someone will go out of his way to welcome the Negro, to aline himself with him. In one case, for example, a man circulating a petition against a new Negro resident was told by two neighbors, "We'd a lot rather have him here than you."

Perhaps because he moved onto a street of mainly professional people, perhaps because a wide treed strip runs down the middle of the street, one downtown Negro established himself on the city outskirts with a minimum of trouble.

And when one of the near neighbors sold his house, his wife made a point of visiting the Negro family and explaining that they were leaving because her husband had been transferred to Buffalo, and for no other reason.

Even this Negro hotly resents one of the circumstances in which he bought his home. He points out that though his bid was in before a second, equivalent bid, he had to submit to having his name put in a hat and having a draw made from paper slips.

For the rest, however, this Negro acknowledges an easier passage than most.

So there are bright spots here and there. But the barriers in housing remain strong and the pressures against them seem likely to keep on growing.

WINDS OF CHANGE—SCAD BECOMES A SYMBOL TO NEGRO COMMUNITY—UNREST CRYSTALLIZED BY DEMAND FOR LOCAL OFFICE

(By Desmond Stone and Jack Germond)

The unrest in Rochester's Negro community has been crystallized by the controversy over the proposal for an office of the State commission against discrimination.

Whatever its merits, the SCAD office has become a symbol to the Negro in all walks of life.

On Vienna street, amid the rubble of the city's slum clearance program, a Negro laborer says: "We ought to have the SCAD. They've got one in Buffalo; we ought to have one here."

And a sophisticated Negro intellectual who lives in a predominantly white neighborhood argues: "It's absolutely essential."

This is not to suggest that there is universal interest in SCAD among the city's 18,000 Negroes. The controversy has passed many of them by. Some are so uninformed politically as to be unaware of their relationship to the agency, or even of its existence.

But the consensus of feeling among the Negro leaders is that no issue in years, if ever, has so effectively drawn the parts of the Negro community together.

Much of this common concern is the result of the efforts of these same leaders to rally their people behind them. Public pronouncements of the Reverend Mr. Quintin E. Primo, local president of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People here, seem to get much closer reading in Negro circles than accounts of even the most startling developments in world affairs.

The SCAD symbol has attained such stature with the Negro that he new equates opposition to it with a desire to delay his progress, to keep him tied to the ghetto and to the apron of the domestic.

"Some of these white people, they don't want anyone messing around here, that's the trouble," a maintenance man says.

"What is the power structure here afraid of?" a Negro professional asks.

The interesting point about the whole controversy is that it has forced both sides to more extreme positions than they might normally adopt.

Some of industry, in justifying its opposition, has left the impression that discrimination in employment is almost nonexistent.

The NAACP, in pressing for SCAD, has created the idea that conditions are uniformly bad.

The true situation lies somewhere in between. But the distinctions that ought to be made have been melted by the heat of battle.

Thus, to the Negro, the absence of a SCAD office has come to mean Rochester's refusal to admit the existence of discrimination at all. This has irritated him even more than discrimination itself.

Because of the way the issue has been blown up, industry now tends to have a fear of SCAD that its history does not justify. And the Negro, for his part, has come to expect more from an office than is likely to be achieved.

SCAD AN ACCEPTABLE ARBITER

Perhaps the principal value of a branch here is related to its status as a symbol. It would be accepted more than any conceivable substitute—official or quasi-official—as a trusted arbiter in discrimination matters.

Negro leaders to a man are convinced that decisions of no discrimination by SCAD would be accepted by most of the Negroes who bring the complaints.

If this proved to be the case, they say, the agency would offer a valuable protection to those industries that follow bona fide fair employment practices.

The Negro's regard for the still conjectural SCAD office probably cannot be transferred to the new Human Relations Committee now being set up. The Negro leadership finds no fault with this concept but suspects that the committee is being put forward as an eventual substitute for SCAD.

The appointment of Robert E. Bray, Jr., to receive discrimination complaints in the courthouse has prompted frank outrage among the Negro leaders. Publicly, they have stressed that Bray, a veteran employee of the county treasurer's office, is not qualified for the job.

What stirred most criticism was the conviction, among some, that County Manager Gordon A. Howe was throwing them a bone by appointing the first Negro in eye range to the job. Above all, they resent the implication that Negro support can be bought by such a simple expedient.

Finally, they view the appointment in the same light as the Human Relations Committee—as a potential excuse for denying the city a SCAD office.

This conviction persists despite the repeated assurances by Howe, in his capacity as Republican county chairman, that the office is a certainty next year.

"What happened this year?" a Negro professional demands. "You can't tell me he couldn't have gotten this thing approved down in Albany, if he'd really tried."

Howe insists, of course, that he really did try but that his involvement came too late to be effective. He became county chairman in mid-January, after the legislature had convened.

To those who watched the situation at Albany, the failure to anticipate the strength of feeling on the issue appeared to be the crucial factor. In any event, Monroe County's legislators had taken such strong positions that there was not time for a graceful reversal.

Moreover, the legislators had become used to a minimum of party discipline intruding on their decisions at the capitol. This situation has changed. Howe has said that the office will be supported vigorously by the entire Republican ticket this fall. And he has told the candidates that they must support it or lose their place.

Outside the legislative delegation, opposition to the SCAD office has centered in the city's major industries, and has been publicly voiced by industry's spokesman, Russell McCarthy of the industrial management council and a member of the SCAD council.

He makes much of the argument that SCAD would represent simply an extension of bureaucracy.

"If you start an office," he says, "it is bound to grow. Staff will go out and drum up business to justify their positions and prove their worth."

He contends, too, that a SCAD office would make for new conflict over employment.

"For many years now the council has been working quietly, effectively and voluntarily to educate employers and personnel people. We've met many times to review and interpret the antidiscrimination laws and to put them into practice. But now that frictions have been created, this educational work becomes harder to do."

INDUSTRY'S FEAR OF OUTSIDE AGENCY

Similar arguments are advanced by the chief personnel officer of one of the city's prime employers. And he adds: Rochester is a city of highly skilled industry, but most Negroes coming into the community, principally from the rural South, lack skills. Therefore, it is unrealistic for the Negro to expect a share of the jobs with particular companies bearing a close relationship to their share of the total population.

Underlying the opposition to SCAD is a fear of an "outside propaganda agency" that, in the words of one civic leader, "might do more harm than good."

Opponents say they feel a SCAD office can "stir up trouble."

Yet some of those who know SCAD say they are at a loss to explain this impression, for SCAD is most often considered a cautious body devoted to soft-sell persuasion and conciliation rather than to saber rattling. In fact, the present chairman, Elmer A. Carter of New York, is unpopular with many Negroes who believe he relies too much on conciliation.

Industry's suspicion here differs from that of some statewide employer groups.

The Commerce and Industry Association (a membership group of 3,500 employers in all categories of business and industry, with headquarters in New York City) has had a cordial relationship was SCAD for years, according to association officials.

In 1956, the Commerce and Industry Association appointed a SCAD advisory committee which joined forces with the agency to produce a booklet on "Management and Merit Employment." This pamphlet outlines seven questions an employer might use in evaluating his own personnel policies on racial discrimination.

SCAD was created in 1945, during the administration of Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, with the initial assignment of administering the State fair employment law. Since then its jurisdiction has been extended to such divergent concerns as age discrimination and resort advertising, but the principal area of interest has remained employment.

SCAD has a 1960–61 budget of $860,000 and a staff of 115 employes, most of them centered in the New York City headquarters. An office here would add $17,000 to $20,000 a year to the budget and two employes to the staff.

EXISTING SCAD COVERAGE

The agency's coverage of Rochester is sketchy, at best. There is a 29-member citizens advisory council, just as there is in most cities, but it has had little impact. In fact, the chairman, Joseph Silverstein, says: "We haven't done a thing"—a record he attributes largely to the lack of so much as a stenographer to implement the council's wishes.

Russell McCarthy, an original member of the SCAD council, feels differently. "Over the years the council has, without question, accomplished a great deal in an educational way by working with employers and agency groups."

The professional SCAD coverage here comes from the Buffalo office, one of three upstate branches. Its staff consists of two field representatives and two secretarial workers. Its area of responsibility includes the 11 westernmost counties in the State and a population estimated at 2½ to 3 million.

The branch necessarily has concentrated its efforts in and around Buffalo. At one time, Victor Einach, the senior field representative who serves as regional director, kept regular office hours here every week or two. But he found that the hours and the demand for the agency did not coincide. Now he comes to Rochester irregularly as the situation warrants.

Between them, Einach, Commissioner Mary Louise Nice and Field Representative Leeland N. Jones, Jr., last year made from 40 to 50 visits to Rochester. Einach says the establishment of an office in Rochester would reduce these visits by 75 percent and confine them to supervisory matters.

Meanwhile, the link between Rochester and SCAD is a telephone at 155 West Main Street, where a State labor department secretary takes messages and passes them on to Buffalo.

SCAD's caseload has shown a substantial increase in the last few years, from 397 complaints throughout the State in 1955 to almost 1,000 last year. For the Buffalo region, an average of 50 a year rose to 77 in 1957, to 90 in 1958, and to 149 last year.

Einach considers the rise in his region principally a reflection of the economic situation on the Niagara Frontier, where hard times have bred more refusals of jobs to Negroes and whites alike. But some of the increase, both in Buffalo and across the State, also may be traced to the increased Negro militancy and the increased Negro population.

The Rochester complaint volume has remained relatively stable—15 in 1957, 17 two years ago and 20 last year. These figures are cited by opponents of a SCAD office here as evidence that it is not justified by the potential workload. On the other side is the argument that the paucity of complaints results from the lack of a place for them to be heard.

FEW CASES HEARD PUBLICLY

Most of the complaints are handled without any of the public rhubarbs that industry might have reason to fear. The procedure is this:

A complaint, once filed in acceptable form, is investigated for probable cause or validity. When probable cause is found, a private conference is arranged with one of the commissioners, who tries to reach a settlement through persuasion and conciliation. If this fails, the case can be ordered for a public hearing before the entire commission, which has the power to issue cease and desist orders enforceable by the courts.

As a practical matter, probable cause is found in only 25 to 30 percent of the complaints upstate, and a settlement is reached through conciliation in almost all of these cases.

Einach reports that in the 15-year history of the Buffalo office, which he has headed since SCAD was created, only one case reached the public hearing stage—a group of complaints from Negro women against a chain of reducing salons.

SCAD takes the position that regulatory activity is only one phase of its work. Equally important in the agency's eyes is its performance as an educational force—with employers, members of minority groups and the public at large.

SCAD's educational program has had no dramatic impact anywhere upstate. But in Rochester it has been virtually nil.

What it might become can be illustrated by an example of recent activity in the Albany office.

Early last year, after a flurry of complaints against downtown stores, Regional Director F. Peter Libassi called on personnel officers of 14 major stores, then arranged a group meeting to discuss merit employment—a favorite SCAD term—with them. The result has been that 5 of the 14 hired Negro sales help for the first time. In addition, four other downtown stores not represented at the meeting have hired their first Negro clerks in the past year.

EMPHASIS PLACED ON EDUCATION

The Albany approach, and indeed that of the entire agency, has been soft sell. Mailings to guidance counselors, placement and personnel directors, employers, real estate brokers, chambers of commerce—all emphasize the information spreading functions of the agency and play down the muscle represented by the statute it administers.

"It is our hope," says a standard paragraph in SCAD mailings, "that we may be able to provide you with relevant reports as they are published by the commission and keep you advised of any changes in the law against discrimination which may affect your right and obligations."

Much of the educational program is aimed directly at the Negro, through settlement houses, churches and, the NAACP. It emphasizes the legal protection offered minorities and it spells out the regular channels for protest.

One pamphlet, for example, tells graduating high school seniors:

"You're assured of an equal chance. The State commission against discrimination was established to protect you and to insure your right to equal job opportunities. If, in seeking work, or training opportunity, you experience discrimination because of your race, color, religion or nationality, write or go to the nearest office of the commission."

Assessing the precise degree and nature of employment discrimination in Rochester is virtually impossible. But the available evidence would seem to confirm the findings of earlier surveys.

Eunice and George Grier, social researchers for SCAD, reported in 1956 that discrimination in hiring was slight in many of the major industries, but that some discrimination still existed in upgrading from routine production line jobs to craftsmen and foreman positions, or to jobs involving contact with the public.

The 1957 SCAD report, "Greater Rochester Takes a Look," made substantially the same points.

"Hiring on a nondiscriminatory basis is official policy in most of the major manufacturing plants and public utilities, although discrimination may still be practiced by individual personnel interviewers, executives, or foremen."

There is no question that discrimination exists. But the experience of SCAD in dealing with complaints suggests how difficult it is to prove. No employer is going to admit it.

In the Negro community, almost everyone has a story to tell. For example, the Reverend John L. Salmon, minister of Trinity Presbyterian Church, recalls trying for several months to find a job for a young music student and finally succeeded in a telephone call. But when he gave the boy's address in one of the ghettos, the employer said:

"I'm sorry, in that case we have nothing."

On occasion, the Negro's sensitiveness leads him to assume discrimination where there is none. One minister had a parishioner come to him with a story that she had been refused a job because of her color. He took the time to investigate and found she had been turned down as a typist, not because she was a Negro but because her typing was too slow and error-ridden.

JOB OPPORTUNITIES IMPROVE

The most conspicuous thing in the employment picture is the fact that Negroes are being found every year in industries and specialties that were closed to them only the year before.

More Government jobs, local and Federal, have also opened up over the years. Thus there are Negro policemen and mail carriers. Truman E. Coles is an assistant district attorney; Lloyd L. Hurst is an assistant county legal adviser.

One of those who has played a part in improving opportunities in industry is McCarthy of the industrial management council, who concedes that often doors are opened only after an employer is convinced there is no way out.

In one such case, a big employer called McCarthy and said he understood his firm was under observation for not hiring Negroes. He was reluctant to employ them, he went on, because he felt the girls on the clerical staff would object to using the same wash basins and toilets.

McCarthy replied: "You've got to do this. Have your personnel man contact some of the ministers and get them to select a good type of Negro employee and integrate them quietly. Tell them they're in the front line and should behave accordingly. And educate your own employees, too."

The company followed the advice and today employs a number of Negroes without any staff conflict.

Very often, the Negro thinks of the employment situation in terms of symbols. His bitterness centers around jobs dealing with the public in which virtually no Negroes have been accepted.

Above all, the bank teller is a symbol. At all levels of the community, Negroes complain because there is none of their race behind the bank counters. The job has special significance to the Negro because it involves both contact with the public and the trust implied in handling money.

DISCRIMINATION CAN BE SUBTLE

The practice of discrimination can be a subtle business indeed. Personnel officers can establish dozens of criteria, any one of which can be essential or completely artificial.

And some employers say that turning a Negro down for a job for which he is not qualified can be embarrassing when the refusal is equated with discrimination. There is a similar risk, they say, when a Negro employee has to be dismissed for legitimate reasons.

Much of the discrimination that does exist seems to be based on the anticipation of reactions of other employees and customers—presuppositions that frequently have little basis in fact.

Thus, a placement director for a business school says:

"You can understand that in many of these small offices, they just can't take a chance with colored. You can see the problems it would cause."

Negroes also are particularly sensitive about what they consider token hiring. One professional who works for a large employer with many Government contracts (which forbids discrimination) put it this way:

"When the Federal man comes around, they point to us. 'See,' they say, 'We have Negroes in every department.' But most of the time it's only one."

The roads that may lead to better job opportunity for the Negro are several. But perhaps the most important is simple industrial necessity. For example, the postwar shortage of engineers has done more than anything else to eliminate the bars in that field.

"They need engineers so bad, they don't care if they're blue," one Negro commented about his employer recently.

But even this is not a universal pattern. There is a critical shortage of skilled secretarial help in Rochester now, but few Negroes seem to end up in offices.

THE QUESTION OF SKILLS

The question of training may be crucial here. In many cases, the Negro complains that there is no place for his people without establishing that there are any qualified for the jobs involved.

According to the 1950 census, 56.9 percent of Negro male workers and 63.4 percent of Negro female workers in Rochester were in the lowest categories on the occupational scale—domestic workers, service workers, and unskilled labor. In contrast, less than 11 percent of white males and 17 percent of white females fell into the same groups.

Fundamentally, this is probably still the situation. Newcomers from the rural South keep the proportion of unskilled workers high.

In qualifying himself for jobs, the Negro begins in school at a big disadvantage. His family often is unlettered and his own knowledge sketchy for his age. He often cannot expect any real help at home, and he is forever moving from one school to another.

Says one grade school principal:

"Many of these children have no stability. Their parents keep moving round and round in the housing trap. There is little insistence that the children try for an A or a B rather than a C or D."

And a high school principal adds: "The biggest problem is to give these youngsters drive and ambition and purpose."

Inadequate home life is reflected at school in poor preparation and in attendance lapses that follow the children through their lives. A Negro boy with 6 weeks of absence from high school will not get a job ahead of a white teenager whose family has been able to keep him regularly at school.

A Negro girl will not get a job as a sales clerk if she cannot answer such a question as: "If cookies sell at 31 cents a pound, how much would you charge for a pound and a quarter?"

The schools try hard to cope with the problem, and some guidance counselors feel that Negro pupils are showing better ability and staying power.

But ambition is still easily defeated, hope still quickly lost. The Negro teenager sees the Negro elevator boy but not the scientist in industry. He sees the Negro street cleaner every day, but the Negro librarian less often.

These are some of the reasons Negroes do not always apply for the best job openings. Initially high factory wages and poor family circumstances often combine to see a prospective secretary or accountant lost forever.

It is the recognition of this that has been responsible for the emphasis in the Negro leadership on education, particularly for those in the lower income brackets with no family tradition of advanced schooling.

There is no clear evidence of great gains, but there are signs. Four years ago, for example, the teenage program at the Baden Street Settlement included only two or three youngsters aiming at college. Today, the same settlement has an organized tutoring program in which eight youngsters are being groomed specifically for college.

In terms of numbers, however, those who go no further than high school are the most important. And giving them ambition is not easy.

In the long run, job opportunities for the Negro cannot be separated from the climate of public opinion, housing conditions and the state of the economy.

WINDS OF CHANGE—NEGRO REMAINS MAN APART IN COMMUNITY—FEW ABLE TO VIEW HIM AS AN INDIVIDUAL

(By Desmond Stone and Jack Germond)

No matter how well the Negro solves his housing and economic problems, he remains a man apart in the Rochester community. If he is ever recognized as an individual, it is only after he has been regarded as a Negro.

This is true even when there is no obvious discrimination.

The accepted Rochester ethic is one of tolerance, and those who practice discrimination carry a heavy burden of guilt. They try to put it off on their neighbors, on anything that will avoid their being identified on the wrong side of what they recognize is a moral issue.

But these same Rochesterians often are unwilling or unable to look at a Negro as an individual, and it is this above all that galls him.

A few weeks ago a Negro cleric, an educated man of many parts, called a radio station to inquire about a program he had been told was being used as a forum for racist diatribes.

He spoke first to the program director, but he was referred finally to a young Negro receptionist—"one of his own people"—for an accounting of what had transpired on the program. Would Rabbi Bernstein or Bishop Kearney have been referred to a receptionist?

A Negro professional who has lived in a predominantly white neighborhood for more than a decade was asked to take part in a capital fund drive for youth organization. He accepted, but when he was given a list of persons he was to contact, he found all were Negroes in the ghetto.

From the fundraiser's point of view, this assignment had obvious practical advantages. But to a sensitive man, this use of his race, which bars him from so much, was intolerable.

A Negro with a college degree, new to the community, called at a leading furniture store to buy furniture for his home. He was given the address of another store and advised to try it instead. He went in all innocence and found it to be a seedy second-hand furniture store.

The father of a college-educated Negro woman was taken to a hospital, and a private room was requested. One of the staff was overheard to say, "No use putting him in there. He won't be able to pay for it."

A Negro's role in the community has been severely limited by this informal apartheid. The middle-class Negro finds generally that he is asked to participate only in matters that deal with his race or with social problems that are vaguely associated with the Baden-Ormond area.

Thus, Negroes serve on the SCAD citizens council, on the board of such agencies as the Baden Street Settlement and on panels discussing urban renewal aims.

And, thus, Dr. William J. Knox was appointed recently to the housing authority, which has as its principal responsibility the administration of the predominantly Negro Hanover Houses.

But where, Negroes ask, are the Negroes on the city planning commission or the zoning board or any of the myriad of citizens committees established by official Rochester to give advice to elective officers?

The area that may offer the brightest hope for Negro recognition is politics, for here he has a weapon—the vote.

In the past, the Negro has been no more than a minor voice in the councils of either party. The only Negroes nominated for office have been candidates for supervisor in the third ward. And no Negroes hold ward leaderships, even in such a heavily Negro one as the seventh.

Part of this has been the fault of the Negro himself. Unlike other ethnic groups here, he has been slow to exert a concentrated pressure.

But with a population of 18,000 and a vigorous new leadership, this situation is changing.

Neither political party has taken any major steps to recognize the Negro yet, but leaders of both realize they will have to bid for his support in the near future. And they realize that this can be done only by giving him a direct voice in party affairs.

FEW NEGROES ON LOCAL BOARDS

This separation of the races does not apply only to government.

A similar picture can be obtained from an analysis of the groups who carry on Rochester's many good works. These organizations have no policy of segregation—and would be horrified at the notion—but the fact remains that Negroes seldom show up on their boards.

For example, participation in the Community Chest is a substantial status symbol here, but there were only five Negroes among the 836 who attended the annual "kickoff" dinner this year.

There are none on the 60-member board of dierctors, and only one among the 170 members of the corporation.

This is not to suggest deliberate exclusion by the Community Chest.

On the contrary, its member agencies are characterized by programs that cut across all social, racial, or economic lines. But the failure of the city's substantial Negro minority to achieve a greater role illustrates the Negro's position as a man apart.

The Negro is realistic about the part he might play in the foreseeable future. He does not clamor for admission to the clubs that bar even the unidentifiable Jew. But he wants recognition as an individual. If his professional attainment justifies his being sought out for advice, he wants to be sought out.

The separation of the races has served to bind the Negro community together, despite the tremendous range of intellectual levels,

economic backgrounds and social interests represented in these 18,000 Rochesterians.

There is a Negro "grapevine" that carries not only news of other Negroes but common expressions of humor and bitterness.

A story told in a roach-ridden kitchen on Clarissa street is repeated in an Irondequoit living room.

In the Baden-Ormond area and the 19th ward alike, Negroes speak sardonically of Rochester winning a brotherhood award.

Stories of the tribulations of individual Negroes spread like a virus, as do those of their triumphs.

Thus, a Baden-Ormond Negro is quite likely to know the details of another Negro's new home in Brighton, although he may never have met the man.

The factors that contribute to the separation in the minds of men are several.

One is the artificial division of labor along racial lines. A Pullman porter is Negro; the conductor, white. The hotel bellhop is white; the doorman and elevator operator are Negro. The waiter is white; the busboy is a Negro.

The Negro himself contributes to the separation in a sense, usually because he has no choice but often because he regards himself as a man apart, a man with a particular crusade to carry on. He attends Negro churches, belongs to Negro fraternities, reads the Negro press.

Visit the home of almost any middle class Negro and you will find that he reads Ebony or Sepia or Jet magazines. His interest in them is a reflection of his identification with his group as a separate culture within a culture.

Look at the articles in the current issue of Sepia to find what interests the Negro—articles about migrant labor, school integration, Miriam Makeba, Louis Armstrong, a movie on race prejudice, a white man's experiences posing as a Negro, Negroes in business, a Negro writer, the AME church, race conflict in Chicago, and Jesse Owens. And all in a single issue.

The racial separation also is abetted by the southern Negro who comes north and finds it hard to emerge from the subjection in which he has lived.

There is one southern Negro here who tells his children to speak to people wherever they go, whether fishing or to the store. Life in the South has convinced him that an alibi is a valuable thing.

But the principal factor inevitably is housing segregation. Many, perhaps a majority of Rochesterians grow up without ever getting to know a Negro on an equal footing.

The suburban dweller may attain his majority without ever going to school or church with a black man. And he may climax this by working in an all-white office and bowling on an all-white bowling team Wednesday nights.

"STEREOTYPE * * * IS NOT BUNCHE"

Ignorance breeds acceptance and perpetuation of the stereotypes. And the stereotype of the Negro is not Ralph Bunche or Jackie Robinson.

It is a man who lives in the slums, has a common-law wife, drinks gin and orange pop on Saturday night and—despite all—is cheerful about his lot so long as he can have yellow suede shoes and the hope of a used Cadillac to ride around in.

("They just love red convertibles," a suburban housewife confided to a reporter.)

Those who come to know the Negro find that some fit the stereotype (as do some of their white neighbors) but that the majority do not. And they find the range is broad.

Just as housing segregation has maintained this apartness—for it is both cause and effect—so will the gradual dispersal of the Negro through the community allow him to take shape as an individual.

Negro after Negro tells of finally winning acceptance from hostile white neighbors who come to realize the newcomer invading their suburban paradise is just another mortgage-ridden, grass-cutting, snow-shoveling bookkeeper or factory worker or schoolteacher.

This experience is a common one. Vance Packard, in "The Status Seekers," cites a study of two groups of white housewives, one in an integrated New York City apartment project, the other in an all-white project in New Jersey. The study found what students of race relations have preached for years—that those who know the Negro best think the most highly of him and are least given to viewing him as Stepin Fetchit.

One Negro professional who finally won civility, at least, from a white neighbor after several years put it this way:

"If I never do another thing for my race, I've educated that woman next door."

The acceptance of the stereotypes causes confusion to the white when he meets Negroes who do not fit.

The attractive college-educated wife of a Negro ballplayer recalls answering an advertisement for an apartment near Red Wing Stadium. When she telephoned, she was received with cordiality and invited to inspect the apartment. But when she appeared, the landlady was stunned.

"Why," she stammered, "I'm sorry, but this is a residential neighborhood."

Recalling the incident now, the wife asks wryly: "What did she think we were going to do, open up a bar?"

HOW THE MIDDLE CLASS BEHAVE

The sensitive, middle-class Negro goes to great lengths to avoid the stereotype. Except when he is in danger of being insulted, he is likely to be soft spoken because he does not want to convey boorishness. He is likely to dress conservatively. He goes to almost ridiculous lengths to prove that he is dedicated to maintaining his property. (In fact one Negro who bought in a white neighborhood was seen outside trimming the hedges and preparing to paint within a day after moving in.)

Because he takes such pains to offset it, the Negro is embittered by the persistence of the stereotype.

"You think we're all like those handkerchief heads you see on Joseph Avenue," a well-to-do housewife tells a reporter angrily.

"The white man always expects us to be carrying a banjo," a factory worker observes, "and some of our people do just that."

Rubbing shoulders is essential to seeing the Negro as an individual, and this means taking an interest in him. A shopkeeper near one of the high schools tells a Negro youth who has wandered in during school hours to go back to class. She sees her student-customers as individuals, Negro or white.

But few members of the community have this chance, and so they push him into the stereotype. Thus, a sensitive and intelligent young Ph. D., is called "Sunshine" by a service station attendant.

The concern with the way he is regarded frequently makes the Negro hypersensitive, and the more candid admit it. Moreover, he is so conditioned to expect discrimination that he sometimes avoids going to restaurants and other places where he might in fact encounter little trouble.

Although most Negroes agree there is little discrimination in stores or restaurants here, some are quick to see the ordinary rudeness and bad temper of a waiter or salesgirl as a comment on their pigmentation.

NEW NEGRO A CRUSADER

Sometimes, of course, the Negro is right. The unsophisticated migrant is apt to flee in confusion from such situations, never to return to that store again. But the new Negro is a crusader who is quick to set the record straight.

A young third ward housewife tells of admiring a $69 dress in one of the city's better women's stores. Just as she concluded that she couldn't afford the dress, a sales clerk gratuitously announced that she could not try it on unless she bought it.

"So I got mad and bought it," the housewife recalls. "It was foolish perhaps but that woman made me so mad."

The picture of the Negro as a man apart appears to be a harsh comment on Rochester. But the situation here is not really a unique one. The Negro faces similar humiliations in most places.

Whether Rochester is better or worse is impossible to measure, although the Negro who is experiencing life here now is quick to assure you that things were never this bad in Columbus or Binghamton or Louisville, or even—some say—in Mississippi.

SHAPED BY TRADITIONS

What can be said with some assurance, however, is that there are significant local influences. The life of the Negro here is shaped by Rochester's special character as a community as well as by the influences that operate throughout the North.

In Rochester, the Negro has been angered by what he regards as the city's tendency to set itself apart, to believe that it has no real problems compared to the rest of the Nation.

He feels so strongly on this subject that he is inclined to overlook the truth that Rochester does have a number of distinctive characteristics—for example, an unusually high percentage of homeowners.

It is significant that this is a city of industries employing exceptionally highly skilled workers. This has meant that there has been no great movement of migrant Negroes into the main streams of the city's productive life.

The migratory worker who drifts in is more likely to wind up doing service work of some kind than he might in Buffalo, where heavy industry offers a higher paid alternative.

Because industry's dependence on the skilled worker is rising all the time and because such devices as the mechanical bean-picker are reducing dependence on migrant labor, it seems unlikely that the Negro population here ever will be a large proportion of the total. This means that the fearful white need not expect a wholesale invasion.

A STRONG ECONOMY

Some of Rochester's peculiarities work to the advantage of the Negro. The city is strong economically. Recessions arrive late and disappear early, and unemployment is seldom as severe as in other upstate cities. This gives the Negro workers a measure of security that he might not realize in Buffalo, for example.

In other respects, Rochester's economic well-being, reflected as it is in an affluent upper class and a generally comfortable middle class, adds to the Negro's problem. The distance between the high men on the totem pole and those on the bottom is greater than it is elsewhere.

This can mean that the man with plenty can give more, as with the community chest. But it also means that he has less contact with the Negro newcomer and is less likely to see him as an individual.

One of Rochester's peculiarities is probably at the root of the controversy over the SCAD office. This is the city's tradition of preferring local enterprise to outside assistance.

Rochester has a reputation for being slow to accept the subsidies of State and Federal Governments, and its political and business leaders are frankly suspicious of what they consider the meddling and waste that inevitably accompany this subsidy.

It is no accident that Rochester has less public housing per capita than any other major city in the State, or that Rochester is the only city that established its housing authority only after it had built a project.

OLD APPROACH IS NOT ENOUGH

Rochester has preferred to meet its social obligations through local action often founded on frank paternalism and benevolence.

And in most things, the city has been conspicuously successful. The city's per capita spending on social welfare is high, and the community chest drive is always a success.

All these things reflect a city that is essentially proud, secure, conservative, independent, civilized, cultured, detached and self-contained.

But the problem of the new Negro does not yield to the traditional approach.

In the past, in the absence of strong labor unions, the need for social action has usually been anticipated by private and public leadership. In the case of the Negro, however, the community has not kept its finger on the pulse.

Comparatively few in Rochester have admitted that the problem is a serious one.

Above all, the city has failed to recognize that the new Negro does not want "better treatment" or "help" or anything that smacks of condescension.

He wants equality. He wants recognition commensurate with his attainments as an individual. And he wants it now.

A letter to the editor put it this way:

"How much longer must the Negro be expected to show gratitude and humbleness for the few freedoms we as a race enjoy.

"I would like to taste the fruit of first-class citizenship in my lifetime. If not, I pray that my children may one day be able to take for granted all the rights, which should be ours as they are the white man's, not for the begging or boycotting, but for the taking."

Soldier of Honor or Soldier of Fortune?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, the following article which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on August 22 and which was written by William S. White, deserves the most thoughtful attention of all Americans:

THE PASSING SCENE—"PEARL HARBOR" IN A MOSCOW COURT

(By William S. White)

Is it a missile lag or a space lag that should most trouble us as we confront the massive and brooding hostility of the Soviet Union across the world?

Or is it, instead, really a lag in our national character, a decline in our old standards of personal guts and personal responsibility? What value all our progress in the weapons we produce if we are to produce fewer and fewer strong, grownup men? What price the old words like "duty" and "honor"? Has a sophomoric pseudo-sophistication snickered these words out of our national language?

These melancholy questions arise in this correspondent's mind in the afterlight of the Moscow trial of Francis Powers, the pilot of the American "spy plane." It is not a comfortable thing for a man who works in safety to pass judgment on another man caught up far from home in an alien, so-called court for a criminal mission on which his superiors had sent him.

The easy, the sentimental, way would be to sympathize with Powers—to say that after all he had his life to save and so why should he not have cooperated with his Russian accusers?

But this would be a view as stickily dishonest as it would be superficially compassionate.

AIDED ACCUSERS OF UNITED STATES

For Powers was cooperating not so much with Powers' own accusers as with the accusers of his Government and his country. He was not, in the language of the American criminal courts, simply "copping a plea" for himself. He was copping a plea for the United States of America. First, he had saved his own life by permitting his aircraft and its secrets to fall into enemy hands, at the expense of his own country's vital interests and in violation of his duty.

Next, in the trial itself, he again saved his life by joining his country's assailants in slandering that country, in violation of his responsibility as an American citizen.

But he was more than a private citizen who had got into difficulty abroad. He was a soldier, if not in uniform, of the United States—specifically of its most urgent arm in the cold war, the Central Intelligence Agency.

KNEW THE RISKS

When he accepted his job—and at $30,000 a year it was an infinitely better job than his background could ever otherwise have found for him—he took his chances. Here was no little boy who had lost his way in the Soviet labyrinths. Here was a man on a high mission who knew in advance of its risks—and of its privileges.

Was he entitled then upon capture—a capture which it was bluntly his duty to avoid at every cost, including the final cost of death itself—to save himself in the way he did? Is a ship's officer on a raft flung from a sinking liner entitled to kick off the passengers if the raft, too, begins to sink? His duty is far more than theirs, for he is a part of the ship's responsible command.

Now I know it is seemingly a cruel thing to say that another man should die, if dying is the only way to protect his country. But millions of men, far less favored than Powers, have died when they had to die to maintain their duty. Many of us have seen hundreds of our friends so die, not gladly but stoically, in the infantry outfits of the U.S. Army. An intelligence officer has no more immunity from death, when death is required of him, than any exhausted platoon leader in Normandy, on Iwo Jima or wherever.

With no wish to persecute one man, it is still sadly necessary to say it: In that Moscow courtroom we have suffered a small, an intimate, a personal Pearl Harbor—but not, unhappily, an insignificant one.

Explanation of Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 120, Friday, June 3, 1960, a record vote on a motion to adjourn, I am recorded as not voting. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "nay."

Unfreezing Our Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an article, informative and exposing, entitled "Unfreezing Our Defense," written by Joseph Alsop, an objective and fearless minded columnist, appearing in the Boston Globe of August 10, 1960.

For several years, Mr. Alsop has made marked contributions by fearlessly discussing our national defense posture, as well as our foreign policy, and where necessary, exposing our weaknesses in both fields.

The article follows:

UNFREEZING OUR DEFENSE—FUNDS FINALLY RELEASED BY IKE WILL BUY MORE AIRBORNE ALERT FOR UNITED STATES—BUT NOT BEFORE SPRING

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—President Eisenhower has now passed over the recommendations of his Secretary of State and ignored the Republican platform's promise to "intensify, accelerate and increase" the national defense efforts.

Quite naturally, without saying so in plain words, the President's message to Congress indicates he has merely decided to unfreeze the last congressional session's added appropriations for special defense projects.

These funds were voted against the President's wish.

They were instantly frozen by the President's and the Budget Bureau's order. And now the act of taking these funds out of the refrigerator again is presented as important and significant.

The best way to gage the real nature of this decision of the President's is to take a look at the problem of the airborne alert.

A maximum airborne alert was urgently requested last winter, by the brilliant man who has personal responsibility for the American deterrent, the strategic air commander, Gen. Thomas S. Power.

In the period of the missile gap, which we have now extended, the SAC airbases in the United States and overseas are nakedly exposed to the Kremlin's long-range and medium-range rockets.

Existing systems provide zero warning against a missile strike.

Hence the only way to have a truly invulnerable deterrent during the period of the missile gap is to keep the maximum feasible number of SAC's B-52 bombers constantly in the air, with bombs aboard and ready to fly at their targets.

According to General Power, a maximum airborne alert is needed now.

The mood will be vastly more acute in 1961 and 1962, when the missile gap will be very much wider.

This need in 1961 and 1962 will not be canceled out, either, by a presidential order for construction of more Polaris submarines, which cannot be at sea before 1964 or 1965.

A maximum airborne alert is now impossible, however, for the simple reason that aircraft in flight wear out their engines and other parts.

SAC does not have a spare parts backlog big enough to maintain a serious airborne alert with continuous attrition of its B–52 force.

With extreme caution, the last session of Congress therefore appropriated an additional $85 million to buy a larger reserve of B–52 spare parts for SAC. This is one of the appropriations that has now been unfrozen.

Unless Budget Bureau pettifogging negates the unfreezing—which is quite possible—SAC will therefore be permitted to acquire the capability of mounting a continuous airborne alert.

But the job will only be completed next spring.

Nine months have already been lost because of the President's obstinate resistance to General Power's recommendation. And an alert of 80 bombers in the air will be the most that SAC can hope to mount, even by next spring.

There is a simple measure for the inadequacy of this belated gesture.

The former SAC commander, Gen. Curtis LeMay, has never been one to overestimate the effectiveness of air defense.

Yet General LeMay used to maintain that SAC needed to be able to send off a first strike of 1,000 aircraft.

General LeMay did not argue that it was necessary for SAC to deliver 1,000 cargoes of nuclear bombs, which would be ridiculous. He argued that a first strike of 1,000 bombers was tactically necessary, to make sure of overwhelming the defenses and reaching all assigned targets.

Furthermore, General LeMay set up his requirement of a 1,000-plane first strike in the period when the Soviet air defense was relatively very weak.

Since then, and particularly in the last 18 months, the Soviet air defense system has been greatly strengthened. But the American Government, with the missile gap staring us in the face, has now decided that it will be quite enough to have a sure first strike capability of only 80 aircraft.

More money—very little more money—would buy more airborne alert.

An additional $100 million of appropriations now would permit an alert of 160 B–52's by next spring.

An additional $150 million would give the means to prepare a maximum alert of over 200 B–52's.

With the Hound Dog missile added to the B–52's, this kind of maximum alert would be a reasonably reliable deterrent, unless the masters of the Kremlin go mad.

But if the spare parts are not ordered now, the alert will not be possible later.

A whole series of other cases might be cited, to show how the future is being mortgaged to suit the present convenience of the Budget Bureau and the wishes of the President.

If this goes on, President Eisenhower's successor, whether he be Vice President NIXON or Senator KENNEDY, may well not inherit the means to defend this Nation and the free world.

Tragic Tariff Decision on Textile Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission and gave reasons for my contention that certain equalizing steps should be taken because of unfair importation of foreign textile products.

This situation is one that is critical to domestic industry.

I was extremely disappointed, therefore, when the Commission ruled against restrictions which would safeguard our home industries.

Of course, I will continue to work through Congress for these safeguards.

An editorial appeared in the Talladega (Ala.) Daily Home on this subject, and under unanimous consent I insert it at this point in the RECORD:

A TRAGIC BLUNDER

Our own J. Craig Smith, who is president of the National Cotton Council, said his group was "aghast and bitterly disappointed" at the 4 to 2 decision whereby the U.S. Tariff Commission ruled against imposition of additional import restrictions on cotton textiles.

Living and moving and having our being here in a cotton economy we understand and share Mr. Smith's shock and disappointment that this Government refuses protection in the face of a situation threatening an entire region.

The commission majority, as Mr. Smith said, clearly refused to recognize the danger inherent in the tide of imports from countries where labor is cheap.

Yet on the streets of Talladega and Sylacauga and other towns right now are women wearing textile garments made abroad and sold at a fraction of the price American textiles must command if they are to survive.

"They have completely ignored the fact that imports of cotton textiles are nearly five times as great as they were 5 years ago and that cotton yarn imports are 15 times what they were just last year," Mr. Smith said.

The cotton industry now must turn to Congress for any possible relief.

In its fight it deserves the backing of every southerner who realizes that our great basic industry is under attack that could prove fatal unless corrective steps are taken—and in time.

Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by me on the Social Security Amendments of 1960.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA

SOCIAL SECURITY

Although I supported the Anderson amendment, I do intend to vote for the passage of this bill. I am particularly interested in the provision to permit men to voluntarily retire at age 62. This language was adopted by the Senate Committee on Finance, it having been proposed by an amendment offered by me and cosponsored by 21 other Senators.

Moreover, I believe that removal of the age 50 requirement is a necessity. If we act favorably on this bill, it will mean immediate benefits for a quarter of a million people, disabled workers and their dependents. The lifting of the age-50 requirement will mean a first-year saving in public assistance funds of approximately $28 million. There is no basis for denying benefits to the group that is likely to be most in need of them—persons under age 50 who generally have family responsibilities. We all know that for a person to qualify for disability benefits he must be, according to the law, unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity. Sometimes he can be rehabilitated, and, despite his handicap, can earn a living for his family. More often he must look forward to a life without earnings of any kind. Many of our disabled are thereby forced to go on public assistance rolls.

I am also pleased with the provision paying benefits to survivors of workers who died before 1940. About 25,000 persons would benefit by this, most of them being aged widows of 75 and over.

Howard Cummings—A Gallant Soldier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks, I include therein a very fine article by the talented columnist of the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item, my good friend, Mr. John E. O'Malley, entitled "Howard Cummings Was a Company K Man."

Company K was an outstanding unit of the famous Yankee Division of World War I fame and Howard Cummings was one of its greatest heroes. The company was largely recruited from Clinton and Howard Cummings was one of its officers having worked his way up from the rank of private.

K Company participated in many of the most crucial and bloody battles of World War I and the magnificent saga of its exploits has been impressively set forth in several publications and articles, one of the most distinguished of which was the dramatic story written by the late Major James T. Duane, also an officer of the original K Company.

Since both of these gallant heroes were virtually next door neighbors of mine from the Acre district in Clinton, they were dear friends and I knew them very well. The community that could produce such brave fighting men and such outstanding leaders may well be proud, and the Nation fortunate enough to have such patriotic and dedicated men fighting and sacrificing in the defense of its freedoms is indeed fortunate.

Both these men, in addition to their memorable military records, enjoyed notable success in civilian life: Major Duane as State commander of the American Legion and prominent business and civic leader, and Lieutenant Cummings as a high-ranking official and leader in the U.S. Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. O'Malley deserves great credit for his fine article on Lieutenant Cummings.

It not only reminds us of a beloved friend and valiant soldier, Lieutenant Cummings, but it brings to mind once again with impressive vividness the exploits of one of the most colorful and gallant military units that has ever engaged in any American war, the famous Company K of Clinton.

Lieutenant Cummings recently followed his beloved friend and service comrade, Major Duane, to the ranks of that silent majority of heroes who, having given unreservedly of themselves for the cause of God and country, have passed to their heavenly reward.

Such men as Howard Cummings and James Duane can never be replaced, but their magnificent contributions, their sterling Americanism and their loyal support of the Nation in war and peace will long be remembered by those who cherish American liberty and who value noble, unselfish citizenship

On the rolls of heroes their names are indelibly inscribed. Their many friends will long honor and cherish their blessed memories and the Nation will long continue to be inspired by their devoted service.

The article follows:

[From the Clinton (Mass.) Daily Item, July 5, 1960]

HOWARD CUMMINGS WAS A GREAT COMPANY K MAN

(By John E. O'Malley)

July 24, 1918, was a sad day at the old post office at 203 Church Street. It was about noon that James R. Connery came in to say that a telegram had just been received that Howard J. Cummings had been critically wounded in France. He had served for 8 years as a mail carrier before he was called to active service with Company K.

It happened in the second battle of the Marne, starting July 18 and lasting for 6 days. Company K was at the apex of the attack. On the fifth day of the battle Lieutenant Cummings stepped out to help remove a wounded comrade. A shell landed close by, killing the wounded soldier and the litter bearers, and a shell fragment hit Lieutenant Cummings causing a severe skull fracture. The act that caused his injury was typical of the man.

The day Company K arrived in Clinton after the war, Cpl., James F. "Dolly" O'Toole was seated in Latin's Lunch Cart. He was wearing his Croix de Guerre decoration. A man sitting next to him told him he should be very proud of it. His answer was a wonderful tribute to a fellow officer.

He said, "I would be proud of it if Howie Cummings had one too."

Dolly had not forgotten the night he volunteered to scout the enemy lines. He had worked his way through the barbed wire entanglement and had crawled close to the enemy lines. He had the same feeling that every soldier had in the same position—the hand of death was resting on his shoulder. Suddenly there was a hand on his shoulder and a soft kindly voice was whispering in his ear. It was the voice of Lieutenant Cummings who had, of his own volition, crawled out in no man's land to sustain a friend.

NOTIFIED OF PROMOTION

February 1, 1918, at Frebercourt, Sgt. Howard J. Cummings was notified that he had been commissioned as a second lieutenant. February 21 he left for Grendecourt for special training and was furnished with a guide for the trip. The guide lost his way. In his report later, the guide stated that it was through the brilliance and high courage of Lieutenant Cummings that they made it without being killed or captured.

On May 3, Lieutenant Cummings was elevated to the post of regimental gas officer. On July 3 he was honored with a 3-day pass to Paris to take part in the Fourth of July celebration.

On his return to Clinton the employees of the post office gave a banquet in his honor. The affair was at the Raymond Hotel, Fitchburg. Raymond Dwyer, the proprietor, set out to make it a gala occasion. In its finest day the Waldorf Astoria never could have surpassed it.

Howie's words to a Veterans' Bureau bureaucrat were typical of the man. He had applied for special training and after three sessions of petifogging questions he spoke about as follows: "I want this very much. It belongs to me. I don't intend to get down on my knees and beg for it." That was the kind of a fellow he was.

A short time ago they sounded taps for Howie Cummings; another hero of Clinton's famous Company K had joined "the innumerable caravan."

He had a brilliant mind, he smiled easily, he worked hard, he was a true gentleman at all times—that was Howard J. Cummings.

Helping Russia To Help Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, the lack of coordinated policy between us and our Allies in trading with Communist-controlled countries, and the administration's policy on oil imports, is working to the advantage of Russia, in her efforts to gain a foothold in the Western Hemisphere by befriending Cuba. This is brought out very clearly in an article in the Baltimore Sun of August 9 by the maritime editor of that paper, Mrs. Helen Delich Bentley, which is reprinted herewith, under permission to extend my remarks:

HOW THE RUSSIANS DO IT—OIL TANKERS FOR CUBA

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

Russia's ability to ship crude oil directly to Cuba is a mainstay of the Castro (or post-Castro?) fight against American and British oil concerns. Yet Russia commands the necessary tanker tonnage for the long ocean run largely because of two practices among the Western countries which have the effect of advantaging the Soviet.

These same two factors help Russia supply India and other countries with crude oil at 5 to 15 percent below world prices, thus building up its own oil industry at the expense of free-enterprise companies all over the globe. True, India yesterday announced cancellation of oil agreements with Russia—but only after three suppliers with refineries in India had cut their price by 11 percent. In fact, worldwide price postings for crude oil are edging closer to a major break as a result of activity such as Russia is forcing in Cuba, India, and like areas.

Russia's first advantage is the failure of the Western nations to retain a unified front concerning trade with the Iron Curtain countries over the past decade. Even during the Korean war, ships flying the flags of Great Britain, Norway, Denmark, Italy, and others called regularly at Red Chinese ports.

The other major factor, and perhaps the more important at this time, is the restrictions imposed on import oil by the U.S. Government. Limiting import oil to only slightly more than 1 million barrels daily, with the bulk of that from nearby Venezuela, Washington policy has forced hundreds of thousands of tons of giant supertankers "on the open market" to shop and ship anywhere that they can pick up trade.

Hungry owners have been searching for business at any price, just to keep their vessels going and hoping to be able to pay off at least the mortgage interest as it falls due. Principal payments have been lagging further behind because of the continuation of the depressed market, now entering its 4th year.

Some owners who have been drawing on their capital reserves during the past 3 years, now face bankruptcy or forced sale of their ships at prices far below the amount still due. Many already have failed. This makes the survivors still more anuxious for any kind of business, including Russian business.

Knowing that approximately 6 million tons of tankers are idle throughout the world and available for charter at rock-bottom prices, the Russians have been able to avoid expending great sums to build their own tankers and still are able to ship their oil all over the world at prices under those of the oil companies, which get bargains on freight rates only when they themselves are able to spot-charter a ship.

Normally the oil companies have their own vessels (which must be amortized and maintained) on their hands as well as those they chartered under long-term agreements before the depressed market set in.

The import oil restrictions which are imposed by the Interior Department to protect a small, but vocal group of domestic independent oil producers are blamed for the tanker situation by the owners.

They estimate that an increase of imports by 800,000 barrels daily, or less than one-tenth of the 9 million barrels consumed in this country every day, would employ the entire 6 million tons of idle supertankers if all of the increase could come from the Persian Gulf. Even a shift in the present quota from Venezuela to the Persian Gulf area would help some because of the longer water haul. With the tankers busy filling the oil needs of the United States, there wouldn't be any left to transport Russian petroleum.

The Maritime Administration has opposed the import oil restriction program of Interior on the basis that the latter governmental branch was undermining Maritime and its efforts to build up a merchant marine under American-flag registry.

Because of the oil restrictions some of the supertankers which the U.S. Government has helped build in this country have carried nothing except grain of one sort or another—not a drop of petrol. The tanker owners would prefer their vessels being used for bulk liquids and so would the dry cargo owners whose market has been depressed further by the entrance of tankers into grain cargo hauling.

The fact that Russia was able to divert tankers to the Cuban run almost overnight is considered quite a feat in shipping circles. That accomplishment plus some other maneuvering she is doing on her cargoes to destinations other than Cuba demonstrates that her officials for all their Marxist preoccupations have become most adept in manipulating the charter market of world-wide private enterprise.

Various reports have been issued within the past 2 weeks about the effectiveness of the threat by the big oil companies, particularly the three whose refineries were seized in Cuba, to blacklist owners who

charter to Russia for movement of its oil anywhere in the world. It is understood that the oil companies definitely want the impression to circulate among shipowners that their threat is very effective so that all will cold-shoulder the Russians.

However, a check on the weekly ship position list published by Lloyds of London shows that a number of tankers—particularly British, Italian, and Norwegian—are in the Black Sea area. Their charters have been kept secret, as charters often after, and the work has proceeded without fanfare.

The Greek shipowners, who for the most part are trying to adhere to the plea by the U.S. Government not to make their tankers available in this trade, have pointed out again that if the British, Norwegian, and Italian tankers are free to move as they please then the Greeks are forced by naked economic necessity to follow suit.

As suggested above, one way in which the oil companies and the U.S. Government could divert these Greek tankers from Russian employment is to put the tankers to work for them.

As might be expected with an increased demand, the prices being offered for charters by the Russians are rising but still are only high enough for an owner to break even on operating costs if he's lucky and if his tanker is already paid for. The Russians have invited charters for 1 and 2 years (unusually long on today's depresed market) at around $2.50 per ton for T-2 tankers. Small owners are chafing at the bit and are hard to restrain from signing the contracts.

Another point not emphasized or realized in lay circles is that it is difficult to reroute any ships to a completely new run on short notice. Normally it takes several weeks and sometimes months to arrange charters, particularly if the ships are to be put on a regular run such as between the Black Sea and Cuba.

To help ease this interim period, the Russians are placing as many of their own tankers as they can on the Cuban run and routing those of other countries to other areas. Further, to increase the tankers available now the Russians are actually selling their oil f.o.b. Black Sea and offering to pay the transportation costs, even though higher, if the purchasers will send in their own ships.

The Department of Interior reported last week that Russian's 1959 oil exports averaged 507,440 barrels daily. Every country in Europe—except Ireland, Spain, and Portugal—had made extensive purchases from the Iron Curtain's oil supplies. Italy led with 3 million tons.

Despite all the statements to the contrary, shipowners still believe that the depressed shipping market will provide enough tankers to the Russians for movement of their oil at a low cost anywhere in the world. Rescheduling and rearranging because of the Cuban situation will take some time, but no one believes the flow of oil from the Black Sea ever will be reduced by a lack of sufficient ships in this market. As stated above, the Lloyds weekly ship movement record supports their belief already.

It was the same Lloyds report which revealed during the Korean war, despite denials, that at the height of that conflict 103 freighters owned in England, Norway, Denmark, Italy, and France were under charter to Russia and her satellites and were engaged principally in transporting cargo to Red China.

During the same war the Danes were building ships for Russia.

The point made is that if western ships were servicing the Communist bloc during the time when the United States and other United Nations troops were fighting the Reds, why wouldn't the same countries make their ships available today when only a cold war is underway and they aren't really affected?

As a matter of fact, today every country in the Western bloc is trading with Russia and her European satellites. Every nation except the United States and the Philippine Islands is trading with Red China, North Korea, and North Vietnam.

Most of this trade is subject to certain restrictions on the movement of strategic materials into the Soviet blocs, but the restricted list grows shorter every year.

The United States permits its ships to bring any cargoes available out of Russia, but only certain items can move in from this country. Again, every year the list of goods exchanged increases.

Many U.S. maritime leaders contend that this country's failure to permit trade with Red China was injurious both to the American-flag ships and to the country's own general trade balance.

John Tyler Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding southern journalist has written an exceptionally interesting short biography of an outstanding southern statesman.

Col. Harry M. Ayers, editor and publisher of the Anniston (Ala.) Star who is widely known and respected in national newspaper circles, has written the story of the life of John Tyler Morgan, who was born in Tennessee and among whose accomplishments was the representation of Alabama in the U.S. Senate.

The name of John Tyler Morgan has been submitted to the Hall of Fame as a representative of the State of Alabama. This is a most fitting nomination, and one which I am proud to second.

I believe everyone who reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will enjoy Colonel Ayer's story, "John Tyler Morgan," and I am pleased to include it at this point:

JOHN TYLER MORGAN

(By Harry M. Ayers)

While John Tyler Morgan was a southerner by birth and by persuasion, his father was a native of Saratoga, N.Y., and was born on the night George Washington was a visitor to the family. Hence, he was given the name of the distinguished visitor, George.

John T.'s grandparents were Gideon and Patience (Cogswell) Morgan of Connecticut and Revolutionary War fame. His mother was the daughter of an Episcopal clergyman of Virginia, and a woman of rare intellectual gifts. Yet the son became a devout Methodist in his mature years.

His earlier ancestors came from Wales and settled in Connecticut. All of them lived to a ripe old age, two of whom were nonagenerians.

Senator Morgan was born in Athens, Tenn., on June 20, 1824 and died as U.S. Senator in Washington on June 11, 1907.

After training at home he entered the pioneer school of Charles P. Samuel, a Kentuckian, located 2 miles from the family home, when he was 6 years of age and there he received the foundation of a classical education grounded in Latin.

He says that when he left school at 9 years of age, he knew more Latin than anything else, having read Historiae Sacre, the first six books of Caesar, the Georgics and Bucolics, plus Aeneid of Virgil. He also had some acquaintance with Sallust and was pretty well acquainted with Horace.

In his other studies, he mastered all there was in his little geography, of which he was always fond, and had gone as far as fractions in arithmetic. However, these 3 years from 6 to 9 comprised his entire academic training.

MOVES TO ALABAMA

When the family moved to Calhoun County, Ala., it was a virtual wilderness. They settled on squatted land and young John helped to make the first crop in a territory still surrounded by Indians.

In the absence of schools, he pursued his studies under the guidance of his mother and, in addition to his Latin, he began a deep study of the Bible and memorized several of the English classics, including Pope's "Essay on Man," Young's "Night Thoughts," Pollock's "Cause of Time," and John Wesley's sermons, some of which were stored in the mind of his talented mother.

Through his legacy from her he developed a memory that was the astonishment of his friends and associates in afteryears. While serving as Senator on a trip to Paris as a member of the Bering Sea Commission, he was asked by Lord Hannen what university he had attended.

The reply was: "I never stepped foot upon a college campus in my life until one day during the War of Secession, I had occasion to take my regiment behind the brick walls of William and Mary College to find protection from minie balls and rifle bullets that were flying in our direction."

LAW AND POLITICS

After having studied law at the office of William P. Chilton of Tuskegee and Talladega, Ala., Morgan made his first adventure into politics as a presidential elector on the Breckenridge ticket in 1860, then later became a delegate to the convention which ratified the ordinance of secession in Dallas County, Ala., which was to become his permanent home in later years.

But although he was an ardent southerner, he opposed the African slave trade, which the convention demanded to be retained in the Confederate Constitution.

It is stated in "The South in the Building of the Nation" that he ranked second only to William Yancey in influence and power of debate in the Secession Convention.

But he said that when he enlisted in the Confederate Army, he still knew more Latin than English. Yet evidently he was recognized even at that time as a very capable gentleman, as he served on the staff of Major General Clemens, commanding State troops at Fort Morgan, in the southern part of the State.

ENLISTED AS A PRIVATE

Later he enlisted as a private in the Cahaba Rifles, which became Company G of the 5th Alabama Infantry, and on the organization of that regiment, in which he became a leader, he was promoted to the rank of major and later was advanced to lieutenant colonel.

Subsequently, however, he resigned that commission, too, and came back to Oxford in his old home county there to organize the 51st Alabama Cavalry in 1862.

He then was advanced to lieutenant colonel and was assigned to protect the railroads in Alabama and middle Tennessee, reporting at all times to General Forrest. He was then appointed to brigadier by Gen. Robert E. Lee and was notified of his assignment to Gen. Robert E. Rodes' Brigade, which later achieved a great victory during the fighting in Tennessee.

Still later, he served under Gen. Joseph E. Johnston and participated in the Atlanta campaign. His principal duty then was to keep watch and harass General Sherman's troops.

RENOWNED AS A SENATOR

But while his military career was outstanding, it was as a Senator of the United States that Morgan became nationally and internationally renowned. He received his first appointment by the Legislature of Alabama to succeed Senator George Goldthwaite, defeating in that contest George S. Houston, who later was to become one of Alabama's greatest citizens, being known as the State's reconstruction Governor.

When the political primary was established he won his first open contest by a majority of 81,795 votes and was unanimously elected by the legislature.

Early in his service in the Senate, he became interested in an interoceanic canal to connect the Atlantic and Pacific and never abated his efforts in that direction until the completion by the United States of the Panama Canal.

FAVORED NICARAGUAN CANAL

As is well known, however, Morgan favored the Nicaraguan route and he was able to carry his point in the Senate for four successive sessions, being defeated after President Theodore Roosevelt had joined with the firm of Cromwell & Co., New York attorneys, and the Continental Railway influences that fought him step by step in the House until the Senate finally voted to select the Panama route.

As chairman of the interoceanic committee during Cleveland's last administration, Morgan's influence was greatly enhanced. But while he favored Nicaragua, he followed the measure of his character after his defeat by accepting an appointment to the Panama Canal Commission out of recognition of his vast knowledge of the entire canal problem.

Thereafter he became known, however, by both Panamanians and Nicaraguans as "the father of the isthmian canal idea."

Morgan was appointed as a member of the Bering Sea Fisheries Commission by President Harrison in 1892, the duty of which was to arbitrate the differences that had arisen between Great Britain and the United States regarding the seal fisheries rights between the two governments.

He served in that respect with Mr. Justice Harlan of the U.S. Supreme Court and his immediate grasp of the situation challenged the admiration of both the English and American delegates.

FOUGHT "FORCE BILL"

It would take a volume, however, to list all of the accomplishments of John T. Morgan as a Senator, but in view of what is taking place in the House and Senate today, it might be of interest to note that in 1900 the Senator vigorously opposed a so-called "force bill" that was introduced by Senator Pritchard, of North Carolina, and he held the floor longer than any other man who had spoken continuously in the Senate up to that time. His contention was that the resolution in question would be an intrusion on the rights of the States. It was defeated.

As to the character and ability of the man, he can best be evaluated by the Senators with whom he served for so many years. In that connection, Henry Cabot Lodge said: "I doubt very much if we ever had a Senator who knew our relations with other countries both past and present and the political conditions of foreign nations so thoroughly as Senator Morgan."

FOREIGN AFFAIRS SPECIALIST

That same opinion was expressed by Senator Burton of Ohio, who said: "As regards the problem of our foreign policy, he had a grasp of the conditions in different countries and of our own proper relations with them, which has rarely, if ever, been surpassed in the history of the Government."

Chauncey Depew said that "Senator Morgan was in the front ranks of the statesmen of the Republic. His great ability, vast acquirements, profound erudition, indomitable industry, self-sacrificing devotion to the public welfare and rare eloquence have placed him in a niche of the temple of American fame."

So impelling was Morgan's advocacy of the Nicaraguan route, as opposed to Panama, that there is considerable sentiment today for another sea level canal by way of Lake Nicaragua.

The late Walter E. Edge, Senator from New Jersey, and U.S. Ambassador to France, made the statement that "we might as well have only one battleship on the high seas as a single canal. For sink that one ship and we would be lost, as we would be also if a single canal were destroyed."

OTHER NOTED ALABAMIANS

However, had the Nicaraguan route been selected originally, it might have been that Alabama and the United States would never have had a Gorgas and a Gen. Robert E. Noble, who was the right-hand man of Gorgas up until the time of his death. It well has been said that the cleanup of the miasmic conditions that prevailed around the old Panama site where they wrought were as challenging as was the engineering genius of Goethals and Sibert, the latter also of Alabama, and having been designated by Pershing as the engineering genuis of Panama.

It has been further said of their achievements that neither would they have had to level mountains, obliterate mosquito manifestations, sliding mud and other handicaps which one authority has likened to "a victory as great as Valley Forge, Gettysburg, Belleau Woods or Guadalcanal."

ROOSEVELT VERSUS COLOMBIA

Neither would it have been necessary for President Roosevelt to summon the entire American fleet to Panamanian waters in order to impose a reasonable concession from the Colombian Government.

We even today can appreciate the great concept of Morgan by reason of the fact that we are greatly dependent upon the people of Latin America for many of the material necessities that we have exhausted in supporting our allies and ourselves at once in two World Wars.

Be all this as it may, however, it was the character of Morgan that counted for most. Often many of a younger generation came to appreciate that fact when the old gentleman came back to Anniston, Ala., nearly every summer to enjoy a cooler climate at the old Anniston Inn, which had been designed by Stanford White.

There he renewed his acquaintanceship with many old friends of Calhoun County and many who made regular pilgrimages to his quarters each year through the ages. And while it may be trite, it still is true that "the lives of great men all remind us that we may make our lives sublime and departing leave behind us footprints on the sands of time."

Or, to quote Senator Nelson, of Minnesota, "When he passed away he was one of the great patriarchs of this body who had helped to bring us back into the promised land of a reunited country, one in heart, in spirit, and in aspirations, a country that we all love, that we live for, and are ready to die for."

Bridgeport Union Supports Bill To Save Jobs of Workers When Plants Move

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK KOWALSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have submitted a bill, H.R. 12895, to protect the rights of workers when a business moves to a new location.

Under my bill, an employer who moves his operations to a new location must offer employment at the new location to old employees who are willing, able and qualified and for whom work is available.

My bill has won the endorsement of UE Local 237, in Bridgeport, Conn. Also, according to an article in the nationally circulated UE News, the union is working to win other support for this legislation.

Under unanimous consent, I present the text to the article from the UE News:

REPRESENTATIVE KOWALSKI INTRODUCES BILL: WOULD GIVE RIGHT TO MOVE WITH THE JOB

(By Charles R. Allen, Jr.)

BRIDGEPORT, CONN.—What may well prove an historic development emerged here recently as a result of the fight that the members of UE Local 237 of the Columbia Record Co. have been waging against this multimillion-dollar corporation's abandonment of the Bridgeport community.

In the struggle to save as many jobs as possible in the face of the Columbia Record Co.'s plans to move its plant operations to Pitman, N.J., the UE sought out support from numerous prolabor sources.

U.S. Congressman at Large FRANK KOWALSKI of Connecticut personally conducted his own thorough examination of the Columbia Record Co.'s action. His sympathy shortly was matched by action when he introduced a bill into the U.S. House of Representatives which would make it an unfair labor charge if an employer denied a worker the right to move with his job to the new plant location.

No utopian panacea to the grave problems caused by run-away plants, Congressman KOWALSKI's bill is based solidly so that the U.S. Congress will be forced to consider it seriously.

A MAJOR PROBLEM

In placing his right to move with the job bill into the congressional hopper, Congressman KOWALSKI said that "the problem of plant transfers has been a major cause for industrial dislocation throughout the Nation. The least that can be done is to give the individual worker an opportunity to move with his or her job if they so choose."

ONE HUNDRED ASK FOR RIGHT TO MOVE

In a survey of some 750 UE members at Columbia Record Co., the union learned that more than 100 workers asked to exercise this right.

In interviews with Bridgeport newspapers and radios, several UE members pointed out that runaway plants were no respecters of jobs or unions.

Said one UE worker:

"A plant can run away at any time in any plant no matter what the plant makes and no matter what union is involved.

"I CREATED THE JOB

"The job that I work on is a job which I have created with my own labor, muscles and brains. You can't separate the worker from the job. Without the worker, there wouldn't be the job in the first place. Without labor, there would be no production.

"Since I have put my labor power and brains into the job, then I should have every right to continue to make my living from that job. And that means if I wish to do so I should have the first chance to move with the job if the company moves the plant.

"As a result of our experience with the Columbia Record Co.," he said, "I hope that the trade union movement will see to it that the right to move with your job is written into all contracts as protection against these run-away companies."

The Kowalski bill in Congress will play an important part in UE's continuing fight to salvage as many jobs as possible from the Columbia Record Co.

ASK BACKING FOR KOWALSKI

UE Local 237 at a recent membership meeting resolved "to contact all labor unions in the State of Connecticut in order to urge them to support Congressman KOWALSKI's reelection to Congress so that the Kowalski bill providing the right to move with the job may be assured passage."

Congressman FRANK KOWALSKI's bill was given statewide publicity throughout Connecticut when he introduced the measure. All UE locals in Connecticut then promptly followed up this widespread reception in the press, radio and TV by announcing their support of this unique step which would advance the workers' fight everywhere against run-away plants.

Topping the list of political action for UE in Connecticut will be a heavy fall campaign on behalf of Congressman FRANK KOWALSKI and his proposal which would make it a law of the land that a worker has the right to move with his job.

Abuse of Irish Names

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial of interest to the Americans of Irish origin, which appeared in the National Hibernian Digest for July–August 1960:

ABUSE OF IRISH NAMES

(By James J. Comerford)

Summertime with its heat waves, vacation days, and reduced time for organization meetings makes one forget the slurs, the jibes, the caricatures, the ridicule which Americans of Irish ancestry had to endure last winter in the greeting-card field, as well as in the field of screen, radio, and TV. We are speaking of the winter of 1959–60. And for good measure, we can also add the 1957–58 winter.

One does not have to look back into the old days, in order to find instances where defamation and slander have been used against Americans of Irish ancestry. Any observer will easily recall that within the last 2 years, since the last national convention, over 1,000 instances have appeared on TV screens in which Irish names were slandered and in which the Irish as a race were held up to contempt and ridicule. Of course, they got an assist now and then from a slob with an Irish name. The movies and the radio also depicted through their own medium on innumerable times, characters and situations which hurled vicious insults at the American of Irish heritage. No one, we are sure, has forgotten the incident around last St. Patrick's Day of the despicable greeting cards.

Does this happen to Americans of other racial origins? You can bet your boots it does not. For if and when it does, the many and varied "antidefamation committees," and "vigilance committees," go to work and bombard the sponsors, the promoters, the "financial angels" who pay for the cost of the shows, the producers, the editors, with dynamic and hard-hitting protests. With and through these committees, they refuse to buy their advertised merchandise, thereby hitting them in the financial pocketbook where it is felt the hardest.

Members ought to recall the words: "I will not countenance by my presence or support any performance that may reasonably be interpreted as caricaturing or debasing the Irish people, whether in public or in private, in song, recitation, or story on the stage or on the screen."

Constant vigilance by AOH members is required. The Irish are traditionally known for their inherent sense of humor and for their ability to tell and make jokes at their own expense. However, this characteristic, no matter how well it is recognized as a special Irish trait, does not grant a license for sellers of merchandise using TV advertising as a matter of business policy to publicly lampoon and brazenly insult the Irish race.

An individual, bearing a historic Irish name, may feel awfully upset on hearing these insults and jibes. Not being a member of an organization, his little protest registers zero. All his fume and fury create an impression no larger than a pin hole in the side of a mountain. Thousands of others, like him, who are unorganized may in the capacity of individuals also protest in rage. But their voices, being only that of individuals, are no more heeded than raindrops falling on ocean waves.

In preserving the pride of race and in protecting the reputation of race, the organized Irish Americans must talk not only for themselves but also for their unorganized fellow clansmen. The experience of people for thousands of years show that this is the rule of life.

Let us, the organized, talk up as we did about some of last St. Patrick's Day greeting cards. We shall be heard. Collective thinking and collective acting are the instruments that modern man yet has at his command in the lands that are still governed by democracy.

When our race is insulted, particularly by those who develop such insults into salespitches for selling their merchandise, let the AOH hit hard with protests. Remember, that bank accounts and pocketbooks of the vendors are always vulnerable targets.

Americans of national origins which are not Irish have stopped the peddling of insults directed against their people. Eventually the Irish will. But why not soon?

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

Senator Thomas J. Dodd Receives Distinguished Award Medal From Knights of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday evening, August 21, 1960, it was my privilege and pleasure to attend the dinner, in my home city of Worcester, Mass., marking the closing session of the 47th Annual Convention of the Knights of Lithuania.

The outstanding feature of this dinner was the official conferring of this great organization's Distinguished Award Medal upon our former House colleague and present junior Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD. The medal is annually given to the non-Lithuanian who has done most to advance the freedom of Lithuania.

The Most Reverend Bernard J. Flanagan, D.D., present bishop of Worcester, and former head of the diocese of Norwich, Conn., Senator DODD's birthplace, characterized the Senator as "a friend of freedom, a man who has spoken eloquently for captive peoples—and a man who has not let us forget our obligations toward them."

The Reverend John C. Jutt of St. Casimirs Church, convention honorary chairman, in his remarks, also praised Senator DODD for "his tireless efforts and dedication, which have given Lithuanians courage never to give up in the fight for freedom."

It was indeed another memorable event in the long, patriotic history of the Knights of Lithuania and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am pleased to include, at this point, the inspiring acceptance award address delivered by Senator DODD. His speech follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD BEFORE KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA CONVENTION IN WORCESTER, AUGUST 21, 1960

Bishop Flanagan, Mayor O'Brien, Father Jutt, distinguished guests, friends, I am moved and deeply honored by the award you have bestowed upon me. But when I ask myself, What have I done to deserve this award? I am, very frankly, troubled.

Somehow it seems to me that it would be more appropriate if I, as an American were here to present an award to a representative of the Lithuanian people. For no people in the world has fought more heroically for freedom, or suffered more cruelly under tyranny, or clung more tenaciously to their national identity, their cultural and spiritual heritage, their faith in the ultimate triumph of freedom.

This great nation, this nation of heroes and martyrs, has, in its suffering, become a symbol for freemen everywhere.

On the one hand, the agony of your people serves as a constant reminder to us of the ignorance and cynicism and lack of foresight and courage that resulted in the abandonment of the captive peoples of Europe at the close of World War II.

On the other hand, by their obstinate refusal to reconcile themselves to tyranny, either under the Czars or under the Bolsheviks, the Lithuanian people have inspired all of us to fight harder and work harder for the eternal cause of freedom.

If I have sometimes spoken up on behalf of the Lithuanian people and the other captive peoples of Europe, if I have sometimes urged the we seek after more effective ways of promoting their liberation, I take no special credit for this. To me it has been a simple matter of conscience. I would have been delinquent had I done less. And so it seems to me that, instead of receiving an award from you, it is I who should be presenting an award—an award for exemplary courage and spiritual fortitude—either to some living Lithuanian patriot or to the unknown soldier of the Lithuanian resistance movement.

America has every reason to be proud of its citizens of Lithuanian extraction—and you have every reason to be proud of your ancestry.

The history of the Lithuanian people, as I have read it, is an epic story of heroism and suffering and man's unquenchable will to assert his God-given human rights. It is a story to be told again and again, for freemen everywhere have much to learn from it.

I believe the story of Lithuania should be told for another reason. Better than any story I know, it illustrates the nature of the enemy we now confront. It teaches us how much trust can be placed in treaties with the Kremlin, in its pledges of coexistence, in its off-and-on pretenses of friendship. It teaches us how inhuman international bolshevism is, how utterly without morality or restraint.

When the Lithuanian people, at the close of World War I established their own Government and proclaimed their independence, the Bolsheviks invaded the newly established state. There were many bitter battles but finally the Lithuanian people emerged triumphant. On July 19, 1920, the Soviet Government signed a treaty of peace. It declared in this treaty—mark these words well—that it "voluntarily and forever renounces all sovereign rights possessed by Russia over the Lithuanian people and their territory."

For 20 years Lithuania knew peace and independence. During this period, there was a great renaissance of their nation literature and culture.

But then came the Hitler-Stalin pact and the partition of Poland between Germany and the Soviet Union. Almost immediately the Kremlin demanded permission to place 20,000 troops in Lithuania for the duration of the war. These troops, it was emphasized, would be removed at the end of the war. Prime Minister Stalin himself stated—and again mark these words well—"We respect the independence of the Lithuanian State. We are disposed to defend its territorial integrity."

History records no blacker or more perfidious lie by the head of a great state.

On October 10, 1939, only 2 weeks after the original demand was served on Lithuania, the Soviet Union concentrated its armed forces on the Lithuanian frontier. The Government of this brave little nation had no alternative but to sign the pact of mutual assistance which the Kremlin placed before it. But at the point of signing, they discovered that the clause stipulating that Soviet bases would be maintained in Lithuania only for the duration of the war had been stricken from the agreement, on the personal instruction of Stalin.

This was only the beginning of the perfidy. Eight months later, on June 14, 1940, the Soviet Government demanded that the Lithuanian Minister of the Interior and Director of Security be brought to trial, that a government friendly to the Soviet Union be installed and that the Red army be granted free entry in force into the territory of Lithuania. There was not even time to reply to this ultimatum. The very next day, on June 15, the Red army occupied Lithuania and the Government was compelled to flee abroad.

The Communists had made their plans carefully, as they always do, and they moved rapidly. They had a quisling regime ready to install. They had their lists of names of Lithuanian patriots who were slated for arrest and execution. They had their plan of action.

On July 7, 3 weeks after the occupation, the quisling regime ordered the liquidation of all non-Communist parties and the arrest of their leaders. On July 14 and 15, the people were compelled to vote in national elections with only the Communist Party represented. The Lithuanian people resisted heroically, desperately. But they were fighting against hopeless odds. On July 17, the regime announced that 95.1 percent of the people had voted and that 99.19 percent of these had cast their ballot for the Communist Party.

Two days later, on July 21, the so-called People's Diet convened for its first session. In less than 1 hour, without any debate, it voted unanimously to ask the supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. to admit Lithuania into the Soviet state as one of its federated Soviet Socialist Republics.

What an object lesson this should be to all those who insist that we must be trustful, who wish to believe that the world's difficulties can be resolved by signing another treaty of nonaggression and coexistence with the Kremlin, who think that we can somehow improve relations by signing treaties on Antarctica or on outer space or on Berlin.

I know there are those who will say, "But the events you relate took place in Stalin's day. Today we have a new regime, a regime that is less brutal, less immoral." How they can argue this in the face of everything that has happened in the captive nations, in the face of the brutal suppression of the Hungarian revolution, in the face of Khrushchev's ultimatums and threats of nuclear war—how they can still pretend that there has been some basic change for the good in Soviet policy, I cannot understand.

Let me point to one simple fact. The man directly responsible for the occupation of Lithuania under Stalin was Gen. Ivan Serov. It was he who installed the quisling government, who directed the mass arrests of Lithuanian patriots, who was responsible for the brutal deportations of scores and hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians to the oblivion of the Soviet slave labor camps.

It was the same Gen. Ivan Serov who was responsible for the inhuman suppression of the Hungarian revolution, the perfidious

arrest of General Maleter while he was negotiating under flag of truce, the mass deportations of Hungarians which took place after the Soviet occupation.

In short, the only thing that has changed in the Soviet slave empire is that Khrushchev has succeeded Stalin. There is the same total inhumanity, the same total perfidy, even the same General Serov. Let me correct myself. There has been another small change. General Serov has been promoted. He is now the head of the Soviet secret police.

The despots of the Kremlin may be efficient, but, like all tyrants, they have a blind spot. They believe that, with enough oppression, they can ultimately destroy the human will to freedom. How wrong they are. The Hungarian revolution and the continuing resistance of the Lithuanian people and of the other peoples of the captive nations prove once again that neither 1 generation nor 2 generations nor 10 generations of brainwashing can produce a breed of men that is willing to accept the denial of the God-given human rights as natural and proper.

The word "liberation" has been somewhat compromised because in the 1952 campaign it was used as a crude election slogan. It is however a good word, a word for which there is no substitute. Instead of abandoning the word, as some have proposed, we must redeem it and give it meaning.

To use it again as an electioneering slogan or simply to pay lip service to it would—I agree completely—be the height of irresponsibility. If we use the word again—and I wholeheartedly urge that we do—we must do so as a serious act of self-dedication, and we must spell out precisely what we mean. "Liberation" does not mean that we confront the Soviets with an ultimatum and launch a war if they object to it. Basically, liberation will have to come from within. But what we say and what we do can encourage or discourage the spirit of liberation—while our behavior at critical moments like the Hungarian revolution can be of decisive importance.

How should we go about encouraging the liberation movement? The first step, in my opinion, would be to demonstrate the earnestness of our concern by raising the issue of the captive nations at every diplomatic conference and at every U.N. session.

In enslaving the captive nations, the Soviets were guilty of violating a whole series of international agreements that guaranteed free election. In imposing their regimes and maintaining them in power, they have used the Soviet Army in the most flagrant manner as an instrument of political intimidations; and when intimidations failed in Germany and in Hungary in recent years, they resorted to open military intervention and repression. They have violated the U.N. Charter repeatedly and at almost every point.

Let us spread the facts about Soviet imperialism on the record at every available opportunity. Let us continue to demand that the Soviets respect all their obligations.

Above all let us make liberation a cardinal goal of our diplomacy. I do not underestimate the difficulty of persuading the Kremlin to liberate its satellite empire. But, after Hungary, I find it easy to conceive of a situation where a combination of division within the Kremlin, unrest in the satellites and hard bargaining on the part of the West will induce the Soviets—in their own interest—to grant freedom to the unyielding, troublesome captive peoples of Europe.

Liberation is not a pipedream. It is the only conceivable way in which we can recapture the political offensive. And, as every schoolboy knows, a side which defends itself when attacked but never takes the offensive, is bound to lose. The same is true in politics.

A point in history has been reached where men who are free must come to the aid of those who seek to be free, because if they do not, the chances are that they will lose their own freedom.

Mr. Chairman, in accepting this award, I salute the brave people of Lithuania. I promise you that I shall continue to speak about the captive nations and the issue of liberation at every appropriate opportunity.

And I venture to prophesy that, before I am too old to travel, I will some day have the great pleasure of visiting a free Lithuania—of visiting your ancient capital of Vilnius, which I have so often wanted to see, and of drinking a toast to freedom and to enduring friendship between the Lithuanian and American nations there, with some of my friends in this audience.

Pennsylvania Sheriffs Association Annual Convention Banquet Held at Altoona, Pa., July 21, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, my hometown of Altoona, Pa., was the scene of the 1960 convention of the Pennsylvania Sheriffs Association which was highlighted by the annual banquet held on Thursday, July 21 at 6:30 p.m., at the Penn-Alto Hotel. It was my pleasure to deliver the principal address of the evening at which time I spoke on "The Nature of the Communist Threat to America."

Blair County Sheriff V. Paul Reed proved to be a fine host to his fellow sheriffs of the Keystone State who in turn expressed their regard and esteem by electing him second vice president of the Pennsylvania Sheriffs Association. Sheriff Reed was the only newly elected officer and in line with the traditional policy, he is slated to become president of the association in 1962.

The 1960 convention was voted as one of the finest in the history of the Pennsylvania Sheriffs Association with the convention banquet providing a fitting climax to the annual convention proceedings.

My address on the occasion follows:

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE ANNUAL STATE CONVENTION OF THE PENNYLVANIA SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION, HOTEL PENN-ALTO, ALTOONA, PA., JULY 21, 1960

It is a real pleasure to address this sheriffs' convention.

As we all know enormous problems beset our country and the world. One of these problems is communism, and I want to talk to you about it.

Certainly, you law enforcement officers, of all people, need not be reminded of the great dangers to our Nation and the free world that are inherent in the Communist threat.

The first page of every daily newspaper throughout the Nation carries a headline or byline—

(a) reporting a Soviet thrust in this quarter or that quarter of the globe.

(b) repeating another boast by Khrushchev about surpassing the United States militarily and economically.

(c) or disclosing the details of another Communist Chinese attack on Tibet, the Indian border, or Formosa.

Most of us are consciously aware of this ominous threat.

What we are not fully aware of, however, is the overall Soviet outlook on the world as it relates to us and the problems it presents to us.

We are not all fully conscious of the political problem and the moral problem that exists in the Soviet concept of a divided world.

There can be no mistake about the fact that theoretically the Soviets view the world as a divided world. In the Soviet mind, ours is the capitalist world; and theirs is the Communist world. Both are "camps," to use the Soviet terminology. Indeed it would be more accurate to say that both are "military camps" in the sense that the Soviets view this historic build-up of power in the same light as a military campaign.

Both "camps" or worlds are to the Soviets distinctly opposite in philosophic orientation, political behavior, and ultimate goals.

The Soviets claim further that as a matter of doctrinal truth both worlds are engaged in disputes at every level of human existence and as a result they are unavoidably engaged in a gigantic struggle for survival.

The Soviets claim that the struggle is a continuing one which will go on until either capitalism or communism triumphs.

Lenin, the founder of the Soviet state and world communism, put it in these terms, "who whom," or in other words, "who will conquer whom."

On another occasion Lenin described the contest for survival in this highly dramatic and imaginative way: "As long as capitalism and socialism (that is, communism) remained, we cannot live in peace.

"In the end one or the other will triumph—a funeral requiem will be sung either over the Soviet Republic or over world capitalism."

However, neither Lenin, Stalin, nor their successor, Khrushchev, doubted that communism would emerge triumphant and in Khrushchev's words, would "bury" us.

Thus, the Soviets are committed to a line of action that seeks not only to destroy the American way of life.

But it goes further because the Soviets are determined to transform the entire world in the Soviet image.

Regarding force and power as political weapons to be used ruthlessly in achieving this end, the Soviets press ever forward.

They seek advantages here and there, probing for soft spots in the defenses of the free world.

Furthermore, they aggressively assert their power through outright territorial conquests or through their fifth column operations within the world Communist movement.

So much for the Soviet world outlook.

On the other hand, what about the United States and the outlook of its people and leaders? We, Americans, have a completely different outlook on the world.

First of all, we, along with our allies, are trying to preserve the prevailing world political structure which we regard generally as the most acceptable structure for insuring freedom and democracy. For us, it is a simple fact of survival.

This does not mean that we are blindly attached to a type of status quo that preaches the ill-fated doctrine of keeping things as they are. We are, and always should be, sensitive to the winds of political change throughout the world.

We admit the necessity of political change not only in our own domestic politics but in world politics in general.

What we seek to preserve is the procedure of free government through which orderly transfer of political power can take place in a genuine spirit of liberty and justice.

Unlike the Soviets, we are not committed to the planned destruction of world societies. In a spirit of tolerance, we seek rather to assist the peoples of the world, wherever possible, to achieve a higher state of human liberty through the institution which is most likely to succeed in acoomplishing this goal, a government of free people.

In addition, we are committed by heritage and national tradition to the belief that differences among nations—as those among individuals—can be resolved through the exercise of reason and good will.

Differences between us and the Soviets, as with any other nation, we would say, are not beyond solution, but rather are adjustable. So it is then that we Americans and the Soviets do have radically different conceptions of the world around us.

We have different national purposes and different national goals. We are both guided by wholly different philosophies of life. But the political problems inherent in this divided and contrasting view of the world has still another particular manifestation.

We could call it the problem of a divided morality. The Soviets operate within a very restricted framework of morality which is radically at variance with our own conceptions. The Soviet moral conscience is colored totally by the dogmatic belief that whatever is good for the advancement of communism is morally right. In addition the Soviets believe whatever deters or opposes communism is morally evil.

Lenin spelled out this belief in answer to the question, "Is there such a thing as Communist morality?" He said: "Of course there is."

He continued, by saying: "It is frequently asserted that we have no ethics, and that * * * Communists deny all morality. * * * We say that our morality is wholly subordinated to the interests of the class struggle. We deduce our morality from the facts and needs of the class struggle. * * * At the basis of Communist morality lies the struggle for strengthening and completing communism."

Finally Lenin said: "For us morality is subordinated to the interests of the class struggle."

Ladies and gentlemen, these standards of morality and ethics conceived in these narrowly restricted terms permit the Soviets and their Communist allies great versatility in political action. Communists can and do operate completely unimpeded by codes of ethical conduct that are normally accepted in world society as morally correct. They can disregard morality, as we conceive it, and assert that to act otherwise would be to them "immoral."

This is a peculiar type of logic I know; but nonetheless this is the foundation of Communist morality. This is the way they, Soviets, think of good and evil.

What this means in concrete terms is that the Soviets are able to profess the principles of peaceful coexistence which explicitly stipulates noninterference in the internal affairs of other states.

Yet, at the same time they carry on subversive activities—on a mass scale—to destroy those states and expand Soviet power.

By the same perverted moral justification, a treaty is to be complied with only so long as it serves Soviet purposes. When its usefulness has been served, then it can be broken.

To you law-enforcement officers this problem of a divided morality has a special meaning.

For the Soviets, law that is formulated by a free capitalistic republic such as ours is not necessarily morally binding on Communists.

Only Communist law, as such, has the real force of moral compulsion in Soviet terms and thus must be obeyed. Non-Communist laws, as all other institutions, are looked upon by the Communists as instruments of what they call capitalist exploitation. As such, they are to be tolerated where no other course is possible until they can be destroyed.

At this point let me quote again Lenin's words on how the Communists are to use legislatures and parliaments, the very heart of free government, as devices to further Communist ends.

Lenin said: "No parliament can in any circumstances be for Communists an arena of struggle for reforms for betterment of the situation of the working class. The only question can be that of utilizing state institutions for their destruction."

Ladies and gentlemen, we don't have to look back very far in recent history to find excellent examples that illustrate the moral level upon which Communists function to accomplish their goals.

You may be interested to know that one of the first areas for penetration and seizure prior to a takeover in Communist tactical procedure is the organization for maintaining law and order.

Throughout Eastern Europe at the end of the war the Communists uniformly took over the functions of the interior ministry which in those countries controlled the national police.

In Czechoslovakia, the democratic opposition was paralyzed when the Communists asserted their power in February 1948 mainly because the police power had been successfully communized.

In Hungary, the Communist police were able to reduce the democratic opposition through terror, intrigue, and torture and thus establish uncontestable Communist control over every facet of national life.

It is significant that the notorious Hungarian secret police who were communized were the first victims of the Freedom Fighters in the revolution of 1956.

Similar patterns of communist control are seen in other countries that were conquered by Soviet Russia. And, there can be little doubt that the Communist supporters of Fidel Castro, following the Communist example elsewhere, have already conspired to assume total control over Cuba's police authority. With this weapon of manipulation and control in the hands of a dictator, the Cuban people will be hard pressed to stage a resistance movement against Castro's excesses.

The Communist aim in a period of takeover, as the East European experience indicates, is to win control over police authority within the nation and thereafter to impose their own system of law and order. But it is significant that one of the primary tactics of the Communists in doing this is to encourage and create civil disobedience. With the ultimate objective of destroying all civil law and order, the Communists seize upon any occasion that can be used to undermine the authority of established police power and destroy the laws it seeks to uphold and enforce.

Only very recently we had a dramatic, and I might add, lamentable, experience of seeing this tactic in operation. I am speaking, of course, of Japan and the recent riots there against the Japanese-American Security Treaty. We know now that a widespread feeling of neutralism existed in many quarters of Japanese political life which are not Communist. But, the Japanese Communists, aided financially by the Soviet Union, were able to exploit these deep-seated emotions of the Japanese populace and direct the vast energies generated as a consequence into a massive and prolonged demonstration of civil disobedience.

Surely, therefore, if there ever was a first line of defense in any nation against Communist internal subversion it is the law enforcement officers. They are in a sense the weapon and the shield of the law. They supply the inner structural discipline within the state that permits law and order to prevail.

The last 15 years' experience of Soviet Communist activity throughout the world bears out the truth of this generalization.

Ladies and gentlemen, great problems face us today and in the future that arise from the threat of world communism.

In many respects the 1960's are the beginning of a new era in American history. It is the beginning of a new revolutionary era in which we must face up to enormous problems. These problems have in part domestic and international implications.

The domestic implications are the following:

(a) The need to speed up our economic growth.

(b) Expansion of American educational facilities.

(c) Fulfilling the social needs of the Nation.

(d) And particularly the urgency of harnessing the enormous material resources of our Nation in the continuing struggle for survival against world communism.

The problems facing us have also international implications which are focused entirely on our conquest with Soviet powers.

Briefly, they are:

First the necessity of reformulating a policy for Western Europe that recognizes the emergence of our allies to a new status of economic and political independence.

Secondly there is the urgency in adjusting our policy requirements to meet the demands of the emerging new states of Asia and Africa.

And finally the need to recast our strategic thinking, taking into account the rising tide of neutralism in Asia and Africa and the development of intercontinental mass destruction weapons.

Ladies and gentlemen as I conclude my remarks let none of us underrate the great dimensions of the challenge of the 1960's.

As our forebears before us, let us extend ourselves and meet this challenge. Frankly our survival depends on it.

Chelsea, Mass., Commends Government on 25th Anniversary of Social Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a resolution adopted by the city of Chelsea, Mass., on August 15, 1960:

Whereas United States has had a quarter century under social security setup; and

Whereas during this period it has paid out more than $10 billion in benefits a year; and

Whereas in Suffolk County alone, more than 777,000 men, women, and children are paid approximately $61 million a year and nationally more than 14 million persons are receiving monthly old-age, survivors, and disability insurance checks; and

Whereas these benefits for elderly citizens allow them to enjoy their elderly age with financial aid and benefits which they ordinarily would not receive: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city government congratulate Congress for this act which was passed during the administration of our late beloved President Franklin Delano Roosevelt with the hope that more benefits will be allowed and improvements made to allow workers 60 years of age and over to continue to enjoy their elderly age; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, our Senators and Congressmen, the Speaker of the House, and the President of the Senate.

JOSEPH B. GREENFIELD,
Alderman.

Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to my bill, H.R. 870, to abolish the death penalty, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Prof. Richard C. Donnelly, professor of law, Yale Law School, and retired member of the Connecticut Board of Parole:

CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

(By Richard C. Donnelly, professor of law, Yale Law School; retired member of the Connecticut Board of Parole)

The massive literature of capital punishment—commencing with Beccaria's influential essay "On Crimes and Punishment" published in 1764—presents special difficulties and frustrations. It is a curious fact that the main arguments against the death penalty have remained remarkably unchanged since the beginning of the debate. First of all, the arguments have been and are usually of a utilitarian character: capital punishment does not deter crime and its consequences are detrimental to social welfare. Secondly, and usually of much greater importance in accounting for the zeal of the advocacy, are allegations based on conceptions of moral value and humanitarian sentiment. These allegations, despite their priority, are rarely stated fully or precisely. To do so, while presumably not impossible, is difficult. They do not necessarily depend, for example, on an absolutist value of human life nor on a Tolstoian doctrine of nonviolence. There is also another attitude sometimes complicating analysis which, while not unrelated to the moral repugnance induced in many by the death penalty, is nevertheless distinct. This attitude is based on assumptions as to the nature of human behavior that create dissatisfaction and uneasiness with the whole concept of criminal responsibility and, indeed of moral responsibility. All of these factors, in large measure unanalyzed and unarticulated, bedevil communication and clear understanding.

It is probably safe to say that the crucial proposition in the abolitionist's case is that the death penalty is no more effective as a deterrent than other non-lethal sanctions. There is, of course, nothing in logic that requires this assertion to constitute the kingpin of an abolitionist position. Indeed, it would seem more logical to place the burden upon the advocates of the death penalty to establish that it does deter and is absolutely necessary for the protection of society. However, those who favor capital punishment have not accepted responsibility for demonstrating that the state kills only because of necessity and that there is no other means of societal protection. Their position appears to be that the existence of the law requires no justification and that its effectiveness may be assumed. It is for those who would change it to prove the desirability of doing so. Nevertheless, all realistic persons recognize that if the abolition movement is to be an effective political force, the nondeterrence point must be persuasively made.

It is a point of very real difficulty. This is true because we know virtually nothing about the deterrent effects of legal sanctions in general. We are ignorant, not only because investigation of the problem presents formidable difficulties, but because, apart from studies made as contributions to the death penalty debate, serious empirical investigation has rarely been undertaken. This is in itself a remarkable fact since, rightly or wrongfully, most criminal statutes become law on the assumption that their enactment and enforcement will eliminate or minimize the conduct for which sanctions are provided.

However, the practical necessities of recruiting popular support for the abolition movement have motivated the production of numerous studies designed to test the deterrent consequences of the death penalty. Although the studies employ several different modes of approach, they arrive at the common finding that, at most, no significant relation can be detected between the presence of the death penalty and the incidence of capital crime.

Putting aside studies of such relevant matters as the significance of mental disorder in the commission of capital offenses, these statistical inquiries tend to fall into one of several common types, the most characteristic of which are probably these: (1) studies of capital-crime rates in a particular country or American State before and after abolition of the death penalty; (2) comparative statistics on the incidence of murder in jurisdictions where capital punishment has been retained and those in which it has been abolished; and, less frequently encountered; (3) broader studies of general crime rates in abolition and death penalty jurisdictions. The abolition position, it seems to me, would be strengthened if it were frankly recognized that such inquiries rarely approach any minimum standards of decent scientific rigor. It is true that many public policy decisions are based on far less knowledge than these studies supply as to the probable deterrent effects of the death penalty. But the fallibility of such statistical inquiries is obvious, and it is important to be aware of what we do not know. In the first place, most of these studies require accurate statistics on the numbers of capital offenses actually committed. This presupposes a system of crime reporting that is both accurate and in such form as to make the information available. The fact is that, particularly in the United States, these conditions simply do not obtain. But even if this basic data were readily accessible, other difficulties would emerge. Suppose, for example, it is shown that in State X, murder rates declined in the 10-year period after abolition. Having learned this, what do we know? Simply that abolition did not prevent a decline. Whether there is a causal connection between the two occurrences, whether the crime rates would have been the same, higher or lower had the death penalty been retained, are questions that quite apparently remain unanswered. Comparisons of jurisdictions in which general economic and cultural factors are similar and where some have and some have not abolished capital punishment are afflicted by similar infirmities. These comparative studies, however, even if they do not succeed in measuring the actual consequences of the death penalty, at least strongly suggest that capital punishment as a factor in the incidence of crime is a matter of comparative insignificance. Now, all of this is not to assert that we can derive no useful inferences from the studies. We may say, first, that if additional deterrence results from the death penalty, it is not of enough importance to reveal itself through the rather crude measures afforded by these studies. Again, if the abolitionists fail to show that the death penalty does not deter, no one else has shown that it does.

There is another aspect of the deterrence argument that deserves attention. No reason occurs why one advancing the abolitionist position must assume, almost as an article of faith, that execution of the death penalty can, under no conceivable circumstances, be expected to enhance the deterrent effects of the criminal law. Rather, the crucial question would seem to be whether one can sensibly anticipate such a consequence, given the circumstances that actually surround the administration of criminal justice. Surely, realization of the deterrent potential of capital punishment, if it actually exists, requires that certain minimum conditions be satisfied. These include, at a minimum, reasonable certainty in the detection and apprehension of offenders, reasonable speed and certainty of conviction, and reasonable speed and certainty in the execution of the death sentence once it is imposed. The incontrovertible fact is that in the United States not one of these conditions is fulfilled today nor is likely to be in the years ahead. No one knows how many capital offenses are actually committed each year in this country. There are probably few believers in capital punishment who would consider it either just or desirable to put all murderers to death. It is because in practice we do not find the penalty of death appropriate that we execute for murder in the United States fewer than 50 persons a year—surely a trivial fraction of the cases in which it might legally be imposed. Our hesitancy and bad conscience in carrying out a sentence of death must largely nullify any exemplary benefits that could conceivably be gained. Perhaps it is sufficient to say that in the United States capital punishment should be opposed on the same grounds that induce one to reject any other futile and foolish course of action.

There are other considerations bearing on the death penalty debate that should be mentioned. It would require more faith than most could muster to assume that, when so few who commit capital offenses are actually executed, selection of offenders for the death penalty proceeds on anything approaching a rational basis. An examination of the cases of those who are executed would show, I am sure, that they are not more deserving of execution or more dangerous than those we do not kill; in fact, the most dangerous are likely to be the legally insane whom we do not execute and the few hired killers—those, perhaps, most deserving of punishment—who are rarely convicted and who are most likely to be killed by their competitors. Pure caprice must play a large part. Even more disturbing is the suspicion that selection is made on the basis of unacceptable criteria, such as, the race or poverty of the defendant, the status of the victim, and the like. In other words, capital punishment is the most difficult of sanctions to administer with even rough equality. Yet, most dramatically when life is at stake, equality is, as it is generally felt to be, a most important element of justice.

Apart from these considerations the possible imposition of the death penalty in a criminal trial has a discernible and baneful effect on the administration of criminal justice. A trial where life is at issue becomes inevitably a morbid and sensational affair. Mr. Justice Frankfurter, in his appearance as a witness before the British Royal Com-

mission on Capital Punishment, put it this way:

"When life is at hazard in a trial, it sensationalizes the whole thing almost unwittingly; the effect on juries, the bar, the public, the judiciary, I regard as very bad. I think scientifically the claim of deterrence is not worth much. Whatever proof there may be in my judgment does not outweigh the social loss due to the inherent sensationalism of a trial for life."

The special sentiment associated with judgment of death is reflected in another way in the courts. It lends added weight to claims of error in the trial and multiplies and protracts the appellate processes, including postconviction remedies developed during recent years. In this regard, one needs only to recall the case of Chessman, who from June 1948 until May 2, 1960, successfully resisted the execution of his sentence. Nor is this situation peculiar to California. These delays, this sense of shame in administering the death penalty, must be symptomatic of a widespread distrust of what we are doing.

There is still another point, namely, the effects of the death penalty on the staff of penal institutions where executions occur. The accepted objective of any modern correctional system is the rehabilitation and reformation of offenders. Any hopes for a more rational penology must rest ultimately upon the development of a professional group committed to correctional work as a career. Progress toward this objective has not been impressive. I suspect the presence of the death penalty is a significant source of difficulty. And I imagine that an enlightened warden finds an execution almost as contrary to his professional standards and duties as would a physician executioner. It has, in fact, been suggested that capital punishment by injection would be simpler, swifter, less mutilating, and less painful than any other method. This proposal, however, gets little serious consideration because it is unlikely that any reputable physician would be willing to give such an injection. The death penalty must create a problem of personal recruitment for correctional institutions. It should not be surprising to discover that able men object to participating in the operations of an abattoir.

My next to last point is that the death penalty if carried out is the only irrevocable sanction authorized by law. Like all human endeavors, the administration of criminal justice is not error proof. Innocent men and women have been convicted of crime and some executed. A mature system of justice makes provision for the acknowledgment and effective rectification of mistakes. The death penalty prevents this.

My final point raises a question beyond my competence to answer but does fall, it seems to me, within the special competence of this audience and the other members of the panel. Many have argued that it is appropriate for a society to express its condemnation of murder by associating the offense with the highest sanction that the law can use, however much considerations of humanity should temper the exaction of the penalty when there are extenuations. For example, Lord Justice Denning, in giving testimony before the British Royal Commission on Capital Punishment, said:

"The punishment inflicted for grave crimes should adequately reflect the revulsion felt by the great majority of citizens for them. It is a mistake to consider the objects of punishment as being deterrent or reformative or preventive and nothing else. • • • The ultimate justification of any punishment is not that it is a deterrent, but that it is the emphatic denunciation by the community of a crime; and from this point of view, there are some murders which, in the present state of public opinion, demand the most emphatic denunciation of all, namely the death penalty."

It would seem to me that if there is a social need for grevious condemnation of certain murders that it can be met, as it is met in abolition states and some 35 other countries, without resorting to capital punishment.

In conclusion, I think a persuasive case for the abolition of capital punishment can be made. At best, our handling of the death penalty is futile and not a little ridiculous. At worst, it may be positively pernicious.

Adrian van Koevering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan lost a highly respected citizen in the death of Adrian van Koevering, founder of the Zeeland Record, an outstanding weekly newspaper published in Ottawa County.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two editorials concerning the work and service of Mr. van Koevering. The first is from the Holland Evening Sentinel of July 16 and the second from the Grand Haven Daily Tribune for July 18, 1960:

[From the Holland Evening Sentinel, July 16, 1960]

ADRIAN VAN KOEVERING

Another pioneer in the publishing business has passed on after a long and useful life of 86 years. He had lived in this community all his life and had spent more than 50 years in the printing and publishing business in our neighboring city of Zeeland. During the more than 50 years he was active in local politics as well as charter member of Rotary, past president of the Michigan Press Association, member of the board of public works, the school board and spent many years as a member of the Zeeland City Council.

Adrian, as he was known by many people in the community, gave many hours of his life to public affairs. In his later years he was a contributing member of the Michigan Historical Society and just this year was elected to the Michigan Hall of Fame, a group that has few living members.

The community has lost another fine citizen, he will be missed by many people.

[From the Daily Tribune, July 18, 1960]

ADRIAN VAN KOEVERING

Adrian Van Koevering, who founded the Zeeland Record, an Ottawa County weekly newspaper, is dead. He was 86.

Although he had been retired for some time, many knew him as an energetic publisher, outspoken in his views and loyal to his chosen work. He had many friends and admirers in West Michigan.

Adrian founded the Record, which has remained in the Van Koevering family. The newspaper has frequently won recognition among Michigan weeklies. It is one of a very few publications in its circulation class to print on a rotary press—equipment normally associated with much larger publications.

We always admired Adrian Van Koevering. He was conservative in outlook but had the highest of ideals and a deep sense of values. He played a key role in helping to make Zeeland a major poultry and agricultural center and was active for decades in county as well as community affairs.

A facet of his character was revealed in a series of Christmas cards he sent to friends after the passing of Mrs. Van Koevering a a few years back. He composed his own verse and poetry to express the deep religious feeling he possessed.

Although his convictions and principles were often expressed in the unvarnished language of the oldtime editor, he was a kindly man concerned with the best interests of his readers. He was a strong-minded citizen in an era of great change. But his newspaper lives on.

Caribbean Crisis Widens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in a series of addresses to the House, I have stressed the widening crisis in the Caribbean and offered a program for the remedy. Thus, it was with the greatest interest that I read in the August 12, 1960 issue of U.S.A., a highly respected fortnightly weekly, an illuminating article by Anthony Harrigan dealing with this crucial subject.

I note particularly that the author includes among his suggestions the creation of what would be a reactivated Special Service Squadron as a "visible reminder to Caribbean peoples of the strength and good will of the United States, and of how military might can be a deterrent to Red aggression and shield against it."

The article, which is commended for reading by all concerned with the Caribbean questions, follows:

CARIBBEAN CRISIS WIDENS

(By Anthony Harrigan)

When finally the Castro dictatorship is overthrown by free Cubans supported by the United States and its Latin American partners, the danger of Communist victory in the Caribbean will not have disappeared. Indeed the island-studded vastness of that sea is the scene of unparalleled opportunities for subversion by Red regimes. Haiti, the Dominican Republic, Puerto Rico and the Caribbean Federation already are targets designated by the conflict-managers of the Kremlin. If efforts to turn the Pearl of the Antilles into a Soviet satellite are a failure, then the United States public can expect that Communist efforts will be shifted to other islands along the southern sea frontier of our country.

Already there are reports of new Communist activity in Haiti. Reds from Europe, including the Iron Curtain countries are being allowed to enter the country. Last May, a "student" demonstration took place in Port-au-Prince where 400 participants denounced "Yankee imperialism." Puerto Rico has harbored for a long time nationalists extremists who hate Uncle Sam. Gov. Luis Muñoz-Marín, while professing strong friendship for the United States, has declined

to allow that territory to be used as a base by free Cubans to smash Castro-type communism in neighboring Cuba. The conditions for future serious disagreements with the United States seem to be present in Puerto Rico.

A most ominous development is reported from the island of Jamaica. A group of Back-to-Africa cultists calling themselves Rastafarians and adopting Mau Mau names and methods is active there. Two British soldiers were killed by Rastafarians last month. Jamaican police say that unidentified submarines, manned by white seamen, have been seen off the northern coast of the island. It is widely believed that arms, presumably from Communist sources, have been turned over to the cultists. In addition, Castro's agents have been sowing seeds of discord among the populace in Jamaica.

These conditions are not the only reason for concern among North Americans. The Trujillo regime seems headed for a major crisis. Even if none takes place in the next year or so, the aging of the ruler of the Dominican Republic poses a serious problem concerning the future of the island of Santo Domingo. This island, shared by Haiti and the Dominican Republic, has a long history of bloodshed and disorder. No one can predict what will happen there when Trujillo dies or steps down. If Communists were to seize power in the Dominican Republic, it would be relatively easy for them to keep it, because the people there are accustomed to authoritarian rule.

The financial mess in Haiti, accompanied by general chaos and lack of popular discipline and stability, makes that country an easy target for communism. The Caribbean Federation, with 3 million people in a long string of islands extending from Jamaica's Cayman Island in the northwest to Trinidad in the southeast off the coast of South America, is more a nation in name than in fact. Heavily populated, lacking industry and responsible leaders, it is in danger of complete fragmentation and then domination by a Communist minority. Red leaders in British Guiana are working on the leaders of the Caribbean Federation, seeking to draw them closer to communism.

MORE CASTROS?

Given these conditions, it is not unthinkable that a score of Castros may pop up in the Caribbean during the next decade. Every day that the tyrant in Havana is permitted to rule, the danger of bad example grows greater among demagogs in the region. And while the United States may legitimately use whatever methods are needed to free the Cuban people from Castro and his clique, our country must look beyond such action to creation of a comprehensive and constructive policy toward the entire Caribbean area.

Undoubtedly, the reaction of the left-liberals in both our parties will be to seek the solution of Caribbean problems through extension of massive government-to-government foreign aid. But this solution completely begs away the question of what must be done about the political climate of the Caribbean region.

The essential fact to bear in mind is this: The Caribbean is but another theater in which world war III is being fought. Moreover, it is a battleground for the struggle between capitalism and collectivism.

SEA OF THE AMERICAS

American free enterprise has an enormous stake in all the countries and islands of the Caribbean. It is a sea where U.S. merchantmen and tankers ply the trade routes. Across this sea, American companies bring cargoes of oil, iron and bauxite; in the skies above the sea, U.S. airlines fly their dominant routes. The Caribbean is the sea of the Americas—South, Central, and Northern. It is a region rich in agricultural products consumed by the U.S. public. It is an area in which hundreds of enterprising North Americans started their businesses within the last decade. In the years ahead, if communism can be thwarted there, the Caribbean will be intimately connected with the daily lives of millions of southward-looking citizens. The Caribbean is a region where healthy and inspired North American leadership and influence can spread over a great arc, nourishing economies and cultures and fostering the politics of freedom.

But this North American projection into the Caribbean, carrying along great rewards for the peoples of the area, will be halted if any of the islands are turned into Communist protectorates. If that should happen, the United States would lose its most strategic area.

HOW TO WIN

What can be done to halt the spread of communism in the Caribbean? The first step, as the people of the United States are beginning to understand, is to stop Castro in Cuba. Beyond this, however, is the imperative need for coordinated anti-Communist action from Haiti to Trinidad.

Nothing is more important for successful action than a U.S. State Department staffed with personnel who are aggressively anti-Communist. There is an absolute necessity that the State Department Director of Caribbean Affairs be a man of demonstrated anti-Red zeal.

Our military men too can do much to check communism in the region. The Army's Caribbean Command, now based in the Panama Canal Zone, might be moved to a more centralized location in Puerto Rico. The Navy's Roosevelt Roads Base at Puerto Rico might be built up into a major installation as the operating base for a patrol force similar to the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean. The need is not for heavy fleet units but for a strong and impressive "show the flag" force that would be a visible reminder to Caribbean peoples of the strength and good will of the United States, and of how military might can be a deterrent to Red aggression and shield against it. Permanent assignment to that fleet of a Marine Corps helicopter carrier with a battle team aboard would be especially useful.

Not enough is known in our country about the mercy missions conducted by the 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean and about its aid-to-orphans program and other humane and charitable activities.

Backing up the visible signs of might must be a broadcasting and printing operation that would smother Communist efforts to subvert any Caribbean nation. The task in the Caribbean is a battle for the minds and loyalties of men, as elsewhere in a world threatened by Red aggression.

PRIMARY EFFORT

Much as these actions by our Government are desirable, the likelihood of their being taken promptly is not great. Heavy demands upon troop and fleet units elsewhere are cited as justification for looking on the Caribbean as an area that can be defended on a brush fire basis. It might require several years of intensive education to persuade the American public to accord such recognition to the importance of the Caribbean as would enable the military to receive the the kind of political and economic support required for the assignment of armed strength there. As for creation of superior broadcasting facilities and printing presses necessary for an effective educational operation, the abysmal failure of our Government Information Agency to develop an adequate truth program for the Cuban people indicates that little can be expected in a hurry for the Caribbean region as a whole.

The continuing inadequacy of our Government agencies in fighting communism in the Caribbean area suggests that the primary effort must be made by private persons. Indeed, such an effort might prove to be more effective than any drive in which the permanent bureaucracy in the State Department and Information Agency has a part. A private anti-Communist effort in the Caribbean with stringent security supervision could not be easily subverted by anti-anti-Communists in key positions. Moreover, the personnel of such a private effort could be composed of stanch believers in free enterprise, not mere lip servants.

What appears to this writer as a necessary and reasonable start for such a private effort is the formation of a Caribbean committee by the U.S. enterprises doing business now in the region. Such a committee would provide a central clearinghouse for political information so that the various enterprises would know the entire scheme of Communist effort against American capitalism in the Caribbean. From such a committee could emerge a common free enterprise strategy, joint action of one sort or another, and coordinated information programs designed to keep America strong in the Caribbean. While individual companies are engaged in competition and have opposing business goals in some respects, it is nevertheless true that all the principal American firms doing business in the Caribbean have a stake in defeating communism and strengthening capitalism there.

Unless private businesses in the United States make such a joint effort, our country may suffer serious reverses in the Caribbean during the next few years—with confiscation of U.S. property and establishment of Red protectorates becoming the rule rather than the exception. Time and again, the State Department and other Government agencies have shown they do too little and too late in the fight to halt communism—even when they understand the menace.

If the American system is to be saved, U.S. private enterprise must organize and work for its own salvation.

Submerged Lands Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, this week I introduced a bill—H.R. 12964—designed to correct a serious inequity which has devcloped regarding the claims of the several States on the Gulf of Mexico to tidelands oil, minerals, and other offshore resources.

This bill would amend section 4 of the Submerged Lands Act—43 U.S.C. 1312—to approve and confirm the seaward boundaries of the States of Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana as extending three marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico.

Legislation such as this is required because of a recent Supreme Court ruling which I believe to be unfair and wholly unconscionable.

In its decisions in the cases of the United States versus the States of Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida, delivered May 31, 1960, the Court in divided opinions decided that the respective boundaries of Florida and Texas extend 3 marine leagues—or 10½ miles—seaward; while the boundaries of

Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana extend only 3 miles to sea.

The result of this peculiar ruling, of course, is that two Gulf States are given special privileges in laying claim to offshore mineral wealth while three other States on the same gulf are relegated to lesser positions; and are, in fact, precluded from reaping the natural benefits of their geography.

Certainly it was not the intent of Congress in enacting the Submerged Lands Act of 1953 to rob, shortchange, or otherwise mistreat any of the Gulf States in relation to treatment given any other Gulf States.

In his opinion of the May 31 decision, partly concurring and partly dissenting, Mr. Justice Black said of the Submerged Lands Act—

> Nothing in the act itself indicates that Texas was to be given any more consideration in this case than Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama. Had Congress wanted to give the land to Texas and refuse to give it to the other States it easily could have done so. As Congress indicated, it is time that the problem be solved, the title be quieted, and the controversy be stilled. In my judgment to interpret this act in a way which grants the land to Texas and Florida and withholds it from the other Gulf States simply prolongs this costly and disquieting controversy. It will not be finally settled until it is settled the way Congress believes is right, and I do not think Congress will believe it right to award these marginal lands to Texas and Florida and deny them to the other Gulf States.

Those Members of Congress who were embroiled in the ramifications of this legislation in 1953 will recall that it was the expressed desire of Congress that the Submerged Lands Act would settle, one time for all time, the injustices, uncertainties, and delays which have for years plagued every sincere attempt to develop the sorely needed offshore resources.

The Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs stated in both reports to the 80th and 83d Congresses:

> We are certain that until the Congress enacts a law consonant with what the States and the Supreme Court believed for more than a century was the law, confusion and uncertainty will continue to exist, titles will remain clouded, and years of vexations and complicated litigation will result.

Sponsors of the Submerged Lands Act in 1953 thought Congress had accomplished an equitable solution in that act, but apparently this act did not go far enough. The Supreme Court now interprets the actions of Congress that year as having desired favored treatment for one State over another.

I maintain Congress did not intend favored treatment for any one State. If the Supreme Court can read this intention into the Submerged Lands Act, let us pass additional legislation, spelling out in no uncertain terms that fair and equal treatment is to be meted to all the Gulf States in the access to offshore submerged lands.

This is what my bill, H.R. 12964, seeks to provide.

It gives to Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana the same seaward boundaries as the Supreme Court has awarded to Florida and Texas.

As Mr. Justice Douglas says in his dissenting opinion of the May 31 decision:

> If the policy of measuring the zone of the United States as "three leagues" into the gulf off the shore of Texas is to give Texas property rights to the submerged lands in that zone, the beneficiaries of that concern should be all our Gulf States. * * * All the States on the gulf should be given the same benefit of the doubts that have been resolved in favor of Texas.

I certainly realize, Mr. Speaker, that there are many matters which could and perhaps ought to be resolved at this abbreviated session of Congress, and there is precious little time in which to act.

But there is no matter of greater concern nor of more importance, it seems to me, than that of clearing the air for putting to work the mineral wealth which lies off the coasts of our Gulf States.

This matter of submerged lands has drifted aimlessly for so long and now is further complicated by such an unjustifiable Court decision that it behooves us to act upon it responsibly at the earliest possible time.

Bipartisan Connecticut Commission on Elderly Endorses Social Security Approach to Medical Care for Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, when a bipartisan body which has been making a careful study of the problems of our elderly citizens recommends a Federal program of medical care under the social security system, I believe we should attach great significance to its findings.

Such a recommendation has been voted unanimously by the Connecticut Commission on Services to Elderly Persons, made up of distinguished citizens of my home State. The chairman is Dr. Donald P. Kent, who is also director of the Institute of Gerontology at the University of Connecticut.

The recommendation of this commission, which is interested solely in the welfare of the 225,000 persons over 65 in Connecticut, should carry great weight.

The action of the commission is reported in the following news article from the Hartford Courant, which, under unanimous consent, I include:

STATE COMMISSION BACKS FEDERAL AID TO AGED BILL

(By Jack Zaiman)

The Connecticut Commission on Services to Elderly Persons called on Congress Friday to pass a medical aid to the aged bill that would cover every one of the 225,000 persons over 65 in this State.

The bipartisan commission voted unanimously at the State capitol to urge Congress to approve the bill at the current session.

FAVORED BY KENNEDY

Dr. Donald P. Kent, commission chairman and also director of the Institute of Gerontology at the University of Connecticut, said the bill favored by the group is the one supported by Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts, Democratic nominee for President.

Dr. Kent said the commission did not go into details of the bill in making its decision. It dealt with the broad general problem of medical aid to the aged, he said.

"We have endorsed the bill on medical aid by the Federal Government to all elderly persons operated through the social security system," Dr. Kent said.

"We did not spell out the provisions," he said. "But we recognized that there is a Federal obligation in this matter, and we feel the 225,000 persons in Connecticut over 65, whether or not they are covered by social security, should be offered this Federal assistance."

Dr. Kent said messages are being sent immediately to Senator KENNEDY and to Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, Republican presidential nominee, informing them of the commission's action.

In addition, messages are being sent to the six Connecticut Members of the U.S. House of Representatives and to the two U.S. Senators from this State.

Safer Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor recently carried two outstanding articles on the success of the drive led by Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff in Connecticut to cut down on traffic fatalities.

This campaign is based on law enforcement with fair and impartial effect and has earned the enthusiastic approval of people all across the country as they recognize that something must be done about the rising toll of traffic accidents. It has had the unwavering support of the press and public in Connecticut, including such public-spirited ventures as a campaign of the Hartford Times a year ago to bring voluntary suggestions from the public on how it could be intensified.

I believe these two articles deserve the consideration of every Member of this House, and, under unanimous consent, I include them, as follows:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 16, 1960]

CONNECTICUT PROVES SAFER HIGHWAYS ARE POSSIBLE

(By Donald Mainwaring)

It can be done.

In spite of the huge numbers of vehicles using the Nation's highways, traffic fatalities can be reduced.

It has been done in Connecticut.

During 1935, with only 400,000 registered vehicles, Connecticut averaged 10 fatal accidents a week.

Since then, despite enormous population growth and with more than 1 million vehicles on the road, traffic fatalities have dropped to fewer than 5 a week.

Nor is Connecticut willing to let it rest at that.

"I don't believe there is such a thing as an irreducible minimum," says James K. Williams, executive director of the Connecticut Safety Commission.

ALCOHOL ATTACKED

"We have accomplished a lot. Connecticut has the lowest highway death toll in the Nation, bue we will never let up in our efforts to bring safety to the men and women who use the highways of this State."

With a total of 2.5 fatalities per 100 million miles traveled in 1959, Connecticut has been awarded another in a long list of National Safety Council awards.

Other New England State figures for this period were: Massachusetts, 3.3; Rhode Island, 3.

A problem within a problem is worrying Connecticut safety officials, however.

Drink-caused traffic accidents have risen in number at the same time that the total of accidents has been reduced.

Nearly half of all fatal accidents in Connecticut involve drivers or pedestrians under the influence of alcohol.

Of 55 fatal run-off-the-road one-car accidents Connecticut State police found that more than half involved persons who had been drinking.

"The drinking driver," says the commission, "is a menace. He has left a trail of death and destruction on nearly every street and highway in the Nation."

SPOT CHECKS HELD

"We have only just begun to tackle this problem," admits Mr. Williams for the safety commission, "but we shall carry out a program of public education based on special studies of the situation."

Just now Connecticut State police make spot checks of passing vehicles and drivers are arrested if found to be under the influence of alcohol.

Involvement in a fatal accident while under the influence calls for an immediate 1-year suspension of the driving license plus any other penalties which may apply.

Under such circumstances a driver could be sentenced to 10 years in State prison.

But the commission knows that enforcement is not the ultimate answer, though its application will continue.

APATHY CRITICIZED

"Our public education efforts up till now have not been realistic," admits Mr. Williams.

"We need to eradicate the crazy notions people have about drinking."

"People should know how one or two drinks can be just as dangerous as many—that a small amount of alcohol can impair one's judgment, turning a driver into a safety hazard.

"Hosts and hostesses should place soft drinks on every tray at their parties so people are not 'pressured' into drinking when they do not want to."

"The greatest obstacle to finding a solution to this problem is public apathy. This is what we must attack."

Present traffic regulations are vigorously applied in Connecticut. Speeding, for example, carries a 30-day license suspension for the first offense, a measure instituted by Connecticut Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff in 1956.

More rigid regulations are expected to result from organization of the new State circuit court which on January 1, 1961, will replace the present local court system.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Boston, Aug. 20, 1960]

HOW ONE STATE BRIDLES ROAD MENACE

(By Donald Mainwaring)

Getting the message across to people.
Strict law enforcement.
Coordination.

These are the means by which the State of Connecticut has, for a steady quarter of a century, been reducing its annual traffic fatality toll.

Some Connecticut drivers have criticized Gov. Abraham A. Ribicoff's 4-year-old program for suspending the right to drive of convicted speeders (30 days at the first offense, 60 at the second, indefinitely afterward).

People generally, however, find it hard to disagree with the Governor's oft-quoted remark that "people won't drive slowly to save their lives, but they will to save their licenses."

ANSWER TO INCREASE

His program came into being as a direct result of an increase in traffic accidents which took place during 1955. Even then Connecticut ranked as the Nation's fourth safest State, with a fatality rate of 3.6 per 100 million vehicle-miles.

The national rate was then 6.4. Connecticut's present rate is the Nation's lowest at 2.5.

The license suspension program and the drop in the accident rate, says the Governor, are directly related.

Safety education in Connecticut begins during early school days. Children are taught to look left and right before crossing the street, not to rush into roadways, and other similar safety habits are encouraged.

Driver education courses are available to high school students.

Because of this last, James K. Williams, executive director of the Connecticut Safety Commission, is against raising the licensing age requirement above its present limit of 16.

"To raise the limit above high school leaving age," he says, "would be to lose the chance to educate our youth into safe-driving ways.

"Right there in the early stages is where safety training can have its greatest effect."

Law enforcement policies in Connecticut have excited much out-of-State comment.

UNMARKED PATROLS

Hard behind the sign welcoming visitors to the State comes the warning, "Don't speed. Conviction means loss of license."

Radar checks are frequent.

Police patrol in unmarked and different colored cars.

Officers in plain clothes also patrol. These do not stop cars or make arrests, but radio ahead to uniformed colleagues whenever they notice violations.

"Unconscious" speeding gets a reminder from signs placed periodically along the roadside. Some simply ask in bright lettering "Are you speeding?" Others carry messages ranging from the swift and telling to the ponderously cute.

They have their effect, however.

Police officers possess an area of tolerance which can sometimes save a "my speed crept up without my noticing it" type of driver from immediate arrest.

But he gets a warning.

POLITE, BUT TOUGH

A Connecticut "warning" is a printed form, a copy of which goes to the commissioner of motor vehicles and becomes part of the driver's permanent record.

A warning also includes a vehicle safety check, and proof that necessary repairs have been made is required within 10 days.

Depending upon the nature of the offense, each warning also counts for a number of adverse "points" which militate against the individual's right to drive.

At three points a driver receives a warning letter. At seven he is invited to a conference. At 10 points, unless he can show good reason why it should not be, his license is suspended.

The program is polite, but tough.

"Certainly it's tough," underscores Governor Ribicoff. "It's meant to be.

"We are tough on the reckless driver and the drunken driver."

Meanwhile, the safety commission continues its program of public education. Members of the commission and its staff will speak wherever the doctrine of safety can be spread.

Information is handed out, mailed, published in the press, broadcast on radio and television.

"And the program's purpose is to educate, not frighten," says Safety Commission Director Williams.

Coordination of all safety efforts, public and private, is the Connecticut Safety Commission's main task.

Highway engineering, law enforcement, the teaching of safety—these and like activities are made to mesh by the commission and its executive.

Mr. Williams notices "a national trend toward making it harder to get a driving license—easier to lose one.

"The day is not far distant, in my opinion, when a special license will be required before drivers are allowed to use turnpikes or other expressways.

"Turnpike driving requires special skills, faster reactions, the ability to think fast and for several cars ahead.

"Meantime, we in Connecticut intend to continue our attack upon this tragic waste of life and property with every resource at our command."

Israel Is Essential for Redemption of Mankind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN TOLL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, just recently I had the privilege of reading the transcript of a radio address by one of the leading and most distinguished rabbis of Philadelphia, Aaron Decter, who now holds the post of national director of community relations of the Israel Histadrut Campaign and director of the American Histadrut Society.

Rabbi Decter's message is so inspiring and gives such encouragement for Western civilization and the eventual success of freedom-loving countries, that I include in the RECORD under unanimous consent, so that my colleagues and others may have the opportunity to read and study it:

ISRAEL IS ESSENTIAL FOR REDEMPTION OF MANKIND

(Radio Address by WWBZ, Voice of Israel, Vineland, N.J., July 31, 1960, Rabbi Aaron Decter, of Philadelphia, Vineland, N.J., July 31, 1960)

I am delighted to share with you in this program, celebrating the 13th anniversary, the Bar Mitzvah anniversary of the Voice of Israel, sponsored by the Labor Zionist Movement of Vineland. It has been an annual privilege for me to come to your anniversary programs and bring greetings on behalf of the National Committee for Labor Israel and the Histadrut Campaign on whose board of directors it is my pleasure to serve. I bring to you, therefore, the greetings of this great institution with which the Voice of Israel and its sponsors, the Labor Zionist movement, is identified, as well as their deep appreciation for the remarkable dedication of all the men and women who have been

identified with this unique and interesting program in public relations, the parallel to which and the like of which it not to be seen anywhere in this great land. For this small community of Vineland is making a contribution in human relations and in communications between the people of America and the people of Israel that is unique and is building a bridge of better understanding. My greetings, therefore, and the greetings and deep appreciation of Dr. Sol Stein, the national director of the Committee for Labor Israel, the Histadrut Campaign, as well as Mr. Mendel Fisher, the national director of the Jewish National Fund, to Mr. Louis Cohen, the chairman of the committee, Max Klein, Abe Cohen, Sam Spain, Rose and Harry Sobelman, and, of course, to Mr. Bob Coucill who has been serving, not only as the news commentator, but also as the coordinator for this program on behalf of the station WWBZ.

Dear friends, while it is true that I bring you the greetings and appreciation of these great organizations which are establishing a bridge between us and the people of Israel, I must also share with you both the anxieties and the fears of our generation as well as the dreams, the hopes, aspirations, and yearnings of our people. We are living in an age of anxiety, of fear, of uneasiness, of malaise—an age of low morale, a period of great challenge to the free institutions that have been the heritage of Israel and the heritage of that Hebraic spirit which helped to mold the great free American institutions of our country. These are dark moments indeed for all of mankind, and our people is girding itself to face the challenges to the free world of many totalitarian countries. While these are dark moments for contemporary mankind, they, at the same time are dark moments commemorating tragic periods in the history of our people. This week has seen the anniversary of the death of Dr. Theodore Herzl, the founder of the Zionist movement; Chaim Nachman Bialik, the poet laureate of our people; it has seen also the anniversary of the Tisha B'Av, the 9 days of Av, the period which witnessed the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem almost 2,000 years ago. And yet hope springs triumphant in the hearts of our people. The darkest moments in the history of our people were at the same time moments that gave forth great hope and inspiration. There is an ancient talmudic legend that tells us that on the day that Rabbi Akiba, the great scholar, was killed during the period of Hadrianic persecutions, Hadrian, Rabbi Yehuda Ha Nasi who was to be the compiler of the Mishna and the Talmud was born. On the day, say the rabbis of old, that the Temple was destroyed, the Messiah was born. "Yom Sha Charab Bet Ha Mikdash Nolad Mosheach." Hope and faith have ever been the hallmark of our people. Therefore, these days which commemorate tragic moments in the history of our people are days which also remind us constantly that there is faith; that through faith there is hope to rebuild and hope to be an example of courage to all mankind.

I am reminded, therefore, of the apocryphal story that is related about a contemporary of ours, Mr. Khrushchev, who some few years ago in his attempt to downgrade Stalin wanted to remove the body of that dictator from the Kremlin and bury it elsewhere. He, therefore, and this is an apocryphal story, sent a telegram to Mr. Eisenhower requesting permission to have the body of Stalin removed from the Kremlin and buried in America. The President of this country immediately answered that we want no Communists in the United States, alive or dead. Therefore, Mr. Khrushchev, upon receiving this telegram, sent a cable to Anthony Eden, then still the Prime Minister of Great Britain, but Mr. Eden, smarting under the diplomatic defeat following the Anglo-French-Israeli puntive expedition to the Sinai Peninsula in 1956, sent back a cable to Mr. Khrushchev: "Sorry, old chap, regret cannot take the body of Stalin." Whereupon Mr. Khrushchev dispatched the following cablegram to Mr. Ben Gurion, the Prime Minister of Israel, requesting permission from him to have the body of Stalin removed from the Kremlin and buried somewhere in the Holy Land. Sometime after this telegram was received, Mr. Ben-Gurion, (B. G. as he is known in Israel), sent back the following cable to Mr. Khrushchev: "Delighted to have the body of Stalin buried in the Holy Land, but don't forget, ours is the land of the resurrection."

Indeed, the land of Israel is the land of the resurrection. It is the resurrection of the land of our people, of the soil of Israel; a soil that is replete with great spiritual experiences; a desert soil that has been resurrected and made once again like a blooming garden of God. Israel is the land of the resurrection of our people, a people that has been dispersed in many lands and for hundreds of years, and that once again is reliving its own way of life even as in ancient days. Israel is the land of the resurrection of the culture of our people, a culture that began with the Torah, with the great prophetic teachings; with the great teachings of Moses and the Biblical injunctions and the inspirations of social justice of the ancient teachers of our people, resurrected once again in the land of Israel through the cooperative institutions that are being created by the pioneers on the land and by the workers and pioneers in the cities. Today in Israel there are many problems as there are many problems everywhere. Constantly we are subjected to the voice of violence from Africa, from Asia. Even at our own doorstep, in Cuba, there is violence as the answer to the problems of liberty, of law, and of order.

In the Middle East, in that little country of Israel, there is being developed a way of life that I believe will be a challenge to all of those peoples who are emerging from the shackles of colonialism and imperialism and are rediscovering what it means to be free without at the same time rediscovering the essence of freedom. The people of Israel have discovered that the essence of freedom means to be free from ignorance, from the fear of death, from the fear of disease, from the fear of insecurity. Therefore, they are creating a way of life that is giving their people security in every sense—educationally, economically, spiritually.

Today in Israel there have been a number of interesting breakthroughs along the scientific field that give a great deal of hope, and courage and encouragement to those people who believe that Israel will become the arsenal of democracy in the Middle East. There has been a breakthrough because of the development of the nuclear reactor at the Weitzman Institute in Rehoboth—a second breakthrough because of the actual use of solar energy which promises much from the standpoint of the utilization of solar energy for fuel for the future, and thirdly the desalination of the waters of the Dead Sea, a process that can mean much for Israel where water is at a premium. But all of these scientific breakthrough are not as important neither for the State of Israel nor its people nor for mankind as much as the moral and the spiritual. For the state and the people of Israel are to be judged not by riches nor by military power nor by technical skills but by moral worth and human values. And I submit to you, dear friends, that the people of Israel is true to its mission and to its vision, the vision of Moses, of Isaiah, of Jeremiah, of Amos and Hosea.

That vision, predicated upon love and friendship and upon cooperation, can be best understood through the establishment only a few months ago of the Afro-Asian Institute in the city of Tel Aviv, an institute to which scholarships are being offered to dozens upon dozens of people from every part of Asia and of Africa, formerly members of the Afro-Asian bloc, now happily joined in treaties of friendship with Israel. From countries like Ghana and the Cameroons to Burma and Ceylon, men and women are coming. From almost 30 different Afro-Asian countries they come to Israel not only to learn various skills, but to learn, above all, how to live together. For Israel is the greatest example today, and the greatest example of many ages wherein a government and a people, wherein the pioneers of labor and the men of spirit join hands to make that country ideal.

I believe, dear friends, that those of us who are imbued with the American ideal of freedom can see therein the union of the great genius of Israel with the great genius of America. This union can be understood best in that philosophy which considers that human beings are important, significant, and have value. And while it is true that Israel is a rich little country; rich in soil—a soil replete and redolent with great historic and spiritual experiences; rich in resources in the Dead Sea, and in the Machtesh ha gadol, the Great Canyon; rich in the great potential. It is richest, above all, in the human resources, in those human beings who have been gathered together from every part of the world and who are giving hope to the world because coming from the valley of the shadow of death they are able to live and to be productive. This gives me, therefore, in conclusion, the opportunity to bring to you once again that remarkable vision of the Prophet Ezekiel wherein he saw in his dream the vision of the valley of the dead bones. And the Lord God appeared to him and said to him, "Ben Adam, Oh son of man, will these dead bones live again?" and the prophet said to him, "Lord God, thou knowest." God said to him. "Ha Atzmot ha elu bet yisrael hem." These dead bones, they are the household of Israel. Behold they say, "our hope is lost, our bones are dried up, we are completely cut off." Therefore I say unto you, go thou and prophesy unto these dead bones that they may live again." And do thou breath unto them, that I may clothe them with skin and breathe my spirit into them for why wilt you die oh house of Israel?"

Even as the land of Israel and the people of Israel are living once again, recreating institutions predicated upon cooperation and giving concrete example of the teachings of love of the ancient sages of our people, so will mankind live again by the message of the Jewish genius that emanates from the land of the Bible. It will live again because of the message of universal love; because of the passion for freedom, because of the principle of freedom under law and order; and because of the vision of international peace and comity. It is to these ideals that the land of the people of Israel and all of those institutions created by Histadrut are dedicated, and it is this great vision and with these great ideals that the men and women of the Labor Zionist movement who are sponsoring the Voice of Israel are identified. We hope that the communication with our Christian as well as our Jewish neighbors in South Jersey will help to bring all of us closer to the ideals of the prophets which are being made real and concrete by the pioneers and the laborers of Israel.

Through our association with the spiritual genius of Israel, we will not only enrich our American heritage, but help in the redemption of the world.

Boston Shipyard Takes Missile Era in Stride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article about 160 years of service by the Boston Naval Shipyard, which appeared in the Boston Globe on July 27, 1960:

160 YEARS OF SERVICE—BOSTON SHIPYARD TAKES MISSILE ERA IN STRIDE

(By Capt. F. L. Ruhlman, U.S. Navy)

In the shadow of historic Bunker Hill, Boston Naval Shipyard upholds a long and proud tradition of service to the Navy and to the Nation. The shipyard, a modern and potent industrial facility vital to the entire New England economy, is now completing its 160th year of service as an integral part of the Naval Shore Establishment.

From an origin of a few hardy shipbuilders and a few acres of land, the shipyard has progressed to a complex and magnificently equipped installation, valued at over $100 million, employing over 9,000 personnel and capable of meeting the diverse and constantly changing requirements of the fleet it supports.

Two years after the establishment of the Navy Department in April 1798, Navy Secretary Benjamin Stoddert recommended to President John Adams the purchase of land on the Charlestown waterfront for a naval shipyard. The land was obtained and the shipyard officially came into existence on Aug. 26, 1800.

The first job performed was attributed to John Tapley, a Charlestown blacksmith, who shod a team of oxen. The first known employment notice, soliciting the services of 8 or 10 able-bodied men to be employed in the shipyard by the month, appeared in the Boston Independent Chronicle in 1801.

First structures were simple sheds. The commandants' house, erected in 1805, is still in use as the home of the commandant, 1st Naval District.

Many notable events occurred in the shipyard in the first half of the 19th century. The first naval officers' school was established at the shipyard in 1815. It was the first ever organized by the Navy and may be said to be the forerunner of the present Naval Academy.

Drydock No. 1, one of the two oldest drydocks in the Nation, was completed in 1833 and has been in continuous use since that time. Old Ironsides was the first ship drydocked. In 1836 a ropewalk was built which provided most of the rope requirements of our fleet for the next century.

About 5,000 civilians were employed at the shipyard during the Civil War period. The majority of them were ship carpenters and joiners and the tools employed were primarily hammers, crosscut saws and axes. Teams of oxen did most of the heavy hauling in the shipyard until 1898.

During World War I, the shipyard served as an embarkation point and supply center in addition to its primary assignment as a repair center. Employment rose to 10,000 civilian workers. Additional piers and buildings were added to handle the average of 50 ships which docked or departed daily. Strategically located close to the North Atlantic, the shipyard accomplished a major load of World War I ship repair work.

The shipyard played a vital role in World War II. More than 165 ships of lengths greater than 100 feet, ranging from escorts and landing craft to large auxiliaries were built here for the Navy and America's allies.

Hundreds of smaller craft were constructed and thousands of ships repaired during the 4-year period. Employment of personnel increased to more than 38,000.

Through the years the facilities of the shipyard have grown steadily; slowly during peace, rapidly during wars. Large, modern shops have been built. Other shops have been enlarged, modernized and rearranged.

The shipyard's civilian employees and its military personnel and those of the ships present in the shipyard spend over $75 million annually in the New England area. Its material requirements necessitate procurement of additional millions of dollars worth of supplies and equipment, much of which is obtained from local sources.

Recent work includes conversion of U.S.S. *Albany*, which is scheduled for completion in 1961 as the Navy's first all-missile ship. The only original guns remaining on the U.S.S. *Albany* will be a 40 mm. saluting battery. When converted, the U.S.S. *Albany* will have one Asroc (antisubmarine rocket missile) launcher, a twin Talos (long-range, surface-to-air guided missile) launcher forward and aft, and a twin Tartar (short-range, surface-to-air guided missile) launcher on each side of the ship.

A powerful sonar will detect targets for Asroc and MK32 homing torpedoes which can be launched from either of two deck mounts.

Thus, as in the earliest days when the fleet consisted of ships dependent on cannon and sail until the present guided missile and nuclear power era, the personnel of the Boston Naval Shipyard stand ready and confident to meet many new and complex problems in developing and maintaining the Navy's strength and readiness in the defense of our Nation.

Panama Canal: State and Defense Departments at Loggerheads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, among the most gravely important questions that now face the United States are policies affecting the maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection of the Panama Canal.

An important recent contribution to the cumulating literature on the canal question is a series of articles in the August 12 and 13, 1960, issues of the New York Times by Hanson W. Baldwin, its distinguished military editor.

These articles reveal to the people of the United States that the Departments of State and Defense have been at loggerheads over what our canal policy should be. Moreover, they show that influences in the State Department have evidently been contemplating the transfer by the United States of the Panama Canal to the Republic of Panama.

In order that the Congress, especially committees charged with legislative and investigatory matters affecting the Panama Canal, may be more fully informed, the two articles are quoted:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 12, 1960]

THE PANAMA CANAL—I

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The construction of a sea-level canal across the Isthmus of Darien in Panama, about 100 miles east of the present lock canal, has been proposed as part of a long-term solution to Panama Canal problems.

The proposal was part of a program outlined in a recent study prepared by the State Department. The program, if approved, would alter fundamentally the present U.S. position in the Panama Canal Zone, and our military, political and economic relationships with the Republic of Panama.

That part of the program that envisioned shifting the management of the present canal and of the Canal Zone from military to civilian control, inclusion of Panamanians in the Board of Directors and perhaps ultimate transfer of the canal to Panama aroused opposition within the Pentagon. This was particularly true of the Department of the Army, which is now charged with the canal's administration. As a result, most of these suggested changes have been temporarily eliminated.

Discussion of this program and these differences by the Cabinet resulted in a directive to the Defense and State Departments to try to find a common position upon which a long-term Isthmian Canal policy could be built. So far, however, no agreed-upon program has been completed, and Washington experts believe the problem of the Panama Canal and its future must await action by a new administration.

CANAL GROWING OLD

The policy discussions about the Panama Canal that have been in progress for some time in Washington stem from economic, political, military and organizational problems that have become obvious within the last 2 years.

From the economic point of view, the present canal is growing old, and requires modernization or replacement. The Panama Canal is essentially the same engineering plant, with minor modifications and improvements, that was opened to the world's maritime traffic in 1914. The 110-foot width of the six double (two-way) locks through which ships pass in their 50-mile passage from ocean to ocean, and the narrow defile of Gaillard Cut, sharply limit canal capacity.

None of the world's modern aircraft carriers can pass through the locks, and large, heavily laden ore ships and supertankers have to be piloted through the cut with extreme care.

The suggestion for a sea-level canal across the Darien area of Panama is one of many proposals for increasing Isthmian Canal capacity that date back to before World War II. Prior to the war, a third set of superlocks—much larger than the present locks—were started near the present canal, within the 10-mile-wide strip of the Canal Zone over which the United States has exercised since 1903 full authority and control as if it were sovereign.

The construction of these locks was abandoned when the United States entered the war. Since then, various engineering studies and surveys have been added to the many authorized in the past by Congress or other agencies.

The Darien canal route (suggested by the State Department), which would utilize much the same routes that Balboa used in his early 16th century explorations, is one of many suggested. Other choices are: Completion of the third set of locks for which excavation work was started prior to World War II; transformation of the present lock canal into a sea-level canal; a canal through Nicaragua; a canal across the Tehuantepec Isthumus in Mexico; a sea-level canal, per-

haps blasted by nuclear explosives, through northern Colombia.

Cost estimates for these projects are as high as $5 to $10 billion over a 5- to 10-year period. Any of these projects would require Presidential and congressional approval—and in the case of a new canal—complicated international negotiations.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 13, 1960]

THE PANAMA CANAL—II

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

The problem of the modernization or replacement of the Panama Canal has been complicated by our deteriorating political relations with the Republic of Panama. Violent nationalism, encouraged by Fidel Castro and by the Communists and complicated by many other factors including the concentration of wealth and political power in Panama in the hands of a few, resulted in anti-American riots last year and attacks upon the Canal Zone. Despite two revisions to the basic treaty of 1903, major economic and other aid to Panama and numerous concessions on the part of the United States, Panamanian political leaders are still pressing for more concessions. They have demanded the right to fly the Panamanian flag in the Canal Zone, as a symbol of residual or titular Panamanian sovereignty.

The State Department's program for meeting these difficulties envisioned a 10-year plan of readjustment, involving continued aid to the Republic of Panama, increased annual payments to Panama, inclusion of Panamanians in top jobs in the canal administration and eventual inclusion of Panamanians on the board of directors of the canal. The canal board is now composed entirely of U.S. citizens, all appointed by the Secretary of the Army. Eventually this plan apparently contemplated, in its original version, the transfer of the present canal to Panama. Many of these suggestions are violently opposed by the Pentagon.

MILITARY PROBLEMS CITED

Many in the Pentagon also feel that if a new canal outside the present Canal Zone is to be built, its location should be outside of the Republic of Panama. The construction of another canal in another Central American country would greatly strengthen the U.S. political and bargaining position in Panama and in the entire area.

The military problems of the Canal Zone have been at least partly remedied since the riots last fall. The U.S. forces there—one infantry battle group without field artillery support; obsolete 90-millimeter and 120-millimeter antiaircraft guns; no modern planes permanently assigned, and only two naval minesweepers—have been strengthed recently.

A second infantry battle group has been assigned to the Canal Zone, and two Hawk missile batteries and 40-millimeter automatic weapons are to replace the old antiaircraft guns.

The zone, with a troop strength of 6,500 to 7,000, is now far better prepared than it was a year ago to provide internal security and antisabotage and antiriot protection, and defense against low-flying aircraft.

For the immediate future, the organizational problem also appears to be settled. A new president of the Panama Canal Company and Governor of the Canal Zone, Maj. Gen. William A. Garter, took office a few weeks ago. Like all other Governors in the past he is from the Army Corps of Engineers.

A State Department program had urged that the Governor be a civilian responsible to the State Department.

In the past there have often been major differences between the U.S. Ambassador to Panama and the Governor of the Canal Zone and between Pentagon and State about canal methods and policies.

The suggestion that the administration of the canal and of the Canal Zone be shifted to a civilian aroused intense opposition from the Army.

Maj. Gen. William E. Potter, who had been Governor of the Canal Zone for the last 4 years until he was succeeded by General Garter recently, was firm during his regime in upholding U.S. rights to the exercise of sovereignty over the Zone. He and the former U.S. Ambassador to Panama, Julian F. Harrington, had often disagreed.

Until relatively recently it had been expected that General Potter would be appointed the next chief of engineers of the Army, a promotion to three-star rank. Instead, the term of the incumbent chief of Engineers, Lt. Gen. E. C. Itschner, was extended. Recently, General Potter decided to retire to take a position as executive vice president of the New York World's Fair. His sudden and unexpected retirement has been interpreted by some in the Army as, in part, a result of his differences with the State Department, and in part due to the Army's opposition to the State Department program.

RUBOTTOM CRITICIZED

Many of General Potter's supporters in the Pentagon and in the Canal Zone, who had felt he was one of the ablest governors in canal history, have been discouraged by his retirement.

On the other hand, the Pentagon, which has been extremely critical of Roy R. Rubottom, Assistant Secretary of State for Latin American Affairs, feels that Mr. Rubottom's impending transfer to Argentina may clear the way for the formulation of short-term and long-term canal policies.

At the same time a new Ambassador to Panama, Joseph S. Farland, who is regarded rather highly by the military, has just presented his credentials. A new commander in chief, Caribbean, Lt. Gen. Robert F. Sink, with headquarters in the Canal Zone, has also just assumed office. And Roberto F. Chiari, newly elected President of Panama, takes office this fall.

Thus new men with new ideas will be restudying the problems of the Panama Canal in the near future and some short-term program may be formulated quickly. But the evolution of a long-term program and policy—including the possible modernization of the present canal or construction of a new one—will be the responsibility of a new administration.

A New Program for the New Situation in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, now that the tide is turning in Asia and the Communists are becoming unpopular, it is time for us to reappraise our position in order to effect a more intimate association between ourselves and the Asian nations. Economic aid is not enough. "Something beyond economics determines the success or failure of economics," says Dr. Paul K. T. Sih, Ph. D., director of the Institute of Asian Studies at St. John's University, New York City, and author of "Decision for China: Communism or Christianity."

I believe the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be interested in the following article by Dr. Sih which appeared in the Catholic World, issue of August 1960:

A NEW PROGRAM FOR THE NEW SITUATION IN ASIA

(By Paul K. T. Sih)

In our past policy we were not lacking in generosity but in spiritual understanding.

The tide in Asia is turning in our favor. An evident upsurge of opposition has set in toward the Red China regime. A Bandung conference is unimaginable at this time. If such a conference were possible today, its major consideration would not be the expulsion of the Western powers but the elimination of the Communist threat.

This view of the Asian situation may seem excessively optimistic in view of the fact that almost half the Asians are under Communist control. It is a fact, however, that communism is not as influential now as it was 10 years ago. The recent riots in Tokyo indicate that Communists have tremendous power in certain circles of students and workers, but these violent demonstrations were symptoms of domestic quarrels rather than proof of a popular enthusiasm for communism. The overwhelming majority of Japanese are still conservative and, although they have an understandable bent for neutralism due to their memories of the last war, they are not pro-Communist.

In Okinawa a small but vociferous group expressed their grievances when President Eisenhower arrived in June. However, these grievances do not reflect pro-Communist sentiment and the Communists there are weak and ineffective. The grievances are based on a rational conviction on the part of most of the islanders that they would fare better economically by having the islands revert to Japan.

Elsewhere in Asia, there has been some deterioration of American prestige due to the cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit to Tokyo but in general the neutralist nations of Asia are becoming less neutral and less sympathetic to communism. In Indonesia, the large, well-disciplined Communist Party has lost ground because of Red China's opposition to the Indonesian Government's treatment of the Chinese in Indonesia. Malaya, under the leadership of Prime Minister Tengku (Prince) Abdul Rahman, has decided to stamp out Communist activities during 1960. The free nations of Asia are achieving new levels of stability and adopting a more realistic policy toward communism.

There are, of course, certain significant reasons for this development. The inhuman program of the people's communes in Red China has terrified the family-loving peoples throughout the entire oriental world. Assault on Tibet has extended to regions controlled by India, from Shipski Pass on the Tibetan border to the North-East Frontier Agency. Pakistan is fuming over a set of Chinese maps showing some 6,000 square miles of Pakistani territory above Kashmir as part of China. Indonesia has seen the much-prized spirit of Asian cooperation callously destroyed. Nepal has taken increased defense measures against Communist infiltration from Tibet into the villages of Hilje, Limi, and Jami. Burma is taking defense measures in its northern region against Communist aggression. In Laos, it has been reported that the rebellion has been resumed with the support of the Chinese Communists. In the Arab world, Kassim in Baghdad and Nasser in Cairo find that their Communist friends are a treacherous support.

This recent decrease of Communist influence does not, however, mean that the dem-

ocratic West has in itself grown more attractive to the Asian peoples. Bitterness based on recent colonial occupation and the West's economic superiority prevent that. The U–2 episode and the cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit to Tokyo were serious blows to Western prestige in Asia. Yet at the same time they did not increase respect for communism. It is most urgent, therefore, at this moment in the cold war, that we make a thorough reappraisal of our position. We must bring about a more intimate association between ourselves and the new Asian nations.

One thing is clear. Our policy in Asia in the past has not been adequate. On the whole we were not lacking in generosity, but in spiritual understanding. A soundly human friendship must be created if America and Asia are ever to achieve that firm basis upon which our future cooperation must rest. Something beyond economics determines the success or failure of economics. Once we establish this deeper understanding, an extensive renewal will take place in every phase of our relationships with Asia.

Here we outline in detail the new attitudes and activities that should follow in the political, economic, cultural, and spiritual orders if this new program of cooperation is to be put into effect.

In the political order:

1. We must appoint ambassadors and ministers to Asian nations who are truly capable of understanding Asians and of obtaining their confidence. Some of the American ambassadors in important posts possess the attributes of good diplomatic representatives, but qualified diplomats are needed in all the free countries of Asia. Present-day diplomacy demands more qualifications than traditional diplomacy. These include an adequate knowledge of the countries to be served. Jusserand, a noted French diplomat, said testily: "Experience has already shown and will more and more show that no invention, no airplane, no wireless will ever replace the knowledge of a country and the understanding of a people's disposition." The present trend reveals that "although the language proficiency of this country's Foreign Service officers is improving rapidly, more progress needs to be made. If the number of our diplomats who can speak French, Spanish, and German is now adequate, this can hardly be said of the numbers who cannot speak other needed languages, especially non-Western tongues. There is, for example, no American diplomat who can speak Singhhalese, only one who speaks Bengali, and only four who speak Burmese. We have had extensive relations with Korea since 1945, yet only nine of our diplomats can speak Korean" (New York Times, November 22, 1959).

Such examples could be multiplied, but the point is clear: we cannot hope to build good will for the United States unless those who are in official posts overseas have the ability to know the people of the host country—their needs, aspirations and point of view. Our representatives must be able to communicate easily and directly with many different peoples.

2. We must act consistently. This is most important for if there are things that are immeasurably irritating to Asian peoples they are inconsistency, hesitation, establishment of programs that are never carried out, and making promises that we do not fulfill. On the other hand, consistency gains confidence for times of crisis. American prestige was never higher throughout eastern and particularly southeast Asia than when our Government took a firm stand with respect to Quemoy and extended needed assistance to the Nationalist Chinese Government on Formosa in its valiant and successful resistance to Communist aggression.

3. We must make new efforts to mitigate inter-Asian political quarrels. The nations of Asia have conflicts and little cold wars among themselves. Even without Communist aggravation, Asia has its quota of international tensions that can often be relieved by outside assistance. India and Pakistan have to settle their disputes over Kashmir and over the waters of the Indus River system. Japan and South Korea must solve problems that have arisen over the repatriation by Japan of Koreans to Communist North Korea and over fishing rights in the Pacific. Controversies must also be settled between Free China on the one hand and the Philippines and Vietnam on the other with respect to Chinese minority groups. For these differences, an arbiter is frequently needed. This role of peacemaker is not an enviable one. Yet nations as well as individuals do need assistance from others. The United States can furnish intelligent, sympathetic and impartial advice to both sides and thus assist in healing many of the ancient and recent antipathies that exist in Asia.

Of course, before she is able to bring about this political solidarity in Asia, the United States has to overcome some of her own difficulties in Asia. Above all, she has to seek a proper adjustment with Japan, especially in regard to those Japanese who fear that the United States-Japanese Security Treaty will subject Japan to the danger of war. Then too the United States must reassure the Philippines concerning the lease of military bases and must arrive at a satisfactory agreement with free China concerning the status of American Armed Forces. We firmly believe that, with mutual good will, these normal political differences can be bridged.

In the sphere of economics, American programs must find more effective means of aiding the national economies of the new Asian countries. With Communist Russia and Communist China becoming evermore menacing in the Far East, there is no question as to the fact that those nations directly and indirectly threatened by communism should receive special attention. However, there are serious weaknesses in the execution of our foreign aid program. In implementing a new program of economic assistance:

1. We must delegate more power to our field officers. At present, too many details in our economic projects have to be decided in Washington. Efficiency is at stake. Drastic changes for the sake of more effective operation must be inaugurated. American aid in Asia is less welcome today than it was a few years ago. Why? Since 1953 the Soviet bloc has given economic help to the area. Compared with Communist aid, American aid seems less efficient. Sukarno, President of Indonesia, is reported as saying: "It usually takes 1 year to negotiate with the United States and another year to assure delivery. Not so with Communist China. It takes 1 week to negotiate and 3 weeks for delivery." A similar situation is found in Vietnam. Saigon welcomes Australian aid more readily than American aid in economic projects because Australia is more prompt in executing its part of the program.

2. We must institute a more extensive program for training Asian personnel in technical work. Scientists and men of higher learning are necessary and should be trained in the more developed countries on a larger scale. In this regard, the program of the United States Economic Cooperation Administration has achieved certain praiseworthy results in Asia. However, better trained local staffs are even more necessary for a balanced development of the area. It is generally advisable that this training be carried out in the place where the trainees are found rather than in more developed countries where social conditions are very different. Training programs set up in the West for use in the more developed nations are generally not suited to the needs of Asia. To cite one instance: Medical doctors who are at work in Asia are better trained in Asia than in the United States. Asia has particular diseases and types of diseases, such as malaria, smallpox, yellow fever, typhus, dysentery, cholera, etc., that are rarely found in this country. Many doctors who received their specialized training in the United States found, after their return to Asia, that their usefulness in their native lands had been somewhat impaired. We know that India has only 23,000 hospital beds, which can hardly accommodate 2,500,000 active cases of tuberculosis. However, a pilot experiment in Madras has shown that at-home treatment of tuberculosis patients produces results quite as good as those resulting from treatment in hospitals. Less disruption of family life facilitates considerably the recovery of the patients. It is this kind of doctoring and nursing that most of the nations in Asia, which cannot afford modern medical care, are anxious to secure. It is gratifying to note that a serious attempt to cope with the situation has been made in Indonesia. In August 1959 the University of Indonesia graduated 97 medical doctors under a cooperative training program with the University of California. Similar programs should be set up in other Asian countries.

3. We must absolutely separate ourselves from the traditions of colonial times. This is especially important at a time when the Communist bloc nations, sincere or not, are offering "disinterested help" to the nations in Asia. American economic aid programs, of course, do not envisage any imperial interest. Yet they originated in the Marshall plan which was successful in Europe, but which cannot be transplanted, in content and concept, to the newly developing lands of Asia. Asia is essentially a rural society. Being rural, it differs in character and genius from Europe. Therefore, in extending our assistance, we must give more consideration to the views and projects suggested by national leaders. Above all, we must develop our economic aid to Asia in such a way that a regional economy, like the European Common Market, may be formed with Free China, Japan, and possibly India as the leading nations. Experience indicates that many fine systems based largely on foreign patterns are not suited to the special needs of Asia. We must seek to develop "homegrown" programs that would be fundamentally based on the conditions and needs of Asia. This is the reason why Vietnam and Thailand have often sought technical assistance from Free China in establishing textile factories and sugar refining plants. Japan was asked to build a $2,800,000 nickel smelting and refining plant at Bindura in Southern Rhodesia. To those projects for inter-Asian economic cooperation, the United States should give all-out encouragement and help.

Asia is passing from a traditional agrarian economy into a modern industrial economy. While foreign aid is made available great care must be taken to assist the Asian countries to adapt present conditions to a modern economic system. Native resources and foreign assistance can both fail to benefit the people unless they are integrated into a sound functioning economy.

In our cultural exchanges with Asia we must adjust our programs to the psychology, traditions, and cultures of the peoples there. The United States Information Agency has been successful in its limited attempt to carry out oversea propaganda. However, there is room for considerable improvement.

The general impression has been created that intellectual quality is being sacrificed to commercial quantity. Department store catalogs often find more prominent places in our information centers than the works of Lincoln or Jefferson. With a sense of regret we read a news report published in the New York Herald Tribune of July 20, 1959, that the Malayan Government ordered the removal from community centers of all books and pamphlets donated by USIA. Minister of Labor and Law K. M. Byrne, who issued the order, said that the American publications would be replaced by books of Malayan content. The basic defects of our cultural relations with foreign countries derive from the excessively materialistic philosophy of our programs, not from political or administrative failures. This is particularly true in Asia.

Now more than ever, Asia wants more schooling for its children and a share in the fruits of modern cultural enterprises. However, no international program of education and culture could succeed without taking advantage of the rich traditions of Asia's intellectual life. Addressing themselves to the annual assembly of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Professions held in August 1959, at Washington, D.C., Asian delegates made a joint appeal for the setting up of a special commission to study "the educational problems of Asian countries and to make recommendations on them, taking due note of the spiritual heritage of these countries and the necessity of providing an education suited to the modern age." (New York Times, Aug. 4, 1959.) This outcry indicates their dissatisfaction for what they have thus far received from the West.

So far as the United States is concerned, we fail badly even in the entertainment field. American motion pictures are generally more popular with Asians than other Western productions. However, they have often been presented in such bad taste that local authorities were forced to ban them. We know that the Legion of Decency in Taiwan, for example, has established for the classification of films a moral standard that is even higher than its American counterpart. In fact, a puritan crusade prevails in Asia. Laos has carried out a program against indecent songs and recitals. Thailand has closed down night clubs. Singapore has banned pinball games and jukebox parlors. In Burma, both rock n' roll and beauty contests are condemned. In Indonesia, hula hoops are prohibited as sexually provocative. In Bandung, Western movies are forbidden because they tend to provoke "adventurous sentiments."

On the bright side, however, it can be said that good American motion pictures are welcomed by the young generation of Asia with enthusiasm. "The Ten Commandments," for example, was so successful in Japan that the theater in which it was shown established a new Japanese record for box-office receipts. Many nations in Asia, including free China, are unable to show this film because they lack the needed cinemascope equipment. Here is an instance in which a little thought, foresight, and adaptability could make American aid much more welcome.

Last but not least, we must do more to foster a truly spiritual relationship with Asia. In a special way, Asia is now in a state of expectancy, hoping for a fuller life, a spiritual fulfillment of its deepest desires. This can be provided only by Christian faith and love.

For many centuries, Asia has tended to look westward for intellectual and spiritual inspirations. Islam, the dominant religion of Malaya and Indonesia, is of relatively Western origin. Roman Catholicism, the faith of the Philippines, much of Vietnam and part of Malaya, came from the Occident. Democracy's tenets, now struggling in Asia to survive, were derived from England, France, and the United States. Even communism, being pushed in this area by both Russia and China, is a Western product. With this background, Asia tends to develop, not in isolation from the West, but through association with the West. The choice that is to be made is between the democratic West and the Communist West.

The outstanding characteristic of the East is struggle: struggle against poverty, disease, hunger and ignorance, struggle to adopt the West's modern technology and to develop an independent way of life which would combine the East's old heritage with a new hope—hope for a re-creation of the spiritual dimension of society, without which modernization, however successful, will not satisfy the deeper aspirations of man. In this respect, America's chances of success in Asia are far greater than those of Soviet Russia or Communist China. America is viewed as Asia's finest contact with the Western World. For America, it is not so much a question of overcoming difficulties in Asia but rather of taking advantage of the new opportunities that are offered in this area.

To Asia, America's meaning is profoundly human and spiritual. Jacques Maritain in his "Reflections on America" (Scribner's, 1958), stresses the importance of America in the extension of the Christian idea to the whole world. In fact, America cannot inspire Asia to be Christian unless she herself becomes more Christian. This is the real challenge Asia offers to the United States.

In conclusion, we note that Asian neutrality has broken down. But Asia will become a carbon copy neither of the democratic West nor of the Communist West. In maturing politically, the nations of Asia will undoubtedly develop a new sense of community which is less apparent in the individualistic traditions of Europe and America.

We must be very sympathetic to these new developments in Asia even when they do not conform absolutely to our own ideals. The ability of these countries to oppose communism depends on this inner development of their national life as well as on our own external support. We have outlined a minimum program. We know not how long the present opportunity will last. It may be later than we think.

Knights of Lithuania 47th Annual Convention at Worcester, Mass., August 21, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday evening the Knights of Lithuania concluded their 47th annual convention with a great banquet at the Hotel Bancroft in my home city of Worcester, Mass.

The Most Reverend Bernard J. Flanagan, D.D., bishop of Worcester diocese, addressed the gathering and the Reverend John C. Jutt of St. Casimir's Church, Worcester, was the convention honorary chairman.

The feature of the evening was the ceremony during which the officials of this great patriotic organization conferred their Distinguished Award Medal upon our former colleague in the House and present Junior Senator from Connecticut, THOMAS J. DODD. The medal is annually given to the non-Lithuanian who has done most to advance the freedom of Lithuania. Senator DODD's inspiring acceptance award address appears elsewhere in today's RECORD.

It was my privilege to speak briefly to the assemblage and I have been requested to include my remarks in the RECORD, which follows:

Madam Chairlady, Your Excellency Bishop Flanagan, Reverend Fathers, Your Honor Mayor O'Brien, invited guests, officers and members of the Knights of Lithuania, it is a particular privilege and pleasure to meet again with some of my old friends here and join in welcoming you out-of-town members to our great city, the heart of the Commonwealth.

It is a significant tribute to the character and understanding of the Lithuanian people that the fundamental objectives of your great organization are prominent among the virtues most desperately needed by this Nation today to successfully defeat the Communist enemy and lead the world to a lasting peace under God.

Your first purpose is to instill in your members a deeper love of the Catholic faith. This you have consistently done and by your public expression of belief and trust in divine providence you provide an inspiring example to your fellow citizens as well as, I might say, a timely warning.

You realize that without a wider acceptance and practice of basic moral laws and principles by our people, this Nation is in grave danger of collapsing from internal weakness. You are devoting yourselves, in patriotic concern, to preventing such a disgraceful catastrophe and the country is particularly indebted to you for your effective work on this score alone.

Your further objectives are to encourage the appreciation of American citizenship and Lithuanian traditions and provide social activities. As one who was born, and has lived and worked among you all my life, no one has to tell me about the high manner in which you have carried out these objectives.

Your patriotic zeal in instructing and promoting the acceptance of the responsibilities of good citizenship among your members is well recognized and universally admired.

The Lithuanian traditions, the heritage of your forefathers, are those of love of God, loyalty to country, family faithfulness, preservation of individual freedom, and persevering courage in the face of adversity.

The wholesome qualities of your social activities, consisting of good fun, friendly association, personality development, and gracious hospitality, are a legend in this area as they are in world history.

All these fundamental Christian virtues constitute the reason why you have not, and never will, forsake the promotion of freedom for your home people who are bravely enduring cruel and inhuman persecution by atheistic Communist tyrants.

They are also, of course, the reason why the people of Lithuania themselves will never be completely subjugated and will fight relentlessly on to the blessed day, by God's grace, that they, and all the other Communist enslaved people, will be restored to freedom and independence.

You may be certain that so long as I live, as a private citizen or a public official, the heroic efforts of yourself and the people of your homeland to regain their rightful independence, will always be given my complete support.

Because you have set such an inspiring example of devotion and dedication to the freedom of Lithuania, you have enlisted the aid of practically all of the good people of

the United States and, particularly, a great many of those in high public office.

One such great leader is here with you today, in the person of U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD. I have had the honor and privilege of serving with him, side by side, in the U.S. House of Representatives. I have heard him, time and time again, both in the House and Senate Chamber, advocate your cause with intense sincerity, with the intimate knowledge of his own experience at the Nuremberg trials at Germany, and the persuasive eloquence with which he is gifted.

There is no greater champion or more devoted advocate of freedom and independence for Lithuania, and all subjugated people, in this country, than Senator DODD.

I am pleased, indeed, to join with you in welcoming him to Worcester. The high honor you are bestowing upon him today is richly deserved and I know your selection will be universally applauded.

Financing Government Activities in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the disparity between the Federal Government's share of financing governmental activities in the District of Columbia and that of the taxpayers of the District is such as to work an unfair disadvantage on the taxpayers of our Nation's Capital.

In this connection, a letter dated August 8, 1960, written by Carl L. Shipley, chairman of the Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia, to the Honorable Maurice H. Stans, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is most timely.

In his letter, Mr. Shipley cites a lack of formula for a Federal payment to the District of Columbia. He also calls upon Mr. Stans for suggestions that would be helpful to the Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia in drafting new legislation that would provide a formula that would in turn divide financial responsibility equitably.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD Mr. Shipley's letter, and urge my colleagues in Congress to give thoughtful consideration to its merits. The letter follows:

AUGUST 8, 1960.

Hon. MAURICE H. STANS,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STANS: I am writing in connection with our conversation in Chicago last week about the lack of formula for a Federal payment to the District of Columbia. As you know, all revenue and expenditures of the District of Columbia are the result of legislative acts of Congress, pursuant to its role under article I, section 8, of the U.S. Constitution, requiring it "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over the District.

We are confronted with rapid deterioration in our fiscal affairs. The trend is so clear that action should be taken now, rather than awaiting a financial disaster of the sort which has occurred three times in the past. The population of the District has declined from 808,000 in 1950 to 747,000 in 1960. Since 1954 our budget has increased from $145 million to approximately $250 million. Lower income groups are gravitating to Washington, while higher income groups are moving to the suburbs. This has increased expenses for welfare, education, health, hospitals, and law enforcement nearly 60 percent, while other general Government activities have increased about 45 percent. During the same period, personal income has increased only 9 percent. Unless a solution is found, a financial crisis impends in the Nation's Capital.

During the Republican National Convention in Chicago, our delegation attempted to have included in the platform a recognition of the Nation's financial responsibility toward its Capital. That failing, we sought a resolution recognizing this national responsibility. It also failed. Many officials fail to understand that "the government of the District of Columbia is simply an agency of the United States for conducting the affairs of its government in the Federal District." (*Penn Bridge Co.* v. *U.S.*, 29 App. D.C. 452).

The extent of the Nation's responsibility for properly financing governmental activities in the District has been a subject of controversy from the beginning. From the time the Capital was laid out in 1790 up to 1835, the Federal Government contributed about $1,500,000 toward the expenses of the Nation's Capital, which local residents paid $4,100,000. Local taxpayers could not stand the burden, and a state of bankruptcy followed. This led to a congressional investigation. As a result, the Senate District Committee issued a report recommending a Federal contribution of about one-half of the District's expenses. (S. Doc. No. 97, 1835.)

From 1835 to 1870 some $30,100,000 was expended in the District of Columbia, of which $12,400,000 came by way of Federal contribution and $17,700,000 from the District. There were no capital improvements during this period, except for the Washington Aqueduct, built at a cost of $3,385,000 with Federal funds.

As a result, the Nation's Capital had the appearance of a frontier town, and was an international joke. During all of this time, there was in addition to the financial problem a continuing search by the residents for satisfactory local self-government. This compounded the financial problem. For example, in 1802 Congress incorporated the city of Washington and established its first government, consisting of a mayor appointed by the President and a 12-member city council. The council was divided into two chambers, the first containing seven members elected by the people, and the second consisting of 5 members elected jointly by the councilors. This apparently failed.

In 1812 the charter was amended to provide for an elected board of aldermen of eight members and an elected common council of 12 members, with a mayor elected by joint vote of the aldermen and the council. This also failed.

In 1820 the government of the city of Washington was reorganized continuing the elected board of aldermen and the common council, but providing that the people elect the mayor for a term of 2 years.

In 1871 Congress created for the first time a municipal corporation of the entire District of Columbia. The charter of the cities of Washington and Georgetown and the laws relating to the government of the county of Washington, were repealed. The act of 1871 provided a territorial form of government for the District, consisting of a governor and board of public works appointed by the President, and a legislative assembly, consisting of an 11-member council and a 22-member house of delegates. The council was appointed by the President and the delegates were elected by the people. The voters also elected a nonvoting delegate to Congress.

In 1871 marks the real beginning of the modern District of Columbia. But when it was established, it inherited a debt of about $4,350,000. Because of the serious lack of public works, President Grant made a tremendous effort to lift Washington out of the mud. In so doing, the debt was increased to $23,360,700. The local taxpayers could not meet the debt, and Congress apparently would not make an adequate Federal contribution.

So, in 1874 Congress provided that the District should be governed by three commissioners appointed by the President, and authorized him to detail an Army engineer officer to have charge of all roads and bridges. Also a joint committee of two Senators and two Representatives was appointed to draft a suitable frame of government for the District of Columbia. This resulted in the present form, established by Congress in 1878.

Despite three financial disasters and six different types of government, residents of the District of Columbia are still demanding local self-government. In the District Republican primary on May 3, 1960, held pursuant to Public Law 376, 84th Congress, the ballot included some party questions on this point. In response to these questions, the results were:

1. Vote for President and Vice President? Yes, 10,606; no, 281.

2. Delegates in Congress? Yes, 9,093; no, 1,081.

3. Local legislative assembly? Yes, 8,014; no, 2,646.

In response to this demand, the 86th Congress has passed a proposed constitutional amandment (S.J. Res. 39), to provide a vote for President and Vice President. It has been submitted to the various State legislatures for ratification.

In addition, there is pending in Congress at the present time H.R. 4400, a bill providing for an appointed governor, a 15-man legislature and a nonvoting delegate in Congress for the District. That bill proposes far-reaching changes in the method of handling the District of Columbia budget. Although this is an administration bill, our committee has recommended certain amendments. It now appears that bill will not be passed by the 86th Congress.

However, because the voters have indicated a substantial interest in local self-government, the Republican committee, as the only elected representative of our voters in the District must come forward with a bill which does have a real chance of becoming law. Such a bill, to be acceptable to Congress and the President, should be patterned after the law President Grant signed in 1871. Our committee has taken no action on this matter as yet, but I shall recommend to it a proposed redraft of H.R. 4400, incorporating a two-house legislative assembly similar to that in the act of 1871.

The press for local self-government is inexorable, and the ultimate passage of some sort of bill is inevitable. Therefore, it is imperative that some workable formula for financing the District of Columbia be established as a part of such legislation.

The present organic act of the District of Columbia (act of June 11, 1878), originally provided that all budget estimates for the District should be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury and submitted to Congress. It established a 50–50 ratio in defraying the expenses of the District of Columbia government. This was the first definite legislative provision recognizing the obligation of the Federal Government to share in the cost of the District. From 1878 until about 1910 the 50–50 arrangement was complied with and estimates of appropriations and revenues were submitted to the Treasurer and transmitted to Congress.

Between 1902 and 1910 the District had insufficient funds to meet its obligations, and the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized to advance funds. Shortly after 1910 the District began to accumulate surplus revenue and efforts in Congress were made to reduce the ratio. By 1915 the controversy of the Federal contribution to the District had become so vexatious that Congress appointed a joint select committee to investigate the matter. It was composed of Senators William C. Chilton, of West Virginia, William Saulsbury, of Delaware, John D. Works, of California, and Representatives Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois, Warren Guard, of Ohio, and Henry A. Cooper, of Wisconsin. The committee held lengthy hearings and finally rendered a unanimous report. One of its members, Senator Works, prepared a 20-page report of his additional views. In describing the District of Columbia, he said:

"It is a nominal municipal corporation only, without officers, without authority, and without any function whatever to perform as such. The so-called District officers are appointed by and are in fact the officers of the National Government. It can make no laws but is governed wholly by laws enacted by Congress. Its treasury has no existence in fact. It has no money and no power to collect any. Its nominal officers, who are in fact officers of the National Government, are only instruments of the Government for the levying and collection of taxes from property owners within the District. It cannot make appropriations or pay any of its expenses. The money collected as taxes, from property owners is not paid into the treasury of the District because it has none, but into the National Treasury. It is not paid out by the District, but by the Treasurer of the United States upon the order of Congress. * * * In short, the nominal municipal corporation of the District of Columbia is a mere shell, without any authority, power, or responsibility, and without any of the attributes or functions of a municipal government. It is worse than that. It is a delusion and a snare."

More significantly the full committee reported:

"The correct rule should be that the responsibility in taxation of the residents of the District of Columbia be as fixed and certain as the responsibility of the residents of other American cities comparable with the city of Washington, that with the payment of such taxes as may be equitably and properly assessed against privately owned taxable property, the financial responsibility of the residents of the District should be concluded: * * * that the United States pay from its moneys all the balance of whatever sum is deemed necessary * * * We urge upon Congress that its appropriations for the expenses of the District of Columbia should always be in such sum as will not only continue the city of Washington and the District of Columbia in every respect as the splendid and beautiful central residence of this great Nation, but also cause it to become and be forever maintained as a model for all the cities in the world."

The above formula suggested by the 1915 joint committee is not the only one that has come under consideration. Senator Overton on one occasion undertook a special study in the hope of producing a realistic and sound formula for a Federal payment to the District. He suggested that since land is the principal source of wealth, the Federal payment should be measured year by year by the amount of land taken over by the Government for Federal purposes. (Joint hearings on S. 917 and H.R. 3490, March 6, 1941.) On another occasion, Senator O'MAHONEY obtained help from the General Accounting Office and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and proposed a formula basing the ratio of Federal payment upon the total revenue of the District. (S. Doc. 203, 79th Cong., 2d sess., June 11, 1946.) A similar suggestion was made by a Senate subcommittee in 1835, but nothing came of it either.

In any event, the 50–50 Federal payment continued until 1921, when the ratio was changed to 60 percent for the District and 40 percent for the Federal Government. From 1925 to 1938 Congress appropriated the Federal share in an annual lump sum. These annual appropriations varied from $9,500,000 down to $5 million. Since 1921, when Congress discontinued its practice of paying 50 percent of the costs of operating the District, the percentage of costs borne by the United States has fluctuated from a high point of 39.5 percent of general fund appropriations in 1924 to a low of 8.5 percent in 1954.

Since 1956 the Federal payment has been about 12 percent. A newly increased authorization (Public Law 85–451) provides for an annual payment of $32 million, which is approximately 13 percent of the general fund budget estimate for fiscal 1961.

Recently Republican State committee members took the position that they will oppose any further increase in District taxation, except the sales tax, and will oppose any increases in the budget, unless revenues became available from sources other than increases in taxation.

There are at the present time pending in Congress a number of proposed tax increases. The tax on alcoholic beverages is to be increased from $1.25 to $1.50 per gallon, and on beer from $1.50 to $3 per barrel. The tax on cigarettes is to be increased from 2 cents to 3 cents per package. Also, it is proposed to reduce the taxable personal income brackets from $5,000 to $2,000, provide rates of 2½ percent on the first $2,000; 3 percent on the second $2,000; 3½ percent on the third $2,000; 4 percent on the fourth $2,000; 4½ percent on the fifth $2,000; and 5 percent on amounts in excess of $10,000.

Recent surveys indicate that the overall tax burden for a family of four, owning a home and a car in the District of Columbia, is now above the median of tax burdens for similar families in the Washington metropolitan area. Current taxes for persons with incomes of $5,000 to $15,000 are already above the average in 17 other largest cities in the United States. Any further increase in the tax burden will aggravate the loss of middle and upper income taxpayers from the District. Any diminution in the present budget will restrict welfare activities and produce an increase in crime, delinquency, and degradation.

The central fact in this situation is that welfare and government costs are increasing while the District population is decreasing. Laid over this problem is strong local pressure for self-government, which can only lead to increased taxes and expanded budget in response to popular pressure on elected legislators. This will increase the outflow of taxpayers, with ultimate bankruptcy or utter deterioration of the Nation's Capital.

Now is the time for the Bureau of the Budget to assume leadership in this area. Congress has been considering the problem of a formula for a Federal payment for a century and the controversy continues. Now for the first time we are confronted with a substantial population loss, and the President, through the Bureau of the Budget, should properly assume leadership in proposing appropriate legislation. Most of the home rule or local self-government bills offered in Congress, including the administration's bill, H.R. 4400, simply do not take appropriate account of the financial history of the District of Columbia.

It is no solution to suggest that our budget and tax problems can be effectively resolved by a popularly elected legislature of the sort proposed in H.R. 4400. However, I believe it is possible to draft a workable self-government bill, which will provide a proper formula for an adequate Federal payment similar to that suggested in the 1915 joint congressional committee report.

I will appreciate any suggestions you may have in this connection, so that I may lay them before the Republican State Committee for the District of Columbia for consideration before we draft a new bill.

Very truly yours,

CARL L. SHIPLEY,
Chairman.

The Newest Battle of the Sexes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, the most recent issue of Air Force magazine contained an interesting article by that always provocative and stimulating sociologist, Dr. Margaret Mead. Dr. Mead has examined some of the problems of how women can participate in the future exploration of space and some of the prejudices and inhibitions that must be overcome if we are to make full use of our talents.

Her call to develop a new sense of values, in line with the space age, is an inspiring summons to meet the new challenges that have arisen to our generation.

Under unanimous consent, I include the article, as follows:

THE NEWEST BATTLE OF THE SEXES

(By Margaret Mead)

If we are going to have an educated public that can support scientific research, the amount of funds that we need for the space age, and the kind of educational system that we need, a great deal is going to have to be done very rapidly to increase the average lay sophistication. It isn't going to be enough to have small children perfectly at home with relativity, because small children aren't in Congress.

The whole controversy over education gives us an opportunity to aim for this because our peculiar system of education involves so many people on both sides of so many issues that it's possible to turn the education system into a forum where we can discuss almost everything. We can discuss arithmetic; we can consider the fact that 8 years of arithmetic almost certainly ruins any mathematician for good, unless he can invent some very ingenious way of escaping. We can discuss our present attitude that mathematics is unfeminine, that if the best student in the mathematics class is a girl, she is told to study typing, while we walk around with the silly notion that we are going to have enough men scientifically trained to teach science in this country, although we obviously aren't.

No matter what amount of Federal subsidy of education comes through, no matter how well we step up our school systems and honor our teachers, we are not going to get enough men science teachers. And if we continue to insist on having male science teachers, science is going to be taught by male physical-education instructors. Science in this country now is too frequently taught by male physical-education instructors and female home-economic teachers, neither of whom are interested in it or fitted

for it. And we are going to have more physical-education instructors, because girls like boys to go into the field because it gives them a rapid career, allowing them to get married earlier than if they went into the sciences. Teenage girls today are exceedingly important in the career choices of boys.

Our very peculiar present setup, where boys make their career choices when they are in high school, and are already going steady with girls who are determined to marry at once, means that the girls, of 16 or so, have a crucial voice in the career choices of boys. Thousands of boys are being diverted from scientific careers and longtime careers of any sort, because when the boy says, "Oh, how I would like to be a geologist, or a physicist, or an architect," the girl says, "How long will it take?" That is the only thing that interests her.

The present split in knowledge and attitudes toward the future and toward space, between men and women, is very serious. Actually, we have a greater split in the knowledge of men and women today and in the attitudes of men and women than we have had since women started going to school. The general belief that women aren't interested in the hard sciences, that women shouldn't go into mathematics, has coalesced with the fact that women want men to stay at home. Women want men to stay at home now probably more than they have at any period in history. They need them more. They need them to look after the children and help build the house and do all sorts of things that they didn't used to need husbands for. They used to have other female relatives and neighbors to help or not so many children. But now, they need husbands at home, and there is a tremendous objection to men going anywhere. Part of the feeling about space, which spreads right through the country, is women's objection to men's going there.

We have done all these fancy things, such as having seven married astronauts, with one whose wife volunteered for him. We think that's very pretty. But I don't think it is. I think it's like giving women diplomas when they push their husbands through college. We have insisted that the astronauts be normal married men with children. We have not permitted them one single deviation in any known direction. The way they are represented in the magazines, you can hardly tell them apart. They were picked out by computers to specification, and the assembly of seven such perfect people in physical and physiological and reaction time and flexibility terms is, of course, a tremendous achievement that you could only do with a computer and a population of almost 200 million. At the same time, our emphasis has been on producing people who are just alike, and the astronauts are all presented in this form, and they are not models for other women's husbands—not one little bit.

Part of this is, of course, due to the general state of research in the fields of space. Nobody is doing decent research in the social sciences in space at all. No one is really considering what the composition will utimately have to be of groups who will work together in space. They are picking individuals who are nicely anchored to a wife and children here on the assumption that that will make them want to come back. I think it shows a terrible ignorance of space engineering to believe that at this stage it's going to be up to them to a very great extent as to whether they get back or not.

We are not considering the human aspects either, in our attitude toward space or what space colonization and space travel will ultimately mean. Science-fiction writers are, but science-fiction writers take a very gloomy view of the human race, so that while they spread a wonderful picture of the possibilities of space, most of them spread tenth-rate genetics and twentieth-rate sociology and very dim ethics as they picture race wars in space and evolution going backwards in space and terrible rows of incestuous colonies on spaceships in space. The general picture of humanity being presented through science fiction is very poor. The research on the human element is very poor, and the division in our minds between hardware and technology on the one hand and human lives as they are lived here, is much too great. But, on the other hand, what space can do and what a recognition of the importance of space can do to change our present attitudes toward the future and our present capacity to build the kind of character we want in young people, could be enormous.

If you look the world over today, most of the advanced countries in the free world are suffering from apathy, boredom, togetherness, and other sorts of behavior with low survival value. A great many people in the free world are worried about the character of our young people. They are worried, for example, because there is so little respect today for any sort of precision. No one thinks under any circumstances it is necessary to get anything right.

Not only that, the average American thinks that if you blame him for getting anything wrong, you are mean and unkind, and not a good person at all. So, the taxi driver goes in the opposite direction for half a mile and when you point it out to him, he says, "Well, everybody makes mistakes." On the railways, you buy a ticket 3 weeks in advance, and you get on the train and then there is no berth, and they say, "Yes; well, things aren't what they used to be, are they?" Secretaries are incapable of transposing three figures from one sheet to another.

Just as we approach the period where we are going to have to use technology a great deal more, we find we are not able to build a decent respect for accuracy in our young people. And accuracy is terribly necessary in the air and in space.

The second defect—apathy, lack of ambition, conformity—all the different names that we call it today, which results in everybody wanting nothing but togetherness and a job that will guarantee togetherness, comes partly from a lack of belief in any future at all and partly from a lack of belief in a future that is exciting and worth living for. People are behaving today the way they behaved in the middle of the war. They are afraid that they are going to lose the chance to live. So they snatch and grab everything right now. They want to get out of school, they want to get degrees, they want to get a job, they want to get married, they want to have life—all of it right away. This is serious, because it means that we are going to be short of scientists, short of statesmen, short of planners of every sort. In order to have real creativity, you have to have a belief in the future, and a belief that the future is worth planning for, worth working for, and worth living for.

Now, fortunately for us, as Americans, the one thing that Americans like better than almost anything else, is a little empty space. We have been fascinated since the beginning of our Nation by the size of our country, the emptiness of it, the way we could go out and cut down trees and put something else up. We have, in fact, destroyed a lot of the country in our enthusiasm for creating empty space and filling it up with something else.

I grew up with the notion that the frontier had shaped our characters and that there was no frontier any more. In 1920 we all knew that there was no frontier any more. What we had to have were frontiers in literature, scientific research, human welfare. This was a beautiful figure of speech. I used it for years, but the first time somebody really talked to me about space colonization and what it might be like to really put a colony out there that could do as it liked, I discovered that a little real new space in which you could put a new society was much more exciting than pushing back those figurative frontiers.

If we can catch the imagination of our young people with the possibilities that space offers, we then may have a sufficiently longtime perspective for them to be willing to do the kind of studying that is going to be necessary for the kind of scientists and engineers that we need in space. Study is going to be necessary for the kind of poets who are going to write about space too, and the painters who are going to paint about it. Those people who have been advocating a science education at the expense of everything else want to remember that to date it's the poets and the painters and the dreamers who have created the climate of opinion that made it possible for the scientists to invent and build.

This is the first time in history in which we are having to tell boys that "your job in the world is never to kill anybody, if it can possibly be prevented"—in which we are genuinely phrasing all our military establishment as a deterrent. We are telling people that they are going to have to fly around for years and years with bombs they mustn't drop. We are having to tell young people in new countries that are terribly impressed with themselves, just full of oats and beans, who would like to go out and win a lot of glory and die for something immediately, that this is the most destructive thing that they can do.

Bravery is going to consist in living—year after year, with patience, with endless alertness and endless attention, and no chance to drop the bomb, or let off the missile, or anything else. This is our phrasing of the present conflict. This asks a tremendous amount of men—it has never been asked of little boys before to look forward to such a future.

We are asking masses of our young people to go into the armed services where they will be trained in skills that the one thing they must not do is use. This the human race has never asked of males before. Can we only combine this request for endless patience, endless nonprovocativeness, and endless summit conferences, with a sense of outer space, that the next 100 years is going to present the most exciting adventure that human beings have ever had? "You are going to have a chance to get into this, kids," we can say. "You are going to be asked to do things that will require more heroism than any human being has ever been asked to show before."

They are going to be asked to explore, and on explorations, we always send men alone—that is a fixed rule of exploration, because we want them to come back. No women. It isn't a question of coming back to their wives, it's a question of having no women on the exploration at all, so the men will come back. Later, for colonizing, women will be needed. But first astronautics is going to involve men exploring. Girls have got to be back of the idea, and girls won't like a lot of men vanishing into outer space and not coming back. Unless we can involve the girls in the issues that are important, we are going to have every girl in this country pushing against our scientific programs and against an understanding of space, because they don't want the country turned into a widow's walk as Portugal was in the days of Henry the Navigator, when thousands of men sailed away and didn't come back.

What we want today is, instead, the kind of notion for the girls which involves them in the program, too. Now, the way to involve the women in it is going to be to emphasize some other things. Bravery in men women appreciate. But they have never

been awfully enthusiastic about long-term expeditions. The things that women are concerned with today are the safety of their children, the extent to which we are going to be able to turn the possibilities of space into new forms of safety in this world, the question of whether we will develop forms of political organizations that can cope with the dangers of the space age.

There are going to be no continents any more, and no nations in the old sense. We are going to have to transform the role of each nation into keeping all the other nations from blowing up the earth—this is going to be something that is meaningful to women as well as to men. Finally, the more we think about the strange beings we may encounter in space the more we recognize the unity of the human race and realize that we are one species.

Everybody in this country is voting for medical research. You remember there was a Gallup poll just a short time ago asking people where they thought the priorities lay, and space got a little miserable few percent and medical research got way up around 90 percent. Medical research means two things to Americans—it means prolonging their own lives, because they haven't enough faith in the future to think that other people's lives are going to be interesting later, and it means particularly to girls and women humanity and compassion and relationship to other human beings. We are going to have to build these two sets of ideas together into a program, so that space means greater well-being for our children and adventure, an outlet for all the things we thought there wasn't any outlet for, and a belief that the frontier isn't closed, that there are endless possibilities and we don't need to be discouraged by the population explosion, and we don't need to feel that life is going to get duller and duller so it isn't worth living.

We can begin to solve some of our age-old problems of human organization, when we realize that this is just earth, with just one human species on it, and with such communications that you can get anywhere in a few hours.

Once we develop these new values it will be possible to reset our expectations and hopes, release the imagination and creativity of our young people, and preserve the human species on earth and in space.

The Religious Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINT SMITH

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, much has been printed and said in recent months concerning the so-called religious issue as it pertains to the political campaign this Nation faces which will result in the election of a new President of this Republic.

As a result of much that has been printed and said, a great amount of misinformation and misconception of the issue has resulted.

In my opinion, one of the most forthright, factual articles, stripped of any semblance of religious bigotry I have had the privilege to read, is one by Dr. John A. Mackay, a prominent Presbyterian clergyman, which appeared in the July 4, 1960, issue of U.S. News and World Report. I ask that the article, "The Other Side of the Catholic Issue" be inserted in the appendix of the RECORD.

THE OTHER SIDE OF THE "CATHOLIC ISSUE"—A PROTESTANT SPOKESMAN ANSWERS MONSIGNOR LALLY

(By Dr. John A. Mackay, president, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1936–59)

The interview with the distinguished Roman Catholic clergyman and editor, Msgr. Francis J. Lally, which was published in a recent issue of U.S. News & World Report (May 30, 1960) is a fascinating and highly significant document. It is a contribution to a continuing dialogue on a great public question which has been going on in recent years between Roman Catholics and Protestants.

To my mind, however, Monsignor Lally has not satisfactorily disposed of a number of crucial issues which are of widespread concern to Americans, especially in a presidential election year.

I

I am unable to accept Monsignor Lally's suggestion as to the basic source of the anxiety at present prevailing in the United States with regard to Catholicism in politics. Let me say forthrightly that it has nothing whatever to do with social or religious prejudices caused by the advent in recent decades of so many Roman Catholics from abroad.

Much more is involved in the current anxieties and suspicions than a predisposition, which is described as a result of historic forces and is alleged to be located chiefly among Protestants who belong to evangelical and fundamentalist groups.

I speak as a representative Protestant churchman. In terms of denominational connection, I am a Presbyterian. As a Presbyterian I belong to a Christian tradition—the Reformed—which places the Holy Catholic Church, the church universal, above every existing manifestation of the church, including the Roman. While being profoundly evangelical in the classical sense of the term, I am committed to the contemporary movement toward Christian unity. I can say, moreover, gratefully and unashamedly, that I owe much to some thinkers and saints of the Roman Catholic Church who lived in France and in sixteenth-century Spain.

But I speak for myself, and also for a gerat host of informed, influential and unprejudiced American Protestants who are profoundly concerned on precisely this score—Catholicism in politics. It was this anxiety which, a decade ago, led a group of Protestant churchmen and others, myself included, to found the organization known as Protestants and Other Americans United for the Separation of Church and State. The founders of this organization have played a prominent part in the communions to which they belong, and some of them also in the ecumenical movement. At no time have they been associated with bigotry.

It appears to me, moreover, eminently unfair to suggest, as Monsignor Lally does, that, when similar anxieties occur among people who have no religion at all, it represents simply their general antipathy toward all religiously inclined folk. Episcopalians and Baptists and Jehovah's Witnesses. Some such individuals, the editor of The Pilot (Monsignor Lally) suggests, single out Roman Catholics for special attack only because their church offers a larger target.

This analysis fails to do justice to the spirit of the so-called irreligious. These may be philosophical humanists, agnostics or freethinkers, or just plain people with no religious faith. They cherish, nevertheless, genuine anxiety on the subject, Catholicism in politics. They are not bigots, they are just concerned Americans.

The basis of the suspicions and anxieties referred to in the interview have nothing whatever to do with religious bigotry, on the one hand, or with nonreligion on the other. The ground of concern is something entirely different.

It is the growing conviction among Protestants and non-Protestants alike, let me say it with calmness and candor, that a new phenomenon has appeared in the secular life of the United States. This phenomenon played a dominant part, often a sinister part, in the life of the Latin nations of Europe and the Americas for some four centuries. It began to make its presence felt for the first time in this Nation's history in the thirties of the present century.

The phenomenon in question has been traditionally known as clericalism. It may be defined thus: Clericalism is the pursuit of power, especially political power, by a religious hierarchy, carried on by secular methods and for purposes of social domination.

Clericalism has its seat not in the religious rank and file, whether clergy or laity, though it makes use of these, but in the church's hierarchy and its mighty religious orders. By constitutional right, these alone control its affairs. That great Spaniard, Salvador de Madariaga, former professor of Spanish literature in the University of Oxford and the last President of the League of Nations, once wrote: "Clericalism is an evil unknown to Protestant countries. It is a disease of Catholic societies." And he added these significant words: "It is extremely difficult to attack clerical abuses without seeming to attack Catholic institutions, that is, without being labeled a bigot."

The goal of clericalism is to exert a decisive influence upon the representative spheres of public life in the interests of the church's secular power. Clericalism seeks to shape the policies of state, the composition of governmental departments, the expression of opinion, the appropriation of funds, the forms of entertainment. The process of achieving this goal involves the use of pressures which are linked to subtle forms of intimidation where resistance is offered.

II

A delicate but inescapable question arises: Given the phenomenon of clericalism, could it affect the policies and attitudes of a President of the United States who happened to be a Roman Catholic? Would he become subject in a special manner to the traditional pressures which have marked the history of clericalism through the centuries?

Let me make unmistakably clear that, so far as I personally am concerned—and I speak, I believe, for the vast majority of Protestants in this country—there is no question of principle involved in a Roman Catholic fellow citizen's being elected to the Presidency of the United States.

In June 1958, I was a member of the "Meet the Press" panel which debated this particular issue on a national television program. At that time I gave it as my judgment that everything depends upon the personal qualifications, character and outlook of a candidate for the Presidency, quite regardless of his religious affiliation. The debate to which I refer took place before the names of any presidential candidates had been announced. It would be positively appalling if an aspirant to the White House were ruled out in advance because he happened to be a member of the Roman Catholic Church.

It would be equally unfortunate if a candidate for the Presidency were to receive a bloc vote simply because he was a Roman Catholic. If that were to happen, it would do no ultimate good to the person concerned if he were elected. It should also do irreparable harm through popular reaction to the church that gave him mass endorse-

ment. There is no place in a true democracy for bloc or mass voting by citizens who belong to a given religious faith, whatever that faith may be.

III

The issue involved has nothing whatever to do with a man's religious faith or its practice as such. The question of religion could be legitimately raised only in one instance, if, in the exercise of his political responsibilities, a man's conscientious loyalty to his faith involved him in subjection to some power other than God, his conscience or his country.

At this point I am compelled, in the interests of clear thinking, to take issue with Monsignor Lally. He maintains that in the temporal order the relationship between a Roman Catholic and the Vatican is slight. He defines the latter in terms of a diminutive territory which was constituted in 1929 within the precincts of the ancient city of Rome. This territory is known as the state of Vatican City, a state which has its own foreign relations, currency and subjects.

The fact is that the Vatican is the seat of global papal authority. This authority is exercised not only over the few hundred people who inhabit less than a square mile of land. It extends also over scores of millions of men and women throughout the earth. In all matters relating to the witness and welfare of that world organization which bears the name "Holy Roman Catholic Church," these people owe their supreme allegiance to a hierarch, hailed as infallible, who dwells in that historic mansion. The Vatican is thus the local symbol of a universal claim, which involves both church and society.

It is impressive, in this connection, that in recent decades the Roman Catholic Church in the United States has tended more and more, whether for religious or for political reasons, to drop the term "Roman" from its title. This trend has been particularly in evidence ever since Rome as a place name became associated in the American mind with Mussolini and his Fascist dictatorship; and, very especially, since Roman began to suggest foreignness to people increasingly imbued with burgeoning American nationalism.

Not once in the course of the interview now before us does Monsignor Lally attach the term "Roman" to his particular communion and to those who belong to it. The omission of one word and the monopolization of another becomes embarrassing, and even irritating, for Protestant as well as Eastern Orthodox Christians in the United States. They have gloried in belonging to the Holy Catholic Church, to the church universal. They are faced, however, with the fact that a historic Christian communion in whose ecclesiastical title the designation "Roman" is both official and traditional, now drops this term and calls itself simply "the Catholic Church." In the interests of Christian understanding, and of American solidarity at a crucial moment in national and world history, it is essential that this matter become the subject of dispassionate clarification. Is the virtual suppression of the designation "Roman" an effort to disguise a foreign relationship, or is it an attempt to establish an untenable claim?

But, whatever be the answer to the question just raised, of one thing there can be no doubt: The church hierarchy in Rome claims absolute authority to issue instructions to lay members of the Roman Catholic Church. It instructs as to how they should think and act with respect to truths regarded by the church as essential to the faith, and regarding things which it considers indispensable for its institutional welfare. Canon law is universally applicable among Roman Catholics.

In this regard U.S. News & World Report rendered an important public service in reproducing in its issue of May 30 the editorial that appeared in the Vatican City newspaper L'Osservatore Romano on May 17, 1960: "* * * The church, established by Jesus Christ as a perfect society with its hierarchy, has full powers of true jurisdiction over all the faithful, and therefore has the duty and right to guide, direct and correct them on the level of ideas and on the level of action. * * * The Catholic can never overlook the teaching and the instruction of the church; in every field of his life he must base his private and public behavior on the guidance and instructions of the hierarchy."

IV

This leads us directly to the crux of the issue: To what extent can the Roman Catholic Church, in full loyalty to its nature, refrain from projecting itself into the affairs of state?

To what extent would a Roman Catholic President be free to follow in all things his own best judgment while remaining in good and regular standing in his communion? In a word, what authority does the church claim to have in relation to the state, and, in particular, to those officials whom it counts among its members?

Nearly 20 years ago it was my privilege to belong to a small group of Protestants and Roman Catholics who met from time to time in the faculty house of Columbia University. The object of our meeting was to try to understand what we respectively meant by "religious liberty." I shall never forget the luminous remark of the late Father Gerald Walsh of Fordham University, when he said: "Religious liberty is a matter which the Roman Catholic Church deals with, not in terms of principle, but in terms of policy." The eminent teacher did not deny that in this field a historic principle is part of his church's heritage. What he meant to say was that the particular way in which the principle of religious liberty is applied depends upon existing circumstances. To all intents and purposes this important issue is determined in terms of policy, not principle.

The same observation is applicable to church-state relations. No informed Roman Catholic will dispute that there is an official and traditional doctrine as to the relationship which church and state should bear to one another. Each has its own particular character and sphere of responsibility. They are distinguishable but they are ultimately inseparable. As a distinguished Italian hierarch said a few years ago: "The complete separation of church and state cannot be regarded as an ideal situation."

What is the ideal situation in the eyes of the Roman Catholic Church? Monsignor Lally suggests that it may differ from one country to another, according to the will of the people involved. He refers to Spain as an illustration. Let me do so also.

The particular church-state relationship existent in Spain today represents an ecclesiastical tradition and a theological principle which, from the viewpoint of the Spanish hierarchy and of the Vatican authorities who drafted and approved the concordat with the present Government, can be regarded as expressive of the historic aspiration of Roman Catholicism. It is not true that the church-state relationship in Spain, which Monsignor Lally personally regards as most unideal, is due to the will of the Spanish people, "who," he says, "must decide about their own country." In 1931 the Spanish people created a republic, which was not pro-Communist. A democratically elected government was subsequently betrayed by the world's great democracies, who, through fear and ecclesiastical pressure, failed to give it the support to which it was entitled under international law. They abandoned the republic to the mercy of Hitler and Mussolini, who rehearsed on Spanish soil the Second World War.

The way was opened for the coming into power of General Franco. He, in his turn, and without authority from the Spanish people, consummated a concordat with the Vatican. So far as human rights, especially for Protestants, are concerned, this concordat is responsible for the darkest period in Spanish history since the days of the 16th-century Inquisition.

Let me allude now, however, to an opening vista of hope. The traditional doctrine of church-state relationship, it is true, has never been revoked by the Roman Catholic Church. This doctrine is still stoutly defended by distinguished hierarchs. But today this doctrine is being subjected to intense scrutiny by eminent Roman Catholic theologians and ecclesiastical statesmen in many lands.

There is clear evidence that a new doctrine is in process of coming to birth which could be presented in due course to the papal hierarchy. There are distinguished Roman churchmen in Europe and the United States who favor the relationship between church and state which is enshrined in the Constitution of this country. For the present, these men are implicitly regarded as heretics. They represent, it is alleged, a sectarian and not the traditional and authoritative Roman viewpoint. Is an evolution of the historic principle that governs church-state relations underway? Will policy become a mere synonym for expediency? May principle continue to be preserved in order to keep alive a historic dream?

Whatever be the answer to these questions, something of particular interest to Americans is taking place. What Father Walsh called policy and what Monsignor Lally calls political climate tends to become determinative of Roman Catholic action in the application of the traditional pretension of the church to exercise authority over the state and its activities.

Let me cite some recent evidence: When dictatorships which have been favorable to the church, and have had the church's benediction, are clearly headed for dissolution or serious trouble, the church finds a way to criticize their regime by making some public pronouncement. By doing so it is able to anticipate and forestall a possible violent reaction against the ecclesiastical authorities on the part of an emergent revolutionary government on the ground of the church's alleged connivance with the dictator.

Here are concrete examples: When the fall of Perón became imminent in Argentina, the church spoke out critically. It is speaking out critically today in the Dominican Republic. Some sectors of the church begin to speak out in Spain. A dispatch from Benjamin Welles, the New York Times correspondent in Madrid, was published in that newspaper on June 14, 1960. It tells how elements in the church, especially among the Basques, are becoming critical of the Franco regime. This significant paragraph occurs in his report: "The fear among the Franco opponents in the church is that, if the regime falls, the public may attack the church for allegedly having condoned dictatorial abuses."

What is the bearing of all this upon our American situation and upon important political decisions which must be made during the current year? Let it be frankly recognized that sensitivity to "political climate" is becoming a determinative force in Roman Catholic circles.

V

I come to the final decisive question: In this total context of fact, how free could a Roman Catholic layman be in carrying out his duties as a President of the United States while remaining in good and regular standing in his communion?

As regards the fundamental nature of individual freedom, Roman Catholics and Protestants are largely agreed. Over against a viewpoint which has become dominant in American life and culture and which tends to identify freedom with pure license, that is, with complete independence of any absolute loyalty, they stand together. For both Roman Catholics and Protestants, freedom derives from dedication to an absolute of some kind, to which one becomes loyal and obedient. For both the true Absolute is God. In the words of Monsignor Lally, it is "the transcendent spiritual allegiance to God" which makes men free. It is a paradox but it is true: Man becomes free when he becomes captive to the Eternal Goodness.

But what is the place of the church in relation to God and His will? This is the problem. For one Christian tradition, the church is the sphere where God works in a special manner and whose supreme head is Jesus Christ alone. For the other the church itself, in the person of a human hierarch, becomes the absolute and infallible representative of Deity.

In Roman Catholicism, the institutional church takes on an importance and is given a status which it does not have in Protesantism. Loyal obedience to the church's status and authority can lead to clericalism, as it has been doing quietly, conscientiously but insistently in the social and political life of our country. It can lead also to a more absolute demand on the thought and life of the Roman Catholic layman than could ever happen in any Protestant communion.

Let me illustrate what I mean. A leading judge in this country, a man who has achieved national eminence, told me this story 6 years ago: "Some of us who were close friends," he said, "Protestants, Roman Catholics, and Jews, decided to form a club for the discussion of the spiritual life and important religious issues. All were enthusiastic about the project. One day, however, the leading Roman Catholic member of the group came to see me, all crestfallen. 'I have consulted the bishop,' he said, 'and he told me that no Roman Catholic layman can discuss religion with other people unless a priest is present.' "

But in the end everything will depend upon the individual himself whether he be a simple citizen or President of the United States. In the Latin and especially in the Hispanic tradition, devout Catholic laymen have often stood out against what they regarded as the undue pressure of their Church. In some instances they actually brought about its disestablishment. They maintained their religious faith; they were faithful in their devotional practice. But, in the interests of their country and in loyalty to their conscience, they were resolutely opposed to clericalism and all its works. Sometimes they were excommunicated, sometimes they were not. Whether they were or not depended upon the "political climate," national and international, in which the drama was set.

It would be most unworthy if a Roman Catholic layman who aspired to be President of the United States were to be regarded with prejudice or discriminated against. It is both natural and right, however, that certain assurances should be asked of him on matters of vital importance where the official attitude of his church might arouse popular concern.

Many questions are being asked about the attitude of a Roman Catholic as President: Would he be free to attend services in other churches in his official capacity? What would he do about birth-control legislation if passed by Congress? What would be his attitude on Federal aid to church schools and other institutions?

Let us suppose that the candidate in question gives satisfactory evidence of possessing the capacity and the character, the experience and the vision necessary for the fulfillment of his high office. The decisive question to be answered by a candidate of Roman Catholic faith is really this: What would your decision be if called upon to choose between a mandate of your church on a specific issue and what you as a public servant believed to be right?

Juvenile Nondelinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as our newspapers and other news media constantly publicize the activities of so-called juvenile delinquents, it would seem most appropriate to give equal recognition to the thousands of boys and girls who try to be good citizens. With this thought in mind, I should like to point to an article which appeared recently in a St. Petersburg, Fla., newspaper, and which was brought to my attention recently by a very fine lady in my Congressional District, Mrs. Gladys Ragsdale of Springfield, Va.

The article reads as follows:

JUVENILE NONDELINQUENCY

Fortunately the gang wars and other misdoings of juvenile delinquents still remain news, i.e., unusual. And more fortunately they are offset by such items as the one following, which don't often make the news columns.

Recently a woman was driving along the Mount Vernon Boulevard just south of Alexandria, Va., when one of the tires became flat. She got the car off the pavement and began signaling to passing motorists for help.

An acquaintance stopped and she asked him to telephone to a service station to send out succor. But, before he could act, another car drew up, and the driver—a teenage young fellow—asked if he could change the tire. His services were accepted gladly.

When the lady got out her purse to pay him, he politely declined, and handed her a printed card, which read as follows:

" 'Originators' Auto Club, Alexandria, Va.

"Chuck Nolton, a member of the 'Originators' has just assisted you with your roadside repairs. The 'Originators' are an organized Hot-Rod Club dedicated to the safety rules and regulations of the Commonwealth of Virginia."

On the reverse side was an insignia and under it was printed the following legend:

"Remember: Only a cat has nine lives."

Contrary to what some people think, good ideas are as contagious as bad ones. We're glad to see this one being picked up in Pinellas and along the Suncoast. It may have far-reaching effects.

There is a sequel to this story which indicates that the seed took root. A young Florida boy read it, wrote to the Alexandria police for the address of the Originators Club, and personally attended one of the club meetings. His purpose was to learn how the club operated with a view to organizing a similar one in his own hometown.

Our young men and women who are making a conscientious effort to overcome the stigma attached to the term "teenager" deserve every possible boost to their morale and initiative. They are working against odds far above their maturity and experience. I am proud of these fine young men in my own congressional district for striving to set a good record for themselves and their contemporaries and an example for other junior citizens. I know my colleagues join me in praising them for their accomplishments.

Regulating Brake Fluid Manufacture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH A. ROBERTS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill to establish Federal safety standards for motor vehicle brake fluids to eliminate a very serious highway safety hazard.

Substandard brake fluids now on the market are a menace to all who use our streets and highways. Twenty-seven States and the District of Columbia have attempted to meet this threat by legislation but apparently the only way that these hazardous fluids can be kept off the market is by Federal legislation.

In a recent test, Chrysler Corp. engineers found that 28 percent of the brake fluids marketed in the Detroit area were substandard.

Every vehicle with brakes depending on substandard hydraulic fluid is a menace to life and limb.

An article in Automotive News August 15, 1960, describes these substandard brake fluids as "phantom killers."

As part of my remarks, I am including the following article from Automotive News giving details on the danger which my bill is designed to eliminate:

BRAKE FLUID DANGER

Potential death still stalks the Nation's highways in the form of substandard brake fluids, even though 27 States and the District of Columbia have passed legislation aimed at preventing the sale of such products.

In a recent test, Chrysler Corp. engineers found that 28 percent of the brands of brake fluid being marketed in the Detroit area were substandard and that these substandard fluids are "even worse than they were 5 years ago."

Of the 75 brands of commercial brake fluid tested, 15 were found to be so substandard that they would not qualify under any Society of Automotive Engineers rating formula, and six brands were of the "moderate" type or of SAE 70R2 which in most of today's high engine-output cars are considered to have a boiling point below a safe factor.

Despite the fact that 15 brands were definitely substandard and did not meet any SAE specifications (compared with 23 such brands 5 years ago), the quality of the substandard brands tested was considerably below that of the same brands of the earlier period. Five years ago, these substandard brands boiled at an average temperature of 181° F., while today's purely substandard brands boil at 179°.

Five years ago, the 23 moderate-duty brands boiled at an average of 245.5°, while the 6 moderate-duty brands tested this year boiled at an average of 258°, showing an improvement in their quality.

Today, it is considered that a safe brake fluid should withstand temperatures up to at least 300°, and with the larger, more powerful cars, fluids should be able to remain constant at 350°.

The insidious thing about these substandard fluids is that they are not only "phantom killers" in themselves, but when they are added to the 54 brands that do meet SAE heavy-duty or super-heavy-duty specifications, they tend to lower the top boiling point of the safe fluid that is in the car and make it unsafe.

PHANTOM KILLERS

The phrase "phantom" or "vanishing" killers is used in connection with these substandard brands because, while they vaporize under hard stopping conditions, by the time the car is investigated as to the cause of an accident, the brakes have cooled and the vapor returns to its fluid state and the brakes will work again.

Engineers like Charles M. Heinen, assistant chief engineer of materials laboratories for Chrysler Corp., and F. J. Markey, sales engineer of the Delco Moraine Division of General Motors, who are working to develop safer brakes, realize the extreme danger in allowing these substandard brands of fluids to be marketed, although they admit that they have no proven figures on the number of fatal accidents caused by brake failure due to substandard fluids and contributing factors.

Another insidious potential "killer" is found in the cars equipped with the modern foot-applied parking brake that acts on the rear wheels but has no warning light or other means except the release lever that is almost completely hidden under the dash to warn the driver that his parking brake may be partly applied.

Approximately 58 percent of the cars sold this year are equipped with this type of brake and were sold with no warning light to let the driver know when he was driving with his brake partially on.

A recent near accident drives home the dangerous situation that can develop under this condition. In this case, a car that had no warning light was driven at normal expressway speeds with one brake shoe held partially on by the parking brake.

This developed so much heat that it not only caused a failure in the brake, entire loss of brake fluid and entire loss of braking ability but it also blued the metal part of the shoes on that brake.

Under this high heat condition, the brake cylinder cup has a natural tendency to reform and lose the flare that holds it against the brake cylinder. This allows the fluid to gush out of the system. When the cup cools it also shrinks in diameter, it is claimed.

There seems to be no question that vaporization of the fluid also takes place regardless of the quality of the fluid in the system. The only reaction to subnormal fluids under this condition would be that the brake would fail sooner and under much less heat.

In addition to the rubber cylinder cup in the brake cylinder, some makers use metal expanders which will keep the cups from losing their flare and shrinking under high heat longer than the assemblies where only the rubber cup is used. Thus, in a sense, these metal expanders can prevent many accidents of this type.

Since they cost a few cents per wheel, some vehicle companies and many service stations do not put them in the brake cylinder either as original equipment or in brake repair procedures.

MOUNTAIN PROBLEM

The terrible thing about brake-fluid failure is that unless a leak develops in the system, cars normally operate at brake-cylinder temperatures of 158° to 250° under hard driving. But the high heat that makes them killers develops under conditions when the brakes are needed the most.

Coming down a long hill with the brakes on can generate as much as 600° of heat surrounding the brake cylinders, engineers say, and a dragging parking brake can develop 700° or more. Even the master cylinder is located in the engine compartment where temperatures of 300° are not uncommon on hot days and in stop-and-go driving.

Safeguards for mountain driving are giving brake engineers great concern in today's cars with their hothouse wheel compartments. And the problem is becoming more acute as the size of the wheels is reduced.

The day may come soon when present brake linings and hydraulic brake parts may not be able to stand the tremendous heat that is developed.

Currently, however, the problem is centered around areas of mountain driving where, for instance, every 1,000 feet of elevation contracts the volume of the fluid and lowers its boiling point from that of sea level.

Another problem is rush-hour expressway driving where the continual stop and go driving acts as a heat soaking agent and allows cylinder temperatures to climb.

According to Chrysler engineers, the quality of heavy-duty SAE 70R1 type brake fluids is alarming. Several of the commercial SAE 70R1 designated brake fluids tested will not conform to SAE specifications and a number of others are borderline.

Since only a limited amount of specification testing has been done to date, it would seem that a high percentage of trade name brake fluids designated as SAE 70R1 type are illegaly labeled.

Chrysler engineers have not completed their tests on type 70R3 heavy-duty fluid but it is indicated that there is some cheating going on by some makers of even this highest type fluid.

While 27 States and the District of Columbia now have brake fluid legislation permitting the sale of only SAE 70R type brake fluids, only 10 States require registration and certification that individual brake fluids conform to the minimum SAE standards. Many States which do not require registration do not designate any enforcement department or agency.

Since certain less-reputable manufacturers of hydraulic brake fluids can operate in these States with minimum risks, it is apparent that the illegal use of the SAE 70R1 type designation could be harmful or damaging to the SAE, to the driving public and to the dealers who sold the illegally marked fluid in the belief that they were selling a safe, high-test heavy-duty fluid.

MANY SUBSTANDARD BRANDS

Chrysler engineers found that while a few SAE 70R3 type fluids have borderline boiling points, eight trade-name fluids have boiling points above 400°.

While there has been an apparent reduction in the number of individual brands of substandard and moderate-duty brake fluids sold in the Detroit market, the availability of these undesirable fluids is more extensive than the actual percentage of these fluids purchased.

This is illustrated by the following table of the types of brake fluids sold by all retail outlets contacted during this survey:

Retail outlet	Substandard	SAE 70R2	SAE 70R1	SAE 70R3
Major gasoline stations	14	2	50	24
Independent gas stations	7	1	8	2
Auto accessory stores	68	41	104	43
Franchised car dealers	0	0	3	5

Although 27 States and the District of Columbia have enacted legislation to protect motorists from substandard brake fluid, only 10 States have put sufficient teeth in their legislation to prevent the marketing of spurious products.

In the interest of safety, this Nation should have legislation that will adequately protect the owners of cars and trucks against being sold any of these substandard brake fluids.

And every State that now has such legislation should put sufficient teeth in their laws to prevent the unscrupulous from marketing their spurious products.

Dealers should take every precaution to make certain that their source of brake fluid is reliable and that each package is plainly labeled as to its SAE rating.

STATES WHICH GOVERN BRAKE FLUID

1. Alaska.
2. Alabama.
3. Arkansas.
4. California.
5. Connecticut.
6. Delaware.
7. District of Columbia.
8. Florida.
9. Georgia.
10. Louisiana.
11. Maine.
12. Minnesota.
13. Mississippi.
14. New Jersey.
15. New York.
16. North Carolina.
17. Oklahoma.
18. Pennsylvania.
19. South Carolina.
20. Tennessee.
21. Texas.
22. Virginia.
23. Wisconsin.
24. Rhode Island.
25. Massachusetts.
26. Kentucky.[1]
27. Arizona.[2]
28. Michigan.[3]

[1] Sept. 1, 1960.
[2] Sept. 24, 1960.
[3] Jan. 1, 1960.

Greater Hartford Labor Council Resolution Protests Speedup System in Post Offices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, many of us in the House have protested to the Postmaster General against the establishment of speedup systems in post offices.

The Greater Hartford Labor Council, AFL–CIO, representing many thousands of workers in Connecticut, recently adopted a resolution strongly condemning the speedup instituted by Postmaster General Summerfield.

To those of us who believe that the Federal Government should be a model employer, setting standards for private industry to emulate, it is most distressing to find that the Post Office Department pays so little attention to human values in its operations.

Following is the text of the resolution passed by the Greater Hartford Labor Council:

THE GREATER HARTFORD
LABOR COUNCIL, AFL–CIO.
Hartford, Conn., August 9, 1960.

Hon. FRANK KOWALSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOWALSKI: At the regular monthly meeting of the Greater Hartford Labor Council August 3, 1960, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas Postmaster General Arthur Summerfield, not content with the best postal service in the world, has installed in most first-class post offices in the country a system called measurement system which is supposed to guarantee mail deposited in any post office before 5 p.m. will be delivered in any part of the country the following morning; and

"Whereas this system is a hardship on disabled veterans and the older employees in the postal service; many who have given their entire life to the service. No consideration is given to these employees, which is causing many of them who are very efficient employees to leave the postal service; they are unable to meet the efficiency rates prescribed by the Post Office Department; the morale is affected; it being the lowest it has been in years; although denied by postal officials, we consider it an antilabor, antiunion procedure, and nothing less than a "speed up" system: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Greater Hartford Labor Council go on record as favoring a bill which will eliminate this practice or any system which calls for the use of stop watches or allows any measurement of work which will rate the efficiency of any postal clerk; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be sent to Connecticut congressional representatives, asking to actively support and vote for a bill which will eliminate the use of such systems and that all possible publicity be given this resolution in the press and that it be presented to the coming State labor convention August 29–31, 1960.

"Sincerely,
"CHARLES M. YOUNG,
"*Recording Secretary.*"

Columbus Day, a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1959, I introduced a bill, H.R. 3835, to declare October 12 of each year, known as Columbus Day, as a national legal holiday. Some 26 States—more than half of the States in the Union—observe this day as a holiday. I believe the time has come for national, though belated, recognition of the great discoverer of the Western Hemisphere. Properly celebrated, a day dedicated to Columbus could serve as a great inspiration in our times.

I have received many letters of support for my bill from people in various sections of the country. One of these, Mr. Alfred P. Adamo, of Detroit, Mich., has sent me the text of a short article he submitted to the Denver Evening Post, which was published in its issue of October 12, 1958, under the title "Two Pioneers, Noce and Columbus."

Recently, Mr. Adamo had a letter printed at his own expense in support of my bill and copies of this letter were mailed earlier this month to the President, the Vice President, all Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, also to all Governors, and other prominent persons.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD the text of Mr. Adamo's article in the Denver Post and the letter I received urging support of my bill, H.R. 3835:

AUGUST 6, 1960.

Hon. VICTOR L. ANFUSO,
U.S. Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Fifty-three years ago a citizen of the State of Colorado, Angelo Noce, was successful in having the State of Colorado declare October 12 a legal holiday known as Columbus Day.

Since that time 26 other States have followed the example of the State of Colorado. However, I feel that Columbus Day should be national holiday and I am very much in favor of Congressman VICTOR L. ANFUSO'S bill in the House of Representatives requesting that action be taken toward that end.

Christopher Columbus discovered a land which is the cradle of liberty for all liberty-loving peoples throughout the world. Yet, nothing has been done in the United States to give October 12 the recognition which it rightly deserves.

As an American of Italian descent I respectfully appeal to you to do your utmost to support House bill 3835 offered in the 1st session of the 86th Congress.

Your support will be appreciated by all freedom-loving people of the United States.

Respectfully yours,
ALFRED P. ADAMO.

TWO PIONEERS, NOCE AND COLUMBUS
(By Alfred P. Adamo)

DENVER, COLO.—We always feel especially touched on Columbus Day, not only because it gives us occasion to honor a guy who found for us such a wonderful country to grow up in, but because it reflects also the persistence and foresight of one of our own Colorado citizens.

The citizen was Angelo Noce, a Denver printer. What he tried to do, and finally succeeded in doing, was obtain formal recognition from the State for a celebration that had been customary in the North Denver Italian community since about 1880.

Noce, who had been born in Genoa, the vicinity of Columbus' birth, wanted the State legislature to make October 12 a legal holiday, but it was a long time before he got any support.

October 12, so far as we know, was not Columbus' birthday. Not only do we not know the date of his birth, we're not sure of the year (we think it might be 1451) and we're pretty foggy about his family background.

The date picked by Italian-Americans for the celebration was, instead, the date on which Columbus' Spanish expedition first reached land in the New World (some 600 miles southeast of Miami).

The discoverer wrote in his diary that a small island was sighted at 2 in the morning on Friday, October 12, 1492. At daybreak the admiral spotted people on the island, which he approached in a small boat. The natives called their home Guanahani. We now call it by the name he gave it, San Salvador.

At any rate, Noce kept plugging away to make that day a legal holiday. In 1905 he succeeded in having legislation introduced and finally, in 1907, the Nation's first Columbus Day bill was passed.

The idea gained momentum. By 1922, when Noce died, all but nine States had followed.

So on this day, we take off our hats to two men: Christopher Columbus, the persistent explorer who was, in a sense, father of America, and Angelo Noce, the persistent pioneer who fought to be recognized as father of Columbus Day.

Wheat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous approval by the House, I include a tribute to wheat by the Honorable Victor Murdock, a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives from the district I presently represent in Congress. Representative Murdock was one of the great men of our State and our Nation. Members will be interested in reading this well-written article:

The sun is setting in the wheat country. The wind halts as the day dies, and the birds, after careening conclave in midair, wheel with much dispute and wing-ruffling confusion of choice, to their final tree in the grove where, as the rustling leaves grow still, their greenery deepens into shadows and turns purple against the shafts of gold, lanced by the sun across the landscape. Along the damp edges of the hedge the crickets intone for the nightlong chorus and a hunchbacked yellow sunfish noses a single widening circle upon the blue-green mirror of the pond. Across the meadow, grass, flower and weed from their drab, day array brighted to translucent pinks and shining fibrous silvers, quiver, ripple, flush in the pageantry of leveled light.

Silence grows. The house, the barn merge into the tranquility and thrust with strength from a window, back to the weak sun, a blazing bolt of his own light. The horses in their stalls, taking their respite erect, twitch the hay from the mow and grind and grind, in contemplative content and the cow, moved by some vagrant emotional unrest, offers an unavailing protest from her place, which, having begun weakly, she as incontinently concludes. The pullets fidget and fluff fussily and feebly along their perch. The swine contest for the single undesirable corner of the sty in repeated pyramids which at last collapse to a permanent repose. The dog, with an air of despair in exploration, makes final forage at the back door.

Silence grows. Down by the stream, with its trees which bend over it to look upon it

and never tire, a moccasin evidences his presence on a log, by sliding from it, and a muskrat plunges from one hiding place to another with a single splash and leaves no trace. A raincrow, alone at last with silence, mourns and prophesies. Between purpling east, house, barn, grove, stream and the empty west, the wheatraiser stands before the wheatfield and its wigwam shocks, marshaled in a farflung line as at attention. They and the bristling stubble are gold, dull, dead gold.

He and they have traveled long and far together. This is one of the thousands of resting places, of breathing places they have come to. The sweat, the vexations, the defeats, the depredations and deprivations of toil a little while ago were heavy enough upon him. But now as he turns and looks across the dull, dead gold field to the empty west the burden of the day's work lifts, and the yellow twilight strokes his soul in benediction.

Unfinished Work in Courts and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the Federal omnibus judgeship bill is must legislation in this windup session and, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor which succinctly points to the need for this legislation:

UNFINISHED WORK IN COURTS AND CONGRESS

The fact that a record number of criminal trials has been held in any jurisdiction is not of itself good news. But an item of this sort from New York City indicates that the Federal courts there are trying to keep up with a situation which Congress should relieve.

The U.S. Courthouse in Foley Square, Manhattan, during the year ended May 31 saw the trial of 179 criminal cases, the largest number in a 12-month period in its records. This is not only a tribute to the energy of prosecutors and judges but a reminder that Federal district courts in many centers of the United States are badly overloaded and congested, with resultant delays of justice.

The most immediately helpful remedy for this situation is in legislation awaiting debate and a vote when the Senate and House of Representatives come back into session in Washington. The purpose of these is to create new Federal judgeships.

The House Judiciary Committee on June 15 reported a bill to add 35 new judges to the Federal judicial system. This would be better than the 25 positions recommended by the Senate Judiciary Committee a year ago. But, according to the Federal Judicial Conference, representing the courts, the number really needed is nearer 50.

Creation of new judgeships is not the whole answer. Improvement in court rules can help somewhat. And Congress should think carefully before making Federal crimes of acts that can be handled by State courts. But at least twoscore of new Federal judges are seriously needed, and Congress should act next month to pave the way for their appointment.

Why Can't the States Get Together on Voting Rules?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. BATES
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, the article printed below was contained in the edition of the Saturday Evening Post of April 30, 1960.

During the recent recess of the Congress, many new residents of my district contacted me relative to this very serious problem which has disenfranchised millions of Americans. This is certainly negligence of a high order that demands immediate rectification.

It seems to me that the 50 States should amend their laws so that these citizens could continue to vote. This is a subject worth of the consideration of every State legislature and an appropriate matter for the agenda at the conference of Governors.

The article follows:

For a nation that prides itself on universal suffrage, the United States certainly puts up with a whimsical variety of rules and regulations for getting adults of sound mind onto the voting lists. For instance, if you move from South Carolina to Idaho, you can reregister as a voter in 6 months' time. However, if you move from Idaho to South Carolina, it will take you 2 years to get your voting privileges back. That is, unless you are a minister of the Gospel, in which case you will be allowed to vote in 6 months.

Such examples of nonconformity can be multiplied many times. Some States require 6 months' residence, some a year's residence and some 2 years' residence before a person can be registered as a voter. If a person moves from county to county in the same State, he stays off the voting rolls for periods that vary from 30 days in Nevada to 1 year in Louisiana. Even the business of moving from one precinct to another in the same community is attended by wildly varying consequences. If you move from one precinct to another in Jackson, Miss., you lose your right to vote for a year—even if you merely moved across the street. But if you move from precinct to precinct in Madison, Wis., you can get yourself reregistered in 10 days' time. The figures for the other States fluctuate between these extremes.

Residence requirements are only one part of the tangled situation. Five of the States require annual poll taxes, varying from $1 to $2. Eighteen of the States require literacy tests. Seven of the States require voters to take loyalty oaths. Forty-six of them require voters to be 21 years old, but Georgia and Kentucky let their residents vote at 18, Alaska at 19, and Hawaii at 20.

Disqualification of persons from the privilege of voting is treated in individualistic fashion by the various States. Michigan disqualifies no citizen. However, most of the other States draw the line at idiots, insane persons, and criminals. Wisconsin, Virginia, and Nevada also bar persons engaging in duels; Florida, anyone "interested in an election wager"; Idaho, "persons of Mongolian descent not born in the United States"; Mississippi, untaxed Indians, and Oklahoma, residents of poorhouses. Rhode Island withholds the ballot from persons living on land ceded to the Federal Government, while Pennsylvania turns thumbs down on anyone guilty of election bribery.

This odd lack of consistency in voting requirements stems from the fact that the States are responsible for establishing voting requirements—even for elections to Federal office. Some of these differences are unimportant. But others, such as the age and residence requirements, differ too much from State to State, at any rate in national elections. It has been estimated that between 5 million and 6 million Americans are barred from voting at every presidential election simply because they have moved too recently. With our people becoming more mobile, this problem will not be solved until some of the horse-and-buggy rules are brought up to date. For instance, if all the States adopted Iowa's residence requirements of 6 months in the State, 60 days in the county, and 10 days in the precinct, the number of unwillingly disenfranchised American citizens might be halved.

The answer is not for the Federal Government to step into the act, but for the States to face the obvious proposition that uniformity in voting requirements is just commonsense.

The Reviewing Stand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my bill, H.R. 870, to abolish capital punishment, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by William Froug as it appeared in the Beverly Hills Times of June 16, 1960:

THE REVIEWING STAND
(By William Froug)

In 1921 somebody committed a robbery. Somebody else was murdered. Two men were arrested, convicted, and executed for the crime.

The same kind of crime with the same results had occurred a thousandfold times before and, unfortunately, is still going on in these United States with alarming regularity.

What made and still makes this case different from all the others is that the two executed men were both extraordinarily sensitive with the minds of visionaries and martyrs.

It would not be outlandish to suggest that these were just the sort of dedicated idealists who, had their lives turned to religion instead of anarchy, might have become saints.

Instead they chose to be misfits, nonconformists, revolutionaries, antichauvinists. They committed the unpardonable sin of refusing to fight in a war. In short, they are not the sort of men many of us would wish to see flourish in our society because they oppose at the most basic level that which we support.

This is the reason why the case of Nicola Sacco and Bartoloméo Vanzetti refuses to die. And this is also the reason why the Nation's press has reacted to Reginald Rose's

2-hour TV dramatization of their story with the kind of furor they usually reserve for the discovery of a Communist in the State Department.

If Mr. Rose had decided to write a detailed drama in defense of Bruno Richard Hauptmann or Leopold and Loeb, the Nation's newspaper reviewers would have given us a critique on whether or not the play was any good.

INDIGNATION

Instead, from Boston to San Francisco, from New York's highbrow TV columns to Hollywood's trade papers, the men whose job it is to watch the 21-inch tube nightly have cried out in righteous indignation not over the quality of the presentation but over the point of view of the author.

It is safe to bet that not one of the scores of reviewers involved know more than the most cursory facts of the Sacco-Vanzetti case. But almost all of us have heard something about it.

Let me state right off that I haven't the foggiest idea whether the two executed men were innocent or guilty. I doubt seriously if it matters very much now, either to the Nation's welfare or to Mr. Sacco and Mr. Vanzetti.

But I do know Reginald Rose spent weeks and even months researching his subject. I do know he presented a drama based on eyewitness accounts, court records, and, perish forbid, newspaper reports. A great portion of the two 1-hour dramas was made up of direct quotations.

BIAS?

If there is a newspaper columnist who knows more about the case than Mr. Rose this fact has yet to appear in a review. Most of the criticisms have been packed with words like "slanted," "unfair," "biased," etc. Since Mr. Rose defended Sacco and Vanzetti it apparently follows he is also a nonconformist and therefore suspect.

Let a headline-making murder trial appear on the dockets and the newspapers of this and most other communities will have the accused tried and condemned before the first witness takes the stand.

But let one of television's leading dramatists take a position on a 40-year-old case and those same holier-than-thou editors rise to a man to defend the sacred principle of objectivity.

It is interesting and refreshing to note that the general public's reaction to the Sacco-Vanzetti story was not nearly as violent nor concerned as the public print.

Although it is considered beside the point to mention it, I found Mr. Rose's play to be absorbing, brilliant, and provocative. It was easily one of the finest dramatic presentations of the season.

Martin Balsam was superb as Nicola Sacco but, good as he was, Steven Hill's Bartolomeo Vanzetti was one of the outstanding performances this reviewer has seen on television. Mr. Hill is certain to be nominated for the television academy award and will no doubt lose out in the final vote to a more popular and well-known dancer or singer.

Reginald Rose had an ax to grind. But he ground it exceedingly fine.

Unfair Criticism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, shortly after Congress recently voted to override the President's veto of the pay raise bill for postal and Federal employees, the New York Times published an editorial criticizing all Members of Congress who voted to override the veto as bowing to the pressure of the postal workers' lobby.

Some of the postal workers' leaders and members of postal workers unions in the New York area subsequently wrote letters to the editor of the New York Times protesting that the editorial was unfair and answering the criticism it contained. As far as I know, none of these letters were published.

One of those who wrote to the Times is Alwyn J. Aaron, legislative director of the Brooklyn Postal Clerks Union. His letter, too, was not published. In order that the unfair criticism of the majority of Members of both Houses of Congress should not go unanswered, I am inserting into the RECORD the editorial published in the New York Times on July 6, 1960, and the reply by Mr. Alwyn J. Aaron refuting the charges:

BOWING BEFORE ELECTION DAY

The congressional surrender last week to a high-pressure lobby of employees of the U.S. Government marked a low point in the already poor record to date of the 2d session of the 86th Congress.

The President spoke out with rare vigor, but too late, in his excellent veto message, which correctly characterized the pay-raise bill as "indefensible by any light," and violative of "every concept of fairness, every rule of reason and logic." Anyone who bothered to read his message would have seen that this measure, costing three-quarters of a billion dollars annually, throws Federal pay scales even further out of joint than they already are, ignores a Department of Labor study of the subject currently in progress, magnifies existing injustices, bears a distorted relation to the increase in living costs, provides no offsetting income, and brings the annual postal deficit close to the $1 billion mark.

In overriding the veto an overwhelming majority of Members of Congress bowed to what Mr. Eisenhower described as "intensive and unconcealed political pressure" of the postal workers' lobby. Among these Congressmen, we regret to note, were all of the Democratic presidential candidates in the Senate, seven of the eight Senators from New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Connecticut (Senator PRESCOTT BUSH, of Connecticut, was the lone and honorable exception) and every Representative from the metropolitan area except these six: BARRY and DOOLEY, of Westchester; RAY, of Richmond; ST. GEORGE, of Orange; WAINWRIGHT, of Suffolk, and FRELINGHUYSEN, of New Jersey.

BROOKLYN, *N.Y., July 6, 1960.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES.

DEAR SIR: It was with a great deal of dismay that I read your editorial in the New York Times of the above date. Most postal employees were ready to take the President's veto unemotionally, since we have experienced three other vetoes in the last 6 years. I am almost certain that, were I to look at your editorials on those occasions, strong praise would be expressed for the very same Congressmen who, at that time, voted to sustain the veto. In the heat of his excitement, your editorialist labeled, by implacation, as dishonorable, those U.S. Senators who backed up the justifiable and long overdue raise given to postal and classified Federal employees. This is certainly indefensible by any light. Your further implication that all the candidates of one party voted to override, while the other party did not, is also open to criticism. The other political party has only one candidate, and as the Presiding Officer of the Senate, is constitutionally unable to express himself, except in case of a tie.

It is also necessary to point out to your readers and your very righteous editorial writer that, since 1925, this is the second raise approved during a presidential election year. The implication put forth—that a "high pressure lobby" and nothing else—gave us this raise, is open to serious questioning. Where is this "lobby's" strength in restoring to us the rights that every citizen has: Political action without fear of reprisal (Hatch Act); being able to share in the great prosperity of the sixties as outlined in the President's state-of-the Union message; being given the right to have collective bargaining with agency officials? Every one of the organizations which operates in the postal service affirms in its constitution that our means of redressing grievances and legislative needs is through Congress and not any other way.

A great deal has been said about expected reports that are to be issued in January. Since a new President will be inaugurated on January 20, 1961, such a finding would not be binding on him. Furthermore, the Cordiner reports of 1958 and the O'Connell report, submitted to Mr. Eisenhower at his request, to give data on civil service salaries and subsequently disregarded, stated "salaries fixed by statutes have not been adjusted in a timely and adequate manner in response to general changes in non-Federal salary levels."

The word "inequity" appears in several vital points of the editorial. The so-called inequities in the postal pay scales were all supposedly remedied when the Postal Reclassification Act was rammed down the throats of Congress in 1955. This act was hailed as a milestone by the agency head and the President in signing the Reclassification Act. The copious tears that are shed about the poor downtrodden GSF-18 employees, who are receiving a $1,000 raise (5.9 percent) against the "highly overpaid" level 4 postal employees (clerks and carriers), receiving $310-$430 raises (7.2 to 8.9 percent) is indeed ludicrous. We still pay our bills with an amount of money and not the amount of percentage increase.

If your readers are still curious as to the reason for the overwhelming vote of confidence given to postal people by the Congress of the United States, it is due to one factor—the justifiable arguments presented by the union leadership, acting under legal procedures, outlined in the Lloyd-La Follette Act of 1912. This law permits all Federal employees to petition Congress for redress of their wrongs.

May we also nominate our candidate for honors—Senator O'MAHONEY, not a candidate for reelection in 1960, who entered the Senate Chamber in a wheelchair, to cast a vote for Federal employees who cannot wait for a raise until 1961, but need a salary increase now.

Yours truly,

ALWYN J. AARON,
Legislative Director,
Brooklyn Postal Clerks Union.

Happy Birthday, Bernard M. Baruch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

which appeared in the East Side News, a publication with wide circulation in the 19th Congressional District of New York which I have the honor to represent, on the occasion of the 90th birthday of that great American, Bernard M. Baruch:

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, BERNARD M. BARUCH

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

(Baruch means "blessed" in Hebrew.)

Today the Nation salutes the 90th birthday of Bernard M. Baruch. With deep appreciation for all that he means to America, we hail this radiant friend in whose heart there is malice toward none and charity for all, and who, in the course of his years, has learned "to love his fellow men sincerely and trust in God securely." We pray to God that he will be spared to us for many more years of useful and honorable service.

If we were asked to name the man who has contributed most to America's greatness in the last half century, we should place Bernard M. Baruch at the top. He is a monarch of the mind, a giant of the American spirit. He has crowded into his life the achievements of a veritable host of men. His gifts are varied and his pursuits many.

Mr. Baruch has been for America first and always above all the rest of the world. His is a virile Americanism. It is the philosophy of his life, the touchstone of his thoughts, the mentor of his actions.

He is giving himself to his country and his country's cause, justifying the application of Paul's tribute to the Macedonian church: "They first gave themselves." Mr. Baruch is known as a President-maker, a Presidential adviser, a park-bench statesman. He has never held public office, but he has been the head coach of his country.

His towering integrity, his mighty heart, and his greatness of soul exercise far-reaching influence on world events. He is among the foremost leaders of the common good of our generation. He is a genius as a leader of men.

His deep sympathy and sincere interest in all phases of human activity have attracted the admiration and confidence of the people of our Nation. A fidelity of purpose and a profundity of moral rectitude guide him in his public and private life.

His splendid optimism, his lofty patriotism, and his unbounded faith in humanity never desert him. A magnificent individuality coupled with a magnetic personality endears him to all.

His superb courage is neither halted by the magnitude of the task before him nor by the criticisms of those who differ with him.

Bernard Baruch is the apostle of peace. His is the authentic voice of our country. In Europe kings, presidents, and premiers have honored his name and heard his voice. He speaks in denunciation of duplicity, cruelty, bigotry and hate. He speaks in the name of standards unsullied and ideals sublime.

In every act, and in every utterance, his only motive is "My country." His generosity knows no bounds. His life is an answer to that noble sentiment voiced by the poet S. W. Foss:

"Bring me men to match my plans,
Men with empires in their purpose,
And new eras in their brains.
Pioneers to cleanse thought's marshlands,
and to cleanse old error's fen;
Bring me men to match my mountains—
bring me men!"

Loyalty and duty and reverence urge us to write, while memory is clean and events are fresh, what we know of him upon whom his fellow men place such great faith. Let us propose a universal toast to the health of Bernard M. Baruch. Let us resolve to do our full duty in the pursuit of his high ideals and concepts.

Let us give thanks to Almighty God for him.

Financing Health Care for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of the truly important legislative issues facing us is the question of how to properly and equitably solve the problem of financing health care for our older citizens. Recently, the Blue Island Sun-Standard, a community newspaper in my district, discussed this matter in a most enlightening manner:

FINANCING HEALTH CARE FOR THE AGED

The matter of financing health care for the aged—the 15,500,000 Americans who are now 65 or older—has become a major issue in this country. Like all such issues, it has political, economic, and social overtones. It is possible, even likely, that Congress will pass some kind of a bill this year, during its postconventions session. Failing that, action next year is almost inevitable. Then, whether Congress acts or not in the immediate future, the issue will be extensively debated, and additional legislation will be pushed.

No one denies that there is a genuine problem here. The controversy lies in just how extensive the problem is—and just how it should be met.

The proposed solutions run a wide gamut. On the one hand, there is what is known as Forand-type legislation. This would bring all recipients of social security payments into a system of Government-paid medical, hospital, and nursing home benefits. The initial cost is estimated at something like $2 billion a year; thereafter, as more and more people joined the social security rolls, the cost would steadily rise. Some think the ultimate annual bill might be as much as $6 billion.

Another approach, proposed by the administration, would substitute voluntary for compulsory action. However, this approach is also based on the premise, as the Forand-type approach, that almost everyone who is ever 65 is in need of health care but cannot afford it.

Finally, there is a third approach. It is found in a bill developed by Chairman MILLS of the House Ways and Means Committee, which was passed by an overwhalming margin by the House shortly before it recessed for the conventions. It is distinct from the other proposals in certain highly important ways. It provided for a voluntary plan. It is designed to help the actual needy, not just everyone who has reached a given age. And, of great significance, it lays heavy stress on State, rather than only Federal, authority and responsibility.

This measure has been given the endorsement of the American Medical Association. The president of the AMA recently went into some detail as to what he and his organization believes sound health care for the aged should do, and described the principles it should be based on. One basic principle is that needs of this nature are best served by agencies situated as close as possible to the individual. Situations and problems may vary widely from place to place, and local agencies can respond more precisely and promptly to local requirements.

Another principle emphasized by the AMA is that help should be provided only when help is needed. Great numbers of individuals who have passed 65 are perfectly able to meet their own health needs. Surveys indicate that this is true of a heavy majority. The AMA's house of delegates, in a formal resolution, said last June: "Personal medical care is primarily the responsibility of the individual. When he is unable to provide this care for himself, the responsibility should properly pass to his family, the community, the county, the State and, only when all of these fail, to the Federal Government, and then only in conjunction with the other levels of government, in the above order. * * * The principle of freedom of choice should be preserved."

It should be noted that a great many commentators, both within and without the medical profession, fear that compulsory Federal financing of health care for the aged, whether accomplished under social security or in any other way, would be an entering wedge of Federal domination of all medical care and, perhaps, to ultimate socialization of medicine. The Mills bill, they believe, would do the job that is needed without running this danger.

Problems of African Economic Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, we have suddenly awakened to the staggering problem of the economic development of Africa. A most perceptive analysis of the problem appears in the current issue of Orbis, a quarterly journal of world affairs published by the Foreign Policy Research Institute of the University of Pennsylvania. The author, F. Taylor Ostrander, is presently assistant to the chairman of the American Metal Climax, Inc., of New York. He is one of the relatively few Americans who are thoroughly knowledgeable in the field of African economic development. Another is Arnold Rivkin, director of the African study project conducted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, whose contribution is mentioned in Mr. Ostrander's article. Both Mr. Ostrander and Mr. Rivkin have had extensive experience in African development since their joint participation more than 10 years ago as Marshall plan administrators. There follows Mr. Ostrander's article:

PROBLEMS OF AFRICAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(By F. Taylor Ostrander)

Economic development is a far more stubborn problem than political development. The African territories can be given their independence whether it is premature or overdue, but they cannot be given economic development. No matter how much money

and technology may flow in from abroad, and no matter how crucial that flow may be for development, it will nearly always be marginal in the total effort. A major part of the development effort will have to be made by the Africans themselves—an effectively organized effort spanning an extended period of years.

Africa is poor in nearly every respect. Its climate is hostile. There are sharply contrasting areas of too much rain or of brackish aridity. The soil is peculiarly barren and deficient in mineral and chemical nutrients. In addition to the protein and vitamin shortages which humans experience in this geographical environment, Africa has one of the worst health problems to be found anywhere in the world, with many dread diseases prevalent—malaria, sleeping sickness, bilharziasis, yaws, leprosy. Inadequate and unbalanced diets and disease impose their toll on human beings and on their domestic animals.

Overlying this poverty in climate, soil, health, and diet is the poverty of knowledge. The knowledge and skills with which to participate in the life, health, work, and culture of the twentieth century are nearly nonexistent in much of Africa. There is only one way in which the peoples of Africa will achieve economic advancement, no matter what the stage of their political development: they must become proficient in the technology of the modern world; they must learn modern health, modern agriculture, modern transportation, modern industries, and the intricacies of a modern monetary system. The colossal ignorance of all these fields in Africa today will not be eliminated within decades, and Africa's economic development will still be a basic problem to Africa, as well as to the West, at the end of this century.

AFRICA'S MINERAL WEALTH

Why stress Africa's poverty when it is so customary to refer to Africa's vast mineral resources? The answer is that mineral wealth has to be exploitable commercially or it is not wealth at all. For example, according to the Paley Commission Report of 1952, the potentially recoverable copper in world reserves would double if the average "cut-off" grade were lowered from 1 percent to one-half of 1 percent of copper—from 20 to 10 pounds of copper per 2,000 pounds of ore. However, under present prices and costs for copper, and any cost-price relationship that may be foreseen for the next decade at least, many of those potential reserves in the range from 10 to 20 pounds of copper per ton could not be mined at a profit. Therefore, they do not now constitute wealth in any meaningful sense. Much of the so-called mineral wealth of Africa falls into this category of currently uncommercial ore.

Another part of Africa's misnamed "mineral wealth" consists of deposits not yet discovered, although they may well exist in abundance somewhere below the surface in the earth's crust. They may never be discovered.

There are also mineral deposits which, while they have been disclosed and have a grade of ore and type of metallurgy that would make them good mining propositions in other parts of the world, are at present inaccessible to the market. This may be because they lie far removed from any likely or economical means of transport, or because the cost of reaching them is as yet far beyond the capacity of anyone to raise the requisite money. In other cases this may be because they are located in a political and economic environment which effectively excludes the possibility of raising money for their development.

The length of time that may elapse between discovery of mineral deposits and their effective contribution to economic development is often not well understood. To take an example, a report not long ago in the Times of London described "one of the biggest and most dramatic schemes of development yet undertaken in West Africa" at Fort Gouraud, in the Islamic Republic of Mauritania of the French Community. There, on the fringe of the Sahara, are huge deposits of iron ore comparable in quality with some of the best Swedish iron ore. Negotiations are now well underway for the development of these deposits by Miferma, a consortium of French, British, Italian, German firms which has just received a loan of $65 million from the World Bank. It will require about $200 million in all to open this mineral wealth. They will have to build 400 miles of railroad leading from the coast to the mines at 2,000 feet elevation, an entirely new harbor and loading facilities, new towns at each terminal of the railroad, and install mining equipment capable of moving out 4 to 6 million tons of ore per year—to say nothing of finding and training the labor requirements of all these installations.

The significant fact about the Miferma project for this discussion is the time interval between discovery and development. One would expect that a deposit of this size and richness would be opened within a relatively short time of its discovery. Yet these ore bodies were brought to light by a French geological survey in 1934–35. For 25 years, this mineral wealth was open knowledge, but nevertheless undeveloped. One reason for this paradox was the absence of markets. Consumers of iron ore had no need of the rich Fort Gouraud deposits when they were discovered. No matter how much the French administration or the natives of Mauritania might have wished to build their country's economic development on these known mineral deposits during the past 25 years, they could not have found buyers for the ore before our Minnesota deposits were largely depleted and before Europe's consumption of steel reached present levels.

To summarize: In the free world today there are very few known mineral deposits of economic grade ore—that is, ore which is profitable to mine under present costs and prices with an assured market in today's raw-material-hungry world—which are not already in production or for which production is not already planned. If known mineral deposits are not attractive enough to have induced capital to come to them by now, then the markets for them do not exist or the difficulties of distance, grade, mining problems, or economic and political climate are overwhelming in their impact on costs or risks. Such deposits do not today constitute mineral wealth. Some areas in Africa, therefore, will not have the good fortune to have raw materials which can attract Western capital and know-how. This is a severe handicap—one which is not well understood in Africa.

Extensive parts of Africa will have to face the intractable problem of trying to lift themselves to a higher economic plane without the nearly automatic stimulus of valuable raw material resources. In these areas, development is bound to be slower. Hence the improvement of agricultural methods—the most important general problem of economic development everywhere in Africa—may well be almost the only trigger to the development spiral. Neither agriculture nor health lend themselves easily to the large-scale project attack, however. What outside capital can be found to be put to improvement in agriculture and health must be applied in small and unspectacular doses—to villages and single plots of land, to families and individual human beings.

It is clear that the possession of abundant natural resources is one of the easiest and quickest means of achieving economic advance in any undeveloped area. Where countries are favored by having such resources, Western capital—whether private, governmental, intergovernmental or a mixture of these types—can usually be found willing to face the enormous uncertainties, to meet the enormous costs and to wait out the long period of preparation necessary to bring these natural resources into production. Fortunate is the nation which possesses such natural resources that can be financed by outside capital and marketed in the industrialized nations.

THE COPPER BELT EXPERIENCE

The experience of the copper mines in northern Rhodesia illustrates the changes that a single industry can bring in a single generation. In 30 years a thriving industrial area has arisen where before there had been nothing but the African bush. Today its mines produce 450,000 short tons of copper a year, nearly 15 percent of free world output. In the area of the Copper Belt, only 100 miles by 35 miles, is an urbanized population today of about 400,000 persons, of whom nearly 150,000 are mine workers and their dependents, and the rest are workers in supporting occupations in the towns and areas near the mines, and their dependents. The mining companies had to carve out these communities from the wilderness, clearing out malaria, building towns, building powerplants, and creating recreational facilities and in some cases schools. They had to attract labor to work in the mines—African and white labor. Other developments followed the mining of copper—coal mining, a modern railroad system, food supply, and secondary businesses.

The founding of this industry in Rhodesia was solely the result of private investment. Private companies discovered these copper deposits in the twenties. Private companies then found the capital and took the risks, waited many years for their returns, and regularly reinvested a portion of their earnings. Regardless of the original primacy of the profit motive in their venture, however, the copper companies soon found themselves facing social and political problems, chief among them race relations, and the companies' activities began to have significant social and political consequences. This situation continues to this day.

In the context of contemporary discussion of the role of private capital in backward lands, it may be useful to underline the absence of any political objective in the minds of these private investors who opened up the Copper Belt. They did not intend to help create modern political institutions; they did not intend to provide the revenue basis for great waterpower plants and large-scale expenditure on education and social services; they were not even concerned with the secondary economic effects of their own investments. They did not risk their money in answer to pleas by the British Government that its backward African colonial provinces be developed or to pleas by the American Government that American private capital play a responsible role in developing backward areas. This was a case of private investment in its classic sense—in search of profit, nothing more.

I emphasize this because there are those in government and academic circles today who have fallen into wishful thinking as to the role of private business and private investment. It is not a proper business activity to inaugurate projects that are uneconomic or to make investments because of benevolent or patriotic intentions or international good will, or in order to compensate for timid, unimaginative, and inadequate action on the part of government.

It is a proper function of private business, however, in its pursuit of profits to consider the secondary consequences of its activities, to be a good citizen in its environment, and

to be conscious of its role as ambassador for our Western free enterprise system. A good part of American and other Western business has learned this lesson. As the honorary chairman of American Metals Climax, Inc., stated in a speech at the Harvard Business School conference in 1959:

"If most representatives of business sent from the United States and other investing countries between, say, 1890 and 1940 to work in far regions had known more about those regions and their peoples many of the later troubles there might have been avoided. Today there are heartening signs on this horizon. Here and in other Western countries more and more companies are coming to want their managers and chief technicians to have had some knowledge of the language, history and culture of the countries where they are to live. Profitability is still the fundamental criterion for private capital attracted abroad, but among the essential safeguards are vision, tact and courage on the part of its representatives in dealing with problems arising from the racial and national sensibilities they will encounter."

THE POLITICAL CLIMATE FOR DEVELOPMENT

One obvious problem which will condition all economic development in Africa is the degree of political stability of emerging nations and the sympathetic understanding by the new African statesmen of the conditions necessary to attract the capital they so urgently need. Recent developments in Cuba are illustrative of the policies that new nations must avoid if they are to progress. Cuba is an emergent nation, too—emerging from a repressive dictatorship—but her economic attitudes and her highhanded actions against American capital are tragically unnecessary to—in fact, destructive of—the potentialities of her liberation. If African nations follow in the footsteps of Cuban "mobocracy," an era of riot and anarchy would close the door to the outside capital essential to all their plans—except possibly Soviet capital.

The Soviets are watching intently to take advantage of any outbreak of violence or any condition of rapidly disintegrating law and order. Indeed, their agents may well be behind some of the outbreaks that do occur. But it is unlikely that even Soviet economic assistance would flow in large amounts to countries where law and order have broken down completely; rather, the Soviets would first establish their own version of law and order. Yet, long before the Soviets have a chance to transform some of the new states of Africa south of the Sahara into satellites, we could expect our Government, the governments of our allies and those African governments who really want to preserve their independence to devise some means—perhaps a form of the Monroe Doctrine—to prevent Soviet takeovers in Africa, whether outright or by subversion.

It is a primary responsibility of Western governments to see that Africa does not fall to the Soviets. It is for the new African nationalist leaders to insure that their policies do not frighten away the capital that they so urgently need. It is for the international investors to show courage and political imagination in approaching the investment opoprtunities in these countries. Especially, it is essential that the international investor not mistake that turmoil which is a mere expression of political change for a more deeply rooted disorder. Only capital that has the courage to live with the problems of rapid political and economic transition will have any hope of success in taking advantage of the investment opportunities that the new Africa offers.

THE U.S. ROLE IN AFRICAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

What is the United States doing today in pursuit of our basic national interest that the independent states of Africa remain part of the free world? Thus far, technical assistance, covering a few small-scale programs of education, technical training, and advice in agriculture and health, has been nearly the only form of regular U.S. Government aid to Africa. All the technical assistance projects for all the countries of tropical Africa in 1960 total about $15 million of American aid. The list is: $5 million for Ethiopia; $3 million for the Sudan; $2,500,000 for Liberia; $1,500,000 for Nigeria; $1 million each for Somalia, Ghana, and Guinea; $500,000 for Kenya, and $200,000 for the Rhodesian Federation. In addition, a few special assistance projects to the Sudan, Somalia, Liberia, and Ethiopia amount to nearly another $15 million in 1960. In the past 3 years the Development Loan Fund—with authorized funds of $1.5 billion—has made loans of $20 million for projects in three African countries.

This volume of aid is insignificant when compared to the amounts which European countries have been putting into their dependent territories of Africa. In 1959 European support to African major developmental projects exceeded $500 million, of which the greatest portion, about $400 million, is said to have been put by France into the Republics of the French Community comprising the former colonies of French West and Equatorial Africa. The United Kingdom sent about $80 million to her African territories, and Belgium will give the Congo about $60 million for its first year of nationhood. The six European Common Market nations have established a $300 million fund with which to back development in those parts of Africa included in associate membership in the European Common Market. (The Soviets have promised $100 million to Ethiopia and $35 million to Guinea.)

The largest Western investor in Africa is the World Bank, which has loaned over $500 million to countries south of the Sahara. Money in such proportions can begin to have an impact on African economic development. It is true, of course, that the United States makes the largest contribution to the World Bank's capital. However, in other key areas receiving World Bank assistance, as for example India, this multilateral aid supplements direct U.S. grants and loans of substantial proportions.

How does our Government propose to deal with the problem? In the New York Times for February 2, 1960, a Washington official was quoted as follows: "The United States expects Europe to carry the main burden of assisting the economic development of the newly independent African nations." It was reported that the State Department hoped to avoid large programs of U.S. grants and loans for capital investment in Africa, and expected the larger investments to continue to be made by European countries and by international institutions.

Perhaps this is part of a basic policy line followed in some Washington quarters today—a policy that sees the United States withdrawing from heavy oversea commitments in order to solve her own problems, such as the much publicized balance of payments deficit. The European nations, relatively affluent now, are to be asked to take up a larger share of the programs of aid to underdeveloped countries. It is perfectly obvious that Western European nations should assume a considerable share of the total burden of Western aid to underdeveloped nations. We have seen, however, that the scale of assistance by European countries to Africa already exceeds substantially that of America.

What would be a just distribution of the European and American effort in Africa? A number of prominent men of the West have made proposals bearing on this question. One of them is Sir Oliver Franks, chairman of Lloyds Bank, Ltd., a former British Ambassador to the United States, and former chairman of the committee in Paris that, in 1947, performed the basic preparatory work for the European recovery program. Sir Oliver's recent proposals were first stated in a speech in November 1959 before the Committee for Economic Development in New York City. In a statement that may become almost as famous as General Marshall's speech at Harvard in June 1947, Sir Oliver analyzed the vicious circle which prevents underdeveloped countries from breaking out of their poverty. He forecast that the problems and efforts of the 1960's would shift from the old East-West dimension to a new North-South dimension: The relationship of the industrialized northern nations to the underdeveloped nations in the Southern Hemisphere. Sir Oliver proposed that the affluent nations of the north find some informal means by which they can begin now to "argue these things out and harmonize our approach to the new jobs we have to do in the world."

In a Christmas Eve 1959 speech at the White House in Washington, on the day of his return from his successful tour of a number of underdeveloped countries, President Eisenhower stressed that hopes for peace depend upon our persuading "all other free nations to join us * * * in a long term program dependable in its term and its duration." And early this year, one of the outstanding leaders of the West, Sir Anthony Eden, in concluding his memoirs, suggested a Marshall plan for Africa and stated: "Few things are more important now than Western policy towards Africa."

If we were not in the midst of an election year, perhaps we would be moving more rapidly toward joint action in accordance with these parallel views of our responsibilities. But official American policy today apparently finds it difficult to go beyond the concept that the other affluent capital-exporting nations of the North will somehow assume part of our present burden. This concept not only is unfeasible, but undesirable as well. The United States, in the coming decade, will be called upon for vastly increased amounts, by loan and grant, by government and private means, to support the common aspirations of the free world. It is essential, of course, that the other nations of the North join us and do their full share in a much greater measure than in the past. But let us have no illusions that the American effort will not also be greater than any we are now undertaking.

The United States cannot embark upon the decade of the 1960's enjoying a gross national product exceeding $500 billion and expect to shift any part of its present scale of aid to any other shoulders. Despite a temporary problem in our balance of payments, we are not poor. We are, indeed, a rich nation—as prosperous as our campaigning politicians suggest. And our affluence vis-a-vis most of the rest of the world will necessarily impose increasingly heavy demands upon our efforts and on our Treasury in the decade to come.

There are some encouraging signs of progress in the American position. Under Secretary of State Dillon took a major step forward last January with his proposal for the reorganization of the OEEC and his initiative in inviting eight capital-exporting nations to meet in Washington. This has now resulted in recommendations for a new Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development in which the United States and Canada would participate as full members, and which would consider the needs of the world's underdeveloped areas. The capital-exporting nations have now organized the Development Assistance Group to coordinate their national and international investments in underdeveloped areas, including Africa. As yet, however, dollar signs are conspicuously absent from these new organizational efforts.

In February, President Eisenhower's special message on foreign aid proposed to Congress a new special assistance appropriation of $20 million for Africa. This sum is in place of the $15 million of special asistance granted to four African countries this year. It is in addition to the continuing regular technical assistance programs which in the current year total about $15 million and which are included at a slightly increased sum of $20 million in the aid proposal for the 1961 fiscal year. Therefore, in place of this year's total of $30 million for both technical assistance and special assistance projects in Africa, the President has proposed a $40 million total program for Africa, similarly divided half to regular technical assistance and half to special assistance.

This is aid for Africa on a very small scale. Nevertheless, the signs of a new U.S. approach to aid for Africa are implicit in the President's statement of the purposes of the new $20 million fund for Africa and in his belief that this initial effort "must grow significantly in the immediate years ahead." If the present sum is inadequate and disappointing—and it has not yet been adopted by Congress—at least the statement on Africa in the President's message offers some promise for the future:

"Of inescapable interest to the United States in the world today is the increasing assumption of self-government by the peoples of the great continent of Africa, especially in the area south of the Sahara. This vast area deserves and commands the full attention and assistance of the free world if it is to develop its institutions and its economy under freedom. While the needs of Africa south of the Sahara for development capital are real and can be expected to grow, there is an imperative and immediate requirement for increased education and training.

"The request for appropriations for special assistance includes an amount of $20 million for a special program to be instituted for the improvement of education and training in Africa south of the Sahara, with particular emphasis to be given to the meeting of needs which are common to all the countries of the area. It is my belief that this initial effort must grow significantly in the immediate years ahead and complement similar efforts on the part of other free world nations so that the capacity of the new and other developing nations in Africa to manage and direct their development can be strengthened and increased rapidly and effectively. Without such strengthening and development of education and training, the preconditions of vigorous economic growth cannot be established."

THE RIVKIN PROPOSAL: A MULTILATERAL AID ORGANIZATION FOR AFRICA

In a series of articles in the past 2 years, Arnold Rivkin, head of the African study project conducted by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, has proposed the establishment of a "flexible multilateral organization for economic and technical assistance to Africa," which would include (1) the Western European countries that are members of the Organization for European Economic Cooperation, (2) the associate members of the OEEC, the United States and Canada, (3) other free world countries likely to be interested in African economic development—e.g., India, Israel, and Japan, (4) the growing number of independent African States, and (5) in a relationship to be worked out with the metropolitan countries, the African territories that are still dependent.

The essence of Rivkin's proposal is that the recipient nations should participate with the grantor nations in an analysis of their problems and of the respective roles to be played by their own resources and efforts and by the amounts of outside aid which they may receive. It would be possible, for example, for aid to flow through such an organization directly from the United States to one of the African nations, but with the stigma of bilateral aid removed. Other aid measures could be worked out within the framework of this multilateral organization including different groups of nations for different projects.

The proposed structure would make it possible for the former colonies to continue to receive assistance from the former mother countries or from other Western countries without appearing to compromise their newly found independence or without exposing themselves to the charge of seeming to exchange one colonial overlord for another. One of the most important tasks such an organization could assume would be the recruitment of technicians and administators for an international career service to work for the new nations.

Rivkin's proposal is both practical and promising. So long as only capital-exporting nations consult on development plans, there is the tendency for their discussions to fall into "burden-sharing" arguments without coming to grips with concrete problems of economic development in the needy nations. Furthermore, one of the best ways to introduce African statesmen to the realities of economic development is for them to participate in mutual discussions of their problems and needs. The O.E.E.C. nations have had long and fruitful experience in this kind of common approach, and can make this experience available to Africa.

Ultimately, after the usual laborious efforts and after the usual detours, the governments of the West are bound to accept some program of action like Sir Oliver Franks' and some multilateral aid organization such as that proposed by Arnold Rivkin.

A formidable challenge confronts the West in Africa. Let us hope that our statesmen and leaders will become more keenly aware of this challenge, and that their steps will become increasingly less hesitant in turning to meet it.

Wheat-for-Sugar Exchange Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous approval of the House I am including a copy of a newspaper release by the Honorable Clifford R. Hope, former Member of Congress, wherein he proposes a wheat and sugar exchange with South American countries. Mr. Hope is president of the Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association, Inc.:

WHEAT-FOR-SUGAR EXCHANGE PROPOSED

GARDEN CITY, KANS.—A wheat-for-sugar exchange with South American countries was suggested today by an official of the Great Plains Wheat Market Development Association.

"The curb on imports of sugar from Cuba offers an opportunity for the United States to shift its trade to traditionally friendly countries in South America," said Clifford R. Hope, the association's president. Hope based the suggestion on estimates reported by the association's representative, Jack L. Smith, at Lima, Peru.

Brazil, with a productive capacity of about 3 million tons of sugar a year, is eager to carve out a share of the rich U.S. market. So is Peru.

Brazil would be a dependable source of U.S. sugar imports for its annual production is about half of Cuba's 6 million tons. While Cuba is, at present, the world's largest producer of sugar, Brazil could easily boost its production—possibly enough to equal the Cuban total.

"Since the United States is producing more wheat than the domestic market will absorb, this raises the possibility of an exchange which would benefit both the United States and the South American countries," according to Hope.

"At no time in history has the balance of United States-South American relationship been so critical," Hope said. "We should carefully consider any proposal which will allow these countries to stand on their own feet through their productive abilities."

One way to accomplish this is to redistribute Cuba's former share of the U.S. market to countries such as Brazil and Peru, he continued. The exchange thus generated could be used to buy U.S. surplus farm products.

The official said that Latin America is today one of the major markets for U.S. wheat. There is a demand for much more wheat, but these countries must obtain the necessary exchange to finance increased purchases.

"Commercial exchanges with South American countries would help create an atmosphere for continued and increased sales of U.S. products. A sugar-for-wheat trade would be a step in the right direction," Hope concluded.

In anticipation of such possibilities, Smith held a series of conferences with government, milling, baking and agricultural officials of Brazil and Peru. The meetings, conducted over a period of several months, convinced Smith that such an exchange would benefit everyone concerned.

Smith directs the wheat market development office in South America under a program organized by Great Plains wheatgrowers. The program is supported by wheat commissions and wheatgrower associations in Kansas, Colorado, Nebraska, and North Dakota.

The market-expansion projects are conducted in cooperation with the Foreign Agricultural Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

War Talk in a Political Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my contention that this reconvened session of Congress will be so completely political that little practical legislative progress can be made. It was gratifying for me to note that an outstanding community paper in my district clarified for its readers one of the issues now facing us:

[From the Chicago Heights Star, Aug. 11, 1960]

AS WE SEE IT—WAR TALK IN A POLITICAL YEAR

This is an election year and the peril of war stalks the world. Under the circumstances, it is small wonder that some sources would have us believe the United States is equipped with slingshots as opposed to the nuclear weapons of its foes.

A stock Democratic contention is that President Eisenhower, one of history's great generals, has permitted the Nation to fall far behind in the arms race.

The prophets of gloom and doom vigorously assert their right to downgrade what is currently known as our country's defense posture, even though their words might tend to alienate our allies and encourage our enemies—to the point of risking a move to heat up the cold war.

Their right to speak up on U.S. deficiencies cannot indeed be questioned if their information is accurate and their motives lofty. But the administration, which unquestionably has greater access to accurate information, is joined by many nonpartisan experts on the subject in taking views somewhat opposed to those of the self-appointed prophets.

And even the unfortunate U–2 incident seems to strengthen the suggestion that many critics don't know precisely what they are talking about. If they had knowledge that we were able to fly a plane high over Russia for a number of years, their remarks following the incident didn't show it.

We don't presume to know just what our position is with relation to that of the opposition.

It would be easier to measure the sincerity of the critics, however, if we could dredge up any remarks they might have made about our defense posture before our entry into World War II, a rather well-advertised event. How did they feel about the efficacy of the World War I Springfield rifle in the bazooka age?

We don't question the politicians' right to comment on our military bearing in an hour of peril, but their remarks must be confined to subjects on which there can be no doubt of the facts.

Protestant Council of Churches of Pittsburgh Area Denounces Circulation of Bogus Oath, Slanderous to Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the Council of Churches of the Pittsburgh, Pa., area deserves hearty congratulations on their outstanding statement of August 11, 1960.

The council deplores and roundly condemns the continued circulation of the thoroughly discredited "oath" purported to be sworn to by the candidates of the fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, labeling it "vicious slander * * * most alien and unworthy of any person or group claiming to be followers of Christ."

Congress and the American people should note such fairmindedness and the call for religious people of good faith and high mind to close ranks in the face of implacable forces which would divide and destroy our every right as freemen.

This statement has been warmly welcomed by the office of the Catholic diocese of Pittsburgh, which goes far to carry on the era of good feeling among churches and church members in our great community of western Pennsylvania.

The Pittsburgh Catholic, official publication of the diocese of Pittsburgh, under the leadership of the Most Reverend John J. Wright, bishop of the diocese of Pittsburgh, and president, Pittsburgh Catholic Publishing Associates, in its issue of August 18, 1960, states in an editorial on the actions of people who circulate such slanderous and false material as fomentors of discord and bigotry: "The recognition that anti-Catholicism, like anti-Semitism or any form of group hatred, simply will not be tolerated by the American people, Catholic or otherwise."

The statement of the Council of Churches of the Pittsburgh area of August 11, 1960, follows:

As an organization composed of Christian churches dedicated to the important ministry of reconciliation, and believing most sincerely in the Christ-taught doctrine of the brotherhood of all mankind, the Council of Churches of the Pittsburgh area deplores and roundly condemns the continued circulation of the thoroughly discredited "oath" purported to be sworn to by the candidates of the fourth degree, Knights of Columbus. To aid in the spread of this type of vicious slander is most alien and unworthy of any person or group claiming to be followers of Christ.

The following is an extract from an editorial which appeared in the March 1960 issue of the Council News, the official publication of the council, and referring to this bogus Knights of Columbus oath:

"This long discredited document should be thoroughly denounced by all fairminded persons, especially those claiming to be Christians. To bear this type of false witness, to aid in the distribution of such scurrilous matter, is most unworthy of any decent, fairminded, and responsible person. To do so is to deny the love, mercy, and justice of Christ, who has commanded us to love all men as brothers, regardless of their attitude toward us."

The Council of Churches is not attempting to defend the Knights of Columbus or its activities which do not need our defense, but rather denouncing the half-truths, indiscriminate charges, and slander directed toward all faiths and races, which are spreading across our land in a clandestine fashion during a period in which all men, regardless of race, color, or creed should maintain closed ranks in the face of those implacable forces which would divide us and destroy our every right as freemen.

The council urges its member churches and their congregations to take no part in the circulation of this slanderous material, and make every effort to act, as we know the intelligent and mature Christian will, in accepting their responsibility before God and their fellow men.

Higher Northeast Oil Prices Feared

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article on the residual oil price increase in New England, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor on August 17, 1960:

HIGHER NORTHEAST OIL PRICES FEARED
(By George B. Merry)

Already slapped with one residual oil price increase—a 15-cent-a-barrel boost last month—New England industrial leaders are increasingly concerned that further price jumps may soon come.

Only this week the Federal Government established a new residual oil import quota for the six-State region during the last quarter of 1960. The new quota is 5 percent below the quota during the corresponding period last year.

Officials of utility companies and other industries throughout the region who are large consumers of this type of heavy oil, are concerned that the new 415,000-barrel-a-day quota between October 1 and the end of December 31, may not be enough to keep pace with their needs.

With reserve supplies on hand already dwindling, further price boosts on the heavy-duty fuel oil imports is viewed as a distinct possibly especially if weather conditions are severe.

IMPACT ON HOUSEHOLDER

Although not used for ordinary household heating, any residual oil price increase would ultimately affect most householders in other ways.

Large quantities of this type of fuel are used to generate electricity by major utility companies. Price boosts can be turned over to the customers in the form of higher electric bills.

The July residual oil price increase is expected to cost the Boston Edison Co. about $900,000 a year. This utility firm used 6 million barrels of this fuel last year.

Gardner A. Caverly, executive vice president of the New England Council, which has consistently opposed the oil-import restrictions, said today that the July price hike caused by the low quota system will cost industries throughout the region an estimated $10 million in additional fuel oil prices this year.

PRESSURE REPORTED

Mr. Caverly and other New England business leaders have made several trips to Washington in an effort to persuade Government officials to raise rather than lower the import quotas.

He said heavy pressure exerted from coal producers have forced the import limitation.

The NEC had sought a quota of 560,000 barrels of imported residual oil per day, instead of the 415,000-barrel figure established by the Interior Department for the last quarter of this year.

Members of the NEC's Committee on Fuel and Energy are meeting today in Boston in an effort to map future strategy in their battle to raise the import quotas.

IMPORTS FOR VENEZUELA

Domestic residual oil which is not restricted is in short supply, and most of the heavy-duty fuel oil used by New England utility companies and other industries has to be imported. These imports come largely from Venezuela.

The current price to customers is $2.79 cents a barrel in Boston, one petroleum industry spokesman reported.

Until March 1959 when the oil import quota system was set up by President Eisenhower, there was no restriction on oil imports in New England.

QUOTA FLUCTUATION

The quotas have fluctuated somewhat depending on the season and available supplies. During the last 6 months of 1959 the residual oil import quota was 363,000 barrels per day.

The federally imposed limitation for the current 3-month period, ending September 30, is 250,000 barrels a day.

One oil industry official said today that unless the import quota for the final quarter of 1960 is raised New England industry will receive about 5,500,000 barrels less during the last 6 months of 1960 than in the corresponding period last year. This is bound to gnaw heavily into reserve supplies, he emphasized.

Besides utility companies and other industrial firms, apartment houses, hotels, and the metropolitan authority are major consumers of imported residual oil.

Congo Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I insert in the RECORD the column by David Lawrence entitled "Why Governmental, Liberal Silence on Congo Atrocities?" I feel we should all be aware of this situation and the article is as follows:

[From the Houston Chronicle, Aug. 5, 1960]

WHY GOVERNMENTAL, LIBERAL SILENCE ON CONGO ATROCITIES?

(By David Lawrence)

Something terrible has been happening in the Congo these last few weeks, but, for some unexplained reason, the voices of the so-called liberals and their organizations are strangely silent, not only here but in Europe. Just a few months ago, they cried out indignantly because a few Bantus were killed when thousands of them surrounded and threatened a handful of panic-stricken police in a South African village, who then fired in self-defense.

The parliaments of Europe discussed that issue, and even the United Nations was drawn into the debate, but why, when white women are attacked and a shameful orgy is perpetrated in the Congo, is nothing being said officially and publicly by any government in denunciation of such conduct?

ODD SILENCE

Not even the leaders of the British Parliament, which had an extensive debate on the South African episode, have put themselves on record with any declaration on the subject.

The Prime Minister of the Congo, who recently visited here, calls it all a lot of fabrications in the foreign press. Yet the facts have been reported officially.

David Reed, a member of the Washington staff of U.S. News & World Report, who has been in the Congo for several weeks, cabled a full report, published recently, which said in part:

"The full horror of the mutiny of black troops in the Congolese Army is only now coming to light. * * *

"A Belgian doctor and his wife, who is also a doctor, report that they gave injections of penicillin to between 350 and 450 white women who had been raped by soldiers and who feared they might have contracted syphilis. The two doctors say they treated so many rape victims that they lost count of the total. Among their emergency patients were a mother and her two daughters, one 11 and the other 8 years old. All three had been raped repeatedly during a period of 24 hours.

"A French doctor said he examined two Belgian women, wives of Belgian officials. Both of the women had been raped by 12 soldiers in the town of Kisantu.

"Among other victims were two American women at a Baptist mission. One was the wife of the missionary and the other an unmarried nurse.

"It is entirely likely that no one will ever know how many white women were violated by the troops, as the turmoil was so great. Belgians and other whites were pouring out of the Congo by the thousands."

STRANGE TIMES

There was a time in American history when, if American citizens were maltreated, sharp measures of reprisal would have been undertaken promptly by the Government of the United States. But these are strange times. The demands for recognition of nationalist causes and the insistence that independence be granted to uncivilized peoples seem to take precedence over all else.

Make no mistake, white survival is indivisible, and by this I mean the permanent assets and values of Western civilization and democracy, poised as they now are against the overpowering might of communism and Asian and African nationalism.

Emory University Survey of Older Americans—Comments of Participating Sociologists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, following up on the reactions of the so-called participating sociologists in the now discredited AMA-publicized Emory University survey of older Americans, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD letters from three more of these sociologists, criticizing the study and its exploitation by the doctors' lobby.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR: I heartily agree with Dr. Gist's remarks. I never would have participated in the study if I had known the AMA was going to distort our findings in such a way. I am in favor of outlawing the AMA and all such misleading organizations. I agree with Drs. Streib and Thompson's interpretation of our study.

Sincerely,

T. EARL SULLENGER,
Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Omaha.
OMAHA, NEBR.

LEWISTON, MAINE,
August 22, 1960.

HAROLD L. SHEPPARD,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SHEPPARD: In regard to the Emory University study of the aging, may I say that I simply acted as supervisor in having the sample for the State of Maine (58 schedules) filled out. I agreed to do this before seeing the schedule, on the strength of the information that a foundation was supporting the study. There was no mention at any time of the American Medical Association.

In my judgment the schedule was not up to the standard ordinarily expected and found in sociological studies. Among other things, it was very heavily loaded by the sampling method in favor of the upper and middle classes. Any and all persons receiving public relief of any kind were excluded.

I had nothing to do with the tabulation, analysis, and the drawing of any conclusions from this study. My name should therefore not be used in such a way as to imply that I support any conclusions drawn from the same.

Sincerely yours,

ANDERS M. MYHRMAN.

PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY,
University Park, Pa., August 23, 1960.

DR. HAROLD SHEPPARD,
Research Director, Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. SHEPPARD: In regards to your letter of the 19th and the news release of the American Medical Association concerning the study of the aged in which I participated, please note:

My degree of participation was basically the same as that described by Professor Gist in his letter. Like Professor Gist, I had nothing to do with the tabulations and analysis of the data gathered, nor did I see any of the data other than that which was gathered under my supervision here in central Pennsylvania.

I cannot support any conclusions drawn by the American Medical Association since I have not seen a final report of the study. Nor did I authorize the use of my name in connection with the news release which appeared in the local newspaper here in State College.

Being personally acquainted with both Professor Wiggins and Professor Shoeck for some years now, I would be inclined to feel that their findings represent careful academic work. Conclusions drawn from their findings and wild generalizations that the study "emphatically proves * * *" are quite without justification, of course.

I am unable to comment upon the statement of Profs. Gordon Streib and Wayne Thompson since, as I have said, I have yet to see a final report of the study conducted by Professors Wiggins and Shoeck.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH E. FAULKNER,
Instructor.

Ukrainian American Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my message on the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America:

THE UKRAINIAN AMERICAN CONGRESS

Twenty years ago the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America was founded by the First Congress of Ukrainian-Americans. Its objectives reflected the devotion of Ukrainian-Americans to their new country and their love for their motherland. In regard to the United States these objectives called for participation in the efforts of America to maintain peace and to strengthen the American way of life. In regard to the land of their origin, they called for making known the plight of the Ukrainian people and for helping the Ukrainians in their native land achieve their goal of freedom.

Today the Ukrainian Congress Committee is representative of some 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry. It encompasses fraternal, civic, youth, religious, cultural, athletic, and other types of organizations from the many States in which Ukrainian-Americans have settled, providing a unity of action which is unique and valuable. For the past 20 years it has pursued its objectives with dedication and vigor, helping Ukrainian immigrants adapt to their new home, promoting the American way of life, and carrying on a campaign of education about the Ukraine, the largest non-Russian nation behind the Iron Curtain in Europe.

Through the informational activities of the Congress Committee, the longings of the Ukrainian people for independence have been kept before the eyes of the world in spite of Soviet attempts to hide them. The history of the Ukrainian people has been brought to life and we have become more vividly aware of their 300 years of suffering under tsarist tyranny, the proclamation of independence on January 22, 1918, and the tragic takeover by a new tyranny in the form of Soviet communism.

On this 20th anniversary, all Americans join in wishing the Ukrainian Congress Committee continued success in its endeavors. We wish to express our gratitude for the service it has performed to the United States and its citizens of Ukrainian heritage. Finally, we express our hope that its ultimate goal of freedom and democracy everywhere will someday be achieved and the people of Ukraine will live in liberty once again.

Crash Program on Farm Surpluses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the following editorial from today's issue of the Philadelphia Inquirer, a distinguished metropolitan newspaper, calls for congressional action on a proposal which I have sponsored for several years and which is developing steadily increasing support in our farming areas. I call it to the attention of the Congress and the country in the hope that both political parties will unite in getting action on this sensible approach to finding a formula for utilizing our existing farm surpluses and for insuring agriculture of a free and prosperous future.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Aug. 24, 1960]

CRASH PROGRAM ON SURPLUSES

Senator KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota Republican, hails from a State where farm policies and farm surpluses are matters of vital concern. He has come forward with a proposal for the Government to set up a kind of agricultural Manhattan project to seek out means of developing new uses for vast amounts of stored grains and other commodities.

The Manhattan project reference is to the vast, intensive wartime operation which, through mobilization of the skills and knowledge of some of the Nation's and the world's greatest scientists, produced the atomic bomb.

Mr. MUNDT's idea is to apply something as outstanding to what has become a terrific burden of surplus grains and other products due to Government price support measures. In spite of fairly well developed efforts to dispose of some of the surpluses, particularly grains, abroad they continue to pile up and clog warehouses and other storage depots at enormous expense to American taxpayers.

A few days ago Secretary of Agriculture Benson, defending his farm policies, declared that storage of wheat, on which he said Congress has done virtually nothing, is costing the Government a thousand dollars a minute.

Some means of disposing of wheat and other strangling surpluses must be found. Senator MUNDT's idea of an all-out program to seek them surely merits serious consideration. Whatever politicians urge or promise, reduction of the surpluses is of vital importance.

Nasser's Personality Cult

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to draw attention to an important article which has been published in the latest issue—No. 56, summer 1960—of Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, of New York.

This article, entitled "President Nasser and God," is an eye-opening revelation of the degree to which the "cult of personality" has been encouraged by the present ruler of Egypt. It goes without saying that Nasser's "cult of personality" is intended to cow the Egyptian masses and to hinder whatever opportunities there are for democratic development. Furthermore, Nasser's "cult of personality" presents distinct dangers to the free world just as the "cult of personality" under Stalin threatened Western security.

The facts cited in this article are shocking and should be pondered by all security-minded Americans. Under unanimous consent I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

PRESIDENT NASSER AND GOD

Offhand it would seem that dictatorship is the easiest method to rule. The dictator is unhampered by constitutions, parliaments, and independent judiciary or public opinion. In short, he does as he pleases. The theory of dictatorship can perhaps best be summed up by the Roman concept that what the emperor said was law.

However, upon closer examination, rule by dictatorship is not so simple. Indeed, in many respects it is more complicated and requires an inexhaustible bag of tricks to maintain the dictator's hold on the people. After all, it is precisely because the dictator smashes all limitations to his rule that makes it necessary for him to find other instruments and symbols that will secure his position and stature. This means that he has to be constantly on the alert, forever maneuvering in one direction or another, so that at no time is his right to rule absolutely subject to question.

There are a number of stock methods employed by dictators through the ages to achieve the desired objective. For one thing, there is always the use of the scapegoat tactic. The scapegoat makes it possible for the dictator to give his people the opportunity to sound off when they feel aggrieved. It helps to absolve the dictator of any crimes that he has or intends to commit. Moreover, when he fails in a particular adventure, the scapegoat provides a convenient diversion.

Another instrument that is frequently used is the launching of aggressive wars. Here again the people are distracted from their real troubles while the dictator has the opportunity of building up still further his prestige and power in the name of the national interest. Of course, dictatorship also resorts to various forms of suppression including violence.

It is also customary in many instances for dictators to latch on to certain traditions in the history and culture of his people. This requires great dexterity, imagination, and an enormous propaganda apparatus which ceaselessly seeks to convince the people that the dictator is the reincarnation of their past glories. Mussolini, for example, tried very hard to convince the Italians that he was the true successor of the Roman Caesars. Stalin borrowed from the image of czarist rule which portrayed the czar as the little father of his people. Mao Tse-tung borrows from the legacy of the old Chinese emperors who were regarded as the great fathers of their children (the Chinese people).

THE BIG BUILDUP

The President of the United Arab Republic, Gamal Nasser, has a wealth of ancient traditions which he can and does associate with his own dictatorial rule. The earliest tradition, going back to about 3400 B.C., is based on the rule of the Pharaohs. With none to question their powers, which the Egyptians believed to be sanctified by the gods, the Pharaohs dictated every aspect of the lives of their subjects. The Pharaohs' rule on earth was regarded as reflecting the divine order of the universe. This was the meaning of the word "Ma'at" which was represented in the hyroglyphics by a white feather against which the hearts of men were weighed in the hall of judgment after death.

As one historian described the divine government on earth: "He [Pharaoh] as a god, was the state. To be sure, it was necessary for him to have officials of a government which had spread and which would become increasingly elaborated, but our evidence indicates that they were his officers, appointed by him, responsible to him alone, and holding office subject to his divine pleasure. * * * The customary law of the land was conceived to be the word of the Pharaoh, articulated by him in accordance with the concept of Ma'at and ever subject to his divine pleasure, within his interpretation of Ma'at and of his function as a god. * * *" It is clear that Nasser strives to imbue Egyptians with the feeling that he acts in accordance with the "great traditions" of the Pharaohs. Egyptian propaganda dwells on this theme on many occasions. For example, in the official government pamphlet "The Egyptian Revolution (July 1955) we read the following: "Egypt was the first country in the world to have a regular army. When Mena, the first Pharaoh of Egypt, desired to unite Upper and Lower Egypt, he organized the first regular army known to the world, and in this manner achieved his end.

"The army has suffered a great deal under the corruption of previous regimes, but in spite of these persecutions [sic] and the

limitations imposed on it by British imperialism, it has preserved its glorious traditions.

"The army has played its role in the past and will continue to play it successfully."

When Nasser first gained power, his popularity was not at all assured. However, when he seized the Suez Canal, a typical stroke of demagogic adventurism, he managed to conjure in the minds of the people the picture of an ancient hero come alive. As one reporter noted, portraits of Nasser began to appear everywhere. Significantly, a colossal one was set up opposite the giant statue of Ramses II, the Pharaoh who is noted as the great empire builder of ancient Egypt. The Egyptian vice president at that time, Gamal Salem, remarked drily to a newspaper reporter, "I am against the personality cult." The censor cut this remark out of the interview. A few days later Mr. Salem was removed from Nasser's cabinet. Nasser's notorious Fedayeens which had made bandit-like incursions into Israel, were also doused with the Pharaonic tradition. Thus, on August 31, 1955, the Cairo radio boasted about the deeds of this gang in these words: "Egypt has decided to dispatch her heroes, the disciples of Pharaoh * * * and they will cleanse the land of Palestine."

Even though Gamal Salem was promptly removed after his criticism of the personality cult, there is no doubt that he had hit the nail on the head. Nowhere else do we find a clearer expression of Nasser's megalomania than in his book "Egypt's Liberation" written in the first person. It rivals anything that Hitler wrote about himself as the predestined ruler of his people. Like Hitler's writings, it is a mishmash of mysticism, conceit, self glorification, and obscurantism. As one commentator noted, many of the passages in Nasser's book are "purple with a sort of adolescence." Here are some excerpts:

(1) "I got home, threw myself on my bed, my mind in fever, my heart and conscience incessantly boiling. * * * The ecstasy of success on July 23 did not really deceive me. * * * The annals of history are full of heroes who carved for themselves great and heroic roles and played them on momentous occasions on the stage. History is also charged with great heroic roles for which we do not find actors."

(2) "From the height of the stars, I used to come down to earth often and feel that I was really defending my home and my children. * * * I had within me a feeling of distraction which was a mixture of complex and intermingled factors: of patriotism, religion, compassion, cruelty, faith, suspicion, knowledge and ignorance."

SALADIN'S SUCCESSOR

Nasser has also leaned heavily on the historical exploits of Saladin who fought the crusades in the Middle East. Mr. C. L. Sulzberger, chief foreign correspondent for the New York Times, wrote a poignant description of Mr. Nasser, the "Saladin in a gray flannel suit" (March 26, 1958). In describing his personal interview with Mr. Nasser, Mr. Sulzberger wrote: "This dynamic but rather simple Egyptian, with no profundity either of education or experience, is likened by millions of Arabs nowadays to Saladin, the almost legendary figure who emerged from the desert 8 centuries ago to defeat Richard the Lion-Hearted and his Crusaders.

"The concept of Nasser as a modern Saladin has been developed in his own controlled and heavily inspired press. Certainly no Arab since Richard's dashing opponent has been so popular with Middle Eastern masses as this new aspirant to (in his own words) 'a role wandering aimless in search of a hero.' And certainly Nasser himself is not averse to comparing his own ambitious present with Saladin's successful past."

Besides working on the Pharaoh-Saladin angle, Mr. Nasser has also played the religious traditions of his people. Presumably, it would not be a bad idea if he could convince the Arab masses that he was the legitimate successor to Mohammed. Indeed, as his book indicates, Nasser sees himself as a sort of prophet whose mission is to bring into one embrace the people of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East. "Within the Arab circle," he writes, "there is a role, wandering aimlessly in search of a hero. * * * This role is beckoning to us since no one else is qualified to play it. * * * This is a role such as to spark the tremendous power latent in the area surrounding us, a role tantamount to an experiment, with the aim of creating a great strength which will then undertake a positive part in the building of the future of mankind." In his concluding words he repeats his self-appointed mission: "And now I go back to that wandering mission in search of a hero to play it. Here is the role. Here are the lines, and here is the stage. We alone, by virtue of our place, can perform the role."

MOHAMMED'S SUCCESSOR

The extent to which Nasser tries to depict himself as the man closest to God is revealed in many of his speeches. They are soaked through and through with self-glorification and the idea that he is the true interpreter of God's will. One of these speeches was delivered in Syria last year (Feb. 25, 1959). Although the harangue was very short, about 1,000 words, the word "God" was mentioned 12 times:

"Thanks be to God who united us for right."

"The cause which brought us together here today is a cause sent by God."

"With the help of God, your cause—the cause of Arab nationalism—will triumph."

"Your cause, as I have said, is a cause sent by God."

"As I told you before, the cause in which you believe * * * is a cause sent by God in order to awaken us and to restore our glory once again."

"We used to pray to God * * * to unite the hearts of the Arab people."

"Today I thank God after seeing you all united in one cause."

"We thank God who united our hearts in this cause."

"We make God a pledge and I pledge with you that I shall work * * * for this cause."

"With God's will we hope to celebrate * * * victories in all fields."

"May God grant you all success. God's peace and mercy be upon you."

Cairo's dictatorship is not only heavenly sent but, according to Nasser, it is he who interprets God's will in this respect. Thus, in another brief speech on the very same day he declared: "In these glorious days in which we stand to review our pledge to the Arab nation, I feel a propelling force derived from your strength, because this spirit which I see, is a spirit from God which he granted to us so that we might be able to realize the great hopes of the Arab nation."

Certainly, the above passages do not show any humility on Mr. Nasser's part. That he appears before his people as a sort of god-like character reminds us of the role that this concept played in the scheme of rule that kept the Egyptians in subjugation under the absolute pharaohs. Of course, under the modern conditions, Nasser must depend upon a first-class propaganda machine. Here, Nasser has borrowed the techniques, indeed, even the personnel of Hitler's propaganda apparatus. "Every Egyptian today is a new Goebbels and Britain will not be able to defeat these many Goebbels as it prevailed over the one Goebbels in Germany." This was written by Sami Daud in Al Tahir, one of Nasser's most important propaganda organs (Apr. 10, 1956) and so, with this directive, Cairo has let out all stops in its efforts to place Nasser on the right hand of God. Here are some examples:

"Not in vain did God's hand choose President Abdul Nasser to lead the Arabs * * * Arab solidarity in all parts of the Arab homeland, coupled with President Abdul Nasser's leadership, will result in a great force which will lead us to our victory and to the defeat of imperialism" (Nov. 30, 1958).

"Zionist-imperialist propaganda has been describing Nasser as a leader with expansionist ambitions. This propaganda has stuck in the minds of a number of Arab rulers among the agents of imperialism, who see in Nasser a threat to their existence. They do not know that Nasser is the messenger of Providence to his people" (Dec. 1, 1958).

The religious cloak donned by Nasser, is pointed up by a news item from Damascus. It appears that the Syrian Minister for the Interior told German newspapermen that the Germans should more than anyone else comprehend the Arab struggle to achieve Arabdom because the "Arabs fight for their unity like the Germans." In describing the interview with the Syrian Minister, the German reporter noted that there was a bust of President Nasser on his desk with the Koran inscription " 'This is your people—one people' (the Koran verse goes on to say: 'I am your master—therefore pray to me')" (Deutsche Wochenschrift, Feb. 18, 1960).

SUPERMAN

Besides depicting Nasser as God's messenger and prophet, Cairo has outlined Nasser's mission on earth. Here are some examples:

(1) "We established the U.A.R. out of Syria and Egypt as a nucleus of the State of Arab nationalism extending from the gulf to the ocean" (Oct. 29, 1958).

(2) "Imperialism knows very well that the construction of the high dam in the Nile Valley, and the joining together of the struggle of the two brotherly peoples in the Sudan and Egypt, would spell definite doom for imperialism in the whole of Africa, its last haven" (Nov. 3, 1958).

(3) "The revolution of July 23 which surged forth in Cairo under the leadership of Gamal Abdul Nasser was the signal that set in motion the African liberation movements" (Dec. 4, 1958).

(4) "With the emergence of Abd an-Nasir, the historic capital of the Fatimids and Ayubites became a world center no less important than Washington and Moscow" (Jan. 8, 1959).

(5) "The flame of faith, freedom, struggle, and construction which burst in Cairo and lighted the way for the entire Arab nation is now lighting the way for the nations of Africa and Asia. This flame in the strong hands of Jamal Abd an-Nasir will continue to radiate its light. The Arab people will continue to rally around their leader, the exponent of their renaissance, until we accomplish our mission" (Feb. 4, 1959).

In Mr. Nasser's book referred to above, the future Egyptian empire is outlined in the form of three circles. The first circle takes in the Arab Middle East, the second circle "the continent of Africa" and the third one involves the unity of all Moslems. Judging from his recent visit to India and Pakistan it would seem that Nasser might be in the process of outlining a fourth circle to include these two key countries of Asia.

The visit itself was trumpeted by the Egyptian propaganda machine as one of the great historic occasions in recent years. The Cairo radio declared that the Indian people in overwhelming numbers expressed their "happiness" to a person (Nassar) "dear to them." Thus, Radio Cairo broadcast that Nasser's visit "has a great effect on the Indian people" (Mar. 29, 1960). Nasser took

every opportunity to address the Indian people, haranguing them against "Western imperialism." The Egyptian newspaper Al-Akhbar declared: "Nasser is not only the UAR leader, but he is a man of ideas, principles, and beliefs which the peoples of Asia and Africa have adopted." The omnipotent qualities of Nasser's leadership were repeated over and over again as he continued his trip through India. A resolution adopted by the National Union, Nasser's hand-picked political organization, saluted "the hero of peace and vanguard of Arab nationalism, President Nasser, and prays that he succeeds in defending peace and in making the Afro-Asian peoples victorious."

The same sort of buildup took place during Nasser's visit to Pakistan. The newspaper Al-Akhbar (Apr. 10, 1960) wrote: "If the President's visit to India arouses great interest in Africa, Asia, and the other continents President Nasser's visit to Pakistan is no less important." Continuing in this vein, another Egyptian newspaper Al-Ahram (Apr. 18, 1960) wrote: "Observers were also surprised to see that the shouts which echoed in the four corners of the Indian subcontinent were similar to those which have echoed in Cairo, which, in both cases, showed unanimous support for the material and moral results achieved by President Nasser's visit." Summing up Nasser's triumph in India and Pakistan, the chief editor of Al-Ahram wrote: "In this mission Nasser was an ambassador extraordinary representing the whole Arab nation and carrying its message to the people of Asia, the largest and oldest continent." Concluding his evaluation of Nasser's trip, the chief editor declared that "Providence protects him (Nasser) for the fulfillment of missions such as the mission in the heart of Asia" (Apr. 20, 1960).

THE NEW CULT

Obviously, with all of the channels of public information firmly in the hands of Nasser, the Egyptian masses and many Arabs throughout the Middle East are subject to a constant barrage of words extolling the virtues, the heroism, the self-sacrificing, saintly character of the new superman Nasser. Throughout the Middle East his propagandists preach his "pearls of wisdom" and present him as a man who can and will do most anything for the Arab masses. Tragically, this line has made an impression on the Egyptian people because there are no other channels of information except those under the thumb of Nasser himself. They have no way of learning the truth. Under these circumstances, they become prey for the Cairo jugglers of words and ideas. They can be stamped into frenzies of hate and violence when the dictator deems it prudent to reach for a scapegoat so as to cover up his own failures. Western "imperialism" is one of these scapegoats, as is the State of Israel. As noted in the earlier part of this article, this, too, is an old tactic of dictatorship.

From the foregoing it is clear that the "cult of personality," a phrase coined by the Communists in apologizing for the brutalities of Stalin, is very much alive in modern Egypt. Of course, the personality cult could not by itself, maintain Nasser in power. He must continue to use force, terror, and maintain a state of emotional tension among his people. As Walter Lippmann once noted, Nasser's position in Egypt and his influence in the world "would soon collapse" if he agreed to abide by the moral standards of relations among nations. "He must remain in rebellion against them (the Western nations), never for long allowing the conflict to subside. He needs the tension of international, indeed of interracial struggle. He needs it to maintain among the Arab masses the image of himself as their champion. He needs attention also for his political survival at home, to divert his rivals who conspire against him, and as a distraction for the people."

Nevertheless, the cult of Nasser, while not the only element in his power structure, is not to be underrated. Its psychological value is well understood by Nasser himself. Just as the depressed Egyptian masses were forced to cast their eyes on the mighty pyramids dedicated to the ancient Pharaohs, so Nasser calls upon his people to fix their attention on his Aswan Dam project while they continue to languish in poverty and ignorance.

National Television Debates Between Presidential Candidates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the House has now passed Senate Joint Resolution 207, and sent it to the White House. I feel certain that the President will sign this resolution which will make possible a series of great national television debates between the two presidential candidates. I believe these debates will make a major contribution to the forthcoming campaign by permitting millions of Americans to see and hear a presentation by the candidates themselves of the great issues before the Nation.

This week's edition of TV Guide, the most popular of the television magazines—published I am happy to note, by Triangle Publications, Inc., of Pennsylvania, has an editorial commending the Senate for passing Joint Resolution 207. I believe it states the case for this resolution well, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AS WE SEE IT

The coming election campaign will make much more sense to viewers—and to candidates—if the House of Representatives passes a joint resolution already approved by the Senate.

The measure suspends—temporarily—a section of the Communications Act which requires broadcasters to give equal time to all candidates for the same office. Usually there are about a dozen candidates for President and Vice President. Since is it impossible to donate time for, say, a debate between the Democratic and Republican candidates without giving equal time to all the minor party candidates, broadcasters just don't give time to anyone. They sell it.

This results in huge television expenditures by the major parties, and a real possibility of inequity.

All three networks have pledged to give free and equal time to the Democratic and Republican candidates provided they can do so legally. The network plans differ, ranging from debates and joint press conferences to "here is the time, do what you will with it." They are willing to set aside prime evening time on a regular basis for the two political parties.

This system would also permit the Democrats and Republicans to buy extra time, but would tend to reduce the size of the war chests needed to conduct the campaign.

We urge the House of Representatives to pass the measure which would permit broadcasters to donate time to the two major parties. This is no normal election. More is at stake than ever before in our history and it would be ridiculous to permit a legal technicality to prevent full airing of issues.

If readers want to make their wishes known to their Congressmen, the measure we have described is Senate Joint Resolution 207.

A New Program for the New Situation in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article appearing in the August 1960 issue of the Catholic World written by Paul K. T. Sih, Ph. D. Dr. Sih is director, Institute of Asian Studies, Graduate School, St. John's University, Jamaica, Long Island, N.Y.:

A NEW PROGRAM FOR THE NEW SITUATION IN ASIA—IN OUR PAST POLICY WE WERE NOT LACKING IN GENEROSITY BUT IN SPIRITUAL UNDERSTANDING

(By Paul K. T. Sih)

The tide in Asia is turning in our favor. An evident upsurge of opposition has set in toward the Red China regime. A Bandung Conference is unimaginable at this time. If such a conference were possible today, its major consideration would not be the expulsion of the Western powers but the elimination of the Communist threat.

This view of the Asian situation may seem excessively optimistic in view of the fact that almost half the Asians are under Communist control. It is a fact, however, that communism is not as influential now as it was ten years ago. The recent riots in Tokyo indicate that Communists have tremendous power in certain circles of students and workers but these violent demonstrations were symptoms of domestic quarrels rather than proof of a popular enthusiasm for communism. The overwhelming majority of Japanese are still conservative and although they have an understandable bent for neutralism due to their memories of the last war, they are not pro-Communist.

In Okinawa a small but vociferous group expressed their grievances when President Eisenhower arrived in June. However these grievances do not reflect pro-Communist sentiment and the Communists there are weak and ineffective. The grievances are based on a rational conviction on the part of most of the islanders that they would fare better economically by having the islands revert to Japan.

Elsewhere in Asia, there has been some deterioration of American prestige due to the cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit to Tokyo but in general the neutralist nations of Asia are becoming less neutral and less sympathetic to communism. In Indonesia, the large, well-disciplined Communist Party has lost ground because of Red China's opposition to the Indonesian Government's treatment of the Chinese in Indonesia. Malaya, under the leadership of Prime Minister Tengku (Prince) Abdul Rahman, has decided to stamp out Communist

activities during 1960. The free nations of Asia are achieving new levels of stability and adopting a more realistic policy toward communism.

There are of course certain significant reasons for this development. The inhuman program of the people's communes in Red China has terrified the family-loving peoples throughout the entire Oriental world. Assault on Tibet has extended to regions controlled by India, from Shipski Pass on the Tibetan border to the North-East Frontier Agency. Pakistan is fuming over a set of Chinese maps showing some 6,000 square miles of Pakistani territory above Kashmir as part of China. Indonesia has seen the much-prized spirit of Asian cooperation callously destroyed. Nepal has taken increased defense measures against Communist infiltration from Tibet into the villages of Hilje, Limi, and Jami. Burma is taking defense measures in its northern region against Communist aggression. In Laos, it has been reported that the rebellion has been resumed with the support of the Chinese Communists. In the Arab world, Kassim in Baghdad and Nasser in Cairo find that their Communist friends are a treacherous support.

This recent decrease of Communist influence does not, however, mean that the democratic West has in itself grown more attractive to the Asian peoples. Bitterness based on recent colonial occupation and the West's economic superiority prevent that. The U–2 episode and the cancellation of President Eisenhower's visit to Tokyo were serious blows to Western prestige in Asia. Yet at the same time they did not increase respect for communism. It is most urgent, therefore, at this moment in the cold war, that we make a thorough reappraisal of our position. We must bring about a more intimate association between ourselves and the new Asian nations.

One thing is clear. Our policy in Asia in the past has not been adequate. On the whole we were not lacking in generosity, but in spiritual understanding. A soundly human friendship must be created if America and Asia are ever to achieve that firm basis upon which our future cooperation must rest. Something beyond economics determines the success or failure of economics. Once we establish this deeper understanding, an extensive renewal will take place in every phase of our relationships with Asia.

Here we outline in detail the new attitudes and activities that should follow in the political, economic, cultural, and spiritual orders if this new program of cooperation is to be put into effect.

In the political order:

(1) We must appoint ambassadors and ministers to Asian nations who are truly capable of understanding Asians and of obtaining their confidence. Some of the American ambassadors in important posts possess the attributes of good diplomatic representatives, but qualified diplomats are needed in all the free countries of Asia. Present-day diplomacy demands more qualifications than traditional diplomacy. These include an adequate knowledge of the countries to be served. Jusserand, a noted French diplomat, said testily: "Experience has already shown and will more and more show that no invention, no airplane, no wireless will ever replace the knowledge of a country and the understanding of a people's disposition." The present trend reveals that "although the language proficiency of this country's Foreign Service officers is improving rapidly, more progress needs to be made. If the number of our diplomats who can speak French, Spanish, and German is now adequate, this can hardly be said of the numbers who cannot speak other needed languages, especially non-Western tongues. There is, for example, no American diplomat who can speak Singhalese, only one who speaks Bengali, and only four who speak Burmese. We have had extensive relations with Korea since 1945, yet only nine of our diplomats can speak Korean" (New York Times, Nov. 22, 1959).

Such examples could be multiplied, but the point is clear: we cannot hope to build good will for the United States unless those who are in official posts overseas have the ability to know the people of the host country—their needs, aspirations, and point of view. Our representatives must be able to communicate easily and directly with many different peoples.

(2) We must act consistently. This is most important for if there are things that are immeasurably irritating to Asian peoples they are inconsistency, hesitation, establishment of programs that are never carried out, and making promises that we do not fulfill. On the other hand, consistency gains confidence for times of crisis. American prestige was never higher throughout Eastern and particularly southeast Asia than when our Government took a firm stand with respect to Quemoy and extended needed assistance to the Nationalist Chinese Government on Formosa in its valiant and successful resistance to Communist aggression.

(3) We must make new efforts to mitigate inter-Asian political quarrels. The nations of Asia have conflicts and little "cold wars" among themselves. Even without Communist aggravation, Asia has its quota of international tensions that can often be relieved by outside assistance. India and Pakistan have to settle their disputes over Kashmir and over the waters of the Indus River system. Japan and South Korea must solve problems that have arisen over the repatriation by Japan of Koreans to Communist North Korea and over fishing rights in the Pacific. Controversies must also be settled between Free China on the one hand and the Philippines and Vietnam on the other with respect to Chinese minority groups. For these differences, an arbiter is frequently needed. This role of peacemaker is not an enviable one. Yet nations as well as individuals do need assistance from others. The United States can furnish intelligent, sympathetic and impartial advice to both sides and thus assist in healing many of the ancient and recent antipathies that exist in Asia.

Of course, before she is able to bring about this political solidarity in Asia, the United States has to overcome some of her own difficulties in Asia. Above all, she has to seek a proper adjustment with Japan, especially in regard to those Japanese who fear that the United States-Japanese Security treaty will subject Japan to the danger of war. Then too the United States must reassure the Philippines concerning the lease of military bases and must arrive at a satisfactory agreement with Free China concerning the status of American Armed Forces. We firmly believe that, with mutual good will, these normal political differences can be bridged.

In the sphere of economics, American programs must find more effective means of aiding the national economies of the new Asian countries. With Communist Russia and Communist China looming ever more menacing in the Far East, there is no question as to the fact that those nations directly and indirectly threatened by communism should receive special attention. However, there are serious weaknesses in the execution of our foreign aid program. In implementing a new program of economic assistance:

(1) We must delegate more power to our field officers. At present, too many details in our economic projects have to be decided in Washington. Efficiency is at stake. Drastic changes for the sake of more effective operation must be inaugurated. American aid in Asia is less welcome today than it was a few years ago. Why? Since 1953 the Soviet bloc has given economic help to the area. Compared with Communist aid, American aid seems less efficient. Sukarno, President of Indonesia, is reported as saying: "It usually takes 1 year to negotiate with the United States and another year to assure delivery. Not so with Communist China. It takes 1 week to negotiate and 3 weeks for delivery." A similar situation is found in Vietnam. Saigon welcomes Australian aid more readily than American aid in economic projects because Australia is more prompt in executing its part of the program.

(2) We must institute a more extensive program for training Asian personnel in technical work. Scientists and men of higher learning are necessary and should be trained in the more developed countries on a larger scale. In this regard, the program of the U.S. Economic Cooperation Administration has achieved certain praiseworthy results in Asia. However, better trained local staffs are even more necessary for a balanced development of the area. It is generally advisable that this training be carried out in the place where the trainees are found rather than in more developed countries where social conditions are very different. Training programs set up in the West for use in the more developed nations are generally not suited to the needs of Asia. To cite one instance: medical doctors who are at work in Asia are better trained in Asia than in the United States. Asia has particular diseases and types of diseases, such as malaria, smallpox, yellow fever, typhus, dysentery, cholera, etc., that are rarely found in this country. Many doctors who received their specialized training in the United States found, after their return to Asia, that their usefulness in their native lands had been somewhat impaired. We know that India has only 23,000 hospital beds, which can hardly accommodate 2,500,000 active cases of tuberculosis. However, a pilot experiment in Madras has shown that "at home" treatment of tuberculosis patients produces results quite as good as those resulting from treatment in hospitals. Less disruption of family life facilitates considerably the recovery of the patients. It is this kind of doctoring and nursing that most of the nations in Asia, which cannot afford modern medical care, are anxious to secure. It is gratifying to note that a serious attempt to cope with the situation has been made in Indonesia. In August 1959, the University of Indonesia graduated 97 medical doctors under a cooperative training program with the University of California. Similar programs should be set up in other Asian countries.

(3) We must absolutely separate ourselves from the traditions of colonial times. This is especially important at a time when the Communist bloc nations, sincere or not, are offering "disinterested help" to the nations in Asia. American economic aid programs, of course, do not envisage any imperial interest. Yet they originated in the Marshall plan which was successful in Europe, but which cannot be transplanted, in content and concept, to the newly developing lands of Asia. Asia is essentially a rural society. Being rural, it differs in character and genius from Europe. Therefore, in extending our assistance, we must give more consideration to the views and projects suggested by national leaders. Above all, we must develop our economic aid to Asia in such a way that a regional economy, like the European Common Market, may be formed with Free China, Japan and possibly India as the leading nations. Experience indicates that many fine systems based largely on foreign patterns are not suited to the special needs of Asia. We must seek to develop "homegrown" programs that would be fundamentally based on the conditions and

needs of Asia. This is the reason why Vietnam and Thailand have often sought technical assistance from Free China in establishing textile factories and sugar refining plants. Japan was asked to build a $2,800,000 nickel smelting and refining plant at Bindura in Southern Rhodesia. To those projects for inter-Asian economic cooperation, the United States should give all-out encouragement and help.

Asia is passing from a traditional agrarian economy into a modern industrial economy. While foreign aid is made available great care must be taken to assist the Asian countries to adapt present conditions to a modern economic system. Native resources and foreign assistance can both fail to benefit the people unless they are integrated into a sound functioning economy.

In our cultural exchanges with Asia we must adjust our programs to the psychology, traditions, and cultures of the peoples there. The U.S. Information Agency has been successful in its limited attempt to carry out oversea propaganda. However, there is room for considerable improvement. The general impression has been created that intellectual quality is being sacrificed to commercial quantity. Department store catalogs often find more prominent places in our information centers than the works of Lincoln or Jefferson. With a sense of regret we read a news report published in the New York Herald Tribune of July 20, 1959, that the Malayan Government ordered the removal from community centers of all books and pamphlets donated by USIA. Minister of Labor and Law K. M. Byrne, who issued the order, said that the American publications would be replaced by "books of Malayan content." The basic defects of our cultural relations with foreign countries derive from the excessively materialistic philosophy of our programs, not from political or administrative failures. This is particularly true in Asia.

Now, more than ever, Asia wants more schooling for its children and a share in the fruits of modern cultural enterprises. However, no international program of education and culture could succeed without taking advantage of the rich traditions of Asia's intellectual life. Addressing themselves to the annual assembly of the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Professions held in August 1959, at Washington, D.C., Asian delegates made a joint appeal for the setting up of a special commission to study "the educational problems of Asian countries and to make recommendations on them, taking due note of the spiritual heritage of these countries and the necessity of providing an education suited to the modern age" (New York Times, Aug. 4, 1959). This outcry indicates their dissatisfaction for what they have thus far received from the West.

So far as the United States is concerned, we fail badly even in the entertainment field. American motion pictures are generally more popular with Asians than other Western productions. However, they have often been presented in such bad taste that local authorities were forced to ban them. We know that the Legion of Decency in Taiwan, for example, has established for the classification of films a moral standard that is even higher than its American counterpart. In fact, a Puritan crusade prevails in Asia. Laos has carried out a program against indecent songs and recitals. Thailand has closed down nightclubs. Singapore has banned pinball games and jukebox parlors. In Burma, both rock and roll and beauty contests are condemned. In Indonesia, hulahoops are prohibited as sexually provocative. In Bandung, Western movies are forbidden because they tend to provoke "adventurous sentiments."

On the bright side, however, it can be said that good American motion pictures are welcomed by the young generation of Asia with enthusiasm. "The Ten Commandments," for example, was so successful in Japan that the theater in which it was shown established a new Japanese record for box office receipts. Many nations in Asia, including free China, are unable to show this film because they lack the needed cinemascope equipment. Here is an instance in which a little thought, foresight, and adapability could make American aid much more welcome.

Last but not least, we must do more to foster a truly spiritual relationship with Asia. In a special way, Asia is now in a state of expectancy, hoping for a fuller life, a spiritual fulfillment of its deepest desires. This can be provided only by Christian faith and love.

For many centuries, Asia has tended to look westward for intellectual and spiritual inspirations. Islam, the dominant religion of Malaya and Indonesia, is of relatively Western origin. Roman Catholicism, the faith of the Philippines, much of Vietnam and part of Malaya, came from the Occident. Democracy's tenets, now struggling in Asia to survive, were derived from England, France, and the United States. Even communism, being pushed in this area by both Russia and China, is a Western product. With this background, Asia tends to develop, not in isolation from the West, but through association with the West. The choice that is to be made is between the democratic West and the Communist West.

The outstanding characteristic of the East is struggle: struggle against poverty, disease, hunger, and ignorance, struggle to adopt the West's modern technology and to develop an independent way of life which would combine the East's old heritage with a new hope—hope for a re-creation of the spiritual dimension of society, without which modernization, however successful, will not satisfy the deeper aspirations of man. In this respect, America's chances of success in Asia are far greater than those of Soviet Russia or Communist China. America is viewed as Asia's finest contact with the Western World. For America, it is not so much a question of overcoming difficulties in Asia but rather of taking advantage of the new opportunities that are offered in this area.

To Asia, America's meaning is profoundly human and spiritual. Jacques Maritain in his "Reflections on America" (Scribner's, 1958), stresses the importance of America in the extension of the Christian idea to the whole world. In fact, America cannot inspire Asia to be Christian unless she herself becomes more Christian. This is the real challenge Asia offers to the United States.

In conclusion, we note that Asian neutrality has broken down. But Asia will become a carbon copy neither of the democratic West nor of the Communist West. In maturing politically, the nations of Asia will undoubtedly develop a new sense of community which is less apparent in the individualistic traditions of Europe and America.

We must be very sympathetic to these new developments in Asia even when they do not conform absolutely to our own ideals. The ability of these countries to oppose communism depends on this inner development of their national life as well as on our own external support. We have outlined a minimum program. We know not how long the present opportunity will last. It may be later than we think.

Chamber of Commerce, Janesville, Wis., Plans "Get Out Vote" Campaign

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier this session, I was privileged to introduce a resolution designed to establish a National Voters Day.

The purpose of the resolution was to focus a greater effort upon getting a larger percentage of our informed electorate to the polls at election time. This passed the Senate and is now pending before the House Judiciary Committee. I sincerely hope that that body will find it possible to report out the bill for approval prior to the adjournment of Congress.

Encouragingly, more and more individuals and civic-minded organizations are undertaking constructive, worthwhile programs aimed toward getting more informed voters to exercise their priceless heritage for a "voice at the polls."

As a fine example of such efforts, the Chamber of Commerce of Janesville, Wis., is setting up a hard-hitting program to get all eligible voters to the polls in November to cast their ballots for the candidates of their choice.

Recently, the Janesville Gazette published an article reviewing the objectives of this special program. I ask unanimous consent to have the article—reflecting a laudable community-minded endeavor—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET-OUT-VOTE CAMPAIGN AMONG PLANS OF CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

A get-out-the-vote effort will be high on the agenda of the chamber of commerce which is now in the process of completing arrangements for late summer and early fall activities.

Robert Westfall, secretary, said that the chamber has planned a hard-hitting program to get all eligible voters to the polls in November to cast their ballot for the candidates of their choice. Personal contacts, publicity and possibly rides to the polls are being planned by the chamber which will also make an attempt to get everyone registered.

SEVERAL COURSES PLANNED

Several courses and two special events, one of businessmen and industrialists with teachers, the other with farmers, are on the schedule for this fall, according to Westfall.

Education-business-industry day will be held early this fall, the businessmen and industrialists visiting the schools to see them in operation, talk with teachers about policies and problems and gain a better understanding of what is required so schools will keep pace with changing and increasing demands. The teachers were guests of some 30 businesses and industries May 24, touring the establishments and talking with leaders

to gain a deeper insight into the economic system.

CITY-FARM DAY

Businessmen will be hosts to the farmers at city-farm day in the fall. This day is one set aside for farmers and businessmen to get together to discuss mutual problems. It will be climaxed with a barbecue. Last year's city-farm day wound up the Alice-in-dairyland-princess contest, the farmers hosts to the businessmen.

Among the courses planned are those in practical politics, congressional action and economics.

Ten men have completed the pilot course preparing them to moderate the practical politics course for men and women, a course designed to better inform persons on the impact government has on their lives.

They are William Wood, Hiram Nowlan, Jr., Robert Collins, Vern Burrows, Errell Orear, Stanley Judd, Jr., Charles Sanford, Rox Lee, Robert Consigny, and Bill Beyer.

Seventeen persons have already expressed a desire to be a part of the congressional action committee which will meet weekly to discuss issues before Congress and how they affect the area. Major topics will be inflation and spending control, tax reform, labor legislation, Federal controls of business and agriculture, Federal intervention in State and local affairs, and social security expansion.

Committee members are Harry Wright, Janesville district manager of the Wisconsin Power & Light Co., who will be moderator, Alvin Baker, Paul Bergmann, Paul Bayorgeon, Art Dahle, M. J. Deignan, Don Dille, H. R. Friberg, Frank Godec, Hjalmer Hanson, Robert Jerde, William Germain, Gerald Keppert, Jack O'Neill, John Powell, Steve Ruchti, Warren Senstrom.

The economics discussion course is planned to develop informed articulate spokesmen for business. Twenty-one completed the 17-session course last year. An effort will be made to include the course in the high school economics classes here.

The Late Honorable Usher L. Burdick

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of Mrs. Levering, Usher Burdick's only daughter, and his two sons, QUENTIN, now serving in the other body, and Eugene, a district judge in the State of North Dakota, to thank our distinguished Speaker, our majority leader and so many of my colleagues for their kind remarks and expressions of sympathy on the occasion of the death of my father-in-law who served in this body for 20 years.

I have often said, "I never knew a man like Usher Burdick." I repeat that statement today. Someone has said, "I do not think the world is ever going to give much to the man who does not surprise it now and then." On the basis of this statement, the world gave much to Usher Burdick.

I have listened with pride to the praise which came from both sides of the aisle on how the "old gent" served his country here in the Halls of the people, but I knew him best for his love of the land, good cattle, and horses. Only hours before his death, he was making plans to return permanently to the land where he learned as a boy to speak the Sioux language. I will always cherish the hours spent with him riding over his Missouri River ranch on a summer day when the sky is as blue as a baby's eyes and the clouds are as white as the first snow of winter.

My father-in-law undoubtedly enjoyed a unique distinction in being one of very few families where the mother, father, and the three children were all graduates of the University of Minnesota. Also, all of the three children are admitted to the practice of law in the State of North Dakota. Usher Burdick always recognized the need for education and its importance in the molding of a wise and intelligent citizenry.

Mr. Speaker, as has been established, Usher Burdick was a humorist of the Bill Nye school and frequently devoted his weekly newsletter to the humorous side of grim events. A noteworthy example is his eyewitness account of the shooting incident by the Puerto Ricans in the House Chamber in 1954. The late Fred Othman, Washington columnist, yielded his weekly space on one occasion to carry this humorous account to the Nation.

He was the only Member of the House who was able to identify all four of the berserk Puerto Ricans, and he testified at their trial in New York in which they were convicted. He had remained standing on the floor of the House while bullets rained about him and made a careful mental note of the description of each intruder.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement of Usher Burdick which he made in this body on March 11, 1954, relative to the Puerto Rican incident:

Mr. Speaker, while the revolutionists of Puerto Rico were trying to shoot down Congressmen promiscuously there were some comic incidents connected with the tragic affair.

Martin Dies, of Texas, and FRANK BOYKIN, of Alabama, were pretty much in line with bullets landing in their vicinity in the Chamber. They tried to flee to the Democratic cloakroom, and both attempted to pass through the door at the same time. They jammed in the doorway, and could not go either way. At this juncture, Martin Dies said to BOYKIN: "Who was it that just darted between us?" Finally BOYKIN got through and into the cloakroom. He announced he was going for his gun. Someone asked him where it was, and he said it was in Alabama.

Dr. MILLER, whose both legs are artificial and who walks pretty well with a cane, was in the center of the Chamber on the Republican side. Instead of ducking, he stood up, waved his cane at the gunman and shouted: "You can't do this—it's against the law."

Mr. Hale, of Maine, was more interested in the way the seats are constructed than he was in the shooting. He had tried to get his head under one of them, but a cage that holds the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD was built too close to the floor and he could not get his head under it. Before the shooting stopped he was complaining about the poor plan of construction of the seats.

T. Millet Hand, of New Jersey, tried to get down in the space below the seats, but the one he selected was already occupied by Representative CANFIELD. He was still ducking down in that vicinity when someone asked him what he did when he found the space occupied by CANFIELD. "Well," he said, "I crawled under CANFIELD."

Judge Graham, of Pennsylvania, who is about 5 feet 2 inches tall, but still large in girth, could not find a place to get into to avoid the bullets, so remained standing up. Of course, I do not think the judge would have been much protected by getting down because he would have been about as high lying down as he is standing. For some unaccountable reason he was not shot.

JOHN MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, was at the door of the Chamber when the firing began, and TIP O'NEILL, of Massachusetts, was behind him. He is a powerful man and he wanted to see what was going on inside. He rushed at the door and shoved MCCORMACK right into the Chamber and close to the line of fire.

I did not think the firing was real until a bullet hit a seat to the right of me. The dust and splinters flew and for the first time I realized that this was the "real McCoy." I moved out of there with all possible speed and thought of getting down on the carpet, but it was so completely occupied I was prevented from doing so. The firing seemed to have ceased, and I walked down a few seats when the last of the bullets were fired. I did not see any place to go for cover, and someone asked me what I was standing for. I replied that I was looking for a gopher hole. The man said, "You could not crawl into that kind of a hole." "Oh, yes, I could," I replied. "Any common gopher hole would be big enough the way I feel now."

That was the last burst of bullets, and then we began to attend the wounded, and the attempt at assassination passed into history.

To show just what vim a few pistol shots will instill in a body like the Congress, I cite the case of the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Bowler. Unfortunately, he is very badly crippled through a severe attack of arthritis. When the shooting began and a few bullets struck near him he rushed for the door leading out of the Chamber. Seven or eight other Members had the same notion of getting out of the Chamber at the same time. The others were not crippled, but the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Bowler, led the "flying squadron" into the lobby, and was ahead of the whole pack. He seemed to have the stamina of a Man of War or a Whirlaway in the last stretch run.

It ran through my mind, "Just what do those rebels want to shoot us for?" My first reaction was that we were being shot at because we have given $270 billion to foreign countries, but when I heard the rebel woman shout, "Viva Puerto Rico," I became convinced that these would-be executioners believed we had been more partial to England, France, and all the other 62 countries we have helped than we had been to Puerto Rico. You know, when we start giving everything away, jealously creeps in among the donees. This should be a lesson to us.

The bravest men in the House were the women. They did not want to plunge headlong on the floor behind a seat and muss up their clothing and hair, so they sat in their seats and let the bullets come. There must have been a spark of chivalry among the assassins, for none of the women were injured.

I think it is a shame to be assassinated in the House, although in elections in North Dakota I am rather used to that procedure. I have been opposed to an increase in pay for Congressmen. I think we should refuse to wade in and boost our own salaries while thousands of citizens do not get enough to

eat. But this shooting changed my views. I would be in favor of receiving combat pay—say 5 percent—and extra pay for flight duty—say a 20-percent increase on the latter. If a Congressman has to be prepared to run every time someone tries to kill him this is flight duty and we should receive some extra pay.

All the wounded Members are recovering rapidly, and no new elections will be necessary because of this shooting melee.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the Pittsburg (Kans.) Headlight of July 11, 1960, the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer of July 11, 1960, and the New York Daily News of July 12, 1960:

[From the Pittsburg (Kans.) Headlight, July 11, 1960]

FRESH VOICE FROM PAST

A voice out of the Democrat past was heard in Los Angeles Friday. It was the voice of James Farley, one of the most famous national political generals of all time. He managed the campaign of Franklin D. Roosevelt for the nomination for President in 1932. Then he ran the election campaign. He directed the second one in 1936. But he balked in 1940 over the third term which Roosevelt demanded. He stepped down from the high post of command and back into private life. That was 20 years ago.

In Los Angeles, Farley who emerged 2 years ago to seek the nomination for U.S. Senator in New York unsuccessfully, spoke out about the approaching national convention. The veteran made a target out of Adlai Stevenson and Stevenson's position of willingness to accept another nomination. Stevenson, Farley said, apparently holds the "belief that it is the duty of God, the Democrat Party, and the American people to force it upon him." But Farley did not stop with Stevenson. It will not recommend the "Democrat Party to the American people if its decisions are reached by stampede or even by deadlock," he asserted in a speech to a Los Angeles civic club.

And then Farley praised LYNDON JOHNSON and assailed the northern opposition to JOHNSON on geographical grounds as "equally absurd and unconstitutional and disgraceful."

The old generalissimo has not lost his aptitude for forceful political expression in 20 years of successful contact with business.

The voice from the past is dealing with the immediate present and the future, not the past, however.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer, July 11, 1960]

ALL IN THE FAMILY

If a Republican had said what Jim Farley did at Los Angeles last Friday as delegates were streaming into town for their National Convention, he would have been accused of dragging Nikita Khrushchev into the campaign for partisan advantage. Coming from a wheelhorse of the Democratic Party, however, the language cannot be so interpreted.

What the man who led the Democrats to their greatest triumphs in the early Roosevelt era did was to warn his party against the appeasers within it who believe they can negotiate a spectacularly successful Communist terror into giving up two-thirds of the world.

If Soviet appeasement becomes an issue in the forthcoming campaign because of the personality and background of the Democratic nominee the men who will choose their standard bearer in Los Angeles this week will have only themselves to blame.

[From the New York Daily News, July 12, 1960]

JAMES A. FARLEY

In Los Angeles last Friday:

"By their [the Declaration of Independence signers'] ideal, an American is also an intelligent man. Atomic war is dangerous, of course, but no more dangerous to the individual than any other war—as the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier proves. Yet there move among the American people self-appointed Messiahs who constantly call attention to the horrors of armed conflict, as if George Washington, Robert E. Lee, and Ulysses S. Grant were not aware of the devastation of war.

"Do these false prophets think Bunker Hill was a picnic? Do they mistake the Death March from Bataan for a May-walk? There never was a bargain basement price for freedom as the heroic martyrs from the Boston Massacre to the Hungarian revolt prove.

"No party and no free nation can deliver peace. * * * To commit this Nation to peace at any price leadership is tantamount to surrender of the free world. We cannot answer Communist brinkmanship with 'lameduck' slinkmanship."

Wisconsin—Vacation Wonderland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier this session, I was privileged to invite my colleagues—following the fulfillment of responsibilities here in Congress—to come to Wisconsin to enjoy a "breathing spell" in a wonderful vacation land.

Although a great many of my colleagues will be campaigning, I sincerely hope that there will be opportunity for Senators, their families, and vacationers from all America to come to Wisconsin this year.

The creation of a vacation garden spot has not occurred haphazardly. Instead, our people individually, the State government, civic-minded organizations, and businesses and industries have made a notable contribution to further improving our rich, natural heritage.

Recently, the Employee News of the Wisconsin Power & Light Co., of Janesville, Wis., published a fine article reviewing highlights of Wisconsin as a vacation land. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VACATION WONDERLAND

Twenty-eight miles northwest of the State capitol at Madison, a narrow two-lane bridge funnels U.S. Highways 12 and 13 across the Wisconsin River, yawns abruptly and deposits vacationers at the gateway to a year-round recreation and sightseeing paradise.

Driving north through the twin cities of Sauk City and Prairie du Sac, you pass our company's 28,500-kilowatt-capacity hydroelectric plant and into Lake Wisconsin vacation land. Here a winding, 25-mile stretch of water above our dam offers fishing and water sport playgrounds. A sporty nine-hole golf course on Wisconsin Power & Light Co., property lies along the southeast shore—little more than a pitch shot away from attractive summer resorts and cabins. Another nine holes will be added soon.

Although geologists identify the Lake Wisconsin area as the western rim of the great glaciers' terminal moraine, and many of you have been attracted by its flourishing walleyed pike, other know it as one of few Midwest sturgeon waters. Still others flock here annually to enjoy its scenic beauty.

A stone's throw northeast, off State Highway 188, new Richland Memorial park, complete with brick barbecue facilities, is ideal for picnics. A hike to the summit offers a breathtaking view from "Rock of Gibraltar," which juts out some 400 feet above rich farmland. On a clear day, you can see Blue Mound hill 25 miles to the southwest.

Two miles west of the park, where 188 joins Wisconsin 113, a 6-ton eight-car ferry carries traffic over the half mile of Lake Wisconsin that bisects 113 between Merrimac and Okee. Free, the ferry is operated by the State highway commission and open from April to November.

A short drive along the east shore takes you to Okee Lodge, which merits special attention from hungry weekend travelers. A moderately priced smorgasbord dinner is served each Sunday from noon to 8 p.m., and the lodge's outdoor swimming pool is available to dining room patrons. You are welcome in informal dress at all times.

It was in the Lake Wisconsin area, among towering bluffs and tree-studded shoreline, that the Winnebago Indians settled early in the 19th century. Then came the Sauks under Chief Pyesa, whose son Black Hawk led the tribe in its moral victory over the Army in the Battle of Wisconsin Heights in 1832.

Perhaps you will spend a weekend or more here soon. In the not too distant future, the area should increase sharply in popularity; for while it is accessible now via good roads from all directions, it will be readily available to more out-of-State vacationers upon completion of Interstate Highway 90.

It is with great pride that Wisconsin Power & Light Co. has been a factor in the growth and development of this area. And it is with interest in your leisure time pleasure that the company calls your attention to Lake Wisconsin, truly a vacation paradise.

Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Bill

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the act granting certain hospitalization benefits for active Fed-

eral employees, inclusion of Federal retirees was purposely omitted because it was felt that the problems incident to the retirees were quite different and that consideration should be given them in separate legislation. The House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, of which I am a member, has given careful thought and study to these problems, and their conclusions are embodied in S. 2575, now under consideration. I know that the National Association of Retired Civil Employees is very earnest in its efforts to obtain this legislation and it is in full accord with the provisions of this bill.

This association has its own hospitalization program, under which 54,000 policies are in operation. Without the enactment of this legislation, these policyholders would sooner or later be jeopardized in their holdings because Federal employees who now retire will, for the most part, take with them into retirement the policies which they purchased as employees. For this reason, among others, it is highly important that S. 2575 be enacted and I earnestly support the legislation.

Retired Federal employees are on a fixed income and are, therefore, in a much more difficult position when hospitalization disaster strikes than is the case among other groups. I am always glad to lend my support to any reasonable legislation which tends to relieve them of their financial burdens.

The Scheinfeld Address on Underdeveloped Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week the Honorable HENRY S. REUSS, of Wisconsin, presented to the House of the address of Aaron Scheinfeld, chairman of the board of Manpower, Inc., one of the Nation's thinking business leaders on the subject of "Industrial and Business Development of the Underdeveloped Countries of the World."

His suggestions may well be considered by the business leaders of the country, because they offer a method of developing free countries as friends of the United States and eventually saving the taxpayers of our country subsidies and contributions which are now needed to keep as much of the world as possible independent and free.

Congressman REUSS is to be commended for bringing to the attention of the Members a report of such great interest that their constituents may read with great profit to themselves and to their neighbors one of the most helpful solution ever offered for the problems affecting the world today.

The address can be found on pages 16157–16159 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Tuesday, August 23, 1960.

Only by Cutting Expenses Can We Hope To Cut Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, of all the problems which face the average American homeowner, worker or housewife, one of the most serious, most frustrating is the burden of taxation. This is a problem which affects every citizen of our land regardless of wealth or lack of riches. It is one from which none can escape.

Every citizen is aware, in a general way, of taxes. We become acutely aware of them when April 15 rolls around and the Federal and in some instances State and city income taxes fall due. But few are aware that almost every waking moment involves the payment of some form of tax. There are excise taxes piled upon transportation taxes piled upon real property taxes, all of which the consumer must eventually pay. The taxation of large corporations means an increase in the cost of their products. The tax paid by the small retailer, too, is passed on to the housewife and consumer.

For instance, there is much discussion about the telephone excise tax of 10 percent. The telephone companies wanted it removed. It must be remembered, though, that the companies do not pay these taxes—the people who use telephones do. And not only the 10 percent excise taxes, but also the real estate taxes the telephone companies pay are reflected in the monthly bill, and so is the tax on telephone cable and other equipment, and, of course, the transportation taxes to get this equipment from factory to the home. At every step, at every level, there is additional taxation, all paid by the used of telephones.

The growth of taxation has been the result of the growth of government, Federal, State, and local. Every new service actually costs the people who are supposed to be served.

There is talk of socialized medicine for the elderly. This new service cannot possibly be paid for entirely by social security taxes; other taxes will have to go up to help foot the bill. And the very people whom this new service is designed to help will be forced to pay for it from their meager receipts.

Once a new program gets launched, it is nearly impossible to curb it or to prevent it from growing. Therefore, the Congress should look with a careful eye at every new spending proposal, regardless of its purpose.

The other way to curb expenditures is to eliminate waste. Several important efforts have been made to curb this waste. At nearly every turn these efforts, to a great extent, have been blocked. There is fat and waste in the military. Our Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations has attempted to trim this fat, to curb unnecessary military travel, to prevent the overhiring of personnel and to control the use of high-salaried officers to do menial tasks. We are making some progress in this area.

It is my own recommendation that the Congress concentrate more on developing an efficient, streamlined government and less on finding new ways to spend the peoples' money. Only that way can we ever hope to reduce taxes in an orderly, economically sound manner.

VFW Teener Baseball Team, Gastonia, N.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, the VFW Teener baseball team, sponsored by the Absher-Flowers Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of North Carolina, recently won the National Teener Baseball Championship with 13 successive wins without a loss.

Upon their return to Gastonia on August 20, 1960, the young men and their coaches were given a rousing welcome. The coaches were Jim Barker, Russ Bergman, and J. V. McGinnis. These splendid coaches gave excellent training to the following boys who were members of the team: Mark Beauchamp, Charlie Bryant, Roger Teague, Larry Johnson, Fred McMurray, Forest Dover, Boyce Morrow, Dariel Forrester, Ken Ballard, Dexter Bradshaw, Bill Blalock, George Hook, Butch Adams, and Robbie Clemmer.

I was very pleased with a newspaper story entitled "City Welcomes Teeners," as well as an editorial, each of which appeared in the Gastonia Gazette, the daily newspaper of Gaston County. I request that this news story and editorial be made a part of my remarks and printed in the RECORD:

ROUSING WELCOME—CITY WELCOMES TEENERS
(By Ray Jimison)

Gastonians gave a rousing welcome home Saturday to their national Teener baseball champions.

"I feel like President Eisenhower," confessed Centerfielder Roger Teague as he rode down Main Avenue perched atop a sleek new convertible.

An ocean of faces watched from the streets as the jubilant players tasted the glory that goes with being champions.

They won the national Teener championship in Hershey, Pa., Friday with an easy 12–3 win over Struthers, Ohio.

EASY PICKING

"I don't see how Struthers got into the finals," declared one of the victorious players. "That Louisiana team (Bossier) was the best—next to us."

Hungry baseball fans turned out by the thousands to welcome the champs home. Hundreds gathered at the Catawba River bridge at 4 o'clock to meet the bus which arrived 5 minutes early.

The players were swamped with handshakes, pats on the backs, congratulations, and kisses from happy parents and girlfriends.

Players then climbed in convertibles with their parents for a victory ride through Belmont, Lowell, and down Wilkinson Boulevard into Gastonia where a crowd estimated at between 5,000 and 6,000 waited. Hundreds gathered along the side of the highway to wave at the players.

MOTORCADE

The motorcade of parents was formed earlier at the VFW post. It reached Gastonia at 4:55 p.m. and a parade, worked up in short order, started at 5 o'clock.

Mayor Ferguson, city council members, and VFW officials took part. Ambulances and fire trucks were brought in to supplement the festivities. The drum and bugle corps managed to get enough men together for a color guard and music.

The people were not disappointed. They waved Confederate flags and shouted at their champions. Not since 1935, when the local Legion team won the junior world series, had baseball fans had so much to shout about.

REFRESHMENTS

When the parade was over, parents and players gathered at the VFW post for sandwiches and refreshments, courtesy of the VFW Auxiliary.

Fred Deal, senior vice commander, was happy over the outcome. He and Chalmas Jimison worked around the clock for 2 days lining up convertibles and getting everything in order. Everything went off without a hitch.

Several players confessed afterward that they expected a few people to meet them at the Catawba River. "We had no idea it would turn out like this."

As the motorcade arrived on Main Avenue, a player asked if it was all over with. All over with? It's just starting," answered a VFW official. "You mean there's more?" the player asked in amazement. A few minutes later he was riding down Main Avenue with thousands of people massed along the sidewalks.

Gastonians gave a fitting welcome to their teener champions.

CONGRATULATIONS TEENERS

A tired but jubilant group of youngsters were to arrive back in town this afternoon about 5 o'clock.

They would wear the smile of victory on their faces. And they would have such a deserving right, for their record is clean, their year's endeavor well posted with victory after victory.

These are the Gastonia Teeners, who just yesterday won the national championship.

They started off the season on a run. They finished it yesterday barely breathing hard. In between, they won 13 straight games, and the closest score was 9–7.

We are proud of these little fellows suddenly grown big in the Nation's eye. We had heard in midsummer from their close observers that the team would "go all the way" this year. We questioned such optimism. And we crossed our fingers for luck.

These young boys are made of champion fiber. They are durable. They are elastic. They are able to play out their hearts one day and then snap back the next with amazing vitality.

See our sports pages for their names and what they did in the final game.

And don't forget the coaches—Jim Barker, Russ Bergmann, and J. V. McGinnis.

Barker and Bergmann took over from McGinnis when tragedy struck the McGinnis family. The team retained its stature, continued its winning ways.

The community is indebted to these three men not only for turning out national champions on the field but for the high moral standards they taught along with the game of baseball.

To the teeners of Gastonia, we say welcome home. And congratulations for your splendid performance.

International Economic and Political Understanding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon I presented the resolution for Senate Joint Resolution 170, which provides for the appointment by the Speaker and the President of the Senate 20 members from the United States to serve as our representatives at an international convention with the North Atlantic Treaty nations to discuss a program of cooperation on international political and economic problems.

This legislation was reported out of the House Foreign Affairs Committee with only two dissenting votes.

In passing this legislation, the Congress should be commended because these international discussions by the free nations will contribute greatly to curb the economic and political expansion so recently gained by Communist forces throughout the hemisphere.

The following editorial by Mr. H. B. Snyder, of the Gary Post Tribune, Gary, Ind., of several weeks ago reveals the progress made by a similar organization of European nations dealing with their economic and welfare expansion:

ECONOMIC UNITY IN EUROPE

Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of West Germany had a recent meeting with French President Charles de Gaulle, and has just finished a series of discussions with Prime Minister Harold Macmillan of Great Britain.

Out of the talks has come an Anglo-German agreement to seek a compromise formula for the economic unity of Western Europe. Ties between France and Germany have been strengthening lately, through the European Economic Community of which both are a part. The new agreement would seek to bring the EEC into closer relationship with the rival European Free Trade Association (Outer Seven) to which Britain belongs.

The so-called Common Market of the EEC was created with the idea of promoting greater internal trade among the six nations of the EEC. The example of America's 3,000-mile-wide free trade area was not lost on Europe.

Thus far the EEC has been a smashing success. Internal trade among the six member nations has risen 40 percent in 1 year. The rate is twice that these nations have had in their commercial dealings with the outside world.

It is important that the EEC not try to insulate itself from the rest of the world, and particularly not from the Outer Seven. The free world needs a constantly widening area of free-flowing trade. That is the way we can build the strength to resist the economic power of the Communist bloc.

In view of the Common Market's early success, it is logical for the leaders of Germany and France to talk of enlarging their six-nation community, and of including political as well as economic relationships. The Macmillan-Adenauer agreement is a step in that direction.

While the Russian threat still hangs over Berlin, the nations of Western Europe are slowly building a solid fortress of economic and political power. Every stone raised in that fortress will help to blunt Moscow's political and economic aggressions against the West.

Drinking Aloft Plan Criticized by Pilots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial on the subject matter in which I have been interested for some period of time, which appeared in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor:

DRINKING ALOFT PLAN CRITICIZED BY PILOTS

(By Godfrey Sperling, Jr.)

CHICAGO.—The problems of drinking aloft are so compounded by the incoming jet age that the Air Line Pilots Association is intensifying its effort to dry up commercial flights—through Federal legislation.

At the same time, both the pilots group and the Air Line Stewards and Stewardesses Association have rejected a regulatory proposal of the Federal Aviation Agency as being "unworkable." This is the proposal whereby the commercial airlines would continue to serve liquor—but not to any person who "appears to be intoxicated." Also, no passenger would be allowed to drink from his own bottle.

Clarence N. Sayen, president of the pilots association here, says that to enforce this regulation to any degree of practicality, the FAA would be required to have agents on board all commercial flights to police the conduct of passengers and that of the cabin attendants.

ENFORCEMENT PROBLEM

"These agents, by necessity," he says, "must be endowed with all the powers of a law-enforcement officer from the standpoint of making arrests and confiscating evidence. Economic considerations rule out this necessity."

Mr. Sayen points out that the flight crew members of the air carriers could not possibly enforce the regulation.

Furthermore, as Mr. Sayen sees it, apprehending passenger violators carrying and consuming contraband intoxicants may result in altercations and disturbances hazardous to air safety. Pilots will continue to be distracted from their flight duties to enforce the regulations with "subsequent unnecessary absences from the flight deck."

"This proposed regulation," he continues, "would not prevent passengers from consuming their own intoxicants or intoxicants of other passengers: it would not and cannot prevent passengers, already under the influence to an unknown degree, from being served or sold intoxicants by air carriers; it does not prevent passengers from becoming intoxicated, a flight hazard and social problem on board air carrier aircraft.

"This proposed regulation, which sanctions the use of alcoholic beverages legally in flight, compromises safety on board all air carrier aircraft. Additional burdens,

with sanction of law, are placed upon pilots which are unrelated and are completely foreign to their basic important function to the flight deck."

Mr. Sayen then addresses himself to the heightened, jet-age problem:

"The problems for the flight crew, which are associated with transporting passengers in present-day aircraft, are too complex as matters now stand. The industry is now moving people at speeds in excess of 500 miles an hour and in aircraft which fly at altitudes up to 35,000 feet. This equipment costs over $5 million, weighs up to 300,000 pounds, and transports as many as 112 passengers.

"The time and responsibilities of the crews in these high-speed, complex aircraft are fully occupied with normal duties associated with flight and should not be spent solving problems which are unrelated and hazardous to safety in flight."

An Investment in the People—Educational Television

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS B. McDOWELL, JR.
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, a significant study by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, "An Investment in the People" concludes that the country or the State with the highest per capita income is the one with the best educated people. Obviously, if a people are not educated, they cannot take advantage of the resources of a country no matter how rich it potentially may be.

In educational television we have a new and highly important tool for bringing America's educational system abreast of the times.

It is the hope of many Delawareans that the Federal Communications Commission will assign the now silent channel 12 to Delaware for purposes of educational television broadcasting. This is a step which I have strongly supported in the past and will work for in the future with all the means at my disposal. I have, in addition, cosponsored with Senators MAGNUSON and SCHOEPPEL legislation on the subject of educational television which would give financial assistance to get this important program off the ground. In this connection it is important to recognize the tremendous support which the Federal Government has given to American railroads, to the airlines, and to shipping, and highway transportation. Certainly, educational television is equally deserving and is equally important to the welfare of the people of this great Nation.

I include here, as part of my remarks, the text of my weekly radio broadcast to the people of Delaware the week of August 23, 1960, over seven Delaware radio stations:

My subject for this week's report from Congress is one which I know is of great interest to the people of Delaware, and one which has occupied a great deal of my time these past 2 years as a Delaware Congressman. This subject is educational television.

But first, since this is my last report, I want to thank all of the listeners in Delaware who have heard my bimonthly broadcasts, and especially I want to thank your radio station which has made these public service broadcasts possible.

On May 12 and 13, 1959, hearings were held before the Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on a number of bills, including one which I had introduced on the subject of educational television.

On April 13, 1959, the Senate had passed such legislation introduced by Senators MAGNUSON and SCHOEPPEL. I am going to quote to you from the testimony of two prominent educators who testified before the committee. Their views coincide with my views on this important and vital new media which is available to the American people, and more specifically of interest to Delawareans is the assigning of the now silent channel 12 to Delaware for educational television broadcasting.

Raymond D. Hurlbert, general manager of the Alabama Educational Television Commission, had this to say:

"Many of you are familiar with U.S. Chamber of Commerce study, 'An Investment in the People.' This study points out that it is not the country or the State with the greatest natural resources which has the highest per capita income, but the one with the highest literacy, the best educated people. Our State is rich in natural resources, but our great need is to raise the per capita income through education.

"We are on the threshold of tremendous advances in the field of education. Should we ask the question, Has the time come for updating the educational system of schools in America and if so, as an aid, do we not have an available tool in educational television? In fact, we have a providential tool to help make the hurdle of leaping from the traditional to the modern needs in education. What does industry do when it is time for a retooling job? Is not expense for retooling considered essential in the light of future efficiency and greater production, and are not new methods inaugurated? There is no question as to what business would do in such a case. Should we not apply just as much good business to the education of our youth? As stockholders in this big business of education, should we not test the potential in educational television, and its ability to bring increasingly valuable dividends?"

Donald H. McGannon, president, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co. had this to say:

"It is an interesting thing about educational television, that while it is in the sixth academic year and represents a $60 million investment, it has achieved the outstanding goals it has, but far more lies in the future than in the past. As I have indicated, I believe that to be true of television in general but the educational phase represents a dimension without which the medium cannot achieve its full potential or capacity. Commercial television as a medium of entertainment, information and advertising requires the pure research and laboratory techniques and opportunities of educational television, working hand in hand to achieve the degree of fuller enlightenment every one of us in the industry feel can and even must be achieved. Much has been accomplished in less than a decade but far more need be accomplished in this world of nuclear physics and international hypertension.

"In other more blunt words, get the educational station on the air in order that the whole evolutionary and developmental process of qualitative programing can be undertaken and perfected. The longer this is delayed, the longer these vital frequencies are left unused, the longer the American people are deprived of such educational opportunity; yes, the longer our already strained educational system and overburdened municipal finances are denied this dynamic and collateral aid. Then, too, will our ability to achieve the blessings and opportunities of the ultimate public service educational system be forestalled.

"The United States must improve and increase the use of all educational means at our disposal but surely television and radio, occupying so prominent a place among the interests of our people, have a great opportunity and a still greater obligation in this regard."

Many other prominent officials of public and private institutions gave similar testimony in support of Federal participation in the promotion of educational television broadcasting. It is my belief that it is only a question of time before public demand will bring about a more complete use of the vast potential of educational television. There is no mistaking that the most overwhelming fact today is that we no longer have the enormous luxury of time—we must adjust our institutions and methods of democracy to the life or death demands of a speeding world where there can be few mistakes, few revisions and few fumblings. Complete and total education of all of our people is our greatest secret weapon in the cold war struggle of democracy versus communism.

Statement to the Annual Convention of the Maryland, Delaware, and District of Columbia Moose Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include my statement to the annual convention of the Maryland, Delaware, and District of Columbia Moose Association held in Washington, D.C., on August 19–21, 1960:

Fellow members of the Loyal Order of Moose, as the Representative of the First Congressional District of Maryland, and as a member of the Salisbury Lodge, No. 654, Loyal Order of Moose, I welcome you to our Nation's Capital.

The Loyal Order of Moose, an international fraternal society composed of more than 1,700 lodges with a total membership of nearly 1 million men, is dedicated to the service of his fellow man and loyalty to his country.

Moose lodges throughout our Nation have distinguished themselves by supplying leadership, manpower, and financial aid for worthwhile community affairs, with particular emphasis on youth activities.

All of us are proud of Mooseheart, situated in the Fox River Valley of northern Illinois, 40 miles west of Chicago. Since Mooseheart was founded in 1913, more than 5,000 children of deceased members of the Loyal Order of Moose have benefited by its educational and training program.

All of us are proud of Moosehaven, located in Orange Park, Fla. This model home for our senior citizens stands as an epitaph of our concern for the aged and a challenge to all organizations to equal.

True democracy can only survive so long as all men practice humanitarian service to his fellow man. You have pioneered in child welfare, education, and care for the aged. You will carve new frontiers in service, because you are loyal members to the Loyal Order of Moose. I wish you a most successful convention.

Legislative Proposals Relating to Problems of the Aged and Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAT McNAMARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I believe the Senate and the American people would be interested in a summary of the legislative proposals resulting from the past year's work of the Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging.

In my opinion, they form the basis of action in the next session and should be the first order of the day in January and February—especially the matter of medical insurance financed through social security.

I ask unanimous consent that the summary be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY LEGISLATIVE ACTION ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON PROBLEMS OF THE AGED AND AGING

In a series of bills introduced during the 1960 session of the Congress, Senator PAT MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, set forth a concrete program of legislation for cooperative Federal-State-local action to meet the many-sided needs of America's senior citizens.

These legislative proposals were developed out of the year-long study of the Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging and placed in action the specific recommendations of the subcommittee's report.

In explaining the groundwork leading up to the drafting of this legislation, Senator MCNAMARA, chairman, said: "During the past year, the subcommittee has conducted the most comprehensive and intensive investigation of the complex problems of the aged ever undertaken in this Nation. Analysis of the extent to which existing programs are meeting the needs revealed shocking gaps in services. The subcommittee prepared its recommendations for legislative action after careful study of its findings and consultation with noted authorities in related fields.

"It would be senseless and inhumane to permit ourselves to be bogged down in interminable studies. We have much of the necessary facts. Delay in meeting the recognized needs of the aged would not only compound the problem but would, in effect, sentence millions of our senior citizens to an indefinite continuance of their roles as second-class citizens," he declared.

Bringing to life the recommendations embodied in the subcommittee report, the McNamara proposals cover a broad spectrum of needs.

Health: The Retired Persons Medical Insurance Act would help the aged finance the cost of medical care. The Health Maintenance of the Aging Act makes it possible for the aged to benefit from modern research findings on the prevention and treatment of chronic diseases (to be introduced).

Employment: The Equality of Employment Opportunity for Older Workers Act is a measure to combat the practice of age discrimination in employment. The Senior Citizens Service Training Program Act constitutes a pioneering effort designed to create opportunities for retired persons to engage in meaningful part-time employment.

Retirement savings: The Constant Purchasing Power Bond Act would give future retirees an opportunity to safeguard the purchasing power value of their savings.

Federal agency for the aged: A declaration of objectives for senior Americans bill, setting forth the rights to which senior citizens are entitled, sets the tone for title II of the bill which calls for the establishment of a U.S. Office of Aging to serve as spokesman for the aged.

Housing: An appropriation of $20 million was approved by the Congress as a substantial start on a national program of direct Federal loans—at low rates of interest—to nonprofit groups who would provide housing for the elderly at rentals they could afford.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE M'NAMARA BILL

Retired Persons Medical Insurance Act, S. 3503

Top priority was given in the subcommittee report for developing a plan to help the aged in financing the cost of medical care.

The McNamara bill, introduced in the Senate on May 6, contains the various elements needed for a balanced health program for the retired aged (men 65, women 62). The health insurance coverage provides a maximum of 90 days a year of hospital care or 180 days of care in a skilled nursing home or 240 days of home health services; outpatient X-ray and laboratory services for the early detection of illness; and partial payment for expensive drugs. The bill also calls for continuous research and demonstration programs at the community level.

This program would be financed primarily through the social security system by a small increase in the tax—one-fourth of 1 percent each for employer and employee. In this way, men and women could, during their active working years, pay for the health protection they will need upon retirement. No degrading means test will be involved. Instead, this valuable protection will be an earned right.

(S. 3503. Twenty-three Senators cosponsored this legislation.)

Health Maintenance for the Aging Act

A deplorable gap currently exists between the rich fund of knowledge on prevention and treatment of chronic diseases and its present application to benefit America's senior citizens.

Although the subcommittee in its investigations observed encouraging signposts of progress in the demonstration programs for health screening, rehabilitation centers, organized home care programs and programs for the treatment of the mentally ill, such projects were the exception rather than the rule.

Legislation prepared by Senator MCNAMARA for introduction is aimed at closing the gap between knowledge and application. Grants are provided to enable States and local agencies and nonprofit organizations and institutions to expand demonstration programs and to evaluate findings and methods.

Equality of Employment Opportunity for Older Workers Act, S. 3726

How old is old? According to the subcommittee findings, current age discrimination practices make a worker old at 50, 40—and even 30. The subcommittee report recommended that States pass legislation to outlaw such discrimination. Seven have already done so.

The McNamara bill, introduced on June 22, proposes the outlawing of job discrimination for reasons of age in the personnel and employment practices of employers holding Federal contracts. Enactment of such legislation would set a precedent for all employers. Public attention will be focused on the problem and the progress being made through the periodic regional conferences for the orientation of labor and management groups required in the legislation. The shedding of light on the true facts about work performance records of older workers could help to dissipate many of the existing myths and prejudices which currently abound.

(S. 3726 was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Cosponsors are Senators JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia.)

Senior Citizens Service Training Program Act, S. 3793

A sizable number of retired persons over 65 welcome the opportunity to participate in meaningful part-time work in their communities, but have little success in obtaining such work. At the same time, ironically, critical shortages exist in the areas of health and community services—jobs which could be carried out by many senior citizens.

Introduced by Senator MCNAMARA on June 30, S. 3793 presents a new approach which would provide opportunities for those retired persons interested in gainful employment as well as ensuring a needed army of manpower to work for the common good. It would establish a program for the recruitment, training and placement of elderly Americans in community service activities and give them the opportunity to utilize their time, talents and energy.

Federal grants to public agencies and nonprofit community organizations for the next 3 years would be available to implement this program. The bill authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct manpower surveys within the fields of health, education, and welfare to determine the kind and extent of employment opportunities in local areas within these community service fields.

(S. 3793 was referred to Labor and Public Welfare Committee. Cosponsors are Senators PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan; MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana; FRANK E. MOSS, of Utah; JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana; STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri; GALE W. MCGEE, of Wyoming; HALL S. LUSK, of Oregon; JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, of Florida; and PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

Constant purchasing power bonds, S. 3684

Many citizens who painstakingly scrimp and save to accumulate a "nest egg" for their old age find to their despair that when retirement time arrives, their retirement savings have diminished in value.

To protect future retirees against the hazards of inflation and the steady rise in living costs, Senator MCNAMARA on June 16, introduced legislation to authorize the U.S. Treasury to issue constant purchasing power bonds to be adjusted for cost-of-living increases.

These bonds, which could be purchased by individuals, pension funds or insurance companies for retirement programs, would accumulate interest in the same manner as regular savings bonds, but they would have this added feature: 20 years after purchase, or at retirement time, they would be re-

deemed at a value which would be adjusted to any increase in the cost of living.

Not only would this safeguard the savings of individuals, but it would make it possible for insurance companies and industry to offer retirement and pension plans which could be constantly keyed in with the cost of living.

(S. 3684 was referred to the Committee on Finance. Cosponsors of this legislation are Senators JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania, and JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia.)

Declaration of Objectives for Senior Americans Act—Creation of U.S. Office of Aging, S. 3807

The subcommitte report notes: A major need of America's aged and aging is a central agency of the Federal establishment to represent them and their problems. As of now there is no single office legislatively authorized to serve as a clear point of contact for expressing the views, needs, grievances, and desires of the elderly.

On July 1, Senator MCNAMARA introduced S. 3807 designed to establish a U.S. Office of Aging concerned full time with the full range of problems of America's senior citizens. This bill would provide direct grants to the States to enable them to draw up State plans, matching grants for demonstration projects, and grants to public and other nonprofit institutions and organization for research and training programs.

The bill further proposes to create an Assistant Secretary for Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to head up the Office and to assist in stimulating and coordinating Federal activities in aging.

According to Senator MCNAMARA, creation of a high-level Federal agency to administer this program would permit the total problem to be attacked as a whole, rather than in fragmented bits and snatches.

The declaration of objectives for senior Americans, which is an integral part of this legislation, contains the following 10 points:

1. An adequate income in retirement in accordance with the American standard of living.

2. The best possible physical and mental health which medical science can make available and without regard to economic status.

3. Suitable housing, independently selected, designed, and located with reference to special needs and available at costs which older citizens can afford.

4. Full restorative services for those who require institutional care.

5. Equal opportunity to employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age.

6. Retirement in health, honor, dignity after years of contribution to the economy.

7. Pursuit of meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities.

8. Efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed.

9. Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness.

10. Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of initiative in planning and managing their own lives.

(S. 3807 was referred to the Committee on Finance. Cosponsors are Senators E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska; JOSEPH S. CLARK, of Pennsylvania; JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia; OREN E. LONG, of Hawaii; EUGENE J. MCCARTHY, of Minnesota; PHILIP A. HART, of Michigan; HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, of Minnesota; JAMES E. MURRAY, of Montana; RALPH YARBOROUGH, of Texas; and CLAIR ENGLE, of California.)

Housing for the elderly

The provision of safe, sanitary and congenial housing at a rental which older persons can afford is a major unmet need of the elderly. The bulk of America's senior citizens live in unsuitable structures and will continue to do so until decent housing at low rents can be made available.

The Housing Act of 1959 authorized, in a pioneer provision, a $50 million authorization for direct Federal loans at low rates of interest to nonprofit groups to build low-rent housing for older persons. However, with no appropriation request from the administration, the House of Representatives approved a $5 million token appropriation.

In a special communication to the Senate Appropriations Committee, Senator MCNAMARA, joined by Senators KENNEDY, CLARK, and RANDOLPH, urged that the full authorization of $50 million be appropriated as a minimum, but helpful, effort.

Backing up an amendment on the floor by Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, Senator MCNAMARA helped spark a move which resulted in Senate passage of the full $50 million authorization for this program. The final sum approved by the House-Senate Conference Committee and passed by the Congress was $20 million.

There is now available for direct loans to nonprofit groups a revolving fund at low rates of interest to construct suitable rental housing in which older persons can live with dignity and self-respect.

Hon. James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorials from the San Diego (Calif.) Evening Tribune of July 13, 1960, and the New York Journal-American of August 1, 1960:

[From the San Diego (Calif.) Evening Tribune, July 13, 1960]

THIS IS AN AMERICAN SPEAKING AS PATRIOTS HAVE EVER SPOKEN

There have been a lot of words flowing out of Los Angeles this week—lofty words and empty words, and a few words that rang as solid and meaningful for Americans as Plymouth Rock.

These last were spoken by Jim Farley.

They comprised one of the most significant statements to come out of all the political oratory.

Farley, former Democratic national chairman, warned that unless the Democratic Party took an unequivocal stand against the recognition of Red China and a stiffer attitude toward Russia than many party spokesmen advocate, the party "stands in grave danger of becoming the party of appeasement."

Give heed to Jim Farley, a Democrat of long and high standing in his party, but an American first, here talking straight American:

"By what possible theory can they write off the Americans now in Red Chinese or Siberian prisons?" he asked, referring to those in his party who advocate the recognition of Red China.

"A course of recognition is nothing more nor less than the ratification of the illegal seizure and detention of Americans. That principle, most had thought was settled by the War of 1812.

"The fact is that these Johnny-come-latelys to the Democratic Party have assumed an intellectual superiority which they do not possess.

"They are willing to risk the fate of the Nation on what they regard as their divine understanding and persuasive powers—a conceit so great that they believe they can negotiate a spectacularly successful Communist terror into giving up two-thirds of their world.

"Nor does their mischief end with their idiotic foreign policy. It extends to what amounts to the splintering of the Democratic Party.

"Any American administration which refuses to protect American citizens and their property in any quarter of the globe on the ground that its action will be called Yankee imperialism has, in effect, struck the flag.

"Let us not perform the disgraceful act of offering the American people a spurious dove of peace when every page of recent history identifies it as the white flag of cowardly surrender."

So spoke Jim Farley, Democrat American, in Los Angeles.

The words should ring out across the land and in the hearts of all who cherish our heritage of freedom and independence long after the political platitudes have whistled off into the ether.

America has heard a patriot's voice.

[From the New York Journal-American Aug. 1, 1960]

DO'S AND DON'TS IN THE GAME OF POLITICS

(By George E. Sokolsky)

Every human activity has its rules and regulations. Some are simple, such as the propriety of eating with a fork; some are very complicated like the complex proprieties of family life.

Politics is, of course, a science. It is the science of controlling men's minds and wills. It is also a way of life for those who engage in it actively. The first rule of a really successful politician is that "his finger is always good." This term comes from auctioneering, in the course of which a man raises his finger and that closes a transaction which might involve large sums. The "finger" is an inviolable contract. Whoever breaks it once is never trusted again.

This must be true of the politician. Once he gives his word, there is no turning on it or he is a dead man politically. The politician also must have a long memory. He cannot pretend that he has forgotten. He cannot deny that he has given his word. He dare not lie to one of equal rank with himself. These are the proprieties of the game. Every form of social existence has its proprieties. They may not be violated.

The reason, for instance, that a man like James A. Farley, who has long been inactive in politics, is still of importance and still stands out as a figure in national conventions, is that he has the reputation of never having broken faith with any man, of having lived up to his promise and of having quit over a principle and not as the result of a personal row. This rule applies to every man who wants to succeed in politics. His greatest crime is to go back on his word.

Politicians of the two parties do not hate each other usually. Sometimes they are even very close friends, as, for instance, JOE MARTIN and SAM RAYBURN always have been.

The Crisis on the Commuter Railroads—No. 10

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, last week I read in various Fairfield County, Conn., newspapers an account of a proposal submitted by Col. S. H. Bingham (Army of the United States, retired), former general manager of the transit system which operates New York City's subway and surface transit system, to meet the commuter problems of the New York metropolitan region. The plan was sent to Governors Ribicoff of Connecticut, Meyner of New Jersey, and Rockefeller of New York. It provides for a logical and sensible method of using existing facilities to create an up-to-date mass transportation system for this most important urban area. I was impressed enough by the proposition to call Colonel Bingham immediately and request a complete text of the proposal. Colonel Bingham submitted his plan to the Governors as a labor of love and we are fortunate to have a person of such experience in the field of mass transportation to make such a positive contribution to a problem which has already been given much attention by myself and other Members of the Congress. Since Colonel Bingham's proposition could easily be adapted to the legislation which has been introduced by me and others to improve transit systems in metropolitan regions, I believe it is of importance to call the attention of Members of the Congress to the proposal by Colonel Bingham. As an addition to the series of insertions I have submitted to the RECORD dealing with the Nation's commuter crisis and pursuant to permission previously granted, I herewith include the proposal:

Col. S. H. BINGHAM,
New York, N.Y., August 8, 1960.

Hon. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor of New York, Albany, N.Y.
Hon. ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor of New Jersey, Trenton, N.J.
Hon. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF,
Governor of Connecticut, Hartford, Conn.

SIRS: Commuter service in the metropolitan area of New York has been the subject of studies for a great many years, and a number of plans have been offered to remedy the problem. Up to this time, however, no satisfactory solution has been presented, and the problem continues to grow.

During my years as chairman of the board of transportation of the city of New York I had occasion to review many of the plans offered and I feel I am thoroughly familiar with the situation. Since that time I have made studies of this problem for several years and I am pleased to submit herewith a "Proposal for a Tristate High-Speed Commuter System for New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut." This proposal recommends the use of existing trackage of the railroads involved, with a minimum of new construction, to provide a tristate integrated commuter service at a cost which would not be prohibitive.

The estimated cost to provide this unified service as described in this proposal is $210 million, plus $107 million if the system is to be extended under the East River into Long Island.

The construction cost for an entirely new system over the same routes to provide the identical commuter service would be approximately $915 million, exclusive of the cost of acquiring the right-of-way and interest to be paid on the capital investment during the period of construction, estimated to be at least 8 years.

This new rapid transit system would operate attractive, newly designed, air-conditioned, lightweight rolling stock capable of high speeds and would provide greater direct-to-destination service for increased convenience to the commuter.

To implement the program briefly outlined herein, it is recommended that a tristate agency be created with power to enter into the necessary agreements with the interested railroads and to construct and operate the system within the New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut areas. The adoption of this proposal is advocated as an effective solution to a commuter problem which is rapidly becoming intolerable.

I shall be pleased to discuss this proposal in greater detail with you or any representatives you may designate before it is released to the public on August 16, 1960.

Respectfully submitted.

S. H. BINGHAM.

PROPOSAL FOR A TRISTATE HIGH-SPEED COMMUTER SYSTEM FOR NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, AND CONNECTICUT

Commuter service in the metropolitan area of New York has been the subject of studies over a great many years. Forty years ago the problem was confined to the means of increasing facilities to cope with the steadily growing number of commuters who were then taxing the commuter capacity of the railroads. The railroads were finding commuter service a profitable addition to their freight and long-line passenger business. The outlook was bright, and all signs pointed to the need for added capacity, which it was thought the railroads shortly would be unable to provide.

Rapid transit plans of great magnitude for all areas surrounding the city of New York were proposed, the estimated cost for which, even in those days, exceeded a billion dollars. These proposals optimistically forecast that future commuter earnings, with a reasonable fare structure, would suffice to make the venture a financial success. However, in later years with increased costs of labor and materials, leading to increased fares, those forecasted earnings did not materialize. Each rise in fares brought about a drop in the number of revenue passengers.

The phenomenal increase in the use of buses and automobiles shortly before and after World War II supplanted the railroads in the transportation of commuters to the central business district in New York City. To accommodate this huge volume of vehicles the enormous construction program of roads, highways, expressways, bridges, and tunnels was put into effect. Many billions of dollars were spent in these projects, but as fast as they were completed they became inadequate to cope with the rapidly expanding traffic. The greatest problem of all—street traffic congestion within the central business district—was not solved nor has any substantial progress toward a solution been made. To complicate the condition, the problem continues to grow.

In the course of this development, the number of passengers declined and, as a result, the railroads were forced to reduce their commuter services continuously. This caused great concern to the railroads as losses sustained on the commuter services substantially reduced profits from freight and long-line passenger service. Increased commutation fares could not keep pace with the increase in the cost of operation, and each fare increase brought a further reduction in commuter railroad traffic. This vicious circle continued until today when every railroad is pleading for rate increases and permission either to cut service to the leanest areas or to abandon rights-of-way.

Legislative bodies, commissions, authorities, committees and consultants have studied the problem, and dozens upon dozens of reports have been submitted. Those who have attempted realistic solutions have all indicated operational deficits and have proposed the allocation of these deficits to areas in proportion to their use or benefit. None of these proposals has been adopted, and the perplexing problem is still unsolved today.

Many reasons have been advanced for the commuter's preference for buses and automobiles. There is no doubt that it originated in the expansion of the commuter areas beyond walking distance to the stations, and within the city itself to the overcrowded conditions of the rapid transit lines during the rush hour period and the convenience to the commuter of entering his car at his doorstep and driving directly to his destination. While the elapsed time may be somewhat longer in driving the entire distance, the convenience of sitting comfortably in an automobile or bus has overcome the minor time advantage that can be gained by using mass transportation. It is true that the park-and-ride plan has gained in popularity; however, the parking areas are generally located in the outskirts of the city and the idea of standing uncomfortably in a crowded train for a considerable length of time has deterred a great many from accepting the idea.

It is reasonable to assume that if a high-speed, air-conditioned, comfortable ride could be made available to the commuter, which would take him to his destination within the city with a distinct saving in elapsed time, he could be weaned away from his automobile or bus on the crowded highway and street. Such a service has not been available up to this time. A modern, high-speed tristate commuter system which could provide such a service is described herein.

This proposal is not presented to create competition for the highways and turnpikes; it is intended to relieve present congestion and to provide for future growth.

The bankrupt Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Co. today carries less than 30 percent of the passengers it carried in the year of its maximum load. However, its rush hour passenger volume has decreased to a much lesser extent. This requires the maintenance of almost the same amount of rolling stock and equipment, while its use is restricted to rush hour periods only.

A similar condition prevails on the New York Central System and on the New York, New Haven & Hartford, the Boston & Albany, and the Boston & Maine Railroads. They have all made repeated efforts to cease operation of some of their deficit-ridden commuter services, particularly in the Boston, Mass., area, and most of the railroads in New Jersey are also trying to abandon their commuter services.

A commuter service could be established at a cost which would not be prohibitive by using the existing trackage of the several railroads involved to provide a high-speed rapid transit line directly into Manhattan.

The first stage in this proposal would be the construction of a rapid transit line from the Bound Brook Junction of the Central Railroad of New Jersey and the Lehigh Valley Railroad, continuing along the tracks of the Central Railroad of New Jersey to Cranford, thence along the tracks of the Lehigh Valley Railroad to Newark, where a connection would be made with the Hudson &

Manhattan Railroad, thence to Jersey City where the route would divide, with one branch continuing via the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad to its terminal in lower Manhattan where, if desired, it would be possible to provide a secondary passenger distribution system underground from the existing Hudson & Manhattan Terminal at Cortlandt Street to the high-density Wall Street area. The other branch would continue via the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad to its terminal at Avenue of the Americas and 32d Street.

It is further proposed to extend the Hudson & Manhattan subway toward the north in deep rock tunnel in order to make a connection with the tracks of the New York Central Railroad, which are at present used by the commuter services of both the New York Central, and New York, New Haven & Hartford Railroads. Local stations under Park Avenue between Grand Central Station and 125th Street, which at present are not in use, could be rehabilitated to provide service to the entire east side of Manhattan to 125th Street.

This line could then be extended northerly via the New York Central tracks through a densely populated area to Pleasantville and serve all commuters along the route. A branch line could use the New York, New Haven & Hartford tracks to Fairfield, Conn., thus serving the commuters in the densely populated area on that route. If desired, another branch in the vicinity of 76th Street in Manhattan could be constructed which would run in an easterly direction through a new East River tunnel to connect with the North Shore Division of the Long Island Railroad to Port Washington.

To free the New York Central Railroad of all its commuter services, its main-line Hudson Division to Ossining could be integrated into the services outlined above by the construction of a station in the vicinity of East 149th Street where an across-the-platform transfer for passengers could be provided. If desired, this branch could also be extended to the downtown area.

In the morning peak period when very light traffic moves north of 57th Street it may be found desirable to short-line the New Jersey service and store these trains at the yards of the Long Island Railroad or the yards of the New York Central Railroad at 149th Street in the Bronx, awaiting the late-afternoon return trip to New Jersey. It may also be desirable to short-line the Westchester and Connecticut lines in convenient railroad yards in Jersey City, awaiting the return north in the late-afternoon rush hours. Efficient rapid transit scheduling would reduce mileage of nonrevenue runs to a minimum.

In New Jersey the second stage of the program might include a branch along the Delaware, Lackawanna & Western Railroad to serve such areas as The Oranges, Maplewood, Summit, and Morristown which sections generate large volumes of commuters.

It is proposed either to purchase or to obtain satisfactory lease agreements with the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad and the other railroads concerned. The program would involve the construction of connections and the rehabilitation or construction of additional stations of sufficient length to permit the operation of 10-car or longer trains and the acquisition of attractive, modern, lightweight rolling stock, capable of high speeds, and designed for use in the existing Hudson & Manhattan tunnels and structure. Where feasible, the sharp curves that at present restrict train speed would be eased to permit higher speeds. The program would also require the construction of a third-rail electrical distribution system and the installation of a central traffic control signal system of the most modern type.

A brief description of this central traffic control signal system follows:

The entire rapid transit system would be controlled from a central control point by means of centralized traffic control equipment. With the use of the train identification equipment carried on the car and the associated wayside equipment, the exact location and destination of each train would be recorded on a facsimile of the rapid transit system. The information thus shown on the panel would be used by the dispatcher to regulate the train traffic.

Under normal operating conditions, the train identification equipment would also be used to operate the track switches along the route. The inductive train communication system, using the third rail and running rails, would permit the dispatcher to talk to the motorman on the moving train. It would also make it possible for the motorman on a moving train to call the dispatcher in the event that an emergency should develop on his train, or that he should observe on occurrence that required attention.

Under normal operating conditions, the terminal interlockings would be automatically operated. The train would move into and out of the stations without human supervision. By means of an automatic dispatcher, a "Next Train Out" sign would be illuminated to indicate the next train to leave. Thirty seconds before the scheduled departure time the "Next Train Out" sign would be extinguished and the starting lights illuminated. The track switches and signals would be operated automatically for the route of the departing train.

If the dispatcher should desire to change the departure time of a train, he could advance or delay the departure time by making use of the centralized traffic control system. From the central control point the dispatcher could remote-control the switches and signal of the terminal interlocking and override the automatic control. Whereas the rapid transit system would be automatic, human supervision could supplant certain of the automatic features whenever desired.

The rapid transit system would not be equipped with wayside signals, except at the interlockings. The wayside signals at interlockings would be used to indicate the route that has been established over the switches. Four-aspect cab signals, with continuous speed control, would be used. The cab signals would be installed on the train in the motorman's cab. Each of these aspects, when illuminated, would indicate to the motorman the safe maximum allowable speed for train operation. The safe maximum allowable speed would vary depending on the condition, that is, whether the train were operating over straight level track, on a steep grade, on a restrictive curve, or on track during performance of special work. It would also depend on the distance between trains.

If the motorman should ignore the aspect of the cab signal and exceed the indicated maximum safe speed, an audible alarm would sound. It would be necessary for the motorman to make a brake application within 2 seconds; otherwise an emergency brake application would be made, bringing the train to a complete stop. After the application of the brakes by the motorman, they cannot be released until the speed of the train is reduced below the maximum safe allowable speed.

The car design for this system would embody the principles and concepts of aerodynamics, and lightweight materials and the installation of air-conditioning equipment would be specified. A car body suspension system, completely new in car design, would be used to assure comfort. Doors would be spaced to permit easy and rapid passenger ingress and egress, thus reducing time of train stops at stations. Propulsion equipment for each car would consist of four 125-h.p. electric traction motors, d.c.-type, at 600 volts, capable of maintaining maximum speeds in excess of 80 m.p.h. where spacing of stations would permit. Acceleration and deceleration rates would be limited to rates that would insure passenger comfort.

Dynamic braking would be applied down to 5 m.p.h., at which speed air braking would take over to bring the car to a complete stop. In emergencies the combination of both braking systems would be acted upon automatically by the train control and signal system to bring the train to a quick halt.

All station platforms would be at car floor level and of sufficient length to allow for longer trains which would be required by increases in volume of passenger traffic.

The services provided in the first stage of this proposal are illustrated on the accompanying map (No. 1164), dated June 1960.

The plan recommends the use of existing trackage and requires tunnel construction only from 32d Street to Grand Central and the connection under the East River to the tracks of the Long Island Railroad. Therefore, a much lower capital expenditure would be required to provide the services described herein than would be necessary for an entirely new route and general plan.

A high-speed commuter service which would bring the commuter within easy walking distance of his destination in Manhattan, and in addition considerable reduce his traveling time, should apepar very attractive to him. The integration of the railroads involved in the New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut areas would provide commuter service in one unified operation and thus afford complete flexibility of passenger movement within these areas. This attractive service, together with the low capital investment required, should permit a realistic and reasonable fare structure and result in a profitable operation.

To implement this program it is recommended that a tristate agency be created with power to enter into the necessary agreements with the interested railroads and to construct and operate the system within New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut.

It is to be noted that the plan outlined herein, as it affects the State of New Jersey, is in substantial agreement with one of the steps recommended in the report to Gov. Robert B. Meyner by Commissioner Dwight R. G. Palmer, dated April 1960.

This proposal briefly outlines the plan for an integrated tristate commuter service. This plan has been studied in considerable detail for several years with respect to operational feasibility and costs of construction, modern signaling, and rolling stock by Col. S. H. Bingham and his staff of engineers. His chief engineers, Mr. I. Finkel, planning and design, and Mr. C. E. Chisholm, signal and line equipment, were associated with him for many years during the period he was chairman of the board of transportation of the city of New York and executive director and general manager of the New York City Transit Authority.

The conclusions which have been reached are all in favor of the implementation of this program for a high-speed tristate commuter service as an effective solution to a commuter problem which is rapidly becoming intolerable.

Similar studies recently have been made by Colonel Bingham for the cities of Boston, Mass., New Orleans, La., Montreal, Canada, Caracas, Venezuela, and other metropolitan areas, as well as the city of Los Angeles where he participated in the studies as an associate consultant.

In northern British Columbia toward the end of 1959 Colonel Bingham completed the first phase of a railway survey for the movement of iron ore, timber, pulp, and other bulk commodities, and recommended a route

and general plan for 697.15 miles of first-class railway within a 50,000-square-mile area from Summit Lake to the Yukon Territory boundary. On June 29, 1960, the first step in the construction commenced with the clearing of the right-of-way. A second phase involved a survey from the northern British Columbia border, through the Yukon Territory and Alaska to Fairbanks, which, if approved, would require the construction of 690 miles of railway.

COST ESTIMATE OF TRISTATE HIGH-SPEED COMMUTER SYSTEM FOR NEW YORK, NEW JERSEY, AND CONNECTICUT

The estimated cost for the installations and equipment required for the integration of the existing trackage of the railroads involved, which would be either acquired or leased, includes the following items:

Platforms at car floor levels.
Power rail installation.
Complete modern automatic signal system.
Power and substations—no generation.
Rolling stock, including cab signals.
New construction, where required, such as tunnels, stations and necessary equipment.

Estimated cost to provide an integrated commuter service within the New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut areas described in this proposal, without the Port Washington Line	$210,000,000
Estimated cost for the Port Washington Line, including tunnel under East River	107,000,000
Total	317,000,000

For a comparison between the cost of providing the integrated tristate commuter service under this plan and the cost of furnishing the identical service by the construction of an entirely new system over the same route and general plan, an estimate was prepared at current construction costs for labor and materials. The estimated cost of the completely new system is $915 million exclusive of the cost of acquiring the right-of-way and interest to be paid on the capital investment during the period of construction, estimated to be at least 8 years.

COL. S. H. BINGHAM, ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES (RETIRED), O.B.E.M. CONS. E., M.A.I.C.E., M.C.I.C France, MI. Mech. E., LL.D.

On February 1, 1956, Col. S. H. Bingham, formerly chairman of the board of transportation of the city of New York, retired as executive director and general manager of the New York City Transit Authority, which operates the rapid transit and surface transportation facilities owned by the city of New York, to enter private consulting engineering practice.

Registered professional engineer: New York State Registration No. 12369.

Professional society membership:

The American Institute of Consulting Engineers.

The New York Association of Consulting Engineers.

The Association of Consulting Engineers of Great Britain.

Chambre des Ingénieurs-Conseils de France.

National Society of Professional Engineers and its affiliate, New York State Society of Professional Engineers.

The American Society of Mechanical Engineers.

The Municipal Engineers of the city of New York.

The Institution of Mechanical Engineers (Great Britain).

The Institute of Transport of Great Britain.

The Engineering Institute of Canada.

Société des Ingénieurs Civils de France, and its American section.

The Institute of Engineers of Chile.

O Instituto de Engenharia—Sao Paulo, Brazil.

The Society of American Military Engineers.

The Order of Lafayette, Inc.

The Retired Officers Association of the Military Services.

Community Planning Association of Canada.

Colonel Bingham is a member of the National Panel of Arbitrators, American Arbitration Association, and he is an executive member of the New York Building Trades Congress. He is a member of the American Road Builders Association and the Hamilton and District Officers Institute of Hamilton, Ontario, Canada. He is listed in: "Who's Who in America," "Who's Who in the East," "Who's Who in Railroading," "National Cyclopedia of American Biography," "Who's Who in Great Britain," and "The Consulting Engineer Who's Who and Year Book," Great Britain.

Colonel Bingham, a descendant of William Hedley (who in 1812 built the first locomotive, the "Puffing Billy") and a long line of railroad men, began his career in the transit industry in 1915 when he was employed by the former Interborough Rapid Transit Co., a private company. During his early years with the company he was selected for special training which involved working in every department of the railroad for periods of 3 to 5 years. He was then assigned as technical assistant to the president in planning for future expansion and in solving current operating, maintenance, and engineering problems, in which position he continued until unification of New York City transit facilities in 1940.

During World War I he was a master engineer in the Railway Engineers, U.S. Army, AEF. For his services he was awarded the Croix de Guerre and other decorations.

At the outbreak of World War II Colonel Bingham was commissioned in the Military Railway Service of the Transportation Corps of the U.S. Army and served in the ETO. He held important assignments in planning and directing military railway operations in England, Africa, and Europe. He was in charge of designing railway rolling stock, including all types of railway freight cars which were prefabricated, shipped knocked down, and assembled at railway car shops in the United Kingdom and on the Continent. He also made the recommendation for the use of diesel electric and steam locomotives. He developed and carried out designs for specially constructed LST-2's, which enabled the invading forces at Normandy and elsewhere to carry fully loaded freight cars and diesel locomotives with them onto the first beachheads, thus saving several months in time which had heretofore been required to obtain sufficient space for assembly of the equipment. He developed the "Breathing Bridge," which made it possible to land this equipment during all 24 hours of the day, despite the 28-foot rise and fall of the tide. He designed hospital trains used by the British, French, and Americans. He also designed and supervised maintenance of an armored train, "The Bayonet," for General Eisenhower.

Before the invasion Colonel Bingham was liaison officer with the Royal Engineers, British War Office in London, serving under Maj. Gen. D. J. McMullen. He was also liaison officer with the Canadians and the Free French.

Following the establishment of General Headquarters, Military Railway Service, in Paris, he was assigned as assistant to the director general, Military Railways, and supervised the operation of over 50,000 miles of railway in France, Belgium, Holland, Germany, and Austria.

Decorations: For his service in this war he was awarded many decorations and honors, including the Purple Heart, Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, the Order of Leopold of Belgium, Order of the British Empire, Croix de Guerre with Palm and Silver Star and Chevalier of the Légion d'Honneur of France, and in January 1955 he was awarded the Rosette d'Officier of the Légion d'Honneur of France from the French Government.

Upon his return to civilian life and the New York City Transit System in November 1945, Colonel Bingham was assigned as Assistant to the chairman of the Board of Transportation. In 1946 he was appointed general superintendent of the New York City Transit System in charge of maintenance and operations and in May 1947 was appointed commissioner by Mayor William O'Dwyer. This was the first time in the history of the board of transportation that a commissioner had been appointed from the ranks. On January 1, 1950, he was named chairman of the board of transportation by Mayor O'Dwyer. When the New York City Transit Authority was created to take over the operation of the city-owned transit facilities on June 15, 1953, Colonel Bingham was appointed general manager and on March 18, 1954, he was appointed executive director and general manager.

While engaged in the administration and operation of the largest transit system in the United States, Colonel Bingham has also been active as a consultant and as a member in groups engaged in the study and planning of transit and traffic improvements. Colonel Bingham has studied the operations and planning of the Paris and London transportation systems. He has advised the Premier and the Minister of Transport in New South Wales, Australia, on road transport problems. He has acted as a consultant to the city of Oslo, Norway, and the city of Stockholm, Sweden. In recognition of his services in planning a subway for Stockholm and improving its surface transportation system, His Majesty, King Gustav VI Adolph of Sweden, bestowed upon him the Knighthood of the Royal Order of the North Star of Sweden on July 17, 1952.

In March 1948, Colonel Bingham went to San Francisco at the direction of Mayor William O'Dwyer to act as personal consultant on transportation matters to Mayor Elmer Robinson who had requested his services. He presented an interim report after a 2-week analysis of their problems, and many of his recommendations have been put into effect. The long-range plan for a San Francisco subway which he later prepared had been approved by Mayor Elmer Robinson. He has been consulted by the cities of Los Angeles, St. Louis, Minneapolis and St. Paul, Baltimore, Houston, Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Yonkers, N.Y., and Washington, D.C.

Colonel Bingham has acted as consultant for study and planning of additional rapid transit lines for suburban services in Cleveland, Ohio, and rapid transit facilities for Houston, Tex.

Early in 1950 Colonel Bingham made a study of the operations of the Metropolitan Transit Authority in the Boston area and reported on it to Gov. Paul A. Dever, of Massachusetts. In 1955 former Gov. Christian A. Herter of Massachusetts appointed him a member of his committee on regional transportation making a study of all forms of transportation in the Greater Boston area.

In December 1950, Governor Dewey appointed a special commission to study the Long Island Railroad, and Colonel Bingham was asked to act as consultant. He has also acted as adviser to the trustee administering the affairs of the Long Island Railroad who was appointed by the Federal court on the recommendation of the commission, and continued as consultant to the Long Island

Transit Authority, now the Long Island Railroad.

In August 1950 he was the transportation expert in a group of eminent engineers and city planners who made a comprehensive study of the city of Sao Paulo, Brazil. Other cities of the world that have called upon Colonel Bingham for counsel on their transportation problems are Lisbon, Rome, Caracas, Rio de Janeiro, Buenos Aires, Santiago, Milan, Calcutta, Adelaide, Istanbul, and Montreal. Toward the end of 1958 Colonel Bingham was asked to make further studies in Caracas, Venezuela, and Sao Paulo, Brazil. In February 1959, the newly elected officials invited Colonel Bingham to Caracas and Sao Paulo to discuss new studies. He was retained to make two separate studies in Caracas. The first, at the request of the Governor of the federal district, was a preliminary comparative study of two systems of rapid mass transportation for Caracas. Upon completion of this study, Colonel Bingham submitted his report to the Governor on July 4, 1959. The second study, involving general traffic conditions in the metropolitan area of Caracas, was made at the request of the Minister of Communications, and Colonel Bingham submitted his report to the Minister on August 31, 1959, which was adopted and is now being implemented.

As consultant and adviser to the President of Chile, upon completion of studies there in August 1955 he submitted both a short-term and a long-term report on commuter services and subway construction for Santiago.

In July 1956 at the request of Maj. Gen. Edward P. Curtis, Special Assistant to President Eisenhower on Aviation Facility Planning, Colonel Bingham submitted a report, "Air Traffic Control With Automatic Protection", describing an antomatic traffic control system for the airways.

Colonel Bingham is consultant to the city of Montreal for the departments of city planning, public works, traffic and finance, in which capacity he has been retained for more than 4 years. Other professional services in Montreal included the design of a vehicular tunnel under Mount Royal, in association with a Canadian consulting engineering firm. He has made extensive studies in the Province of Quebec and in Labrador for improved transportation of iron ore, timber, and other bulk material.

Colonel Bingham was invited to make an engineering and economic feasibility study on an asymmetric monorail system for the city of New Orleans, La. His report based on these studies was presented to the city council on February 11, 1959.

In the Tomorrowland area in Disneyland Colonel Bingham was consultant to Walt Disney on the mile-long monorail, which was placed in daily revenue operation on June 15, 1959.

In Los Angeles Colonel Bingham has been associated with Daniel, Mann, Johnson and Mendenhall in studies on rapid transit development for the metropolitan area.

Colonel Bingham has completed a railway survey for the movement of iron ore, timber, pulp, and other bulk commodities within the northern area of British Columbia. He has recommended a definite route and general plan to cover 698 miles of railway within a 50,000 square mile area. The construction of this railway is scheduled to begin about July 1, 1960. A second phase of the study will entail a similar survey from the northern border of British Columbia through the Yukon into Alaska.

Three large main-line railroads have retained Colonel Bingham as consultant. He has resigned rolling stock and equipment, both passenger and freight, not only for the war effort but for subway, surface, and monorail systems and for conventional long-line and commuter railroads.

Colonel Bingham has acted in a consulting capacity on the design and development of a portable monorail port system for wartime and emergency handling of cargo, supplies and personnel, which was recently presented to NATO.

Professional honors:

June 1953, honorary degree of doctor of laws, Fordham University.

May 1954, management award from Duquesne University.

June 1954, honorary member, Omega Chapter of Zeta Sigma Pi, national social science fraternity, St. John's University of Brooklyn, N.Y.

September 1954, the Order of Al Mérito Bernardo O'Higgins was bestowed upon Colonel Bingham by the President of Chile.

September 1945, honorary degree of doctor of engineering, Catholic University of Chile.

January 1955, Alfred Brahdy Memorial Award presented by the municipal engineers of the city of New York.

August 1955, honorary degree of doctor of science, Duquesne University.

October 1955, medal from the Société des Ingénieurs Civils de France.

October 1955, honorary degree of doctor of science from Lafayette College.

Out of the Deep to Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a most interesting editorial which appeared in the Gazette, Montreal, Canada, on July 22, 1960:

OUT OF THE DEEP TO TARGET

"Polaris—from out of the deep to target—perfect."

With these exultant words, the captain of the American submarine *George Washington* informed President Eisenhower that the missile-firing submarine was no longer dream, but reality, and, although the thought may not have crossed the captain's mind, informed the world that offensive strategy had entered a new phase.

In order to reach their full possibilities of development, scientists say that organic creatures found it necessary to abandon the sea millions of years ago, and to exist on land. The missile has reversed this sequence. In order to reach the highest offensive capabilities that can yet be envisaged for it, it has had to abandon the land for the sea.

Although the Polaris has much in common with the Atlas and Titan missiles, it is that which is uncommon and different that causes it to make those missiles obsolescent at the moment they have become operational. The Atlas and the Titan are stationary; they are inflexible; they use liquid-fuel engines that have proved treacherous and unreliable.

The Polaris has solid-fuel engines; it can be carried to almost any of the large bodies of water that comprise a greater surface area than do the continents. As previous voyages have demonstrated, the nuclear submarine is as efficient in the Arctic and Antarctic as in temperate regions.

The only coming weapon which can perhaps be compared with the Polaris missile is the Minuteman missile. No doubt this will provide a land-based equivalent of the Polaris. But even this missile, which may be transported on special railway cars, will not have the safety or the flexibility of the Polaris.

The Polaris, if it is quickly manufactured in quantity and installed in nuclear submarines, may give the United States as great a lead over the Soviet Union as the Soviet Union gained over the United States with the missiles that launched the sputniks. But, just as the United States labored to close the missile gap which left it inferior, Russia can be expected to work for a new advantage. She may do this by building a Polaris-type missile herself, or she may seek to devise some more formidable weapon.

In weaponry one great power does not long retain an advantage over another. Each seeks to match its adversaries' achievements. Yet there is a lead of a different kind which exists today, and to which there seems little solution at present.

This is the lead that the offensive weapons of both great powers have gained over defensive weapons. Offensive weapons are today as superior to defensive weapons as defensive were to offensive weapons over 40 years ago, during the First World War. At that time the mass production of arms, like the machinegun, had given the defense a crushing superiority over the unprotected and frail human body. The battles of the First World War were battles of mass slaughter.

Today the situation is reversed. There is no defense against a nuclear-armed missile. The only defense is mental—the inhibition created by the knowledge that the enemy can destroy as freely and as completely as oneself.

Is this defense enough? The question has little meaning. There is no surer defense to be had. The scientists have given immense power to destroy. They have given little power to protect.

The only protection which exists is to insure that the West does not for any appreciable period become inferior to the Soviet Union in weapons. It was the fear of such inferiority that caused endless debate in the United States over the missile gap.

The West must be thankful that the United States has now produced a weapon which should, unless technical difficulties delay it, soon equal the armaments of the Soviet Union. If it is only fear of retaliation that insures security, the West must see that its power to retaliate remains inferior to none.

"Traffic Safety," Speech by Hon. Samuel N. Friedel, of Maryland, at "Clean Sweep" Luncheon, Safety First Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to be able to insert in the RECORD the text of a speech made by my colleague, SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, of the Seventh Congressional District of Maryland, before the Safety First Club of Maryland, at its "Clean Sweep" luncheon held in Baltimore on August 19. The luncheon marked the endorsement received from the Governors of all 50 States for the organization's nationwide campaign for the issuance of a commemorative traffic safety postage stamp.

Mr. FRIEDEL was the author of the original bill introduced in Congress to establish a Special Subcommittee on Traffic Safety, and he was appointed a member of that committee. It functioned so effectively that its work is being continued at the present time and the results of its efforts will be felt nationwide. The speech follows:

TRAFFIC SAFETY

Mr. Chairman, members of the Safety First Club, and friends, it is indeed a pleasure for me to be with you today for this "clean sweep" luncheon. I know how gratified each of you must be in the knowledge that you made a clean sweep of all the 50 States Governors in your drive to obtain support for the issuance of a special traffic safety stamp. This is a real accomplishment.

No one knows better than I do the terrific amount of work that has gone into this project. At this time I would like to commend the chairman of this drive, Harry Abell, the president of the Safety First Club, J. O. Shuger, as well as Morris Kasoff, Sam Abrams, Dr. Leo Kline and the secretary, Maurice Shochatt. Without the untiring efforts of these public spirited citizens we would not be here today to mark a clean sweep of all our State Governors in support of this worthy cause.

It has been my privilege from time to time to assist the executive committee for the special traffic safety stamp in whatever way they deemed appropriate. When your committee passed a resolution last August, calling for the issuance of a special stamp, I was very enthusiastic about using this means of calling to the attention of all our citizens the importance of driving safely on our Nation's streets and highways. In fact, I thought so much of this project that I spoke about it on the floor of the House of Representatives on August 20, 1959, and called upon the Postmaster General to issue a special traffic safety stamp. I pointed out then, and I would like to repeat now, that our most precious asset is the people of our country.

On March 30, 1960, it was my pleasure to announce on the floor of the House of Representatives that the Safety First Club of Maryland had been successful in obtaining the support of the Governors of 48 States in their drive for this special stamp. At that time I asked my colleagues in the House to get behind this drive and assist in every way possible to have such a stamp issued. Today it is a great pleasure for me to note that we now have the support of the Governors of all our States and this could not have been accomplished without the persistent efforts of the members of this club.

As you all know, the Postmaster General has advised me that a special traffic safety stamp cannot be issued this year. However, on Wednesday of this week, I was assured that this proposal will be considered when the decision is made as to the special stamps to be issued in 1961. Our present Postmaster General has made the decision regarding the stamps to be issued in the first 3 months of 1961. However, I hope we will have a new Postmaster General for the balance of next year and that he will be a man who is aware that anything we can do to stop the killing of our citizens on the highways is a moral obligation we all face. I still maintain that if we can issue special stamps calling attention to the need for soil conservation, water conservation, and such other matters, we can certainly find a way to issue a stamp calling attention to the need for conserving human lives. You can rest assured that I will continue my efforts in this direction.

I have stated many times over that traffic safety is everybody's business, yet this continues to be one of our unsolved national problems. Many fine organizations, such as the Safety First Club of Maryland, have expended great effort to bring this problem to the attention of the public and to make people safety conscious. However, much more work is needed if we are to stop the slaughter on our Nation's highways. Just this past weekend our Governor the Honorable Millard Tawes, proclaimed his desire that this be a "deathless weekend" on Maryland highways. Yet, in less than 3 hours after the start of the weekend we had two deaths resulting from accidents on Maryland highways. This makes it look as though we are not getting our message across to the driving public.

I think all of you here realize that we must exert even more effort to make every automobile driver aware of the great necessity for driving safely. We must make him understand that accidents do not always happen to the other fellow—they can happen to us. Each individual driver must do his part by obeying traffic laws and watching the other fellow as well as himself when he is behind the wheel.

I know that each of you here today are doing a great deal to help solve this traffic safety problem, but I think you will agree that the need for safety on our Nation's highways cannot be brought to the attention of the American people too often. Wide circulation of a traffic safety stamp would be very useful in our campaign to stop the needless loss of the lives of so many of our citizens. Again, let me assure you that I will continue to do everything in my power to have such a traffic safety stamp issued next year.

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to address the Safety First Club of Maryland today. Now that we have made a clean sweep in obtaining the support of Governors for our special traffic safety stamp campaign, let us use this support in every possible way so that all our citizens will be made aware of their social responsibility, respect the rights—and the lives—of others. In this way, I believe we can ultimately stop this disgraceful slaughter on the highways.

Unfinished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial of interest to taxpayers, which appeared in the Chelsea Record on July 22, 1960.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Members of Congress have been taking a vacation during the political conventions, but there is no vacation for the U.S. taxpayer. Government expenses and taxes go on without a break.

Most people realize there will never be an end to paying taxes. What many do not realize—including some Congressmen—is that the Federal Government is charging heavier income taxes than necessary. Hanging fire in Congress during the current recess are bills which would reform the income tax rates and ease the load on everybody. These bills, sponsored by Democrat A. S. HERLONG of Florida and Republican HOWARD BAKER of Tennessee, would reduce Federal income tax rates in every bracket.

The Government could be expected to benefit as well as the taxpayers. Economists predict that much of the money released from taxes would be invested to start or expand businesses. This would mean new jobs, new products—and new tax sources.

Now is the time for all good Congressmen to remind themselves that the Herlong-Baker tax rate reform bills 3000 and 3001 need their attention when Congress goes back to work.

Gastonia's National Teener Champs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, August 19, 1960, the Teener Baseball Team of Gastonia, N.C., won the national championship at a tournament held in Hershey, Pa. This team of boys under the age of 16 years was sponsored by the Absher-Flowers Post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of Gastonia, of which I am a member.

All of the citizens of Gaston County are extremely proud of the athletic accomplishments of these young fellows, but we are even more proud of the splendid manner in which they represented North Carolina from the standpoint of their personal conduct.

The Gastonia Gazette of Saturday, August 20, carried a story of the welcome extended to these boys upon their return home. I feel that this story will be of interest to many people and for that reason I insert the story to be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

MOTORCADE TO GATHER AT RIVER

(By Ray Jimison)

A red carpet stretching from the Catawba River to Gastonia was to greet the city's national Teener champs on their arrival home this afternoon.

A motorcade was to meet the victors at the Catawba River bridge at 4 o'clock.

Players were to get off the bus at the bridge and join the motorcade. They were to ride with their parents in convertibles.

TRIUMPHANT JOURNEY

The procession was to travel to Belmont where Police Chief Frank Carpenter was to escort it through the town. It was to swing back to the boulevard for the triumphant journey to Gastonia.

The motorcade was to turn north on Trenton Street and travel east down Main Avenue. It was to stop at Chester Street, if it arrives early, to wait until 5 p.m.

PARADE

At 5 p.m., a parade was to be kicked off at Chester Street. It was to move down Main Avenue through the business section, breaking up at Broad Street.

Not since 1935 when the Gastonia American Legion Juniors captured the little world series has baseball fever been at such a high pitch in Gastonia.

Hundreds of rabid baseball fans were expected to meet the team at the Catawba River for the grand march on Gastonia.

PARENTS MEET

Parents of the players were to meet at Absher-Flowers Post No. 9337 at 2 p.m. to

make preparations to meet their sons. Eighteen convertibles have been secured to carry the happy parents.

Gastonia's homesick Teeners were to get a reception that will long be remembered. Baseball fans still recall when the city won its last national championship 25 years ago.

EVEN BIGGER

"This will be even bigger," declared a VFW official.

Capt. Roy Short of the Gastonia Police Department said the parade was worked up on short order. "We could really have shown the people something had we had more time to prepare."

Efforts were being made to obtain the local drum and bugle corps and also the Concord Drum and Bugle Corps. Several fire trucks and ambulances were to be thrown in for good measure.

RIDE TOGETHER

Teeners and their parents were to ride together in the parade. Coach Jim Barker and VFW Recreation Director Russ Bergmann and other VFW officials were to be in convertibles.

EASY WAY

Gastonia won the national Teener championship Friday afternoon the easy way. They scored 5 runs in the first inning and went on to smother Struthers, Ohio, 12 to 3, in a rain-interrupted game.

The local Teeners fought their way into the finals with three consecutive wins. They beat Bossier, La., 6 to 0; Canal Zone, 4 to 0; and Elgin, Ill., 8 to 5.

In copping the national championship, Gastonia beat three former national champions—Bossier, Canal Zone, and Elgin.

The team has been away from home since Saturday a week ago. They left here at 5 a.m. and arrived in Hershey, Pa., Sunday after stopping off in Baltimore Saturday night. In rolling to the championship, the Teeners won 13 straight games.

Fourteen players and the two coaches were to share the limelight this afternoon.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, this fall marks the 20th anniversary of an organization dedicated to an educational program designed to dispel myths and reveal the truth about activities of the Soviet Union with regard to captive nations. This is the Ukrainian Congress Committee of American, which represents some 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry. We salute the committee both for what it is doing to uphold and perpetuate the ideals of the Ukrainian people and for its efforts in the cause of freedom. How the work of the committee relates to our efforts in the struggle for freedom is clearly outlined in the following excerpt from a letter to me from Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, chairman of the committee and associate professor of economics at Georgetown University. The excerpt:

Our aim has been purely educational. As citizens knowledgeable in the affairs of the Soviet Union, we are dedicated to the task of serving the national security interests of this country by advancing the strategic value of all the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union itself; informing our fellow citizens about the independence struggles of the dozen captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.; exposing the many current myths about Soviet unity in all its alleged ramifications, and proposing concrete ways and means to defeat imperialistic Moscow in the cold war, the chief mode of which is psycho-political and propagandistic.

One Hundred and Fiftieth Anniversary of Mexican Independence Commemorative Postage Stamp Will Be First Placed on Sale September 16, 1960, at Los Angeles, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to extend the text of a letter received by me from the postmaster, Otto K. Olesen, Los Angeles, Calif., and the text of an information statement about the 4-cent commemorative stamp to be issued September 16, 1960, on the 150th anniversary of Mexican independence, with the first day of sale in Los Angeles.

While most of the great 23d District, which I represent in this great legislative body, in this my 14th year, is not within the city limits of the city of Los Angeles, a portion of the great 23d District is within the corporate limits of the city of Los Angeles, and therefore within the limits of the postal service of the U.S. Post Office, Los Angeles, Calif.

The letter and statement follow:

U.S. POST OFFICE,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 19, 1960.

Hon. CLYDE DOYLE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Los Angeles has been honored again.

The Post Office Department in Washington has informed me that the U.S. commemorative postage stamp, marking the 150th anniversary of Mexican independence, will be first placed on sale September 16, 1960, at Los Angeles.

This stamp is part of a joint issuance of special stamps by the United States and our good neighbor nation of Mexico. Los Angeles was designated as the place of initial issuance because it has the greatest concentration of Americans of Mexican origin.

We are planning a gala celebration for this event of international significance, to be held on the steps of the Federal Building at 10 a.m. on September 16, 1960. Please put this date on your calendar because I certainly would like to have you in attendance at this ceremony as a special guest.

Will you please drop me a line, or call my office at Madison 5-7411, extension 257, telling me whether or not you will attend?

With kindest personal regards, I am,

Sincerely,

OTTO K. OLESEN,
Postmaster.

INFORMATION ABOUT THE 4-CENT MEXICAN INDEPENDENCE COMMEMORATIVE STAMP, TO BE ISSUED SEPTEMBER 16, 1960, WITH FIRST-DAY SALE IN LOS ANGELES

The U.S. commemorative postage stamp marking the 150th anniversary of Mexican independence, which is to be part of a joint issuance of special stamps by the two neighboring nations, will be first placed on sale September 16, 1960, at Los Angeles, Calif., with a special ceremony at the Spring Street entrance to the Los Angeles Federal Building at 10 a.m. on that date. Los Angeles was designated as the place of initial issuance because it has the greatest concentration of Americans of Mexican origin in this country.

Except for the necessary differences in text and denomination, the Mexican independence stamps issued by both nations will be identical in design, featuring the historic bell at the National Palace in Mexico City which is rung each year by the President of Mexico to signal the beginning of the independence anniversary. This bell was brought to Mexico City from Dolores, where Miguel Hidalgo rang it in his call for independence.

The design is the result of the cooperate efforts of Leon Helguera of Mexico and Charles R. Chickering of the U.S. Bureau of Engraving and Printing. It was approved in Mexico City by postal officials of Mexico and members of the U.S. Post Office Department's Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee.

This is the first time the two countries will issue postage stamps embodying the same basic designs. The stamps will be of the 30 centavos denomination for Mexico and the 4-cent denomination for the United States, these being the respective rates for first class letter mail in and between each country. Both stamps will be printed in red and green on white paper, thereby featuring the Mexican national colors.

Collectors desiring first-day cancellations of the 4-cent Mexican Independence commemorative may send addressed envelopes, together with remittance to cover the cost of the stamps to be affixed, to the Postmaster, Los Angeles, Calif. A close-fitting enclosure of postal card thickness should be placed in each envelope and the flap either turned in or sealed.

Envelopes submitted should be of ordinary letter size, and each must be properly addressed. An envelope must not be sent for the return of first day covers and orders for covers must not include requests for uncanceled stamps. The outside envelope or wrapper to the postmaster should be endorsed "First-Day Covers 4-Cent Mexican Independence Stamp."

Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield in announcing the Mexican independence stamps said, "The Government and peoples of the United States and of the great nation of Mexico—governments and peoples who share a long common and peaceful border—have learned to live side by side in friendship and harmony.

"It is indeed significant, in these days when international crises are all too frequent, that our two countries have created this atmosphere of good neighborliness—an atmosphere of mutual respect, understanding and trust—and thus contributed to the well-being and progress of each.

"It was with these thoughts in mind that I proposed to Rafael Murillo Vidal, Director General of Posts of Mexico, in November 1959, that our two nations jointly issue Mexican Independence stamps in 1960."

The Postmaster General recalled that the friendly relationship between the two nations was further evinced, during the past year, by the visits of President Eisenhower and his brother, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, to Mexico and by the state visit of President Adolfo Lopez Mateos of Mexico to the United States.

Statement of Thomas F. Carpenter, Assistant Research Director, District 50, United Mine Workers of America, to the U.S. Tariff Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEVELAND M. BAILEY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues to the following statement of Mr. Thomas F. Carpenter, assistant research director, District 50, United Mine Workers of America, to the U.S. Tariff Commission with respect to proposed GATT negotiations:

STATEMENT OF THOMAS F. CARPENTER, ASSISTANT RESEARCH DIRECTOR, DISTRICT 50, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA, TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION ON INVESTIGATION NO. 9, UNDER GATT, AND TO THE COMMITTEE ON RECIPROCITY INFORMATION, WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSED GATT NEGOTIATIONS ANNOUNCED UNDER DATE OF MAY 27, 1960

A notice of intention to negotiate pursuant to the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended and extended, including a list of dutiable items to be considered, was published in May 1960. Under schedule I, entitled "Chemicals, Oils, and Paints," paragraph 1 through paragraph 95, of the Tariff Act of 1930, there appears a list of chemical, oil, and paint products, numbering some 425 items, imported into the United States and proposed for consideration in trade agreement negotiations. Generally speaking, these items are either directly or indirectly competitive imports of practically every major industrial chemical employer in the United States.

District 50, United Mine Workers of America, represents, for purposes of collective bargaining, a large number of workers who contribute to the production of either the source material or the end product of practically all of the items listed in the above announcement.

Taking into account the broad scope of the chemical industry in the United States, we find that a substantial number of the chemicals listed above are used by other industries in the production of durable goods—i.e., building materials, electrical equipment, furniture and fixtures, hardware, lumber products, machinery, metal products, motor vehicles and equipment, and transportation equipment—and nondurable goods—i.e., beverages, food products, leather and leather products, packaging, paper and paper products, petroleum and coal products, rubber products, and textiles.

District 50, United Mine Workers of America, represents, for purposes of collective bargaining, a considerable number of workers employed in the manufacture of those products itemized in both the durable- and non-durable-goods lists mentioned above.

Therefore, in behalf of the members of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, who may be affected by the proposed negotiations, it is the desire of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, to object to further decreases in tariffs on the May 1960 list.

Free enterprise in the United States has prospered and grown through competition. Competition has caused American industry to engage in exhaustive and costly research to make more products cheaper and better. We have today, resulting from an international competitive chemical industry, a most superior complex machine contributing its fair share to the success of the United States of America in peace and war. The members of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, employed in this industry have, likewise, made a substantial contribution to the success of this industry and the maintenance of an American standard of living.

Now this industry and the people who work to make it successful turn to the U.S. Government for the least that can be asked; i.e., an opportunity to continue to serve the United States. The American worker is entitled to necessary protection from the competitive imports of products produced by the chemical industry in other nations where wages, working conditions, and living standards are greatly inferior to our own.

For example, the workers in the six nations comprising the European Economic Community receive average hourly earnings that are between 21 and 22 percent of the average hourly earnings received by the chemical worker in the United States. It must be noted that the chemical producer in the United States is required by law to pay minimum straight-time hourly wages of nearly double the average hourly earnings of the foreign chemical producer manufacturing these competitive imports.

American industry can continually improve its output per man hour, but productivity alone can not make up the differential between the domestic industry wages and the wages paid to their foreign counterpart.

Blocs of nations such as the European Economic Community can within that geographic area remove trade barriers because this relatively small area (approximately one-sixth of the size of the United States) has within its confines similar living and economic conditions. The problem of differentials is of no significance in this community of nations. However, comparing the wages of this economic bloc with that of the United States, we have the following:

Comparison of average hourly earnings of nonsalaried workers in the chemical industry [1] in the European Economic Community (Common Market) countries with comparable workers in the United States for comparable periods

Country	Average hourly earnings		Percent of U.S. rate	Year
	Domestic rate	U.S. dollars		
United States	----------	2.31	100.00	1958
Belgium: [2]				
Males	32.08 francs	.645	27.92	1958
Females	18.59 francs	.373	16.15	1958
Germany (Federal Republic):				
Males	2.51 marks	.599	25.93	1958
Females	1.64 marks	.391	16.93	1958
Italy	234 lire	.374	16.19	1958
Luxembourg	32.47 francs	.651	28.18	[3] 1957
Netherlands	1.82 gilders	.482	20.87	1958
France	2.50 francs	.505	21.86	1958

[1] International Standard Industrial Classification 31 (Chemical and Chemical Products).

[2] Hourly rate estimated on a daily average earnings of 240.6 francs for male and 139.4 francs for female and an average workday of 7.5 hours.

[3] Latest figures available.

NOTE.—Combined average hourly earnings (excluding United States) equals $0.503. Percent of combined average to U.S. average equals 21.77 percent.

Sources: Yearbook of Labour Statistics, 1959, International Labor Office, and U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Based on the above data, we find such vast differences in the wage structure that it would seem completely unrealistic to presume that any real competition could exist between the domestic and foreign industries, based on labor costs portrayed in this table.

The vast and dynamic machine of industrial United States requires all of its components in working order. The interdependence of various large and important segments of industry on the chemical industry was outlined above and discussed in a statement by the president of the Manufacturing Chemists Association before the House Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy in 1957, and is well known to interested persons and need not be restated here.

While it is true that some American chemical manufacturers have acquired chemical plant facilities in foreign countries and enjoy cheap foreign labor, that in itself would be no justification for the further reduction in tariffs in order to unfairly enhance their competitive position against the workers in the chemical industry in the United States.

It appears that our Congress is also concerned about the unilateral trade program. On January 26, 1960, Congressman BAILEY submitted to the House of Representative House Concurrent Resolution 512, and Senator KERR, for himself and Senators THURMOND, CURTIS, DWORSHAK, ALLOTT, and JOHNSTON of South Carolina, submitted to the U.S. Senate Senate Concurrent Resolution 104. These documents express the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming negotiations since "profound changes in the international competitive standing of the U.S. producers have occurred since the passage of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958;

"Whereas, imports have increased sharply while exports have declined."

Both of these resolutions are in appropriate committees of the respective houses of Congress and we feel certain that they capably express a growing concern of Americans everywhere.

On March 30, 1954, President Dwight D. Eisenhower sent a message to Congress, on foreign economic policy, containing the following passage:

"I have approved the Commission's recommendations that the United States withhold reductions in tariffs on products made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country. This policy shall be placed in effect. I have also approved the Commission's recommendations concerning raising of labor standards through consultative procedures and cooperation in international conferences such as those sponsored by the International Labor Organization."

The essence of the first sentence of the President's message, quoted above, is also stated on page viii of the "Notice of U.S. Intention to Negotiate."

This announced policy should bear some weight in these negotiations where the wages paid in the exporting nations are substandard to those of the United States. The United States of America has adopted a very formal policy as to what is substandard. This is outlined in the Fair Labor Standards Act. This act proclaims that all persons, employed by employers engaged in interstate commerce, shall be paid not less than $1 per hour. If we are to compete in international commerce, the United States must require that any foreign producer, desiring to sell his products in the American market, pay his workers the minimum required to be paid under domestic policy. The alternative, then, is to impose necessary restrictions on competitive imports, produced under sub-

standard wages and working conditions, as will more fully protect the American worker in his employment opportunities as a citizen and as a taxpayer.

The policies of the United States are not to be taken lightly by Americans themselves nor should they be undersold to our foreign counterparts.

The history of the United States is resplendent with bold and virtuous actions. In this matter, an action to raise the standard of living of foreign workmen to that of American workmen is preferable to lowering the American standard to that of our foreign competition.

In reemphasizing the position of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, in this matter, it is noted that under the Fair Labor Standards Act, we have, by law, established certain restrictions upon the employment of child labor by domestic employers. Oppressive child labor is defined as the employment of minors (1) under 18 in occupations found to be particularly hazardous, (2) under 16 in any other occupation, and (3) under 14 in limited work outside school hours in nonmanufacturing and nonmining occupations.

Further, under the Fair Labor Standards Act, there is established a national policy that all persons, employed by employers engaged in interstate commerce, shall be paid not less than $1 per hour. Consideration is now being given by Congress of increasing the minimum under the Fair Labor Standards Act from $1 per hour to $1.25 per hour by step rates over a period of 3 years.

In connection with this subject matter, it might be well for both the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information, during their investigation of this matter, to consider the imposition of additional import restrictions on goods produced by foreign manufacturers which pay wage rates to their employees and impose restrictions on their workers that are below the minimum standards required by law to be maintained with respect to domestic manufacturers within the United States of America.

We respectfully submit that we are opposed to any further reduction of tariff duties on competitive imports during the forthcoming negotiations.

Television's Role

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr Speaker, in a recent talk at a dinner of the St. Louis Educational Television Commission in his honor, Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, put forward a convincing case for employing every means at our command to fill the perilous gap between what our citizens know and what they need to know in order to make fast and sound decisions. He emphasized that such a curtailment of the freedom of any information medium as the abridgment of the rights of broadcast journalism in election campaigns, is shortsighted and hazardous in the extreme.

This is a timely alert to the fundamental and central dilemma facing democracy as both a means of government and a way of life. I urge you to read it in its entirety.

Dr. Stanton's speech follows:

For some reason, I find myself coming frequently to Missouri to discuss such aspects of broadcasting as education and journalism. There seems to be here a wholly constructive compulsion to discuss and to stimulate discussion among others.

Some time ago, when CBS concluded that the responsibility of its own stations as journalists could not be fully met without their giving attention and time to the editorial function as well as to the reporting function, KMOX and KMOX–TV moved promptly to correct this deficiency. At the time the most pressing local issue was the St. Louis Metropolitan District Plan. KMOX delivered itself of a clear, forceful, closely reasoned editorial—against the plan. Its sister station, KMOX–TV also delivered itself of a clear, forceful, closely reasoned editorial —in favor of the plan.

If dissent is the chief nutrient of a democracy, you have nothing but the growth of the democratic spirit ahead of you here in Missouri. In addition to a historically robust press and lively universities as stimulators of opinion, you now have vigorous and independent-minded broadcasting stations.

This is all relevant to our concern here tonight: the contribution that television can make to education in a democratic society. This is an enormous topic, of course, and I can discuss with you only one major aspect of it. Before I do, I want to say that all of us at CBS have followed with great interest the work of the St. Louis Educational Television Commission and the progress of KETC.

As a vivid communications medium, television can supplement greatly the traditional tools of education. It can possibly also introduce a new economy in educational methods. But educational television will never, and should never, replace institutional education or even take over its major burden. Used wisely and well it can lighten that burden and at the same time add a new dimension to teaching.

A YOUNG FORCE

Such commissions as yours, made up of interested citizens with a special competence or interest in education and its problems, seems to me the right way to go about giving direction and guidance to the development of educational television. Much of what has already been done in educational television is of proved good. Some, I suppose is doubtful. Some is probably useless, misguided, or basically wrong. But educational television is extremely young. It must rely on evolution to realize itself and make a valid contribution to the formal educational process. Certainly we at CBS want, when we can, to aid in that necessarily slow progression from experiment to a sure place in the educational scheme.

In one way or another, of course, all television—as all communications—serves an educational purpose. I imagine that even those lighter entertainment programs about which the academic people may have somewhat limited enthusiasm can touch off the curiosity of sociologists and anthropologists. And if the proper study of mankind is indeed man, television—whatever its mistakes and failures—offers the student a window of unlimited proportions.

TELEVISION'S EDUCATIONAL ROLE

Tonight I want to limit my talk on the most direct educational role that television plays in a democratic society.

In all societies, education is a basic need. The Soviets have certainly recognized this—however repugnant to us their use of it may be as a mechanical adjunct of the State's business of controlling individuals so as to create a collective machine. With us education is the pervading premise of the democratic proposition. You cannot have democracy without education. But neither becomes the tool of the other. They exist side by side, feeding upon one another. Each exists for its own sake and, at the same time, for the sake of the other. You can no more separate education and democracy than you can separate energy and matter.

THE LUXURY OF TIME

Now there was a day when this interdependence of democracy and education had simple enough implications. It was necessary to have a literate people, and provisions were made to teach everyone to read and write. For the rest, the constitutional guarantee of a free press and freedom of speech, and the natural interplay in a small and on the whole peaceful society of person-to-person communications did the job. Democracy had room and time for its slow machinery to move—room and time, too, to make mistakes. De Tocqueville was quick to see the natural tolerance that the America of the last century had for the uncertainties of the democratic procedure. "The great advantage of the Americans," he said, "consists in their being able to commit faults which they may afterwards repair."

That was 125 years ago. And it was true for 115 years thereafter. But for the last decade, the words come to us from the hollow echo chamber of a lost world—a world where there was the incomparable luxury of time. Time to make mistakes, time to correct them. Time to flush out the facts on which to move. Time to feed and to feed back public opinion. Time, in short, for the slowest and most hopeful form of government devised by man to work.

A NEW DILEMMA

There seems to me no mistaking that the most overwhelming fact in political science today is that we no longer have that enormous luxury of time—that we must adjust the institutions and methods of democracy to the life-or-death demands of a speeding world, where there can be few mistakes, few revisions, few fumblings after the right decision.

This is a prodigious and a wholly novel strain to put upon democracy. And in our history it comes at a time when we have not solved other older, far less perplexing and infinitely less pressing political dilemmas. Even as de Tocqueville wrote so reassuringly in 1835, the essential problem of democracy in modern America was emerging: Democratic concepts born in the peaceful plantations and villages of the 18th century colonies, but whose embryology began 2,500 year earlier in ancient Athens, had to be adjusted to a mass society—a society made up of scores of millions, moving out across a 3,000-mile wide continent, moving too towards a complex industrial economy.

With our talent for improvising, we survived this challenge without ever really solving it. We have simply been groping towards a solution. But before we achieved it, we had imposed on us this more perplexing, more sudden and more critical challenge to the placid idea of democracy conceived in Athens and reborn in the Thirteen Colonies. The age of the intercontinental ballistics missile has pressed upon democracy standards of speed and certainly that no man envisioned when this republic was founded—that we ourselves did not envision until they were full upon us.

We have no secret weapon in our arsenal—nor any hope of one in the laboratories—to deal with this. Democracy depends upon human capacities. And prime among these is the ability to communicate—to inform, to discuss, to form opinion. Democracy cannot be saved by any substitute for these—

for that would be a denial of its own nature. Obviously then, this informing, this discussion, this opinion forming—this essentially educational process—must be adjusted to the new demands.

HOW TELEVISION CAN SERVE

I have said before that it seems to me providential that television came along at this time, when the working principles of democracy are stretched taut, when old values have been swept away by the ruthlessness of progress, and when—whether we like it or not—we are in for the most critical readjustment we have ever faced. The question is what is television doing about this opportunity for service and what can it do?

I am going to be as exact and as direct with you on this question as I know how.

This year the American people will be making a decision—a choice of leadership—that is bound to influence not only our own future but the future of mankind throughoutthe world. It is a tough, hard, fateful decision binding for 4 years into the future. It will be made impulsively, on vague impressions, on surface feelings; or it will be made thoughtfully, on clear information, in full knowledge and understanding of the issues.

LEADERSHIP FOR FREEDOM

There is no single act of self-government that is more important than this quadrennial choice of our national leadership. No matter how resolute our people, we are in trouble if that leadership is faltering. No matter how constant our devotions to freedom, we plunge it into jeopardy if the leadership we choose is indifferent. No matter what our material strength, we are in physical danger if our leadership is weak.

The role that television must play in this outstanding business of democracy is clear: it is education for effective, informed citizenship capable of making sound decisions and making them fast. Television today is in 88 percent of American homes. Through networks it can be in every one of those homes simultaneously. It can be there with voice and with image. It can be there with immediacy, with the event itself—not as somebody saw it happen but as it is happening. It can bring virtually the entire electorate into one room. That is, in fact, what has happened to the national party conventions.

TELEVISION AND THE CONVENTIONS

In 1956, more than 102 million viewers saw some part of the conventions. Out of the total convention coverage of 55 hours, the average set was turned on for over 16 hours. Even a session at 2:30 in the morning was watched by as many as an estimated 10 million people in 4 million homes. Moreover, the predictability of the convention has little to do with the size of the audience; in 1956, the general certainty that President Eisenhower would be nominated for a second term by acclamation did not diminish the size of the audience.

Television has made the convention more than an organization devise to select a candidate and frame a platform. It has become the major forum through which voters all across the land come to know the personality of the party and its leaders, to get a sense of their values, to judge them, their characters and their capacity for leadership.

CBS takes such a serious view of the conventions that it started planning the coverage of the 1960 events 2 years ago. Nearly 300 CBS staff people—reporters, news analysts, technicians—will be working at each convention. While the Democratic Convention is going on in Los Angeles, an advance crew of CBS News will be in Chicago, preparing for the Republican Convention 2 weeks later. In each convention city CBS will have two news headquarters, one in the convention hall and one behind the scenes. More than 22 tons of equipment and hundreds of miles of wires and cables will be used to cover each convention. The cost to the parties for the coverage that the three networks gave the conventions in 1956 would be $12.5 million for air time alone, not including the huge production costs.

This quantitative picture of television's convention coverage is only the beginning of the story. If we were seeking only to give every American "a seat in the hall," we could do it with a couple of cameras and a handful of men. What we are after is an understanding of the convention, not just a passive witnessing.

INTERPRETING THE NEWS

A stark chronology of the proceedings of the conventions would be meaningless, dull, and worthless to most viewers. The job of journalism is not just to record, but to appraise, to evoke meanings, to search out implications, and to probe behind-the-scenes actions and trends. A convention is necessarily chaotic, for only a fraction of the significant activity is on the floor. All the rest—the trends and countertrends, the appeals, the deals, the obstinacies, the weaknesses, the strengths—these are revealed in committee chambers, in delegation headquarters, in candidates' rooms, in corridors, and in hotel lobbies. Unless order is conferred on this chaos of happenings, unless selections are made from the vast volume of talk and action, the viewer would get little enlightenment. He would be swamped by the sheer mass of news going on before his eyes. So the job of television goes far beyond a matter of using advanced electronic equipment to bring the convention's floor proceedings to the viewer. It is a matter also of mobilizing and deploying the human resources of CBS News so that they are used in the best interest of the viewer.

Anyone at all familiar with the television networks' news and public affairs programs for the last 4 years knows that the conventions are a culmination as well as a beginning. Every issue and every possible candidate has been presented on television over and over again almost since the last election 4 years ago. The surprise candidate—the real darkhouse never heard of outside of his own State—has become an unregretted casualty of the sweeping light of television. So has the hidden issue—the prejudice or vested interest that operated behind the scenes in conventions far removed from wide public scrutiny and then slipped back into hiding for another 4 years.

THE CHANGE IN POLITICS

Since television treats the conventions not as isolated spectacles but as episodes in a continuing story and phases of a continuing discussion, subtle changes are coming about in the patterns of our political habits and customs. James Reston of the New York Times has commented upon the shift of presidential possibilities away from State and regional leaders to national figures, attributing this to the continuing television coverage of the Washington scene and the consequent prominence of Senators. Although Warren Harding was the only man in this century to be nominated directly from the Senate for the Presidency, the vast majority of candidates for the nomination this year either are or have once been Senators.

It does not seem to me too much to suggest that the whole folklore of American politics is undergoing profound changes. Regionalism is declining in the face of widely aired common problems not just of the Nation, but of the world. The alchemy of public opinion, once the distillation of bands and parades, slogans and songs, is giving way to the surer chemistry of information, discussion, and conclusion. The criticism of the opposition is made easier and more lively because it is not limited to the stilted jargon and indulgent formalism of the legislative chamber. It may well be that, whatever our troubles, we will never again face one of those desolate and dangerous wastes of history where the voices of criticism are all but silent.

HINDRANCES TO REPORTING

I hope that I do not read into television journalism achievements to which it has no fair claim. I do not think that I do. Television has shown its ability to arrest attention, to report—but to go beyond reporting to analysis and meaning, to bring the event itself into the full, unposed view of a hundred million families. Moreover, it has done this in an atmosphere of restriction and harassment. And if we press on to the question of whether television has done enough—whether it is doing enough—in the face of the staggering test to which democracy is being put, then we need to ask, too, whether it is being allowed to do enough.

I do not think that it is.

Since colonial times, it has been a basic tenet of the American creed that journalism must be free—that any risks that this involves are far less hazardous than any kind or any degree of control. Today, the facts of life are that electronic journalism is as important as printed journalism and as much a part of the lives of Americans. A survey by the University of Michigan after the last presidential election showed that, at every educational level, more Americans got their information about the candidates and issues from elevision than from news papers.

By any terms of comparison the combined news output of the three networks and some 500 individual television stations represents massive journalistic enterprise. It is obviously entitled to the same freedom that made the print media the first safeguard of democracy throughout our history. Obviously there is no area of the news in which this freedom has more relevancy or importance than in the political field. That, indeed, is the whole point of a free press.

EQUAL TIME STRAITJACKET

Yet this is the one area singled out by section 315 of the Communications Act to deny broadcast journalism its freedom and to apply the "equal time" straitjacket, requiring every candidate—however obscure—to get equal time on all but regularly scheduled news and news interview programs. For all practical purposes this not only strips broadcast journalism of both the right and responsibility of news judgment, but it makes really significant and useful special election programs impossible. For example, under the present law, if in 1956 we had broadcast a debate between the Republican and Democratic Presidential candidates, we would also have had to invite candidates from the New Party, the For America Party, the Mississippi Black and Tan Grand Old Party, the American Third Party, the Christian National Party, and the American Party, among others. The resulting Donnybrook would, of course, have been utterly useless.

THE NEED FOR A CHANGE

Virtually every thoughtful person has agreed that this legalized negation of the classical role of a free press in a democracy is dangerous, wasteful, and intolerable. Chief among the most articulate critics of section 315 have been the print media of the country. Yet it is still on the statute books. Monday the Senate passed a resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 207—which waives the equal time requirement of section 315 insofar as it applies to presidential and vice-presidential nominees during the 1960 campaign. To become effective, this temporary measure also must have the approval of the House. Unless the House acts in the few remaining days until adjournment, television

will be unable to go beyond regularly scheduled news and news interview programs in covering the critical campaign we are about to enter.

A BATTLE TO BE WON

Education and journalism have always been related. They are both directed at conveying knowledge and promoting discussion. Journalism is that part of the continuing educational process that deals with the events, and personalities, and issues of our own time. If we in any serious way restrict this freedom of journalism, we deny ourselves the only road to salvation open to us—an educated and informed people.

This is the great unfinished business in television as an educational force. I have every confidence that the institutional uses of television as a tool of formal education are off to a good beginning and in good hands. As I said earlier, aside from the support of all of us, their major need now is time to develop. And the outlook is positive.

But this broader use of television as education for democratic living and, indeed, democratic survival, is plagued and choked by a statutory negativism. I believe it essential that educators and those interested in education see the need for permanently correcting this as infinitely more than a battle of journalism versus government. It is, in sober fact, a battle to meet the increasingly urgent need for information if this society is to survive.

Can We Keep Our Living Standards?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial regarding the forthcoming political campaign which appeared in the Boston Globe on August 1, 1960:

CAN WE KEEP OUR LIVING STANDARDS?—IN WORLD OF TODAY UNITED STATES FACES HARD CHOICES—NEXT PRESIDENT WILL HAVE TO ASK FOR SACRIFICES

(By John Harriman)

With the convention fanfare and shouting behind us, we now settle down for the long grind of the political campaign.

In many ways this campaign will be quite different from any that have preceded it. Not since the deep depression of the 1930's have issues so questioned the strength of the American economy and the national security, even the whole American way of life.

When Franklin Roosevelt first took the reins of Government, it was touch and go whether the system we call capitalism could survive. The next decade will ask an equally profound and challenging question: In the jungle world that emerges today can the towering living standards of the American people be maintained?

This is the great issue. It is in a sense the only real issue, for the politics, the trade, the economics of the world today are but reflections of what might actually be called an assault on our living standard or, to put it differently, on the huge difference between our standard of living and that of the rest of mankind.

The cold war is one facet of that assault. The Communist ideology was born to the economically dispossessed, and to fulfill its mission it must raise the well-being of its masses to equal at least that of the system it seeks out of bitterness to destroy.

In the underdeveloped areas, unrest and revolution are rising, demanding by what God-given right the American economy should be suffering under the problems of distributing its abundance while much of the rest of the world goes hungry and in rags.

But the challenge, the assault, is not only from our ideological antagonist and the economically frustrated. It comes also from our allies. From a Europe and Japan, reinvigorated and enjoying such economic strength and expansion as they have not known in 50 years.

The Soviet challenge is in what we call the cold war. That of the underdeveloped areas is through political revolution that threatens us with isolation. And Europe and Japan challenge in the markets of the world, competitively, with currencies now as strong as the dollar and production costs that cast a shadow on the whole high wage-high purchasing power concept which is at the core of American life.

The danger here is that there is no political capital to be had in meeting such issues, and forging a policy which will cope with them. Roosevelt could move to meet the threat of his times with ringing phrases, "a quarter of a nation ill-housed—ill-fed." He was a champion of the people pointing to a better life.

But the successful candidate next year must tell people that which no one will want to hear. He must point out that unless the farm problem is solved, we shall slip ever nearer serious economic trouble—that unless trade is freed at a sacrifice to many industries and jobs, the result will be another serious depression.

He must say in effect that it may be more in the public interest that a mill be built in Calcutta by American capital than in some American city. He may well have to say to the Ameriacn people that a certain amount of deflation and unemployment here is a necessary experience, if our international position and leadership is to be maintained.

Roosevelt could offer security, and an increase in the standard of living. But next year's occupant of the White House must in effect point out that in the modern world there is no security, and that it is not ours but the living standards of others which must occupy our minds.

Both political candidates are tough young men, and a tough campaign is expected. But the real toughness will be that which the victor will be called upon to exert when he is in the White House—the toughness to face the dangerous issues of a dangerous age.

Three Months To Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RANDALL S. HARMON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. HARMON. Mr. Speaker, the most terrible of modern diseases, cancer, is still an imminent threat to humanity. Therefore, it would scem of the utmost importance that tests be made of any new drug which might reduce the pain and number of deaths caused by cancer. The eminent physiologist, Dr. A. C. Ivy, has made widespread tests which show that Krebiozen has apparently been helpful in treating many patients. Despite these reported results, the American Medical Association has violently denounced Dr. Ivy and his discovery. Why should the opposition of the official branches of medicine prevent an impartial testing of Krebiozen as a cure for cancer? Why, as long as there is even a slight possibility that Krebiozen has curative and palliative effects, should it not be given the same tests as are given other discoveries in this field? Cancer usually strikes two out of every three families in America. Miss Edna J. Reese of Muncie, Ind., is a member of one of these ever-growing families; and, under unanimous consent, I include her statement in the Appendix of the RECORD. It is hoped that her words will be carefully read by every Member of Congress, for this disease cares not about party affiliations.

The statement follows:

THREE MONTHS TO LIVE

When cancer strikes two out of every three families in America it will care little whether its constituents are Democrats or Republicans.

Typical of thousands of cases, an air of suspense and tragic waiting pervades the lives of relatives and friends of my nephew.

His dilemma has intensified my interest in cancer, aroused by many acquaintances dropping out of the picture, as well as by pupils of mine who have been blinded by retinal blastoma, brain tumors, and other malignancy.

Our nephew, 21, was operated on in December 1959 for the removal of an external tumor (after a week of having his foot hung over the end of the bed with a 10-pound weight, in the hospital, thinking the lump was a twisted muscle on his back).

The doctors who operated said he wouldn't need radium.

In January his wife had him examined by a surgeon. His prognosis was 3 to 6 months to live. July? This is August.

He is said to have a malignant Schwanoma tumor on the nerve sheath in the fourth or fifth lumbar region.

My prayer has been that his life might be preserved until something beneficial could be done. "Faith without works is dead."

I have been warned, "Just leave it up to the doctors." The doctors are not to mention the word cancer until his wife releases it. Unless he can be rescued from a maelstrom of prejudice and unbelief, as dooming as cancer itself, there is no hope.

Here lies my appeal.

If the word "cancer" may have a new connotation, created by a new social concept, then something might be done. Little more can be accomplished without the help of God and Congress.

For this reason I enlist your interest in Krebiozen—its possibilities and its struggles.

To read of the beneficial results of the drug on other inoperable, X-ray resistant tumors of advanced and terminal patients makes me wonder if Krebiozen just might apply to this tumor so rare that little experimentation has been done with any chemicals, let alone Krebiozen.

Why not try something to save or prolong a life instead of letting it die, doing nothing?

Since this (Krebiozen) represents the first and only nontoxic chemical agent to show definite biological activity of any degree against tumors of all types, it seems justifiable to encourage as much basic and clinical investigation as possible.

Here are just two examples of the treatment of tumors:

"Patient G.C.: Malignant neoplasm, bedridden, terminal.

"No benefit from X-ray therapy was obtained. Tumor was inoperable. More than 3 years after boy was declared hopeless and with a life expectancy of 6 to 8 weeks, patient

is without any signs of malignancy and is in perfect physical condition."

"Patient L.T.: Malignant melanoma, advanced, inoperable.

"One year and three months after beginning Krebiozen therapy—'following this therapy (Krebiozen) patient is free of symptoms of malignancy.' Patient is entirely normal and carries a full day's work."

A further example of the benefits of Krebiozen:

"Patient No. 2, Mrs. H.D.: Brain tumor, terminal.

"On January 20 patient was deeply stuperous and death seemed imminent. On the dose of 0.1 mg. weekly, this patient has retained a normal condition for the last 2 years. She goes to market, to church and her attitude, physically and mentally is that of a normal person."

Concerning leukemia:

"Patient No. 3, Mr. S.Y.: Acute lymphatic leukemia.

"After his second dose of Krebiozen—feeling very much better and his hemoglobin is begining to rise."

"Patient R.S.: Acute leukemia, advanced

"Clinically his condition is excellent."

Many other types on cancer are listed. Since many patients are advanced terminal, inoperable cases, what might be the results if Krebiozen were employed earlier? Two other types are:

"Patient No. 5, Mrs. M.P.: Adenocarcinoma. Bedridden, Terminal (death was expected within a day or two). Two months after beginning Krebiozen therapy: patient is improving."

"Dr. R.P.: Michigan: Patient: A.V. Cancer of Lung, Bedridden, Terminal: 'Whether or not the Senator's life could have been saved had Krebiozen been administered at an earlier stage, is, of course, a matter of conjecture. To see a man suffering unbounded pain only partially dulled by maximal doses of morphine, abruptly become completely and permanently relieved, in the presence of widespread devastating malignancy, has been one of the most dramatic therapeutic achievements it has ever been my privilege to observe. Dr. S. and I are unable to express in words our gratitude to you Dr. Ivy and Dr. Durovic for your courtesy and cooperation and assistance in Senator V's terminal illness."

For your convenience, these are only abreviated examples of many cases listed in the Report on Krebiozen, published in 1954.

"Krebiozen has already been withheld unnecessarily for several years from many cancer patients whom it might help, through no fault of their own, but by the excuses of pseudocritics."

WHAT IS KREBIOZEN?

"Krebiozen is a compound extracted from the blood serum of horses which have been previously infected with a preparation made from a culture of a 'mold', called Actinomyces bovis * * * Enough is now known about the chemistry to warrant the hope that it may be synthesized."

"Biologically there is evidence that Krebiozen is a hormone which acts to restrain the unregulated growth of body cells."

"The Krebiozen Research Foundation is a not-for-profit organization incorporated in April, 1951, under the laws of the State of Illinois. Its purpose is to conduct scientific research in the cancer field. The foundation is located at 105 West Adams Street, Chicago 3, Illinois.

"Since 1951 the foundation has been investigating the drug Krebiozen, a new drug agent discovered by Steven Durovic, M.D., for the treatment of cancer.

"Dr. Durovic is the scientific director of the Promak Laboratories (formerly Duga Laboratories) incorporated in the State of Illinois."

"All the investigations on Krebiozen have been directed under the auspices of the Krebiozen Research Foundation with the advice and supervision of Dr. A. C. Ivy, distinguished professor of physiology and head of the Department of Clinical Science at the University of Illinois.

"At the time when Dr. Ivy began his investigation of Krebiozen, he was Executive Director of the National Advisory Cancer Council of the U.S. Public Health Service and a member of the board of directors of the American Cancer Society. Dr. Ivy had been selected and proposed by the board of trustees of the American Medical Association, to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of State to serve as an expert adviser and witness at the Nuremberg medical trials on the subject of medical ethics and clinical investigation. Dr. Ivy served in this capacity during the Nuremberg trials."

The secretary, Dr. J. F. Pick, is "well known for his demonstration among prisoners at Stateville Penitentiary, Joliet, Ill., of the role of facial deformity in the genesis of criminality. This involved corrective surgery of more than 1,000 men and aided the rehabilitation of most, a feat for which Dr. Pick has been honored by the John Howard Organization, and scientific as well as legal groups the world over."

Why has Krebiozen met such opposition?

"Unscientific and unusual criticism of an experimental work before it had been completed and its results published gave rise to the appointment by the 68th Illinois General Asembly of joint committee of 14 legislators to investigate the Krebiozen controversy. The committee later became a legislation commission to continue the work after the adjournment of the Illinois Legislature on July 1, 1953.

"As to Dr. George Stoddard, who resigned as president of the University of Illinois on July 25, 1953, at the height of the controversy over Krebiozen on a vote of noconfidence by university trustees, the commission concluded that unsatisfactory handling of his public statements added to the controversy.

"The records of the legislative commission show that an attempt to secure financial rights to Krebiozen and control of its commercial exploitation preceded publication of the AMA's status report. These facts, taken from sworn testimony and written material accepted in evidence by the commission, were never denied under oath, though those concerned were given full opportunity to do so.

"A group of businessmen headed by Mr. Edwin R. Moore, president of the Bell & Gossett Co., Morton Grove, Ill., attempted to use their acquaintance with the Durovics to gain financial control of Krebiozen. It should be borne in mind that these individuals had in no way contributed to the development of the drug financially or otherwise.

"They enlisted the aid of Dr. J. J. Moore, then treasurer of the AMA, who brought pressure on the Durovics to give the financial exploitation of Krebiozen to these men. Dr. Moore had a very bitter discussion on this subject with Mr. Marko Durovic, as was testified to under oath by the interpreter Dr. Moore brought with him on this occasion.

"Subsequently, the Durovics were warned that the AMA would destroy Krebiozen unless they made a financial arrangement with Mr. Edwin Moore.

"When this warning was ignored, Dr. George Lull, secretary and general manager of the AMA, stated to the press: 'The American Medical Association has begun a critical study of Krebiozen, the experimental cancer drug, and will issue a public report on its findings within the next 6 weeks.'

"Shortly thereafter, Franklin Bing, a former secretary of the AMA Council on Foods and Nutrition, wrote to Dr. Ivy informing him that he would be ruined unless he offered the AMA for publication a letter stating 'Krebiozen has no value in the treatment of cancer.' He offered Dr. Ivy a dubious recompense: Let him first deny Krebiozen publicly and then he might, if he wished, continue his research on it in secret. Probably no scientist ever received a more astonishing or cynical suggestion. Dr. Ivy refused. This refusal was the real reason why the Chicago Medical Society was stirred up to discipline Dr. Ivy. The formal reasons—those given to the profession and the public—were merely invented and were on their face ridiculous, as the then president of the Chicago Medical Society tacitly admitted when he said the society's action against Dr. Ivy was a big mistake.

"Thus the reason for the AMA 'Status Report on Krebiozen' is apparent. It was never intended as a true evaluation of this drug. It had only one purpose, to destroy Krebiozen, whatever the consequences to science and humanity.

"The transcript of the hearings of the Illinois Legislative Commission investigating the Krebiozen controversy contains the full record of the matter.

* * * * *

"As further evidence that Krebiozen has been tested and found worthless, the American Cancer Society paper cites the 'Report of the Committee on Cancer Diagnosis and Therapy of the National Research Council,' chairmaned by Dr. Ira T. Nathanson, who was also one of the collaborators on the AMA's status report.

"The American Cancer Society paper attempts to convey the idea that this National Research Council committee tested Krebiozen. Actually, it did no such thing. It did not make a test. It only endorsed the forged report of the AMA. In 1954, Miss Isabella Wason, executive secretary of the committee, stated: 'Dr. Ivy sent us Krebiozen to use in clinical trials, but it was not used.'

" 'The Status Report of the Committee on Research of the Council of Pharmacy and Chemistry of the AMA' dealt with 100 cases allegedly treated with Krebiozen. The facts are supported by uncontroverted documentation and testimony given under oath.

"They fabricated 24 case histories denying any beneficial effect to Krebiozen and stating that all these patients were dead or dying. * * * This falsification was discovered when the commission subpenaed the AMA file on Krebiozen, and the patients identified. Ten of those declared dead or dying by the AMA in 1951, then in 1953 appeared before the commission. * * * 'We the undersigned were among those Krebiozen patients and herewith certify that we are alive and in good health for over 3 years.'

"Today, after 8 years, seven of these patients, all residents of Chicago, are free of cancer."

"On March 9, 1959 the American Cancer Society released what it calls a 'Background Paper on Krebiozen,' which has since been reprinted in the Journal of the American Medical Association.

"Excluding the 24 fabricated cases, the AMA report was based entirely on selected negative cases. Meanwhile, and this is very significant, the AMA had in its possession 140 clinical histories of patients treated in outstanding scientific and medical centers throughout the country, including 6 large university clinics and 2 world-famous medical centers. These reports were almost universally favorable to Krebiozen, and had been supplied the AMA in ample time to be included in the status report but the AMA did not include one of them. Thus it is obvious that the AMA never intended that Krebiozen be honestly and scientifically evaluated, but that its report was and is a smear report."

THE COLE REPORT

The society's paper also refers to the committee of six physicians headed by Dr. Warren Cole (of the University of Illinois) and known as the Cole committee.

Even "13 patients who were free of cancer after Krebiozen treatment were brought before this committee."

"In the published part, in 'conclusions' the Cole committee report states: 'We have been presented with no histological evidence by Dr. Ivy that the material produced degenerative or regressive changes in tumor cells.'

"At the time the conclusions of the Cole committee were published, this report bore only the signature of its chairman, Dr. Cole. It was revealed at the legislative hearings that a plain signature sheet had been circulated to the other members, who signed without reading the report."

The part containing favorable evidence for Krebiozen was marked "confidential" and was not released until called in by the commission.

But observe: "Writing in the Journal of the American Medical Association of April 11, 1959, Dr. Cole (president-elect of American Cancer Society) remarked: 'Evidence of the occurrence of spontaneous regression of cancer supports the concept of biological control of cancer and reinforces the hope that more satisfactory methods of treating cancer than surgery and/or radiation may be found in future years.'"

CHEMISTRY?

"The American Cancer Society points out that two chemists, Drs. Paul Kirk, of the University of California, and Arthur Furst, of Stanford University, testified in 1958 that Krebiozen is nothing but nujol.

"Dr. Kirk stated he received six ampules from Dr. Batchelder, chairman of the American Cancer Society division in San Francisco. Dr. Furst testifies that he found one ampule at Stanford University and that another ampule was given him by the same Dr. Batchelder (scientific procurement?). As an experimental drug Krebiozen can only be obtained from the Krebiozen Research Foundation. Neither Dr. Kirk, Dr. Furst, nor Dr. Batchelder ever requested Krebiozen and none was ever sent to them."

"No pharmaceutical company reveals all of its manufacturing details on any substance. The American Cancer Society paper [tries to] convince the public that Krebiozen is a 'secret remedy', intimating that it may also be nonexistent.

"It may be as difficult to define the exact chemistry of Krebiozen as it was to learn the exact chemistry of insulin, which was still a mystery 25 years after its discovery and has only recently been precisely prescribed."

PUBLICATION OF KREBIOZEN INFORMATION BLOCKED

The American Cancer Society paper sights absence of publications on Krebiozen in U.S. scientific journals.

"The real fact is that all publications on krebiozen in the medical literature has been systematically blocked—through the exercise of bureaucratic control by the American Cancer Society and the American Medical Association over the scientific community.

"The latest attempt by Dr. Durovic to gain scientific publication was in December 1958 when he submitted to General Practitioner a very substantial article on the activity of Krebiozen aaginst spontaneous tumors in animals. The article was rejected.

"Publication of a report on 40 cases treated with Krebiozen at the Lankenau Institute has not been permitted. This report written by the man who treated these patients is still being suppressed.

"Dr. Ivy has never succeeded in publishing one article in a medical journal on Krebiozen.

"The monograph on this subject written by Drs. Ivy, Pick, and Phillips was initially accepted by a medical journal but was later returned after pressure was brought to bear on the publisher."

This publication which would be enough to justify further "exploration and perfection—was sent 3 years ago to all of these organizations and has been deliberately ignored."

No tests on Krebiozen at National Cancer Institute

In August 1958 Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS' proposal to test Krebiozen "was immediately accepted by Dr. Ivy and the Krebiozen Research Foundation. The National Cancer Institute and its Director, Dr. John R. Heller, rejected.

"At one of the meetings Dr. Durovic asked Dr. Heller if he 'considered the double-blind test unscientific.'

"Dr. Heller answered: 'No; of course not. It is our standard of drug evaluation at the National Cancer Institute.'

"Nevertheless he admitted in answer to another question that in his capacity as a director of the American Cancer Society, he had voted a little earlier that the proposal to evaluate Krebiozen by this method should be turned down as 'unscientific.'

"From Pasteur on the double-blind test has been accepted in science as the most objective and certain method for evaluating a new therapy, since it rules out subjective impressions of both the physicians giving the treatment and the patients receiving it. Only results based on facts count.

"Yet the American Cancer Society and the National Cancer Institute contend for one reason or another that this method should not be used for Krebiozen. One reason assigned for refusing the test, for example, is that its results—under the stipulated conditions—would 'not be acceptable to the scientific public.'

"Entirely invalid is the astonishing opposition to Dr. Ivy's assisting in the administration of the drug. Neither Dr. Ivy, nor anyone else, could by serving in this capacity make an inactive drug give positive results."

"Dr. Ivy has experimented with Krebiozen for nearly 10 years. He has more knowledge of the dosage rate and effect of the drug on various types of tumors than anyone else. In a committee of five, he would have only one vote, which would certainly not be decisive."

FINANCES

In his speech in the U.S. House of Representatives, May 27, 1959, Hon. ROLAND V. LIBONATI of Illinois, from Dr. Durovic's own district, stated:

"Dr. John R. Heller, director of the National Cancer Institute, with its millions of dollars for research given by the Government through the Congress—knows and is fully cognizant of the nefarious practices against Krebiozen. He further knows that the American Medical Association is in control of the American Cancer Society and the individuals serving in its official family are known enemies who have fought against Krebiozen."

Recalling the monetary ambitions of some of Krebiozen's early opponents, let us observe the other side of the picture:

The fact that Mr. Marko Durovic (brother of Stevan Durovic) was the chief financial supporter of the Krebiozen Research Foundation for 3 years; and that Dr. Andrew C. Ivy who "has been and is research adviser—has accepted no remuneration for his services to the foundation; and that no official of the foundation has ever received any compensation for his work. They rely on other sources for their livelihood;" and that "for 5 years Krebiozen was given free and office maintenance was paid by the Durovics; and that today about 60 percent of patients still receive the drug free."

All should be proof in itself that they are dedicated in their service to humanity, in direct antithesis to the apparently ulterior motives of some of their adversaries.

Why did not the American Cancer Society go to the U.S. Department of Internal Revenue, where it is open for inspection, instead of to the foundation library center so they could report that "the Krebiozen Research Foundation has not published a list of officers, a report of activities, or a financial statement"?

"Krebiozen should be produced in larger amounts so that larger doses may be given to patients with resistant tumors." The radiant tumor is my immediate concern in the present crisis.

Convincing

After careful study I am convinced of the veracity of the statements I have quoted.

Dr. George Crane, Chicago columnist, wrote, "From what I've been observing in the last year and a half, I think Dr. Ivy's Krebiozen Theories seem to show a great deal of merit."

My regard for the profession of medicine is such that I have often thought of studying it myself. If so, I believe I'd never say die.

For several years I have deducted certain minor theories of my own regarding cancer, whatever their value.

"Some 40,000 chemical compounds are being screened each year on the bare chance that they will show anticancer activity. Krebiozen alone—a drug which at the least has the evidence of some 300 doctors that it gives a 70-percent beneficial activity in advanced and terminal cancer patients—is denied a test by the very people who profess to be leading the search for drug remedies against cancer."

"Krebiozen alone has a reparative function and represents an attempt to solve the biological problem of cancer on a biological basis by supplying the substance which normally prevents cells from becoming cancerous."

It is an interesting coincidence that my registered letter to Dr. Heller, Director of the National Cancer Institute, was the only one returned, "Unclaimed." Maybe he was away. The others responded with a great deal of thought.

Yet due to the prevailing fatalistic attitude, all attempts have failed to get a report to Sloan-Kettering or others for professional review or further analysis.

A plea for united effort

What action can be taken to alleviate this intolerable situation in the status quo?

Could the Illinois Legislative Commission interim report of March 25, 1954, derived from 6,502 pages of testimony, be consulted?

What can be done to remove the whole matter from prejudicial surveillance?

How could enlightenment or protection be supplied to members of the profession whose careers seem to depend upon acquiescence?

Why is application for a patent still pending? "Dr. Durovic first filed for a patent (No. 254,985) November 5, 1951. This application has been amended three times and is still pending under continuation dated May 5, 1958"—contrary to quotes from the American Cancer Society paper.

Could action be so direct, so immediate, and so publicly avowed that it will banish some of the shadows that slink into the realm of the unknown and the enigma of the closed mind?

I sight again just one thin, quiet, blond youth with a crewcut, big ears—and eyes growing sadder with the passing weeks. He can now walk only with assistance.

Waiting for the next Congress will be too late to possibly help many to be cured or live under therapy who now watch their dream clouds drift slowly by.

In this matter of life and death, the individual should no longer be deprived of the traditional American right of freedom of choice.

EDNA J. REESE.

Burdick Election Victory Proves Farmer's Revolt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, Publisher Harry F. Miedema, Jr., has put together facts and common sense in his editorial in the July 15, 1960 issue of the Badgerland Farmer, a hard-hitting, biweekly farm newspaper circulated to 12,000 Dane County, Wis., farm homes.

Senator BURDICK's election was, as Mr. Miedema concludes, the farmer's call for action on the farm situation. I commend the following editorial for your consideration:

BURDICK'S NORTH DAKOTA VICTORY IS A SIGNAL—FARMERS DEMAND ACTION

Metropolitan newspapers and the slick magazines are engaging in mental gymnastics in their interpretation of the recent North Dakota U.S. Senate special election returns.

Newsweek's interpretations of the significance of the special election is summarized in their conclusion: "a farm revolt fails to develop."

City newspaper editorials and the other slick weekly news magazines made a similar interpretation of the election.

A close examination of the North Dakota election returns discloses that these editorial writers are way off base.

No one expected that QUENTIN BURDICK, the farmer-endorsed candidate for the U.S. Senate in North Dakota, could possibly win in a landslide. No matter how deep farm discontent was in that State, a change in voting habits from overwhelmingly Republican to overwhelmingly Democratic just doesn't happen overnight or even in 8 years.

In 1952 the Republican vote in North Dakota was 191,000 while the Democratic vote was 76,000. In other words, the Republicans received 70 percent of the vote or better than 2 to 1. The 1952 Republican percentage vote in North Dakota was higher than in any other State in the Union.

When there is a change from the Republicans winning over 2 to 1 in North Dakota in 1952 to the Democratic candidate just winning in the recent special election, though winning by less than 1 percent of the vote, there must be something really big brewing.

That "something really big brewing" in North Dakota was farm unrest and farm revolt.

The personality factor could not have been overriding because the Republican candidate was a popular young two-term Governor.

The only other explanation is that the Democrats' popularity went up that much on the issues generally in North Dakota. We don't believe the Democrats "just got more popular." People don't change that much without a strong reason. The only strong reason in North Dakota is farm unrest and farm revolt.

In light of these facts, the QUENTIN BURDICK victory in North Dakota is little short of fantastic.

Those newspapers and magazines which refuse to believe that American farmers are in a recession or refuse to believe they are angry because nothing is done about it should take a look at the following facts:

1. The purchasing power of total net income of U.S. farmers declined 19 percent from May 1952 until May 1959. At the same time corporation dividends were up 41 percent; personal income from interest was up 69 percent; and nonagricultural personal income was up 41 percent.

2. Farmers have been underpaid $129 billion during the past 9 years on the basis of parity prices. Parity prices are standards declared by law to be fair to farmers on the basis of prices charged farmers for goods and services they buy.

3. An examination of operating statements of American farms shows a pitifully low return to the farm operator for his own work on the farm. For example—the Wisconsin dairy farmer earned only 73 cents per hour for his labor in producing 3.5 testing milk at the average of $3.11 per hundredweight for 1958 after deducting other costs of production including return on his investment.

4. The return to the average western Wisconsin dairy farm operator for his labor in operating the farm declined from $2,852 in 1952 to $1,997 in 1958. At the same time U.S. average family personal income before Federal taxes went up from $5,120 in 1952 to $6,220 in 1958.

No wonder farmers are hopping mad.

Hoover's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. HENDERSON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Speaker, on August 10, during the recent congressional recess, one of the most celebrated Americans observed his 86th birthday. I refer to our former President Herbert Hoover.

President Hoover is the Nation's eminent elder statesman who through a long life actively devoted to the service of his country has become one of the most beloved and respected Americans of the 20th century. I wish to cal the attention of the House of Representatives to the statement by Mr. Wilbur D. Matson concerning President Hoover which appeared recently in the Chicago Tribune. I might add that Mr. Matson himself is a significant figure in Ohio and beyond our State whose sound philosophy expressed in the editorial voice of the Morgan County Herald has had wide influence far beyond the reaches of his newspaper's circulation. The statement is as follows:

HOOVER'S BIRTHDAY

MCCONNELSVILLE, Ohio, August 2.—August 10 is the 86th birthday of America's grand old man and first citizen, Herbert Hoover. No American statesman of the present century has given as much of himself and his great talents to the preservation of our free institutions and American ideals. Great of mind, great of heart, great of character, our ex-President has been an inspiration to a higher and better life and the cause of liberty throughout the world.

One of the moving scenes at the recent convention was Hoover's appearance before that body. He received a splendid ovation from a host of admirers. America will not soon see another character such as Herbert Hoover, who easily ranks with our all-time great.

WILBUR D. MATSON.

Spencer Olin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, it was with great personal pleasure that I learned of the recommendation of Spencer T. Olin, of Alton, Ill., for the post of treasurer of the Republican National Committee. The recommendation was made by the National Committee Chairman, the Honorable THRUSTON B. MORTON.

Mr. Olin, whom I am proud to call friend, has long been devoted to service, to his community, his State, and his country. As a young man he early became active in community affairs in his home community of Alton. His leadership soon became apparent, particularly in the field of finance. Over the years he has served as chairman of fundraising activities for various organizations, including Community Chest drives and fund campaigns for the benefit of the three hospitals located in Alton. His activity in public affairs has included chairman of the Madison County (Ill.) War Finance Committee in 1943, finance chairman for the National Citizens for Eisenhower Congressional Committee, and, in 1955, an appointment by President Eisenhower to a 4-year term as Chairman of the National Monument Commission.

Mr. Olin assumed active charge of the Republican Finance Committee in August 1958. Through his experience, his diligent devotion to duty, his tremendous executive ability in fundraising, he has accomplished wonders in bringing the Republican National Committee, and its dependent committees, to a sound financial structure.

I need not go further into the accomplishments of this splendid citizen, and one who has proved his mettle in many places. These are detailed in the article I insert herewith from the Champaign (Ill.) News Gazette. I do want to state that, with a man of Spencer Olin's skill, intelligence and integrity at the financial helm the Republican Party will have the type of leadership from which it will not only benefit but so will the Nation. The article follows:

SPENCER OLIN HAS BROAD RECORD OF PUBLIC SERVICE

(By Richard W. Lay)

ALTON, ILL.—Spencer T. Olin, Alton, who has been recommended for treasurer of the Republican National Committee, is a hometown boy with a long background of service in business and public affairs.

Olin, whose name was suggested by GOP National Chairman THRUSTON B. MORTON, is now chairman of the National Finance Committe for the Republicans.

Previous to this assignment he was the finance chairman for the National Citizens for Eisenhower Congressional Committee.

Olin, who was born in Alton, August 20, 1900, is a director of the Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp. He attended schools in Alton and Ithaca, N.Y., before entering Cornell University where he was graduated in 1921 with a B.S. degree in mechanical engineering.

FATHER OF FOUR

Immediately following his graduation, he began his successful business career with the Western Cartridge Co., East Alton, a company founded by his father, Franklin W. Olin, in 1892.

Olin was married to Ann Whitney of Alton in 1928. He is the father of four children and has eight grandchildren.

Aside from his many activities at Olin Mathieson he is associated with other business and financial institutions. He served as a director of the Illinois Bell Telephone Co., the Laclede Steel Co., the St. Louis Union Trust Co., the First National Bank & Trust Co., Alton, and the Illinois State Bank of East Alton.

He has also been active in many community affairs in past years. He is a past chairman of the Community Chest campaign, and was one of the leaders of a fundraising drive for three local hospitals in 1957 and 1958.

AID TO EDUCATION

In addition to these many activities, his interest in education has benefited several universities and colleges. In 1957 he announced he was donating the money for the construction and furnishing of a new civil engineering building to his alma mater. He also provided a substantial portion of the funds necessary for the construction of a new medical dormitory at Washington University in St. Louis.

However, his concern with the improvement of the educational system does not end with his monetary contributions for newer facilities.

He also serves in the role of adviser, as a director of the Washington University corporation, and as a member of the board of trustees of Cornell University, and Monticello College in Godfrey, Ill.

H.R. 9866

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the vote on the bill, H.R. 9866, to authorize the spending of $100,000 for five agricultural employees in the island of Guam is typical of what has been happening under the leadership of the Democrat majorities in Congress. The Department already has about 30 employees serving the island of Guam in an agricultural area about 37 square miles or, in other words, about the area of one township.

Only the day before yesterday afternoon I appeared on the same platform with my colleague, GEORGE MCGOVERN, who blasted the amount of spending of the Department of Agriculture and told how much it was costing the taxpayers to operate this Department as compared with a few years ago. He left that meeting by plane, flying directly to Washington, and upon his return yesterday afternoon one of the first bills upon which we were called to vote was this bill requiring the Department to spend an additional $100,000 on a project as unnecessary as any project could possibly be and yet he and his New Deal colleagues voted for it.

My opponent in this campaign has many times said he would vote exactly as MCGOVERN has voted. Just how can they make sense out of blasting spending one day and voting additional spending on the very next day?

The Cost of Medical Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, one of the serious problems confronting the Nation is the mounting cost of a medical education and its relation to the growing shortage of physicians. Despite the gradually worsening ratio of physicians per 100,000 of population in the country the opportunity for talented young people to enter the profession is restricted by the factor of cost. At a minimum, a family must be able to spend $12,000 to finance the medical education of a son or daughter. As a consequence, although only 8 percent of all families in the country have incomes of $10,000 a year or more, 40 percent of the medical students come from families with such incomes. There is no real shortage of talent, it is just not being identified and assisted.

I have introduced legislation—H.R. 11651—to provide for a 10-year program of Federal scholarship aid to medical and dental school students plus a 10-year program of loans to interns as a means for enabling needy but talented youngsters to complete a medical education. I urge that Congress consider action in this field before it adjourns. The Nation is becoming more and more aware that the shortage of physicians will become more acute unless steps are taken now to correct the factors inhibiting the entry of trained and skilled persons into the field of medicine.

One of the finest descriptions of the need and its remedy was contained in an editorial in the Long Island Daily Press of August 22, 1960. Under unanimous consent I insert this excellent article entitled "The Cost of Medical Education" in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks:

THE COST OF MEDICAL EDUCATION

Legislators from 16 Southern States, meeting to consider the South's shortage of physicians, point out that the average family can't pay the full costs of a medical education.

It surely can't. The average family must lay aside about $12,000 if Junior plans a medical career.

About one-third of the money is needed for tuition, fees, books, and instruments and two-thirds for living expenses.

Scholarships accounted for only $3 million of the total outlay of $78 million for medical education in 1959, according to the Association of American Medical Colleges, and about 28 percent of the 1959 graduation class had to float loans.

This was true even though the family of the medical student has a median annual income of $9,374, considerably higher than the nationwide median.

The fact is, that despite the shortage of doctors, which is not confined to the South, financial need is a big bar to the study of medicine.

What's the answer? A program of grants and loans to supplement a student's own financial resources, the legislators were told. Grants are available for other scientific careers. Why not medicine?

More Federal funds should be devoted to the expansion of medical schools and to aid qualified young men and young women.

The national ratio is 129 physicians for every 100,000 of population. The shortage will continue until something is done.

Discriminating Against the Worker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the Senate, Senators KENNEDY and JOHNSON, respectively Democratic candidates for President and Vice President, with a two-thirds Democrat majority back of them and Senator JOHNSON in the powerful position of majority leader, are pushing S. 2643, introduced by Senator KENNEDY—H.R. 9070 in the House—in an effort to please a few labor leaders and so capture the so-called labor vote.

At the same time, they are insisting upon legislation which they say will give equal rights to all. On equality they blow hot and cold.

It needs but a glance at S. 2643 and H.R. 9070 to show rank inconsistency. The purpose of both bills is to amend the present labor law so as to enable a minority group on a construction job to tie up the whole job.

Example: A partnership at Port Chester, N.Y., contracted to build a home for a man in Greenwich, Conn. The partnership used its own employees on all but the electrical installation. That they subcontracted to an employer who had two nonunion men on the job. Other workers by a strike tied up the whole job. The U.S. Supreme Court held (*Electrical Workers* v. *Labor Board* (341 U.S. 694)) that it was not lawful to throw all the other workers out of their jobs just because the two electrical workers did not belong to the union.

Now Senator KENNEDY and Senator JOHNSON insist the law be changed to enable union officials to do just that.

Where hundreds of union workers are employed on the construction of an apartment building, an office building, or

an industrial plant or home, they can be thrown out of work just because a comparatively small minority is dissatisfied.

In this day and age when there are several million out of work in this country, when workers from other countries are coming here, when politicians are insisting upon equal rights for all, is there any consistency or advantage in advocating legislation which will enable a few (in the case decided by the Supreme Court they numbered but two) to throw hundreds of other workers who are satisfied with their working conditions and their wages out of their jobs and onto the unemployment rolls where the rest of us must contribute to their support?

Yet that is just what S. 2643 and H.R. 9070, sponsored by Senators KENNEDY and JOHNSON, the Democratic candidates for President and Vice President, would permit if it became the law of the land.

In my judgment, after spending 38 years trying jury lawsuits, 25 years here in Washington, it seems the height of folly to enact legislation which will permit any small group to injure and deprive other citizens, several million of them, of their right to earn a livelihood.

This proposed legislation is not designed to protect the worker against his employer.

It is designed to permit a few union employees—a very few—and a very few union officials, to tie up any construction job. Its enactment would permit a few dissatisfied union workers to throw all other workers—union and nonunion—on the job out of their jobs, halt construction.

Apparently, the advocates of the legislation have forgotten the slogan over the Supreme Court door, "Equal justice under law."

I shall vote against the bill—vote to protect the worker against discrimination by a union would-be dictator.

Fake?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the newsletter Inform of August 23 put out by the International Services of Information Foundation, Inc., has an interesting lead sentence:

FAKE?

(By phone from London)

It is the consensus of opinion in informed emigre circles that Soviet claims to have shot dogs into orbit and recovered them, were made in panic and are not to be trusted. The Soviet Government and the Soviet Communist Party feel that they must surpass any American achievement anywhere, and will claim to have done so, whether true or not. Emigre intelligence authorities insist that no Soviet claim to anything should be accepted unless proved beyond any reasonable doubt.

This may be distressing news to those politicians who hope to garner votes through proving that the United States is a second-rate power, and at best always second to the Soviet Union.

I heartily agree that politics or not, "No Soviet claim to anything should be accepted unless proved beyond any reasonable doubt."

Tariff and Trade Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the problem of imports continues to be of uppermost concern to many of our domestic industries. In my own State of West Virginia the glassware and pottery industries, the coal and chemical industries and others have been sorely beset by imports and the injury inflicted upon the companies and their workers is not subsiding, but from all appearances continues to get worse.

Many industries in other parts of the country are experiencing similar difficulties. Industries that in the past were little concerned about imports have within the past year or two begun to complain. In some instances the import tide has risen very rapidly; and it may be expected to do so in yet other cases. Products that have long been immune to imports are beginning to feel the encroachment of low-priced goods competing for consumer patronage.

The problem is national in scope and the two political parties must meet the issue as it grows in its demand for a solution.

Under leave to extend my remarks I wish to offer for the RECORD the statement made before the Republican resolutions committee at Chicago on July 20, preceding the national convention by O. R. Strackbein, Chairman of the nationwide committee on import-export policy, and commend his reasoning to all Members of this body:

TARIFF AND TRADE POLICY

The 1956 Republican platform contained the following paragraph with respect to foreign trade policy:

"Barriers which impede international trade and the flow of capital should be reduced on a gradual, selective, and reciprocal basis, with full recognition of the necessity to safeguard domestic enterprises, agriculture, and labor against unfair import competition. We proudly point out that the Republican party was primarily responsible for initiating the escape clause and peril point provisions of law to make effective the necessary safeguards for American agriculture, labor, and business. We pledge faithful and expeditious administration of these provisions."

Since the adoption of this plank in 1956 changes of possibly far-reaching and unhappy consequences in our foreign competitive position have broken through the placid surface of our self-assurance.

This country today faces a set of competitive factors that are stubbornly different from any we have ever faced before. There is little evidence that the peril to our industry, our agriculture, and our labor is either transient or superficial.

The trade policy of the past 25 years has been made obsolete by a series of domestic and foreign developments. It is now badly out of focus with the competitive realities of the world.

1. The leading foreign industrial nations have installed tens of billions of dollars' worth of advanced machinery and equipment. They have adopted modern mass-production methods. They are improving their technology and are gravitating toward mass markets.

2. Their wages continue very low in relation to ours while the productivity gap between them and this country has narrowed visibly.

This combination of rapidly rising foreign productivity hand in hand with lagging wages has confronted us with loss of export markets and with the need of manufacturing abroad. At the same time it has exposed us to an increased flow of imports, particularly finished and semi-manufactured items, against which there is now no effective official remedy. Industry after industry in the past 2 years has felt the rising tide of deadly import competition engulfing the market. The imports of manufactured products have doubled since 1956.

Because of the rising prosperity of the past year, the high consumer income and liberal consumer spending, distress has been kept from the factory door in many cases; and the fear in such instances is for the future rather than the present. In other instances there is present distress, attributed directly to import competition.

The remedy, then, would seem to be perpetual prosperity, assured by constant expansion and full employment. High wages would furnish the necessary consumer income as it has in the postwar years.

This formula would continue to work as it has in the past were the past conditions to continue. Unfortunately for the formula, the conditions have changed. We are challenged from without, not (except in the Russian threat) as a matter of hostility but as a natural consequence of postwar rehabilitation, foreign aid, etc. This external factor is a new element in our economy. Unless we insulate ourselves against it in some reasonable degree we cannot hope to operate our domestic economy on the same basis as in the past 15 years.

Assuming no military outbreak, all presently proposed measures to right ourselves must necessarily fail because we cannot pull away from the encroaching competitive realities. This conclusion assumes the continued vigor of labor bargaining in this country, for this will prevent the catchup of foreign wages (even in terms of relative labor productivity). Should labor oppose the necessary protection against imports it must be prepared to moderate its demands for higher wages, better fringe benefits, etc. Otherwise it will strip this country of many industries that employ tens of thousands of workers.

If we are to increase our exports we must have prices that will help sell our goods, or services or credit terms or quality of goods that offset foreign advantages. In a world of trade rivalry we cannot assume that other countries will not also bestir themselves. They, too, can lengthen credit terms, reduce prices, and offer high quality goods, and they are out to do it. In the race of increasing productivity they have outdone us with our help. The substitution of modern machinery for relatively backward equipment means a greater leap in productivity than does the replacement of relatively modern machinery by more advanced models, as in this country.

If water is poured into a tapering glass the water rises faster with the first few ounces than with the next and the next.

The broader and deeper the water becomes the less the water level rises with each equal increment. So it is with our productivity as we add more improved machinery. It has less effect in raising our level than the addition of an equal or even smaller amount in other countries.

Already over half our exports of agricultural products depend on some sort of Government assistance program or noncommercial factors. We subsidize both wheat and raw cotton some 30–35 percent in order to export the bushels and bales in large quantities. These subsidies in 1960 will cost the Treasury some $500 million. Much of the exports under Public Law 480 are at special prices, for foreign currency or no currency.

In other words, the more we export of our agricultural surplus the heavier the Treasury burden and the less our net returns from exports. Thus our subsidized agricultural exports add to the weakening position of the dollar in the world.

With respect to industrial products we are also in an unenviable position. In many lines we are as surely and as deeply outpriced as in agricultural products. This should be expected since our general price level is no exception to the level of farm prices. In point of fact, farm prices have been lagging for several years and many of them are well below parity. Parity with what? The answer is parity with industrial prices. This fact indicates that if our farm prices which are below parity in this country are well above world prices, our prices on industrial products, which are well above the farm parity level, should be expected to be above world prices.

If we then seek to reduce the cost of our industrial products, how can such a reduction be accomplished? Examine the possibilities: Automate? Other countries have the advantage over us in that field, as already explained. Moreover, automation leads to displacement of workers, in the short run. In the long run it has generally led to an increase in employment; but with foreign competitors waiting on our doorsteps this is another honored economic theory that may burst on impact with the new reality.

Increase the efficiency of labor? This is usually accomplished in any meaningful sense by the introduction of new machinery. This door is closed as a way of staying ahead of other countries, again, as already explained.

Reduce wages? Ask the leaders of American labor what their attitude would be.

Many alarms over imports have been sounded by American industrial leaders, labor organizations and agricultural groups. They have seen the havoc worked by low-cost imports and have beaten the drums to awaken the country to the danger.

Yet too many of these complainants walk to the edge of the only remedy with fear and trepidation. After drawing the problem in compelling terms they back away and say "but tariffs are not the answer. Trade restrictions, such as tariffs and quotas, would be a step backward. Other countries would retaliate." They forget that we have run forward so far and so fast, that a few steps backward now would be better than a full retreat later.

Their fears of retaliation in any case are false and unfounded. These favorite fears have been so often voiced as a means of supporting the trade agreements program that few have stopped to consider their meaning.

Trade restrictions have been used more extensively by other countries since World War II than in any other period of history undoubtedly. Where was the retaliation? Did we retaliate? No. We continued to reduce our tariff and we recognized the need of other countries. The diplomacy of the other countries saw to it that we understood the plight of their position. Because of or despite the restrictions adopted by them the afflicted countries have recovered and reached booming proportions in their trade.

Now we are in need of import regulation. Can we not explain that to the countries that we accommodated, in terms understandable by them? Why then should they retaliate against us?

We should make a true remedy available to each industry, including labor, that is seriously hurt by imports. This should not be in the form of a general tariff increase or import quotas applied willy-nilly; but it should be an instrumentality far superior to the useless one now on hand.

The remedy of today, consisting principally of the escape clause of the Trade Agreements Act, has, in the words of a U.S. Senator, become a "hollow sounding board." With the minor exception of the very recent typewriter ribbon cloth, not a single new case in the past seventeen months has found its way to the White House in the form of a recommendation for higher duty. About a dozen cases were disposed of during this period.

This record is in sharp contrast to the numerous assurances voiced over the past 25 years by three Presidents, every Secretary of State and sundry Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries and other Cabinet members that it is not the intention of the Trade Agreements Act to injure American industry; and that should such injury nevertheless occur, there is a sure and prompt remedy. These assurances have not in fact been honored administratively.

What is needed is an escape clause that cannot be nullified by unsympathetic administration. It should be invoked when injury is demonstrated and should provide relief either in the form of an increased tariff or an import quota or a combination of the two. The Clause should of course not be invoked to satisfy trivial complaints.

We suggest that this year's platform recognize the changed competitive position of this country and the implications of the massive shifts among the economic factors that have moved us into an unenviable corner.

More is needed than a pledge of "faithful and expeditious administration" of the escape clause and the peril point provisions of the law. This has in any case not been forthcoming. A change in the law is needed, for today an industry can have but the slightest hope of gaining a favorable recommendation from the Tariff Commission, and even less hope of support from the President. This fact points to the responsibility of Congress in the case. All the fair words of the executive in proposing extensions of the Trade Agreements Act and all the fair words of political platforms will remain meaningless and will be nullified unless a drastic change is made in the administration of the remedies provided by Congress.

Failure to face this problem squarely would represent evasion of one of the greatest issues of today and tomorrow.

Brooklyn and the Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which Borough President John Cashmore of Brooklyn, N.Y., addressed to Mr. Arthur F. Young, regional field director of the Bureau of the Census regarding the Bureau's preliminary announcement of Brooklyn's population:

THE CITY OF NEW YORK,
OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE
BOROUGH OF BROOKLYN,
July 19, 1960.

Mr. ARTHUR F. YOUNG,
Regional Field Director,
Bureau of the Census,
U.S. Department of Commerce,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. YOUNG: This is to thank you for sending me the preliminary announcement of the Census Bureau's enumeration of New York City's population.

The statistics you have forwarded consist of the census returns for each of the city's boroughs. I have studied them, and I have noted especially your statement that "these figures are believed to be substantially correct, but are subject to revision after the returns for nonresidents are credited to their proper locality and other routine checks have been made."

You also state that "although a significant revision is unlikely, minor revisions may possibly occur after careful examination of the returns."

Your preliminary announcement of the enumeration for the Borough of Brooklyn places this community's population total at 2,604,001.

I am satisfied that the effort of your enumerators was conscientious and painstaking. Yet, because there is so much evidence to the contrary, I am compelled to tell you, in all sincerity, that I cannot accept the total shown for Brooklyn as an accurate one.

I realize, of course, that the country's large urban centers have shown declining populations, in many instances, while suburban areas have experienced growth.

The factors responsible for such population shifts have been well known and understood for many years. The war and the postwar period produced problems which, in their economic and social impacts, impelled many families to move to the suburbs. These problems affected the Borough of Brooklyn just as they affected other large residential centers. Indeed, anything else would have been most remarkable.

The Federal census of 1950 places the population of Brooklyn at 2,738,000. In subsequent years, the Consolidated Edison Co. of New York prepared careful estimates of population changes in Brooklyn as well as the other boroughs of the city. From 1950 to January 1, 1958, this company's estimates showed a decline from 2,738,000 to 2,696,000, or about 1.5 percent. After the latter date, however, its estimate obviously reflected its conclusion, based on data available to the company, that this declining trend had been arrested and reversed and that Brooklyn's population was again on the upgrade. Thus, the estimate for January 1, 1959, was 2,706,000, an increase of .4 percent over the previous figure.

Therefore, your preliminary returns for Brooklyn show a difference of more than 100,000 from the statistics of the Consolidated Edison Co., a variation of almost 4 percent.

Moreover, as president of the borough, I have been in a position to appreciate and understand developments, confirming the conclusions of Consolidated Edison as they have taken place on a week-to-week and month-to-month basis.

I have seen whole areas, once sparsely developed, emerge into new and attractive communities. These are now inhabited by persons who occupy one-family and two-family dwellings built in such areas within recent years. These sections include Sea-

view Village and the larger Canarsie environment where thousands of new homes have been constructed. Mill Basin, East Flatbush, and Bergen Beach are other areas where new home-building activity has taken place on an extensive scale. In addition to small private dwellings, scores of large apartment houses have been built in other sections of Brooklyn and more are under construction at the present time.

In view of these factors, and the disparity between your figures and the Consolidated Edison Co.'s estimates, I am convinced that the total offered in your preliminary announcement must be regarded with skepticism.

Despite this disagreement, however, I want to express my appreciation of your thoughtfulness in calling the preliminary figures to my attention. I shall await, with much interest, the official announcement of population returns which the Director of the Bureau of the Census will make at a later date.

With kind personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

JOHN CASHMORE,
President.

Hawaiian Airlines: America's Pioneer Carrier in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a deep sense of personal privilege and pleasure that I commend to the attention of the Members of this Congress an address by Mr. Arthur D. Lewis, the young and aggressive president of Hawaiian Airlines, given before the 1960 Hawaii dinner of the Newcomen Society honoring Hawaiian Airlines.

In his address, Mr. Lewis describes cogently and eloquently the history of Hawaiian Airlines and its pioneer father, Stanley C. Kennedy, as a central chapter in the larger history of commercial progress in Hawaii.

Mr. Lewis, a Texan by birth and now a Hawaiian by choice, has long been a valued friend to Hawaii. His brilliant leadership of Hawaiian Airlines in recent years is more than worthy of the high standards set in its earlier years. Certainly Hawaiian Airlines can stand as one of the symbols of forward-looking Hawaii; its success can illustrate the conducive climate in Hawaii for pioneer effort and initiative in whatever field of endeavor.

I know the Members of this Congress will enjoy reading this address as much as I have enjoyed it:

HAWAIIAN AIRLINES—AMERICA'S PIONEER CARRIER IN THE PACIFIC

(By Arthur D. Lewis)

By long and honorable tradition the Newcomen addresses have recorded the history of distinguished men and the institutions which they have created and served. You have invited me to talk to you about the history of Hawaiian Airlines, and in doing honor to Hawaiian, you are honoring no less surely the one man who possessed the imagination, perseverance, and faith to nurture it into existence and husband it during its perilous first years. That man is Stanley C. Kennedy.

It is fitting and proper that we pay tribute tonight to one of the outstanding men of the airline industry who has played so notable a part in the development of aviation in Hawaii. It required great tenacity and strength of purpose, together with a very real type of courage, to establish scheduled airline service back in 1929. In fact, it took more than a little courage just to be a passenger—much less the organizer who placed his money back of the company and placed his dreams up for possible public ridicule if failure should be his lot.

Hawaiian's existence is taken in a rather matter-of-fact way today—but it was not a matter-of-fact proposition on November 11, 1929, when that first Sikorsky amphibian rolled down the runway and lurched into the sky with 11 worried passengers and crewmen aboard. Hundreds of airlines have been organized in the past 31 years which did not make the grade. In fact, another airline was organized simultaneously in 1929 and operated throughout the island chain for approximately 1 year before it washed out one of its five airplanes and with it washed itself out of existence.

Stanley Kennedy first started flying in the First World War—over 40 years ago. With the outbreak of hostilities, Stanley tried to enlist in the infant air service in Hawaii—only to be turned down, since they were not recruiting here. He filed an application with the Bureau of Naval Operations. Without waiting for an answer, he packed his bag and made the long trek to Washington. Shortly after his arrival there he passed the rigid physical and mental qualifications and was sent directly to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, where his career as an aviator began. After 6 weeks of intensive study at MIT, he was sent to Pensacola, Fla., where he graduated as a naval pilot in January 1918.

Apparently his determination to fly impressed naval officials because after his graduation as an ensign Stanley was posted to a desk in the Navy Department in Washington. Unhappy with this assignment, he was able to convince his superiors that he belonged in a cockpit—not in a swivel chair. Six months later he was on combat patrol over the North Sea piloting the largest aircraft ever operated by the U.S. military up to that time. After his arrival at Killingholm on the east coast of England, Stan flew H–16 twin-engine flying boats on daily patrols over the North Sea. While in England in 1918, he established a worldwide record for sustained flight when he and his four-man crew flew for 7 hours and 59 minutes on submarine patrol. Those long hours in that H–16 amphibian gave rise to his dream of organizing an air transport service in Hawaii.

Stanley returned to Hawaii after the war and went to work for the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. He became assistant general manager of the company in 1926 and was solely responsible for convincing the officers and directors of Inter-Island Steam that they should establish an air service in Hawaii. In 1928 he began working full time toward his objective and from that time on labored unceasingly to give birth to this fledgling airline, 2,500 miles out in the Pacific and completely isolated from the developing stream of aviation on the mainland. It was not a simple matter to operate in such isolation, particularly when communication was either by wireless or by letter on a slow ocean steamer. Support for the airline depended on ship supply. It was impossible then to rely on air freight for a resupply of spare parts to prevent the grounding of an airplane. This isolation meant that all maintenance service had to be provided in Hawaii. The company had to have the ability to overhaul its engines, airframes, and any component part of the airplane.

Airline operation today is a complicated business—and getting more so, but today we operate with nearly 31 years behind us to provide systematic approaches to solutions to our problems. We operate from a body of technological and scientific understanding which did not exist even remotely in 1929. But to the pioneer in 1929, everything had to be proven out. Everything we assume today to be simple routine operational matters developed only after vexing trial and error. The fact that those problems were ever solved, that a successful operation did come out of the sweat, strain, and disappointments is a tribute to the pioneer spirit, the capability and determination of Stanley Kennedy and, of course, his associates persevering with him.

A few weeks ago I was handed a complete airline guide for all the American carriers operating on regular schedules in the United States and to foreign airports during the year 1929—our first year of operation. There were then only a very few national and international airlines and their schedules were listed on a single sheet of paper. The folder is about the size of Hawaiian's present timetable, which is a four-fold single sheet. The Official Airline Guide which lists airlines in operation today is nearly 3 inches thick and weighs more than 3 pounds. A note at the bottom of the 1929 Airline Guide reads, "Unless otherwise indicated, the planes are single-motored." Well, it was "otherwise indicated" very few times in those days, and Stan's decision to purchase the twin-engine S–38 for interisland operation was a progressive one. Of course, the planes carried no stewardnesses and passengers simply sat by themselves until they reached their destination.

The choice of the S–38 with its two Pratt & Whitney engines and accommodations for nine passengers and crew of two was the result of months of study. It was an amphibian and therefore had the capacity to land either on land or water. The cabin was suspended below the wing and engine mounts providing a unique pendulum effect for which the young airline found it could not charge. With a comparatively broad expanse of wing, the airplane tended to react to wind gusts like a kite. In the slightest turbulence, this pendulum effect caused the craft to roll sickening from side to side. The passenger of early days not only had to have courage in good measure, but had to have an iron stomach as well. The S–38 cruised at 110 miles per hour, and with a stop at Molokai and Maui the overall elapsed time from Honolulu to Hilo was 3 hours and 15 minutes. However, with all of the limitations of the S–38, it was a good airplane for the specific job of flying in the islands. There were several instances in the early days when an accident would have resulted except for the ability to land the airplane on water.

Inter-Island Airways began regular operations on November 11, 1929, when thousands of islanders flocked to a small coral and dirt runway which is today the bustling Honolulu International Airport. In those days the airport consisted of a tiny strip only 1,000 feet long and 25 feet wide. Sugar cane grew on all land areas surrounding the field, and it seemed a considerable distance from downtown Honolulu to the airport—today only 10 minutes by car. Miss Betty Judd, daughter of the then Governor of Hawaii, christened the first two Sikorsky S–38 amphibians which were to operate the company's schedules. It was an exciting occasion with more than 40 Army and Navy airplanes taking part. Following the gala celebration, the first commercial flight was made from Honolulu to the islands of Maui and Hawaii. On the following day another inaugural flight was made from Honolulu to

Kauai. With this, interisland commercial aviation had at last become a fact.

Those first happy days of inauguration, however, were only the beginning of a long and difficult struggle. The vast majority of people were simply afraid to fly and believed that flying was a sport only for the venturesome few. In those days Hawaiian was faced with the same problem encountered by all beginning airlines. In order to get the public to fly, the company had to perfect its product to a point considerably beyond that which the average passenger understood or believed existed. This provided real problems in generating sufficient revenues to undertake developmental operations. By and large, development costs of scheduled airlines had to be borne out of paid-in capital and could not be generated from earnings. And there were not too many stockholders interested. The first stock offering to the general public was underwritten by the parent company, the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. It had to pick up 80 percent of that offering. The company was started with an initial paid-in capital of $313,880. There was a loss from operations in each of the first 5 years. In the first full year of operation, the company carried 10,367 interisland passengers. However, because of the effects of the advancing business depression, business steadily declined, and in 1933 the company carried only 6,868 passengers. By point of comparison, we recently carried 4,505 interisland passengers in 1 day. The company was not able to secure a mail contract in the earlier days. The first real break in the affairs of the company came in 1934 when the Post Office Department awarded the first contract for carrying airmail between the islands. This contract, however, did not provide for subsidy. It provided only for a service payment for carrying the mail. (In fact, the company pioneered the air transport system in Hawaii without a penny of subsidy until 1949 after certification of interisland competition forced it into losses.)

The second major factor bringing the company out of the era of losses was the acquisition of the S–43 amphibian in 1935. This airplane carried 16 passengers and a crew of 2 and with this plane the company crossed over into an era of profitability. The third major factor boosting Hawaiian along its road was the strike of employees of the Inter-Island Steam Navigation Co. in the summer of 1938. This forced many passengers to fly between the islands, and for the first time focused attention throughout Hawaii on the fact that the airline had been in existence almost 10 years and had performed its pioneering services without accident. The most important change in the company's fortunes, however, occurred with the delivery of the DC–3 in 1941. With 24 seats, this airplane developed a reasonable profit with a reasonable load factor.

Success in attracting passengers to the amphibians was due in large measure to the fact that they could operate from land or water. This presented something of a problem when the company bought the DC–3 land planes. The question was how to convince the traveling public that the new planes, more comfortable and modern in every way, were perfectly safe. Stanley Kennedy decided upon a dramatic move. Three planes took off from Oakland, Calif., one August evening in 1941 and flew in formation all the way to Honolulu in only 14 hours and 58 minutes. It was at that time the longest overwater flight ever made by the DC–3. Thousands of people were at the Honolulu Airport when the planes came in over the city. The event was heralded in Hawaii's press and the DC–3 won immediate acceptance as a safe and advanced transport for the islands. It was at this time that the company changed its name to Hawaiian Airlines. This was done primarily to pave the way for ultimate transpacific operation.

With the December 1941 attack on Pearl Harbor and other Oahu installations, Hawaiian became directly involved in the Second World War. When the Japanese had finished their surprise strafing attacks at Honolulu airport, every airplane but one in the fleet was touched by bullets. One was riddled to such an extent that for years after it was repaired it was known as "Old Patches." On that morning, 24 passengers had already boarded a DC–3 and the captain was ready to start the engines when he noticed enemy fighter planes diving on the airport from the south. He was able to have the passengers unloaded just in time for them to watch in awe as a torpedo bomber riddled the plane with incendiary and explosive bullets. One of the engines burst into flames as the plane swooped past, and then, in one of those seemingly impossible quirks of fate, a following plane's bullets struck the system which activated the fire extinguisher and the fire was put out. Additional strafing attacks ripped into the company's hangars and other buildings at the airport, and one pilot was killed outright as he ran for safety.

In retrospect, it was fortunate that the attack did not take place 10 minutes later. If it had, the fully loaded DC–3 to which I have referred would have been directly over the entrance to Pearl Harbor on its scheduled flight to the island of Kauai. Since there were more than 200 enemy planes in the air at that time, we can assume with certainty that its fate would have been a tragic one.

The destruction to Hawaiin's equipment and buildings was considerable—yet within 2 weeks the company was back on a military-regulated schedule to meet the increasing demands for wartime transportation. It was touch and go for nearly 2 weeks as to whether the Army would take over the airline and run it as an arm of the military. Fortunately for Hawaiian Airlines, however, they decided to let the company continue its operation under their direct supervision.

During the years of the Second World War interisland steamship service was removed and the airplane became the only means of transportation. The company boomed when thousands of people took to the air. However, with the company under the direct supervision of the Army, seats were allocated on a strict priority basis to those passengers directly connected with the war effort. This system of control had its damaging effects on Hawaiian Airlines immediately after the war. Many islanders had strongly resented the military system of priority and the manner in which it was administered. Although the whole airline industry faced a postwar public relations problem, Hawaiian's was particularly acute for this reason.

Shortly after the outbreak of the war it became necessary to airlift meat and fresh vegetables from the neighboring islands to Honolulu. The interisland ships were needed to transport troops into the Pacific, and the island of Oahu faced a growing food shortage. On March 20, 1942, Hawaiian Airlines became the first scheduled carrier in the United States to be granted an air cargo certificate by the Civil Aeronautics Board. Two of the S–43's were converted to freight carriers and airlifted more than 1 million pounds during the first year of operation.

Interisland steamship service, which was suspended during the war, was reinstated shortly after termination of hostilities. But its future was to be short-lived. Once the people in the islands had become converted to air travel with its speed and comfort, there was no turning back to a slower surface form of transportation. Interisland steamship service was discontinued in 1948 and Hawaii became one of the few places in the world where intercity travel was limited to air transportation only.

In 1949 competing air service was certificated by the Civil Aeronautics Board. With this, the affairs of the company began to take an adverse turn and it was necessary to file for subsidy. Prior to this time Hawaiian had operated without subsidy and with satisfactory earnings. In fact, for the first 20 years of our existence, Hawaiian averaged earnings equal to 8½ percent return on invested capital. This is about par for the course in this business. Since 1949 the success of the company has been dependent largely upon the amount of subsidy received, and that has been irregular indeed.

The 23d anniversary of the inauguration of air service in Hawaii was highlighted by the company's acquisition of five new Convair 340 aircraft. The first was delivered on November 11, 1952—exactly 23 years to the day from the time Stan Kennedy watched with pride as Betty Judd christened the first S–38. By the end of May 1953, all five of these planes were in service. The Convair 340 met with immediate acceptance throughout the islands as the first pressurized aircraft ever to be placed in operation in Hawaii.

In 1955 Stanley reached his 65th birthday and retired from active management to become chairman of the board of directors. I was invited to succeed him and am very proud to have had the opportunity to be associated with him. We have valued his advice and counsel since that time. Stanley, of course, is with us here today and is celebrating his 70th birthday this month.

In 1958 the company took its first steps toward transpacific flying when it acquired a four-engine DC–6C and began contracting with the Military Air Transport Service to fly passengers and freight throughout the Pacific area. Since the advent of statehood, Hawaiian has been able to develop a substantial volume of commercial charter flights between Hawaii and various cities on the mainland carrying principally tour groups. This year we will carry nearly 6,000 passengers between the mainland and Hawaii. With inauguration of transpacific services, the company began contracting to perform flight planning and flight watch services for miscellaneous transpacific carriers, principally MATS contractors, and to perform en route turnaround services at Honolulu. We have a variety of contracts with eight carriers and this now comprises a major activity of the company.

We acquired four-engine equipment and began transpacific flying as a step leading toward attaining a possible certificate to operate regularly scheduled flights throughout the Pacific. In developing our contract operations we have in fact become a transpacific carrier as well and not just an interisland operation. We have developed the procedures, the organization, and the trained personnel as required for an overseas operation.

I think that some description of the basic company today is now in order. We have a peculiar situation here in Hawaii which does not exist in many places in the world. As I have said before, the airlines of Hawaii carry all interisland, or, in effect, all intercity travel. There is no surface means of travel between the islands. This fact produces many unique characteristics in our operation.

Hawaiian's customers are a complete cross section of the population of these islands. On every flight we have, of course, a sprinkling of business men, some of whom virtually commute between the islands. Also, on our flights, we will have a goodly number of children, grandmothers, and family groups of all kinds. You will see a

kamaaina dowager and a plantation worker sitting side by side. The people on our airplanes resemble more the composite load which is found in bus travel on the mainland as compared to mainland airlines. The cross section of people we carry represents all racial groups in Hawaii. Some of the older people will speak with a heavy pidgin accent. A few retain the languages of the Orient. Because of this, we have a requirement that a stewardess must have lived most of her life in Hawaii. She must be able to speak or understand pidgin and to address a customer by his name even if that customer has a name as difficult to pronounce as Kealanahele (one of our passenger agents) or Yoshikazu Matsui (one of our sales representatives).

We get deeply involved in the family life of people who live on the neighbor islands. For example, on the golden wedding anniversary of Mr. and Mrs. George P. Cooke of Molokai, Hawaiian and Aloha Airlines airlifted to the island more than 300 people in 1 day. We alone operated 12 extra sections just to accommodate friends and relatives of the family. People flew to Molokai from every island in the chain. While this is probably the biggest wedding anniversary movement we have had, it is certainly not the only one. And, of course, in family life we get involved in matters of drastic urgency involving life and death. This might include rapid transfer of a seriously injured person to a Honolulu hospital where specal equpment is available, or involve flag-stopping a flight at Kona for a heart specialist from Honolulu. All airlines figure in emergencies, but ours is of a more intimate sort.

There is a certain informality in living in Hawaii, particularly on the neighbor islands, and this is reflected in the way many people travel. We have men in business suits and aloha shirts and/or shorts, and some that are barefoot or wearing go-aheads. We have women in muumuus, pakemuus, pedal pushers, large straw hats, small straw hats, some carrying parakeets, some carrying flowers, and others carrying leftover luau foods in paper sacks. By and large, a completely friendly and informal family-type service exists.

Another characteristic of our business which is peculiar to us is he tremendous number of group movements that go by air. Such groups might include a statewide Rotary meeting—if held on Maui, we might carry 200 people to and from that island—or a statewide meeting of Credit Union Associations in Hilo might result in our carrying 500 people from Honolulu to Hilo. This fall Hawaiian exclusively will transport 5,000 Gibson appliance dealers to Kauai. Other group movements develop from church activities, spotrs competition, and the like. We have a lot of them.

Because of the absence of surface travel, the airlines of Hawaii must organize to handle the peak movements of passengers which on the mainland are normally handled by private automobile or buses and trains. On the day school is out, traffic almost doubles. Over the Easter and Christmas school holidays we operate sharply expanded schedules over that of the period immediately preceding or following the holidays. Similarly, with a 3-day weekend, we handle the peak movement which is handled elsewhere by the private automobile. Instead of major highways out of Honolulu being three lanes deep and jammed for hours over a July 4 weekend, it is the airport and the flight schedules which are jammed. To point out the degree of this peaking; on the last day of the 1959 Christmas holiday period, we carried 4,500 people. Two weeks later we averaged less than 1,000 daily.

The degree of peaking cannot be compared with any other airline system on the mainland. Almost 25 percent of our total mileage is in extra sections. This compares to 1 to 3 percent for the average airline. Last summer, on the Friday before the July 4 weekend, we operated 26 extra-section round-trip flights to Kauai. Normally we schedule only six round trips daily. Our daily operations usually terminate at about 7:00 o'clock in the evening simply because people do not care to travel after business hours on the short 30 to 60 minute flights in Hawaii. But, on many peak weekends, we have operated extra sections around the clock for several days in a row.

This peaking takes the company into several complicated labor problems related to working conditions, overtime, on-duty hours, and a host of other problems caused by irregularity of operations. And operating costs are higher, reflecting the inefficiencies of standby equipment, manpower, and facilities. But, this is part of doing business as an airline in Hawaii.

Peaking of traffic in Hawaii is also caused by the fact that our flights are short haul. On these short-haul flights, people tend to want to fly to their destinations in the morning and return in the afternoon. This, coupled with the fact that 80 percent of our traffic originates in Honolulu, means that our traffic is highly peaked outbound from Honolulu in the morning and inbound in the afternoon. Again, 1 day last summer we operated 343 seats out of Honolulu between 7:30 a.m. and 9:30 a.m. There were only nine empty seats. Inbound on that same day there were only about one-third of this number destined for Honolulu within those hours.

Another interesting aspect of our business in Hawaii is that such a high percentage of our business comes from tourists visiting the islands. This year visitors will contribute approximately 45 percent of our traffic. They come principally from the mainland United States and Canada, although the number of people from foreign areas who now have enough dollars to stop over in Hawaii for a vacation is growing substantially. The tourist trade brings about entirely different sales problems than we encounter in the local market. First, we must extend our sales efforts to the sources of this traffic. We have three offices on the mainland—New York City, San Francisco, Los Angeles. The effort of our people there is supplemented by personnel from Honolulu who are traveling extensively on the mainland and in Canada. This year we have for the first time extended sales effort to Japan, Hong Kong, the Philippines, and Australasia to tap the layover business from those countries. For a carrier operating only in Hawaii, geographic coverage of our sales force borders on the fantastic.

Then, too, the nature of our sales effort is somewhat different than that of the average airline. One of the unique charms of Hawaii as a vacation land is its mixture of Pacific cultures. We have found it particularly effective to supplement our regular sales effort with dancing and singing teams who entertain at cocktail parties and other special events. We have four to six people in this capacity on the mainland almost constantly. As a result of this need, most stewardesses are selected on the basis of their ability to entertain as well as to generate a warm and friendly atmosphere aboard our planes. And we make certain that we have stewardesses whose origins are representative of the various racial groups which live in Hawaii. We can organize a professionally qualified show among our stewardess and agent personnel—and we can put on surprisingly good productions with our stewardess group presenting representative dances of all the countries of the Pacific—Hawaiian, Japanese, Korean, Chinese, Filipino, Tahitian, and the like.

Hawaiian's operations are unique in still other respects. One of the greatest differences between running an airline in Hawaii and on the mainland lies in the fact that Hawaii business is done on a highly personal basis. On the mainland, airlines are engaged in developing a long-haul, essentially interstate business. Their operations are not related to the basic requirements of one community. By and large, the relationship of the carrier to the community is impersonal. Here it is not, and the airline gets involved deeply in community life. This is not an unpleasant thing—actually, it adds to the enjoyment of doing business here. It is different, however.

In addition to our passenger operation, we run the only interisland freight service with freighter equipment. We carry 93 percent of all interisland air cargo. In the freight business, too, we differ somewhat from mainland airlines in the makeup of the freight load. Mainland air freight is composed principally of high-value commodities such as machines and electronic parts, the latest in fashion clothing, and the like. However, in Hawaii bread is the single largest volume account, closely followed by newspapers. In addition to this, we airlift a substantial volume of fresh vegetables, principally lettuce from Kamuela; dressed beef, principally from Maui; and in season we carry a substantial quantity of bulk fish, principally tuna from Maui and Hawaii to a cannery here in Honolulu. We have even carried a small elephant and some water buffaloes. Movement of household goods is also done on a surprisingly large scale. This is followed closely by finished goods, furniture, appliances, and other miscellaneous consumer goods.

At the present time we are operating two DC–6C's in transpacific military contract operations or in commercial charter service. In addition, we operate eight Convair 340 aircraft. We are currently in the process of converting these eight airplanes to the Super Convair 440 configuration. The difference between the Convair 340 and 440 is that the latter airplane has been soundproofed to a point that the cabin noise level is lowest of any twin-engine, propeller-driven airplane in commercial service. Vibration level is also sharply reduced, and the speed has been increased slightly. The Convair 440 is a superior airplane for interisland use. We have removed the carry-on baggage feature and installed eight seats in the space previously occupied by it—thus we have a 52-passenger airplane. Even with this seating capacity, we can carry between 1,000 and 1,500 pounds of freight in baggage compartments. As a result, the airplane is not only very comfortable for the short-haul interisland flights, but it is a very economical airplane as well. In addition to the Convairs we still have five DC–3 passenger aircraft and two C–47 freighters in operation.

Today the entire Pacific area is in the midst of an air transportation revolution. We are living in an age when jet aircraft fly from San Francisco to Hawaii in less time than it required the S–38 to make the 432-mile round trip from Honolulu to Hilo. The speed and range of the jets are remaking world relationships, and their impact on Hawaii and the countries bordering the Pacific will be enormous. As America's pioneer carrier in the Pacific, Hawaiian is eager to participate in this revolution.

Last year we applied for authority to operate regular common carrier services between Hawaii and Los Angeles/San Francisco—and from these two west coast cities through Hawaii to Hong Kong, Japan, the Philippines, Tahiti, and Australasia. We visualize our future role as a regional carrier in the Pacific, and since we have had such complete identification with this area for so many years, we feel the name "Hawaiian Airlines" is known and respected throughout all parts of it.

Some of you may wonder about Hawaiian's prospects in obtaining these additional routes. Frankly, I hesitate to predict.

There are other major applicants for most of these routes, but we think the natural factors in the case favor Hawaiian Airlines to a greater degree than other applicants.

We of Newcomen believe that the imagination, drive, and ingenuity of the pioneers of industry have left a legacy of which we can all be proud. All too frequently, I suspect, we tend to feel that the day of pioneering has passed. Nothing could be further from the truth. The difficulties, the challenges, the opportunities that confront today's management of Hawaiian Airlines, as well as those of your companies, are every bit as exciting as those of generations past. As we have honored Stanley Kennedy tonight, so also do we honor countless other pioneers in Hawaii. While we are confident that agriculture and tourism will be the two cornerstones of Hawaii's economy for many years to come, our commerce must diversify and grow if we are to provide the jobs and prosperity which will continue to be needed by our rapidly expanding population.

To honor Stan and the rest of these pioneers, we can do no less than follow the leadership patterns which they have set. It is our firm conviction that a good corporation owes the debt of growth to the community which it serves, as well as to its stockholders and employees. Since those early days when Stan Kennedy pioneered interisland air service with the first Sikorsky aircraft, Hawaiian Airlines has attempted in every possible way to discharge that debt. Hawaiian is now a major corporate taxpayer, and our 900 employees have consistently enjoyed wages at or above the local level. Throughout the company we are proud of our record of good citizenship. Hawaiian Airlines has delivered to the people of our islands a caliber of service we feel they have every right to expect. This of course is the obligation of any good public utility.

As we now complete our 31st year of continuous operation, we can look back on an impressive list of milestones which have marked the progress of Hawaiian. We take this moment to rededicate ourselves to continue this record of public service and to continue to provide the State of Hawaii with the finest air service which is economically feasible.

Retirement of Leo Allen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOFFMAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. HOFFMAN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem honoring our colleague, LEO ALLEN. As we all know, LEO is leaving us after the close of this Congress, having faithfully served his country and the constituents of the 16th District of Illinois for 28 consecutive years.

Mr. ALLEN will be sorely missed on both sides of the aisle. Not only is he a fine citizen, a good Congressman, but a true friend.

The poem follows:

From the lead mines of Galena,
From the Apple River Canyon,
From the county of Jo Daviess,
Came to Congress—LEO ALLEN.

From the father of the waters,
From the borders of Wisconsin,
From the town of "Old Ulysses,"
Came our friend and brother—LEO ALLEN.

He ranked high in legislation,
High in Presidential estimation,
High in argumentative presentation,
Statesman—scholar—LEO ALLEN.

Now he leaves the Halls of Congress,
Now he leaves the field of legislation,
He'll be homesick and so lonely,
Our honored colleague—LEO ALLEN.

May the future bring him gladness,
As he rocks and reminisces,
He will always have our friendship,
Our beloved colleague—LEO ALLEN.

The Honorable Albert P. Way, Prominent Businessman of Du Bois, Pa., and Former State Assemblyman, Is Hailed on the Attainmentof His 91st Birthday as the Oldest Theater Owner in the World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, among the outstanding businessmen of the central Pennsylvania area, the Honorable Albert P. Way, of Du Bois, Pa., who recently reached the 91st milestone on life's highway may well be proud of his varied activities in every phase of community life, including the 4 years he served in the Pennsylvania State Legislature as assemblyman from Clearfield County during the period 1929–33.

Sixty-one years ago, Al, as he is affectionately called by young and old alike, went to Du Bois from his native Curwensville and for well over a half century he has been identified with every facet of the civic and business life of Clearfield County's third-class city. Despite his many business interests, Al Way has always found time for his family, his neighbors and his church. He has enshrined himself in the hearts of the youth of Du Bois-because of his intense interest in their problems and more important his determination to help solve them. His efforts in behalf of the little league baseball program in Du Bois is one instance by which he has demonstrated his love and faith in American boyhood.

It has been my good fortune to have known Al Way for over a quarter of a century and to admire his many fine accomplishments and his love for his fellow man, despite the demands of his many business enterprises It is a pleasure to salute Al on the 91st anniversary of his birth and to aid in calling attention to the fine tribute tendered him by Jane Dietzel, staff writer of the Clearfield (Pa.) Progress, who in the August 13, 1960, issue referred to the recent issue of Boxoffice, a motion picture trade journal in which it was pointed out that Al Way is the oldest theater owner in the world. Miss Dietzel interviewed the Du Bois theater owner at his office and then wrote the following nostalgic account of his 64 years in the theater and motion picture industry.

Miss Dietzel's article follows:

IT SEEMS TO ME
(By Jane Dietzel)

An item in a recent issue of Boxoffice, a motion picture industry trade journal, noted that Alber P. Way, of Du Bois, who celebrated his 91st birthday July 26 was the world's oldest theater owner—so we decided to call on Mr. Way one afternoon this week and see how he was taking this double honor.

He greeted us in his office in the Avenue Theater Building where he was clearing the mail—among it a letter concerning one of the two annual scholarships his company provides for students at the Du Bois Campus—and told us he was feeling fine.

It took a little time to learn how Mr. Way's theatrical career began, but it was worth it as he reminisced about boyhood and his ventures as a young man in Curwensville. They included working as a youngster at all sorts of things—delivery boy, farm boy, hotel boy—the latter finding him trundling trunks on a wheelbarrow from the Pennsylvania Railroad Station up an unpaved hilly street to a hotel that stood a few doors beyond the present Park Hotel. He made one trip downriver to Lock Haven on a logging raft and worked on other lumbering jobs around the big dam that was the first stop for the rafts from Cherry Tree and the Chest Creek floods. The fishing above the Pee Wee's Nest was also good, he remembered.

When he was slightly more grown up—but still in his teens—he went into the chicken business, encouraged by a national contest conducted by the North American, the big Philadelphia newspaper of the day, with his blooded, imported-from-England stock one time placing fifth in the nationwide competition. At the age of 20, he was the youngest storekeeper in Curwensville, but it didn't work out too well because people kept charging things and sometimes—most times—not paying for them.

So, when Charles E. Patton, son of one of Curwensville's first citizens and a good friend of young Mr. Way, suggested that he take over the opcration of the Academy of Music, he was willing. On December 1, 1896, the Academy of Music opened under new management—Mr. Way's—and show business was his life from that point. Within a year, he leased the Pierce Opera House at Philipsburg and operated it successfully for 2 years.

Special trains transported the patrons from Osceola Mills, Houtzdale, and the other Moshannon Valley towns. In the meantime, Curwensville's academy of music (this was just a fancy name for a theater, perhaps to allay the stigma that some people still associated with "playacting") was in its heyday. In 1899, Mr. Way moved into the Du Bois scene, leasing the Fuller Opera House, a church building converted into a theater. A couple of years later, the congregation rallied and, back on its feet financially, was able to repossess the building and Du Bois was without a theater.

Forming a partnership with his Curwensville friend, Mr. Patton—one that was to last 34 years—Mr. Way began construction of the Avenue Theater, opening September 2, 1902 with "The Messenger Boy," a gala production starring Frank Deshon, with a company of 50.

Some of the great ones of the American entertainment world played on the stage of the Avenue. John Philip Sousa brought his band there three times—once leaving on a special train for Pittsburgh immediately

after the show when his manager caught the rumor that the company was to be arrested for playing a Sunday night concert. Madam Schumann Heink received $1,000 for a 1-night, standing-room appearance. Victor Herbert and his concert orchestra was one of the high marks, and another DuBoisite told us "I was just a kid and a bunch of us stood in the alley and tried to sneak into the lobby to hear through the doors—I waited until the show was over and saw Victor Herbert come out of the theater. He was, I thought, old, but he was humming and smiling and said, 'Hello, there boy' as he and a lot of people and the draytrucks started down the street to catch the nightflyer to Pittsburgh."

DeWolf Hopper, appearing with Marguerite Clark (later to desert the stage for movies) came back on stage after his role in "Happyland" to give a request rendition of his famous "Casey at the Bat" and George M. Cohan brought New York to Du Bois with his "Forty-five Minutes From Broadway."

A list that Miss Aloyse Simmons, Mr. Way's right-hand-Girl Friday and secretary-treasurer of the company, prepared for me is a history of American theater when it lived, not just in New York, but in the very blood of the land—the small towns.

"Some of them had never heard of DuBois," Mr. Way remarked, telling of his trips to New York to book the shows, "but I could get them as a stopover bill between two larger places. We had the best in our time. One time I bought a show for a whole week—played seven times in 6 days—here, Punxsutawney, Ridgway, Curwensville, Brookville, Clearfield and someplace else—one experience like that was enough. I ran special trains into here, you know, sell a block of tickets in a town and arrange for a train, the railroad companies were very cooperative." He thought a minute and then continued, "Once we had eight horses on the Avenue stage—rented them and the men to ride them from a livery stable—the audience didn't know what to think when they came riding down a hill, you do it with scenery, but it all worked just right."

These enterprises were Mr. Way's as head of the central Pennsylvania circuit, at its time one of the biggest booking agencies in this section of the State.

The coming of movies and a new phase of the entertainment world was to bring an end to it. The movies were introduced as novelties in 1907 or 1908—records are a little hazy on this—and nobody expected them to supplant the living stage, except possibly Mr. Way—"Things kept changing," he mused.

They changed more swiftly with the coming of sound, with one of the most significant the way entertainment could be furnished without the efforts of so many people. Long gone was the pit orchestra, now no longer needed was the pianist who had supplanted the orchestra. Everything required was on the screen and sound track. The first talkie shown at the Avenue was "Fox Follies"—plot, if any, forgotten. Next came "The Jazz Singer." What today offers, you know.

Time has been kind to Mr. Way, or perhaps he has licked it by joining it, if you will excuse the cliche. Retirement is no part of his plan. His son, Marlin, and Miss Simmons have taken over the bulk of the work, including the management of the latest Way enterprise, the Du Bois Hi-Way Drive-In Theater, but one senses that his is still the guiding spirit.

Theater, however absorbing and demanding, is not the sum total of Mr. Way's life. Nor is business. As vice president of the Union Banking & Trust Co., he was more interested in telling about a bank employees' picnic and the fun he had attending it, than talking about the trend of commerce. Fishing at a lodge in Potter County is still a prime recreation. His friends report that he has always, and to this day, played a sharp game of bridge and don't get involved unless one wants a battle.

For many years, Mr. Way and his wife, the former Sara E. Draucker of Lock Haven, spent a good portion of the winter in St. Petersburg, Fla., where the bridge partners were cunning and one could see six or seven preseason big league baseball games before it was time to return home to DuBois.

Interest in baseball and the recreation it provides for youngsters led to Mr. Way's sponsorship of the Du Bois little league program and eventual establishment of a little league park, although he tries to deprecate his contribution. Sort as if, well the money was just lying around and the ground was there and boys ought to have a place to play—and suddenly, there's the ball field.

The scholarships mentioned earlier are equally casual. The only stipulation is that, in one case, a recipient must have been a little leaguer, and in the other, at one time been a newsboy. What they want to do with their future is of no concern, except that it is hoped that it will be a satisfying and productive one.

Such as, for instance, Mr. Way's has been.

Big Problem of Our Times for the State Legislatures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the editorial which appeared in the May-June 1960 issue of the Carolina Israelite which, as you all know, is edited by the famous Harry Golden. I do not have to give him accolades at this time in view of his prominence in the literary field. I am sure you all know his books and columns.

The editorial which appeared in this latest issue of the Carolina Israelite in my opinion, typifies the problems of small business in this monopolistic world.

The story relates to the credit problem of poverty and the terrible conditions that exist when a poor man must live on credit which he cannot attain in the same fashion as his affluent neighbor.

This is the problem of financing small business.

The small businessman must pay high interest at unreasonable and extortionate rates. He is never in the position of the wealthy or of the big businessman who can receive credit under favorable terms. Permit me to quote the last paragraph of this editorial:

It is exciting to talk of sending astronauts to the moon, of making a new planet, of the new aids in education. But it is well to remember that there are many matters concerning the dignity of the individual which we should not overlook and which we all too unfortunately do. Let us try to help.

It is high time that we took a look at the credit situation of small business.

The item is as follows:

BIG PROBLEM OF OUR TIMES FOR THE STATE LEGISLATURES

The English, who have several hundred years on us in the experience of human dignity, call installment buying, "Never, never." They are absolutely correct.

Take Rudy, a young colored man who works in Charlotte. Rudy marries and buys furniture which costs him $1,100. He pays off this bill at the rate of $14 a week. The furniture could be purchased at either of the two leading department stores in Charlottee for just under $500. Rudy doesn't have $500, and he is unlettered in the ways of buying wisdom. He buys the $1,100 in furniture and pays an additional carrying charge of $87.50. In a year's time he has paid back over $500. But he runs into some financial trouble. His wife goes to the hospital and he cannot command an extra $14 a week for his furniture payments. He stalls. Oddly enough the furniture installment house does not press him.

They let him go, because they knew Rudy would sooner or later become delinquent in his payments. Rudy goes along for 5 weeks and has just about convinced himself that they have forgotten him when they lower the boom and lower it hard. They tell him to bring in all his delinquent payments or they will come and get the furniture.

Rudy cannot spare $14, let alone spare $14 times 5. He is shocked that they didn't forget him after all, they did not lose his account sheet.

What he does not know is that the company does not want to repossess the furniture. That $1,100 worth of furniture now will bring exactly $85 from a secondhand furniture dealer.

But they threaten Rudy with repossession the following Monday unless they receive that $70 he owes. Rudy consults his boss who tells him to inform the company that he will pay them what he can. Surprisingly, the loan company is agreeable. They make a brand new bill with Rudy. He can forget the delinquent weeks and start off anew and now he owes $511, plus a new addition of $87.50 carrying charges. Exhilirated, Rudy will make payments for 6 weeks, then he will fall behind again, and again they will not bother him. But at the end of the fifth week, they catch him up short again. He owes then $421.16 and they will clamp down unless he pays them the money he owes for the past month or so. Rudy again appeals to them.

Again they introduce the same procedure. They waive the 6 delinquent weeks and let Rudy commence at $14 a week plus, of course, that additional $87.50 and again he owes them in the neighborhood of $500.

Over the next 2 years, Rudy will repay them. The brute facts are that he will have spent over $2,000 on $1,100 worth of furniture which he could have bought in Altman's on Fifth Avenue or Ivey's in Charlotte for $500.

The small loan companies operate on the same principles. They occupy small, nondescript offices and supply the bread-and-butter keep-the-lights-on money to thousands of people who always stand in need of an extra dollar. The vast number of loans they negotiate are for $25. This $25 represents the most brutal exploitation imaginable. For that $25 plus interest, plus investigation charges, a debtor owes $34 to be paid back at the rate of $2 a week. This is only the beginning. In many instances a debtor pays 5 cents a day for tardiness. In some instances, if he needs $100, the loan company will insist he borrow $100.01 because they can charge another $1 for all loans over $100. These loan companies never let their customers off the hook.

In repaying $34 for that $25, the debtor reaches a point where he owes $8. They say to him, "Let us lend you $17 on a new loan." You can be sure that a man who borrows

$25 from a loan company always stands in need of $17; he will be happy to walk out of the place with $17, instead of minus $2.

These companies are segregated. There are Negro loan companies and white loan companies, but the suffering is integrated. The $25 loan can be juggled over a period of 4 years and the man will have paid back $109 for the use of that $25.

It is exciting to talk of sending astronauts to the moon, of making a new planet, of the new aids in education. But it is well to remember that there are many matters concerning the dignity of the individual which we should not overlook and which we all too unfortunately do. Let us try to help.

The Mere Fact of Existence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Louis M. Orr, of Orlando, Fla., is a distinguished, patriotic American fighting to preserve the principles and ideals that made the United States great. Dr. Orr as past president of the American Medical Association rendered outstanding service. He was an ambassador of Americanism around the world and rendered great leadership to the medical profession. I commend to the attention of this Congress the following superb speech made to the graduating class of Emory University on June 6, 1960:

THE MERE FACT OF EXISTENCE

(By Louis M. Orr, M.D., president (1959–60), American Medical Association; delivered before 1960 graduating class, Emory University, Atlanta, Ga., June 6, 1960)

President Martin, members of the board of trustees, faculty, members of the class of 1960, ladies and gentlemen, I was truly pleased when President Martin invited me, on behalf of the trustees and faculty of your university and mine, to deliver the commencement address. At the same time, I was somewhat awed by the responsibility of delivering such an address from the position of a returning alumnus.

A situation like this usually implies a kind of model for success who is going to tell you to go and do likewise. I am much better qualified, I can assure you, to discuss the mistakes I have made and to warn you against doing likewise.

However, I do want to talk about you and the mere fact of existence.

An engineer in one of America's largest companies has described a human being this way:

"Man is a complete, self-contained, totally enclosed powerplant, available in a variety of sizes, and reproducible in quantity. He is relatively long lived, has major components in duplicate, and science is rapidly making strides toward solving the spare parts problem. He is waterproof, amphibious, operates on a wide variety of fuels; enjoys thermostatically controlled temperature, circulating fluid heat, evaporative cooling; has sealed, lubricated bearings, audio and optional direction and rangefinders, sound and sight recording, audio and visual communication, and is equipped with an automatic control called a brain." Thus ends his description.

The engineer's picture of a human being is significant, I think, for what he has omitted. He did not tell us what sets his "robot" apart from such mechanical marvels as manmade moons in the sky, factories run by electronic brains, and engines powered by atoms. He does not tell us what goes beyond the mere fact of its existence and turns it into a human being.

The meaning of being human is a big, broad subject. But for our purpose, let me put it this way: Science will never be able to reduce the value of a sunset to arithmetic. Nor can it reduce friendship or statesmanship to a formula. Laughter and love, pain and loneliness, and challenge of accomplishment in living, and the depth of insight into beauty and truth, these will always surpass the scientific mastery of nature.

WANTED: IMAGINATIVE MEN

Yet, strange things are happening. We are doing our best to act as though the engineer's description of man is accurate. We are accepting a system under which workmen, regardless of skill or productivity, receive the same pay for the same job. Laborers are forbidden to do more than a specified amount of work per day. The doctrine of promotion on the basis of seniority is creating human deadwood that does only what it is accustomed to do, or what it is told to do.

Throughout the country, many college graduates entering business are reported to be more interested in security than in competition. In politics, voters are accepting vague enthusiasm and expressed good intentions as substitutes for talent. In our communities, civic appointments are being influenced not by outstanding skill, but by extraneous considerations.

For example, in Massachusetts, the head of a local veterans' organization maintained that any former serviceman, regardless of the grades he received on his qualification tests, should be given the appointment as a public school teacher in preference to nonservicemen who had passed with higher marks. He was quoted as saying that a few points more or less on an examination make no real difference.

In the book, "The American Conscience," Roger Burlingame offers this explanation:

"We are prosperous. We are complacent. Religion has become, for the most part, a social convention. Skill is anonymous. Thought is under pressure to conform. Security has replaced venture as a dominant aim. Intellect is in the discard, and politics are dictated by * * * mediocrity."

As I see it, the mediocrity in our lives, the leveling down, the elimination of competition inevitably leads to the final step at the bottom—the acceptance of the idea that the mere fact of our existence gives us a claim on the productive powers of our fellowmen. Is the philosophy behind this parasitic idea already damaging the competitive spirit of young America?

A businessman, the head of a large, enterprising manufacturing company, has remarked:

"I have dozens of fine-looking, well-groomed young fellows for routine jobs. What I want, though, is restless men with imagination, ready to break out of conventional procedures and move into untried fields."

Can this businessman find such young people today?

LEARNING, LIBERTY, AND LIGHT

Here at Emory, you have all been exposed to an influence which I call the "Three L's." They are learning, liberty, and light.

As seniors, you know what learning is. Criticism notwithstanding, our American education is imitated abroad for its basic philosophy which is: There is no profession nor significant occupation for which an ambitious and capable person cannot prepare himself in some American institution.

As Americans, you know what liberty is: The atmosphere that makes possible strength combined with inquisitiveness; the inventive turn of mind; that masterful grasp of material things; that restless, nervous energy; that dominant individualism; that buoyancy and exuberance that comes with freedom.

As men and women, your light has been cast for you by those who have gone before, leaving the beacon glow of understanding, of ambition, and of dedication to ideals under which we have lived and progressed.

But one of the most frustrating aspects of contemporary life is its tendency to develop compartmental divisions. Business is business, politics is politics, science is science. Thus, it is easy to confine ourselves to our own thinking, our own immediate problems and interests—to communicate only with our own kind.

In such an atmosphere, young people probably will hardly notice that they are living in a restricted world filled only with the requirements of their interests. But we should not make the mistake of thinking ourselves into such a narrow channel. A man must be concerned with the environment in which he lives.

HEART OF A FREE SOCIETY

The individual must be prepared not just to work, but to live—both as a unique person and as a fellow member of the human race. American philosophy places a fundamental value on the uniqueness and worth of the individual in his own right. The individual is the heart of a free society. Achieving this end depends upon how conscientiously individuals use their freedom.

In a free society, the individual, be he businessman, politician, or scientist, plays many roles and shares in making many decisions. Of course, the individual must have special knowledge and skills in a vocation or profession. But in addition, he plays three major roles: in the home, on the job, and in the community. These are the atmospheres in which he lives, in which he makes his presence felt. These are the atmospheres in which he finds his responsibilities and through them his individuality.

I believe it is especially important to know people to be a part of the people. As each of you grows in your various careers, change will dominate your life. Upheavals and pressures from scientific, technological, and social advances will confront you. But mankind will always remain the basic factor. The physical world was meant to serve man, not vice versa.

As Clarence Manion, in his "Key to Peace," has said: "It must be remembered that 95 percent of the peace, order, and welfare existing in human society is always produced by the conscientious practice of man-to-man justice and person-to-person charity."

DIFFERENCES DISAPPEAR

Many of you are aware that man is moving toward a worldwide sameness in cultural pattern. In my travels, I have observed that the house in America is beginning to look like the house in Brazil, Switzerland, or Turkey. Furnishings in the house in Sweden are beginning to resemble those in England, Japan, or Argentina.

The people in the house, too, are undergoing a worldwide stereotyping process through the spread of mass production and distribution. To cite two extreme cases of distribution: The late hula hoop fad went around the world, and I have been told that a popular nightspot in ancient Kyoto, Japan, is called Bar Brigitte Bardot.

As mass appeal spreads, as it undoubtedly will when worldwide filmed television and other mass media of entertainment further influence styles in living and standards of taste, New Delhi will look and act like Chicago, Hong Kong, or Mexico City.

At the moment, America seems to be supplying most of this sort of thing because we are currently able to please the common denominator of taste throughout the world.

In my travels outside the United States, I like to look at local newspapers. I am continually surprised to find American columnists and cartoon strips in many of the papers.

Some people look upon this growing sameness in the world as evidence that humanity is surrendering its individuality, country by country, and man by man. They say that sameness is creating mediocrity. Unlike these people, I am not too concerned over the worldwide standardization of things. In the end, the similarity of styles in living and standards of taste could bring people closer together. Perhaps travel will not be as interesting, but the common ground between people will be firmer because it will be less strange, and perhaps less suspicious.

I am not too concerned either over the worldwide standardization of ideas—which is undoubtedly the step following the standardization of things. In the end, the similarity of ideas could give people fewer differences to reconcile. The differences left will be bigger and more basic, probably, but less cluttered with regional biases.

FREEDOM SPURS PROGRESS

Some of you may be wondering how I can stress the inestimable value of individuality and at the same time show little concern for standardization. I do not believe that standardization can harm true individuality in man because standardization is a pressure from without and therefore can be resisted. Standardization leaves room for the rebel. It merely narrows down the field of details and provides more room in which the rebel can work.

On the other hand conformity, not standardization, is the true cornerstone of mediocrity. Conformity kills individuality because conformity is an attitude from within. Conformity is the atmosphere of nationalization. It is surrender. It destroys the rebel.

There is the standardization of a basic idea making the rounds of the world today. The idea, of course, is nationalization versus individual freedom. Those of us who are free to do so have chosen sides. We know that mankind needs freedom in which to realize its greatest triumphs. We know that under the personal freedoms already won by people throughout the world, more advancement has been made in the last 200 years than was made in the 5,000 preceding years. We know that standardization of this idea, individually accepted of course, should be based upon the rights of the individual. And the most important right is freedom.

The alternate can only lead down to that final step in the surrender of individual liberty and the responsibility that goes with it—conformity to the idea that the mere fact of our existence gives us a claim on the productive powers of our fellow men.

How important is our individual choice in this matter? The author, Frank E. Holman, put it clearly when he said:

"In all the world, we are the last hope and last stronghold of individual liberty. When the great problem of world peace is examined from all sides, the necessity for preserving America's integrity and strength becomes more and more apparent. And one is impelled to the conclusion that a strong, independent and free America is not only best for its own citizens, but is also the best guarantee of world peace and world order."

As young people in the changing world of today, your idea of freedom may be different from mine. You may be succumbing to the idea that your existence gives you a claim on the productivity of others. You may not be aware that this idea can smother your natural spirit of restlessness, your ardor for healthy disagreement, under a blanket of conformity.

A GIFT FROM GOD

As a member of the older generation, I have seen the American conception of a free people replaced by the concept of a free nation. This suggests that freedom is a gift from the National Government, and not, as I grew up to believe, a gift from God.

Some of you probably think of security as a synonym for freedom, or will when you begin actively to establish your place in the world. This is an understandable modern misconception. For example, the four freedoms—freedom of speech, of worship, from want, from fear—have become for many people a sort of digest version of our Bill of Rights.

May I point out that the so-called freedoms from want and fear have no relation to our traditional concept of freedom because they do not come from a self-directed course of action. For fulfillment they depend upon an outside source—the National Government—and because of this, they must be considered a form of security, and not true freedom.

I have nothing against security. Security is essential to the full happiness and productivity of which we are capable. But few of us have really found it. Most of us are still searching. You are on the threshold of looking for yours. Whoever we are, at whatever age, the majority of us seek security in the same three general areas—money, public programs, and company benefits such as pension plans, vacation schedules, and seniority.

Money is a weak base for security. It does not hold its value over the years. In all the world's history, no currency has even survived for more than 42 years after being transferred from a physical base—on gold, for instance—to a political base. Your money and mine was changed from gold to congressional paper 26 years ago, and thus far has more than halfway disappeared.

Public programs such as social security, unemployment insurance, public housing, while they may have merits of other kinds, represent the great delusion that we can obtain security by voting for it. No political program has ever given more than a passing semblance of security. Programs invariably change with political expediency.

SELF: THE SOURCE OF SECURITY

Lately, company benefits have become more important to job applicants than opportunities for advancement. Employees' interest in what a company will do for them is greater than concern over their capacity to earn the income and financial advancement they demand.

We have not found security in these three areas. We have not found it because we are looking in the wrong places. For you and me, whether we even believe it or not, there is only one place where security can be found. That place is inside ourselves. Here, and here alone, lies the real source of security—ideals, not dollars; principles, not pensions; character, not convenience or expediency. Here is the place where each of us is in absolute control—beyond standardization, beyond conformity, beyond claiming the skills and efforts of others to underwrite our existence.

Backed by the strength of learning, liberty, and light, we must listen to and heed the restlessness in our spirit. We must grow in both individual and national vigor. We must act together, not as members of a herd following the loudest voice, but as diversified individuals of a group, combining our experience into an ever greater wisdom.

EXISTENCE: JUST THE BEGINNING

This then, is the way in which we must approach the ideological conflict of nationalism versus individual freedom, the way in which we combat human robotism, the way in which we prove that mere fact of existence is only the beginning of life.

And what will that life be? An old Chinese story gives us the only answer possible:

One day, a traveler met a philosopher on the highway. The traveler held a small bird enclosed in his hands. To test the philosopher, the traveler asked him whether the bird was alive or dead.

The philosopher did not answer right away. He surmised that the bird was alive. However, should he say that the bird is dead the traveler would need only to open his hands and let the bird fly away. If the philosopher should say that the bird is alive, the traveler could so easily crush the bird and prove the philosopher wrong.

At last the philosopher replied: "I cannot say what the answer is, because the answer lies in your hands."

And what will your life be? The answer lies in your hands.

Post Office Department Official Makes Dedication Speech for Branch Post Office Building, Lynwood, Calif., East Lynwood Station, in Great 23d Congressional District, California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present the text of what happened to me as a very appropriate and informative dedication speech given in my presence on July 23, 1960, by Mr. Michael F. Houlihan, field service officer, Post Office Department, San Francisco regional office, on the occasion of the dedication of a new and most beautifully and efficiently constructed branch post office building at East Lynwood, in the important city of Lynwood, Los Angeles County, Calif. At this dedication it was my pleasure to also participate as Representative in Congress of the great 23d District, wherein this very much needed new branch post office building was dedicated.

The speech follows:

DEDICATION SPEECH OF MICHAEL F. HOULIHAN, FIELD SERVICES OFFICER, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, SAN FRANCISCO REGIONAL OFFICE

Mr. Chairman, Postmaster Lane, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a privilege to be here today in Lynwood to participate in this dedication ceremony as a representative of the Post Office Department and to have the honor of extending to you the personal greetings of Postmaster General Arthur E. Summerfield and Regional Operations Director Verne Scoggins.

As we dedicate this new post office today, we should look at this structure as a symbol of the Government of our country and all that it represents—freedom, opportunity and justice for all. That's because the building will be used by the agency of our Government which has the closest and most intimate daily contact with the American public.

In fact, the U.S. Postal Service is the very trademark of a free people. It is vital to such basic American freedoms as freedom of speech, freedom of press, and freedom of religion, because they all require freedom of expression. All of our basic American freedoms would be seriously curtailed if you did not have good mail service to communicate thoughts and ideas.

The right to communicate freely with one another—to express your ideas without fear of censorship—is fundamental to all of our freedom and, like the postal service itself, it is a freedom nearly all of us take too much for granted.

The postal employees who will serve you from this new building are united with more than half a million other postal employees throughout the United States to provide the American people with fast, dependable mail service and to protect your freedom to communicate in absolute privacy, without fear of censorship.

In doing that, postal employees are helping our country to overcome the most crucial challenge of this era. The people of our country and the free world must be constantly alert to the true danger we face.

The Communist challenge to our way of life and to our form of government is many-sided. It is military, political or intellectual, spiritual, and economic.

We know that the Soviets are extremely able and resourceful people. They are dedicated competitors and they have shrewd and well-informed leaders.

Americans must buckle down to engage the Communists in every field to prove and demonstrate that we are better because our way of life is better.

Our country advanced into a position of world leadership because of the strength that developed in an environment of personal liberty, human dignity, and sound moral and spiritual values.

I want to emphasize here today that postal employees throughout the United States are loyal, dedicated, patriotic citizens and they are determined to provide the American people with an ever-improving mail service because that will be an important contribution toward protecting and preserving our fundamental freedoms.

We in the Postal Service are proud of the fact that under the leadership of Postmaster General Summerfield there have been so many improvements in the mail service in the past 7 years. This new building we are dedicating today is part of the sensational parade of postal progress which has resulted in tremendous improvements in every phase—every function and activity—of the postal service.

A new "metro plan" for mail movement in major metropolitan areas throughout the country is highly successful. Barring occasional uncontrollable factors such as human errors—it practically guarantees next-day delivery for letters within each metropolitan area. Here in California, virtually the entire State is included in two "metro" areas.

General Summerfield's announced goal is to link the "metro" areas in such a way that next-day delivery will be effected almost anywhere in the country.

You often hear about "growth industries." Well, your postal service certainly is a "growth industry" and we have our growing pains, too. In this region—which includes the States of California, Hawaii, and Nevada—the budget for postal service this year is $340 million and the budgeted expenses keep increasing every year because we have to provide additional service.

For example, in California during the past 12 months, an average of two new letter carrier routes have been added every working day. That's one of the effects of our ever-increasing population and the suburban residential and shopping center developments throughout the State.

Nationally, mail service was extended last year to more than 1¼ million additional American families and nearly 100,000 additional business concerns.

We operate the world's largest fleet of vehicles—more than 85,000 trucks of all kinds. Obsolete, inefficient vehicles have been eliminated and replaced by new red, white, and blue equipment which is specially engineered for specific mail duty.

Mail transportation methods have been changed and improved to take advantage of modern superhighways and jetplanes.

Amazing advances have been made in the development of automatic equipment to improve and speed the processing of mail. A great deal of mechanization is operational in many of the larger post offices.

Mechanization and automation are essential because mail volume has been growing at twice the rate of the population in this country. This year the postal service will handle 62 billion pices of mail. That's equal to twice as much as all of the mail for all other countries combined.

Recently Postmaster General Summerfield told me about some of the progress in the mechanization program.

He visualizes a time—not too far off—when almost every step of mail processing will be mechanized. There are already machines in operation that sort out regular-size letters from bulky envelopes and packages.

There are canceling machines with electric eyes that find the stamp and put on the postmark no matter which way the envelope enters the machines.

Other machines are being used for semi-automatic distribution of letters, but Mr. Summerfield told me the scientists and engineers are experimenting with an electronic-brain type of machine which recognizes typewritten or printed addresses and automatically sorts the letters according to destination.

Various kinds of self-service machines have been invented, and soon there will be 24-hour self-service post offices. There will even be a self-service parcel post machine which will accept your package, weigh it, apply postage and insurance. These mechanical marvels will also return your exact change.

Looking farther into the future, the Postmaster General said a system of coded postal addresses is in an experimental test stage. Someday you may not have to address letters the way we do now. Envelopes will be standardized in size for rapid and efficient handling. You will have a code book that will give you the postal code of the person you are writing to—it will be somewhat similar to using a telephone directory.

With a handy little device, you will stamp your friend's postal code on the envelope. Then your letter will be fed into a machine whose electronic eye will cancel the stamp, scan the coded address, sort it, and dispatch it in a matter of seconds on a streamlined journey to its destination.

Mr. Summerfield's crystal ball also shows that the day is coming when missiles will carry mail in a few minutes between the key cities of the world. As a matter of fact, the postal service has already done some pioneering in the missile field. Last year, mail was delivered safely by a Regulus missile from a Navy submarine 200 miles at sea to the Florida coast.

A basic requirement for modernizing, mechanizing, and improving the mail service is represented by the reason why all of us are here today—and that is the need for modern functional postal buildings.

When Mr. Summerfield became Postmaster General, he recognized the need for many, many new post offices. He also wanted to get away from the old, forbidding, monumental post offices and replace them with buildings that are light, airy, modern, and efficient.

The need for buildings was so great that it was impractical to expect Congress to appropriate all of the money that was needed. So a program was developed which makes it possible for the Post Office Department to get private investors to construct the kind of buildings we wanted and needed to provide mail service and then lease the buildings to the postal service on a long-term basis.

Approximately 4,200 of the new kind of post offices have been built and Congress has been asked for funds to equip 12,000 more that must be built or modernized as fast as possible.

This building we are dedicating today is modern. It is utilitarian. It is in architectural harmony with the rest of the community.

As we dedicate this building to its important role in a vital public service and welcome it into the world's greatest communication system, I suggest that we also rededicate ourselves to doing all that we can to promote and strengthen the American way of life.

We in the postal service dedicate this new building to the proposition that we will continue to do our utmost to preserve and strengthen the moral, spiritual, and economic values of our country by providing the best mail service in the world—and, indeed with man on his way to outer space, we will expand that pledge to wherever man goes, even to the moon and beyond.

Thank you very much.

America's Military and Economic Strength Is Great

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of those members who have not had an opportunity to read them, I am inserting herewith in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from President Eisenhower's speech at Chicago last month. He pointed to our economic and military strength, and to our position in the world today. What he said merits the attention of everyone who has concern over these matters.

The excerpts follow:

To this convention I bring no words of despair or doubt about my country—no doleful prediction of impending disaster. Whoever misleads by calculated use of some but not all the facts, whoever distorts the truth to serve selfish ambition, whoever asserts weakness where strength exists—makes a mockery of the democratic process and misrepresents our beloved country in the eyes of the watching world.

The irrefutable truths are that the United States is enjoying an unprecedented prosperity; that it has, in cooperation with its friends and allies, the strongest security system in the world, and that it is working ceaselessly and effectively for a peace with justice, in freedom.

Our own mounting living standards, and the history of these Republican years, provide the proof that these are facts.

THE ECONOMY

There are more Americans today employed, at higher wages and with more take-home

pay, than ever before in our history. They have more confidence in the stability of their money than they have enjoyed in three decades.

In these past 7½ years, the annual gross national product has increased by $100 billion or 25 percent. This figure, though stupendous, is asserted by some to be unnecessarily low. But what would they say if they knew that during the almost 8-year duration of the prior Democratic administration, the gross national product actually declined in every single peacetime year, save one.

During all the years of this administration, I've heard much from the opposition, especially from its free-spending clique, about increasing the rate of economic growth by depending principally on governmental activity, with vastly increased Federal expenditures.

We reject the argument that healthy growth can thus be bought from the funds of the Federal Treasury.

We believe profoundly that constant and unnecessary governmental meddling in our economy leads to a standardized, weakened, and tasteless society that encourages dull mediocrity, whereas private enterprise, dependent upon the vigor of healthful competition, leads to individual responsibility, pride of accomplishment and, above all, national strength.

Inflation—the most insidious and cruel form of taxation ever devised—drove prices up to 48 percent in the previous administration, thus robbing millions of our people of savings and of purchasing power.

In the last 7½ years, we have succeeded in keeping the total price rice below 11 percent. And, at least this is my fixed opinion, this record could have been even better if I might have had the privilege of working all these years with a Republican Congress.

SECURITY

In the sum of our capabilities we have become the strongest military power on earth. But just as the Biblical Job had his boils, we have a cult of professional pessimists who, taking counsel of their fears, continually mouth the allegation that America has become a second-rate military power. This extraordinary assertion amazes our friends in the world who know better; it even bewilders many of our own people who have examined our 7½-year record of military expansion and who are not used to hearing their gigantic defense efforts so belittled.

Defense expenditures during the twelve months preceding the outbreak of the Korean war were less than 12 billion. Today we are spending, after 7 years without hostilities, over three times that much, more than $41 billion annually on a powerful, flexible and adequate defense establishment, which commands worldwide respect.

The United States today possesses a military establishment of incalculable power. Combined with the strength of our NATO, SEATO and other allies, the free world is prepared to meet any threat and, by its retaliatory strength, to face any potential aggressor with a mighty deterrent.

All this—all this—has been brought about by vigorous and imaginative leadership, the genius of our scientists, the skill of our Armed Forces, and by the sacrifices of the American people. To belittle this might, and the prestige, pride and capabilities of these groups does such violence to my sense of what is right that I have difficulty in restraining my feelings of indignation.

If we can be blessed with experienced and steady leadership in Washington, the possibility of the outbreak of future war will be minimized and we can eventually win the peace.

THE WORLD

In the pursuit of world peace, I have personally journeyed more than 90,000 miles during the past year and visited the people of more than a score of nations on four continents. I have heard the insistent demands of multitudes for the right to live their lives in peace, and I have seen and taken part in many impressive American initiatives directed toward this crucial goal. The United States has made proposal after proposal, each in good faith, in an effort to reduce tension in the world and to lessen the economic burden of armaments. Moreover, we are prepared always to consider any reasonable proposal made by others.

Only a few months ago the men in the Kremlin were calling for complete and total disarmament. But suddenly thereafter, they began devising one crisis after another.

They brutally wrecked the summit conference.

They have threatened us with missiles.

And today, they cold-bloodedly boast of shooting down one of our planes legitimately traveling over intercontinental waters.

The Soviet dictator has said that he has, in his recent journeys and speeches, succeeded in damaging the prestige of America.

Now, this is indeed an empty boast.

Concerning this matter of comparative national prestige, I challenge him to this test: Will he agree to the holding of free elections under the sponsorship of the United Nations to permit people everywhere in every nation on every continent to vote on one single simple issue?

And that issue is: Do you want to live under a Communist regime or under a free system such as is found in the United States?

My friends, are the Soviets willing to measure their world prestige by the results of such elections? Well, you know the answer to that.

But the United States would gladly do so.

THE PARTY

The people expect and demand honesty, integrity and moral courage from the men and women who bear public responsibilities. They know that political office should be, and demand it be, a position of trust and honor; qualification for it must comprehend more than mere personal ambition. They realize, as never before, that the stakes in today's world are too high to risk their futures to the hands of frivolous, irresponsible or inexperienced government.

In the successes of the past 7½ years you have a solid foundation on which to build toward new levels of attainment.

Oscar Hammerstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, Oscar Hammerstein II left the world a better place than he found it. His contribution to the happiness of mankind cannot be measured. The most we can do is to state simply that millions of people the world over were left a legacy by Oscar Hammerstein that will continue to inspire and lift them for all time. The world is saddened by his death. It seems that everyone, whether they knew Oscar Hammerstein or not, feels they have lost a warm and old friend. Joshua Logan, the producer and director along with Oscar Hammerstein of "South Pacific," spoke for everyone when he said, "He is going to be immortal. His songs will never die. There is no question but that Hammerstein will be remembered as long as people sing."

Oscar Hammerstein was born on July 12, 1895, on West 125th Street, New York City. He received a B.A. and a law degree from Columbia University. He was president of the Dramatist Guild and a member of the board of directors of the Fund for the Republic. In 1923 at the age of 28, he collaborated on the musical "Wild Flower." The following year he collaborated on "Rose Marie" and "Sonny." In 1927 he joined Jerome Kern on "Show Boat." In 1943 he formed his partnership with Richard Rodgers and they jointly created "Oklahoma," "Carousel," "The King and I," "South Pacific," "Sound of Music," and others.

None of us can ever forget the songs for which Oscar Hammerstein wrote lyrics. These include "Rose Marie," "Indian Love Call," "Who?" "One Alone," "Desert Song," "Ol' Man River," "Only Make Believe," "Why Do I Love You?" "Can't Help Lovin' Dat Man," and many others.

What a priceless heritage this is. We are grateful for it.

I am sure that I speak for all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives when, as a Representative from New York, I express our sympathy to Oscar Hammerstein's family and friends. We remember today particularly Oscar Hammerstein's widow and his great friend Richard Rodgers. The country shares their grief.

For the benefit of my colleagues who may not have seen them, I include in my remarks the editorials which appeared in the New York Times and Herald Tribune, which are particularly moving tributes to the memory of Oscar Hammerstein:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 24, 1960]

OSCAR HAMMERSTEIN 2D

Although Oscar Hammerstein 2d had a genius for the musical theater, he had something finer than that. He had character. His death yesterday shatters the remarkable collaboration of Richard Rodgers, composer of the music, and Mr. Hammerstein, composer of the lyrics and most of the books of their plays. Now we must accept the doleful fact that there will be no successors to "Oklahoma," "Carousel," "The King and I," and "South Pacific." The big four—written within the span of 8 years—have become part of our cultural heritage.

But the theater has also lost a man of character who stood for all that is decent in life. His point of view was implicit in everything he wrote. The concern for racial respect in "South Pacific," the sympathy and respect for a difficult though aspiring monarch in "The King and I," the indomitable faith that runs through "Carousel" were not clever bits of showmanship. They represented Mr. Hammerstein's faith in human beings and their destiny.

Outside the theater, as well as inside, he quietly accepted the responsibilities of a man of conscience. If his work represents something more than surface pleasure, it is because he brought the whole force of his character to it. Like Billy in "Carousel" he was always prepared to be judged by the highest judge of all.

Since he was at heart a serious man, his lyrics were rarely clever. Instead of turning facetious phrases he made a studious at-

tempt to write idiomatically in the popular tradition of the musical theater, for he was a dedicated craftsman. But the style that is apparently so artless has brought glimpses of glory into our lives. "There's a bright, golden haze on the meadow" sings Curly in "Oklahoma," and the gritty streets of a slatternly city look fresher. "June Is Bustin' Out All Over" sing Carrie and Nettie in "Carousel," and the harshness of our winter vanishes. "Getting to Know You" sings Anna in "The King and I," and the world becomes a friendlier place.

In memorable songs there is a quality of transmutation that turns the common materials of life into something that seems ideal. Since Mr. Hammerstein was a craftsman it must have been a gratifying experience to have written the lyrics of so many songs that have become musical literature—all the way from "Show Boat" to "Sound of Music." To us it is gratifying that he also had the character to use his genius with faith and scruple.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 24, 1960]

OSCAR HAMMERSTEIN AND HIS SONGS

The role of the librettist traditionally is a minor, even a minimal one. When one thinks of "Aida," "Carmen," "Don Giovanni," one remembers Verdi, Bizet, and Mozart, not Ghislanzoni, Meilhac, and da Ponte.

But this was not true of Oscar Hammerstein 2d any more than it was true of W. S. Gilbert. The great musical shows of our time such as "Oklahoma," "South Pacific," "The King and I," and "Carousel" were all by Rodgers and Hammerstein, and few conjunctions have been as significant in theatrical history.

Mr. Hammerstein's achievement was all the more remarkable in that, in his partnership with Richard Rodgers, he stepped into a role that had been filled with flair and distinction by another man, Lorenz Hart.

To this collaboration Mr. Hammerstein brought new qualities of literary distinction and emotional impact. He wrote not only good lyrics but good plays. He respected and put to good use the richness of the American language.

Even aside from the collaboration that began in 1943 with "Oklahoma," Oscar Hammerstein was assured of his share of immortality. It could not be otherwise with the man who wrote the words of such songs as "Ol' Man River," "When I Grow Too Old To Dream," "The Last Time I Saw Paris"—words which caught a mood, a moment; words which stirred profound emotions.

Others made his country's laws; Oscar Hammerstein made its songs. And in them he lives beyond death.

Coal Tax for New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting editorial regarding the coal and oil industry, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald, on July 31, 1960:

COAL TAX FOR NEW ENGLAND

New England has been handed a kind of tax bill for the assistance of the soft coal industry. This "tax" is now at the rate of over $20 million a year. It is collected through a contrived increase in the price of residual oil. Its purpose is to force New England utilities, industries and office and apartment buildings to shift from residual oil to soft coal.

The Government is a party to this outrage. The import quotas on petroleum products, ostensibly set to maintain a healthy petroleum industry in the United States, have been extended to residual oil, which matters little or nothing to the domestic oil producers, but a great deal to the coal producers.

New England relies heavily on residual oil imports, chiefly from Venezuela. Recently the Government sharply cut the import allowance and at the same time reduced the quota period from 6 months to 3 months. This latter means that dealers cannot stock up on oil for winter consumption during the slack period for tankers ,and must pay higher charter rates in the fall.

Of course the price of residual oil shot up. The military installations here, must pay $2.6968 beginning October 1, under a new contract with the Military Petroleum Supply Agency. This is a measure of the price increase, around 16 percent.

This will bring an increase in electric rates by those utilities which, like Edison, are permitted to increase rates to meet higher fuel costs. It will tend to raise rents for apartment houses and office buildings. Industries will have to pay more. And we may expect soft-coal prices to go up, as they always do when residual prices rise.

Senator SALTONSTALL and representatives of Massachusetts oil dealers and industries recently met with officials of the Interior Department and the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization to urge an increase in the quota. They got only a promise that the fairness of the price would be studied.

Actually, there is only one fair price for residual oil in New England—the price that it can be shipped in here for in a free and competitive market without import restraints. This is not the price today.

Why is coal able to impose this tax on New England?

Because coal industries flooded Government officials with their demands and the oil industry and the consumers did not protest. A writer in the trade magazine Petroleum Week quotes one official:

"I was against this proposal [to reduce the quota] and hoped we would be flooded with protests so that we could show good reasons for dropping it.

"But what happened? We received 400 comments, of which only 7 were from the oil industry.

"All the rest came from coal and its organized supporters—labor unions, banks in the coal areas, coal-carrying railroads, coal-equipment manufacturers, etc.—all strongly backing the proposal.

"So we had no alternative but to go ahead with the proposal."

In Government, it appears, the nonsqueaking wheel does not get the (residual) grease.

This interference in the operation of a free economy is something we usually think of as more a Democratic policy than Republican. And, sure enough, the Democratic platform contains a recommendation for a national fuels policy, which would be a way to force coal on New England by permanently restricting residual oil. The Republican platform is somewhat less specific on this, but still sanctions economic intervention.

New England is already taxed $118 million a year because of import restrictions on crude oil. Here is another $20 million tax even more indefensible.

How long must we pay to help support the domestic oil industry and the coal industry?

Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, in this period of our history of conflicting ideals and sometimes lack of definite purpose it is encouraging to find an organization of 2½ million Americans united in one single, overpowering aim. The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is just that. I take pride in congratulating it on its anniversary for 20 years of holding the ideals of freedom and independence from tyranny before the American public and all the world. It is indeed rare to find such a group that works selflessly and tirelessly to prove to those of us who have sometimes taken our liberties for granted that there are hundreds of millions of people today that do not and have never had such liberties. The members of the Ukrainian Congress are ideally suited to make us aware of these facts, for the history of the Ukraine is the history of liberty hard fought for, hard won, and then hard lost.

In 1918, the Ukrainian peoples declared themselves independent from the newly formed Soviet Government. Two years later it capitulated to the forces of the Soviet, after more than a year of resistance against overwhelming military odds. There followed the suppression by force of the Ukrainian culture and the Ukrainian heritage under the militant Communist regime, which confiscated the produce and resources of the Ukraine. Collectivization was enforced; Ukrainian nationalist leaders were persecuted; and the Ukrainian Autocephalous Orthodox Church was dissolved. Thus was the Ukraine drawn into the Soviet Union, no longer to have a voice in the world except through such agencies as the Ukrainian Congress.

The Congress was organized in 1940 for one major purpose—to be the voice of the 40 million Ukrainians who are not free to inform the world of their captive condition. The membership of the Congress is composed of 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry. Ultimately they hope to see once again an independent Ukraine. In the interim they devote their time to exposing to Americans and to the world the methods and atrocities of Russian tyranny, so well exemplified in the history of the Ukraine in the last 40 years. They speak on behalf of all captive nations and captive peoples. In their publications, local organizations, public programs, and promotion of the annual Captive Nations Week their message has become more and more startlingly clear. Soviet goals and methods are diametrically opposed to everything the United States stands for. Sometimes it takes an organization like the Ukrainian Congress, with ties and

interests in a country subjected to Communist rule, to remind us of our own purpose and beliefs.

Enter Ye in at the Strait Gate: for Wide Is the Gate, and Broad Is the Way, That Leadeth to Destruction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today, Tuesday, July 26, 1960, Republicans in Chicago are writing their party platform and tomorrow will name their candidate for President—the Democrats recently finished that job.

You now have an opportunity, a duty, to consider seriously the kind of Government you will bequeath to your children and their descendents.

We differ in our decisions as to methods and policies we should follow which will give to our people the greatest possible opportunity for prosperity, happiness, and freedom, as to the course we should follow in dealing with other nations.

Differences in opinions are not only permissible, but unavoidable. However, there is no excuse for the mentally indolent individual who fails to think and act when opportunity is given to personally, effectively participate in solving questions which vitally affect not only his own welfare, but that of all, as well as the future security of our Nation.

By 8 long years of hardship, suffering, sometimes death, our forefathers won our freedom, and for the first time in the world's history, established a Government of principles which, if religiously followed, mean freedom and happiness to us as individuals, as well as security for our future existence.

Billy Graham, today's evangelist, might well have used the words uttered last night by Herbert Hoover who, in substance, told us that insuring our moral and spiritual future is just as, if not more important than attaining temporary material prosperity. It is obvious that unless we give more and effective thought and action to the principles underlying our Government, the United States of America will follow the road to ruin down which every nation has traveled since the dawn of civilization when its people preferred idleness, pleasure, and wasteful practices to methods and policies which called for courage, endurance, and thrift.

The nation, as well as the individual, which seeks "the wide gate, the broad way" is, as was written so many years ago, doomed ultimately to failure.

Reading the Chicago Tribune this morning, I learn that Republican politicians are striving for a platform which will assume to give the greatest degree of civil liberty to each of us, regardless of race, creed, or state of origin. That is all to the good, and to that principle, all can subscribe.

However, on the same page stretches a headline reading "One Thousand Goons Besiege Plant." The caption reads "State Refuses Protection in Racine," and the story discloses that "a mob of 1,000 strike goons and sympathizers besieged the struck plant, without deterrence by State authorities or Gov. Gaylord Nelson." Is anyone concerned about the civil liberties of colored, yellow, or white who desire to work?

Eager to secure votes in November, the Democratic Party platform and presumably the Republican platform to be adopted today, will go far to protect some civil rights, to prevent certain discrimination, but why deny the right of any one to earn a livelihood as at present is the practice? Why boast about efforts to prevent discrimination in some fields of activity while sanctioning it by failure to act in others? Why yield to political expediency rather than adhere to principle?

All civil rights of everyone should be protected.

Veteran Organizations Coordinating Council of Los Angeles County Resolution Supports H.R. 3508

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent granted me so to do I present the text of communication dated August 10, 1960, from the Los Angeles County Veteran Organizations Coordinating Council of Disabled American Veterans with reference to H.R. 3508, together with the resolution accompanying said communication. This is for your information and for the information of all members of this great legislative body:

VETERAN ORGANIZATIONS COORDINATING COUNCIL OF LOS ANGELES COUNTY,
Los Angeles, Calif., August 10, 1960.

On July 8, 1960, the Los Angeles County Council, Disabled American Veterans, passed a resolution, authored by John S. Taylor, past commander C.C., that H.R. 3508, having been introduced by Congress, should be passed and sent to the President for his signature.

By regular rules of order and bylaws, this council sitting in session on July 28, 1960, did move and pass that the Veteran Organizations Coordinating Council of Los Angeles County approve and support the above resolution that H.R. 3508 be passed and sent to the President for his signature.

JOHN J. FLYNN,
President.
HARVEY T. STEINHOFF,
Secretary-Treasurer.

LOS ANGELES COUNTY COUNCIL DAV DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA JULY 8, MEETING

In regular session, under powers granted the council by its bylaws, as governed by Roberts Rules of Order, the following motion by Past Commander Taylor and seconded by Past Commander Paul Whithill was put, to wit:

Whereas since World War II our compensation has risen 95 percent and our cost of living has risen 145 percent; and

Whereas if this condition continues the same trend the disabled veteran will shortly become distressed veterans in a very prosperous nation; and

Whereas legislation to remedy this deplorable condition has been introduced by Congress in the form of House H.R. 3508; and

Whereas the increase asked in H.R. 3508, is modest and should be passed and sent to the President for signature: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Los Angeles County Council in regular session adopt this resolution; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent all Congressmen and Senators of California and to other persons the council believes should be interested in the disabled veteran.

JOHN S. TAYLOR,
Past Commander C.C.
(Author).

Adopted July 8, 1960.

MURRAY MILLAR,
Commander.
RAY WALKER,
Secretary-Treasury.

The Nation's Wartime Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution submitted by William S. Bartlow, commander, disabled American Veterans, Department of Ohio, and adopted by a unanimous vote of the DAV convention, July 29, 1960:

A RESOLUTION BY THE NATION'S WARTIME DISABLED VETERANS

Whereas the many complaints received regarding the inefficiency and near chaotic conditions in certain areas of the Veterans' Administration, prompted the State commander of the Disabled American Veterans, to appoint a committee to make a thorough investigation of this entire situation—and this committee reports as follows:

"Finance: Some months ago the Veterans' Administration established an automatic data processing center in Chicago for the purpose of distributing benefit payments to wartime disabled veterans. It is apparent that the management misjudged the problem involved and the failure to deliver the payments to the needy wars' disabled, the widows and other dependents is astounding. Many of these payments are delayed for months: payee names are abbreviated, making it very difficult to get the checks cashed and addresses are also abbreviated to the point of difficult postal delivery. This situation particularly involves payees in the northern part of Ohio as the Cleveland office of the Veterans' Administration presumably is completely integrated with this new system. The conditions have caused an indefinite postponement of complete merging of the Cincinnati office of the Veterans' Administration with this new setup. The present situation is such that inquiries at Chicago are limited to only individual cases of stress.

"Claims: The backlogs in the rating of claims for benefits by wartime disabled veterans and widows of veterans are increasing in the regional offices of the VA checked, with

no improvement in sight. Much of this delay is due to ever-changing procedure instructions, statistical coding, so-called quality reports and the continuing review of war-disability claims to determine whether the service connection for disability is legal, after many years of—review and review. Where doubt is indicated, the record is sent to Washington for further instructions. Many of these records have been handled so frequently over a period of years that the housing jackets are torn and worn out, leaving loose papers and documents that could become misplaced. The Veterans' Administration, faced with a dead line by a law enacted by the present session of the Congress and approved by the President, which will prevent the Veterans' Administration from breaking service connection and eliminating or reducing the benefits of many thousands of wartime disabled veterans, it appears that they are making a determined effort to accomplish this in as many cases as possible before this law becomes effective on January 1, 1962.

"The records of individual wartime disabled veterans are shifted from place to place, remaining out of the files weeks and even months, which make it difficult to locate them when an emergency arises.

"Hospital and medical service: The Veterans' Administration management continues to reduce the bed capacity for medical treatment and domiciliary care for veterans disabled as a direct result of war service. Many so-called reasons are given for this action. Buildings, apparently in satisfactory repair are suddenly declared obsolete. In one instance an entire ward was vacated to make space for an additional canteen. Only recently 22 beds were eliminated in one VA hospital to set up a barber chair. Admissions to VA hospitals, to an extent are on a selective basis as to the type of disability or disease—and long term patients are usually rejected. The outpatient medical department of the office of the VA in southern Ohio was moved to the VA hospital in Cincinnati in recent years. This experiment has certainly proved far from satisfactory. The VA have publicized the advantages of this move, which was supposed to make available all hospital facilities in connection with the out-patient examinations, medical study, as well as treatment. However, there has never been an actual integration of the outpatient service with the hospital itself. This Department is operated separately and independently; authorized physical examinations for rating purposes are delayed; out patient medical treatments, authorized on a fee basis for out-of-town veterans, are delayed; purchase of needed prosthetic appliances for veterans suffering with war-incurred disabilities are sometimes held up for months, all on the theory of insufficient funds. The hospital facilities are rarely used in connection with outpatient needs, thus it is felt that perhaps the hospital did not graciously accept the merging of the outpatient service, which could well account for the failure to allocate sufficient funds to carry on this important activity in serving veterans with war disabilities. As an example of the hospital management efficiency, the many veterans housed at the Veterans' Administration Center, Dayton, Ohio, for domiciliary care are sent to the outpatient clinic in Cincinnati for the necessary routine physical examination. Naturally, this entails much added expense in transportation costs to the Government. And at the same time—problem cases requiring special medical study and observation to determine diagnoses—are sent to the Dayton VA hospital. Many complaints are received from veterans with regard to the lack of courtesy, etc., shown them by some employees and especially by some physicians at Veterans' Administration hospitals.

"Publicity: The Veterans' Administration at Washington maintains—an extensive public relations program, with ample funds for constant News Releases, advising the public of the wonderful service extended to the wars' disabled and the widows of war veterans. Many of these Releases do not give all the facts and lead to false impressions. It is felt that a Government agency, such as the Veterans' Administration, should not require a press bureau—beyond reporting the true facts to the public.

It is apparent that the operations of the Veterans' Administration today—place the principal stress on research, statistics and a revised philosophy of veterans' benefits—with the need or consideration, etc., of the welfare of the war veteran and his dependents—secondary."

In view of the above report: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 39th annual State convention of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Ohio, assembled in the city of Columbus, July 29, 30, 31, 1960, That we enter our protest regarding the above mentioned conditions direct to the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs of the Congress, to all Members of the Congress from Ohio, and to others.

San Jose Is Place To Reassert Real Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, all Americans in the Western Hemisphere are watching developments at the Organization of American States foreign ministers' meeting now in progress in Costa Rica. They want to know what action will be taken to stop the advancement of international communism in the Americas.

The citizens of Florida are particularly concerned about the OAS meeting because Cuban based communism is but 90 miles from our shores. The necessity of action by the OAS is imperative. An editorial from the Pompano Beach Town News in Florida clearly points up the interest and concern, and also expresses our sympathy for democratic evolution in our sister Republics. Because this editorial should be of interest to all who are taking part in the conference and the Members of Congress, I ask that it be reprinted here in the RECORD:

SAN JOSE IS PLACE TO REASSERT REAL REVOLUTION

We hope, as the Organization of American States meets in San Jose, Costa Rica, Tuesday, that our statesmen will contrive to fill the atmosphere with the spirit of true revolution—the painfully conceived, hardily initiated and still continuing American revolution.

That, we believe, is the one sure and abiding antidote for the insurrections against the inter-American conceptions of freedom with which Fidel Castro and his shadowy Moscow confrerees will expect to poison the conference atmosphere.

Since it is more than evident that nothing said or done by Latin Americans in the conference will be far removed from a spirit of social and economic restlessness that has been in ferment in their countries since World War II, it should be no insurmountable task for our people to channel the conference toward the unfinished business of the great inter-American dream.

For inter-American dream it certainly is.

The British colonies in our northern sector had not become the free United States too long before ardent Simon Bolivar initiated his series of patriot victories against Spanish rule in New Granada in 1819. This was a long campaign, as bitter in frustration and starvation as George Washington's struggle, but ending with such battles as Carabobo and Ayacucho now recited by the school children of Latin America as milestones on the road to liberty.

Enshrined in history as "The Liberator" and "The George Washington of South America," Bolivar lived in those stirring times when the great North American Revolution was still being tested by the monarchic pretensions of England, France, even Spain.

He left a legacy as the first man to attempt a league of American States. The very first conference of American States was held under his plan in Panama in 1825.

Since then, pursuit by our various nations of the great inter-American dream has at times taken diverse routes dictated by diverse national ambitions and necessities. Inter-Americanism has been painted in many colors, has developed many faces.

But one rallying point had thrust many an incipient inter-American struggle into the background. The shared determination of keeping this hemisphere free from foreign domination has made inter-Americanism a potent force in world politics. In many instances, too many to enumerate here, the inter-American conference table set up in the spirit of the various American revolts against outside rule has proven a more powerful instrument of history than any intra-American battlefield.

Probably because they are younger as free men than we, Latin American patriots and statesmen are apt to be more vehement in their recollections of the purposes of men like Blivar and San Martin, Sucre, O'Higgins, Marti, Morales, Juarez.

But their pride in the revolutions these men brought about can be no deeper than our pride in the Union established by Washington, saved by Lincoln, ennobled by its unselfish assistance to Cuban freedom, and savagely fought for by our unpretentious millions through two world wars, a United Nations action in Korea and now during an imposed cold war.

We think the aware and cognizant Latin American statesmen who are to assemble in San Jose Tuesday will welcome a show of this pride. For their own democratic revolutions are far from completely stabilized. In them we may be sure to find a responsive chord if we show a scorn for the betrayers of the American Revolution while we face up solidly to the fact that the revolution itself is a piece of unfinished business.

We should eloquently and truthfully demonstrate to the assembled statesmen that what we and they have gained by keeping faith with our revolutionary forebears is but a sample of what that same faith will bring our grandchildren.

This does not mean the launching of unbridled giveaway programs. It does mean our fraternal aid where that aid is needed. It means better cultural and commercial interchange, better educational facilities everywhere in the Americas, a jealous regard for the progress of the democratic system in our hemisphere—a replenishment of our

faith in the American way—the inter-American way.

Only thus, we submit, will the puppets in our midst be revealed for what they are—prattling insurrectionists who seek to use the very words and phrases and themes of our own long-enduring revolution, to cloak their undemocratic, sacrilegious, and internecine thirst for power.

If nothing else comes of the meeting of American States we hope it will establish at least one thing: That there is still a very real economic and social revolution going on in these Americas and that there are a sufficient number of thoughtful leaders in the hemisphere to see that it continues toward those freemen's goals dear to the hearts of Americans everywhere.

Tribute to Air Force Personnel on the 20th Anniversary of the Opening of Westover Air Force Base, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, just 20 years ago, in the summer of 1940, the Army Air Corps officially opened its newly designated northeast airbase named Westover Field in honor of the late Army Air Corps Chief of Staff, Maj. Gen. Oscar Westover.

Westover Air Force Base played a major role during World War II, the Berlin airlift, the Korean war, and now is a vital link in the worldwide force of the Strategic Air Command.

Mr. Speaker, the Air Force personnel stationed at Westover Air Force Base enjoy a very high rate of mutual respect, friendliness, and understanding with the citizens of adjoining cities and towns in my congressional district. Westover Air Force Base has burgeoned into a new community and a good neighbor in the last 20 years. I wish to extend my best wishes to Lt. Gen. Walter C. Sweeney, 8th Air Force Commander, Col. William C. Lewis, the base commander, and all Air Force personnel my best wishes for continued success and friendship in the future.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include a message from Colonel Lewis entitled "Community Relations Everybody's Business," which appeared in the Westover Yankee Flyer newspaper on August 12, and an editorial from the Springfield Union of July 25 entitled "Westover's 20th":

[From the Springfield Union, July 25, 1960]

WESTOVER'S 20TH

Twenty years ago this summer Army Air Corps personnel from Maxwell Field, Ala., were getting settled on a 7½-square-mile tract in Chicopee that was being converted from tobacco land to an airbase. Congress had appropriated some $3,608,000 for the project, designated as Northeast Airbase. Soon it was renamed Westover Field, in honor of the late Army Air Corps Chief of Staff, Maj. Gen. Oscar Westover.

The mission of the base has varied. First it was a World War II training center—for fighter pilots and antisubmarine crews, then for B–24 bomber crews. In February 1946, the Air Transport Command turned Westover into a huge aerial port of embarkation. After ATC became part of the Military Air Transport Service, the Berlin airlift brought renown to MATS and Westover too. The Chicopee base was also a staging point for Operation Bluejay, the "top of the world" Thule Airbase project in Greenland.

Westover Air Force Base today is a mighty link in the armor of the free world. It is headquarters for the Strategic Air Command's 8th Air Force and a forward base for retaliation against any aggressor. From the lumbering B–24 to the jet-driven Stratofortress, from the demolition bomb to the unspeakable power of the atom, Westover has kept up to date, and seen many changes.

Unchanging has been the friendly spirit existing between the base and its civilian neighbors—a spirit much older, incidentally, than the $25 million annual base payroll that nourishes the Greater Springfield economy. For a good neighbor and a powerful keeper of the peace, may the past 2 decades be only a prelude to future successes.

[From the Westover Yankee Flyer, Aug. 12, 1960]

COMMUNITY RELATIONS EVERYBODY'S BUSINESS

(By Col. William C. Lewis)

Recently, the Springfield Union paid tribute to Westover and its growth over the past 20 years.

This acceptance of Air Force personnel as good neighbors was made possible through the full cooperation of everyone.

It is imperative that each of us remain constantly aware that community relations is everybody's job. Many of you, I know, give generously of your off-duty time to promote and improve this relationship individually and in large-scale community efforts.

My thanks to each of you for your contribution to this friendly relationship with our neighbors.

Paul Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. DORN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the following tribute to our distinguished colleague, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, appeared in the Anderson, S.C., Independent. This splendid article in this great newspaper indicates that the admiration for PAUL BROWN is universal. He is loved and admired in South Carolina the same as in Georgia. We are going to miss him here in the Congress, but our affection and love will go with him to his beloved home town of Elberton.

The article follows:

"FATHER OF SAVANNAH"—REGION GRATEFUL TO ELBERT STATESMAN

Heart-warming tributes from hundreds of business and civic organizations and individuals in all walks of life have been received by Elberton's PAUL BROWN—the "Father of the Savannah Valley"—who is retiring as Georgia's 10th District Representative in Congress this year with 28 years of incomparable service.

From the day the distinguished statesman announced he would not seek reelection in the September primary on the advice of his physician, messages and resolutions containing grateful thanks for his contributions to build a better world, together with sincere regret he is leaving Congress, have poured into his office in Washington, D.C.

They have come from friends and well-wishers throughout Georgia, from South Carolina and other sections of the Nation.

Apart from his ardent support in behalf of the farmer, small businessmen, veterans, Commodity Credit Corporation, REA, and other national legislative measures now law of the land, it is agreed that Congressman BROWN has fathered Congress steps in the development of the Savannah Valley of South Carolina and Georgia.

Only those behind the scenes know of the constant labors of the 80-year-old statesman that led to the construction of Clark Hill and Hartwell Dams to open the way to what leaders say will revolutionize the economy of this entire region.

The U.S. House Banking and Currency Committee, of which BROWN is vice chairman, recently honored him at a dinner in the Nation's Capital. Members told of their high respect and admiration for the Georgian and his high principles and integrity. They presented their colleague with a silver tray bearing the engraved signatures of committee members.

Said Representative A. J. MULTER in remarks to the House of Representatives printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"While all of us want him to do the things he wants to do, and wish him and his family long life, good health, and the utmost of happiness, it saddens us to know that he will not be with us in the next session of Congress.

"For 14 terms his integrity, his knowledge, his competence, all coupled with his genial personality, have been a leveling influence in bringing about the enactment of legislation in the best interests of our country. He served his people and his Nation long and well. He was always willing to compromise on form to advance principle but he never compromised on principle.

"It is unfortunate that we did not take a stenographic report at the dinner of the nice things that were said about PAUL, led by our distinguished chairman, Mr. BRENT SPENCE from Kentucky. I am sure that before this session ends he and our other colleagues will have an opportunity to express themselves to the same effect on the floor of the House."

The American Bankers Association held a reception for Congressman and Mrs. Brown at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. In attendance were high ranking Government officials, many Members of Congress, including the Speaker of the House and other leaders.

Numerous resolutions of praise for his services have been passed by organizations in the 10th District of Georgia.

Typical of wide commendation from veterans is the resolution unanimously adopted by the Hart County American Legion Post 109 at Hartwell. "Upon his retirement a true friend of the veterans of all wars will be missing from the Nation's Capitol," the post said. "We hereby express to Congressman BROWN, as a post and as individual members, our sincere appreciation for his loyal and patriotic service in the effective and able performance of a job well done for his district, State, and Nation. We extend to Congressman BROWN and his family our very best wishes for the days to come and a hearty 'welcome home.'"

And a resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of Roads and Revenue of Richmond County, Augusta, Ga., said in part. "We are cognizant of the faithful and untiring efforts on behalf of the Honorable

PAUL BROWN for all things constructive for the 10th Congressional District, and the central Savannah River area of Georgia, and South Carolina."

The Rayle Electric Membership Corp. at its annual stockholders' meeting in Washington, Ga., this summer said in its resolution that "during the 27 years that PAUL BROWN has represented the 10th Congressional District, he has been a true and loyal friend of the rural electrification program throughout this Nation and he has been largely instrumental in the construction of the Clark Hill project, which construction has made available to persons in the area of said dam low-cost electric power. PAUL BROWN has proven himself a true and loyal friend of both the REA as well as all other programs affecting rural people and the farm economy of this Nation."

Members of the Georgia Savings & Loan League at its 35th annual convention sent a resolution to Congressman BROWN extending "sincere expression of gratitude for his service to this business and to all of the people of Georgia and to his country. Congressman BROWN has served his district, his State, and his Nation in a very able and efficient manner throughout a long and illustrious period of service."

The Hart County Electric Membership Corp., which serves families in Hart, Elbert, Franklin, Madison, and Stephens Counties, dedicated to Representative BROWN the June issue of Along These Lines, a monthly publication going to thousands of rural electric users.

Col. T. S. Mason, of Hartwell, manager of the rural electric facility, wrote this glowing account:

"Congressman PAUL BROWN, who has served the 10th Congressional District of Georgia for 27 years, has announced his retirement at the end of his present term. This announcement came as a great surprise to his thousands of friends at home, in Washington, and throughout the country.

"Mr. BROWN is leaving Washington on account of his health. He said, 'I am tired and want to go home.' God bless you, PAUL. A great welcome awaits you back in Georgia. You can truly say as the great Apostle Paul said 2,000 years ago, 'I have fought a good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith,' and I say that a crown of love, respect, and admiration will follow you from now on. History will record your life among the most faithful of the great men who have served in the Congress of this Nation.

"Born on a farm in Hart County, attended Pleasant Hill rural school, PAUL was known as a serious student as a child. Growing to young manhood, he graduated from Hartwell High School, entered the University of Georgia where he graduated from law school and soon became one of the most brilliant lawyers of his day and generation.

"PAUL never did things in a halfway manner, for it is told by the older people of this county that he, as a teenage boy, often picked 400 to 500 pounds of cotton in a day while he was living on the farm.

"After leaving college, he opened a law office in Lexington, Ga., the seat of Oglethorpe County, and shortly afterward was elected to the State legislature. For personal reasons, he did not offer for another term, which he could have had without opposition. Later he married Miss Frances Arnold of Hampton, Ga., a former resident of Oglethorpe County, and shortly moved his law office to his present hometown of Elberton, forming partnership with the late Judge W. D. Tutt, and the two comprised one of the strongest law firms in the State.

"There were born to this couple one son, Bobby, who was lost in World War II, and one daughter, Rosalyn, who resides with her parents in Washington.

Congressman BROWN is known as one of the most able men in either branch of the Congress, and he counts his friends by his acquaintances. Republicans and Democrats alike call him PAUL. He is truly a beloved man. We hate to lose your influence in Washington, but we will welcome you home. Rural Electrification will lose one of the stanchest supporters when Congressman BROWN retires.

"Much worthwhile legislation sponsored by Mr. BROWN, such as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, soil conservation, rural electrification, the development of the Savannah River, and many others, are now the law of the land and will continue to bless the Nation in the years to come.

"We wish for you and yours, PAUL, a long and peaceful life after you retire. We welcome you home as a friend and neighbor and expect to see lots of you in the days to come."

Wadsworth Bargains Hard but With Irresistible Charm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I like James J. Wadsworth and I like the following article written about him in Tuesday night's issue of the Washington Daily News:

WADSWORTH BARGAINS HARD BUT WITH IRRESISTIBLE CHARM

(By Dickson Preston)

The words that best fit James J. "Jerry" Wadsworth, who is slated to succeed Henry Cabot Lodge as U.S. delegate to the United Nations September 3, are "big, friendly, and extremely competent."

He's so popular with U.N. delegates from other nations that it often takes him half an hour just to walk through the delegates' lounge at U.N. headquarters in New York.

And he's so affable that when he first took over as this country's disarmament chief, in 1958, a friend remarked: "If Jerry can't disarm the Russians, nobody can."

But Mr. Wadsworth is also an old hand at dealing with the Soviets without losing either a disputed point or his temper.

He has been Mr. Lodge's deputy since 1953 and has spent most of the last 2 years in Geneva negotiating on the tricky—and so far unresolved—question of banning atomic tests.

UPSETTING

Mr. Wadsworth occasionally upsets Russian delegates by winking solemnly at them during a hot exchange. Usually, after a startled stare, they wink back. They like him—although they admit he's a hard bargainer.

He's 55, 6 feet 4 (an inch or so taller than Mr. Lodge), weighs 225. At Yale, where he was graduated in 1927, he played fullback.

Since then he's learned a few other things, such as how to play jazz and folk ballads on the guitar and how to do primitive paintings so well his pals call him "Grandpa Moses."

His father, the late James W. (Jim) Wadsworth, was a Senator and Congressman who showed his political courage by running as a wet in the heyday of prohibition and by tangling bitterly with Franklin Roosevelt at the height of the New Deal. His grandfather, John Hay, was Abraham Lincoln's secretary and later Secretary of State.

Mr. Wadsworth was born near Geneseo, N.Y., where the family for many generations owned a huge estate. With a brother, he still manages a 4,000-acre cattle farm there.

ASSEMBLYMAN

He was elected to the New York General Assembly at the age of 26, served 10 years, worked for the Curtis-Wright Aircraft Corp. during World War II, and has held increasingly important Government positions under both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations.

He is married to the former Harty Tilton, of New York, and has a daughter, Mrs. Trowbridge Strong, of Philadelphia, and four grandchildren.

In moving up to the top U.S. post at the U.N., Mr. Wadsworth will get a $2,500-a-year raise to $27,500.

He'll also get living quarters in the U.S. mission's de luxe Waldorf Towers apartment, a "representational allowance" (to entertain other delegates), and use of the mission's 1960 Cadillac.

Although he's a Republican, he'll bring a measure of family bipartisanship to his new job. His sister Evelyn is the wife of Democratic Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri.

A Project Worthy of Every Citizen's Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a project worthy of national recognition and one that could be put into use throughout the country has recently been launched by the Fort Lauderdale Symphony Orchestra of Fort Lauderdale, Fla.

The residents, visitors, and school children of Fort Lauderdale are proud of their fine symphony orchestra, and its valuable contribution to the cultural life of the community cannot be measured. The fact that the orchestra is supported by civic-minded individuals and receives no tax-supported income is another reason for the pride our people have in this fine organization.

This year the orchestra has undertaken a new project to help raise funds to continue to bring good music to the community, and also hopes to bring a new feeling of patriotism into our lives.

The organization has undertaken a countywide sale of new, 50-star American flags. The profits from the flag sale will go into the orchestra fund, while the new flags will go to homeowners for display on all national holidays.

Twenty or thirty years ago such a sale might not have produced very much revenue, as most Americans had flags for their homes and displayed them with pride on all civic occasions. But today, too often on holidays the only flags to be seen in many communities are those displayed in the business areas by our merchants. A drive down a residential street clearly shows that either there are few flags in our homes today, or we have

forgotten to display a flag on proper days.

This project by the Fort Lauderdale Symphony Orchestra is one that should be duplicated by other organizations throughout the country, to help bring about a rebirth of patriotism that we need to meet the challenges confronting us today.

The Fort Lauderdale News presented an editorial by Mr. William Mullen on August 4, outlining the flag project and its implications to the community. Because this project should be of interest to other cities and towns and to all Members of Congress, I include the editorial here in the RECORD:

A PROJECT WORTHY OF EVERY CITIZEN'S SUPPORT

The Fort Lauderdale Symphony Orchestra is engaged in a countywide project desreving of the support of every patriotic citizen here.

What the symphony offers is an opportunity to catch up with the times, to manifest love and pride of country and to assist an important adjunct to our community culture.

The program is the sale of the new 50-star Old Glory, which most of us don't have, along with a lawn pole and socket so that the flag may be readily displayed on appropriate occasions.

Through this program, the symphony not only hopes to raise sufficient funds for its inspiring, entertaining and beneficial work, but it also envisions through this effort a beautiful city proudly displaying the American flag during Fort Lauderdale's 50th anniversary next March.

The flagpole-socket kit, boxed for easy storage, is priced at $8. Also available are a 3 by 5 banner with embroidered stars and sewed stripes at $6 and a 2 by 3 bunting of the same quality for $3.

The flag sales will be conducted by the women of the symphony orchestra society. They plan to call at every house in Broward County in a 4-week period to inform citizens of the project and to solicit their help in the orchestra's fine work.

A self-supporting organization, the symphony orchestra derives its funds from ticket sales, program advertising, individual contributions and money-raising projects, such as the ambitious and practical flag sale.

The orchestra then transposes its money into entertainment, education and opportunity for young musical talent here. These accomplishments are effected through five annual subscription evening concerts, four Sunday afternoon chamber concerts, in-school concerts, the donation of 300 tickets to students for the evening concerts, a youth orchestra and a symphony chorus.

The orchestra also presents two youth concerts annually in the War Memorial Auditorium, estimating that it brings fine music to 19,000 students each year through its varied youth programs.

Of course, adults who enjoy the works of the masters and of fine contemporary composers have them available through the symphony presentations.

The purpose here is to acquaint further the people of Broward County with our fine symphony orchestra and to urge that its "Buy a Flag To Fly" endeavor receive the fullest public support.

The tie-in of "Buy a Flag To Fly" and aid to the Fort Lauderdale Symphony Orchestra is indeed appropriate.

Some of our most stirring music has been composed in tribute to our national emblem; "The Star-Spangled Banner," "The Stars and Stripes Forever," "It's a Grand Old Flag," and many others.

The sales promotion also offers a fine opportunity to those who may not necessarily lean toward classical music, or the "Pops," but who nevertheless are patriotic and civic minded.

In purchasing a new flag from the women of the orchestra's society, citizens of Broward County will acquire a very fine Old Glory at a reasonable price; they will reward the women for their devotion to a worthwhile cause, and they will assist in continuing an esteemed musical project benefiting our school children.

If for no other reason, those who Buy a Flag To Fly may display it with pardonable extra pride for aiding in the school music endeavor.

The sales program is under the direction of Mrs. Roger Nesbitt and her cochairman Mrs. John L. Callan.

Undoubtedly, the sweetest music to their ears will be a "Yes," when you are asked to buy a Star-Spangled Banner to help the Fort Lauderdale Symphony Orchestra.

The money will not be wasted and the patriotism will not be lost.

An Attack Is Launched Against the Record of Representative Ken Hechler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday afternoon's mail brought a letter from my opponent in the November 8 election in the Fourth Congressional District of West Virginia. Mr. Clyde B. Pinson, who lives in my hometown of Huntington, W. Va., honored me by writing a spirited criticism against my record in the House of Representatives.

Politics and life itself would really be pretty dull if we did not have some good differences of opinion. That is what I like about Mr. Pinson's letter: It will help to sharpen the issues, so the people of our district can decide for themselves which one of us should represent them.

Of course, I am writing a complete answer to Mr. Pinson's letter which I will mail to him so he gets it before my answer is made public. Right now I just want lots of people to read Mr. Pinson's letter so they can get the full benefit of his point of view.

Most people realize these days that candidates cannot be wholly objective about their own records, how hard they have worked, how effective they are and what they have accomplished. A man's colleagues in the Congress, his constituents in his district, members of the press and others are probably in a better position to pass judgment on the achievements of the individual Member of Congress. That is why I would like to have Mr. Pinson's letter printed, and ask anyone who reads it to send me comments on what they may know of my own record or efforts on behalf of the people of West Virginia and the Nation.

There is a wonderful morning paper in my hometown, named the Huntington Herald-Dispatch, which printed Mr. Pinson's letter half a day before I even received it. Thus I am not violating any confidence by reprinting the letter. The Herald-Dispatch has attacked me editorially for putting too much junk into the Appendix of the RECORD, but I am sure that great newspaper would not place Mr. Pinson's letter in that category.

Anyhow, here is the letter, and I hope I hear from those who may read it:

AUGUST 22, 1960.

Mr. KEN HECHLER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HECHLER: When you were elected to Congress in the Democratic (sic) landslide 2 years ago, I had grave doubts about your ability to do a good job for the people of this district. You had only been in the State a few months and quite naturally you knew little of our problems.

Since January 1959 it became apparent that you were obsessed with only one thing, reelection. You made headlines through the use of gimmicks, but you did nothing to help my State. The articles you wrote on your trip to Formosa were interesting, but they did not feed our hungry children. The book you sent the Queen of England on how to take care of her baby was unique publicity, but it did nothing to bring new industry into our State. When you wore rose colored glasses into a House Space Committee hearing, you made headlines, but many people know of your consistent record of opposing defense expenditure bills.

Your party has an almost two-to-one majority in the House and Senate. This special session of Congress called by your party leaders for the sole purpose of escaping the responsibility for a do-nothing Congress, is your golden opportunity to help my State.

If you will use the remaining time left to you in Congress to do something for our people, I shall be happy to consult with you on the problems we face. As you know, Mr. HECHLER, I have lived all my life in this district. I am a taxpayer. I have a large family. I will continue to live here in the future. Aside from politics, I am vitally interested in the welfare of my State.

This is your last opportunity to ensure that this session of Congress produces something that you can show the voters of this district prior to their passing judgment of you, as the Representative of their interests.

Sincerely,

CLYDE B. PINSON.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Address of Senator Moss Before the 11th Annual Summer Conference of the National District Attorney's Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. CANNON
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the distinguished junior Senator from Utah, Mr. Moss, on August 13 was accorded a unique honor.

As a former prosecutor myself and one who has studied the career of Senator Moss for many years, I believe it is worthy of our attention that the National District Attorney's Association presented the distinguished Senator with the Furtherance of Justice Award.

Edward S. Silver, district attorney of Kings County, Brooklyn, N.Y., and president of the association, stated that Senator Moss, who was twice national president of this outstanding group, has made a notable contribution to law enforcement. In presenting our colleague with a bronze plaque, the association honored him for "his outstanding service as a prosecutor exemplifying by his courage and humanity the highest ideals of justice, and for his resourcefulness, initiative, and continued interest in all Federal legislation contributing to more effective law enforcement throughout the country."

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Senator Moss at the conference of the National District Attorney's Association be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR FRANK E. MOSS, DEMOCRAT, OF UTAH, AT THE 11TH ANNUAL SUMMER CONFERENCE OF THE NATIONAL DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S ASSOCIATION, BOSTON, MASS., AUGUST 13, 1960

Gentlemen, once again I have the opportunity to address this great organization—an organization in which I have labored and of which I am honored to be a member. I cherish the organization, my membership in it, and I cherish my colleagues and friends whom I have learned to love, to respect, and to enjoy. It is an honor to be with you at this 11th annual meeting of the National District Attorney's Association.

Sincerely I thank you for the honor you have just bestowed upon me. I accept it with the greatest pride and with deep humility. I regard it, however, not so much as a badge for service already rendered but rather as an invitation and a license to render service and as a challenge to do so. It is my hope that I can meet the challenge and make some significant contribution to the furtherance of justice.

When Ed Silver notified me that I was to be honored by being selected to receive this most coveted award, my first reaction was disbelief. Naturally I was thrilled and pleased, even though I felt unworthy. And upon further reflection I became somewhat overwhelmed with the seriousness which the subject of justice demands. Justice is a word which is used often, in many different contexts, and many times very loosely. Because of its constant use I think we tend to forget its real meaning and its significance.

Justinian's Digest says of the lawyers: "We worship justice and profess knowledge of what is right and just."

Daniel Webster said: "Justice is the greatest interest of man on earth."

Roscoe Pound defines it to be "The ideal relation among men." He further says, "The administration of justice is the adjustment of human relations and ordering of human conduct in order to achieve and maintain that ideal relation."

In the rotunda of the Department of Justice Building in Washington there is carved a sentence that was first written in a Government brief by Frederick William Lehman, a solicitor general of the United States in President Taft's administration. The words have become famous. They have a more profound meaning in 1960 than when they were first written. They will remain fresh and meaningful as long as men love justice and prize decency. The words, simple but eloquent, are: "The United States wins its point whenever justice is done its citizens in the courts."

Justice is the most pervasive purpose of society. It is an ideal for all men. It is the dream of all men of all religions, races, and creeds all over the world. It is the goal which today throughout the world is causing men to revolt against the old and established order—causing them to make sacrifices, risk their lives and their modest fortunes in their aspirations for decency and justice.

I would define justice to be that fair and impartial resolution of differences between man and his fellow man, between man and government, and between government and government, with a view to preserving to each and every individual his right to dignity, privacy, decency, and liberty.

I think that we who work daily with the law and with the management of justice sometimes become so involved with informations, indictments, warrants, depositions, witnesses, court reporters, judges, bailiffs, sheriffs, coroners, complicated legal problems (and our wives) that we cannot see the forest for the trees. Occasionally we should step back, take a deep breath, and take a look at the forest. By doing so we can recall this noble purpose of mankind—justice—and we can rededicate ourselves to that purpose.

You are probably interested in two or three things that are taking place at the national level. I suspect you think I can give you a knowledgable report on these matters. It is only fair to warn you that I, too, find it necessary to read the daily newspaper to find out what is going on in Washington, so don't be disappointed if this news is old hat.

As you know, there are two bills pending before the Congress dealing with wiretapping and eavesdropping. Both of these bills were introduced by Senator KEATING, of New York.

S. 1202 is a comprehensive bill modeled after the New York statutes. It not only relates to wiretapping and eavesdropping by Federal agents but also has an enabling clause granting authority to the States to enact legislation dealing with the same subject. There has been no hearings on this bill and it has not been considered this session. It is very unlikely that anything will happen to this bill this year.

The second bill introduced by Senator KEATING is S. 3340, which is a rather limited bill. As you know several States have statutes permitting wiretapping under court order. The U.S. Supreme Court has indicated that the Federal statutes dealing with Federal Communications Commission prohibits any wiretapping by the States, even under court order. S. 3340 would merely clarify the FCC provisions dealing with this subject and would, in effect, say that there is no prohibition in the Federal statutes to prohibit wiretapping by State agents under court order with adequate safeguards. This would, as you see, merely revalidate those State laws which permit wiretapping under court order.

Hearings have been held and the full committee reported the bill to the Senate floor. It came up on the consent calendar for consideration and upon objection by Senator HART it was passed over. I cannot predict whether or not the Senate will take action on it this year.

With reference to the legislation dealing with pornography, I can report a little more progress. A bill, which would strengthen the hand of the Postmaster General in dealing with pornography, has passed the House but there has been no action in the Senate. On the other hand, the Senate has passed a bill which would establish a commission to study the problem and set some guidelines. This bill has not been acted upon by the House. As you know, there are some constitutional questions involved and many fear that we might do more damage than good in attempting to legislate in this area. Because of the controversial nature of the problem—and I attribute good motives to all who speak upon it—I doubt that there will be any legislation passed this session.

I am sorry to tell you that we haven't had much success in getting a national charter for NDAA. The House committee has held hearings but has not taken any action. The Senate committee has not yet held any hearings and we can't really expect any favorable legislation this year. Unfortunately, it will be necessary for the organization and its members to spend a great deal more time and energy in educating the individual Members of Congress. I will continue to do my utmost for this cause.

I submit, however, that what we in Congress do or fail to do in any of these areas is relatively insignificant in comparison with the work the local prosecutors do or fail to do from day to day. This is so because the discretionary power exercised by the prosecuting attorney in initiation, accusation and discontinuance of prosecution gives him more control over an individual's liberty and reputation than any other public official.

As you from day to day go about your work as professional prosecutors, you should be consciously aware of the very vital role you play in a democracy.

Underlying the structure and fabric of our low is a bill of rights designed to protect the

life of every citizen, his liberty and his property.

At the time they framed this charter of liberties, the lawyers who in an earlier day set the fires of the revolution were mentally smarting from the personal abuses heaped upon them by king and government and the violation of personal and property rights that had been secured to free men by the Magna Carta. Officers of the king had broken into shops and homes of frnends and neighbors, searched and seized anything and everything at pleasure. Respected and honored citizens had not been free of arrest upon a hint or a sly suggestion of a petty official. Often they were imprisoned on suspicion with no opportunity to be heard and without a fair trial.

Out of their bitter experiences they wrote into the Constitution basic and fundamental principles to restrain any excesses of government and check any arbitrary power that might invade the rights of personal liberty and private property.

Today the principles of freedom and fair play are being challenged and opposed around the world by totalitarian ideology that denies the existence of God and subjects the individual to arbitrary naked power of the state.

The greatest threat to the rule of law in any of the nations of our free world is the danger that the people will become dissatisfied with the functioning of their system of justice and do irreparable injury to it, without realizing that by so doing they are destroying the very foundation of the rule of law in their society.

It is our professional responsibility to keep the pulse of life beating strongly in the law. We cannot do this by treating our fundamental freedoms as abstract theoretical concepts of a legal system. The people of the free world must learn to believe those freedoms to be what we believe them to be, the practical dynamic concepts for living, unalienable in every human being.

In earlier days the status of law in other nations was not a vital concern to us. But we are living in an era where it is no longer possible to ignore the attitudes of other peoples. This state of society is the result of two factors. Under the impact of science and technology our world is shrinking. And old empires are dissolving into new nations, filled with aspiration not unlike our own.

The tremendous success of scientists and technicians has left a gap between our scientific discoveries and their beneficial and peaceful utilization within the framework of the institutions devised to insure freedom and rights of the individual. The bridging of this gap may well prove to be the legal framework of free societies in the making.

If we reflect on the issues at stake in the cold war, if we analyze its deepest meaning, we come to the inevitable conclusion that among the most essential values at stake are legal ones: the relation between citizen and State, and the liberty and liberties of individuals.

Obviously, our system is under attack and tremendous pressure from without. Our national survival will depend upon our internal social strength. We cannot be strong in a democracy unless we can effectively enforce the criminal laws and at the same time safeguard the sacred right of the individual.

You are the agents of your State who from day to day must work and live with the criminal law, its ramifications and complexities. The strength of our Nation and the reputation it enjoys in the world is in your hands. Only if the criminal law is fairly and properly administered can this Nation survive in its present democratic form.

Keeping in mind the necessity of effectively enforcing the criminal law and at the same time safeguarding the rights of individuals it is somewhat disconcerting to look at the results.

The latest available figures dealing with criminal activity in the United States are published in the 1958 Uniform Crime Reports. The figures are astonishing. For the 1958 calendar year (the latest published report) the following criminal offenses were reported:

Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter, 3,870 for an increase of 3.2 percent over 1957.

Forcible rape, 7,622 for an increase of 13 percent over 1957.

Robbery, 56,207 for an increase of 13.7 percent over 1957.

Aggravated assault, 72,460 for an increase of 3.5 percent over 1957.

Burglary, 427,457 for an increase of 11.8 percent over 1957.

Larceny ($50 and over), 272,805 for an increase of 10.3 percent over 1957.

Auto theft, 196,784 for an increase of 1.9 percent over 1957.

It should be of interest to us that during the calendar year 1957 45 police officers were killed in the performance of their duties.

It is apparent that organized crime is growing. Starting with the days of prohibition, we saw the advent in America of organized crime on a large scale. There were different mobs operating in well-defined territories in the handling of liquor and these mobs often warred with each other. But their organization was loose and their methods were crude compared with the type of organized crime which I perceive to exist at the present time.

Since the 1930's crime has become better organized and criminal gangs now operate with the best legal and accounting advice. They have adopted corporate methods in the handling of vast enterprises.

There is no lack of money in these criminal enterprises. It is estimated that narcotics peddlers take between $180 million and $300 million a year from a gullible public. In the field of labor racketeering the take could amount to $100 million very easily. It is estimated that between $14 and $16 billion are involved in gambling enterprises of one sort or another in this country. Of this amount, over $2 billion goes into the pockets of the gamblers and the syndicates. I shall not try to estimate the millions of dollars which are involved in the distilling and sale of illegal alcohol, or in the other areas of criminal activity.

Needless to say, most of this money is not reported on income tax returns—it is "hot money." As such, it goes into the channels of illicit trade such as narcotics, vice, and other enterprises. Some of it goes into bank accounts in Switzerland identified only by a number and kept in great secrecy by bank officials, to be siphoned off abroad where it can be invested without fear of discovery.

It is no wonder then that these organized criminals have set up as a control, an invisible government whose edicts are carried out by unknown enforcers and nameless assassins and who, themselves, are not prohibited from employing the most modern devices to perpetrate their crimes and to conceal them. It is not surprising that they attempt to buy protection from those who enforce the law.

I do not wish to belabor the point and I do not wish to appear as an alarmist, but it is important to recognize the threat posed by the modern criminal—he is a modern man, with modern tools at his disposal and the know-how to use them. He is represented by modern attorneys. He deals in and with the modern corporate institutions. He circles the globe in modern airplanes and he has readily available to him modern means of communication that can put him, within minutes, in touch with almost any place in the world.

We cannot cope with a jet age criminal with a horse and buggy prosecutor. We need a modern district attorney, with modern tools and the legal right to use them. He must have the right to intercept messages, with proper safeguards for personal liberty; he must have power to compel attendance from foreign jurisdictions; he is entitled to expert counsel and testimony. American never has believed a fight to be fair and even when one participant had one hand tied behind his back. The never-ending war against crime calls for every modern weapon we have.

The prosecutor needs to become a specialist and as such should have some specialized training. There was a time when the only training a posecutor received was on the "battlefield." As a specialized profession, however, the situation is changing, and for the better. The prosecutor now has several inservice training schools which are doing a great deal toward professionalizing the office. Most of you have attended these. I submit that it is in the public interest that attendance by prosecutors should be at public expense since the public reaps the benefits in better service.

The professional prosecutor needs a professional library and the public needs to be educated as to the wisdom of paying for one. In many States the bar association can be persuaded to cooperate in the development of a good library for the prosecutor.

I am proud of the small part I have played in the National District Attorneys' Association. Through this association of prosecutors there is a continual exchange of information and ideas. And through this exchange, members not only become more competent in their duties, but they discover that many situations arise where they can be helpful to each other and thereby discharge their duties better. This cooperation of district attorneys is of inestimable value to our people.

Of course, the prosecutor can do a great deal to improve the effectiveness of his office by helping to train the personnel of the other offices with which he works. Classes and lectures for the police officers and sheriffs force can pay untold dividends in cooperation and in giving direction to the efficient performance of their duties.

Fortunately the prosecutor has now learned the value of new and modern tools in meeting the challenge—and fortunately new and better tools are becoming available—the wire tap—the FBI lab—the medical examiner, and other scientific laboratories. Also the regular exchange of information about criminals and their activities has been greatly facilitated.

The best tool which we have, however, is the well-trained, competent and imaginative professional prosecutor.

In the complex society of a democracy the modern district attorney must be a man of dedication, strength, and honor beyond reproach. This is by far the most imoprtant quality.

Perhaps one of the greatest problems facing today's prosecutor is that of his salary. This is especially true in the smaller jurisdictions. The district attorney is generally a well-trained, competent, and professional atorney. His responsibilities are large and complex, and the demands on his time are excessive. Of course this is the age-old problem of salaries for public officers, but here it is magnified since the public at large fails to realize the responsibilities involved and the value of professional legal competence. To hold any public office generally involves personal sacrifice but in the case of attorneys, the sacrifice is usually larger.

Because of this simple fact new problems are created. The prosecutor usually needs and looks for additional sources of income. He practices law on the side, either solo or in partnership and then the delicate prob-

lem of conflict of interest raises its head to haunt the prosecutor and constantly to subject him to criticism, either warranted or unwarranted, of the press and the profession. Sometimes this results in a loss of confidence by the public. I needn't tell you what this leads to.

In the same general area the prosecutor is always subject to the pressures and influence of groups who want favors and the temptation is strong to dispense such favors in the hopes of winning votes. It is interesting to note that such favor seekers consist of not only the criminal element, but also the chamber of commerce, labor groups, racial groups, churches, in fact almost everyone—his seems to be the American way of life. The prosecutor who succumbs to these requests by special groups, however, is surely undermining his own effectiveness and will eventually pay the price.

It is necessary because of these problems for the prosecutor to have the finest sense of discretion—to be absolutely honest and of unquestioned integrity. This seems to me to be the only answer and it is a standard which the great majority of prosecutors meet.

I have spent considerable time talking about the problems of prosecutors—these are the problems you live with daily—the problems each prosecutor must resolve for himself. But, the trust and the challenge of the prosecutor are greater than any one of these problems—in fact, greater than all of them put together.

The Supreme Court of New Jersey has said:

"In his county, as we have seen, the prosecutor is the foremost representative of the executive branch of the government in the enforcement of the criminal law (*State* v. *Winne* (96 A. 2d 63))."

And in Kansas, the supreme court held:

"He is the officer upon whom the State relies for the prosecution of all criminal offenses within his jurisdiction. If he fails or refuses to act, the law is voiceless and powerless. It is paralyzed (*Johnston* v. *Foster* (32 Kan. 14, 3p. 534))."

You must keep in mind that you are the chief law enforcement officers of America. By way of contrast, the courts are too remote and too formal—the public cannot speak with, deal with, or negotiate with the courts. On the other hand, the police department often is regarded by the public as being hostile, antagonistic, severe, and unapproachable. Thus, it is the prosecutor who must deal with the public on a day-to-day basis—on whom the public relies—who must shoulder the responsibility and the honor of maintaining law and order.

The public must feel that the district attorney is alert, incorruptible but understanding. He must be a man of courage—but he must also be a man with a heart and with wisdom.

It would be well for you to stop and realize that in this context, the office which you hold is to a degree more important than any other office in government. Justice is the cornerstone of our democracy, and the framers of our Constitution and the drafters of our statutes have entrusted this cornerstone in your keeping.

The Supreme Court of the United States identified this trust in the case of *Berger* v. *U.S.* when it said:

"The [prosecuting] attorney is the representative not of an ordinary party to a controversy, but of a sovereignty whose obligation to govern impartially is as compelling as its obligation to govern at all; and whose interest, therefore, in a criminal prosecution is not that it shall win a case, but that justice shall be done. As such, he is in a peculiar and very definite sense the servant of the law, the twofold aim of which is that guilt shall not escape or innocence suffer. He may prosecute with earnestness and vigor—indeed, he should do so. But while he may strike hard blows, he is not at liberty to strike foul ones. It is as much his duty to refrain from improper methods calculated to produce a wrongful conviction as it is to use every legitimate means to bring about a just one."

Speaking of fair play, I am reminded of an amusing story about a very famous international incident. During World War II, at a meeting between President Roosevelt and the Russian dictator, Stalin made a proposal which the President said he could not undertake to carry out because he thought the Republicans in the Senate would never agree to it. Stalin was genuinely astounded. "You mean," he asked, "that you have been in power all these years, and you still have Republicans?"

I would like to conclude by reminding you that this great and noble experiment in democracy has provided mankind with his best opportunity for justice. The quality of that justice is in your hands. It will not be perfect—but it is an ideal for which you can work.

Carl Schurz once said:

"Ideals are like the stars—we never reach them, but like the mariners of the sea, we chart our course by them."

It is my firm conviction that our democracy is here to stay and that the individual's opportunity for justice will survive.

If the public chooses its local prosecutors carefully, pays them well, and provides them with adequate tools and training, then our quality of justice will continue to improve.

In my experience, the district attorneys of America have been people who are devoted to the public welfare and are concerned with the effective execution of the office which they hold. Some of our finest district attorney's have turned down the opportunity to sit on the bench or to hold other public office because they were devoted to the position of prosecutor. Many others, who have chosen to move on to other fields, have nevertheless given their best efforts while holding the office of prosecutor. In any field of public endeavor where many are involved, there will always be a few misfits and downright rascals. Fortunate it is that we have had so few in America. The office of the modern prosecutor is one of great power and a fine tradition. He who takes the oath and embarks upon this service should be prepared to devote his heart and mind and his personal life to the service of his people.

Gov. G. Mennen Williams' Remarks Before Americans for Democratic Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there is no question in the minds of any of us that the overriding issue of our times is that of maintenance of a just peace.

The great Governor of the State of Michigan, G. Mennen Williams, has often expressed his interest in this vital subject and in a recent address to the Americans for Democratic Action succinctly stated the basic requirements that must be met if this objective is to be attained.

Because I believe that Governor Williams' statement would be of interest and value to Members of the House, under unanimous consent, I include excerpts from his statement at this point in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY GOV. G. MENNEN WILLIAMS BEFORE AMERICANS FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

One of the most important questions of our time then, if not the most important, is just this: Is there a reasonable alternative to the deterrence doctrine of balance of terror?

Do we have to leave the business of peace wholly to the generals or can we do something about it ourselves?

ADA has established itself as an organization dedicated to meeting the great challenges head on, with bold answers if the situation requires, so I have no doubt as to what the nature of your answer is.

Today it is not enough to be just intellectually for peace. Remember the Sermon on the Mount didn't promise the peace lovers that they should be called the children of God. The promise rather was to the peacemakers. Today's imperative is for action.

In my mind a positive, creative, active peace program can be effective. It should include at least five elements: (1) Disarmament, (2) domestic programs and institutions for peace, (3) relief of world tensions, (4) development of viable and stable economies throughout the world, and (5) world law.

DISARMAMENT

Disarmament is the symbolic keystone to a successful peace program. It is the great litmus test of sincerity of intentions. It is the unmistakable demonstration of action rather than talk for peace.

Disarmament to be effective must be mutual. Unilateral disarmament creates uneasiness rather than security. Erosion of military strength on the altar of a balanced budget creates neither peace nor good will. The world will not be happier with an unarmed America and a well armed Soviet Union. What the world looks for is mutual disarmament of all the great military powers.

There has been the practical possibility of mutual agreement on the banning of all atomic tests. And this could be the break in the logjam holding up disarmament.

As you know the U.S.S.R. has seemed willing to agree to suspend all atomic testing and submit to a detection setup that would even pierce the Iron Curtain. But our negotiators have been held back by lack of a clear American policy. The State Department has been confused by lack of Presidential directive while the Pentagon, the AEC, and others have pulled in all directions.

The choice of policy seems clear to me. The risk of the Soviet Union violating a test ban by attempting a series of small underground explosions is so small—in the face of the chance of their utter condemnation by an aroused world—that we are foolish to risk the possibilities of a nuclear holocaust by holding back from entering into a reasonable inspection-guaranteed test ban agreement.

* * * * *

Obviously the first requisite here is that the Chief Executive be prepared to organize a massive movement for peace and back it up. Outside of a travel bureau there has been no organization for peace in the White House since Stassen left.

One good way to mount such an organization is the Democratic advisory council's peace agency which Trevor Gardner has described as follows:

"One of their missions would be to apply the techniques of operations research—presently employed so sucoessfully in the development and use of weapons systems—to the generation of new ideas and new concepts for the development and use of 'peace systems.' They would work on techniques for limiting the use of space for military purposes. They would study and develop surprise attack de-

tection systems. They would examine the legal aspects of national sovereignty extending to the space domain and to the subsurface of the oceans."

Another important job is to blueprint a plan for economic and social readjustment as we disarm. There should be programing which will hold to a minimum industrial dislocation and unemployment through imaginative development of work on school buildings, roads, etc., through stimulation of the private sector by tax relief, through stimulation of business through foreign aid and investment, and so on. There should be also programs to promote individual and industrial rehabilitation for new kinds of jobs.

* * * * *

As long as men are ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed, in ill health, as long as men suffer the devastations of poverty—in other words, as long as the average per capita income for two-thirds of the people of the world is less than $100 per year, the achievement of an enduring peace is indefinitely postponed.

The very idea of peace as a desirable social condition contains the corollary idea of the importance of human dignity. We must help the peoples of Asia, Africa, and Latin America to find their way to healthy, viable, and vital economies—to break through the vicious circle of poverty and dependence, into a new cycle of self-propelled economic growth, capital formation, and growing dignity and strength in freedom.

* * * * *

Certainly there are no easy formulas to solve such tension-packed problems as the Arab-Israeli differences, the political limbo of Korea and Vietnam or the freedom of the captive nations. But that is cause for consistent attempts to break through the pseudostability of status quo stalemate.

As one example, both Adenauer and De Gaulle have indicated they might subscribe to a plan marking off a zone of relaxed tensions from the Atlantic to the Urals. This kind of disengagement would be a real breakthrough, and because it has many potential advantages for both East and West is not an impossibility.

Another example is China. Our current policy ignores the one-quarter of the human race residing in Communist China. We must seriously consider the participation of China in disarmament agreements. The policy of enforced noncommunications solves nothing, and perhaps heightens tensions. At a minimum we should encourage the exchange of newspapermen and open a freer two-way flow of information.

Well, each of these first four programs—disarmament, political settlements, economic aid and mobilization for peace—points toward a world which substitutes order for chaos, law for force in the settlement of international disputes.

* * * * *

This brings me to the fifth peace proposition and let me state my belief in this matter in no uncertain terms: Ultimately, world peace will depend on world law.

Leaders throughout the world have recognized it. Our own Secretary of State, in a recent speech, said that one of the objectives of disarmament is: "to create certain universally accepted rules of law which, if followed, would prevent all nations from attacking other nations. Such rules of law should be backed by a world court and by effective means of enforcement, that is, by an international armed force."

Obviously, we can't accomplish all of this at once, but we can begin by strengthening international institutions wherever possible: Border patrols, test-ban agreements and inspection teams, foreign aid—all of these activities can be effectively channeled through the United Nations. And that is why I believe in strengthening the one unmistakably contemporary institution of law in the world community—in the International Court of Justice.

Today the functioning of the World Court is hampered because we reserve to ourselves, under the so-called Connally reservation, the right to call a matter domestic whenever we consider it expedient not to submit to the jurisdiction of the Court. We should repeal the Connally reservation and thereby take a step in the direction of world order, demonstrate our desire to live in peace with our neighbors under the rule of law, and lead the way for other countries of the world to repeal their own Connally amendments, which they adopted after we adopted ours. The repeal of this amendment is a tangible objective we can all understand and all work for.

Family Farming—America's Ray of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, throughout our Nation thousands of farm families have worked long years through the National Catholic Life Conference to maintain those spiritual and social values that the family farm alone can contribute to the enrichment of our rural community life and our total national life.

It has been a great privilege during my years in the Senate to work closely with the Catholic Rural Life Conference to secure a national farm policy founded on a full realization of the irreplaceable social value to our Nation that accrues from thriving family farms and rural communities. In these years of cooperation it has been especially satisfying to know and work closely with the conference's former director, Msgr. Luigi Ligutti, now the director of international activities, and with the Washington representative, Father James Vizzard, S.J.

The conference in its most recent statement of policy reflects again its dedication to spiritual and social values and with the usual practical commonsense of this group emphasizes that a sound economic policy for agriculture is absolutely essential to the future of the family farm. But the conference insists, as I insist, that the question of farm policy cannot and must not be reduced to a purely economic question—ignoring basic human freedoms and all the range of spiritual and social values involved.

In the same July 1960 issue of Catholic Rural Life, the conference magazine, in which this policy statement appears there is printed an article which I prepared outlining my views on a family farm development program as contained in my proposal, S. 2502. I am greatly complimented to have my views included in the farm policy discussions of this group and to see that the conference statement of policy and my proposals are generally in agreement on the fundamentals of the farm policy our Nation must have.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the policy statement of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference and my article entitled "Family Farming—America's Ray of Hope," from the July 1960 issue of Catholic Rural Life be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF POLICY

Introduction: The American farmer is confronted with serious economic problems which jeopardize the family farm pattern and endanger many religious, social, and cultural values of the rural way of life. Procrastination and indecision on the part of rural leaders in the face of this situation would be inexcusable.

Some of the solutions proposed are so controversial that agreement about them can be hoped for only after extensive debate. Such would be true, for example, of the debate on whether or not farm subsidies are to be continued. Other proposed solutions would require extensive education and far-reaching changes in the economic, political, and social structure of rural America. An example of this would be the formation of cooperative organizations capable of controlling surpluses, strengthening farmers' bargaining power and effectively competing with vertically integrated enterprises.

Agricultural leaders should work diligently on these controversial and long-range solutions. In the meanwhile, we urge immediate action on the following solutions—solutions about which little rational disagreement can be had, solutions which can be applied readily and within the framework of our present economic, political, and social structure:

1. Let us put an immediate end to the payment of unlimited subsidies to large farms. Subsidies can be justified only on the principle of distributive justice according to which assistance is to be given in proportion to the needs of the recipient and with a view to the effect of such assistance upon the common good. No single farmer has a rightful need for tens or even hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayers' money. Neither is the common good advanced by such unlimited subsidies which often enable wealthy farmers to increase their acreage at the expense of relatively poor farmers.

2. The importation of hundreds of thousands of low-paid agricultural workers from Mexico under the provisions of Public Law 78 embodies an unjustifiable subsidy for the large-scale growers who employ them. Family farmers must compete with these underpaid workers. American born agricultural workers suffer because these alien laborers depress wage rates and reduce employment opportunities. The braceros themselves endure inadequate wages, working, and living conditions. This is not only an unsound economic policy, it is morally indefensible.

3. We must share our surplus foods more generously with undernourished peoples at home and abroad. Missionaries in underdeveloped areas can guarantee distribution to those who need food. Such a program need not seriously disrupt agriculture in other lands, because the recipients do not have funds to purchase food. If we continue to store billions of dollars worth of foodstuffs, domestic market prices will continue to fall, spoilage and storage costs will steadily consume the capital invested in these foodstuffs and we shall incur the wrath of needy people overseas.

4. We must adopt a soil use policy in keeping with the fact that presently we are overproducing some commodities and in the future we shall need to increase production for an expanding population. To advance, the conservation program must have a continuing supply of new knowledge, new ideas and

better ways of getting the job done—hence, the need for a sound research program to back up the technical assistance program essential on individual farms.

5. We must accelerate the development of industry in communities outside the metropolitan centers. This will create employment needed by rural people, make our Nation less vulnerable to attack, and alleviate the problems of supplying housing, schools, and churches in metropolitan areas.

For several decades the Extension Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture provided leadership in multiplying the productivity of the farm but it did not provide new employment opportunities for those who were put out of work by the introduction of machinery and improved methods. We urge the Extension Service to utilize its talented personnel and grassroots contacts in assisting rural communities to attract suitable industries.

Since nonfarm industries in rural areas mean the prospect of a new way of life with new problems and new pitfalls, rural leaders should make a thorough study of what is desirable and undesirable in industry. It is of supreme importance that morally sound principles be instilled at the beginning of rural industries.

As factories are established in rural areas, new legislation will be needed to protect the rights of both labor and management and to provide zoning regulations needed for the good of the community.

6. It is inevitable that some rural youths must leave the countryside to seek careers. There is great need for schools and parish organizations to furnish more guidance to these young people regarding their aptitudes. Those who are leaving should be given training for trades and professions in keeping with their abilities. Parish organizations in the urban areas should assist the incoming youth in finding dwelling and making religious and social contacts. Some of the necessary steps to accomplish these aims will need legislative action.

America's Ray of Hope—Family Farming

(By Hubert H. Humphrey, U.S. Senator from Minnesota)

For too long, our national farm policy has been engulfed in deep-seated controversy that shows little sign of abating.

The continuous debate waged over the past decade has, unfortunately, engendered more heat than light. Regrettably, it has been marred by distortions of fact, by recriminations, by misinformation, by a belittling of agriculture's basic role in our economy, and by attempts to turn city people against farm people.

Controversy is neither wrong nor harmful if it is aimed at a constructive goal. Spirited debate is helpful in a democracy, and necessary to the formulation of public opinion. But out of it should always come decision—and progress.

Make no mistake about it—better solutions can be found and must be found to the complex economic and social problems confronting rural America and its currently depressed economy. Solutions can be found that are far more in the national interest, and far less costly to taxpayers.

Supposedly, the great national debate on farm policy has all been over differences of opinion about best methods to achieve the same objectives.

The Nation's press, in trying to oversimplify a complex issue, has led the country to believe that it is merely a fight between advocates of higher price supports and lower price supports, or no price supports at all.

Actually, far more is involved.

I can no longer accept as true the premise that this struggle is merely over differences as to how we can best achieve the same objectives for farm people.

DIFFERENCES REMAIN

If we really were in accord on the purpose and objectives of farm policy in this country, reasonable men of good will long ago would have resolved such differences out of the experience of trial and error of the last two decades. The fact that it has been impossible to do so brings us face to face with the inescapable conclusion that much more is involved than the best methods to achieve common objectives.

The truth is that fundamental differences do exist over the objectives themselves—over the pattern of agriculture we should have in America.

Until we bring those differences out in open, frank discussion, we will remain bogged down on farm policy progress.

The real issue is the right to economic survival of America's traditional family farm pattern of agriculture—the most efficient the world has ever known and a solid bulwark of our free enterprise democracy.

America's independently operated free enterprise agriculture—the owner-operated family farm where managerial skills, capital investment, and actual labor are all combined; where ownership carries with it an inherent pride in the care and conservation of our productive resources; where human and social values of rural community life are not subjected to mere material values of a soulless corporation—this is what is at stake.

We are being led down a path that threatens this fundamental, basic American pattern with extinction. This is being done (overtly, not directly)—and certainly with no sanction from the Congress of the United States.

EMPHASIS ON BIGNESS

We hear less and less concern about perpetuating our family farming pattern, and more and more about giving way to the pressures of mass operations. We hear more emphasis on mere bigness and so-called efficiency, and less on human values and social problems of rural living.

This trend is deeply disturbing to me.

I am against collectivization of our agriculture—either by the Soviet pattern or by the corporate pattern of absentee ownership.

I seriously challenge the current school of thought that "bigness" may be the answer to farm prosperity. Currently the efficency factor of mass corporate farming activities is essentially cheap labor—just as it once was in the sweatshops of our industries.

I cannot conceive of a permanent, peasant-class "cheap labor" force as the source of our Nation's food supply, and the custodian of our productive resources. It would be a dangerous backward step in America's social progress, inviting the seed of social unrest and revolt. At the very minimum, it would create the necessity of farm workers organizing to bargain collectively for decent pay, eventually wiping out the supposed efficiency factor of cheap labor and at the same time endangering the assured flow of food abundance we Americans now take for granted.

No one can convince me, for example, that the Nation's consumers can ever be as well protected by having productive resources concentrated in the hands of a few giant corporations as they are today with the widely dispersed ownership of the source of our food and fiber supplies.

No one can convince me, either, that we are really more efficient if we separate capital, managerial skills, and labor into three classes in agriculture, instead of having them all combined in the family farm unit.

None of us wants to perpetuate inefficiency, or tie farmers to units too small to be economically practical. Yet, there is a distinct line between improving the efficiency of family farmers and increasing their opportunities to make family farming profitable, on the one hand, and abandoning the family operated farm concept to be replaced by large-scale industrialized farming operations with absentee-ownership and hired labor on the other.

POLICY CONCERNS CONSUMERS, TOO

Serious questions of public policy are involved if we are to cross that line. It isn't just the farmer who should be concerned. It is every consumer in America. It is every believer in real competitive free enterprise. It is every American wanting to see democracy succeed in the world.

The entire Nation needs to realize that farm policies must be geared to desirable social objectives as well as desirable economic objectives.

And foremost among such social objectives there should always remain the encouragement and preservation of our traditional rural pattern of the family farm type of agriculture that has long been accepted as essential to a strong democracy.

It is easy to understand why.

A large number of prospering farm families on family farms is a strong balancing force within the Nation against the political and social extremes of economic class warfare.

On the family farm, the economic functions of capital ownership, of arranging for financial needs, of managing the productive enterprises, and of farm labor are all performed by the farm operator and his family, thus eliminating controversy and tension along economic lines.

BUILDS GOOD ATTITUDES

Our family farm pattern of agriculture has been the basis of all our agricultural progress and good community life. It builds in farm family members attitudes of self-reliance, social responsibility, individual initiative, tolerance, and self-government—the attitudes that make for a sound and progressive democracy.

The family farm builds strong families, and the family farm builds strong social communities with good schools and active churches.

There is no need for either corporatizing agriculture, or collectivizing it. Family farmers themselves, in the true democratic tradition of learning to work together, have developed their own extension of the free enterprise system in farmer-owned, farmer-controlled cooperative marketing and supply enterprises—as a legitimate and desirable means of preserving individuality and yet finding a way to compete in an economy of bigness.

Farm cooperatives are the free world's answer to collective agriculture of the Soviet Union—and a far more successful answer. They are a powerful example to the world of how freemen, working together, can develop democratic institutions that far surpass Government-dominated collectivization for efficiency. Farm co-ops must be recognized as a vital part of our free enterprise system, and must be zealously guarded and protected along with the family farm system which they serve so effectively.

The family farm system is the right pattern for our democracy. It is right for the farmers, and to the best interest of the rest of our country. But even more, it offers a ray of hope to much of the rest of the world.

As seriously concerned as we are with our domestic problems in agriculture, the gravest problem of our time is war or peace in the world. Everything we as a Nation do, or fail to do, has an influence on the world's destiny for generations to come—perhaps even on our own survival.

AGRICULTURE'S ROLE IMPORTANT

Too little attention is given by our foreign policy experts to the real role of agriculture in creating a just and lasting peace.

At long last, we are making some progress in winning recognition of how powerful a

force for peace and freedom our undistributed abundance of food and fiber can be, when converted into economic development and elimination of hunger, disease, and misery in vast areas of the world.

Yet an even more significant contribution is being ignored.

America's foreign policy needs a dramatic symbol—a symbol of hope to newly created natons, a symbol of democracy's effective answer to Soviet propaganda.

What more dramatic symbol, what more effective ray of hope, can we offer the uncommitted nations of the world than the example of America's free enterprise family farming system, where farmers own their own land—and have a decent opportunity to share equitably in returns from the produce of their soil and their labor?

That is the story the world needs to hear.

FREEMEN WANT LAND

The dream and desire of freemen everywhere is to own land. Unrest in many parts of the world today results from insecure and inequitable farmland tenure, creating hopelessness among those who work the soil, and making them easy prey for communism's glittering false lures and promises.

The restless peasants of the world can find the ray of hope they seek in America's pattern of family farming and family farm ownership that enables the Nation's farmers to farm efficiently, conserve soil and water resources, provide adequately for their family needs, and participate fully in civic, community, and public interests.

Can we risk destroying that ray of hope ourselves?

Can we risk destroying the very symbol that proves democracy's superiority over communism?

With all of its trips into outer space, the Soviet Union cannot equal our achievements in agriculture. And it can offer no fulfillment to the dream of peasants elsewhere in the world of eventually owning a farm of their own.

How we take care of our own farmers, and our own system of farming, can have a profound effect on the struggle now underway in the world.

Other areas of the world are revolting against exploitation by bigness, and insisting upon opportunity for individual independence and dignity.

We have in our grasp the opportunity to lead them by our example, to prove democracy's effectiveness in offering equal opportunity for all.

I have not made specific suggestions here as to the means to correct our farm plight. The specifics are the easiest part of it, if we can create a real understanding in the Nation as to the fundamental objectives we seek to achieve. These objectives are fourfold:

OBJECTIVES LISTED

1. To assure the American people continued abundance of food and fiber.

2. To offer America's farmers an opportunity of achieving economic equality with citizens in other walks of life.

3. To preserve and protect America's traditional pattern of family-owned, family-operated farms as the type of agriculture best adapted to our democratic way of life, and to encourage farm cooperatives as a democratic extension of the free enterprise system to serve farm families.

4. To make greater use of America's undistributed abundance as a force for peace and freedom in a world of the hungry, and to hold forth the American pattern of family-owned and family-operated farms as a ray of hope to the millions of struggling peasants in underdeveloped areas of the world.

Once we make clear that national farm policy must be shaped to serve these objectives, the way will be clear for once again giving America the kind of farm programs that are needed.

Problems of the Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lancaster News, Lancaster, S.C., of August 22, 1960:

OFF THE RECORD

Retrospect: Several years ago, when the battle against Japanese textile imports was at its height, a sincere citizen of this community wrote the editor of this newspaper asking why, in a free America, people should not have the right to choose between a 98-cent Japanese shirt and a $2.98 American shirt.

If the Japs could offer us a quality shirt at one-third the cost of the domestic product, he said, then it was up to the American industry to match that price or suffer the consequences of failing to meet the competition.

The answer to the letter was contained in some hard facts on Japanese and American production costs. Jap wages at 14 cents an hour compared with American wages of $1.40 an hour and the ability of Japanese manufacturers to purchase American-grown cotton at 8 cents a pound cheaper than American mills, placed the American mills in an impossible competitive position. They could not remain in business without some form of tariff and quota protection.

As a tribute to the logic of this situation, the Japs did patch up a voluntary quota system which released American mills temporarily from bankruptcy. But it was a temporary release and one that rested on the commercial instincts of a predatory foreign industry. The Japs were wise enough to realize that the American market could not be swallowed in a single gulp.

The answer: We are afraid we now have a different answer to the query in our friend's letter. Americans are going to have the unlimited privilege of buying 98-cent Japanese, Hong Kong, and other foreign-made shirts.

In September in Geneva the member nations of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade are going to meet in plenary session to work out reductions in international tariff restrictions. The American delegates are already committeed to concessions in cotton textiles.

For the majority of America this may represent a real break. Shirts at 98 cents, sheets at $2 a pair, dresses at $1.98 and cloth at 50 cents a yard are real bargains.

But what of an industry second only to steel in its importance to the defense of the United States? That is how the Pastore committee characterized the cotton textile industry in its report last year to the U.S. Senate.

The cotton textile industry is going to fold. Our friend is going to have a chance to buy 98-cent shirts. But he lives in a textile-supported community. When the mills shut down, where is he going to get the 98 cents to pay for his shirt?

What is important? As against security for the United States or peace for the world, let us concede that the American textile industry is as nothing. If the decision to sacrifice the textile industry had come about as a long-range, well-considered program, we would not be happy. But we hope that we could put national considerations above personal welfare.

Actually, no such serious consideration of long-range effect has ever been included in bureaucratic planning. Cotton mills represented the quickest way to give employment to the most people in the underdeveloped nations. So the foreign aid program financed cotton mills.

It was inevitable that the output of these cotton mills would exceed the demand of native populations and that the surplus production would find its way into international trade. This was not included in the thinking of our planners.

We now have a worldwide surplus of cotton textiles. Native populations cannot afford and have no desire for 98-cent shirts. But the United States is a ready, profitable market for cheap cotton products. In fact, with its high standard of living, it is the greatest market in the world.

Tapping this market has become the most important objective in international trade. Every member nation of the GATT concentrates on securing concessions from the United States. We are accused of being a high-tariff nation; we are charged with being unfair to the have-not nations.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Of 36 major trading nations, the United States ranks eighth from the bottom in average import duties. In the percent of money collected from imports, the figure is only 5 percent of declared values. For most nations this figure is upward of 9 percent, with two major European industrial nations ranging as high as 25 percent.

What is important? Up to now the United States has been more than generous to the rest of the world in reestablishing its industrial production, in providing a market for its surpluses. Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, and a host of others are now prosperous.

But their prosperity, their continued existence, depends on the strength of the United States, economically and militarily. Should the United States fade, they would be left naked in their opposition to Communist aggression. Diplomatically, they recognize this. Commercially, the United States is their patsy.

It is important that we reassess our position in world affairs and act our age and weight. It is no longer necessary that we give any concession to any nation. Maintaining the United States in full military and economic strength is the most important objective of the free world. Nothing else counts.

Why textiles? Textiles are clothing. In the basic needs of mankind, food, shelter and clothing are always listed. The production of textiles is one of the necessary activities of mankind. To surrender this to foreign mills, to rely on importation for our needs, would amount to a return to dependence on the favor of kings for our survival.

You say this cannot happen? Let's go back to the 98-cent shirt. No American mill can produce the cloth for a 98-cent shirt. If you buy one, you have saved yourself $2. But you have deducted $2 from the sales of an American mill, an American shirt manufacturer and the store that sold it to you.

You have saved yourself $2. But you have given approval to 14 cents an hour for a Japanese textile employee. You have denied a fair wage to an American textile employee, an American shirtmaker and a fair profit to an American store.

A little of this doesn't hurt anybody. But a lot of it closes mills, discharges textile employees and bankrupts an industry. This is the result our planners have never considered.

The American textile industry is ninth in the United States in economic importance. As an employer of American citizens, it is one of the largest in the Nation. What affects this industry is bound to affect the prosperity of the United States.

Yet, our planners are willing to play ducks and drakes with this most important segment of American prosperity because some

muddleheaded idiot decided a few years back that the American textile industry could be expended in the struggle for world friendship.

Water Resources Developments: Key to Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. MOSS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, on August 22, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] delivered an address in Boulder, Colo., at the Western Resources Conference, entitled "Water Resources Developments: Key to Tomorrow."

It is an excellent address which contains a great deal of information in terms that can be understood by the public. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE] has done a great service to the Nation in pointing his finger to a very serious subject.

Because of its timeliness and its importance, I believe it should be read by all Members of Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENTS: KEY TO TOMORROW

For a rank outsider to venture into the realm of water resource development in the presence of those who have dedicated a lifetime to mastering its problems is brazenly presumptuous. Yet, the remarks to follow are undertaken in precisely such a context.

In the 1st session of the 86th Congress the Select Committee on National Water Resources of the U.S. Senate was created. Under the skillful and energetic leadership of its chairman, Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, and with the participation of all of its 17 members, the committee has striven to integrate the large volume of materials assembled in earlier studies; to update the most critical of the information; and is now preparing to translate the whole into meaningful programs for action. More than any other single force, it has been my membership on that committee which evokes the comments which follow. In no sense, however, should these remarks be attributed to that group. I, alone, bear responsibility for what I am about to say.

This intrusion into your affairs by a "Johnny-come-lately" may carry more significance than one might first think. If, as I believe it does, it symbolizes a new and spreading concern among plain citizens about our national water needs, then we may, indeed, be on the verge of a major breakthrough of one of the chief barriers to an adequate water resources program—that of massive public indifference.

In a much larger measure than some in the water fraternity are wont to admit, the problem is less and less one of definition and more and more one of action.

For all too long water experts, resource engineers, and assorted technicians have spent a disproportionate amount of time talking to each other, usually in a professional jargon unintelligible to the rest of us. Along the way, there has been altogether too little effective communication with the man on the street. What use, one is entitled to ask, is there in calculating the coefficient of N in an unlined channel unless a channel gets built in the first place. In my judgment the time has come when you should talk less with your colleagues and more with your neighbors.

Without popular understanding of both the magnitude and the urgency of the problem of adequate water resources; without a public disposition to accept—or even demand—greater tax expenditures for water, there can be little hope for major strides forward. Without it, moreover, professional and scientific advances in the field remain largely academic exercises, or possibly suffer a worse fate—that of being drowned in a sea of public apathy.

Since most everything these days seems to begin and end with money, this discussion might just as well start there, too.

The Department of Commerce has come up with an estimate that between now and 1980 we are going to have to invest through all government levels, from Federal to local, and through private instrumentalities well in excess of $200 billion in the development of our water resources. This figure is based upon a most conservative estimate, which may in fact be on the low side, that our gross national product will increase only 2.7 percent per year. A more rapid growth rate—say of 4 or 5 percent—would inescapably mean proportionate increases in water demands.

To put it differently, the per capita consumption of water is expected to double—or according to some projections—even to quadruple in the next quarter century. At present rates our population will nearly double by the year 2000. Simple arithmetic calculation suggests the magnitude of the new demands for water which lie immediately ahead of us.

To see what will be involved in this effort, one has only to examine some of the projections which have been charted for us by agencies which deal with water.

From the Public Health Service we have learned that between now and 1965—scarcely 5 years hence—we shall need to spend over a billion dollars a year on a local, State, and Federal basis just to catch up with the sewage and waste treatment needs which will exist by that date.

The Corps of Engineers warns that the total foreseeable flood control program will cost another $10 billion. This program will protect the lives and property of a substantial portion of our population.

Within the Department of Agriculture there are studies which suggest that to protect the vital watersheds from which our streams and rivers flow is going to cost over $4½ billion by 1980 and is going to involve the treatment of almost a quarter billion acres.

The Federal Power Commission foresees that by 1980 we will need almost four times the installed generating capacity we now have.

In the vital and rapidly developing field of recreation needs, the National Park Service has proposed a policy which envisages 8 billion annual visitor days of use of National, State, county, and municipal parks by 1980. By that time also there will be a total of 70 million hunters and fishermen in the fields, according to the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Resources for the future predicts that by 1980 in our own area we shall need 14.5 million acre-feet of additional storage capacity to develop the remaining water in the Colorado River system. At least this much storage is essential if we are to meet the anticipated need for power, irrigation, recreation, domestic, industrial, and other uses. The majority in Congress has consistently supported appropriations for the Colorado River storage project and has advanced its construction more rapidly than proposed by the administration, and, indeed, against strong administration opposition. There is much to be done if we are to meet the predicted need, and recognizing this, Congress has initiated six of the participating units of the project in the last four annual appropriations; three of them by overriding a Presidential veto.

One of the most damaging features added to the original bill to authorize the Colorado River storage project by the administration was the drastic change in the basis for determining the interest rate on power and municipal water construction repayments. The interest rate formula was changed from "the average rate paid by the United States on its long-term loans" to "average yield to maturity." This would result in substantially higher interest rates that would limit the financial feasibility of the project and deprive water users of many millions of dollars of financial asistance to irrigation projects from surplus power revenues. This crippling requirement has finally been removed by Senator ANDERSON'S majority-backed amendments to Public Law 86-529. We can ill afford a policy which prefers to add additional millions of dollars to interest charges at the expense of desperately needed water resource developments.

The predicted additional storage requirement in the upper Missouri River system to develop the remaining water supply by 1980 is 30 million acre-feet, and the requirements for other systems are correspondingly large.

What a delight it would be to be able to report to you that new technological breakthroughs may enable us to meet expected water needs for much less money than is now estimated. How gratifying were I able to report that by waving the wand of modern science we would solve our water problems. But, of course, I cannot do so. While Federal agencies have undertaken research programs in the deveolpment of these technical processes which may make much more water available for use or reuse, to date, progress has been painfully slow.

We are indebted again to Senator ANDERSON for his vigorous leadership in the development of research in the conversion of saline water. Thanks to his bill, passed in 1958, the administration is now finally getting around to setting up five experimental stations to test various methods for converting both sea water and brackish groundwater. There are also programs underway for the development of chemical films, such as hexadecanol, to prevent evaporation of water stored in open reservoirs, to test the feasibility of storing water in relatively impervious underground aquifers, to change the nature of plant cover for arid areas so that more water will be retained in the soil and less will be consumed through evapotranspiration and to salvage water which has hitherto been regarded as waste.

These programs do hold a great deal of promise, but they should be crash programs and not just designed to find the answers "someday." Suddenly—now in 1960—some among us have begun to grasp a sense of urgency with regard to water. Many millions more must come to the same realization before we can hope to stir public demands to meet our needs. Only in this way can the popular will become disposed to spend more money on research.

As I said, these programs are promising. But even if they are brought to fulfillment in time, they will not do the whole job. Even if they are put on a crash basis, the lag in time between the ideas which are the most concrete results of this research and their realization in efficient production inevitably lengthens as the technology involved becomes more complex.

After all of these expensive and challenging prognostications, you may be wondering

whether a sudden act of magic will pull some sort of rabbit out of a hat in the form of an easy way out. Unfortunately, there is no simple way out, but there is reason for hope.

With imagination, resourcefulness, and real tenacity of purpose our chairman, Senator ROBERT KERR, of Oklahoma, has channeled the select committee's intent into a program which has enabled us to hold hearings in every section of the Nation and in almost half the States. We have consulted with technical experts on every phase of this vastly complicated problem area; we have asked the appropriate Federal agencies for their best estimates not only as to the size and nature of the problems, but as the figures I have cited make obvious, for their best estimates of the programs we need to solve the problems.

A competent staff has toiled diligently with the tremendous volume of material which we have gathered together. All of these hearings, studies, and researches which the committee has undertaken help to mark out the road ahead.

Senate Resolution 48, introduced by Senators MURRAY and MANSFIELD and unanimously endorsed by the Conference of Western Democratic Senators, created for us the obligation to find out "the extent to which water resources activities in the United States are related to the national interest."

To serve that national interest properly in the coming years it is probable that we shall need even more than the $40 billion per year we now spend on military preparation if we are going to prevent the balance of power in the world from shifting irrevocably against us. In addition, we are going to have to develop more adequate systems of education, economic distribution, and technology here at home. In order to maintain our position of leadership in the free world, we cannot expect to rely upon military expenditures alone. We must also give economic, technical, and moral support to those nations and peoples which have recently grown to nationhood and which look to us for leadership because our Revolution has produced durable democratic institutions.

The question which is obviously raised by the size of the water resources programs we are going to have to undertake is whether or not we can do it and still meet all of these other goals which as Americans we have set for ourselves. This is a question for the members of our committee to answer in the immediate sense, but ultimately it is a question which must be answered by every American. The only answer which the American people can tolerate is that we must do it.

We have learned that such seemingly disparate problems as the development of the Central Valley project in California and the eradication of the pollution which, carried to the ocean by the rivers of Maine, threatens the future of the commercial fishing industry of that State are related. They are related because they are all involved in the national interest.

To bring it close to home, I should like to read to you an excerpt from a letter written to me as a member of the committee and included in the record of the committee hearing held in my hometown of Laramie last October. It is from the county assessor of Carbon County, Wyo. In it he speaks of the need for increased supply of irrigation water for the fertile but arid land within his county, and he says:

"In viewing the economic aspects of the present situation, we find that 6.8 percent of the land on the tax rolls of Carbon County pays 41.4 percent of the county tax. If it were possible to increase the irrigated acreage of the county, it is apparent that our revenes would increase materially, our towns would once again begin to prosper, new people would settle here, creating new wealth, and it would be an inducement for our children to stay here instead of moving away to places where opportunities are greater."

It is the people who are on the tax rolls in Carbon County, Wyo., as well as in each one of the other counties throughout the Nation who are going to have to pay the taxes which we use to accomplish our national plans and achieve our national goals.

The individual water resources development projects which are needed to increase the incomes of the residents of Carbon County, Wyo., will not only make it possible for Carbon County to meet its public goals, but, multiplied throughout the Nation, they will also make it possible for the United Sates to achieve its goals. The connection between the development of our water resources and the national interest is that only if we develop our water resources can we achieve these broad and inspiring objectives. Only in this way can we expand and otherwise "beef up" our national economic capabilities.

Up to this point in these remarks, I have dealt primarily with the enormity of our task. The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources is asked to do more, however, than to state the problem. There have been many reports on the state of the Nation's water resource development in the past. In most cases they have delineated the problem adequately. Senate Resolution 48, however, requires us also in transmitting the results of the study it authorizes, to make "such recommendations as at that time may be found desirable."

Nineteen hundred and eighty is only 20 short years away. As a Nation, we have fritted away the time we once had to do this job in a leisurely manner. Having defined the problem, we are now required to tackle its solution. This is where the West comes in. Not only is our section of the country one of the greatest remaining repositories in the world of mineral wealth, but it is also the one major section of the United States which has not yet fulfilled the promise which these riches imply.

One of the most precious of our unexploited nonmineral treasures is space. We have room for the burgeoning population of America and if we develop our water resources so that water shortages do not put a ceiling upon the extent to which our population can increase, we can support this population at a desirable standard of living. The programs which I have already described are national in scope, but the West is going to be called upon to do more than its share in carrying them out, and the West is ready.

Even with transpiration, evaporation, consumption, and seepage into impervious acquifers, three-fourths of the water of our western rivers still discharges into the ocean. This means that the West has only begun to use its water. The Bureau of Reclamation, in its report to the committee, states, "The amount of physically feasible water resource development remaining in the 17 reclamation States is enormous."

Their report summarizes 1,085 reclamation projects, both public and private, upon which construction has not yet been undertaken.

The Bureau estimates that 75 percent of the Federal projects and 90 percent of the non-Federal projects listed can be developed by the year 2000. Such a program would provide for the irrigation of 17 million acres of new land equivalent. It would pour over 4 million kilowatts of hydropower into our transmission systems. It would cost $22 billion.

At this point someone not acquainted with our western economy and with the vital relationship of the reclamation program to the national interest might ask, "In light of present crop surpluses, is it all worth it?" The answer is that it is not only worth it, but that the Department of Agriculture has warned us in its report to the committee that we may need an increase of as much as 34 million acres of irrigated land on a nationwide basis by the year 2000 to feed our population. The Department makes it clear that whatever the level of present crop surpluses, the need for the products of agriculture will increase in the future.

It is estimated that the domestic market for farm products by the year 2000 will range between 85 percent and 200 percent higher than it was in 1954. Not only is our population going to increase but our consumption per person of meats, fruits, and vegetables is going to increase. Millions of acres of currently productive nonirrigated land are going to be converted to other uses by the year 2000 as the result of population growth.

Obviously, it would not be in the country's interest to steal these new millions of needed acres from existing forest lands. Reclaimed land is the answer. The West is ready to do its share, but we cannot make the necessary progress if our vision of tomorrow is blurred by a myopic fixation upon today's surpluses.

A Bureau of Reclamation report describes a program in which the West can provide food and fiber and otherwise absorb 25 million more people. In addition, it would enable us to build a quarter-million new full-time family-size farm units and add 800,000 persons to the farm population. Additionally, this new West could support an increase in local nonfarm population of 2.4 million people. In the process there would be need for over 40,000 new local retail enterprises which would do more than $4 billion in retail trade each year. Predictable growth of this magnitude in our western economy would add almost $1 billion to the Federal Treasury each year.

I want to call particular attention to the last of these points because it reveals dramatically the relationship to the national interest which I have already discussed. This is the type of investment in the Nation's economic future which some habitually charge off as free spending. Evidently they do not realize, either, that these investments are repaid to the Government, or that they add many times their own sum to the gross national product.

It is diffcult at this time to foresee the exact nature of the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources' report to Congress. It is already obvious, however, that the committee and the Nation are going to have to muster the courage to ask the right questions and to face the consequences of honest answers and unpopular solutions. It is not simply a matter of spending a great deal more money. While finding more than $200 billion for water resource development is a staggering prospect, it would be a delusion to think that we can somehow buy our way out of our predicament. Much more than money is demanded of us.

We have conflicts of long standing which are now hindering the progress of vital water resources development work. For example, what shall be done about the question of Federal-State water rights? The first Iowa and Pelton Dam decisions have intensified this conflict, rather than resolving it. Unless one understands its true nature, and thus how serious it is, one cannot comprehend the extent to which it diverts the energies of officials at all levels of government as well as those of private individuals. The overall result is a tragic sapping of the thrust for progress at the very point in our history when progress is absolutely essential to the national interest. We must now face the fact that until this area of controversy and uncertainty is resolved, it will continue to erode our water resource capabilities.

This conflict must be resolved in order to unleash our full energies for progress in water resource development.

A second question is: How many agencies of what kind are needed to supply the maximum development with the minimum waste of the Nation's water resource potential?

At present, 25 separate Federal centers alone possess jurisdiction over some phase of water development. Would 125 do it better? Or would just one be more effective? The answer will not be easy to come by. Deep-vested interests, bureaucratic empires staked out earlier in our history, and petty jealousies and rivalries mitigate against a clearcut decision. Yet in some way, a wise decision must be reached. This problem can no longer be swept under the rug.

Perhaps the moment is at hand to apply to our water agencies the same harsh demands made of our defense agencies. In the late forties, after they had existed separately for more than a century and a half, the Armed Forces were finally coordinated by act of Congress. It was not an easy job, and I would be the last to claim that we now have entirely effective coordination in our military effort. Yet, most citizens have come to accept the central judgment that national defense should be first in priority, rather than the perpetuation of historic rivalries for tradition's sake.

So it might be with water. If, despite their advantages, there is reason to believe that our multiple efforts and dispersed responsibilities for water development slow down and/or waste too much of our water potential, then what was done for the armed services could also be done, if careful study disclosed it to be good public policy, for our water agencies.

Whatever may be done about combining our water agencies, there is no doubt that we now need greater coordination of resources and conservation efforts within the administration and Congress. Led by Senator MURRAY, of Montana, many of us sponsored a bill (S. 2549) during the second session of the 86th Congress which was designed to supply this coordination by creating a joint committee in Congress and a responsible agency in the Executive Office of the President. This seems to many of us to be a good approach. But the question is not whether this approach is right or whether there is a better one; it is whether we are going to make an approach to these problems and attempt to solve them now or to fritter away once again the chance to take decisive measures.

Perhaps the most acute problem which we must face with respect to water resources, whether we have one Federal agency or many, whether we have a joint committee in Congress or not, and whether we settle the Federal-State water rights problem or not, is that of water priorities. How we shall allocate our water resources among the various geographic and functional sectors of our economy? If we do not utilize fully the water-saving techniques of which we are already aware and if we do not start now to develop our water resources, there are going to be greater shortages and the need for water will rise more sharply than our capacity to furnish it.

This question is a tough one, too. Unless present trends toward greater water shortages are reserved, we in the West, for example, may someday soon have to determine whether we can spare water for both cows and people. We may be approaching the point in parts of the West where a gallon of water will be worth more than a gallon of oil. Last summer the State engineer in New Mexico was forced to limit the use of irrigation water to protect municipal supplies because the San Juan-Chama project—already authorized twice by Congress—hadn't been constructed.

Similar shortages are threatening irrigators on the east slope in Colorado. There, also, projects have been authorized by Congress but remain unconstructed.

In 1954 38 percent of our cities all over the country with a population of more than 100,000 had to ration water. Such shortages, always particularly acute in the West, weaken and erode the capacity of our western cities to attract new citizens, and lessen the willingness of new industries to locate here.

Not only do these shortages put an artificially low ceiling on our growth, but they also cause industry and population to pile up in the already populous areas which, for the moment, have enough water. Thus, the vulnerability of our industry to military attack may be increased, social and economic problems affecting proper community growth arise, and all relate the problem of water location and use, once again, back to the national interest.

In the future we must apply a new standard when we are trying to decide whether any particular water development project should be undertaken. This new standard must, in my judgment, take into account the effect of the project on our national rate of growth. It should also measure the results of the project as a generator of employment as well as its effects on the distribution of income among the geographic and functional sectors of our economy. In addition, the revenue potential for all levels of Government—Federal, State, and local—should be weighed in the balance. In short, it must relate the particular water resources development project to our national destiny in a much more sophisticated and relevant way than has any conceptual device we have used up until now. Such a standard will reflect the relationship of the needs of individual people throughout the Nation to the national interest. It will reveal to us in each instance the connection between the fulfilling of these needs by the individual water project and the fulfilling of our national aspirations.

This, then, is the problem of water as it appears to me. Forgive me for having taken the question of water out of the professional arena and for having tried to put it in the public market place. Stripped bare of jargon, the facts are tough—sometimes shocking—and, in a few instances, even frightening. They will be ignored or soft-pedaled only at the Nation's peril. If not ignored or soft-pedaled, they still will pose a difficult future because they lay upon the public conscience weighty problems, the solution to which will cost much money and even more hard work. I am confident it can be done; I know it must be done.

Military Cemeteries Overseas—Part 1

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I represented our committee at the dedication of the American military cemeteries and memorials overseas during the recent recess of Congress.

Upon my arrival in France, I was immediately escorted to the dedication of the Henri-Chapelle Cemetery and Memorial in Belgium. It is located about 2 miles northwest of the village of Henri-Chapelle which is on the main highway from Liege. This cemetery covers 57 acres and 7,989 of our war dead are buried here, most of whom gave their lives during the advance of the U.S. Armed Forces in Germany. The headstones are arranged in gentle arcs sweeping across a broad green lawn which slopes downhill. To the east is the long colonnade which, with the chapel and museum room, form the memorial overlooking the burial area. The chapel is simply but richly ornamented. In the museum are two maps of the military operations, carved on black granite with inscriptions recalling the achievements of our Armed Forces. On pylons of the colonnade are inscribed the names of 450 of the missing who gave their lives in the service of their country. Also carved thereon are the seals of our States and territories.

The dedication address was delivered by Capt. William Hallam Tuck, U.S. Naval Reserve. Others addressing the gathering were the Honorable William A. M. Burden, American Ambassador to Belgium; the Honorable John J. McCloy, representing the President of the United States; and the Honorable Albert Lilar, Vice Premier of Belgium.

The band played the national anthem of Belgium, "La Brabançonne," which was followed by our anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Since I was unable to be present at the dedication ceremonies held on July 4 at the military cemeteries in Luxembourg and Margraten, in the Netherlands, I requested permission to visit these two cemeteries which was granted by the Chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission, Gen. Jacob L. Devers.

The Luxembourg Cemetery lies within the city limits of Luxembourg. It is situated in a beautifully wooded area, 50½ acres in extent. Not far from the entrance is a white stone chapel, set on a wide circular platform surrounded by trees. It is embellished with sculpture in bronze and stone, a stained-glass window with American unit insignia, and a mosaic ceiling. Flanking the chapel at a lower level are two large stone pylons upon which are maps carved in various granites with inscriptions recalling the achievements of the American Armed Forces in this region. Inscribed thereon also are the names of 370 of the missing whose remains were never recovered or identified.

Sloping gently downhill from the memorial is the burial area, containing 5,076 of our military dead, many of whom gave their lives in the Battle of the Bulge and in the advance to the Rhine. The headstones follow along graceful curves; and trees, fountains, and beds of roses along the main paths add to the dignity of the ensemble.

My next visit was to the only American military cemetery in the Netherlands, which covers 65½ acres and lies in the village of Margraten. Its tall chapel tower can be seen from a considerable distance. Upon entering the cemetery, the visitor is led to the court of honor with its pool reflecting the tower. To the right and left, respectively, are the visitors' building and the museum which has three large engraved maps depicting the military operations of the American Armed Forces. Stretching

along each side of the court are two walls with the names of 1,722 of the missing who rest in unknown graves.

Beyond the chapel is the burial area, divided into 16 plots, for 8,301 of our military dead. The headstones are set in long graceful curves and a wide tree-flanked mall leads to the flagstaff which crowns the crest.

The light fixture in the chapel, the altar candelabra and the flower bowl were presented by the Netherlands Government and by the local provincial administration. During the dedication ceremony, Her Majesty, the Queen of the Netherlands, was presented. The following addressed the gathering: the Honorable Philip Young, American Ambassador to the Netherlands; the Honorable John J. McCloy, representing the President of the United States; His Excellency Ir. S. H. Visser, Netherlands Minister of Defense; and the Honorable Wilber M. Brucker, Secretary of the Army. After the Netherlands national anthem, "Het Wilhelmus," the band played the "Star Spangled Banner."

In the next issue of the RECORD, I will include the remainder of the military cemetery dedications I attended.

Automation Without Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH S. CLARK
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech delivered at the Harvard Business School Conference on Automation, June 2, 1960, by the secretary of labor and industry of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the Honorable William L. Batt, Jr., on the subject of "Automation Without Fear."

These remarks are an unusually able analysis of the problems of displacement of workers by technological change and of the steps which must be taken if we are to minimize the hardships and suffering which result.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUTOMATION WITHOUT FEAR
(Remarks of William L. Batt, Jr.)

Automation, like so many innovations in our society, is a mixed blessing. It protects jobs by making the companies that keep abreast of technical innovations more competitive. It also causes unemployment by replacing men by machines. We welcome it because we have been conditioned to welcome laborsaving devices, whether they promise added economies in production, or greater volume with lower unit cost, or simply less work for mother. Automation has been promoted in the United States perhaps more speedily than elsewhere in the world not only by aggressive managements, many of them forced to compete in increasingly competitive national and world markets, but also by aggressive unions which have steadily driven wage levels up through free collective bargaining and made the considerable capital required for laborsaving machinery well worth the investment.

Despite enormous such investment in recent years, much of our industrial plant is still obsolescent and must be replaced if our industries are to remain competitive and the jobs of their workers protected. Leaders of organized labor have generally recognized this, despite their quite understandable fears of the unemployment it causes. One steel union official recently, after pointing out to me that production in his plant was down to half its capacity and the labor force had gone on a 4-day week, expressed the ardent hope that that company would succeed in its current efforts to raise new capital to replace some of their old open hearth capacity with new oxygen converters, even if it cost jobs for his members.

Isn't this the problem we face? How do we assure to ourselves the blessings of automation, without exacting a prohibitive price in increased unemployment, the impact of which falls today almost entirely upon the displaced worker and his family?

After all, to the displaced worker, unemployment caused by automation is not unlike unemployment caused by a myriad of other causes, and it's often hard to differentiate, identify, and measure. The 20 percent unemployment in the southwestern bituminous coal mining section of Pennsylvania has been caused in large part by the dramatic automation in that industry as a whole. Four-hundred and forty-five million tons of coal were produced in 1937 with 492,000 employees, and 410 million tons in 1958 with 195,000 employees, only 8 percent less production with 60 percent less workers. But major contributing factors have been the loss of the railroad market to oil, the exhaustion of some deposits in this area, decreasing exports as world production and trade barriers have increased, and import competition from residual fuel oil from South America.

Nor is there much difference between the character of bituminous unemployment in southern Illinois and eastern Kentucky, or anthracite unemployment in eastern Pennsylvania, or textile unemployment in New England, or automobile unemployment in Michigan.

Just as there is not much difference in the character of unemployment, so there is not much difference in the cure. Whether it be New England or southern Illinois or upper Michigan or West Virginia, the areas have got to find a new economic base and set about attracting and developing the new industries needed to employ their workers. Aggressive Federal and State Government aid is essential if this problem is to be substantially solved in our lifetime.

What we need as a matter of top priority in the next administration is to undertake as a nation a three-point adjustment assistance program. Although they are listed consecutively, this implies no time priority. We can and should move on all three fronts at the same time.

First, strengthen our unemployment compensation and other social insurance programs so that the most pressing immediate financial needs of the displaced worker and his family are met;

Second, vastly supplement and strengthen our counseling, retraining, rehabilitation, job development, and placement resources so that he can be promptly retrained for and steered into a new job in a growth industry well matched to his aptitudes and interests; and

Third, and most important of all, see that our Federal Government effectively implements the Employment Act of 1946, not only as regards maximizing production and employment nationally, but also in areas and regions long plagued by chronic unemployment. The best social insurance system and retraining and placement resources are of little use unless there is a job at the end of the readjustment process.

1. We must have more adequate social insurance throughout the Nation, to provide an immediate source of financial support for the jobless worker and his family. Unemployment compensation only lasts for 26 weeks in most States. Chronic unemployment in areas like the anthracite section of Pennsylvania or the cutover areas of Michigan's Upper Peninsula may last for years. Even in the recession of 1958, much of our cyclical unemployment in the steel industry lasted from September 1957 until late fall of 1958, a far longer period than unemployment compensation is now designed to cover.

Unemployment compensation benefits are far below the levels contemplated when the act was passed. Originally conceived as replacing two-thirds of a worker's lost pay envelope, in most States it still falls short of replacing half of average earnings. Since there is no required standard nationally, benefit amounts and duration differ widely. Low-benefit States use their poor standards as an inducement to industry to favor their States for new plant location. Federal minimum standards along the lines proposed by Senator JOHN KENNEDY are long overdue.

Yet in pointing out the shortcomings of our unemployment insurance system, let none of us underestimate the unique role it already plays as our first line of defense against unemployment of whatever character—cyclical, chronic, seasonal, automation-caused, or merely frictional. It not only helps the displaced worker and his family meet their irreduceable minimum needs, but it helps support consumer purchasing power in the economy at exactly the places and times that economy is hit by reduced payrolls. Even conservative economists credit this program with being one of the most influential forces in reversing recent recessions. The National City Bank Newsletter and Harvard's late, great Sumner Slichter both agreed on this point in late 1958. In Pennsylvania alone, close to $400 million was paid in U.I. benefits in calendar 1958. For purposes of comparison, payrolls in steel, our largest industry, totaled $1.5 billion in the same year. The steel-union supplemental unemployment benefits plan certainly proved itself of immeasurable value in that recession too, not only to its workers, but as a considerable countercyclical influence in the National and State economies as well.

No matter how you improve unemployment insurance, however, it will still fall far short of meeting the needs of many unemployed in many national or local economic crises. While the suggestion has been made that unemployment insurance continues until a worker gets called back or gets another job, however long a period this might be, and this certainly has a great appeal from the worker's standpoint, it would be quite unmanageable from the Government's viewpoint and inequitable to the business taxpayer.

More feasible expedients are extending benefit duration in long national recessions by temporary unemployment compensation, extending benefits for the worker taking retraining for a new occupation, as proposed in the Douglas area redevelopment bill, reviving the food stamp plan so that our huge agricultural surpluses can be far more effectively used than they are today in feeding our own hungry people, and finally, improving public assistance by national participation and national standards.

Public assistance now has a connotation of the pauper's oath that degrades the recipient. In my State, a worker has to sign over his mortgage to the State to qualify. Seventeen States deny public assistance to families with one employable member, whether there are jobs available or not.

Residence requirements in 49 States ban many needy families. In 18 States, the father must desert his family for his children to qualify for aid to dependent children. Obviously, if public assistance is to do its part of the job of building a better minimum standard of decency under the families of our long-term unemployed, we need to take a good long look at it all across the Nation.

2. Social insurance by itself is obviously not enough. Unemployment compensation is designed primarily for the temporarily unemployed—the steelworker laid off because of lack of orders—as tens of thousands are laid off today—with the full expectation on their part and their employer's part that they'll be called back when business picks up.

It is of much more limited usefulness to the anthracite miner laid off for good, who never again will work at his trade. What he needs, like all the rest of us, is the self-respect that goes with a useful job. What can be done to help him help himself back into dues-paying membership in our reputedly affluent society? We can identify him the first time he appears in the unemployment compensation line and make sure he obtains the fullest benefit of our testing, counseling and job development resources in the employment service side of the same office. If retraining is needed in a new skill in order to land a new job, we can see he obtains such training while his benefits are still coming in to support his family.

True, substantial additions must be made to our State and national employment services in skilled personnel, in budget allowances for counseling and job development activities and in imaginative leadership. Likewise, our public school systems and vocational educators must take on their proper responsibility for equipping the unemployed with new skills in short supply occupations. We have some brilliant examples where this is being done—centers like the Williamsport Technical Institute who equip young and old from their town and from other towns throughout the country with saleable skills in jet engine repair, draughting, neon sign construction, welding, bricklaying, electrical wiring, offset printing and many others, placing 95 percent of their graduates even in national recession. Such facilities should be available to every one of our long-term unempolyed as well as to our young people graduating into job markets demanding progressively higher and higher skills.

Of almost equal value is adequate testing, counseling, job development and placement effort in cases where retraining is not required. In an experimental program in Philadelphia with unemployed older workers, we succeeded in placing 30 percent of 1,600 between 40 and 65 years of age, when we poured in this kind of intensive personal attention to each case. In our control group without this personalized attention and left to the vagaries of the job market in the recession year of 1958, only a fraction of 1 percent were placed, despite State legislation making discrimination against hiring older workers illegal.

We have noted with interest the work being undertaken in the steel and meatpacking industries to distribute the benefits of automation fairly between the workers, the stockholders and the public. How about the fellow who loses his job because of automation? Should he not be perhaps the first claimant on any benefits? Surely he is the one paying the highest price.

Clint Golden, of Steelworkers Union and Harvard Business School fame, suggested in a recent talk at Duquesne "creating a fund out of the savings from automation. This could be used for training men, more liberal severance pay and the transfer of workers to other companies."

I would like to see a pooling not only of financial resource, but also of knowledge of men, of skills and of the labor market, by management, labor and government, to make sure that those men who lose their jobs as the result of automation or any other reason get the full benefit of our society's resources for counseling, for retraining, for job development and for placement in a new occupation.

Progressive management must realize that the victims of automation must be helped to readjust if they expect to maintain the wide public and labor acceptance of technological innovation that they enjoy in this country today.

Adoption of an "every-man-for-himself" philosophy by management could lead to demands on legislative bodies to restrict the right of management to lay off workers, irrespective of decreased demand or increased automation. In Italy, such government-sponsored featherbedding is the law of the land.

3. But without a doubt, the most important single factor of this three-point adjustment assistance program is the achievement of substantially full employment, not only in the Nation as a whole, but also in areas and in population groups of long-term chronic unemployment.

Unemployment insurance is of limited duration, and so is a worker's morale. Long-continued enforced idleness exacts an immeasurable toll in a man's self-confidence and feeling of usefulness to society, to himself and to his family.

Nor is the most effective counseling, retraining and job development program of much use in a job-scarce economy. It makes no sense to train people for jobs that don't exist.

We can only solve our problems of unemployment in the context of an expanding full employment economy. Prof. John Dunlop of Harvard, in his provocative paper for the Senate Special Committee on Unemployment Problems, suggests this would mean 2 million unemployed or 3 percent of the labor force; 3 percent would represent a dramatic improvement over the 5 percent average unemployment of the last 6 years, but this is a goal well within the realm of possibility. The fears of automation we're concerned about today cannot be dispelled if we set our sights any lower or achieve any less.

Of course, overall statistics tend to obscure disproportionately high unemployment rates among special hard-to-place groups in our labor force, such as older workers, unskilled younger workers, minority groups and handicapped workers. National averages also gloss over much higher unemployment in areas of chronic long-term labor surpluses.

For instance, while we have unemployment today of only 5 percent nationally and 7 percent in my State of Pennsylvania, almost 20 percent of the labor force is idle in the Pottsville anthracite area, the Uniontown bituminous area, and 15 percent in the Altoona railroad area, in spite of heavy outmigration and intensive and outstandingly successful State-aided industrial development programs.

These situations are well known, as are those of the textile cities of New England, the automaking cities of Michigan, the coal towns of Kentucky, West Virginia, Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois. But in a dynamic economy like ours, who can foretell what industries will decline next, forcing wholesale readjustments by workers, communities and States now largely dependent upon them? What would happen to Wichita, East Hartford and Los Angeles if peace broke out, disarmament progressed from dream to reality, and we folded up our defense industries as we did in 1945?

It is my firm conviction that we cannot solve the unemployment problem in the United States and reach the targets Professor Dunlop has set until we face up to and solve this problem of chronic area unemployment. In November 1959, the total unemployed in the 172 distressed labor markets numbered 923,000. With but 13.7 percent of the civilian labor force, they accounted for 25.1 percent of the unemployed. The average rate of unemployment was 9.8 percent as compared with a national rate of 5.3 percent with rates of 20 percent and higher in some of the areas. If we had better statistics on duration of unemployment, we would see that a far higher proportion of the Nation's long-term chronic unemployment, by any standard our most critical kind, is centered in these same areas.

The techniques for solving area unemployment are well known. We have used them in foreign-aid programs since the days of President Truman's Marshall plan and point 4 program. They consist of a combination of technical assistance to regions and communities for economic planning, loans to industry for plant expansion, loans and grants to communities for utilities necessary for new industry, and training and subsistence for jobless workers to equip them with needed new skills. They have been embodied in the so-called area redevelopment bill introduced by Senators DOUGLAS, CLARK, KENNEDY, COOPER, and many others of both parties which has passed the Senate three times, the House twice, only to be vetoed by the President on two occasions.

This area redevelopment bill is based on extending and accelerating tried and proven principles of diversification of industry through attracting new growth industries into communities and areas to replace jobs lost in declining or migrating industries. The vast expansion of electronics in New England to partially replace the lost textile industry is a case in point.

In my State, hard-hit communities of 20,000 population have raised a million dollars and more to lay out planned industrial districts, construct 40,000 square foot industrial shell plants on speculation, and brought in branch plants of "bluechip" industries to help provide jobs for their unemployed. The State has supplemented their efforts with an aggressive industrial development program initiated by Gov. George M. Leader with strong utility, banking, railroad, and industrial development backing, and with $20 million in second-mortgage funds. This enables us to offer industry 100 percent financing for new plants and plant expansions. This program has been instrumental in Pennsylvania's attracting 84 new enterprises in the last 6 months of 1959—more than any other State in the Union.

But these new plants are not absorbing our labor surpluses fast enough. Continuing to subsidize this surplus unemployment is enormously costly—far more than the cost of helping finance new jobs in expanding industries. In the last 7 years, Gov. David L. Lawrence has recently estimated that unemployment insurance and public assistance for our surplus labor areas alone has cost us $440 million more than it would have, had we had full employment, an average of $63 million a year. We have found it is far more economical to invest in productive jobs than to subsidize idleness. You can understand Pennsylvania's interest in Federal area redevelopment legislation.

Both parties have endorsed the idea in their platforms. The differences between Congress and the President have been more of mechanics and of degree than of basic principles. It is my devout hope that such a program will be high on the agenda of the next President and the next Congress. Until we apply what we already know to the solution of long-term chronic unemployment, we will never reduce our national unemploy-

ment to the low levels achieved by Switzerland, Sweden, Great Britain, and other Western European nations we like to think are no smarter than we are.

On the whole, I am optimistic that the dislocations of unemployment caused by automation, just as those caused by unemployment from any other source, can be absorbed with a minimum of shock to our society. But we will have to invest some of the same kind of money we put into machinery, into people. And we must have national leadership with the will and imagination to do so.

Government's role may be viewed as a three-sided adjustment assistance program. First, greatly improved social insurance to build a floor of human decency beneath our unemployed workers and their families. Second, radically improved machinery of counseling, testing, retraining in short-supply skills, job development and placement, to assist our technologically unemployed to become self-supporting and self-respecting. And third, a far more effective national full employment policy, aimed not only at minimizing cyclical nationwide unemployment, but also at correcting chronic, long-term area and group unemployment.

Only if we achieve substantially full employment in our free society, once defined by Sir William Beveridge in his historic study of that name as an economy in which there are more jobs than men instead of more men than jobs, a society where people feel in demand and not in surplus, only then can we greet automation without fear.

Health Aid for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times, August 25, 1960:

HEALTH AID FOR THE ELDERLY

Few issues have aroused such prolonged and warm debate during this session of Congress as has the question of providing adequate financing for the medical needs of persons over 65. Among the various alternatives available we favored the principle of attaching to the social security system a mechanism for accomplishing this end. This principle the Senate has now rejected, and whatever plan emerges from conference with the House is bound to be less than adequate.

The arguments for the social security approach may be briefly summarized. It would avoid anything resembling a means test for eligibility, a kind of test we believe Americans find abhorrent. It could have taken effect nationally in short order because the apparatus required already exists in the existing administrative arrangements for social security measures. There is no objectionable element of compulsion involved because Americans already accept the principle of paying social security taxes, and the change involved would only be a slight increase in those taxes accompanied by corresponding benefits for those meeting eligibility requirements. And we believe there is no real element of socialism attached since hospitals, doctors, and others involved in giving medical care to beneficiaries would not be controlled by the State as they are where systems of socialized medicine exist.

By now the use of the social security system as the means by which our society attempts to provide a minimum cushion and protection for the elderly is a well-established part of our American tradition and practice. Its extension to medical care for this same group seems logical and beneficial. We hope and believe it will ultimately prevail.

The increased number of our people in the elderly population bracket and the steadily rising cost of medical care combine to present a problem that must for human reasons be solved, and before too much time has passed. The Congress will have to come to grips more realistically with this problem when it reconvenes in January after the political season.

The Rugged Individual and Government Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Rugged Individual," which was published in the Rotary magazine.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RUGGED INDIVIDUAL

It seems a young man lived with his parents in a public housing development. He attended public school, rode the free school bus, and participated in the free lunch program. He entered the Army and upon discharge kept his national life insurance. He then enrolled in the State university, working part time in the State capital to supplement his GI check.

Upon graduation, he married a public health nurse, and bought a farm with an FHA loan and then obtained a Small Business Administration loan to go into business. A baby was born in the county hospital. He bought a ranch with the aid of a GI loan and obtained emergency feed from the Government.

Later he put part of his land in the soil bank and the payments helped pay off his debt. His parents lived comfortably on the ranch with their social security and old-age assistance checks. REA lines supplied electricity. The Government helped clear the land. The county agent showed him how to terrace it, then the Government paid part of the cost of a pond and stocked it with fish. The Government guaranteed him a sale for his farm products.

Books from the public library were delivered to his door. He banked money which a Government agency insured. His children grew up, entered public schools, ate free lunches, rode free buses, played in public parks, and swam in public pools. The man owned an automobile so he favored the Federal-aid highway program.

He signed a petition seeking Federal assistance in developing an industrial project to help the economy of his area. He was a leader in obtaining the new Federal building and a new post office and went to Washington with a group to ask Congress to build a great dam costing millions so that the area could get cheap electricity.

Then, one day, he wrote to his Congressman:

"I wish to protest excessive Government spending and high taxes. I believe in rugged individualism. I think people should stand on their own two feet without expecting Government handouts. I am opposed to all socialistic trends and I demand a return to the principles of our Constitution."

Let the Enemy Do His Own Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with the Powers trial in Moscow a front-page story we must be careful at this time not to get hysterical about the U–2 program. It has been of invaluable assistance to our defense planners in providing much-needed information about the Soviets' aggressive intentions.

As one who has investigated the entire U–2 program, I can assure my colleagues that our country and its people should thank God for the foresight that brought about the U–2 reconnaissance flights. America is safer today and in the future because of this program.

Under unanimous consent I include as a portion of my remarks an outstanding column from the San Diego Union by one of the Union's most respected editors, Richard F. Pourade:

LET THE ENEMY DO HIS OWN WORK

(By Richard F. Pourade)

The liberals have fallen back in exhaustion after the excesses of deriding their own country over the U–2 spy incident, the summit conference failure, and the Communist-inspired riots in Japan. There hasn't been so much excitement since Alger Hiss.

A liberal crescendo can be set off by the merest of incidents, but the magnitude of the events of the past few weeks caused their usually well-synchronized proganda effort to get out of hand. Adlai Stevenson went so far as to shock many of his own supporters, and Senator JOHN KENNEDY was stirred to suggest President Eisenhower should have apologized to Khrushchev.

In all fairness it must be said that there was general restraint in legislative halls. Most Senators and Congressmen realized the terrible implications of careless words at such a delicate time. The country came first.

From where, then, came the barrage that swept the country, that caused doubt and confusion, that turned one citizen against another in angry debate, and for a time left the country appearing divided and uncertain before the world?

The United States is a country of almost overwhelming communications. Thousands, even millions of words pour down upon the average citizen. The very volume of information and the competitive speed with which it is disseminated makes selectivity and appraisal—and caution—difficult but vitally necessary.

While most newspapers in the last few decades generally were driving toward objectivity in the news, there was a paralleling development of comment and interpretation. The newspaper columnist and then the radio and TV commentators largely took over from

where the old-style personalized journalism left off.

This has been an attractive field for the articulate idealist, the liberal, the reformer and even the radical, for all those who would set the world straight every day.

Separate from the responsibility of decision or action on their many conclusions, they have been able to roam far and wide. Gradually many have drifted into partisanship and crusading.

In short, many have become advocates. It is not a question of direct misrepresentation or deceit. It is largely a question of emphasis and premise. If you begin with the assumption that the administration by its very political position is handling things wrong, selected facts can be assembled to indicate you are right.

If, for example, an Adlai Stevenson, a Walter Lippmann or an Edward R. Morrow says the United States has been humiliated by being caught spying, this is in the concept of their beliefs of obvious administration weaknesses. This statement, or suggestion, can quickly pass into the public realm as an accepted assumption, and then become a fact, by mere repetition.

The United States has been embarrassed before the world. Much hand wringing can ensue.

If a Red-instigated riot in a Japanese street is suggested as another humiliation for the United States, repetition, too, makes it an assumed fact. We are humiliated, thus communism has scored another triumph and the U.S. foreign policy has suffered another serious defeat.

This isn't an organized effort. It springs out of common thinking. Its like following the leader. One commentator jumps in. The next one takes over, and so on down the line. In a few hours, or days, an incident has been blown into a major issue, or a major happening has been turned into a national calamity.

Many politicians ordinarily take their cues from these same sources. It is a phenomenon of the times that the issues today are being created more by sociological writers and commentators than by political leaders and responsible organizations.

Looking back over the U-2 incident, after this passage of time, is it now certain that this was an embarrassment to the United States? That it was a diplomatic and strategic defeat?

Who screamed the loudest? Russia. Who was exposed to the world as vulnerable? Russia. Who had to back away from its own threat of force over a summit conference table? Russia.

When all the sound and fury dies, the country usually is found to be sitting about where it was before. We have an implacable enemy who will try anything to damage us and eventually destroy us. We should let him do his own work.

Progress of National Railroad Museum at Green Bay, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, during the 1st session of the 86th Congress, I introduced a concurrent resolution to grant congressional recognition to the National Railroad Museum at Green Bay, Wis.

The purpose of the museum is to tell the dramatic story of railway progress and its contribution to growth and development of our great country.

In introducing the resolution I felt that granting congressional recognition to this splendid project—which I strongly feel merits such recognition—would help contribute to its stature.

Regrettably, action on the resolution has long been delayed.

I am deeply proud, however, that the forward-moving, public-spirited citizens of Wisconsin—rather than demonstrating dependence upon congressional action—are going ahead successfully with improvement and expansion of the museum. As a matter of fact, the project, in addition to its historical value, is turning into a new business for the community. According to estimates, the museum, as a tourist attraction, may well result in an income of well over a million dollars for the community.

In this constructive effort to make the museum a success, the Wisconsin State Historical Society and many others cooperating in the project, I believe, deserve real commendation.

Now, I ask unanimous consent to have an informative article published by the Green Bay Gazette on progress of the project printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, Aug. 19, 1960]

RAIL MUSEUM DESCRIBED AS NEW AREA INDUSTRY—INCOME FROM TOURISTS ESTIMATED AT $1.2 MILLION; FUND DRIVE PLANS MADE

The National Railroad Museum is a new industry for this area which can bring $1¼ million in new business on a conservative estimate.

So stated Dr. Clifford Lord, former director of the State historical society and now a dean at Columbia University, before the board of directors of the museum corporation at the Beaumont Hotel Thursday evening.

Dr. Lord reviewed the beginnings of the idea of the museum and told how it came to be located in Green Bay. Here's how he estimated its potential monetary value to the area:

A through traffic count on nearby Highway 41 6 years ago revealed that the museum has a potential of attracing 125,000 visitors each season, based on percentages experienced at other such sites.

WOULD STOP TOURISTS

An attraction like the railroad museum would stop tourists in the Green Bay area whereas now they mainly drive right through. National statistics reveal that a tourist spends $20 a day. Cutting this half, again for conservatism, new income of $1,250,000 per season is reasonably possible when the museum is in full operation.

Dr. Lord qualified his remarks by saying that such results cannot be expected the first year of operation. He said that he was highly gratified that actual construction is now starting on the museum project, but he pointed out that this initial phase, in which a depot and operating standard-gage railroad will be built, is only the beginning.

He said that buildings must be erected as soon as possible to house the very valuable historical collections already assembled. "Those," he said, "will flow in from all over" once housing is available for them.

RECALLS GRAY COLLECTION

Dr. Lord recalled how Gen. Carl R. Gray, Jr., president of the Omaha Railroad at St. Paul, began assembling a collection of early railroadia before World War II. It was displayed in the board room of the Omaha offices.

World War II interrupted his project, when he rose to be General Eisenhower's transportation chief in Europe. After the war General Gray interested the State historical society in founding a national railroad museum, but he died just when the idea was being formalized.

Attending last night's meeting was Col. Stanley Beggs of Hudson, Wis., a close personal friend of General Gray who as executor of his estate, secured this collection for the historical society. This was the keystone of the collection now being assembled for the railroad museum here. Colonel Beggs is director of the museum.

REASON FOR SITE CHOICE

Dr. Lord said there were three factors which led the historical society to locate the museum in Green Bay against competition from Milwaukee, Stevens Point, and other communities. These were the fine site given by the city of Green Bay, the reputation of this community in getting things done, and a pledge by business and labor here of all-out support.

John Torinus, museum corporation president, told the directors that the time has now come for the community to demonstrate this support with cash.

"Now that Brown County and the city of Green Bay have made additional land available, we are ready to build the museum," he said. "Now we have something concrete to sell. The museum is no longer just an idea. Its value to the community will be graphically illustrated when the Short Line Railroad Association of America holds its national convention here in October."

ASKS FOR PLEDGES

Torinus asked each director to pledge himself to raise $1,000 for the museum. There are 45 directors, and allowing for those far removed from this area he estimated this should result in $30,000.

In addition, sale of souvenir stock in the museum will begin in September and Torinus said all media in the area have promised all-out support of the drive. Stock brokerage houses in the city have agreed to conduct the sale.

"This will give everyone in the area an opportunity to help build this museum," he said.

Each person buying a $10 share of stock will be entitled to submit his idea for a name for the new railroad. Torinus announced that the winner, to be announced in October, will receive a free trip to Disneyland for himself and another member of his family.

ST. LOUIS COMPETITION CITED

Both Dr. Lord and Dr. Leslie Fishel, Jr., his successor as director of the historical society, referred to the fact that Green Bay has competition in building a railroad museum. A group in St. Louis, for example, has started promoting a National Museum of Transport there and is out to raise $5 million.

"But we've got a head start on all of them," said Dr. Fishel. "We welcome the competition. It is good for all of us. No railroad museum as yet has any building in which to house exhibits, and we're going to be the first one off the ground. We're all going to build in the Green Bay area the best railroad museum anywhere," he declared.

Torinus pointed out that one advantage this museum has which no other can boast is that the historical society has agreed to take over the operation of the museum when it is erected, thus guaranteeing permanent administration.

TO START OPERATIONS

Jack Doering, head of the local model railroad club, said the club will have its narrow gage steam railroad at the museum in operation by next week.

Torinus reported for Vern Bushman of the Short Line Association that the contractor will start putting in footings for the depot Monday.

Harold Fuller outlined construction plans for the railroad, saying that construction will start next week on the first section, and that ties and rails will start arriving next week.

The main track north of Dutchman's Creek will be built this fall. Army Engineer reserve units will start construction of two trestles across the creek this fall, and the entire setup will be ready by the tourist season next year.

Officers were elected for the next year by the directors at the end of the meeting. Clayton Ewing was named second vice president and Mike Barnard secretary. John M. Rose was renamed treasurer.

Improving Mail Service in Our Cities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I am very much aware of the delays and disruptions in the delivery of first-class mail in our major cities. Time after time, we have called to the attention of postal authorities instances where letters have been diverted to the wrong cities resulting in interminable delays. And the promise of overnight delivery of first-class mail within cities is still, I am sorry to say, mostly a promise and not a reality.

To divert attention from the continuing inadequacies of postal service, the Postmaster General has been shedding many tears lately over the so-called interference from Congress in his airlift program for sending first-class mail by air on a space-available basis. One would think Congress had no right to look into this matter.

Actually, it is quite the opposite. Congress has never given the Postmaster General the authority he has exercised in recent years to send first-class mail by air. It has been an assumption of authority. When we looked into the matter comprehensively, it was the decision of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service that very strict limitations should be imposed on the airlift—not as a rein on the prompt delivery of mail but rather to prevent disruptions in mail service. The airlift is a hit-and-miss proposition in many instances; worse than that, by eliminating rail service we find ourselves in a real mess when weather conditions are such the mail cannot go by air—or when the airlines do not have space available for first-class 4-cent letters.

Of course all 7-cent airmail goes by air and people who want and need airmail service are normally willing to pay for it. But if there is a good chance some of this mail will still go by air even if it only carries a 4-cent stamp, many people are taking that chance and not purchasing airmail service, hoping to get it anyway. So airmail revenues are falling off.

But that is not the point which so concerns me right now. The House has passed the bill on use of air service for 4-cent letters and it is up to the Senate. But in the meantime, this is not an issue as concerns local mail deliveries in, say, Philadelphia, or in other major cities.

The service has suffered terribly because of impractical management practices and out-of-date personnel practices dictated by the Post Office Department here in Washington. This is true all over the country, as every postal worker will quickly point out to you once you start to ask some searching questions about postal operating policies.

We can all remember when the postal worker was so proud of the postal service that he could tolerate no criticism of the Department, and always wore proudly the uniform of his service. In recent years, however, the postal employees have been kicked around so much by their superiors in Washington that many have lost their sense of dedication and pride in the postal service. This is too bad.

A new President in January must correct this deplorable situation by appointing as Postmaster General a man who can work with and inspire the postal employees to give their very best, and who regards them and their work as important. In recent years, the postal workers have been downgraded by the very man who should be most interested in their welfare.

Atom Submarine Opens Route Under Ice of Northwest Passage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, recently I had the privilege of visiting the Portsmouth Naval Yard. I spent an entire day there. It was my privilege to go aboard the U.S.S. *Seadragon*, an atom-powered submarine, which was then making preparations for its planned trip through the Arctic under the ice by the North Pole. This was to be the first complete passage from east to west in that region.

On this visit I met a very fine young naval officer, the commanding officer of the submarine, Comdr. George P. Steele II, who is one of the finest clean-cut young men I have ever met. I was most favorably impresed with him. I was also favorably impressed by his staff and with the enlisted men who make up the *Seadragon's* crew.

I went all through the submarine. I visited with the officers and with the men. I observed the supplies being placed in the submarine. The preparations seemed to be most complete and efficiently handled. I was particularly impressed with the fine spirit, the esprit de corps, the high morale of the men. This experience gave me a better appreciation of our submarine fleet and the men who serve it. The U.S.S. *Seadragon* and its crew is one of the great assets of the Navy and of the Nation.

Mr. President, I noticed in the morning newspaper that the submarine has completed the more hazardous part of its journey. It has opened a new passage and it has made a contribution to naval history. It has opened new thoroughfares to the world. I ask unanimous consent that the article published in the New York Times of today be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATOM SUBMARINE OPENS ROUTE UNDER ICE OF NORTHWEST PASSAGE

WASHINGTON, August 24.—A U.S. nuclear submarine has made the first underwater transit of the Northwest Passage through the iceladen waters of the Arctic, the Navy said today.

The U.S.S. *Seadragon*, with Comdr. George P. Steele 2d of Washington, D.C., serving as captain, made the 850-mile east-west passage in 6 days. She emerged from the waters of McClure Strait on Sunday.

Tonight, the *Seadragon* was reported in the Beaufort Sea, heading for the North Pole.

The submarine, by using the Parry Channel route, was said to have opened a more direct passage through the Canadian archipelago from the Atlantic to the Pacific Oceans. Previous explorers used longer, more tortuous "southern" routes.

The *Seadragon* sailed from Portsmouth, N.H., on August 1, and went up the Greenland-Labrador "slot" through Davis Strait and Baffin Bay. In Baffin Bay, she dived deeper under ice than any submarine had before. She went under one iceberg that was 1,400 feet long and extended 300 feet down into the sea.

The submarine encountered no difficulties, the Navy said.

In addition to blazing a possible military and commercial route through the Parry Channel the *Seadragon's* trip is expected to help the Navy further develop techniques for underice operations.

Only five transits have been made of the Northwest Passage. The first was made by the Norwegian explorer, Roald Amundsen, whose 47-ton herring boat sailed the east-west route in 1903–06.

The Navy's nuclear submarines have operated under Arctic ice on other occasions. In August 1958, the *Nautilus* submerged in the Bering Strait off Alaska, and 4 days later surfaced in the vicinity of Iceland. At the same time, the *Skate* traveled under the ice to the North Pole. The *Skate* repeated her performance under more difficult winter conditions in March 1959. Last February, the *Sargo* went under the Arctic ice from the west.

The *Seadragon* is a sister ship of the *Skate*. For the current voyage, in addition to her crew of 75 men and 8 officers, she is carrying a group of civilian advisers and technicians. They are headed by Dr. Waldo K. Lyon of the Naval Electronics Laboratory in San Diego, Calif.

Dr. Lyon's group was using sonar and underwater television to study the ocean, the sea ice overhead and the sea bottom. By watching screens inside the submarine, crewman could spot "ice lakes" where the

surface ice was fairly thin and where the *Seadragon* could break through to surface, the Navy said.

The *Seadragon* traveled most of the Northwest Passage submerged but surfaced for a day near the Royal Canadian Air Force Base at Rosolute Bay to put ashore mail and photographs of the voyage.

The *Seadragon* was commissioned at Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, Portsmouth, N.H., last December 5. She has an overall length of 267 feet, a beam of 25 feet, and a surface displacement of 2,250 tons.

This was her first major cruise. She is due to report to the Pacific Fleet at Pearl Harbor, Hawaii, on September 9.

Alaska Warming Up to Legion Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, during the congressional recess, the Sporting News, "The Bible of Baseball," ran a series of articles on the American Legion junior baseball program. One of the articles featured American Legion baseball as it is played in Alaska. American Legion baseball is relatively new in Alaska, the first teams having been formed only in 1953. However, since its inception the program has been enthusiastically received by Alaskans, and, as a result, it has been expanded with each passing season. This year, for example, a team from the city of Anchorage competed—unfortunately without success—in the western regionals of the American Legion junior baseball playoffs at Bend, Oreg. To convey to my colleagues the interest of Alaskans in our great national sport, under unanimous consent I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the article by Dodge G. Morgan, as it appeared in the July 20 issue of the Sporting News:

ALASKA WARMING UP TO LEGION PROGRAM

"When it's springtime in the Rockies," they're still shaking dry snow from fur parkas at Fairbanks, Alaska, 140 miles below the rim of the Arctic Circle, America's farthest north exposure of American Legion junior baseball. But if summer baseball fever is slow coming to the 49th State, it's as hot as anywhere else in the Nation when it arrives.

Joseph M. Briones, State chairman of Legion ball in Alaska since its inception in 1953 (long before the 49th star was added), is perhaps more aware of Alaska's unusual baseball problems than anyone.

"Our short playing season, great distances between population centers, and scarcity of playing fields tend to load the count against junior baseball," says Briones. "But in spite of it all, we've watched the program grow from one city and 5 teams to 7 cities and 11 teams in a period of only 7 years."

The 39-year-old Briones, player-veteran of the Texas League and armed services baseball, is one of the primary reasons for the success of Alaska's Legion baseball. A member of Anchorage's Jack Henry Post No. 1 in 1953, he now carries on his activities from Post No. 4 in Juneau, Alaska's capital city. His domain of 571,065 square miles, the State of Alaska, covers two junior baseball districts, the western and the southeastern. It's routine for Briones to make a 1,500-mile trip, measured on a line drive, from Ketchikan to Fairbanks, to contact sponsors.

The State's 2 largest population centers, Anchorage (82,586) and Fairbanks (42,746), provide the manpower for the western district. Fairbanks supports two teams, the Chuck Jays and the Ladd Air Force Base club, as the northernmost contingents. The Chuck Jays are the only Alaska Legion team to break into the winner's column in national competition, so far. Their victory came in the region 8 playoffs last year.

In Alaska's largest city, Anchorage, one team led this summer's Legion league awakening. The Alaska Sales and Service Braves were raring to go even before the sled-dog racing season had ended. Their eagerness was a reflection of the enthusiasm of Jim Vernon, manager of Alaska Sales. In addition to sponsoring the Legion club, he also is president of O.B.'s Tricity Braves of the Northwest League.

Three more Anchorage area clubs, sponsored by the Elks, Elmendorf Air Force Base, and Fort Richardson Army post, are competing with the Braves.

ALASKA'S SOUTHEASTERN DISTRICT SUPPORTS FIVE TEAMS

In the southeastern district, five towns, ranging in population from 900 to 9,000, support just as many teams. The defending district champs are the Sportsmen of Juneau, sponsored by the whole of the capital city and monitored by Post No. 4 of the American Legion. The expenses are considable because the only way out of Juneau for competition is by air. A big money-raising effort was made on July 4 when everything from a car raffle to a potluck supper was run off for the boys.

Other southeast teams which are town-sponsored are the Ketchikan Kings, tutored by Post No. 3; the Petersburg team, Post No. 14, and the Sitka club, Post No. 13. Auke Bay, with a population of 900, just 15 miles from Juneau, is sponsored by Hudson's Shoes for Post No. 25.

The great distances and general lack of inexpensive transportatiton throws up the major hurdle for Legion ball in Alaska. Many of the teams must scavenge for competition until they can meet their contemporaries. This year, for instance, the Anchorage Braves played senior teams in the Anchorage City League, waiting for the Legion season to start.

But problems withall, the call of "Play ball" sounds much the same in Alaska as it does in Texas or Rhode Island, California or Michigan. And Alaskans doubt whether the enthusiasm can be matched anywhere.

The Soil Bank

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. QUENTIN BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter addressed to the editor of the Atlantic Monthly by Rev. Richard D. Vangerud of Bottineau, N. Dak., dealing with the soil bank.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 23, 1960.

The EDITOR,
The Atlantic Monthly,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial in the July Atlantic to me was one of the most fair discussions of the farm situation I have read. The trend to the soil bank that you discuss is a trend that can cause real concern. To be sure this trend is causing real socioeconomic problems in the towns and cities dependent on the rural economy as well as to the open country areas. The statistics are real people caught in these forces. However, the problems that cause me concern are the moral and religious questions involved.

Every vocation needs a religious-moral purpose in which a man seeks to express himself purposefully in serving his God and his fellow men. A man needs to have a feeling of beng useful, that his life has a real purpose. If this need is obliterated in reducing a life calling to a mere economic formula the moral, creative worth of the individual is destroyed.

Farming stands high as a vocation with a real purpose. The farmer has the calling to produce food for the human race and to conserve his soil for unborn generations. If this sense of purpose is divorced from his calling his dignity as a creative human being is eroded. If making money is the only goal in life there would be no real moral question involved, but if there is a higher goal the farmer's dignity as a human being is being destroyed my any farm program that does not look beyond mere economics.

To me, it seems, that the soil bank is guilty of destroying the moral-religious purpose in the farmers' calling. The farmer is paid for not carrying out the basic purpose of his vocation. There are cases, of course, where taking land out of production may be necessary for the purpose of conservation. There is land that should never have been put into cultivation. In such cases a program of assistance such as the soil bank or something related does serve the religious-moral purpose of conservation, however, the entire soil bank cannot be written off in this Senate.

I still feel that the real problem is not overproduction. It is rather faulty distribution. The negative approach of controlling production certainly is not the solution in the world of 1960 where starvation is the rule for the world's people. There is a need for the farmer to produce bread for the hungry, for the hungry are certainly with us. We should not blame the farmer for expressing his God-given purpose in abundant production. The world has a need for this production.

Long-range programs that are positive and forward looking should have priority and not the expedient of the moment. The solutions should not counter the religious-moral purpose of the farmer's vocation. In addition to the problem of international distribution that needs a solution, there is the local need of planning to meet the food needs of the future. Perhaps incentive should be given to meet these needs. Water diversion programs that would help transfer areas now limited to small grain production into diversified farm areas merits consideration. This is out of my field, but I am certain that our creativity as an American people is capable of something greater than paid curtailment.

Again, what will be the end result of a farm program that will not let the farmer express his religious-moral reason for being? What will its result be on the farmer? What will its result be on the American nation as a whole? I feel that a farm program that will stand the test of time should let the farmer creatively express the religious-moral purpose of his vocation—to produce food for man and beast, to conserve the soil for generations yet to come.

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. VANGERUD,
Pastor, First Lutheran Church.
BOTTINEAU, N. DAK.

Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Awarded the VFW Americanism Medal at the Annual National Encampment, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, at Detroit, Mich., August 22, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, during the current week, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is holding its annual convention in Detroit, Mich.

Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr. delivered on August 22, the keynote address at the opening meeting of the convention. In view of the great contributions which our very able Defense Secretary has made to our national security, the Veterans of Foreign Wars bestowed upon him, prior to his address, the Americanism Medal of the VFW. This is the highest honor which that great oversea veterans organization—the Veterans of Foreign Wars—can bestow on any American citizen.

The award was made, on behalf of the VFW, by its commander in chief, Louis G. Feldman of Pennsylvania. Mr. Feldman's introductory remarks set forth in clearest terms why this huge veterans organization selected Secretary Gates to be the recipient of this rarely bestowed award.

I believe that Mr. Feldman's remarks are particularly significant in that they reflect the deep interest of the VFW in national security matters, and express an understanding of the importance of the things Secretary Gates has done to enhance the effectiveness of our Armed Forces. Appropriately, Mr. Feldman referred to Secretary Gates' leadership in accepting the decisionmaking responsibilities of his office by sitting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, his key role in bringing into reality the Polaris missile, and his strong but prudent action in ordering, on the eve of the ill-fated summit in Paris, a worldwide readiness test of our military forces.

These were some of the reasons why, in making the award, Mr. Feldman said to Secretary Gates "We are grateful for the many things you have done to give us military power second to none."

The speech delivered by Secretary Gates is a penetrating, well-reasoned, and precise statement of the great power of our Nation's Armed Forces. In his address, the Secretary pointed up the great accomplishments of our Nation's science, industry, and military, in providing such powerful defense forces. Also, Secretary Gates expressed the belief that while recognizing the need for able and constructive criticism, there must be appropriate care exercised so that unjustified criticism does not undermine confidence in our Armed Forces, which is so important not only to our Nation, but also to our allies throughout the world.

Because of the importance of Secretary Gates' remarks, as well as the significance of the introductory address by the Veterans of Foreign Wars commander in chief, Louis G. Feldman, under unanimous permission I insert both speeches at this time:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS OF COMMANDER IN CHIEF LOUIS G. FELDMAN, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, IN PRESENTING THE VFW AMERICANISM MEDAL TO SECRETARY OF DEFENSE THOMAS S. GATES, JR., VFW NATIONAL CONVENTION, DETROIT, MICH., AUGUST 22, 1960

Secretary Gates, distinguished guests, fellow comrades of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, this opening session of the 61st convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States is indeed an auspicious occasion. We are honored in having as our keynote speaker for this convention a man whose statesmanship is internationally respected, a man whose professional competence is widely admired, a man whose leadership is daily demonstrated in discharging his responsibilities in keeping America strong so that our Nation may persevere against the ceaseless aggressions of communism.

As you know, I refer to Thomas S. Gates, Jr., the Secretary of Defense.

We welcome him not only as the distinguished Government official, but also as a former companion in arms, a naval veteran with two European battle stars and eight battle stars on his Pacific campaign ribbon. In 1953, Secretary Gates came to Washington to serve as Under Secretary of the Navy. I suspect that he, like others, who left private life for the perils of the Pentagon, intended to serve for a respectable period of a few years, and then return, as others have done, to private business.

Yet for him there was always one more problem to solve, one more development to explore, one more crisis to meet. The result was that Mr. Gates came to Washington and stayed there.

Although it may well have been burdensome for Mr. Gates, it has been good for the United States. Our Nation is safer, and the free world is stronger because Secretary Gates is still on the job.

Coming to Washington as Under Secretary of the Navy, he has successively served in the higher positions of Secretary of the Navy, Deputy Secretary of Defense, and now in his present position as Secretary of Defense. It was during his service in the Department of the Navy that he saw the vast possibilities of what was then a wild theory of firing a solid propellent missile from a submerged nuclear submarine. Contrary to the opinions of those who said it would not work, he vigorously supported his Chief of Naval Operations, Arleigh Burke, in giving highest priority to that project. Thus today, we have Polaris. We have, in Polaris, a virtually invulnerable missile that makes our retaliation certain and deadly. Again, the vision and ability of Secretary Gates has contributed tremendously to our Nation's security.

Shortly after taking his oath as Secretary of Defense, he issued what is probably the most important single directive in the history of defense organization in this country. I refer to his directive by which he announced that he, as Secretary of Defense, would thereafter sit with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Seldom has any one action by a Government official received such widespread acclaim and support from the press and from Congress.

The reason for such acclaim was apparent. It was readily recognized that by his decision to sit with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Secretary Gates was actually accepting and discharging the decisionmaking responsibilities which were properly those of his office.

I believe it appropriate to repeat a few of the comments that have been made concerning this historically important action by Secretary Gates.

The distinguished military writer, George Fielding Eliot, said:

"Thus, for the first time, a Secretary of Defense not only formally assumed personal responsibility for civilian leadership in top-level policy decisions, but insures that in reaching such decisions he will have given full consideration to the views of all his military advisers."

Mr. Hanson Baldwin, the famed military commentator of the New York Times, summed up the effect of Mr. Gates' action by writing:

"Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates has galvanized the decisionmaking process of Government by the simple expedient of making decisions."

In Congress there has been unprecedented commendation expressed on the floor of the House and Senate by outstanding members of both political parties.

While it would be far too voluminous for me to quote even briefly from the many commendatory speeches made on the floor of the House and the Senate concerning Mr. Gates' Joint Chiefs of Staff directive, I would like to read to you a passage from a speech by the ablest authority on military affairs ever produced by our Congress, a man to whom the VFW awarded its Distinguished Citizenship Medal at our annual congressional dinner last February. I refer, of course, to that great statesman from Georgia, the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. Address-in his remarks to Secretary Gates, Chairman VINSON said:

"I especially wish to commend you for your recent directive with regard to your participation in the deliberations of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

"With this one directive you have left an impressive mark on defense organization.

"You have strengthened our great Joint Chiefs of Staff system and, at the same time, have dealt a shattering blow to the advocates of a single Chief of Staff system, and you have vitalized and reaffirmed the constitutional principle of civilian control."

I think also that it should be noted that Secretary Gates' action in strengthening the Joint Chiefs of Staff and thus blocking the efforts of those who would separate the Joint Chiefs of Staff members from their positions as Chiefs of Services and thereby impose on our Nation some form of alien and discredited system of supreme command is in firm accord with the longstanding position of the VFW, a position repeatedly reaffirmed by resolutions of the national encampment.

I would like to recall one other action taken by him. You will undoubtedly recall that on the eve of the ill-fated summit meeting in Paris last spring—the summit meeting that ended before it took place—United States-Soviet relations reached a new peak of tension. The bombastic truculence of Nikita Khrushchev had all but shattered the uneasy peace which characterizes East-West relationships.

It was on the eve of the summit that Secretary Gates, who accompanied our President to Paris, quietly, without fanfare, but reflecting great prudence, maturity, and statesmanship, ordered a worldwide command readiness test of our military forces.

This was a precautionary step which, had an enemy intended an overt act against the United States, would have prevented another disaster such as Pearl Harbor.

This action was widely acclaimed by our friends of the free world.

It was the kind of leadership that we continually seek, but all too seldom achieve in moments of peril.

But unfortunately, the acclaim was not unanimous, as there was some gratuitous criticism from a few eager and vocal critics in our own country.

While there may have been isolated criticism in this country, we veterans can understand why that action of Secretary Gates enhanced American prestige and strengthened the courage of free men throughout the world—free men who appreciated the bold and simple grandeur of this masterful action.

One of the foremost leaders of the Far East, the much-respected, youthful, and fast-rising mayor of Manila, the Honorable Arsenio H. Lacson, bluntly gave his opinion as to Secretary Gates' action in Paris. This is what Mayor Lacson, one of the most astute Far Eastern observers of world affairs said:

"You Americans would have looked irreparably foolish but for the brilliant action of the Defense Secretary Gates when he ordered a worldwide alert.

"Asians really understood that one and applauded. It saved your face as no other act could have."

From the other side of the world, from Paris, there were similar reports. In a syndicated article from Paris following the breakup of the ill-fated conference, the widely respected writer, Alice Widener, reported:

"Here in Paris, after the arrival and departure of Khrushchev and Malinovsky, the public opinion is 'Good for Gates.'"

We veterans, with a feeling of pride in our Secretary of Defense, echo the words "Good for Gates."

Mr. Secretary, we veterans who have carried the flag, and the arms to protect it, to foreign lands throughout the world, appreciate your leadership, patriotism, and courage. We are grateful that you have heeded the call of duty, and by your selfless service have provided those rare attributes of leadership which our Nation and the free world so desperately need in these perilous times. We are grateful for the many things you have done to give us military power second to none.

Therefore, Mr. Secretary, it is my distinct honor, on behalf of the 1,300,000 members of the VFW, to bestow on you the Veterans of Foreign Wars Americanism Award—the highest honor which it is within the power of the VFW to award to any American citizen.

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE THOMAS S. GATES, JR., BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, AUGUST 22, 1960, DETROIT, MICH.

Commander in Chief Feldmann, fellow veterans, and friends, for this wonderful medal, and the generous words that go with it, I am grateful. I know that the award speaks for something more than one man's work. It speaks of your confidence in the state of our national defenses. It is, I am sure, a certificate of your trust in the devotion and competence of the men and women who maintain the watch for the rest of us in a time of conflict and peril.

I am here to talk about the Armed Forces of the United States which in power are second to none—just as they were when you served with them.

When veterans meet, we always have to resist the desire to look back. Man can never forget his own experiences—or the personal pronoun. The battles of the past grow bigger with the years and the telling, and they tend to dim the vision of a changing world. A large proportion of all living Americans have been born since World War II—and profound changes have placed that war in its proper perspective in history. When most of us here look back—and remember Omaha Beach, Anzio, the Slot, Okinawa, and the kamikazes, we ought to realize that these must be strange names to a whole new generation of Americans. Well, they were once strange to us also. Many of our generation stayed in those places. We had the determination and the will and we met our destiny.

Now the factors have changed. Hours seem to have become seconds. Science pushes research and research pays off. We seem to be coming to a point where we can do just about anything we can imagine. The important choices are not just between good and bad ideas, but often between scores of good ideas. So the great stories of our past—the flag on Iwo, the march from Normandy across the Rhine—are still great and proven records. But they are records of bygone days, and now we write a new kind of history almost daily.

History is crowding us once again. Its course is no longer to be taken for granted. Powerful outpourings are entering the stream from new and hostile sources on the darkened sides of the earth. At such a time, there is an advantage in having a long memory. We of the war generation have better reason than most to know that no good man can safely rest, no family can feel rightfully secure, no society can consider its duties fulfilled, when its freedom and its ideals are under threat.

We look, therefore, not to the past but to the present and the future. This is a fitting forum for a serious discussion of the military policies of our Government. All veterans have, in a real sense, a proprietary interest in national security.

We contend with ever changing circumstances. We can no longer develop our defense programs once a year. We must constantly review and change them whenever necessary, always exercising good judgment. The best brains of America and the devoted concentration of Congress, the press, the military, and our citizens are required if the proper balance is to be achieved and maintained. No issue in American life has been more thoroughly debated than that of defense. It is not without significance that during the current session of Congress the hard working and well-informed members of the appropriate committees, in their judgment of the sums needed, came within 1.5 percent of our own recommendations.

Money is, of course, important but the amount at any given moment only reflects decisions which must themselves respond to change. The needs of our national security must always come first. We have spent and will continue to spend whatever sums are needed in support of a foreign policy backed by great military strength.

There are two central questions that any Secretary of Defense must live with. First, have the policies that guide our defense programs been soundly conceived and competently executed? Second, what guidance do they supply from this point on?

Looking back across my 7 years in the Pentagon, I am struck by the fact that the broad outlines of our national objectives and the military policies designed to further them have not greatly changed during that time. This is not to say, however, that the national means have remained as they were. New and revolutionary weapon systems have emerged, and they have given rise to radically new military concepts. But these have been fitted to policy, and policy was prepared for them.

The reason for the steadiness of our national military policies should be clear. They have been steady because we recognized that the essential nature of the threat to us would not soon change. This judgment has proven correct. The grand design of Communist imperialism persists: To convert the entire world to the Communist way of life.

There have been shifts in tactics. The main weight of the attack swings from one arena to another, from the military to the political; from the political to the economic; from the economic to the psychological. But the attack never lets up for long. It is relentless. It is ruthless. It has no time schedule. It has become for Americans and for friendly people across the face of the earth the most important reality of our times.

Khrushchev tells us that communism is in no hurry; he thinks history is on his side. Let us never be in doubt of the outcome of the struggle into which we have been drawn. The desire for freedom lives on in the souls of men everywhere, including those behind the barbed wire fences of communism. The lesson of history, so dearly learned from the fall and rise of civilizations, teaches us that freedom is the true goal of man. We have the best of reasons for believing, if we persevere and endure, that the false doctrine of communism will in time fail, as earlier false doctrines have also failed.

Perseverance, endurance, and will—these are the qualities which the times demand of us. The struggle with communism is certain to be long and costly. Already it has lasted, with but brief respites, for more than four decades. With such a prospect, the only sensible national strategy for this Nation is one that gathers our resources with those of our allies for a prolonged test of endurance within the framework of our common beliefs. And that in fact is precisely what our strategy for the long pull is doing.

The idea of defense for the long pull grew in the minds of certain of our World War II leaders who foresaw the true character of the U.S.S.R. No one saw more clearly what was making up than did one of our greatest men, the late Secretary James Forrestal. In December 1950, only 2 weeks after Communist China entered the Korean war, another distinguished and honored predecessor in the Defense Department, the late General Marshall, also perceived what was coming. In a prophetic statement, he warned us that "a trial of endurance" had begun. The experience would be "new to the American people," and the "intensity" of the mobilization then underway would accordingly be governed by the realization that the effort would have to be sustained through "possible years of tension."

This new concept, however, was a long time penetrating the then existing military policies. Two years later, planning in the military services was still tied to the old D-day concept—a bending of effort toward achieving a condition of maximum readiness on a hypothetical date when the preparations of the adversary might approach a climax. This approach tended to generate artificial requirements and a false peaking of effort. As each successive D-day approached, it had to be arbitrarily pushed forward to a later date with consequent disturbances and instabilities in defense planss and operations.

It then fell to another soldier-statesman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, to harmonize the policy and the practice. In April 1953, after some 3 months in the Presidency, he placed into effect the long-pull strategy that became known as the new look in the national military posture. The D-day concept was being abandoned as the regulator of planning. In its place the President was installing a policy designed to provide what he described as "adequate protection to be projected as far into the future as the actions and apparent purposes of others may compel us." It was to be a durable policy, one the Nation could live with, as he put it, "over a period of years."

By now that policy has been vigorously in operation for more than 7 years. It has become central to our national military planning. Because the logic combines realism with prudence, it should continue to guide our strategy through the cold war as far as one can now foresee.

How well has this policy been carried out? How good are the forces? In the judgment of the President, in the judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and in my judgment, the Armed Forces of the United States are equal to the historic task which confronts them. This strength is real. It should inspire confidence in all our citizens and our friends abroad.

In fact, confidence in our Armed Forces is in itself the most important element of strength of the free world. It secures the prestige and dignity of our military stature. Let us be extremely careful that that confidence is not undermined by unjustifiable criticism. Constructive criticism of our methods is helpful and essential to the improvement of our defense program, but this should be within the boundaries, understanding, and belief that our defenses are strong and will be able to meet our heavy responsibilities. The determination of the free world to resist communism rests in large measure upon a shared confidence in the armed might of the United States.

And, most importantly, we must not inadvertently create a false impression of weakness that could induce a Communist miscalculation or adventure in aggression.

The cause of peace is well served by recognition of the true fact that the United States is the greatest power on earth and that this power is in the service of world law and justice.

My own feeling of confidence in our Armed Forces is based on years of close observations. The position of Secretary of Defense imposes a discipline all its own. It is not just a matter of dealing with papers, important as that is. It also means getting out of the Pentagon and getting into the factories, the laboratories, the missile test complexes, flying out to the carriers and checking on the readiness of our forces at home and overseas. What is to be seen is a strong country, a sense of urgency and conviction. To see these things and to put them together is to be proud.

One reason the forces are superb is that the Defense Department has been constantly reshaping forces and programs to take full advantage of the new technologies. The changes, as you well know, have been deep. But none has been so dramatic as the joining of the nuclear warhead and the ballistic missile. The Air Force's first-generation Atlas and Titan intercontinental ballistic missiles have already been overtaken by much-improved versions of the same species. They will be overtaken in turn by the Air Force's Minuteman solid-fuel ICBM, a more versatile weapon of equally great range.

The Navy has in the meantime married its Polaris solid-fuel missile to the deep-cruising nuclear submarine, to produce an utterly novel weapon system of immense significance. Polaris is the newest strategic system to enter the U.S. order of battle. It has fired the imagination of all who study it.

The submarine carries 16 missiles, and these can be launched from the submarine hidden below the surface. This system, like many others of importance today, was brought forward from a dream to reality during the span of 5 or 6 years. Along the way, technological problems of overpowering complexity were mastered. Polaris is a magnificent example of the unity of purpose prevailing among science, industry, and the military. And beyond all that, the system is unique, in a geographical sense, for the use it makes of the vastness of the oceans and of the concealment to be found in the ocean deep.

The combination of the nuclear submarine and the Polaris missile constitutes one more reason why the military power of the United States is unmatched.

I shall not dwell on the other retaliatory forces. You know them well. Their effectiveness is being increased. We are moving toward a faster reaction time, a wider dispersal, more hardening for some, more mobility for others, all toward the end of having our systems more nearly invulnerable. Our second generation missiles were conceived for these purposes.

I do want to say a few words about our limited war forces. They too are strong and ready. They include virtually our entire Armed Services excepting only a few single mission, single purpose weapons systems.

It is, of course, impossible for the United States alone to maintain tactical forces large enough to counter simultaneously all possible local Communist aggressions throughout the world. Thus we have chosen a course of collective security in company with other nations of the free world who stand with us. Through these arrangements, there has been mobilized across the world a formidable array of tactical military forces. These forces, aided by our military assistance programs and backed up by our own highly mobile land, sea, and air task forces, have been, and will be, able to deal effectively with local aggressions.

The effective VFW support of the military assistance program is a valuable contribution to the continued maintenance of these vital alliances. The United States must never abandon its forward strategy.

But sound policies, superior weapons and a worldwide system of bases and alliance would in themselves be meaningless without competence and devotion of the men and women of our armed services.

I have long held the belief that our Nation's most enduring military asset, its surest source of strength lies in our military personnel. I have seen them in battle. I have also worked with them in these days of troubled peace. From being with them in cold war and hot I know of their courage and patriotism. I can assure you that those in uniform today are worthy successors to you who, in your turn, served so well.

The young men you send us from your homes, your schools, your churches and synagogues, have the kind of spirit, intelligence, religious strength and courage that merits the trust our Nation places in them. They are superior to anything that communism could put against them.

Before leaving let me thank you on behalf of the Defense Department for your sustained and constructive interest in national security. You were quick to recognize the importance of a powerful strategic air force. You gave early and sturdy support to the Polaris program. Your appreciation of the value of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system, and of the need for the maintenance of powerful limited war forces have made for a better national understanding of the goals we all seek. There will always be an unbreakable bond between those of us who are now serving and you who have served and who wear the Cross of Malta.

I am glad and honored to have been with you.

A Chance To Undo Wage Bill Excesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRY GOLDWATER

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of August 24, 1960, entitled, "A Chance To Undo Wage Bill Excesses."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHANCE TO UNDO WAGE BILL EXCESSES

If the minimum wage bill gets by its final House Rules Committee hurdle today and goes to Senate-House conference, we hope the House conferees will fight a good fight for their more moderate and sensible version.

The Senate last week gave candidate KENNEDY pretty much what he asked, which was too much. The House, which acted before the conventions, rejected a bill virtually the same as Senator KENNEDY'S. It adopted instead a considerably more modest substitute.

The escalator provision of the Senate bill—raising the minimum to $1.15 the first year, $1.20 the second, and $1.25 in 1963—is a tacit recognition of the pervasive impact the boost would have on the economy, and the dislocation a full 25-cent increase would have if made effective immediately. The House bill, more reasonably, raises the minimum to $1.15 effective January 1, and leaves to future Congresses the question of whether future increases are justified or desirable.

The Senate bill would extend coverage to an estimated 4 million additional workers, nearly all in retail and service fields. The House bill would bring in another 1.4 million. But the key difference is not in numbers, but in the criteria for coverage.

It is a question of whether Congress shall begin regulating wages in intrastate, as well as interstate, commerce. The Senate bill uses language so broad that, in effect, it scraps the whole interstate-commerce concept of congressional authority.

The Senate bill uses sales volume as the criterion for coverage of retail firms, arbitrarily including all that do $1 million or more business annually even if they operate in only a single city. The House bill respects the interstate-commerce concept by covering only those with five or more outlets in two or more States, regardless of sales volume.

Justice Hugo Black is one of the great bulwarks of liberalism on the Supreme Court. In 1937, as a Senator, he was among the sponsors of the original wage-hour bill. He said then on the floor of the Senate:

"I believe it was the prevailing sentiment of the committee, if not the unanimous sentiment of the committee, that businesses of a purely local type which serve a particular local community, and which do not send their products into the stream of interstate commerce, can better be regulated by the laws of the communities and of the States in which the business units operate."

This fundamental question of Federal-State relationships is now directly at issue between the Senate and the House.

Senator KENNEDY has put his name on a bill that makes a superficially attractive campaign issue. The House has passed a bill that makes better sense.

The Federal Mutual Savings Bank Act, H.R. 12913

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on July 1, 1960, I introduced H.R. 12913 to authorize Federal mutual savings banks.

In that connection I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter dated August 12, 1960, addressed to me by William F. McKenna, together with the article referred to in Mr. McKenna's communication:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS,
New York, N.Y., August 12, 1960.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MULTER: In view of your sponsorship of the Federal Mutual Savings Bank Act (H.R. 12913), you may be interested in the enclosed photocopy of the lead article on that subject appearing in the July 25, 1960, issue of the United States Investor. You will note that the article treats introduction of the legislation in a highly favorable manner. Among the attributes of mutual savings banks it mentions are a well-deserved reputation for strength and safety, their impressive record in the field of home financing, and the public-spirited record of mutual savings bank trustees. The article also refers to the fine body of seasoned State law affecting mutual savings banks that can serve as a guide for Federal consideration of the proposed legislation.

This article is the more encouraging since it represents an expression of views by a respected, independent member of the financial press that has no ties to the mutual savings bank industry.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM F. MCKENNA,
Director-Counsel.

FEDERAL MUTUAL SAVINGS BANKS

The news from Washington indicates that much progress has been made on a Federal mutual savings bank bill. The bill has now been introduced simultaneously in both branches of Congress. We do not need to point out to the readers of this paper how enthusiastic a good many of the savings banks are over a possible nationalization of their industry. So far, throughout its long history, the industry has depended upon individual States for its charters, its examinations and the scope of its activities. One of the results has been that some States have a good many savings banks, some have only a limited number and some have none at all. The impression has grown among savings bank men and it takes deeper root with the passing of years, that the industry would be better off if it operated in 50 States—even including Alaska and Hawaii—than in only 17. It is a very popular type of bank wherever it operates because it is able to treat depositors so handsomely and because it has so well deserved a reputation for strength and safety.

But it could have some great opportunities for popular service in the other 33 States and it would have more influence at Washington if more Congressmen knew mutual savings banks from a firsthand acquaintance with their ways and accomplishments. That is why so many savings bank men are glad to hear that the efforts to create Federal charters are taking tangible form. They feel that the old stalemate which has made them little known, outside of 17 States, can be done away with through such a law.

KEEN RIVALS

We are likely to discuss some elements of the proposed measure from time to time. Of course, it will be a bone of contention between the savings banks on the one hand—perhaps with savings and loan associations for their allies—and the commercial banks. Of course, the savings banks expect opposition from the latter. There are States where mutual savings banks and commercial banks operate in a considerable atmosphere of harmony, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and New Hampshire being fairly representative of such a condition, but by and large, the commercial banks and the mutual savings banks are keen rivals. It must not be supposed, however, that the commercial banks have any such preponderance of influence at Washington as some statistics might indicate. There are more national banks and more trust companies, by far, than the whole number of mutual savings banks in the 17 States combined. There are far more Congressmen coming from communities where national banks and trust companies operate than from communities where mutual savings banks exist. But Congress has never been disposed to leap into action at the call of either national banks or trust companies and it is likely, therefore, to listen as intently to the arguments of the savings banks as to those of the commercial banks.

In some respects, the savings banks' testimony for Congress to consider is exceptionally impressive. The record they have made in home mortgage financing provides an example. It is this record, as you know, which has made Senator SPARKMAN so good a friend of the mutual savings banks. He has not only urged them on in their purpose to obtain geographical extension but is now a sponsor of the bill and intends to keep up a sympathetic interest in its progress. There is a Republican sponsor for the bill in Senator BUSH of Connecticut and there are numerous sponsors for it in the House from both parties. Home mortgage financing is very close to Senator SPARKMAN'S heart and he admires what the mutual savings banks have been doing in this area.

MORTGAGE LENDING

Well he may, for FHA and VA mortgages held by savings banks are to be found in every State of the Union. The mutual savings banks receive their deposits at home offices and branches in 17 States only, but their mortgage lending—taking them as a whole—is national in its scope. Of their $25 billion of mortgages, some $5 billion is on properties outside the States where they operate. In some States in the West and the South this savings bank interest is a very important segment of home financing activity. The banks perform the useful function of spreading the concentrated savings of a portion of our country over a broader area where these are genuinely needed. One cannot help but believe that Congress will be impressed with the helpful use which the mutual savings banks have made of these several billion dollars of savings. We know that Senator SPARKMAN has been. It shows that the mutual savings banks have been qualifying for operation on a national scale before they have asked for the privilege of operating, deposit-wise on a more than purely local scale.

Of course, Congress will be interested, too, in the life story of mutual savings banks. We do not mean the record of the movement from 1816 to date, although that can be told with moving effect. We mean rather the story of how the typical savings bank came into being, how much its beginning partook of a community welfare movement, and how, all through the years, men have served it as trustees in the same spirit as they would serve the local hospital or the public schools. They had been working for the cause of thrift with little regard for personal advantage. There are plenty of Congressmen quite unaware that so much service is being given to millions of savers through mutual savings banks by public spirited men.

Calculated to make the listening Congressman open his eyes wider still is the story of the dividends paid to savers which such banks have made and of the remarkable degree of safety for funds which these banks afford. We shall not attempt to forecast the form in which these data will be presented. The record of the dividends can be presented in bulk figures or in the romance story contained between the covers of cherished old passbooks. Compound interest at a generous rate can produce astonishing results.

BANKING TROUBLES

As for the story of safety provided for funds, we have often wondered why somebody does not write a book on how the mutual savings banks came through those days of disaster which we associate with the banking troubles of the 1930's. That was a period when thousands of banks closed their doors and never reopened them. They had weakened themselves by too lavish distributions of interest to depositors and by investing in high coupon speculative bonds. The runs of frightened depositors brought the finishing touch of ruin to many of them. How did the savings banks fare? Thanks to wise State laws, they were kept away from these high coupon speculative bonds and their dividends paid to depositors were based on sound earnings. Their reputation for good conduct among savers spared most of them from runs. There were precious few savings bank doors that failed to reopen. In New York State, for example, not so much as one savings bank failed to do so. The total losses of patrons of mutual savings banks the country over, due to bank closings, scaling of deposits, and the like, were trivial in comparison with the general record. What a field day for the cause of Federal mutual savings banks can be the hearing in Washington, when the stories of 1929 and of the 1930's are presented for the committee's inspection.

PROVEN GOOD

The truth is that a good Federal law for chartering and for the government of mutual savings banks will represent primarily a selection of laws already proven good in State experience. There is a good deal of similarity among the laws of the States and the task of selection cannot have been extraordinarily difficult. The process by which the States have acquired these laws has not varied greatly as between the States. Each proposal for a new law has usually been born in actual savings bank experience. Then the proposal has had to run the gauntlet of approval by savings bank men, generally—usually involving action by the State savings bank association. Next, the proposal has had to earn the favor of the State bank commissioner. Only after this winnowing process does the proposal reach the legisnature for that body's exacting scrutiny. That the scrutiny is exacting anybody familiar with the legislative handling of new bank law will testify. The members of the legislature are too familiar with the record and the reputation of mutual savings banks to take any long chances with new laws for governing them. The final step, approval by the Governor, takes place in an equally exacting atmosphere. Congress can't help but be impressed with the quality of the State laws with which it will become familiar through this proposal for Federal mutual savings banks.

Boston Renaissance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very interesting broadcast delivered by Messrs. Paul G. O'Friel and James E. Allen, general managers of sta-

tions WBZ and WBZ–TV, in Boston, respectively. The presentation on Westinghouse stations WBZ and WBZ–TV is a part of the company policy of contributing to the public betterment and a fuller measure of information and understanding:

BOSTON RENAISSANCE

Those pessimists who have been preparing to bury Boston will have to put away their shovels. Events of the past few weeks have shown that there is abundant life in the old city still.

On the government level, approval seems assured for the all-important Prudential Center, which will renovate a large section of the Back Bay. There has also been agreement on the plans for the vast government center in the blighted Scollay Square section.

On the educational front, Boston University has unveiled plans for a $25 million new building program that will alter the skyline along the Charles River.

Two private development plans announced this month have tremendous significance, too. The New England Mutual Life Insurance Co. plans a $7,500,000 expansion that will more than double the size of its home office building in Copley Square. Finally, the Gillette Safety Razor Co. has announced a $6 million plant expansion and development program in South Boston. Here we have large business and manufacturing firms saying in the most meaningful way that they like the city and have faith in its future.

Add up the cost of all this construction and you get a figure close to $300 million. And it seems like only yesterday that ground was broken for the West End renewal project and plans were being announced for the new Harvard Medical Center here and the vast MIT development across the river in Cambridge. Even those and the other projects now underway are but a beginning.

The government center itself will not provide any new tax revenue for the city. But by elimination of the slums in the area additional private investment will be encouraged. More development is sure to follow around the Prudential Center, too.

Rebuilding an old city is a slow and painful process, and there are still many other problems that must be met. With the events of recent weeks, though, August 1960 may be remembered as the turning point in Boston's renaissance.

Stand Firm on Guantanamo, Our Vital U.S. Base in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, has been working these past few days on social and economic aid for Latin America. We must also realize from the U.S. point of view, as the Truman administration failed to realize in South Korea, that this area needs the maintenance of strong military protection by the United States, even when we are working, through the Organization of American States, on the good-neighbor policy instituted under President Roosevelt and continued under President Eisenhower on a bipartisan basis.

There are many methods of carrying out a firm and patient U.S. policy toward Cuba suggested by all shades of American opinion. But there is one policy that as a Navy Reserve officer I believe all U.S. citizens should agree upon without question: The United States should firmly maintain its rights on the vital Guantanamo Bay base in Cuba and mince no words when it comes to the question of our decision to continue this vital base under all circumstances.

Having been a Navy officer in World War II, and having continued my service in the U.S. Navy Ready Reserve, I know what a strong base this is guarding the windward passage in the South Atlantic, the islands of the Caribbean, and being the major advanced base to protect the eastern approaches to the Panama Canal.

Having had sea duty on a guided missile ship within the past few years based at Guantanamo Bay, I believe I have personal knowledge to speak on the vital necessity of the United States retaining this giant and strong base.

I believe that the great mass of the Cuban people want the United States to maintain this base against outside aggression, and are pleased with the help it gives to the Cuban economy in Oriente Province. Most of the Cuban people have been our friends during the years, and as God-fearing Christian citizens, and largely members of the Catholic Church, oppose, as strongly as we do, the continued veering and danger-our drift to the left. We must maintain our U.S. stand on the Monroe Doctrine, and Guantanamo Bay is one of the chief supports of this policy for the protection of the entire Western Hemisphere.

I am calling to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress and the American people an article in the New York Times about Guantanamo.

The article follows:

CLOUDS OVER GUANTANAMO

(A military expert describes the mood of the Navy base in Castro's Cuba today, and explains why we cannot afford to lose it.)

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

GUANTANAMO BAY, CUBA.—The floodtide of Fidel Castro's revolution surges around the 7-foot fence that marks this American enclave. Barbudos—or bearded ones—stand at the gates; militiamen in berets ride the fence line; handbills exhorting the Cuban workers of the naval base to "fulfill your duty for your country" are distributed at the northeast gate.

The U.S. naval base at Guantanamo Bay—more familiarly known as "Gitmo" to generations of bluejackets—has today acquired a new name, the "bird sanctuary." It is a closely guarded haven of quiet and stability in a tense and fearful island. The 45 square miles of the base are isolated from the rest of Cuba. For almost 2 years now the gates have been closed on the 5,600 Americans in the base and on the thousands of bluejackets and officers aboard visiting ships of the fleet. They may go to Jamaica or Haiti for leave and recreation but not into troubled Cuba. The fleet is in—but the rafters no longer ring at Pepe's Place in nearby Caimanera; the Arizona Bar in Guantanamo city is dark and dreary.

But despite the hate-America tirades from Havana, the base—a blend of Cuban scenery and Yankee energy—maintains the organized routine of the Navy, seemingly immune to the winds of change. The hot Caribbean sun shines down day after day on an arid reservation, on the great shining bay, and the mud-flats and the tumbled cactus-covered hills, on the fronds of royal palms waving gently in the humid breeze, on the flaming scarlet of the flamboyant trees, on jasmine and hibiscus and bougainvillaea.

It is a deceptive scene, for this beauty—with the stark Cuban hills as a kind of Hollywood backdrop—comprises a complex of power, a base for which Americans once fought and died and for which they are ready to fight again. Since 1898, when a battalion of marines accompanied by war correspondent Stephen Crane, the author of "The Red Badge of Courage," seized Guantanamo Bay from the Spanish as a coaling station for Admiral Sampson's fleet, the naval base has been developed into a $76 million investment, with some 1,400 buildings.

On the low western shore of the bay, the Leeward Point jet airstrip, 8,000 feet long, parallels the coastline—in places only a few yards from the craggy coral bluffs against which the sea thunders. On the eastern shore, beneath the steep hills and along the indented points which reach out into the bay like a many-fingered hand, stretches for miles the main part of the base. McCalla Field, a 5,000-foot strip for propeller-driven planes, and the headquarters of the naval air station, lies to seaward, near Fisherman's Point.

Off Sherman Avenue, the main thoroughfare, are ships' piers and machine shops, the administration building, fueling areas, a chapel, recreation fields, radio towers, fuel tanks, warehouses and repair shops, commissary and post exchange, a modern, finely equipped 100-bed hospital, marine barracks, and the frame or cinderblock houses of officers, enlisted men or civilian employees.

With all the venomous anti-Americanisms that are the stock in trade of the Cuban radio and press, there is very little anxiety or tension in Guantanamo Bay. The residents are, indeed, amused—though sometimes irritated—by the concern voiced in letters from home and by the alarmist articles printed in Cuban and some American newspapers.

But there is watchfulness. There are 246 officers and almost 2,700 enlisted men assigned to the base; the rest of the 5,600 Americans are civil service employees and dependents. Normally, there is an average of 4,000 to 5,000 more men aboard ships that are using Guantanamo's training facilities. But there are also 2,200 Cuban civil service employees (most of whom live in Caimanera, Guantanamo City, or other nearby points) who run the machine shops, operate powerplants and provide essential services both for the base and for visiting ships of the fleet. And there are 1,443 Cuban laborers and domestics (with non-civil-service ratings), of whom about 800 live on the base.

Under the old 1903 treaties with Cuba, reaffirmed in 1934, the United States was granted until it renounced the right, complete jurisdiction and control over the base. Ultimate sovereignty remains Cuban, but the exercise of this sovereignty over the base area in the United States hands, an arrangement that has been at least inferentially affirmed by the Cuban Supreme Court. The treaty provides for free access of ships through Guantanamo Bay to the small Cuban port towns of Caimanera and Boquerón, which lie in the upper bay outside the reservation.

The base has no fresh water; its water supply is piped from a pumping station on the Yateras River, more than 4 miles outside the fence. There are almost 10 miles of seacoast and some 24 miles of fence to be guarded.

These facts, plus the small army of Cuban workers who maintain the base and live on

it, make "Gitmo's" security problem a complex one. There is not much worry—or need to worry—about an all-out armed attack against the base. There is too much weight of metal on the U.S. side. And if anything develops that the local garrison cannot handle, reinforcements could be rushed in in a matter of hours from the States or from Roosevelt Roads in Puerto Rico.

But sabotage and terrorism would be more difficult to meet, since Cuban workers are all over the base. So far there has been none. If such a campaign were started, probably the only ultimate answer would be the exclusion of all Cubans from the base and their replacement by Seabees and workers brought from the States.

Demonstrations and minor harassment—all sporadic—have been the only evidence as far as "Gitmo" is concerned of the Cuban Government's hostility to most things American. Four Cuban workers, including the head of the base workers' union, have been fired for slanderous attacks upon the United States or their superiors. There have been no repercussions; in fact, the union head was virtually repudiated by his fellow workers.

Castro's militia have threatened, bullied, and bluffed the base workers to force them to change their dollars into pesos after they leave the reservation. A whole fleet of Cuban fishing boats, protected by an armed detail, tested the ban against fishing in the bay, but retreated when met with a firm stand by Rear Adm. F. W. Fenno, the base commander.

Girls from Guantanamo City, 28 miles distant, who—heavily chaperoned—used to attend the Saturday night dances on the base, have been dubbed "pro-American," arrested, maltreated, and threatened by Cuban militia and police. Minor officials and the Cuban press have breathed threats; a few have said, "The base is ours." Propaganda about American "imperialism" and "maltreatment" of workers fills the airwaves.

But the Castro government, despite all its threats and accusations against the United States and the base, has said it would honor the treaty unless the United States committed "aggression" against Cuba. Cuban Army officers and militiamen have visited the base. The Cuban All-Stars baseball team played a base team on July 4 (and lost). And the important water supply from the Yateras, which could be cut off at any time by Cuba, is still flowing into the reservation's tanks. (If it should be interrupted, "Gitmo" has plans to supply its needs by tanker ship.)

Given this mixed picture, the marines and sailors, with jeep and helicopter, patrol miles of fence and maintain sentry posts at key points. Police dogs help keep watch at night (and have reduced pilferage to an all-time low). Harbor police patrol the bay in speedboats. Workers' passes are carefully checked; spot searches of incoming and more thorough ones of outgoing workers are made. The magazine areas are off-bounds and closely guarded. Ships in port maintain armed anchor watches against boats, swimmers, and frogmen. Information about what is going on "outside" in Oriente Province is carefully collected, checked.

All of this effort invites the question: Is "Gitmo" worth it? What is the present importance of a base first acquired in the last century, when the lethal radius of naval weapons was measured in yards rather than in continents and our ships needed coaling stations in large numbers?

From the military point of view, Guantanamo Bay has threefold importance.

Both in peace and in war it has major value as a training base. Gunnery ranges and maneuvering areas lie close by, between the south coast of Cuba and Haiti and Jamaica. The weather is ideal for flying. Sometimes there are as many as 40 naval vessels in the harbor or at sea nearby, engaged in 3 to 10 weeks of shakedown or refresher training. The base's facilities are geared to this training; a fleet training group, under the commander in chief, Atlantic, aids the ships.

Guantanamo as a training base is, of course, replaceable. The facilities at Roosevelt Roads, built up during World War II, augment the Cuban base. Missile ships work out of the Puerto Rican base because of the longer firing ranges available rather than "Gitmo." But Guantanamo Bay, long established, has many station facilities which Roosevelt Roads lacks. They could be duplicated in Puerto Rico only at high cost.

In addition to its training and fleet-support roles, Guantanamo Bay has strategic and wartime value. Its geographical location, commanding the important Windward Passage from Atlantic to Caribbean, is a major asset. It is an outer sentry for the Panama Canal.

During World War II it was a convoy port—where Atlantic and Caribbean convoys made up and sortied. It is an important base for antisubmarine warfare operations by both surface ships and aircraft. It is the key link in a chain of bases guarding the Caribbean and its important oil, copper and bauxite traffic and extending from Key West to Trinidad. It is a staging base for fighters and troop and freight-carrying aircraft bound for Central or South America. It greatly simplifies the Navy's supply problem in the Caribbean.

For all these reasons it is highly important in any limited war—though probably not vital. We could do without it, but at the expense of greater costs and increased logistical and tactical difficulties.

For all-out nuclear war, Guantanamo Bay, with its present facilities, is useless. There are no missile bases there (though some could be built if needed). Its southern location away from the most direct route between the Soviet "heartland" and the United States, reduces still further its importance in missile-nuclear war.

But "Gitmo's" political and psychological importance transcends its military utility. The base stands today as a symbol of U.S. power and prestige. Its future is clearly linked with the future of other U.S. overseas bases—particularly with the future of the Panama Canal Zone and of Chaguaramas, our leased base in Trinidad. What we do in one will affect all. If we are bullied, bluffed, blackmailed or persuaded to abandon Guantanamo the effects will be apparent throughout the Caribbean and in Latin America; it would mark the ebb tide of American power.

The Communist grip upon Cuba probably has not yet been consolidated to the point of no return. Guantanamo Bay, with its $7,446,000 annual expenditures in Cuba for payroll and purchases, with its small broadcasting station, its Cuban workers, its long history of friendly relations with the people of Oriente Province, stands as one obstacle in the Communist path to power. If Cuba becomes a completely totalitarian Communist State, "Gitmo" under the U.S. flag will be even more important to American survival than it is now.

These are the positive aspects of Guantanamo Bay under the Stars and Stripes. The base also has value in the negative sense of what it denies a potential enemy. Suppose we abandoned "Gitmo" and turned it over to a Communist-oriented government in Cuba, or suppose Cuba leased Guantanamo—or some other Cuban site—to Russia?

Cuba, as such, could not hope to use the facilities of Guantanamo Bay effectively, even if the entire $76 million installation were turned over to Castro intact. The Cuban armed forces are too small and do not have the skills, training or equipment to justify such a base. But if the base were to serve, by proxy, for another power; if it were to become, in thin disguise, a Soviet base, "Gitmo" might be a cause for war.

Most of our strategists are agreed that we cannot afford to allow the Russians or the Chinese Communists to develop bases in the Western Hemisphere—much less in Cuba, only a few miles from our shores. The political and economic challenge to the Monroe Doctrine—which the Communists already are commencing to pose in Cuba—would then be supplemented by a blatant military threat.

This, we cannot possibly permit. The lease by Cuba of such a base as Guantanamo to the Russians would almost certainly mean armed U.S. intervention in Cuba—if possible, under the auspices of the Organization of American States; if not, by U.S. forces alone.

These are highly unlikely eventualities. There is no intention in either Pentagon or State Department to give up Guantanamo. There is apparently no present intention in Havana to lease bases—at least overt bases—to the Russians or other Communist powers.

But, starkly stated in these terms, the political, psychological and military importance of Guantanamo Bay—positively and negatively—becomes evident. "Gitmo" is a link in a chain of world power, and the chain is no stronger than its weakest link.

Ethics and the Politician

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Stephen K. Bailey as it appeared in the August 15, 1960, issue of the New Republic.

Stephen K. Bailey is a professor of political science at the Maxwell Graduate School, Syracuse University, and a consultant to the Fund for the Republic's Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions.

The article is as follows:

ETHICS AND THE POLITICIAN

(By Stephen K. Bailey)

Insofar as I refer specifically to experiences in Middletown, Conn., during the years when I was mayor of that city, I hope that friends there will show me the same charity that Huckleberry Finn showed Mark Twain. Referring to "The Adventures of Tom Sawyer," Huck commented, "That book was made by Mr. Mark Twain, and he told the truth, mainly. There was things which he stretched, but mainly, he told the truth. That is nothing. I never seen anybody but lied one time or another, without it was Aunt Polly * * *." And Huck Finn was perceptive in spotting the moral flaw in Aunt Polly and in her old maid sister, Miss Watson: a flaw of self-righteousness so hideous that when Huck learned that Miss Watson was living "so as to go to the good place," Huck could "see no advantage in going where she was going," so he made up his mind he wouldn't try for it.

I have worried far more about the ethical consequences of my decisions as mayor since leaving office than I ever did as an incumbent. And perhaps this is the first point to be made. Most elected executives find that there is an ethics of action which is normally far more compelling than the urge to balance with precision the ethical niceties of pressing public issues. There are times when the

good of the community demands firmness and decision at the expense of marginal injustice. Those who would make justice the sole criterion of the good society are not only, in my judgment, myopic in their ethical vision; they establish an impossible operating norm for administrators.

When the nicest people have rationalized their selfishness with a tactical deference to the public interest, elected political executives are often grateful that they are too preoccupied to be ethically astute. Even where venality seems clearest, as in the rare case of an attempt at straight bribery ("Mayor, here's $1,000 in $5 bills if you get that easement through the council"—the political version of "payola"), the ethical issues may not be self-evident. Let us make some assumptions: Suppose that the mayor knows that the easement will go through "on its merits" (begging what that slippery phrase means). Suppose further that the mayor knows that the party needs money not only to run the forthcoming election but to pay debts on the past election. Suppose the mayor knows further that the voting public has not responded favorably and positively to the appeal of the American Heritage Foundation for everyone to give to the party of his choice. Suppose finally that the mayor believes that a working two-party system is the Nation's and the community's greatest safeguard of democracy and freedom. If it could be proved to the mayor's satisfaction that the lack of $1,000 at the moment could do irreparable damage to the two-party system in the area, would it be a higher principle in a naughty world for the mayor to accept the money on behalf of the party, or to refuse the money?

Stated this way, the issue is still not very complex for most people. They've known what's right and wrong since they've been 10. You do not accept bribes, period; and you most certainly do not compound evil by cheating the briber. This is all very clear. But is it, really? There are ways of playing slight variations on this theme which would remove from the sternest Presbyterian moralist any burden of guilt. The briber has made a number of contributions to the party over the years. The latest thousand is simply another indication of his belief in the great principles of the party. On the easement question, every party member on the council, including the mayor, attempts to examine the issue on its merits. But a will to believe has set in—a subtle coloration of the problem. Good old Joe is a friend who provided all the favors for the party picnic. Isn't it fortunate the merits of the easements case are on his side?

And bribery can take so many forms: money, favors, flattery, help in time of trouble, influence in building status. To pretend that bribery is a simple and easily spotted phenomenon is naive. To pretend it takes place only in politics is silly. I have seen the egos of older university professors successfully bribed by astute and ambitious instructors; I have seen great institutions bribe men into conformity with promises of promotions or demotions. I have seen them kill, spiritually, those who resisted. I have received threats that unless such-and-such happened, I'd be voted out at the next election. Is this not attempted bribery? Is money any more a thing of value than power or status or reelection?

I was never asked to fix a traffic or parking ticket in Middletown; but I cannot swear that tickets were not occasionally fixed while I was mayor. And I am not sure that under certain circumstances (e.g., a hectic woman delayed in buying her six children school clothes) I would not have paid the dollar fine myself rather than penalize her for something beyond her effective control. Nothing is more unjust than unexceptional law except law that is all exceptions. Surely, one of the most difficult ethical problems in all governance is the drawing of lines between rules and exceptions. That the lines, to be moral, must be drawn near the rules end of the spectrum I do not question. But that exceptions are never warranted seems to me the most callous of all moral judgments.

IT COSTS MONEY

George Bernard Shaw once wrote what many politicians must at times have felt. Shaw learned that a Labor candidate named Joseph Burgess had refused to compromise on some issue and had thereby lost his seat in Parliament. Shaw commented bitterly: "When I think of my own unfortunate character, smirched with compromise, rotted with opportunism, mildewed by expediency—dragged through the mud of borough council and Battersea elections, stretched out of shape with wirepulling, putrefied by permeation, worn out by 25 years pushing to gain an inch here, or straining to stem a backrush, I do think Joe might have put up with just a speck or two on those white robes of his for the sake of the millions of poor devils who cannot afford any character at all because they have no friend in Parliament. Oh, these moral dandies; these spiritual toffs. * * * Who is Joe, anyhow, that he should not risk his soul occasionally like the rest of us?"

I was once confronted with a possible kickback on a firetruck purchase. The party representative reminded me that it costs money to run elections; that generosity from firetruck manufacturers to those who had the insight to see the need for public safety in their communities was rather standard, and that no one would really suffer. The gift would come as a preordained slice of the salesman's commission; he would give of his own income because "he believed in the principles of the Democratic Party." I drew myself up to my maximum height, stared at my good friend, and said in what I am sure must have been the most patronizing of tones, "If the party needs $400 or $500, I shall be happy to try to raise the money personally; but I shall not do it that way." I then went a step further. I called the poor firetruck salesman into the office and made him add about $400 worth of extra equipment to the firetruck at the bid price he had quoted. In a swift double blow I had proved my moral worth and defended the taxpayers' interests. I had proved that at least in one American community public office is a public trust.

I had also proved that it is easy to be moral when the pressure is not really on. Suppose the party coffers had been empty? Suppose my confident bluff to raise $400 or $500 for the party had been called? Suppose the alternative to a Democratic reelection was the election of a rather disreputable Republican gang who would have practiced "boodle" with more frequency and with infinitely less flair than the Democrats? What then? And why should we refuse to accept money for the imperative cause of political party machinery, almost regardless of source, when the so-called "good" people of the community would not be caught dead giving to their political party—to the system of options which does far more than the Constitution to guarantee freedom and democracy?

The only serious ethical struggle I had with party leaders in Middletown dealt with a request for a zoning exception. Here I was firm, morally aroused, and dogmatic, and would be to this day. A contractor, who had contributed liberally to both political parties locally, hired a leading Democratic lawyer to plead for a commercial spot zone in a strictly residential area. The people of the area were almost solidly opposed to the change. Even if they had not been, nothing can ruin the orderly and esthetic development of a growing city like politically inspired spot zoning in contravention of a general plan. The members of the zoning committee, to their credit, said to me, "Mayor, there is a lot we'll do for the party, but we won't do this." The final showdown on this case took place in the lawyer's office with all major party leaders present. I walked in swinging. I made it quite clear that if the plumbing broke down in city hall, I would hire a licensed Democratic plumber over a licensed Republican plumber any day of the week; that if the law did not force us to go to bid, I would buy insurance from a Democratic rather than a Republican insurance agent; but that when it came to what Edmund Burke once called "the permanent forces" in the community, I was ready to do battle. I suggested that although there was much in politics that one rendered to Caesar, almost without qualms, city planning was rendered only to God. A few party leaders were upset; but most of them were understanding; and the lawyer in question, who over the years has been one of the most brilliant as well as constructive forces in the community and State, had the grace to accept my position without rancor.

But contrary to what many people seem to believe, the hard ethical issues of public life rarely concern party politics. Party decisions tend to roll according to preset patterns. Every elected executive works out a few obvious benchmarks for relationships with political leaders (for example, "consult party leaders on all appointments, but solicit their help in trading little appointments to the party for big appointments to you"). In any case, to suggest that most party officials are frequently ethical "problems" is to distort their normal role beyond recognition. For every occasion when a party leader asked me for a favor that disturbed my conscience, I can think of a dozen times when the same party leader helped me defend the public interest against the importunities of nonparty pressure groups.

Upon reflection, it is my firm belief that insofar as party politics interferes with the pursuit of the public interest, it is largely a result of the necessities of campaign finance. Most venality in public life could be abolished or reduced to insignificance if the public would assume responsibility for broadly based campaign financing and would insist upon the public auditing and disclosure of all campaign gifts and expenditures. This would not eliminate corruption entirely, for wherever power and money converge some venality will be found. But our present method of financing political campaigns is, in my estimation, the single most corrupting factor in our political life—local, national, and especially, State.

OF PARKING LOTS AND PEACOCKS

Take 10 problems which faced me as mayor, and which are typical of perhaps 100 I faced in 2 years as an elected executive.

1. A peacock farm on the edge of town kept neighbors awake for a month or so a year during the peacock mating season. The city government was asked by the neighbors to see to it that the birds were quieted. Ethical question: Is a tempory irritation—including loss of sleep—for 10 families worth the destruction of a hobby and a partial livelihood for one person?

2. The best detective on the chronically underpaid police force is suspected of taking protection money from some local two-bit gamblers. The evidence is too vague and unsubstantial to stand in court. Ethical question: is the possibility of the evidence being correct important enough to warrant a substantial investigation, with a consequent probable loss in efficiency and morale in the police department during and long after the investigation, a certain loss in public confidence in the whole force, and the ever-present possibility that the rumor was planted by a crank? And out of the

many pressing issues coming across the mayor's desk, how much time and effort does such an investigation warrant from the mayor himself?

3. The whole scheme of volunteer fire departments is looked upon by the chief of the city's only paid department as wasteful, inefficient and dangerous to the public safety. The volunteers claim that their firefighting record is topnotch, that they save the taxpayers money. Ethical question: if neither side can be proved incorrect, how does one weigh the values of volunteer community endeavors against marginal inefficiencies in operation of a vital service?

4. Many years ago, one department store was farsighted enough to have bought up some land for off-street parking. This off-street parking gave the store quite a competitive advantage. The city, in a new municipal parking program, needed a portion of the private parking lot assembled by the department store years before. When established, the municipal lot might destroy the store's competitive advantage. Ethical question: at what point does the public interest demand that private farsightedness be penalized?

5. Two mayors in 4 years happened to have lived on Wyllys Avenue. Wyllys Avenue desperately needed repaving. But so did some other streets in the city. Ethical question: should Wyllys Avenue be paved, granted a heavy presumption that many citizens would claim that the mayor had "taken care of himself"?

6. A Federal grant-in-aid cut in half the city's welfare load, making a sinecure out of one of the two city welfare positions. The holder of the sinecure was a Negro appointed by the opposition party. Ethical question: should work somehow be made for the Negro, or should he be dropped? (For anyone who knows the problems of status, morale and upward mobility among Negroes in a largely white community, the political questions posed by this case are easy compared to the long-range ethical questions.)

7. The virulent opposition of a local printer publicist might be tamed on a few key issues with the proper placing of a few city printing contracts. Ethical question: obvious.

8. Buying of tires in wholesale lots would save the taxpayers $300 a year—about 1 cent per citizen per annum. A score of little Middletown tire merchants would lose $10 or more in income. Ethical question: how does one balance 1 cent each for 30,000 people versus $10 each for 20 merchants?

9. Parents concerned with the safety of their children on the way to and from school are constantly demanding increased police protection and more sidewalks. A more legitimate demand would be hard to imagine. But there are limits. Ethical question: granted that total safety never can be assured, what grounds beyond obvious necessity and "the squeaky wheel gets the grease" can be found for awarding or denying protection?

10. There is a likelihood that one of the major industries in town will have to close down a sizable slice of its operations. This may mean 2,000 unemployed. A steel company is looking for a New England site for a steel mill. It finds an ideal location in Middletown. That ideal location is a stretch of the Connecticut River which is unspoiled and is deeply treasured by small-boat owners and by nature lovers. Ethical question: is the provision of employment for 2,000 people worth the destruction forever of natural beauty?

If I should be asked today how I resolved, in my own mind, the ethical dilemmas posed in the previous paragraphs, I should not know how to answer. Most of the dilemmas were not mine to resolve alone. Other people shared official power with me, and many citizens without official power assumed substantial unofficial responsibility for community decisions. But insofar as I had to make up my mind by myself, or felt that my judgment might be determining in the minds of others, I did repair to two or three very general propositions for ethical guidance. In practice, the propositions were never articulated, but in retrospect I know that they were there. All of them had been woven into my life by parental, religious, and academic influences—in most cases by all three. My father, although never a minister, was a professor of religion and a firm believer in the social gospel. My studies at Oxford had brought me close to Immanuel Kant and Jean Jacques Rousseau. Ideas like "the categorical imperative" and "the general will" were connected in my mind with such Biblical injunctions as "Let justice roll down as waters; and righteousness as a mighty stream."

THE GARDEN OF VANITY

The most helpful single question I could ask myself seemed to be, "What do you want Middletown to be like 10 years from now?" Against this, many things fell into place. I wanted more beauty, fewer slums, less bigotry, more recreation, more community spirit, a more sustained sense of public responsibility, a more dynamic and prosperous economy, better education, a stronger and more truly competitive two-party system, and a heightened sense of personal dignity for all. These were some of the benchmarks against which specific ethical issues were measured or rationalized. They were not my marks. They were the marks of the civilization of which I was a minuscule reflection.

There are, perhaps, two other matters which ought to be touched upon. The first has to do with the effect of power upon personality. I remember one evening when I was returning with political friends from a television performance. For a half hour they told me what a brilliant performance mine had been. By the end of the half hour I was aware only that a new political star had been born on the horizon: namely, myself, and that I could not long deny the people of the State of Connecticut the chance to vote for me either for Governor or at the very least for U.S. Senator. It was not until I got home that my wife—with that wonderful sixth sense of a level-headed and thoughtful woman—reminded me that my performance had, in fact, been a little on the mediocre side—but that she was sure I had just had an off night. The most devastating traps of public office are the ones set to catch the ego. It is so easy to forget that the tribute is to the office, not to the person. Even a mayor stands out a little; fathers bring up their daughters to shake the mayor's hand; the mayor sits at head tables; he officiates; he is often the central figure in ceremony. All this inflates the sense of personal worth and waters the thirsty garden of vanity. The consequences are often pathetic, often silly, sometimes dangerous.

But Acton was wrong in suggesting that the only flowers in the garden of vanity are the weeds of corruption. Power may corrupt, but it also can ennoble. The sense that you, and the office you hold, are widely valued often creates a heightened sense of responsibility, a desire to live close to the public expectation, a wish to become a kind of community example. I have seen men utterly transformed by a judgeship. A politician—an old pro in western Connecticut—once confided to me that he hated all judges. "What are they but some hack lawyers who happened to know a politician?" And he went on, "After you've made 'em, what do they do? They turn around and kick you in the teeth. They draw their robes around them as though they were Solon or something. You can't touch them. Who the hell do they think they are?" The fact is that they think they are Solon; they suddenly realize that instead of petty politicians they are an essential part of the fabric of civilization—a fabric which can last only so long as there is a widespread public belief that judges in courts of law will try to be just. And what is true of judges is equally true of elected executives.

This brings me to my final point. All ethical questions ultimately revert to propositions about the nature of man. Perched precariously on a whirling planet, blind to his origins, blind to his reasons for being, beset by the terrors of nature and of his own creation, man wobbles drunkenly between a certainty that he is nothing and an occasional, blinding revelation that he has a transcendent dignity and perhaps destiny. When man feels alienated from his universe, he may huddle in fear with his fellow men; but he cannot reach them with that fullness of feeling, that intenseness of identity, which is suggested by the Christian concept of love, or by the civil concept of community. I am not a mystical person, but I sense strongly that my best moments as mayor came when I felt—in an almost religious way—that what we were attempting to do in Middletown had meaning beyond itself. I remember Fred Smith, the editor of the local paper, once writing me an intimate note when I was particularly discouraged about the public response to some issue. "Never," he wrote, "lose faith in your neighbors." And he went on to explain, not that they were perfect, but that he had known them for a long time, and that they would ultimately respond to the good if they could be shown the good.

Surely this is the ultimate ethical postulate in a democracy: not that man is good, but that he is capable of good; not that he is free from corruption, but that he is desperately sick of it; not that he has fashioned the good society, but that he has caught an unforgettable glimpse of it.

Once in a Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH GREEN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, this week the press of my State has spoken eloquently in tribute to an outstanding Oregon citizen—Gov. Oswald West, who died Monday.

"Once in a century" begins the leading editorial in a major Portland daily, describing the unique place Governor West has held in the hearts of Oregonians.

His multiple interests and contributions, and his vital, many-sided personality are recalled in other articles from the Portland newspapers.

Self-educated Os West began his career as a bank teller, a Klondike gold hunter, and later an attorney, State land agent, and a member of the State railroad commission. He was long known as an implacable foe of fraud and deceit, as well as for his pungent comment and piercing intellect.

The widespread reforms and improvements which he sponsored during his 4 years as Governor, and his many contributions as a historian of the Northwest are enduring evidence of the great contributions Os West made to the State of Oregon.

Under unanimous consent I insert the following newspaper comments on this great Oregonian to be printed at this point in the RECORD:

OS WEST—NEVER ANOTHER LIKE HIM

[From the Oregon Journal, Aug. 23, 1960]

Once in a century, perhaps, comes a man so colorful, so courageous, so wise in the ways of his fellows and so mindful of their welfare that the memory of his deeds and wit-spiced sayings stands out like a beacon in the history of his State.

Such a man was Os West, whose turbulent yet productive career ended quietly—ironically so—in his bed with his boots off—Monday morning. He was 87.

So much has been written and said about Os West, so many adjectives have been used to describe his characteristics and accomplishments, that one hardly knows where to begin in paying tribute to this man. Inimitable. Indomitable. Bizarre. Tragic. Heroic. Lovable. Great friend of the people. They all fit Os West and the Os West saga.

But to describe him adequately, his purple prose, his crusty exterior which partly concealed his abiding faith in his State and the eternal verities to which he clung, you have to judge him by his pet hates. They represented in reverse the things and people he admired, and loved, and fought for all his life.

For Os West, you see, devoted almost all of his career to fighting the stuffed shirts, the spoilers, the fakers, the racketeers, the hypocrites, and the all-around bums of his era.

Largely self-educated, from grammar school to his bar exams, he never forgot the tribulations of his youth—poverty, hardships, a drunken father, nor the inspiration of his sainted mother.

This accounts for his abiding hatred of liquor and the two promises he made his mother—never to drink, and some day to become Governor of Oregon.

These promises he kept. But the other promise he made in his youth, half serious, half jest—to shoot a bartender—he did not live to fulfill.

Oregon will remember Os West for the history-making term he served as Democratic Governor—4 hectic years in which he jammed widespread reforms through an unwilling Republican legislature.

And while Governor West always derided the do-gooders of his time, he became one of the really great do-gooders of Oregon history—prison reform, improvement of State institutions, saving Oregon's beaches for the people for all time, protection of women and children in industry, creation of the State board of control, the State game commission, and the office of State printer, to name a few.

And no one will forget his single-handed expose of the school land grabbers and the recovery for his State of almost a million acres of valuable timberland.

But we shall remember Os West as a friend who made history live, whose worldy wise advice and pithy comment inspired and enlivened our days. Like thousands of others, we are proud to have known Os West, the incomparable. There will never be another.

[From the Oregon Journal, Aug. 23, 1960]

OS WEST'S MARK FELT IN OREGON TODAY—EX-GOVERNOR HAD HAND IN ALL PHASES OF LIFE

Horse-loving, whisky-hating Oswald West, 14th Governor of Oregon, is dead at 87.

A lifelong Democrat, he was the State's chief executive from 1911 to 1915. Before his turbulent 4 years were over, West had pushed through legislative reforms which shaped State administration to this day.

In more recent years he was known for the torrent of articles, editorials, letters-to-editors and notes he wrote to friends. With both pen and tongue he was a master of language, withering his opponents with pungent comment and vitriolic criticism.

Although a reformer in matters of legislation, he was no pious do-gooder—in fact, he scorned that breed. Once he fulminated, "The professional uplifter has become more of a public nuisance than the earwig."

ADVISED SOCIETY

And in the winter of his life he felt compelled to advise society:

"Many men, as they approach old age, appear to grow virtuous and prayerful, but don't let them fool you. They are merely attempting to offer the leavings of the devil as a sacrifice on the altar of God."

His passion for progressive social legislation seemed to stem from early experiences as a bank teller, State land agent and railroad commissioner. He had little sympathy with the group he called "malefactors of great wealth."

He served only one term as Governor, quitting politics for law practice in Portland and declaring, "The good of the community demands that there should be someone with a little political experience who is willing to refrain from public office and who has the courage to tell the truth occasionally and shame the devil."

His telling and shaming were curtailed by a severe heart attack in 1945 and a few years later a stroke burdened his powers of speech, though it dimmed his piercing intellect no one whit.

Born in Guelph, Ontario, May 20, 1873, West attended public schools in Portland and Salem. His business career began at 15 when he gained a job at Asahel Bush's Ladd & Bush bank at Salem. This job came to him as winner of a penmanship contest.

In 1900 he went to the First National Bank of Astoria. Gov. George E. Chamberlain appointed him land agent in 1903, and West promptly created a furor by recovering 900,000 acres of fraudulently obtained Oregon school lands. From 1907 to 1910 he was on the railroad commission.

His influence as Governor preserved the beaches for public ownership and for that a State park along the ocean was named for him. He was a prime influence in prison reforms, strengthening of State institutions, and in creation of the game commission, highway commission, State board of control, industrial welfare measures including workmen's compensation and child labor laws.

West claimed to his death that "I was 50 years ahead of my time."

FOR PROHIBITION

Two of West's avowed ambitions never were fulfilled. One was to shoot a bartender (because he hated whiskey), and the other to outlive his wife, Mabel Hutton, whom he married in 1897. ("She'll be worrying about where I've gone if I go first.")

Disturbed when his beloved Democratic Party leaned toward repeal of prohibition in 1931, West counseled, "The Democratic Party should see to it that the Nation is provided with its daily bread—the individual can be depended on to rustle his own drinks."

And, at about the same time, "Victory is within our grasp, unless, being controlled by our party emblem, we make asses of ourselves."

But if he hated "booze", he also loved playing the horses and dogs, claiming, in later years that wagering was his "exercise."

Probably no other Oregon Governor was as brash or audacious. He once grabbed a rifle and personally hunted down an escaped prison trusty.

Another time he announced he would march personally to Copperfield, a tough mining town in Baker County, and close down vice and gambling by declaring martial law. When the Copperfielders allowed they'd shoot him on sight, West shrewdly sent his petite secretary, Miss Fern Hobbs, instead. The toughs of Copperfield stood dumbfounded as Miss Hobbs read her proclamation and cooly directed a half dozen National Guard men to burn all the gambling tables and seize all the booze.

Surviving West, besides his wife, are two daughters, Mrs. Helen West Stone and Mrs. Frank J. "Jean" McHugh Jr., both of Portland; three grandchildren and two great-grandchildren. J. P. Finley & Son Mortuary is in charge of funeral arrangements.

It isn't likely that "Os" West regretted going much. He resented the succession of illnesses that depleted his physical powers. On his 80th birthday he snapped:

"I don't figure what a man wants to hang around for, after his usefulness is gone."

[From the Portland Oregonian, Aug. 23, 1960]

EX-GOVERNOR "OS" WEST, 87, DIES IN SLEEP

Oswald West, whose single 4-year term as Governor (from 1911 to 1915) has been called the most colorful in Oregon's history, died Monday morning in his sleep at his home. He was 87 years of age.

West lived to see the legislation he sponsored, often with forceful pressure on the Legislature, and the policies and State agencies he helped create, become and remain a most important segment of the State's government.

And he lived to enjoy virtually every honor a grateful State and community could bestow on him.

It was Oswald West, who, with the help of railroad tycoon Samuel Hill, laid the plans for Oregon's present highways system. He appointed the State's first highway commission.

His most enduring monument, perhaps, is public ownership of Oregon's 400 miles of ocean beaches, a result of farsighted legislation for which he was responsible.

Less known, perhaps, is the important legislation which he authored as State land agent, before he became Governor, which reserves to State ownership the beds and the land which lies below the low water mark of streams.

He was responsible for such social legislation as the workmen's compensation law, the child welfare commission, the establishment of funds for institutions caring for homeless children and foundlings. As State land agent he obtained adoption of a State law setting aside school funds from the sale of public lands.

CONTROL BOARD CREATED

Creation of the State board of control (the overall administrative agency composed of Governor, secretary of state, and State treasurer), was one of Oswald West's accomplishments.

Oregon's 14th Governor, Oswald West was a lifelong Democrat. He quit active participation in politics at the end of his term as Governor, but not his active interest. A prolific writer of letters to the editors of newspapers almost to the end, he remained a vigorous and powerful influence in State affairs.

He leaves his widow, the former Mabel Hutton, of Salem, to whom he was married in 1897, and two daughters, Mrs. Helen West Stone, and Mrs. Frank McHugh, Jr., both of Portland.

Funeral services will be Wednesday at 11:30 a.m. in Finley's Morninglight Chapel, with Bishop Benjamin D. Dagwell officiating. Committal will be private.

[From the Portland Oregonian, Aug. 23, 1960]

SELF-EDUCATED "OS" WEST SAVED BEACHES FOR PUBLIC

Ex-Governor West died in his sleep Monday morning in his apartment at 636 Northwest

20th Avenue, leaving an heritage of some 57 years of outstanding service to his adopted State.

With a formal education halted midway in the eighth grade of the old East School in Salem, Oswald West, encouraged by his mother, educated himself as both banker and lawyer.

Born May 29, 1873, on a farm near Guelph, Ontario, Canada, the future Governor of Oregon came to Portland with his parents, John G. and Sarah McGregor West, in July 1877. Their first experience in the State was an unhappy one. The old Cosmopolitan Hotel on the waterfront, where they stopped, burned and they lost virtually everything they owned.

NAMED LAND AGENT

Young West was successively a messenger and teller at the old Ladd & Bush Bank in Salem, a sheepherder in the Spokane area, a Klondike gold hunter, and an employee of the First National Bank at Astoria.

From the latter job Governor George Chamberlain chose West for appointment as State land agent, with instructions "to clean out the old State school land ring and recover as many fraudulently acquired school land acres as possible."

This was the beginning of Oswald West's long career as the implacable foe of fraud and deceit. On the evidence he produced, a Marion County grand jury reported State certificates of sale outstanding covered around a million acres of fraudulently acquired school lands. The State land board canceled all the certificates and recovered the lands.

West also uncovered a scheme in which crooked school land operators had duplicated the State seal, had forged copies of land board certificates of sale and assignments, and the signatures of State officials. Some of the State's best timber had been sold in this manner.

West's next post was as a member of the newly created State railroad commission, which brought lower rates and better service to Oregon shippers. In 1910 the Democratic Party nominated him for Governor and, campaigning on such issues as the direct election of U.S. Senators, the initiative and referendum, and recall, he was elected by a majority of around 6,700 in a State that had a registration of more than 2 to 1 Republicans to Democrats.

West's campaign expenses totaled $8,804, to which he contributed $450. The story was told that Ben. W. Olcott, who had returned from the Yukon and Alaskan gold fields with better luck than had West, put up $1,500 toward the campaign. Olcott later became Republican Governor of Oregon.

West moved from Salem to Portland in 1915 after concluding his one term as Governor and resumed his law practice, continuing until a heart attack forced his retirement in 1945. He had declined to run for a second term of Governor and years later he said he had accomplished nearly everything he had wanted to do in that one term.

TOWN CLEANED UP

One thing he never got to do was to "shoot a bartender." He recalled that as a child he used to sit in front of a saloon waiting to be taken home. He was a lifelong foe of alcohol and was instrumental in bringing prohibition to Oregon.

One of his exploits was the taming of the little mining town of Copperfield, in Baker County, where he sent a detachment of National Guard troops and put his 90-pound secretary, Miss Fern Hobbs in charge, with instructions to "burn the gambling equipment and seize the booze."

West not only cleaned up Copperfield, but defended his actions in court when he was sued for $30,000 damages. He won the case in the Supreme Court.

As Governor, Oswald West was responsible for important contributions in the field of human resources. He instituted the honor system in the State prison, created the State parole board, had the indeterminate sentence laws modified, and brought about other prison reforms.

He also solved some prison problems with direct and forceful action and on one occasion he took a rifle and joined the warden in tracking down an escaped convict and bringing him back to the penitentiary.

Although he quit active politics when he left the Governor's office, West continued to fight for the laws he had helped put on the statute books, and others which he thought should be there. In 1953 he made a spirited protest against a proposal to amend his tidelands measure, and in 1957 he rebuked the Democratic house for its plan to abolish the State board of control.

"The new crowd of Democrats who are running the show can go plumb to hell," he said.

Throughout the years he was his party's severest critic when he thought criticism was necessary. On his 86th birthday he castigated the 1959 Oregon Legislature, the first to be controlled by Democrats in 80 years, with these words:

"They're all college graduates, but not one of them knows how to add or subtract."

Oswald West was regarded as an authoritative historian of the Pacific Northwest, a subject on which he had written extensively. In recent years he had been working on a history of Oregon banking.

Newspaper readers knew him as a prolific writer of letters to the editor, one of which written not too long ago, began thus: "I wish to offer some free but sound advice."

A Plan for Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN H. DENT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to insert some remarks recently made by David J. McDonald, president of United Steelworkers of America, entitled "A Plan for Prosperity":

A PLAN FOR PROSPERITY

(By David J. McDonald)

Automation, while a great boon to mankind, creates and contributes to troublesome problems requiring bold action and broad cooperation between many forces, primarily labor, management and government.

Because this is so axiomatic, it is indeed regrettable that so little attention is being given to widespread unemployment and denial of full-time work opportunities for major groups of industrial workers. The leaders of the steel industry spent much time last year demanding the right to reduce their work force and get more work out of the steelworker. I note that only last week these same leaders have launched a campaign to get rank and file steelworkers to understand their version of inflation and foreign competition, and their notions of what to do about them.

But regrettably, we do not find these steel industrialists addressing themselves to the problems caused by automation, unemployment and underemployment. These mighty men of steel seem determined to concentrate on new methods of satisfying their personal aggrandizement and piling up new record profits. They apparently mean to ignore the pressing economic problems of their employees and of the hard-pressed steel communities.

Meanwhile the leaders of government in most cases do not even acknowledge the existence of this great domestic problem. All eyes are still riveted on money management, not on the crying needs of millions of American wage earners.

This then is the backdrop against which I must of necessity discuss the issue of automation.

When a nation begins to act as if production is the ultimate goal and profits per se are the measure of economic health, we are in deep trouble. A free democratic private enterprise system must never lose sight of the central purpose of its economy—satisfying human needs. We measure progress in terms of how people live, of their economic security, of their ability to provide education for their children, of the degree to which production of goods contributes to a happier life and a more wholesome community.

There are three areas in which I think practical steps are needed to face up to the challenge of automation and other labor-saving developments.

First, the workers who man automatic equipment require proper protection. The elimination of back-breaking work and the substitution of machine skill for human skill must not be allowed to result in reduced living standards for those who work. We in the Steelworkers Union have been mindful of this problem for many years. The standard job evaluation systems and incentive pay methods when coupled with automation directly threaten pay scales. No one can convince us that it is just or wholesome for workers to suffer wage cuts when new technological production methods are introduced.

Our major steel contracts have made progress toward preventing such wage cutting. Our negotiated job evaluation system balances the factors of labor and skill on the one hand with responsibility for equipment, operations and materials on the other to such an extent that its application rarely results in any rate reductions and often leads to rate increases as new equipment is installed.

In steel, incentive pay is not cut when effort is reduced and production increased as a result of automation or other developments. No matter what engineering studies may suggest, our contracts forbid less earning opportunity as processes and equipment are changed.

These basic collective bargaining devices we commend to our colleagues in labor and to the leaders of industry as well. It is shortsighted to use devices which drastically increase production for purposes of decreasing workers' pay. Any concept of industrial engineering which dictates such a result is doomed because it is founded on injustice and on the notion that economic progress can be made by depressing living standards.

Second, we come to the simple fact that despite enormous increases in the amount of production, the shadow of unemployment is darkening our country and our industrial communities. If the present trend in the steel industry continues, we will see a degree of unemployment in our industry in the year 1960 which equals or even exceeds the depths of the 1957–58 recession. And this after the 116-day strike depleted inventories. Apparently the steel industry is on the road to becoming a 9-month industry.

There are men at this conference better qualified than I to tell the story of the auto industry, the coal industry, the electronics fields and many others. Throughout Amer-

ica, major groups of industrial workers are unable to look forward to steady year-around work. Half a loaf is better than none, but it is not good enough for the American worker in this year of 1960.

Labor has tried to approach this question in several ways. We have developed supplemental unemployment benefit plans in major industries, a giant step forward but one which is temporary and cannot solve the basic problem of chronic unemployment and lessening opportunities for full-time work in major industries.

We have improved pensions to make retirement more feasible. One result of the steel strike was a provision for a full pension for employees of 55 years of age with 20 years' service who permanently lose their jobs.

Longer vacations and breakthroughs toward a 3-month vacation periodically for industrial workers are steps we have taken toward creating more employment opportunities.

But we are the first to admit that, valuable as these steps are in their own right and as methods of increasing employment opportunities, they still are not adequate in the face of the rapid onrush of technological unemployment.

Our union and other great unions have sought a more comprehensive approach in recent years—a shorter workweek with no loss of pay. We have had no success because the industrial leaders with whom we deal have turned a deaf ear to our suggestions. I do not want to appear unduly pessimistic but realism on this issue is certainly in order. There is no sign that a negotiated shorter workweek in major industries is on the horizon. Perhaps the implications are too big for any one company or any one industry. The interdependence of costs and prices, and the competition within and between industries may be factors blocking such progress. But whatever the reason, it appears unlikely to say the least that any collective bargaining breakthrough is imminent to get us on the road to a shorter workweek.

The 40-hour week came into being as a result of the New Deal, first launched 27 years ago in the face of a critical unemployment problem. The 40-hour week has been established in the major industries for more than two decades. It came about as a result of legislation which required payment of overtime over 40 hours a week. It was introduced in stages, adapted to the varying needs of separate industries.

If we are to achieve a shorter workweek, I now believe that legislative action will be required. The laws that made sense in the 1930's do not fit the 1960's. This has been an era of unprecedented economic change and progress. The 40-hour week must give way to current needs and to the technology of modern America. If our industries employ more people 30 hours a week, maintain and advance their standard of living, and keep up a program of modernization and automation, America will be stronger than if we permit the current drift toward unemployment, declining incomes, depressed business communities, and low morale.

I propose that the Congress of the United States enact a new fair labor standards law reducing the workweek. I believe that either 30 or 32 hours a week should be the new figure. For many industries, a 30-hour week seems appropriate. For steel I would favor 32 hours so that a 4-day workweek can be instituted. This happens to make the most sense for an industry many of whose basic processes are necessarily continuous. In any event, I am certain that steelworkers would rather have that extra day off than fewer hours of work per day.

More practical questions will be posed. Is this too violent a step? Will the less prosperous companies be able to survive so sharp a reduction in the workweek? Let me just say that these same problems were present in the thirties; during the years of transition they were worked out. The steel industry is stronger than ever. The American economy is stronger than ever, if one measures strength by the prosperity of the companies. Employment has grown, not as fast as the population and not in line with the needs of a growing productive capacity, but grown it has nevertheless.

Labor, industry, and government have the know-how to work out the practical questions now as we did in the thirties, even before unions constituted so important a force in the basic industries. Stages for reduction of the workweek can be arranged to meet the practical needs of the industries involved. In fact, these stages need not necessarily be the same for every covered industry. All this we went through in achieving the 40-hour week. All this we can do again, and perhaps better.

It is my firm belief that this issue is not one that can be put off to some distant future. Unemployment and underemployment are with us now; the suffering and the depressive economic effects are with us now. The year 1960, a political year, is a good year for discussion of this urgent domestic issue. Early next year is a good time for enactment of legisaltion instituting a shorter workweek.

Our political leaders cannot avoid the issue of unemployment and I venture a prediction that the political action of members of organized labor, their families, and their fellow townspeople will be significantly influenced by this issue. You can be certain that members of the Steelworkers Union will expect candidates for office to speak out on the shorter workweek; I am certain that members of the other great unions in our Nation are no different than steelworkers in their concern for jobs and economic security.

Finally, I want to say a few words about general economic policy in America. As less people turn out more goods, it is apparent that more jobs must be made available and more human needs must be met. While the steps I have suggested above are urgent for today, in the long run they are not adequate because the prospects of labor displacement and automation promise truly fantastic production achievements. We cannot count on the demand for more and more autos, more and more TV sets, more and more suits of clothes being sufficient to keep America growing. Rather we must look elsewhere, toward the fields where human wants are not being satisfied and where great needs exist.

Look around you, in terms of your own communities. In every major city, people are inadequately housed. There are shortages of hospital facilities. There are too few schools and too few teachers. Recreational and vacation facilities are needed; transportation systems are antiquated. Cultural facilities are usually inadequate. These are shortages which keep us all poor. Even the rich are impoverished by these inadequacies. But every time a program is put forth to tackle these problems, we find that public funds are needed. And every time we look for more public funds, we find that the tax and public finance structure is such that it is to Washington you must turn because that is where the sources of taxation and public investment are centered. And then we are told, we cannot afford it. Public expenditure, we are told, is inflationary.

If we hope to adapt our Nation to the age of automation, this horse and buggy concept of economics must be eliminated. Expanded economic activity creates taxes. The people who work pay taxes. The companies that produce pay taxes. The stores that sell pay taxes. The higher degree of economic activity the more taxes are collected. I remember last year during the steel strike the newspapers carried stories almost daily about how the strike was reducing the Federal revenues and increasing the Federal operating deficit. Incidentally, I have not seen one single line in any newspaper which points to tax loss due to steel operations falling below 70 percent and steel unemployment rapidly rising. News reporting seems strangely selective in this news and editorial coverage.

But the fact is that Federal income does rise rapidly as economic activity rises. Therefore, as in all business activity, public investment results in increased revenue. And we are beginning to see that lack of adequate public investment means decreased tax revenues as the costs of unemployment and idleness rise.

Therefore, I suggest that we need a modern attitude toward public investment to get things done which need doing and which are not and cannot be done without Federal expenditure. I do not look on these activities as socialistic. If they were socialistic, I would oppose them vigorously and unflinchingly. We cannot serve our democracy by destroying it.

But when private contractors build houses, financed partially by Federal funds or backed by Federal credits, this creates tremendous new private investment and private employment. The man who buys a house and pays off the mortgage is a private enterpriser who is investing private funds to become just a little bit of a capitalist. This is capitalism—not socialism.

The schools, built by private builders, often financed by private capital paid out of school tax revenues to enable our children to be more useful citizens is not socialistic. If it were, then our public school system would be a threat to American democracy; no one really believes this.

Every device must be employed to build America, its economy and its communities. To the extent this requires public investment, let's have it. To the extent this requires effective collective bargaining—and I cannot conceive of a successful modern America without effective collective bargaining—this too must be encouraged and not fought. To the extent that this means wage levels which keep up with our growing productive capacity, this too must be accomplished. After all, only people can buy goods and only adequate wages enable people to be adequate consumers. To the extent that this means further introduction of automation and modern production facilities, this too should be encouraged and we of labor are fully prepared to continue our cooperation with industrial progress.

But to the extent that progress creates unemployment, the whole process is in danger. Therefore, I repeat that the next order of domestic political business must be Federal legislation instituting a shorter workweek. It is no longer practical to operate under the 40-hour week of the 1930's. The 1960's require a change in the law suited to the needs of this decade of automation and production know-how.

I sincerely hope that the managers of American industry will have the vision to face up to what I have proposed here. Perhaps individually they cannot handle the problem of the shorter workweek but collectively through Government they should welcome this giant step toward a stronger private enterprise economy.

As for the leaders of Government and those who strive for such leadership in this political year, now is the time to speak out. We seek their support for a shorter workweek in 1961, not in the sweet bye and bye. America needs courageous leadership and American workers will give great weight to this issue in judging the political needs of the Nation.

Recalls Two Apostles of Captive Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call attention to an article by Mr. John C. Sciranka, which appeared in the July 21 edition of the Advocate, which recalls the role of the two Slovak apostles, SS. Cyril and Methodius. As the author points out, their story is particularly appropriate in connection with Captive Nations Week, which we celebrated last month.

The article follows:

RECALLS TWO APOSTLES OF CAPTIVE NATIONS

During Captive Nations Week (July 17–23), our thoughts turn to the two apostles, SS. Cyril and Methodius, who are patrons of the Slavonic nations in general and the Slovaks in particular, because they brought Christianity in the middle of the ninth century to the nations of central Europe, now under the domination of Reds.

The Christian origin of the two apostles, whose feast day was observed on July 7, can be traced to their native city of Salonika (Thessalonica), which was visited by St. Paul on his apostolic journeys.

What appeals to us in their missionary journeys during this Captive Nations Week is their constant desire to free the captives instead of accepting rich gifts for their missionary sacrifices. For instance, after the successful but hazardous mission among the Khazars, a group of tribes in the Crimea on the Black Sea, Cyril refused gifts from Chief Kagan. Instead he pleaded for the release of Greek captives. His wish was granted and 200 captives were released.

It was, no doubt, this noble gesture and the missionary zeal of the two apostles, which prompted the Slovak ruler Rastislav to petition Emperor Michael of Constantinople to send the two brothers to his Great Moravian Kingdom (863 A.D.) which included Slovakia.

After 40 months in his kingdom, the two apostles departed for Constantinople with their new disciples, probably to have them validly ordained. Ruler Rastislav, pleased with their missionary work, showered upon them precious gifts, but again they refused them and pleaded for the release of the captives, which Ruler Rastislav reluctantly granted.

On their way home they stopped in Pannonia, then ruled by Kocel, who received them joyously in 867 at Blatnohrad. They remained guests of Kocel for about 6 months, preaching in Slovak. Upon their departure again they refused precious gifts and pleaded for the release of the captives. It is estimated that Rastislav and Kocel released more than 900 captives at their request.

These are but a few minor instances which prove their love for freedom and zeal for the liberation of captive nations.

St. Methodius, as Archbishop, was summoned in 871 to Ratisbon, Bavaria, where the Germans held him captive for 2½ years. Pope John VIII compelled the Germans to release him, and thus he returned to the missionary work among the Slavonic people.

It was Pope Hadrian who made Methodius archbishop of the Slavs after the death of St. Cyril in the Eternal City. The present Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and part of Yugoslavia were embraced in his archdiocese.

In 874, the Bohemian prince, Borivoj, received at Vclehrad baptism from Methodius. In Nitra, Slovakia, the oldest Christian church in central Europe was built in 833 A.D., by Pribina. In 966 the Poles received Christianity under Duke Miecislas at the behest of his Bohemian wife, Princess Dombrowka.

Everywhere the two apostles and their successors aided in freeing the captives in the countries now enslaved by the Communists.

Let us, therefore, offer our prayers and sacrifices in honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius, especially during this week for the liberation of the captive nations for they experienced the same trials and tribulations which fell 1,100 years later on their successors in the countries behind the Iron Curtain.

The American Slovaks, in honor of the two "captive nations apostles," will erect at the behest of the Holy See through the wishes of Cardinal Pizzardo a minor seminary in Rome, which will train priests for future missionary work in Slovakia in commemoration in 1963 of the 1,100th anniversary of the arrival of the two apostles in Slovakia.

Let us all honor these apostles in some special way, especially during this Captive Nations Week.

JOHN C. SCIRANKA.

PASSAIC.

J. Edgar Hoover Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on July 25 and 26, the Mississippi Law Enforcement Officers Association met in Biloxi, Miss., for their annual meeting. On the first day of their meeting, the association unanimously adopted a resolution expressing appreciation to Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and the FBI. The resolution so clearly expresses the close cooperation between the FBI and State law enforcement agencies that I am pleased, under unanimous consent, to include the resolution in the Appendix of the RECORD:

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has dedicated 36 years unselfishly and unstintingly to the elevation of law enforcement to its rightful position as a respected and admired profession in America; and

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover has extended to law enforcement the fingerprint identification facilities, the scientific technical laboratory facilities, and the extensive training facilities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in order that law enforcement in Mississippi and throughout America might efficiently and effectively discharge its responsibilities to the people of this State and of the United States; and

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover has stood firm and resolute in the forefront in leading law enforcement in its relentless battle against the forces of lawlessness and crime in order that the great heritage of freedom and liberty in America might be safeguarded and perpetuated; and

Whereas the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover has through the facilities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation extended unqualified and unreserved cooperation and assistance to law enforcement officers in the State of Mississippi: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the Mississippi Law Enforcement Officers Association expresses its appreciation and the appreciation of its individual members to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation for outstanding achievement in the furtherance of law enforcement as a profession, and for the cooperation and assistance of the FBI to the members of the Mississippi Law Enforcement Officers Association, and reaffirm support of the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover and the Federal Bureau of Investigation by the Mississippi Law Enforcement Officers Association.

In behalf of each and every member of the Mississippi Law Enforcement Officers Association, a copy of this resolution be furnished to the Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, and be included in the minutes of this association.

New England Council Opposed to Presidential Order Reducing Oil Import Quota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement directed to the New England congressional delegation by the New England Council, regarding residual fuel oil imports:

THE NEW ENGLAND COUNCIL,
August 24, 1960.

To: The New England Congressional Delegation.
From: Gardner A. Caverly.

As you know, the Department of the Interior has established the year-end quota for residual oil imports at 415,000 barrels per day for regions 1–4, which includes New England. This figure is very close to the 400,000 barrels per day requested by the National Coal Policy Conference and is far short of the 560,000 barrels per day recommended by the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation.

We feel that this quota for the fourth quarter of the year is inadequate for the following reasons:

1. It is more than 20,000 barrels per day less than for the corresponding period in 1959. Imports last year were greater despite the steel strike which lasted from July 15 to November 11, and despite the fact that we had a very mild winter—6 percent warmer than normal.

2. The quota does not take into consideration the expanding industrial growth of regions 1–4. East coast residual fuel oil sales increased by about 7 percent in both 1958 and 1959. In fact, they have risen in all but one of the last 5 years.

3. Nor does this quota take into account the ever-lessening availability of residual oil from domestic sources. As U.S. refineries become more and more efficient they have less and less residual oil to offer. The resulting differential must be met through increased imports.

4. Present restrictions on imports have already been reflected in price increases of 15 cents per barrel, which will cost New Englanders about $10 million a year. Continued severe restrictions can only lead to higher prices.

Representatives of the Department of the Interior have repeatedly assured us that they will not permit a residual oil shortage to occur. They have promised to increase

quotas immediately should actual shortages develop. However, to remedy such shortages would require the sudden mobilization of importation facilities on an unplanned and disorderly basis. An emergency movement of this nature obviously entails considerable cost and could but result in even higher fuel prices in New England.

We wish to reemphasize the seriousness of this problem to the New England economy and hope you will bend every effort to assist us in seeking a satisfactory solution. We will keep you advised as developments occur.

Army Sport Parachuting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith two most interesting articles on our U.S. sport parachute team. These men come from the great airborne parachute teams at Fort Bragg, N.C.

Mr. Speaker, this world prize-winning team is scheduled to appear at the Rockville (Md.) Airport at 2 o'clock on Saturday, August 27.

The articles follow:

A BRIEF HISTORY OF ARMY SPORT PARACHUTING UNTIL MAY, 1960

(By Sgt. Don Kidd)

Three years after Columbus discovered America, one of the many prophets of today's air age, Leonardo da Vinci described a parachute. "If a man have a tent roof of calked linen 12 braccia broad and 12 braccia high, he will be able to let himself fall from any height without danger to himself."

For nearly 5 centuries, men have been designing and testing air umbrellas, but not until the closing decades of the 18th century did the practical use of the parachute become apparent. Then it was pressed into service to save the lives of aeronauts experimenting with balloons. It has taken almost 500 years for the parachute to become a piece of sporting equipment as well as a lifesaving device.

Parachuting as a sport in the United States began about 5 years ago and today has been considered for inclusion in the Olympics. In early 1958, the U.S. Army officially recognized sport parachuting and published a regulation authorizing active duty personnel to participate in competitive and exhibition parachute jumping activities. It outlined responsibilities, governing rules and regulations, equipment to be used, and authorized the establishment of parachute clubs. Almost immediately clubs began to spring up within the Army Establishment supervised by experienced parachutists. Some former civilian sky divers joined in and soon competition between individuals and clubs began. Many colleges and universities across the country had already organized sky diving clubs and almost every airport around the country had its group of enthusiasts.

Many European countries consider it a major sport and all world championship meets have been held there. A few Americans have entered international competition but until the summer of 1959, when a team of sky diving Army paratroopers journeyed to the little resort town of Tivat, Yugoslavia, did not begin to jump in the same league with European parachutists. The event held at Tivat was the Adriatic Parachuting Cup Meet and the paratroopers were from the Strategic Army Corps (STRAC). They came home with second place behind Bulgaria. Nine other European countries competed in the meet and it marked the first time that the United States made a creditable showing in an international parachute meet.

In April 1960, Parachute Club of America (PCA) conducted tryouts at Fort Bragg, N.C., to select members for the 1960 U.S. parachute team. The team will go to Sofia, Bulgaria, in August 1960 to compete in the fifth world championship of parachuting. Some 50 of the best military and civilian sport parachutists in the United States vied for places on the team. The Army made a clean sweep of the tryouts capturing the first 11 places. The top seven were selected for further training and only five of them will actually go to Bulgaria for the world championship meet.

All seven of those selected for further training are members of the newly redesignated, U.S. Army Sport Parachute Team. It had formerly been called the STRAC Sport Parachute Team. Now, for the second time in the history of American sport parachuting, the United States will be represented by an all-Army team of sky divers in an international meet. This time to decide the world's champion.

Top scorer in the tryouts at Fort Bragg was Sp4 Loy B. Brydon. Winning the top spot places Brydon as America's No. 1 sky diver. He had been a civilian sky diver before entering the Army and has continually placed high in national and international parachute competition. He took second place in the Adriatic Parachuting Cup meet last summer.

It seems significant indeed, that the members of the 1960 U.S. sport parachute team also happen to be members of the U.S. Army sport parachute team.

With the redesignation of the STRAC team to the U.S. Army team, membership will not be limited to members of the Strategic Army Corps. The U.S. Army sport parachute team will be just what its name implies and qualified jumpers throughout the Army will be eligible to try out for the team.

The new U.S. Army sport parachute team is available for demonstrations of sky diving acrobatics throughout the United States in support of the Army's recruiting mission. Requests for the team should be routed through channels to TAC, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

XVIII AIRBORNE CORPS AND FORT BRAGG

(By Pfc. Patti George)

FORT BRAGG, N.C.—The United States can well be proud of the U.S. Sport Parachute team as its members returned to Fort Bragg Thursday with individual and team honors from the fifth world championship of parachuting at Sofia, Bulgaria.

Deplaning at Pope Air Force Base adjacent to Fort Bragg, the team was greeted by a crowd of happy wives, children and friends as the 440th U.S. Army Band played in the background.

Sport parachuting is a relatively new sport in the United States as compared to some of the individuals and teams abroad. The achievements of the individual members and the team as a whole at the meet indicates the degree of professional ability achieved in the new sport.

The United States and Fort Bragg's Sp4 Jim L. Arender took first place and a gold medal in the third event to become the world champion style sport parachutist.

The third event was the individual style jump. Arender, 82d Airborne Division, competed against 45 men from 12 countries. Distaff competition included 24 women. Judged on two jumps, the event was held from 2,000 meters and consisted of a series of five turns and a backward loop performed within 20 seconds prior to opening the parachute. The parachute was opened between 23 and 30 seconds after exiting the aircraft.

Sp5c. Richard T. Fortenberry, Quartermaster Detachment, 7th Special Forces Group (Airborne), took a silver medal as the second high individual jumper overall.

The U.S. team placed fourth in the second event. The second event consisted of a team jump for accuracy from 2,000 meters with a 23–30 second delay. Each jumper exited one behind the other. The team made four jumps and the average of the best three jumps of the members was computed for the team score.

Specialist Fortenberry placed fourth in the first event, individual jumps for accuracy from 2,000 meters with a 23 to 30 second delay. Each jumper made four jumps with the best three counting.

Fortenberry dislocated his right elbow on August 12 in his third jump in the event. He scored a direct hit on his second jump, landing in the center of the target jumping circle in the individual accuracy event. He is believed to be the first man in the history of world competition to have achieved such a feat.

Miss Sherrie Buck, member of the Rumbleseat Sky Divers of Hollywood, Calif., and only civilian member of the U.S. team, placed 10th in the women's division of the individual accuracy event.

A surprise greeted well-wishers as Capt. Barbara D. Gray, physical therapist at Fort Bragg's Womack Army Hospital, returned with a broken leg. Contrary to reports received, Captain Gray, rather than Miss Buck, broke her leg during the second jump of the team accuracy event.

"Peace and friendship through parachuting" was exemplified through the tremendous hospitality shown the U.S. team during the meet, according to Col. William P. Greives, team leader, and Maj. Merrill L. Shepard, assistant team leader.

Other members of the team are Sp4c. Loy B. Brydon, XVIII Airborne Corps Artillery; Sfc. Harry E. Arter, 618th Engineer Co.; 2d Lt. James P. Pearson, 82d Airborne Division, alternate, and Capt. Henry Rust, pilot, all of Fort Bragg.

The Church-State Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Joseph Breig as it appeared in the Hawaii Catholic Herald of July 15, 1960:

THE CHURCH-STATE ISSUE

(By Joseph Breig)

If Catholics, Protestants, and Jews are not to be forever talking at cross-purposes, one thing that must be clarified is church-state separation.

Specifically, Jews and Protestants must realize that Catholics do not oppose church-state separation, but favor it.

Indeed the history of the Catholic Church is in large part a recital of the church's agonizing struggle to free religion from the grip of political rulers—to give to Caesar

only what belongs to Caesar, so that to God can be given what belongs to God.

POAU SAYS SO

The idea that Catholics oppose church-state separation has been carefully cultivated in recent years in the propaganda of POAU—Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State.

But POAU is all wrong.

Two things about POAU should be kept carefully in mind.

First, POAU does not represent most American Protestants. Second, what POAU says about Catholic attitudes is almost invariably in error.

AGREEMENT

When the truth is known, Catholics, Protestants and Jews find themselves in general agreement on separation of church and state.

Nobody wants church-state union.

Nobody, on the other hand, wants hostility between government and religion.

What every sensible person wants is mutually helpful cooperation between the two, each keeping to its proper sphere.

Questions do arise about spheres. But reasonable citizens can hammer out the right answers on the anvil of calm discussion.

SOUTH AFRICAN STATEMENT

The best single statement I have seen of this whole problem recently came from the Catholic archbishop of Durban, South Africa.

Archbishop Denis E. Hurley, in a sermon in his cathedral, said that the division of authority between church and state is human liberty's greatest safeguard. He put the matter in these words:

"The spiritual ruler is denied political force, so he must rule by moral persuasion.

"The political ruler is denied spiritual sovereignty, so he must bow his head to a law higher than his own.

"Political rulers have often found this a frustrating business, and many an honest man has gone to the gallows because in the name of God he had dared to say to his prince: 'Thou shalt not.'

"Spiritual leaders have sometimes yielded to the temptation to usurp and absorb the political kingdom * * * [Then] the spiritual leader who had hoped to run the political kingdom like a priest ended up by running the Kingdom of God like a politician.

"The [church-state] duality is, without doubt, the greatest safeguard of human liberty, although God knows it is not easy to observe it faithfully in every detail, to give the proper balance of loyalty to the city of God and the city of man."

CAN BE DONE

No, it is not easy; but certainly the Founding Fathers of America created a marvellous working arrangement under which the proper balance can be sought with confident hope that it will, in each particular case, be found.

In seeking that right balance, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews must work together. Otherwise, they leave open the way for secularism and irreligion to reign.

Canada, too, has developed some splendid insights in this matter, and there is much that Americans can learn from our northern neighbor.

Archbishop Hurley concluded by saying that justice requires "that we give every man his due; respect his life and all its powers and expressions, his right to worship, to eat, to earn, to own, to marry and beget and educate, to enjoy liberty of sojourn, movement and association."

INCLUDE LOVE

But, Archbishop Hurley added, justice alone is not enough. Something else is necessary to make happy harmony possible in any nation—that something being charity, love. And this love is "the peculiar quality of the city of God" and "must be vividly reflected in the political community."

To show forth that love is a prime duty of every religious person.

Platform Committees Hear Federation of Independent Business Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, more and more small businessmen throughout the country are coming to realize that they must make their voices heard in the shaping of Government policies affecting their independent enterprises.

This is entirely proper. In fact it is necessary, for many small and independent businessmen are engaged in a critical struggle for survival.

In this connection, I call attention to the following statement made by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, when he appeared before the Platform Committees of the Republican and Democratic National Conventions a few weeks ago:

Our appeals in behalf of independent business enterprise are not made with a selfish desire to obtain any special favors or special privileges for any group in our economy. What we are asking for is equal opportunity under our natural laws, based in great part on the individual rights that are rooted in our Constitution, to acquire, hold, and use private property with all due regard for the rights of others.

By seeking fair consideration, fair play, equitable tax treatment, a minimum of Government competition and interference, we are asking only that the independent enterpriser be given a chance to stand on his own feet, and be protected from forces in our society with which no individual can contend.

Small businessmen and their friends have taken heart from the fact that both parties honored 12 of the 18 pledges made during the 1956 presidential campaign, but new problems have risen, and the failure to carry out all pledges has left small business far behind in the race for survival.

As a means of securing independent business opportunities in the years ahead, we recommend:

All manufacturers who sell through both independent and their own outlets, be required to grant their independent customers the same price charged their own stores. This will tend to slow down the present slaughter of many small businesses by their own suppliers.

The direct income-tax load on smaller corporations and small business should be reduced, which would provide more funds for improvements, and there should be a fast tax chargeoff on purchases of used equipment as well as new.

Multimillion-dollar Federal subsidies are enjoyed by big business and big farmers, which should be greatly reduced, and it is time we cut down on and/or eliminate subsidies to foreign nations which are able to stand on their own feet.

Ability of small business to compete for defense contracts has long been a subject of discussion and investigation, and it is time that smaller companies seeking defense contracts be given equal opoprtunity with their bigger competitors. The Small Business Administration has done an admirable job in this direction, and so have the House and Senate Small Business Committees, but much more work will have to come before this problem is solved.

Our organization has long advocated adoption of the Hoover report's recomemndations, that the paperwork piled on small business (creating burdens many are unable to carry) be lessened in every way possible. Small business, and, yes, bigger business, too, is having to add much to the price of goods and services to take care of Government reports, which are becoming a virtual Frankenstein.

Many of our members have come up from the ranks of labor, but have voted overwhelmingly for laws that will restrict bargaining to the local level wherever practical and possible; that unions be limited to picketing businesses that are on strike, and that no business can be picketed unless at least one-third of the employees are supporting the union.

Entire lines are now suffering the ravages of low wage foreign competition, and indications are that the situation is growing worse. Certainly, the movement of giant U.S. firms to set up subsidiaries in foreign lands, and ship products back to this country at prices that destroy our jobs and businesses, is suicidal, to say the least. One answer would be to tie tariff rates to foreign wage levels, reducing the rate as wages rise in foreign countries.

Is Free Economy Failure?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the San Diego Union Financial News, August 5, 1960:

IS FREE ECONOMY FAILURE?—HERE'S ACCOLADE TO BUSINESSMAN

(By Carl W. Ritter)

During the presidential campaign just now moving into high gear, a principal topic will be economic growth.

The general question of such growth can be expected to resolve itself into simply this: "Do the American people have confidence in a free economy?"

One of the candidates has indicated belief that big government can spur the national economy to continuous growth at boom pace, without the periodical letup for consolidation of gains that a free economy demands.

His philosophy calls for a vast buildup in government spending and all but overlooks the fact the Nation has been propelled to greatness by private business and private citizens.

If this political aspirant to the world's highest elective office has any genuine confidence in the American businessman, it has been well concealed.

There is little reason to doubt that he would keep the U.S. businessman under a fat and expanding Federal thumb.

The question here then is whether free enterprise, as exemplified in at least one very important way by individual business initiative, has failed this country. If it has, our history certainly has failed to record it.

The businessman, who in essence is everyone in avenues of industry, trade, and commerce, has risen to each major challenge in war and peace.

CHARACTER SEEMS AS STRONG AS BEFORE

It is doubtful that this composite's progressive character is deteriorating at this stage of the game.

Looking ahead, it is apparent that the main problem for the businessman in the decade ahead will be different from that of the 1950's. Essentially, it will be one of marketing rather than of producing. But is there any better marketer in the world than the American businessman, left to his own ingenuity?

If there is, again history has failed to record it.

To sell the American businessman short now—as the candidate in question seems to be doing—is close to a personal affront directed toward every American citizen taking pride in free personal enterprise.

Growth? The American businessman has been vitally absorbed with growth ever since he came into complete being when this Nation's early planners declared themselves for freedom.

SURVIVAL DEPENDS ON STRONG POINTS

He has had to be energetic, courageous, resourceful, and expansion minded to survive. Competition and other demanding problems are part of his day-in-day-out existence. He not only lives with these problems but he solves them—or he and his business are passed by.

The 100 largest American manufacturers more than doubled their assets and sales during the decade ended with 1959. The number of manufacturers with assets exceeding a billion dollars also increased more than 100 percent—from 12 to 27.

Thousands of smaller businesses did even better than these companies in rate of growth.

The top officeseeker who cocks a ready ear toward Walter Reuther and implies that the American economy, operating freely, leaves a lot to be desired would seem to be much better suspect than the American businessman.

Our Air Reserve Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith an excellent article by Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff of our U.S. Air Force, entitled "Citizen Soldiers in Aerospace," published in the Air Force and Space Digest for July 1960.

General White's views on this most important aspect of our national defense system are well worth reading:

CITIZEN SOLDIERS IN AEROSPACE

(By Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force)

Traditionally, the reserve forces of the United States have comprised a pool of military manpower and units available to expand our forces rapidly toward required wartime strength. In every war in which the United States has been involved, these "citizen soldiers" have been a most important factor in achieving our national security objectives.

Nevertheless, in recent years it has become apparent to the Air Force that something more than a pool type of reserve force would be required in the event of future wars. To be truly effective in the modern era of ballistic missiles, supersonic aircraft, and nuclear weapons, our air reserve forces must be an in being part of Air Force combat and support capabilities—comparable in effectiveness and readiness to our first-line active units.

Today, our air reserve forces do comprise a significant portion of this Nation's overall aerospace capability. An idea of the current importance of our air reserve forces in terms of total force can be gained for the fact that two-thirds of the tactical reconnaisance units, nearly half of the tactical fighter units, and more than three-fourths of the troop carrier units available to the Tactical Air Command in an emergency are contained in the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve. In addition, a considerable portion of our interceptor fighter defense capability is in the Air National Guard.

Despite these substantial contributions, it has become apparent, through comprehensive study of the possible uses of the air reserve forces, that there is additional potential in these forces—a potential which if efficiently managed would result in better utilization of our total Air Force resources—both in wartime and in peacetime. Consequently, the Air Force approved a new plan for the management of the air reserve forces—a plan generated in response to several factors. These included: The necessary and vital role that the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve play in our present-day overall aerospace power; their proven capability to perform wartime missions; the desire to find more useful missions that the reserve forces could effectively and economically accomplish; and the requirement to gear the combat and support units to a much higher degree of operational readiness.

The high cost of maintaining aerospace power and the comparatively lower cost of using reserve forces to perform some of the necessary functions of the Air Force mission clearly indicate the desirability of assigning to the air reserve forces greater responsibilities in certain areas. In many cases these forces already have demonstrated their capability to assume such responsibilities.

Fine as the record of the air reserve forces has been, the Air Force and members of the air reserve forces must jointly continue to exert every effort toward improving the value and usefulness of the reserves. In this respect, the new management plan for the air reserve forces provides for a closer integration of the reserves into the active establishment than ever before. It accomplishes this by placing the responsibility for peacetime supervision of training and for the measurement of training progress and capability of reserve force units in the hands of the Air Force commands which would have operational control over these units in an emergency.

The new plan also puts the vast and virtually untapped reservoir of planning and management ability in the reserve forces to work by providing for much of the management of the Air Force Reserve program to be done by reservists themselves—in region headquarters as well as in local units.

The plan also provides—in addition to the specific new missions—for the assignment of additional missions to the reserve forces whenever such missions will improve the Air Force's overall capabilities.

I am confident that implementation of this plan will result in greater contributions by the air reserve forces to the overall Air Force mission and will permit more effective and economical utilization of our total Air Force resources. This, in turn, will enable the Air Force to perform its share of the total national defense task more efficiently.

Modernize and Expand our Transportation Systems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a very thoughtful and provocative letter recently sent me by my dear friend and constituent, Hon. Joseph D. Ward, distinguished secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Democratic convention nominee for Governor in my State, urging the support of S. 3278, recently passed in the other body.

S. 3278 provides for grants to the several States, municipalities, and other local governments for planning of various solutions to the serious problems of mass transportation, and for low-interest loans to State and local governments of not more than $100 million to finance equipment purchases and integrate the forms of public transportation.

Several similar measures are pending in the House and, as Secretary Ward so ably and aptly points out, over 100 million people reside in our great metropolitan districts, of which 16 million people are totally dependent on public transportation and 40 million people frequently use it.

While the Congress has recognized, from time to time, the seriousness and urgency of our local, State and National transportation problems, and has taken action in the past to grapple with these problems, this is the first time that broad, enabling legislation has been proposed for comprehensive, rationalized planning and, where necessary, selective integration of transportation facilities.

That adequate, streamlined, modernized transportation is imperative to the economic, social, and cultural life of the Nation and essential to the convenience and well-being of our fellow citizens is a demonstrated fact. The shocking deterioration of our transportation system, nationally, locally, and statewise can no longer be neglected.

Primary responsibility for the solution of these problems lies with private management and the State and local subdivisions of government. But it is clear to me, as I have evidenced time and time again, and as the Congress has frequently emphasized by concrete action, that in the public interest we can no longer afford to delay proper, effective solutions of the critical problems of this industry which is so vital to the lives, interests, and well-being of our people.

The gravity of our interstate, intrastate, and local transportation problems compels the deep concern and effective action of the Congress, and I hope and

urge that the House may not only extend early consideration to S. 3278, but that it move on a sweeping front to promote adequate planning and to support and strengthen in every way that we can, consistent with our constitutional mandate, the great transportation systems which serve the American people.

I commend my able and distinguished friend, Secretary Ward, for his timely recognition of these problems and for his efforts to advance and consummate expeditious and fitting solutions.

Let us pass S. 3278 without further dalliance or delay, and then let us move on a much broader front to rehabilitate our great transportation facilities that have been riddled and shattered by lack of vision and leadership. Let us with all speed restore, modernize, and expand those facilities so they may adequately serve the American economy and the American people.

The letter follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH
OF MASSACHUSETTS,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Boston, August 22, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN: I would like to take the liberty of calling to your attention important legislation now before the House concerning Federal assistance to State and local government toward the improvement of mass transportation facilities.

The Senate has passed S. 3278 which would: (1) authorize the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make grants to States, municipalities, and other local governmental agencies for adequate and comprehensive planning of solutions to the vexatious problem of mass transportation; and (2) would authorize the Housing and Home Finance Agency to make low interest loans to State and local governments up to a total of $100 million to finance equipment acquisitions and integrate the varying forms of public transportation.

Legislation similar to S. 3278 has been introduced by Congressman DWYER, of New Jersey (H.R. 12746), Congressman IRWIN, of Connecticut (H.R. 12606), Congressman NIX, of Pennsylvania (H.R. 12181), and Congressman THOMPSON of New Jersey (H.R. 11923).

Over 100 million people now live in metropolitan areas in the United States. Sixteen million people are totally dependent on public transportation, 40 million people use public transportation frequently if not always, and many millions should be converted to use of public transportation if our cities are to avoid perishing of transit arteriosclerosis. Transportation is a problem of increasing national gravity and as one authority on urban affairs, Luther Gulick, has written, "So central to metropolitan life is this problem of physical circulation of men and goods that it might be said that all the rest of our metropolitan problems would become tractable if only we could find out how to solve the transportation problem."

If the problem is grave on a national level, it is already critical in Massachusetts. Rail passenger service from Boston to the South has died—toward the west we can hear the death rattle and toward the north the symptoms are ominous.

Our answer thus far has been to build roads. This is neither the economic nor the sound answer. Roads cost billions where mass transportation costs millions. They gobble up land that could be otherwise productive. And when all the money has been spent and the homes and businesses dislocated, roads cannot carry the necessary volume, and the cities cannot accommodate the cars. Surely this has been the lesson Los Angeles can teach us. On the other hand, in Massachusetts we have existing rail rights-of-way and roadbeds which can be wisely used if proper planning is done.

Even without comprehensive planning, the experiment of the Meteropolitan Transit Authority on the Highland branch has proved an exciting success. Road traffic has been eased, peak traffic congestion in downtown Boston has been reduced by 7 percent and 1,300 downtown parking spaces freed. And the people who use it like it.

Cities are our major wealth producing centers. Congress has recognized that urban revival is a major Federal concern. I urge you to do all in your power to forward the passage of this legislation before the House designed to help tackle the problem of public mass transportation—a problem so central to municipal existence.

Respectfully yours,
JOSEPH D. WARD,
Secretary of the Commonwealth
of Massachusetts.

U.S. Space Triumphs Set the 1960 Pace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, every American has been impressed, and I am sure gratified, by the record which our country is achieving in space exploration. Those who have felt that the Russians were making the major contribution have seen the United States push forward in recent months. All of us are confident that the work done by our scientists and technicians will result in increased knowledge and the purposeful uses of space in the cause of peace.

An editorial in the Grand Rapids (Mich.) Press of August 19, 1960, pointed up some of the implications of our recent success. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial which is entitled, "U.S. Space Triumphs Set the 1960 Pace":

U.S. SPACE TRIUMPHS SET THE 1960 PACE

Since the launching of the Russian sputnik nearly 3 years ago there has been an easy assumption in the minds of many disparagers that America is badly outdistanced in the space race. But in 1960 the scales are heavily weighted on the side of American achievement.

Echo I, the huge balloon sent into orbit for experimentation in communications, is but one of a series of triumphs counted by the United States. Simultaneously with the Echo launching came word of the first recovery from a planned ejection of an instrumented nose cone from the Discoverer XIII and a record-high space flight by the X15, which followed a new world speed record by the same plane a few days earlier.

Last April the United States launched the first reconnaissance satellite, the Tiros I, which sent back thousands of pictures of the earth's surface, giving immediate promise of long range weather forecasting. Two weeks later the Transit IB, a satellite which might be used as a navigational aid, was launched.

Also chalked up for 1960 was a record shot by an American ICBM and the first successful launching of the Polaris missile from a submarine.

All these are American "firsts." It is not less significant that several of these were designed for peaceful purposes rather than military. The Tiros, Transit, and Echo satellites all hold possibilities for useful and peaceful research. The world may judge for itself whether American space exploration is foremost in peaceful conquest of space.

Meanwhile Russia has been strangely silent. Perhaps it is planning a major spectacular thrust, but to date it has contributed far less to scientific knowledge than the American effort.

Summer Commencement Address of Dr. Harold C. Case, President of Boston University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE CURTIS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Harold C. Case, president of Boston University, delivered the commencement address at the university's annual summer commencement exercises on August 20, 1960.

In extension of my remarks I include his excellent address, as follows:

VITALITIES TO BE MASTERED

Exupery, writing about the agony of France during World War II, said, "If a man is to strive with all his heart, the significance of his striving must be unmistakable. The ashes of his village must be as telling as the significance of the village itself."

This is the critical issue of our generation. Unless we know why we are striving, we will not practice stern self-discipline, nor accept great goals as our own. Lacking these, we will deteriorate into insignificance.

The forces now let loose in our world contain unprecedented energy. The effect of these forces will determine the nature of the future of man.

With bombs 100,000 times as destructive as those dropped on Hiroshima, the inspection of arms, reduction of missiles, and use of peaceful alternative to war are not fine theories to be proclaimed from public platforms, but practical policies to be implemented for the saving of civilization.

With revolutionary forces dynamic enough in the hands of a small island government official to embarrass the world's most powerful nation, and with the voice of emerging peoples dramatic enough in the throat of an inexperienced Congolese Premier to necessitate, on his daily whim, the reconvening of the Security Council, human energies are mobilized for changes of status hardly known a decade ago.

Fate has delivered a commanding challenge. Are we able to unite nobly only when disaster threatens? Is luxury more cherished among us than self-discipline? Is complacency to replace intelligent concern among us regarding honesty, efficiency, and economy in government?

If we defer decisions on these and other important problems, until our cities are ablaze against a dawn sky and our liberties are obscured by the excesses of libertines, it will be too late.

Nothing less than ample, precise knowledge, hard won by all-out effort, can prove adequate in the race for space. Only by emerging from the tawdry to the timeless, from comfort to courage, and from irrespon-

sibility to commitment, can we match challenge with greater challenge.

"Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Civilization is a series of homely customs, a composite of folk wisdom, a complex of institutions, a set of rules, and an assortment of promises. Its roots are in cultural commitments, moral convictions, mental discoveries, and religious dedications. These vitalities give meaning to existence and magnificence to society.

How can I impress on you the greatness of our task, or what can I say to convince you that these are vitalities to be mastered, not merely mimicked?

Our job is a demanding one. Education is asked to convey live knowledge to the next generation, to create an atmosphere in which learning is cherished, and to breathe a new inspiration into our Nation's people.

Parents are asked to rear their children in the midst of unprecedented labor-saving conveniences, and yet to create in them a love of hard work.

Teachers are asked to relay more subject matter to the oncoming generation than the past has known, and, at the same time, to initiate original and creative quests for knowledge on the part of students.

Religious leaders are asked to come to terms with social problems without losing the sense of the mystical.

Freedom is an atmosphere in which enticing opportunities for human development are abundant, integrity is so sacred as to forbid betrayal, and self-giving inspires greater effort than self-getting.

In the midst of the reports of rioting and the delicate problem of maintaining peace in the Congo, an American citizen who lives in Leopoldville, who owns a shirt factory employing more than 350 Congolese, and who operates an important art school and center in the capital city of the Congo, Maurice Alhadeff, wrote me from that strife-torn community. His letter is dated August 9:

"We hope that all the difficult times which we are going through will be of short duration and that a brilliant and prosperous future is in store for us. The actual difficulties are inherent in all the young states and are difficulties of growth; they are less serious than the outsider would think."

This is the long-range faith to which we must give our loyalty. Then, and only then, can we maintain poise in the midst of the prevailing confusion.

Genuine love of learning is the first vitality I want to underscore. We must be done with slavish acceptance of assignment as boring necessities, and lay hold of creative dedication to knowledge with depth.

Jacques Barzun in "Teacher in America" says: "Every college * * * should * * * be dedicated to intellect, not in the sense of pedantry or verbalism, or highbrow superiority, but in the sense of mind, free and restless in its desire to experience, comprehend and use reality."

The unifying element in all of our diversity is quality. Today no person, institution, agency, profession, enterprise, or organization can afford to countenance shoddiness in its philosophy, goals, program, or membership. The artisan and the artist alike must be nurtured in the same high tradition of excellence.

Each one of us should reexamine our relationship to quality of effort and outcome.

Informed minds will decide future issues. If we have the will to achieve self-knowledge and self-learning, we can prevail. If not, we shall lack mental vitality, to our sorrow.

Still, reason and logic are not the only vitalities, nor are they ample to provide proper direction for Western civilization.

Reason may be outmatched in its struggle with instinct. Unless, that is, there are other vitalities to be summoned to aid us.

Consider fear. It is not wholly to be despised. It protects cautious men from disastrous accidents. Recently it has accomplished in international affairs, dealing with the Soviet, what could not have been otherwise achieved. Together with Nazi philosophy and policy, these new energies have provided a mirror of forces in these United States. The nationalism which became a horror of blood and death under Hitler lives in a less violent form in the democracies. The confidence in solutions of local problems by governmental action; the glorification of technology as the new messiah, of science as the sure answer to social ills; the subordination of law to mass interests—all of which are dramatically illustrated in Soviet society—have appeared in the West with enough stress to cause the individual citizen to feel helpless or frustrated before the well-financed smooth efforts of the "organization man," from school board members to presidential candidates, or to lose hope for municipal or State government, in the presence of public and private bureaucracy.

Fear is an excellent barometer. It warns of storms to come. It is not a preventative. It never builds shelters from the raging elements.

The West, with its wealth, will prove more vulnerable to the thrusts of hate and the energies of the frenzied than any other nations, if it abandons the pursuit of ideals and visions. More than any other society, it is the product, not of favorable climate, abundant resources, or friendly racial groups, but of the shaping, molding power of the human spirit.

Because of our people's vision of man, high and lifted up, idealistic and capable of dedication, we have developed schools and colleges to enlist all-out effort for fullest development of individual abilities. We have sought and found instruments for physical mastery, comfort, and well-being.

"Man is not master of the universe because he can split the atom. He has split the atom because he first believed in his own unique value. Faith led to the material achievement, not the achievement to faith" (Barbara Ward, "Faith and Freedom," p. 265).

An audacious view of man as a worthy creature, produced adventurous enterprises for fulfilling mankind. Loss of such a view, and its replacement by a concept of accidental birth, unfortunate existence, meaningless years, and on to the fatality of death, and man is ready for a slave state without protest.

Speaking of faith as the vitality we require, I am not referring to sectarian creeds of any sort. Rather, I am referring to confidence in existence as being meaningful, and in God as the supreme fact of this vast life.

Such faith will not be restored in the West because people believe it to be useful, but only because they believe it to be true.

Echo I, performing on schedule, is convincing evidence of the reliability of the physical universe. Goodness, appearing again and again in indistinct corners or in top headlines, compels acknowledgment of values outside of physical characterization.

Here is the root of Western freedom—the infinite value of every person, an intelligently managed physical universe, every person's responsibility to leave society better than he found it.

No one can forecast the hour or place of the mastery of these vitalities. One may say that in human history, often times of greatest tribulation and deepest despair have been preludes to times of enlightenment. Today, the uneasiness and the premonition of doom—if we succumb to violence as the arbiter of our fate—may become the powerful prompting to seek another route.

Let us remember, however, that only the seekers truly find; only to those who ask shall it be given, and only to the bold who stand at doors and knock shall portals be reopened to creativity, freedom, and fulfillment.

Resolutions Adopted by the Polish American Congress, Central and Northern New York State District

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include resolutions adopted recently at a meeting of the Polish American Congress, central and northern New York State district. I believe these thoughtful resolutions deserve the earnest consideration of every Member of this House:

The delegates to the Polish American Congress, central and northern New York State district, in their regional meeting assembled at the Polish American Community Club, Columbia Street, in the city of Utica, on Sunday, June 26, 1960, have unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"With faith in our belief that God created man to his own image and breathed into him the breath of divine life:

"We stand vigilant in the defense of our United States of America, our American way of life and our American institutions—thereby upholding the dignity of man—the individual: all of which root and stem and sprung to life and continue to grow—from that faith and belief.

"On this occasion we greet all our fellow Americans and we wholeheartedly support our Government in its efforts to seek a just and lasting peace and we have full faith in our sincere and courageous leader, the President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower.

"We urge our Government to stand ready and always prepared to defend our country.

"We hereby express our gratitude and sincere thanks to our spiritual leader, our chaplain, the Reverend Ladislaus Ouzielek, who for so many years devotedly has contributed so much to our organization by his advice, counsel, and active participation.

"We note with much satisfaction, for their valued, faithful, and untiring service, the raising to the dignity of Prothonotary Apostolic, the Right Reverend Monsignor Casimir S. Piejda; to the dignity of Domestic Prelates, the Right Reverend Monsignor Bernard A. Janczewski and the Right Reverend Monsignor John A. Kociela; and we note the 25th year anniversary of fruitful service rendered to God as a priest by the Reverend Edmund Stankiewicz, pastor of St. Stanislaus parish. To all these right reverend and reverend fathers we send greetings and we offer our wholehearted congratulations and best wishes: Szcześć Jem Boże.

"We call upon all our fellow citizens to support the Polish American Congress; the Alliance College; the Catholic League; the Kosciuszko Foundation; the Orchard Lake Seminary; the Paderewski Foundation; the Polish Immigration Committee; the Pulaski Foundation; and all the other noteworthy charitable and humanitarian organizations.

"We call upon all Americans to act, initiate, and organize committees for the purpose of drawing up programs to appropriately observe:

"1. The 1,000-year anniversary of the acceptance of Christianity by the Polish Nation, noting its myriad contributions to Europe, Christianity, civilization and the world.

"2. The 100-year anniversary of the birth of Ignace Jan Paderewski, champion of freedom and world-renowned maestro of the piano and musical composer.

"3. The refugee year in which the nations of the world have and are participating and which is so proclaimed by our President or the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, whereby help and aid is given to the refugees cast and strewn all over the world and particularly those of Polish descent who are calling for our aid and help and on whose behalf our great leader, the Right Reverend Monsignor Colonel Felix F. Burant, through our Polish immigration committee, is appealing to us.

"4. In memory of one of the greatest fighters for freedom, that brave American Revolutionary War hero, a contemporary and colleague of our Founding Fathers and of George Washington, Gen. Casimir Pulaski.

"We call upon our brethren, the Americans of Polish descent, not to forget, but to dignify them by appropriate testimonial ceremonies for their well deserved contributions made to their Polonais, those elder statesmen, the pioneers and builders, the seniors of our Polonais who have spent a lifetime in building those communities which include churches, schools and community homes wherein the best of Polish culture is expressed to add to the beauty of the American landscape; whereby they will be made to feel that their life's work for the community is appreciated.

"And at this time we hail Konstanty Sarnowski, one of the senior builders of the Schenectady community.

"We urge our Governor, The Honorable Nelson A. Rockefeller, and the honorable mayors in our district to proclaim Paderewski Day to be observed on November 7, 1960 in honor of the 100-year anniversary of the birth of that champion of freedom and to proclaim Gen. Casimir Pulaski Day on October 11, 1960 to commemorate that great patriot's memory.

"We send brotherly greetings to the people of Poland in their continuing fight for freedom and democracy and we assure them of our continued support in their efforts and in their struggle.

"We bow our heads in reverence to His Eminence, Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski, the primate of Poland, and we assure him of our support in his cause.

"And together, as we ascend to the various summits confronting our national and international life may the blessing of the Lord be upon us."

The Polish American Congress, Central and Northern New York State District: Rev. Ladislaus Guziolek, Chaplain; Mr. Stephen Obremski, President; Dr. W. Kotwas, Vice President; Mrs. Ann Szczepanska, Vice President; Mrs. Sophia Czachowska, Vice President; Mr. Stanley Zabek, Financial Secretary; Mrs. Violet Michalska, Secretary; Mr. Robert J. Pietruszka, Assistant to the President; Mr. Anthony Sawicki, Sergeant-at-Arms; Mr. Joseph Dylong, Treasurer.

National Police Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a National Police Hall of Fame will be dedicated on October 15 at Port Charlotte, Fla., to the memory of all police officers in the United States who have given their lives in the line of duty to protect our citizens.

The hall of fame will consist of a beautiful modern building containing typical equipment used in police departments, as well as a memorial listing the names of all law enforcement officers who have been killed in the line of duty.

The memorial is being built by the National Police Officers Association of America and will be open to the public year round without charge. This nonprofit association, the largest of its kind in the United States, has chosen Port Charlotte as its retirement city. Floridians are happy to have these dedicated public servants come to Florida, and take pride in the National Police Hall of Fame being located in our State.

The law enforcement officer is one of the most important, yet often neglected member of our community. He strives to give us and our families the protection that we need and expect. Personal sacrifice is often the result of the police officers' devotion to duty—too often this sacrifice is his own life. Forty-eight officers lost their lives in 1959 while giving us that protection we frequently take for granted.

The National Police Hall of Fame has been designed to commemorate these sacrifices in the war against crime. It will be maintained by the National Police Officers Association of America membership, but will be dedicated to all law officers throughout America, regardless of their membership or nonmembership in the organization.

Because this project is national in scope and will represent the fine police men and women in every community, it should be of interest to all Members of Congress and citizens interested in law enforcement.

Chief G. S. Aremberg, executive director of the hall of fame has asked local police officials who have not yet done so to contact him about their own men and women who should be represented in this national memorial. The hall of fame will be dedicated at 2 p.m. October 15, and the Police Officers Association, through President Frank Schira, has invited the public to attend at that time, or any day thereafter.

It's Time To Give the Railroads a Tax Break

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is high time we gave the railroads a tax break. Some months ago I introduced legislation to provide such a break by authorizing a faster depreciation allowance on railroad rolling stock, H.R. 7927.

In spite of the fact that my bill received a favorable report from the Interstate Commerce Commission it has not yet been favorably reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. The urgency of this need, however, was recently pointed up in an item that appeared in Railway Age for August 8, 1960. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the article:

Depreciation: A fellow was telling me the other day about a trucking company that fully depreciates its tractors in 4 years. With such a depreciation practice, a company never lacks untaxed money to provide replacements—and inflation doesn't have time in 4 years to raise the price too much.

Because of the slow depreciation of railroad equipment, the inflow of cash is modest—and replacements may well cost three or four times as much as the property written off.

Most businesses are hollering about the Government's inadequate depreciation allowances—but railroads have a right to a bigger beef than anybody. Not only are their depreciation rates much lower than average, but they have such poor net earnings out of which to make up the difference between depreciation charges and the cost of replacements. The setup is just plain murder for the railroads—and also for their suppliers.

Realities of the Space Age

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEONARD G. WOLF

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, northeastern Iowa had the privilege and honor of receiving into its midst on June 26 an outstanding officer of the U.S. Air Force, Col. W. W. Woodard, who spoke at a flight breakfast at the Oelwein, Iowa, airport. Colonel Woodard is Chief of the Engineering Division, Headquarters, Air Research and Development Command, Andrews Air Force Base, Washington, D.C. He has outlined very succintly the realities of the space age, and I commend his message to all Americans:

We often hear the view expressed, that a military organization is concerned solely with destruction—and that it therefore has little to offer in the way of intellectual or spiritual enrichment. This attitude is a holdover from an earlier era, when the soldier—belonging to a caste apart—was dedicated solely to the profession of war.

Though I address you as a military man, I am concerned—deeply concerned—with the same problems—economic, social, political, and most of all moral—that trouble all our people across the length and breadth of our Nation. Airmen, soldiers, and sailors in our country are very much like other citizens—like businessmen, farmers, lawyers, or teachers. They want the same things other people want—a life of peace, progress, and prosperity for their families.

Unfortunately—yes, even tragically—war is a factor in human existence that cannot be ignored. The threat of war is always with us, especially in this period, which includes most of the years the majority of us here have lived. Since the end of World War II, we have been involved in a conflict of cold war. It is an insidious, deadly, and disarming kind of war. It is one in which the opponents, up to now, have not engaged in full-scale hostilities, with the weapons of destruction which they possess.

If I were to leave only one message with you, the opportunity to talk with you would

be most worthwhile, that is, the cold war conflict is a very real war. It is being waged relentlessly and continuously, by the Communists everywhere in the world,—against our allies and against the so-called neutral nations.

One of the characteristics of communism, is its insatiable desire to impose its will on others. In the last 15 years, we have seen the two greatest Communist powers—the Soviet Union and Red China—engaged in a ruthless drive toward world domination—even though their territories already are among the largest on earth, and are still far from being fully developed.

The Communists follow this course because they know that so long as freedom endures anywhere in the world—so long as there exists a single nation which has faith in God, and believes in the dignity of man—their own power is limited and insecure.

Any nation, founded on the principles of freedom for the individual citizen—freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of the press, is a major obstacle to the ambitions of communism. Ours is such a nation. The compelling urge of communism, therefore, is to see it destroyed.

During the past 20 years, national strengths have been augmented by the two most powerful physical forces ever placed in the hands of human beings. One is the release of energy from the atom—the same type of energy generated by the sun, sustaining all the life on our globe. The other force is the development of rocket propulsion. It has given men the power to overcome the universal force of gravitation—to launch vehicles into space where they can travel the outer reaches almost indefinitely.

When these two forces are joined together, we have a rocket-powered vehicle capable of carrying an atomic warhead vast distances. The significance of the intercontinental ballistic missile, in terms of the worldwide conflict between communism and freedom, is that it has lifted the struggle for man's mind and spirit beyond the confines of any single territory or continent, and given it global dimensions.

The ballistic missile transcends any barrier that human beings may interpose on the ground or in the air. It travels through space at the speed of an interplanetary body. It strikes with little or no warning. The missile, therefore, is the ideal weapon of surprise attack.

What does all this mean to you and to me? It means that in the missile era—in which we all now must live—our traditional concepts of defense have become outmoded and meaningless. In the past we felt secure behind the oceans that separate us from Europe, Africa, and Asia. In fact, we relied on these ocean barriers to give us time in which to mobilize our vast productive capacity, so that we might overcome the initial advantage secured by a powerful aggressor. The oceans are no barrier for the ICBM. It traverses them with ease, in half an hour or less.

So, today, when missiles could destroy our industrial base in a matter of minutes, there is no time to assemble our industrial resources.

We must be prepared in advance for any attack that may be coming.

You will find in your everyday affairs that you are inevitably enrolled as a combatant in the cold war, on the side of freedom, whether or not you wear a uniform as I do. In a struggle whose dimensions are as vast as these, there must be the closest possible integration of the military and civilian effort. The depth of your understanding of the challenge posed by the missile and space age—and the way in which you meet it—will in no small measure determine the future of human freedom at home and abroad.

These are the unpleasant, yet undeniable facts about the age in which we live—the age of the cold war, of the intercontinental missile, and of space. No amount of rationalization will make these facts go away.

But there is also an encouraging facet to the age in which we live, for if it is a time of peril, it also is a time of great promise. Strange as it may seem, this promise springs from the very forces which have placed our lives and our well-being in such danger—from the vast horizons of scientific and technological promise opened up by rocket propulsion and the energy in the atom. Let me try to define these implications for you.

First of all, these discoveries offer to all mankind the prospect of an almost unlimited source of power. The energy in the atom already is beginning to provide a new and nearly inexhaustible supply of fuel for generators, for machines, for engines in vehicles of many kinds. The energy in rocket propulsion gives us the means to venture into space. There, at the very least, we will add immeasurably to our fundamental knowledge. We may even find a way to exercise some measure of control over the environment in which we live.

In the years of intensive research since the last world war, these two scientific advances have touched off what may be called a technological revolution. They have led to many new concepts, new techniques, new instruments—and even to a vast complex of new industries in the fields of electronics and the chemistry of fuels. If we use these new reserves of technical accomplishment wisely, we can look for impressive advances in the material welfare and the spiritual strength of mankind over the years ahead.

The military have been far from idle in meeting the challenge of the space age. Though we started some time after the Soviet Union on building a missile force to deter aggression, our Nation today is second to none in the development of these weapons. Just 5 years after the Air Force began working intensively on our first intercontinental ballistic missile, the Atlas was placed in the operational inventory of the Strategic Air Command.

Similarly, the intermediate-range missile, Thor and Jupiter, now have been made available to our allies. They are being deployed at bases in the United Kingdom and Italy, where they will be manned by British and Italian personnel.

Another ICBM, the Titan, will reinforce the Atlas within the next year or so.

We have a much more advanced ICBM coming along in the Minuteman. It is lighter, more compact, and easier to handle than either Atlas or Titan—and yet powerful enough to do any job we may have to ask of it. Minuteman has two advantages of great economic and military significance. First, it is relatively cheap to build and operate. Its economy means that we can have a large and flexible force of these weapons. Second, it can be launched from mobile platforms to avoid detection, as well as from fixed sites in concrete silos, deep underground. This achievement is a breakthrough of the utmost importance in missile technology.

To give our missiles and long-range aircraft the utmost speed in reacting to any threat of aggression—and also to provide the maximum protection for our civil population—we are preparing to establish a new kind of warning system known as Midas. The new system will be carried in satellite vehicles circling high above the earth. It will be able to detect hostile missiles immediatey after they have been launched.

Hence, our warning of a ballistic missile attack will be extended to about 30 minutes from a period of no warning at all today. Thirty minutes is the best alert we can expect in the space age. Obviously, our communication systems will have to relay this quick warning swiftly and reliably.

We are developing satellite systems for this purpose too. They will be able to communicate immediately with our missile and air forces deployed around the globe. Still another satellite system called Samos will provide us with valuable information.

These are all passive aids to our deterrent postures. None of the systems I have been describing represents a threat of aggression of any kind on our part. It has been clearly demonstrated to the world that our national policy rules out any use of our military strength, unless we are attacked. But in the missile era—as I have remarked already—no traditional defensive system will secure us from a surprise attack—and no time will be allowed us, as in previous wars, to marshal our industrial and military strength. Our only safety now is in having a strength so great, and in such a state of readiness, that no sane antagonist will provoke us into using it.

Wise men of all ages have taught us that there is no virtue in being weak. Virtue lies in strength, provided the strength is held in proper check. Men of good will and good sense arm themselves with the most effective weapons available. They use their weapons only as a last resort against the forces of an unprincipled adversary.

The military carries out its assigned mission of service to the Nation by providing the deterrent strength necessary to prevent aggression. The task of finding the overall solution to our cold war problem is one for the constructive forces of education, diplomacy, and free business enterprise. You people here are personal representatives of these forces.

In this critical time when the going is tough, we can see that the years ahead will be difficult. They will require that we exercise great courage, great patience, and great singleness of purpose to meet Communist aggression with superior civil and military strength. We must measure up to this obligation. We can, and, we will.

Recognize the Veterans of World War I for Certain Pension Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following resolution adopted by the La Societe des 40 Hommes et 8 Chevaux urging the Congress to recognize the veterans of World War I for certain pension benefits:

Whereas World War I has been over for more than 40 years; and

Whereas the Veterans of World War I are the only veterans of the United States of America who have not been recognized as a body for pension benefits: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Grande Voiture de West Virginia, That La Societe des Quarante Hommes et Huit Chevaux, in Grande Promenade duly assembled on this 20th day of August, 1960, in the city of Morgantown, W. Va., do urge the Congress of the United States of America to recognize the Veterans of World War I as a class for pension bene-

fits comparable to those now being paid to the Veterans of the Spanish American War; and finally be it

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our representatives in Congress and the United States Senate for their consideration and action.

CHARLES W. MORRIS,
Grand Chief De Gare, 1960.

Attest:

RICHARD D. BENTEL,
Grand Correspondant, 1960.

A Revolutionary Shrine in Montgomery County, N.Y., the Grave of William McConkey, Owner of the Ferry on Which Washington Crossed the Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, as the Member of this body who has the honor to represent the 32d District of New York, an area rich in historical shrines and memories, I am frequently surprised and delighted to read of new discoveries that link our great area with major events in the history of our Nation, from its inception right down to the present time. No event perhaps has had greater significance or greater recognition in our Nation's early fight for its independence than Washington's timely and courageous crossing of the Delaware River to take the British soldiers in Trenton by surprise on Christmas, leading to a great victory. The grave of the man who made that trip possible is located in the town of Charleston, Montgomery County, in my district. Under leave to extend my remarks I include an article that appeared in the Amsterdam Evening Recorder on July 30, 1960, written by my good friend Richard Hency, describing this shrine and the events surrounding his important place in history:

WASHINGTON'S PILOT ACROSS DELAWARE RESTS UNNOTICED BENEATH CHARLESTON'S SOIL

(By Richard Hency)

Cars swish by a couple of State historical markers on Route 30A in the town of Charleston, unaware of what they read and of the fact that a little cemetery is buried back among some wild apple trees, with grasses growing in wild profusion brushing against the worn stones. Buried here is a man who played a leading role in a turning point in the career of George Washington during the blacker days of the Revolutionary War.

Those who wade through the grass and weeds will find several weatherbeaten stones and several American flags placed there each year to honor those who served their country. Among these stones one will find a stone which reads, "William McConkey, died September 10, 1825, aged 81 years, 7 months, and 15 days."

GUIDED WASHINGTON

Little is found here to note that this is the grave of the man who guided General Washington and his troops across the Delaware River on Christmas night, December 25, 1776, to their famous attack on Trenton and the capture of that city from the Hessian troops.

William McConkey was born in County Tyrone, Ireland, on January 22, 1744, the 15th generation from Donnachaide Reimhar MacAonghus of Scotland. With a thousand others he despaired of living conditions there and listened longingly to the tales of America and her opportunities. Finally he embarked and arrived in New York. He journeyed to New Jersey and settled 9 miles north of Trenton on the banks of the Delaware River.

Later a road was built to the spot and McConkey built a ferry and docks. He earned a comfortable living from the farthings and half-crowns charged for crossing the river in his ferry.

McConkey settled down to raise a family and built a large stone house near the banks of the river. The river became his great interest, and he studied each mood of the river, learning the shifts in the currents and whirlpools between the high waters and the low until he had satisfied himself that he could outguess the Delaware under any conditions.

SYMPATHIES WITH COLONIALS

The outbreak of the war reached his ferry and his sympathies lay with the Colonials, but enlistment was out of the question. Ferrying was too heavy work for Mrs. McConkey, and the oldest child was only 5 and another was coming.

The Colonial forces had been forced to retreat down from New England and New York, and had settled in Pennsylvania. The King's Hessians with braggadocio manners settled in Trenton.

On the Pennsylvania side McConkey talked with groups of Colonial scouts, uniforms nondescript, ragged, some with feet bound in rags. Early in December, Colonial staff officers approached McConkey to learn if he might be trusted to take men across the river for an attack on Trenton.

McConkey agreed, and with Patrick Colvin collected boats during the following week and hid them in the woods which bordered the river. On December 24 at a council of war it was decided that Colonel Cadwalder should cross the river at Dunk's Ferry to Curlington on Christmas night and tackle the British at Mount Holly, Columbus, and Bordentown. General Washington on the same night would take a detachment of 2,400 men and 18 pieces of artillery and make a direct attack on the 1,200 Hessians at Trenton.

POSSIBILITY OF DISASTER

Preparations for the move continued on through the Christmas night, with hail and snow falling on the area. Washington paced back and forth near the ferry wondering. There had been few successes under his leadership to date. Defeat at Trenton might lead to his resignation, wholesale desertion of his troops, and the possible end of a Nation not yet 6 months old.

McConkey worked all night leading the string of boats acros sthe ice-filled river. Washington himself rode with McConkey on one of these trips. Daylight was breaking before the last crossing was made. Many officers advocated abandonment of the attack. They had depended upon surprising the Hessians under the cover of darkness. Furthermore, the ammunition of many of the men was wet, others dropped by the road, unable to walk further on their bleeding feet. The whte snow everywhere was tinged with the blood from the poorly clad Colonial troops.

EASILY TAKEN

Then, with the first streaks of sunlight, Washington bade that the men arise. His plan was wise as history has shown. The Germans had indulged in intoxicants to excess the night before, celebrating Christmas, and were unfit for battle, and Trenton was easily taken.

Following this the life of the ferryman returned to normal and he continued to operate until the end of the war when he sold it and was paid in Continental script. He found out later that the money was worthless.

With his wife and children he migrated to New York State, settling in the town of Charleston, and was said to have built the first hotel in the hamlet of Glen. This building was used as a hotel until 1870 when it was run by the Saltsman family.

When McConkey died in 1825 he was buried alongside his wife in the small cemetery known as the old Wykofite churchyard. McConkey had one grandson, Marcus D. L. Simpson, who became a professional soldier, graduating from West Point and rising to the rank of brigadier general.

Today one can search the maps in vain for McConkey's Crossing, as the town has been renamed Washington's Crossing and is called this on both sides of the river in New Jersey and Pennsylvania. The site is also marked by Washington Crossing State parks.

Today few people, even students of history, remember the man who, with his great knowledge of the Delaware River, made the historic crossing possible even though the river was choked with floating ice and dangerous swift currents.

Our Strategic Planning Process

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, for some time there has been a discernible requirement for improvement in our strategic planning process. The present techniques are effective, but the advent of the ballistic missile and the Polaris submarine is resulting in significant changes in our strategic retaliatory capabilities. Therefore, it was with considerable satisfaction that I note the decision, announced Wednesday, August 17, by Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., establishing a centralized system for strategic operational planning which will insure the integrated employment of our military forces for strategic retaliation.

As Members of this House are aware, this matter of strategic retaliatory planning is an extremely complex one. For that reason, the Secretary of Defense merits commendation for the sensible and sound manner in which he has provided a solution to this problem.

His plan rejects—and I believe very properly so—the proposal for an overall strategic command. The grounds for rejecting such a command are obvious. It would simply add a delaying layer in the command structure, and it would be extremely vulnerable in event of a sudden surprise attack.

Also, the decision of the Secretary to make the Director of the Strategic Target Planning a direct subordinate of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is indeed sound.

We have, during the tenure of Secretary Gates, seen the Joint Chiefs of Staff brought to an impressive point of efficiency and effectiveness. Placing the

Strategic Target Planning organization directly under the Joint Chiefs of Staff further strengthens our Joint Chiefs of Staff system. This, of course, is in complete accord with the intent and philosophy of the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958.

I believe it important to emphasize that the Director of Strategic Target Planning performs this assignment distinctly and separately from his other position as Commander of the Strategic Air Command. The utilization of the extensive facilities of the Strategic Air Command for the purposes of the new Strategic Target Planning organization is a sensible decision in order to eliminate the unnecessary waste that would be involved in duplicating the SAC establishment.

This recent decision by Secretary Gates should be the source of reassurance and confidence in the manner in which the Department of Defense is being directed in these times of international tension. This is another in the long list of worthy accomplishments which have characterized the actions of Thomas S. Gates, Jr., as Secretary of Defense.

One of the clearest explanations of the new strategic target planning was printed in the Baltimore Sun of Thursday, August 18, and was written by Mark S. Watson, the distinguished military correspondent of the Sun. I include it in my remarks at this time, and recommend it to the attention of the House:

GATES ENDS DISPUTE, SETS UP DEFENSE UNIT TO FIX WAR TARGETS—REJECTS AIR FORCE'S IDEA OF NEW STRATEGIC COMMAND

(By Mark S. Watson)

WASHINGTON, August 17.—By what Thomas S. Gates, Jr., Defense Secretary, termed "the most important military decision since coming to the Pentagon in 1953," the Defense chief today ended a serious dispute between the Navy and Air Force, affecting the control of the Polaris submarine missiles.

Gates rejected altogether the concept, urged by the Air Force, of a new strategic command which would exercise control of both the planes and missiles of the Strategic Air Command and those of the Navy—chiefly of the Navy's treasured Polaris, now coming to reality.

WILL SUBMIT PLAN

Instead, the Secretary, with complete approval of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and all the unified theater commanders as well, has created a new planning section (as distinguished from a new command), to be set up at Omaha, Nebr.

This planning office, whose first chief will be Gen. Thomas S. Power, of the Air Force, with a deputy chosen from the Navy and a considerable staff from all services, will do the strategic target planning, submitting each plan and its revision to the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Joint Chiefs will study and accept or revise the plan, and make the indicated distribution of forces throughout the world.

Execution of that plan will, as now, be by the designated service, but under the overall command from the Defense Department itself, via the Joint Chiefs.

This newly created planning staff will do its work at the Strategic Air Command headquarters at Omaha, of which General Power is and will continue commander, thereby "wearing two hats," in Pentagon lingo, precisely as do the North Atlantic Treaty Organization commander in Europe, the NATO commander in the Atlantic, the Far East commander, and others.

MOST ECONOMICAL USE SEEN

The selection of the Omaha headquarters permits most economical use of the very large resources at that important center, not only of people, knowledge, and experience but also of the immense computing machinery complex set up there.

Machinery's importance in the planning of execution of modern warfare is difficult for the layman to grasp.

In this case it is most easily understood if one first faces the problem of:

1. Determining the enemy targets to be attacked in retaliation once the enemy has opened an assault on the West.

2. Designating the exact American force which will conduct its retaliatory action against each enemy target.

PRECISE CALCULATION

It can be seen that in the case of intercontinental ballistic missiles, or intermediate range ballistic missiles whether land or air based, this calls for the most precise calculation of the exact missile trajectory which will place a particular missile on a particular target 1,000 or more miles away.

In the case of a mobile launcher, this calls for a computation of a great many trajectories. In the case of duplicated missions (in case some of our launchers are out of business), again there is need for more than one computation.

The total of computations is so immense that they can be arrived at only through the "magic" of such huge electronic machines as are set up at various places in the United States.

One of the most efficient, it is obvious, must be that at Omaha hence the selection of that complex for the headquarters.

Hence, too, presumably the selection of General Power, who is head of the Strategic Air Command, as the first director of planning. It seems pretty clear that at present and for the immediate future SAC is sure to possess the Nation's most potent long-range retaliatory power.

How long this directorship will lodge with the Air Force is speculative. SAC will acquire even more power through the multiplication of Atlas and Titan missiles and the arrival in 1962 of the Minuteman missile.

FLEXIBILITY OF STAFF

But beginning in a few weeks the Navy's first Polaris sub will become operational, and within about a year four other and larger Polaris subs will join it, with three or four more coming annually.

It is quite possible that in time the Navy will be regarded as having the greater powers of deterrence through massive weapons. Hence the flexibility of the new planning staff.

While the Air Force and Navy are providing the mass of today's deterrent and retaliatory weapons, they are not alone. The Army's oversea forces have some in that category, and so—most significantly—have certain allies of the United States.

HOLDS EXTENDED CONFERENCE

It must be remembered that every plan affecting allies is adopted only after study and approval of those allies. This will apply to whatever plans are worked out by the new staff before the Joint Chiefs at the Pentagon give their own approval.

Gates, with Gen. Nathan F. Twining, Joint Chiefs Chairman, beside him, announced his decision late this afternoon after an extended conference with the eight unified and specified commanders who assemble periodically at the Pentagon.

IMPROVED ARRANGEMENTS

All eight commanders—from Europe, the Pacific, Atlantic, Eastern Atlantic, Caribbean, Alaska, SAC, and Continental Air Defense—were here, save for the last who sent his deputy.

All supported the Secretary's plan as wholeheartedly as have the Joint Chiefs themselves.

"In conjunction with the Joint Chiefs," Gates said, "I have been working on plans to insure the most effective balance of the missile bomber force and to insure that we can properly integrate these various forces if it ever becomes necessary to use them.

We have improved our arrangements. The actions do not represent any change in established national military policy or in our relations with our allies."

Simple as today's solution may seem, it called for several months of study necessitated by the Air Force's strong pressure for a new command of all long-range plane and missile forces, rather than a planning section only, and by the Navy's equally stout resistance to any loss of command of its unique elements.

The Department's conviction is that the new plan is better than any of the substitute proposals in that it assures more flexibility and swifter adjustment of the Nation's immense resources to either an emergency or a new situation.

May I also call attention to the article appearing in the August 29 edition of U.S. News & World Report entitled "On 15 Minutes' Notice: How the United States Plans To Strike Back" and commend it equally as worthy of examination by my colleagues:

ON 15 MINUTES' NOTICE: HOW THE UNITED STATES PLANS TO STRIKE BACK

A quick, devastating counterpunch to any surprise attack from Russia is being set up.

U.S. weapons—land, sea, air—will be pointed at Soviet targets, ready to fire on short notice at a single command.

For the first time, this country is to have a unified master plan to strike back at Russian targets in nuclear war.

The United States will be provided with this overall blueprint for retaliation by an interservice brain trust established by the Pentagon on August 17. A new job, Director of Strategic Target Planning, was created on that day and given to Gen. Thomas S. Power, Commander of the Strategic Air Command.

The aim is to gear all of America's retaliatory weapons to fire at previously earmarked targets within 15 minutes after warning of attack. The new strategy is to guarantee that the Navy's Polaris submarines and carrier aircraft are tightly integrated with Air Force bombers and missile forces.

At a time when Soviet strength is great and Soviet threats are growing, urgent need is seen for closer cooperation among U.S. military services. The Power agency is designed with this in mind.

MACHINES AND MEN

The new strategy for attack against Communist targets is to be made by 40 officers drawn from all services. They will work under General Power's direction at SAC headquarters in Omaha, Nebr. Elaborate electronic computers now used by SAC will help pinpoint targets that are to be destroyed once an enemy has launched a first strike.

The new central agency will designate the exact U.S. force to strike back. In some cases it also will name the weapon—B–47 or B–52 bombers, Atlas or Polaris missiles, fighter-bombers based abroad, or the Air Force's Titan and Minuteman missiles of the future. Timing of the attacks will be assigend. Other targeting information will be given.

This U.S. master plan will be ready December 1. Until then, target plans now existing will be kept in force. These existing plans were drawn up by U.S. theater commanders overseas and at home and coordi-

nated at annual meetings in Washington. Some Pentagon authorities say this method failed to provide effective overall strategy for answering Soviet aggression.

Authorities explain the need for the new system this way: In a period when weapons are more complex and available in greater variety, and when the Soviets have just reorganized their own nuclear rocket forces, old ways of planning war are no longer good enough.

Under this new system, General Power and his staff will prepare integrated target plans. These will be reviewed by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Standby orders for action will go out to U.S. commanders around the world.

Target: targets. How to make the target assignments will be the big job.

Targeting—backbone of strategic warfare—is a complicated process in the missile era. It requires knowledge of enemy locations, their defenses, what weapons are needed to destroy them, proper timing for attacks, computations for missile trajectories, where to place forces so they may strike on short notice.

How will the process work? How will it be decided who gets what target?

Here is a hypothetical case: Say, for example, that General Power's staff has learned that the big naval base of Vladivostok on the Soviet's Pacific Coast includes deep submarine pens, "hardened" against aerial attack. In the city itself are important railway yards. Thousands of troops are garrisoned 30 miles from the city. Seventy miles away is a deeply entrenched Russian missile complex.

The central agency in Omaha goes to work. Assignments are quickly made, approved by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and, in this example, relayed through the U.S. Pacific Command. The moment there was sure knowledge this country had been attacked, this would happen:

1. A B-47 bomber of SAC leaves Guam with a multimegaton bomb powerful enough to penetrate and destroy the naval base and its submarine pens.

2. A Polaris submarine far off the coast pinpoints the railways yards with a half-megaton warhead. The bomber and submarine have also wiped out the city itself.

3. Navy carrier planes, with still lighter atomic loads, go after the troop concentration far outside the city.

4. An Atlas missile is launched on a preset course from Cheyenne, Wyo., and in 30 minutes has traveled from its U.S. base to the Soviet missile site. The Atlas carries the required 4-megaton punch.

No "overkill." That example, imprecise for security reasons, indicates the need for central planning. Under present arrangements, one of the targets in the Vladivostok area might have been "overkilled" while the others were left undamaged.

Now targeting is to be taken from individual services. Know-how is to be pooled. The result is to be America's first truly unified plan for atomic war and, for Russia, new evidence of U.S. determination to strike back hard if attacked.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer will arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: First, the Senate proceedings; second, the House proceedings; third, the Appendix: *Provided*, That when the proceedings of the Senate are not received in time to follow this arrangement, the Public Printer may begin the RECORD with the House proceedings. The proceedings of each House and the Appendix shall each begin a new page, with appropriate headings centered thereon.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10. *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix except in cases of duplication. In such cases only the first item received in the Government Printing Office will be printed. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the final adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President, Richard Nixon

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*—Carroll Arms
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.*—6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Beall, J. Glenn, *Md.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Bridges, Styles, *N. H.*
Burdick, Quentin, *N. Dak.*
Bush, Prescott, *Conn.*
Butler, John Marshall, *Md.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.*—The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*
Capehart, Homer E., *Ind.*—The Westchester
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.*—Sheraton-Park
Carroll, John A., *Colo.*
Case, Clifford P., *N. J.*
Case, Francis, *S. Dak.*—4635 Mass. Ave.
Chavez, Dennis, *N. Mex.*—2525 P St.
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N. H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Dworshak, Henry C., *Idaho*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.*—5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Engle, Clair, *Calif.*
Ervin, Samuel J., Jr., *N. C.*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii*—5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Frear, J. Allen, Jr., *Del.*
Fulbright, J. William, *Ark.*
Goldwater, Barry M., *Ariz.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Green, Theodore Francis, *R. I.*—University Club
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hennings, Thomas C., Jr., *Mo.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.*—5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.*—Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Humphrey, Hubert H., *Minn.*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N. Y.*
Johnson, Lyndon B., *Tex.*
Johnston, Olin D., *S. C.*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N. C.*
Keating, Kenneth B., *N. Y.*—3509 M St.
Kefauver, Estes, *Tenn.*—4929 Hillbrook Lane
Kennedy, John F., *Mass.*
Kerr, Robert S., *Okla.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Oren E., *Hawaii*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
Lusk, Hall S., *Oreg.*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.*—2930 Chesapeake St.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.*—The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Martin, Thos. E., *Iowa.*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.*—4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.*—122 Schotts Court NE.
Murray, James E., *Mont.*—The Shoreham
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
O'Mahoney, Joseph C., *Wyo.*—Sheraton-Park
Pastore, John O., *R. I.*
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.*—2320 Tracy Pl.
Schoeppel, Andrew F., *Kans.*
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala.*—4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S. C.*
Wiley, Alexander, *Wis.*—2122 Mass. Ave.
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N. J.*
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph W., *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.*—Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Secretary for the Majority—Robert G. Baker.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Johnson of Texas (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Anderson, Kerr, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Bridges, Wiley, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Martin, and Case of New Jersey.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston of South Carolina, Holland, Eastland, Humphrey, Symington, Talmadge, Proxmire, Jordan, Young of Ohio, Hart, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Hickenlooper, Mundt, Schoeppel, and Cooper.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Chavez, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Johnson of Texas, Pastore, Kefauver, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, Dodd, McGee, Bridges, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Dworshak, Kuchel, Hruska, and Allott.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Byrd of Virginia, Johnson of Texas, Stennis, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Thurmond, Engle, Bartlett, Cannon, Saltonstall, Bridges, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Case of South Dakota, Bush, and Beall.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Fulbright, Sparkman, Frear, Douglas, Clark, Proxmire, Byrd of West Virginia, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Capehart, Bennett, Bush, Beall, and Javits.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, Frear, Hartke, Beall, Case of South Dakota, and Prouty.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Kerr, Frear, Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Butler, Curtis, and Morton.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Green, Sparkman, Humphrey, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Kennedy, Gore, Lausche, Church, Wiley, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Capehart, Carlson, and Williams of Delaware.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Humphrey, Gruening, Muskie, Mundt, Curtis, and Javits.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Murray (chairman), Anderson, Jackson, O'Mahoney, Bible, Carroll, Church, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Burdick, Dworshak, Kuchel, Goldwater, Allott, and Fong.

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Smathers, Thurmond, Lausche, Yarborough, Engle, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Schoeppel, Butler, Cotton, Case of New Jersey, Morton, and Scott.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Kefauver, Johnston of South Carolina, Hennings, McClellan, O'Mahoney, Ervin, Carroll, Dodd, Hart, Wiley, Dirksen, Hruska, Keating, and Cotton.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), Murray, Kennedy, McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Burdick, Goldwater, Dirksen, Case of New Jersey, Javits, and Prouty.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston of South Carolina (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Clark, Jordan, Randolph, Carlson, Fong, and Young.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. Chavez (chairman), Kerr, McNamara, Randolph, McCarthy, Young, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Long of Hawaii, Lusk, Case of South Dakota, Martin, Cooper, Scott, Prouty, and Fong.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Hennings (chairman), Hayden, Green, Mansfield, Jordan, Cannon, Curtis, Keating, and Martin.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D. C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Frankfurter, of Massachusetts, 3018 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Whittaker, of Missouri, 5000 Van Ness St.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 3013 Q St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—James R. Browning, 454 New Jersey Ave. SE.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Richard J. Blanchard, 427 St. Lawrence Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Walter Wyatt, 1702 Kalmia Rd.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Frankfurter. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Whittaker. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Live-Virus Polio Vaccine Approved for Use in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news story from the New York Times of Thursday, August 25, 1960, as well as a feature from the same edition on Dr. Albert Bruce Sabin:

LIVE-VIRUS POLIO VACCINE APPROVED FOR USE IN UNITED STATES—PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE ENDS DISPUTE BY SELECTING SABIN COMPOUNDS—DRUG HOUSES TO SPUR OUTPUT

(By Bess Furman)

WASHINGTON, August 24.—Live poliomyelitis vaccine was approved today as suitable for use in the United States.

The announcement, ending a long controversy, was made by Dr. Leroy E. Burney, Surgeon General of the Public Health Service.

Simultaneously, he laid down exacting rules under which the live vaccine will be licensed for commercial use in this country. His timetable calls for this to take place next spring. He predicted large supplies by the fall of 1961. He said the winter months were best for live polio vaccinations.

The live vaccine, given by mouth, has already been used to immunize millions of persons in the Soviet Union, South America, and other parts of the world. It is a virus so weakened as not to cause the disease, but still alive enough to produce antibodies.

In manufacture of the Salk killed vaccine, used in this country since 1955, the virus is heat-killed to a point where it will not cause disease, but still will produce antibodies. It is given by injection. Dr. Burney predicted today that the live vaccine would not replace the Salk variety, but that each would complement the other. For instance, live virus might be used as "booster" shots for the Salk vaccine.

The rules laid down today permit initial commercial production of only the Sabin types of vaccine—types I, II, and III, developed by Dr. Albert B. Sabin of Cincinnati to protect against the three polio strains.

Ruled out were two other types of live polio vaccines—that developed by Dr. Herald R. Cox, at the Lederle Laboratories in Pearl River, N.Y., and that developed by Dr. Hilary Koprowski, at the Wistar Institute in Philadelphia.

Dr. Burney praised both these scientists for their "great contributions." He said that large-scale field trials of both the Cox and Koprowski vaccines had shown "the hazards to man to be very, very slight."

But he concluded that the Public Health Service had to apply a monkey test for safety in licensing a vaccine—and that the Sabin strains showed least virulence when injected into the brains, spinal cords, and muscles of monkeys. Sabine strain No. 1, the least virulent, was made the laboratory measuring stick for all other strains.

STRAINS AVAILABLE TO ALL

Since the Sabin strains were developed with funds furnished by the National Foundation, Dr. Burney added, they will be available to all the drug manufacturers that wish to produce live polio vaccine.

Dr. Burney said he did not know what the cost of the live-virus vaccine would be as compared with that of the Salk vaccine. The Salk vaccine now costs about 45 cents a dose, plus the doctor's charge for its injection.

Dr. Burney also said he thought that three or four doses of live virus would be required. This is similar to the Salk vaccine which ideally is given in three injections with a later booster shot.

There is still some difference of opinion whether the live-virus vaccine confers greater immunity. However, some believe it does because with its passage through the intestine it stimulates formation of more antibodies. Another advantage is that through contact between persons the live virus is spread and immunity may be developed in persons who have not taken vaccine themselves.

Drug companies already in experimental production of the Sabin vaccine include Wyeth Laboratories of Philadelphia; Pitman-Moore of Indianapolis, and Chas. Pfizer & Co. of Brooklyn.

The American Cyanamid Co., under which the Lederle Laboratories operate, immediately issued a statement that Lederle would start manufacture of the approved strains as soon as all the Public Health Service requirements were met. The company said it had already invested 14 years and $13 million in its faith in the superiority of live polio vaccine.

Other drug companies sending experts to the live-virus conference held here last week were the Eli Lilly Co. of Indianapolis; Parke, Davis, of Detroit, and Merck Sharp & Dohme, of Rahway, N.J. Attending as observers were scientists from Connaught Laboratories at the University of Toronto in Canada, where live vaccine is now being produced, and from Chas. Pfizer Laboratories of Kent, England.

The Surgeon General defended his long delay in endorsing the live vaccine by saying: "It has been stated that we have been ultraconservative. I have no apologies to make for conservatism, which is justified in an issue as important as this."

EVIDENCE EVALUATED

Dr. Burney said that today's endorsement of the live vaccine resulted from scientific evidence presented at a meeting on polio in Moscow in May; the Pan-American Health Organization-World Health Organization meeting in Washington in June; and the International Congress on Poliomyelitis last month. The final evaluation was made last Saturday by the six-member Public Health Service Committee on Live Polio Virus Vaccine.

Dr. Roderick Murray, Chairman of that Committee and head of the Division of Biologics Standards that will license the vaccine, stressed these points today:

To minimize the possible danger from a wild virus that might develop after repeated trips through the human intestinal tract, use of live virus vaccine should be on a communitywide rather than individual basis.

The claim for immunization through a single dose of live virus has not been borne out by recent experience. Repeated doses must be given at intervals, whether single strain or polyvalent vaccine is used.

Laboratories must be isolated and other special precautions instituted, including tests of both the persons who make the vaccine and the monkeys used in testing it.

The product must be kept under 30 degree centigrade in manufacture, and under refrigeration pending use.

The production regulations will be published in the Federal Register about November 1 and again in late November.

FOUNDATION IS PLEASED

The National Foundation hailed Dr. Burney's announcement as another milestone in the organization's fight against polio.

Basil O'Connor, the foundation president, said here that it had awarded $1,198,000 to Dr. Sabin since 1940 for research that led to his development of the live polio virus vaccine.

WARRIOR AGAINST POLIO—ALBERT BRUCE SABIN

Another breakthrough was marked yesterday by mild-mannered Dr. Albert Bruce Sabin, who delights in using military terms in his nonstop warfare against viruses. The formal approval of vaccine made from his strains of live polio virus by the U.S. Public Health Service may well revolutionize vaccination methods in this country in the next year or so. But the white-haired scientist already has his next aggression mapped out. He and his fellow workers will turn their attention to cancer next year. For the last 25 years he has concentrated on the battle against poliomyelitis.

In his office at the University of Cincinnati, where he is professor of research pediatrics, he celebrated the American breakthrough yesterday with champagne.

It is a strange twist of circumstances that he had already broken through in startling fashion in the Soviet Union.

Dr. Sabin was born in Bialystok, now Polish, but then a part of czarist Russia. His family was permitted to leave in 1921 when he was 15 years of age. They emigrated to the United States, and he has been a U.S. citizen since 1930.

TESTED IN SOVIET UNION

While the United States has been concentrating on the Salk vaccine, the Soviet Union has made a massive test of his type which can be taken orally. In the last year the Russians have given the vaccine in the form of candy balls or liquid to 77 million persons. Extensive tests have also been made in Mexico, Poland, Malaya, and other countries.

Bespectacled and scholarly looking, Dr. Sabin remarks that his use of military terms dates from his 30-year connection in one capacity or another with the Surgeon General's Office.

Although he once remarked that his intensive work was also his hobby, he said yesterday that "his principal achievements were his 2 daughters, Deborah, 10, and Amy, 8. He loves symphonic music and travel.

Music, he says, helps him "to recharge the mental batteries." And he enjoys meeting many different kinds of people on his travels. He has been in the Soviet Union four times since 1956, most recently in May. And in 1958 he was official guest of Poland.

The Sabin family, after coming to this country, first lived in Paterson, N.J. Young

Albert Savin attended Paterson High School, where he was a member of the literary and debating societies.

Then he worked at odd jobs to obtain money for his undergraduate and medical education at New York University. But he was nearly steered far afield from the future battle with poliomyelitis by an uncle, who offered to pay his tuition if he would become a dentist.

In fact he attended the university's school of dentistry for 2 years. But he relates that the reading of Paul de Kruif's book, "Microbe Hunters" gave him the desire to turn to research.

As an undergraduate he impressed the famous microbiologist, William H. Park, then a professor at New York University, by asking quietly if he might work in a corner of the laboratory.

For many years thereafter Dr. Sabin worked on various projects suggested by Dr. Park. "I owe him more than any man can ever repay," Dr. Sabin has said.

It was after being appointed to the Rockefeller Institute in 1935 that he began the long war of attenuating, or taking the sting out of, live polio viruses—the work that led to the vaccine.

During World War II he served in the Army Medical Corps and developed vaccines against dengue fever and Japanese encephalitis. He was discharged with the rank of lieutenant colonel. He was awarded the Legion of Merit.

By 1955 he was ready to test his vaccine on human beings. Twenty-six volunteers at the Federal reformatory in Chillicothe, Ohio, participated in the successful experiment.

His connection with the University of Cincinnati goes back to 1939.

U.S. Policy in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Maj. Gen. Julius Klein, retired, delegate at large from Illinois to the Republican National Convention, 1960, to the platform committee of the Republican National Convention.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ON U.S. POLICY IN THE MIDDLE EAST TO THE PLATFORM COMMITTEE OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION BY MAJ. GEN. JULIUS KLEIN, RETIRED, DELEGATE AT LARGE FROM ILLINOIS TO THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION, 1960

Ladies and gentlemen, my name is Julius Klein. I appear before you as a lifelong member of the Republican Party, a veteran of both World Wars, and one who has had the privilege of serving committees of the United States Senate in study missions abroad relating to the conduct of American policy in foreign military and economic aid. I am also privileged to be a member of the Illinois delegation to this convention.

The Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS, the very distinguished Senator from New York, who is known throughout the land for his comprehensive knowledge and understanding of international problems, has submitted a plank on the Middle East for inclusion in our party platform. I should like to take this opportunity to voice my complete support for this very eloquent statement of principles and to urge its adoption for our party program.

Two weeks ago I returned from an extended visit to Europe and the Middle East. I arrived in Europe on the eve of the betrayal by Soviet Premier Khrushchev of the hopes reposed by mankind in the aborted summit conference. During my journeys through Europe, I had the opportunity to renew old friendships among many of the leading political figures of our Western allies. They were united in the view that Mr. Khrushchev's vulgar display in Paris marked the opening of a new period of political aggression that could be expected to reach into every corner of the world. As we now know, the Soviets' brutal rejection of peaceful negotiations in Paris was swiftly followed by fresh upheavals in Havana and Russian and Chinese Communist intrusion in the unhappy island 90 miles to the south of our Florida coast.

There is a direct and ominous relationship between these events and the subject of my statement to this committee.

A little more than a week ago, the Soviet Union announced its intention to continue large-scale shipments of arms to the Arab States. Mr. Khrushchev made no secret of his motives. He made it plain that he considers it to be in the Soviets' national interest to nourish Arab hostility toward Israel and to keep the Middle East smoldering with tension and unrest. Against this naked incitement to armed aggression in the Middle East, the Western nations, and particularly the United States, have sought to walk a middle course that is growing ever narrower and increasingly untenable.

In the course of several weeks stay in Israel, I had the opportunity to talk with that country's highest political leaders and military figures. The burning determination of this small country to achieve a secure and self-reliant democracy cannot be doubted. I found also a genuine desire by the leaders and people of Israel to reach a peaceful settlement of differences with the Arab States. It is not for lack of any will on the part of the Israelis that the Arabs have refused to enter into peaceful negotiations. And there can be no doubt whatever that as long as the Soviets provide aggressive leadership in the direction of continuing Arab hostility towards Israel, the Middle East will continue to live in a state of tension and ferment. Moreover, it will remain one of the world's most inflammable areas if it is not fire-proofed by decisive and united action by the nations of the free world.

I am convinced that we are close to a point of no return in the Middle East. Some of our friends in the West have perceived this somewhat more clearly than we. France long ago recognized the urgent necessity for helping Israel to keep within range of arms equality with her hostile neighbors who have been the beneficiaries of military giveaway programs by the Soviets. Under one of the great statesmen of our time, Konrad Adenauer, free Germany has been a vital factor in aiding Israel's economy. Not only the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, but private industrial enterprises, have come to Israel's aid, despite threats of Arab boycotts and actual blacklisting by the Arab States.

I would not for a moment question the deep sense of awareness shown by our own Government under the leadership of President Eisenhower that the Middle East and its people are of vital concern to the national interests of the United States. Certainly, President Eisenhower's forthright decision to throw the full weight of the United States behind the protection of Lebanon's independence was a clear and unmistakable signal to international communism that our country will not flinch from its duty to help safeguard human freedom.

Nevertheless, I think we can agree that in dealing with as fluid and complex a set of problems as exist in the Middle East, there is a need for constant reassessment of our national policies.

Our party has long recognized that animosities prevailing in the Middle East are a major threat to internationl peace. Our platform in 1956 took note of the conflict between Israel and the Arab States and properly condemned the Soviet bloc for hampering a peaceful settlement by its arms shipments to the Arab States.

We pledged ourselves to the preservation of the independence and integrity of the several states of the Middle East, naming both Israel and her Arab neighbors in that commitment.

We pledged our continuing efforts to encourage the Arab States and Israel to negotiate a peaceful solution of their differences.

We promised our good offices to bring about an end to boycotts, blockades, and restrictions on the use of international waterways.

We pledged assistance to the rehabilitation and permanent resettlement of the Arab refugees on the basis that would "give Israel that assurance of national security which the situation and our national interests require."

We approved appropriate action to oppose the imposition by foreign governments of discrimination against U.S. citizens, based on their religion or race and we noted that "we shall do all we can to bring an end to these deplorable practices."

A good many of these pledges have been kept. We have indeed acted to preserve the independence and integrity of the nations of the Middle East.

We have sought to persuade both sides to enter into negotiations looking toward a peaceful resolution of their differences.

We have voiced our concern over Arab refusal to lift the Suez Canal blockade on Israeli shipping.

We have expressed our abhorrence for discriminatory practices aimed at U.S. citizens because of racial or religious considerations.

We must, however, face the hard truth that despite these expressions, the evils at which they were aimed have continued. In the United Arab Republic, Nasser has found it more expedient to accept the moral and, in many cases, physical support of the Soviet bloc than to contemplate roads to a peaceful settlement with Israel. The Suez remains closed to Israeli shipping in violation of an established international convention and a decision of the Security Council and the pledge of Egypt to comply with the six principles adopted and with the Security Council in 1956. Persons and firms of many nations are boycotted and blacklisted for doing business with Israel. Arab Governments receiving United States aid are boycotting American firms and refusing to honor the passports of American citizens for no other disqualification than their religious faith. Arab States are excluding American citizens of Jewish faith from U.S. Government civilian and military posts and from employment on U.S. defense contracts in Arab countries. We find ourselves, therefore, in the incredible position of maintaining friendly relations with governments that do not hesitate to impose second-class citizenship on our own nationals.

In 1956, the Senate of the United States unanimously adopted Senate Resolution 323 condemning attempts by foreign nations to create religious distinctions among our citizens in the granting of personal or commercial access of any other rights otherwise available to American citizens generally. Much

the same principle was expressed in an amendment to the Mutual Security Appropriations bill enacted in 1959.

Admittedly, the problem of dealing with Arab Governments on a basis that will safeguard military and economic relations important to our national interests is complex and prohibitive of any pat solution. But if events since the outbreak of World War II have taught us anything, it must be obvious by now that it is profitless to temporize with dictatorship, no matter what its guise and no matter how small the land in which it takes root.

As a businessman, I am conscious of the vast investment stake we have established in the Middle East. But I cannot persuade myself that any true long-range advantage can accrue to us if we permit the rights of our citizens to be subordinated to the expediency of international bargaining.

We must, of course, put forward our best efforts to persuade the nations of the Middle East to reach a peaceful settlement of their differences. Indeed, it would be my hope that we would signify our intention of giving this area of the world a high priority on our foreign policy agenda, and that we would exercise the leadership which I believe the nations of that community and our friends in the West would welcome. I would hope that we could move in this area in full concert with our Western friends, all of whom have as crucial a stake in the area as we have. Among them is to be found a great fund of skills and experience which would serve us well if they were put to coordinated use. And among them, as I have noted, are countries which have already made plain their intentions of standing firm by the democracy of Israel. I saw no signs that these countries are faring badly at the hands of the Arabs despite the efforts to dissuade them from their course. I would have no fears that any worse fate would befall our own country if we were to move anew in the direction of restoring the Middle East community to stability and reducing frictions.

I would regard it as essential that our point of departure take the form of an invitation to all the states of the area to meet with us and our friends for the purpose of examining a full range of economic and social measures by which the Western nations can begin at once to make a meaningful contribution to the raising of living standards in the area. High on such an agenda would be the question of rehabilitating and resettling the refugees. Equally prominent would be a solemn assurance to these states that we continue to respect their sovereignty and integrity and that our sole interest in asking them to meet jointly with us is to ascertain how we can best move toward helping them to achieve national self-reliance. As to the differences that now obtain between the Arab States and Israel, we should make it plain at the outset that we are prepared to serve as friends of both parties to bring direct negotiations with them. At all events, we must make it plain that an essential factor in our relations with the area is the readiness of others to accord our country and our people the same degree of respect we give to them.

The steps I suggest may well touch off new torrents of propaganda abuse from the Communists. To what extent this will make itself felt in Arab lands can only be surmised. But one thing is clear: our national interest requires that we assert President Eisenhower's call for peace with justice through a program that will give fresh meaning to this idea. We must make it plain that we are prepared to give practical and effective support to those nations of the Middle East that are genuinely interested in the peaceful development of their lands and in peaceful relations with their neighbors. This excludes any inference of intrusion into the internal affairs of these countries. It is for them to decide their own destinies. To the extent that they contribute to the peace and stability of their area they are entitled, and should be assured they will receive, the fullest support possible within the range of our international commitments.

For this, we are entitled to, and should receive, assurances that established principles of international law will be respected. We must make sure that the patience manifested toward Fidel Castro is not misread. If we sometimes seem to ignore our friends while rewarding our enemies, let none who follow in Castro's path be deluded into thinking that we have any higher regard for appeasement today than we did in the time of Hitler.

I respectfully submit that, given the benefit of a superb candidate for the Presidency of the United States in the person of Vice President RICHARD NIXON, it is of the greatest urgency that our party platform assert a policy that will make plain our determination to pursue the establishment of genuine peace and cooperation in the Middle East with renewed vigor and enterprise.

Appeal by Employees of the Government Printing Office Composing Division

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the brief filed by the employees of the Government Printing Office Composing Division with the Joint Committee on Printing. The 1,400 members of the composing division are the ones who are primarily responsible for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, bills, reports, hearings, Federal Register, and so forth. Evidence of the efficiency of these compositors are all around us attesting to the fact that we have the best printing establishment in the world. Yet in terms of wages, hours, and so forth, we are apparently lagging behind the industry in the major printing centers of the country.

I commend the points raised in this bill to the sympathetic attention of the Joint Committee on Printing. Unfortunately, the move toward early adjournment may preclude a hearing this year. However, I hope that when the 87th Congress convenes the Joint Committee will thoroughly analyze these grievances and correct the inequities which are set forth in this brief:

BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF AN APPEAL BY THE EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE COMPOSING DIVISION FROM THE DECISION AND OFFER OF THE PUBLIC PRINTER RELATING TO WAGE ADJUSTMENTS AND OTHER MATTERS TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING, 86TH CONGRESS, AUGUST 19, 1960

A. JURISDICTION

The Kiess Act (44 U.S.C.A. 40) provides that "the rate of wages, including compensation for night and overtime work for more than 10 employees of the same occupation shall be determined by a conference between the Public Printer and a committee selected by the trades affected."

The said act further provides:

"If the Public Printer and the committee representing any trade fail to agree as to wages, salaries, and compensation, either party is granted the right of appeal to the Joint Committee on Printing."

The Composing Division, Government Printing Office, consists of approximately 1,300 employees and represents "employees of the same occupation" (printing) within the meaning of the aforesaid statutory language.

The scale committee of the Composing Division (hereinafter referred to as "the scale committee") consists of five members who were selected by the Composing Division on February 3–4, 1960, and the committee has been vested with authority to enter this appeal by the employees of said Composing Division.

B. BACKGROUND

On July 26, 1960, the Public Printer presented to the scale committee his preliminary thinking on matters likely to be considered at the formal wage conference scheduled for August 8, 1960.

On July 27, 1960, the scale committee submitted to the Public Printer the proposals of the Composing Division for the year beginning August 18, 1960.

On August 5, 1960, the chairman of the scale committee replied to the Public Printer's preliminary thinking letter of July 26, 1960, in which the scale committee recommended four changes in the weighted average formula if such formula is to be continued. In addition the scale committee recommended that its counsel be permitted to attend the formal wage conference and that a verbatim transcript be taken of the conference.

On August 8, 1960, the Public Printer discussed the proposals of the Composing Division in a formal conference with the scale committee.

On August 8 Mr. F. E. Christofane, Comptroller of the Government Printing Office, advised the scale committee's counsel, John C. Williamson, Esq., that because the Kiess Act did not specifically provide for attendance of counsel, such attendance would not be authorized. In the same letter the request for a verbatim transcript of the formal wage conference was rejected because:

"The Kiess Act does not make provision for recording a wage conference or for furnishing transcripts of the proceedings of such a conference."

On August 9, 1960, the Public Printer advised the scale committee that he was rejecting all of the several proposals made by the scale committee and that in lieu thereof he would "reluctantly agree to recommend continuation of another year of the present formula, and the compositors' pay in the Government Printing Office be raised by 9 cents per hour—from $3.34 to $3.43 per hour—for the coming year; continuation of the 15-percent night differential; time and one-half for hours worked in excess of 40 in any workweek; and for holidays, in addition to gratuity pay, 1½ times the regular hourly rate for all hours worked."

The Public Printer's reply of August 9 failed to comment on the four changes in the weighted average formula recommended by the scale committee in its letter of August 5.

On August 10, 1960, the chairman of the scale committee urged the Public Printer to reconsider his decision of August 9 in view of his apparent disregard of the four recommended changes in the weighted average formula.

On August 12, 1960, the Public Printer advised that the four changes in the formula were rejected.

On August 15–16, 1960, the employees of the Composing Division rejected the Public Printer's offer by a vote of 831–148.

C. DISCUSSION OF THE SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES RAISED BY THIS APPEAL

1. The weighted average formula:

This formula which seeks to arrive at a minimum hourly rate by taking a weighted average (weighted toward the cities with more employees) of compositors in 25 major cities has been in use for 12 years. The composing division employees' dissatisfaction with the formula has been repeatedly expressed to the Public Printer. The Public Printer's dissatisfaction with the formula is underscored in his decision of August 9 to "reluctantly agree" to its continuation for another year.

A formula which both parties find distasteful must be reexamined and either rejected or modified in order for it to provide an equitable basis for negotiation.

The scale committee receded from its prior insistence that the formula be abandoned and the Government Printing Office accept the highest minimum hourly rate. (San Francisco, Calif.; $3.92 per hour.) Instead the scale committee proposed that if the weighted average formula be continued it be modified so as to remove four defects, defects which the scale committee insists makes the weighted average a biased average.

These four changes are as follows:

(a) Night employees in the applicable cities should be included in determining the average.

All day and night employees are paid the minimum hourly rate. (The night differential which is applied to the minimum rate is not in issue and has no bearing on this argument.)

The present formula by including only the day workers causes the final average not to reflect the higher rates in the cities which have large numbers of night employees.

For example, assume two cities as follows:

City A: Day, 1,000; night, 1,000; hourly rate, $3.

City B: Day 500; night 50; hourly rate $2.50.

By including only the day employees the weighted average is $2.83.

By including the day and night employees (all of whom are subject to the rate) the weighted average is $2.89.

The conclusion is inescapable that excluding the night employees represents a fundamental defect in the weighted average formula.

(b) A percentage of newspaper employees in the applicable cities should be included as a component part of the weighted average formula.

The weighted average formula includes only day employees of commercial book and job establishments. (Reference has already been made to the arbitrary exclusion of night employees.) The weighted average formula excludes newspaper employees in the cities used presumably because the Public Printer has determined that the nature of the work of the GPO Composing Division is purely commercial-book-and-job type to the exclusion of newspaper-type work. This the scale committee insists is an error on the part of the Public Printer. A substantial percentage of the Composing Division's work relates to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, committee reports, bills and hearings, the Federal Register, and several nondaily periodicals all of which reflect newspaper-type deadlines.

It is significant that on August 11, 1960, the Deputy Public Printer expressed his opinion to the scale committee that 10 percent of the Composing Division's work was newspaper type. This concedes the principle sought here, although an examination of the work of the Composing Division will reveal a larger percentage figure.

The scale committee believes that at least 25 percent of the work of the Composing Division is sufficiently related to newspaper work to dictate that at least 25 percent of the newspaper employees in the cities used be added as a component part of the weighted average formula.

(c) Contributions to vested pension and profit-sharing plans in the applicable cities should be considered in applying the weighted average formula.

Many wage negotiations in the printing industry include contributions (or increases in existing contributions) to pension, profit sharing, and other welfare programs in lieu of, but still part of, equivalent wage increases. This is attractive to the employees because the latter does not have to include the contribution as income for tax purposes, and, more important, the pension and profit-sharing plans are required by the Internal Revenue Code to provide for immediate or partial vesting. "Vesting" means that the employee has a contractual right to that part of the fund attributable to the contribution even if the employee leaves before retirement, or dies.

The announced minimum hourly rates in the cities concerned, which are used by the Public Printer, do not reflect these contributions, yet they are essentially compensation.

The scale committee recommends, therefore, that a percentage differential be determined (by negotiation with the Public Printer) and be applied to the minimum hourly rate in the cities where the Secretary of Labor determines that vested pension or profit-sharing plans are prevalent and customary.

(d) The number of cities used in the weighted average formula should be reduced to the five major printing centers as determined by the Bureau of the Census.

The existing number of 25 cities used in the formula has no basis other than precedent. The scale committee believes that the smaller number of cities recommended herein would contribute to a more equitable formula.

On May 13, 1955, the chairman of the Joint Committee on Printing, the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, expressed himself most eloquently on the subject of the weighted average formula in these words:

"The Joint Committee on Printing, therefore, approved the weighted average formula but there was no understanding that it would remain unchanged for all time to come.

"It was the committee's opinion that while the weighted average has apparently served a very good purpose, it was by no means infallible and should any alternate plan be agreed upon that would, in the interest of all concerned, be more applicable, then consideration should be given to its use."

The scale committee believes that if the Public Printer makes use of the weighted average formula he has the solemn duty of applying it with a zealous regard for the propriety of its component parts. A formula is valid only if all its components are valid.

2. The Public Printer's rejection of the proposed overtime rates is arbitrary because in so doing he rejects a formula which has been accepted overwhelmingly in the printing industry.

The scale committee recommended that overtime compensation shall be 1½ times the regular rate for the first 4 hours of overtime; two times the regular rate thereafter, and two times the regular rate for Sundays. The present formula is 1½ times the regular rate regardless of the amount of overtime or Sundays.

3. The Public Printer's rejection of the proposed shorter workweek is arbitrary because in so doing he rejects a workweek which has been overwhelmingly accepted in the printing industry.

The scale committee recommended a 37½-hour week. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports the average workweek in the printing industry to be 36.7 hours. Of 43,334 printers employed in 25 large cities, 43,038, or 99.99 percent, work less than 40 hours per week, the present GPO workweek.

The Public Printer admits that he is influenced in his decision by the Civil Service Commission. This is an abdication of the Public Printer's responsibility. A decision should be based on custom in the printing industry as are other decisions affecting wages and so forth in the Government Printing Office.

D. DISCUSSION OF THE PROCEDURAL ISSUES RAISED BY THIS APPEAL

The scale committee recognizes that the Kiess Act limits the scope of the appeal to "wages, salaries, and compensation."

The Attorney General (vol. 41, Opinion No. 38) has rendered this opinion:

"The establishment of regular hours of work and the regular workweek is generally recognized as part of wage negotiations and the Public Printer is required to conduct such negotiations."

The scale committee regrets that the Public Printer's approach to the conference table is not in the traditional spirit of the "collective bargaining" process. For this reason the scale committee urges that the Joint Committee on Printing take cognizance of the Public Printer's procedures under the Kiess Act.

The scale committee respectfully submits that the procedural approach of the Public Printer to the letter and spirit of the Kiess Act is not conducive to a just determination of the issues.

House Report 412, 68th Congress, to H.R. 7996 (the Kiess Act) expresses the intent of Congress in this manner:

"The wages and compensation for these various groups ought to be determined in the same manner as any large industrial concern negotiates with its employees."

How does the Public Printer react to this expression of intent by the Congress?

1. The Public Printer refused to permit counsel for the scale committee to attend the formal wage conference. The Public Printer advised, through his counsel, that the Kiess Act "does not authorize or provide for the scale committee to have a counsel" at such proceedings. This is a patent violation of a fundamental right.

2. The Public Printer refused to permit a verbatim transcript to be taken of the formal wage conference. He advised through his counsel that "The Kiess Act does not make provision for recording a wage conference or for furnishing transcripts of the proceedings." Apparently, the Public Printer believes that nothing so fundamental as the right of counsel or a record may be implied in a statute which confers a right.

This is truly the reductio ad absurdum of strict construction of the letter of the law.

The Public Printer's approach to both the substantive and procedural aspects of the formal wage conference of August 8th is reflected in the following statement in his letter of August 9th referred to above:

"Although I have found your committee ready to accept any compromise which would have the tendency to increase rates, I have not found you at all willing to accept any proposals which might have the effect of reducing some rates."

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

The scale committee trusts that the Joint Committee on Printing in evaluating these arguments will reject the concept expressed by the Public Printer as to the nature and meaning of this appeal. On August 8, 1960, speaking through counsel the Public Printer stated that an appeal would be only from the "conclusion" as to wages, salaries, and compensation, and "not on the record, the procedure, or the method or basis used in determining the conclusion." The scale committee believes that congressional inquiry into "procedure," "methods," and "basis" for arriving at decisions is fundamental to the American concept of law and equity.

The scale committee therefore recommends that the Joint Committee on Printing, in light of the facts presented herein and to be supplemented by oral presentation, direct:

1. That the Public Printer resume negotiations with the scale committee with the end in view of correcting the four defects in the weighted average formula as presented herein.

2. That the Public Printer pay overtime compensation as follows: 1½ times the regular rate for the first 4 hours and 2 times the regular rate thereafter; all Sunday work to be at 2 times the regular rate.

3. That the Public Printer initiate a workweek as follows: 7½ hours per day or per night for 5 days or 5 nights, Monday through Friday.

4. That the Public Printer permit counsel for the scale committee to participate in formal wage negotiation conferences held under the authority of the Kiess Act.

5. That the Public Printer, upon request of the scale committee, provide for a verbatim transcript of formal wage conferences under the Kiess Act and to make a transcript available to the scale committee.

Respectfully submitted.

For the Composing Division Scale Committee, Government Printing Office:

BURL I. PALMER,
Chairman.
RALPH A. MEYER,
Secretary.
HUBERT P. HOY.
JOHN W. REID.
EARL D. THOMPSON.

Tribute to Mr. and Mrs. Richard L. Barnsley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a column which appeared in the August 10, 1960, issue of the Manila Times, regarding an employee of the U.S. Information Service, Richard L. Barnsley, who is completing a tour of duty as public affairs officer in the Philippine Islands.

In view of the criticism which, fairly or unfairly, is often leveled at the deportment of U.S. Government representatives abroad, it is gratifying, indeed, to read such glowing accounts in the foreign press as that accorded Mr. and Mrs. Barnsley.

This fine family deserves great credit for the distinguished representation they have given our country, and I am very pleased to invite this complimentary item to the attention of the American public.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUNDRIES
(By Lina Flor)

Despedidas for Mr. and Mrs. Richard Barnsley continue to gain momentum as the date of their departure (August 31), approaches. There's another one slated for tonight, with Mr. and Mrs. Go Puan Seng as hosts, at Peking House of Hotel Mabuhay.

What was it that Scarlett O'Hara said toward the ending of the book, "Gone With the Wind," of course, when, faced by the worst crisis in her life after Rhett Butler had said, "I don't give a damn what you do," and left her? She said, "I won't think about it now * * * I'll think about it tomorrow."

To the generation that avidly perused the Mitchell novel and the succeeding generation that shared with the first the thrill of seeing it come to life on the screen, the phrase and the attitude it signifies (putting off the unpleasant and unwanted things for as long as possible) are easily recognizable in the term, "doing a Scarlett O'Hara."

Well, this columnist has been doing a Scarlett O'Hara with regards to the impending departure of Dick and Doris Barnsley. Since it had been made known as early as last January that their tour of duty would be ending around July and not later than August, we—that is, myself and many others—have chosen to ignore. For a while, there was wishful thinking: perhaps it would be just another homeleave and they'd be reassigned again here for another term. Even after this was declared as most unlikely and it had been verified by Washington (the home office of the USIS) that there would indeed be a new Public Affairs Officer to replace Mr. Richard L. Barnsley, we still refused to think about it. We were not going to think about it till the tomorrow when it would no longer be possible to avoid doing so.

It is not surprising that this sentiment should be shared by many, many others. During the almost 5 years they've been here (Dick first came as Deputy Public Affairs Officer before he made Chief after the first tour of duty), the Barnsleys have become one of the most popular and well-loved couples of the U.S. Embassy-USIS setup, their circle of friends not confined to the diplomatic and press groups but extending widely to those of other and varied interests.

And it is not surprising, either, that this should be so, for in the Barnsleys, together and individually, are all the elements for popularity anywhere and, perhaps, particularly here in the Philippines. They are both young and good-looking, well-dressed but not showy, friendly without the exuberance of the Dale Carnegie type, intelligent without being pedantic, interested (in local and personal affairs) without seeming to pry, understanding without being meddlesome and, best of all, imbued with keen sense of humor and devoid of that subtle air of condescension that we Orientals inutitively sense in most apparently friendly Americans, particularly those of the Foreign Service.

They are good sports and good at sports—tennis, badminton, bowling, golf. In the last mentioned, they are not only good but excellent; in Dick's case, outstanding. They entertain well and with good taste, but never lavishly or ostentatiously. They are good dancers in the conservative way but enjoy watching the experits of really fashionable dances.

In addition—and in certain local circles this would be the foremost factor—they are Catholics and, Doris specially, have become active in semireligious charity organizations since they resided in San Lorenzo village. They have been among the most ardent members of the CFM (Christian Family Movement) unit in their district since its establishment.

I could go on and on about the Barnsleys and if I seem biased, then so are countless others who have become their friends here. And, anyway, we—that is, again, I and those others—have been doing the Scarlett O'Hara long enough to make it excusable now to let go.

Military Cemeteries Overseas—Part 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the remainder of the military cemetery dedications overseas which I attended last month.

The Ardennes Cemetery is located near the edge of Neuville-en-Condroz, near the city of Liege. It is 50½ acres in extent and contains the graves of 5,250 of our military dead who died also in the Battle of the Bulge. The headstones are alined in straight rows which take the form of a huge Greek cross on the grass, framed by masses of trees.

Near the entrance, to the south of the burial area, is the memorial—a rectangular gray stone structure containing a small chapel, 3 large maps of inlaid marble, 24 panels depicting combat and supply activities, and other ornamental features including the insignia of the major American units in northwest Europe. Two of the maps depict operations of the American Armed Forces, and the third commemorates the services of supply in the European theater. On the exterior is a large scale sculpture. Along the sides, inscribed in granite slabs, are the names of 462 missing who lie in unknown graves.

Those addressing the dedication ceremony were the Honorable William A. M. Burden, American Ambassador to Belgium; the Honorable John J. McCloy, representing the President of the United States; the Honorable Gaston Eyskens, Prime Minister of Belgium; the Honorable Thomas E. Martin, U.S. Senate.

On July 16, the Commission dedicated the American Naval Memorial, at Brest, France. This memorial was erected on the ramparts of the city overlooking the harbor which was a major base of operations for American naval vessels during World War I. The original monument built on this site, commemorating the achievements of the United States Navy during World War I, was destroyed by the enemy on July 4, 1941, prior to our entry into World War II. The present structure was completed in 1958, and is a replica of the original. The monument is a rectangular rose-granite shaft rising 145 feet above the lower terrace, and 100 feet above the Cours d'Ajot. All four sides are ornamented by sculpture of nautical interest. The surrounding area has been developed by the U.S. Government into an attractive park.

The following made addresses at the dedication: the Honorable Amory Houghton, American Ambassador to France; Monsieur Georges Lombard, Député-Maire of Brest; the Honorable William B. Franke, Secretary of the Navy; and the Honorable Michel Debré, Prime Minister of France.

The band played the French national anthem, "La Marseillaise," which was followed by the "Star Spangled Banner."

On July 19, the Lorraine Cemetery, located in the little town of St. Avold, was dedicated. This ceremony covers 113½ acres and contains the largest number of graves of our military dead in World War II in Europe—a total of 10,489. The headstones are arranged in a generally elliptical design, in nine plots, extending over the beautiful rolling terrain of eastern Lorraine and culminating in a prominent overlook feature.

The memorial, containing maps in ceramic and service flags, as well as the chapel with five sculptured figures above the altar, stands on a plateau to the west of the burial area. High on its exterior wall is the large figure of Saint Avold, the martyred Roman soldier who overlooks the silent host. On each side of the memorial and parallel to its front, stretch the walls with the names of 444 Americans missing whose remains were never recovered or identified.

The dedication address was made by Gen. Charles D. Palmer, deputy commander in chief, headquarters European command. Others addressing the gathering were the Honorable Amory Houghton, American Ambassador to France; the Honorable Charles E. Potter, member of the American Battle Monuments Commission; the Honorable John J. McCloy, representing the President of the United States; Mr. Emile Schilling, Maire-Adjoint, Saint Avold; and the Honorable Raymond Triboulet, French Minister of Veterans Affairs.

The band played the French national anthem, "La Marseillaise," which was followed by the "Star Spangled Banner."

At each dedication ceremony, prayers were offered by chaplains of the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish faiths, of the American Armed Forces. Floral tributes were placed at each memorial, which was followed by volleys and taps.

The entrance to each cemetery is similar to the entrance to a large park—the road is lined with beautiful shrubbery and evergreens of every description. The grounds around the cemeteries are beautifully kept.

The sites were selected with a view of their accessibility, aspect, and drainage. Tiles around the cemeteries carry off the water in seasons of heavy rainfall. Each cemetery has water storage reservoirs and a high pressure sprinkling system for use during dry seasons and real drought conditions.

Fourteen outstanding architects, each to design one of the cemeteries, were selected by the American Battle Monuments Commission. Each plot has a devotional chapel, inscription of the names and particulars of the missing in the region, and a graphic map—in permanent form—of the services of our troops.

In most of these cemeteries, the children in the vicinity place small American flags on each grave on such national holidays as Veterans Day, Memorial Day, and so forth.

The grass is kept at a 1½-inch level and looks like a green carpet. The supervision of the maintenance of these cemeteries is under an American, and I am unable to find sufficient words of praise to compliment the people who take care of these cemeteries.

Gen. Jacob L. Devers is the Chairman of the American Battle Monuments Commission, and Adm. Thomas C. Kinkaid is Vice Chairman. Others serving on the Commission are Mr. Leslie F. Biffle, Mr. Alexander A. Vandegrift, former Senator Charles E. Potter, Mr. John Philips, Mrs. Theodore Roosevelt, Mrs. Wendell L. Willkie, Gen. Carl Spaatz, Maj. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis, Hon. Forest A. Harness, and Gen. Thomas North.

Putting the Brakes on Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Putting the Brakes on Spending," written by Mr. David Lawrence, and published in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUTTING THE BRAKES ON SPENDING—SENATE ACTION ON AGED CARE BILL CALLED BIGGEST NEWS OF CAMPAIGN

(By David Lawrence)

The biggest news of the presidential campaign happened Tuesday night in Congress. A coalition of Democrats and Republicans in the Senate applied the brakes on unnecessary spending. Even though, for political purposes, the candidates of both parties wanted other legislation, the majority stuck to the fundamental principle that, irrespective of party, the most important duty today is to prevent inflation and excessive governmental spending.

For many years now the Democrats have had majority control of Congress. But the Democratic Party is split. Approximately 20 Democrats who are against inflationary spending usually join with 31 or more Republicans to make a majority against the spenders.

Although this has happened several times, the most significant vote of all has just come on medical care legislation. Because of its political importance, it was assumed that the Democrats would uphold Senator KENNEDY's position. Despite the fact that the presidential candidate of their party was directly involved and that nearly all the Democratic Senators have publicly stated their intentions to vote for the Kennedy-Johnson ticket, the so-called conservative group adhered to its principles and brushed aside partisan politics.

This means a good deal to the Nation and especially to those voters who had begun to fear that, if a change in administration should occur in January, there would be a spending orgy.

There were two proposals offered to the Senate as substitutes for the Senate Finance Committee bill. One, sponsored by a Republican group, wanted to provide a larger program of medical care but outside the social security system. The cost would have been paid on a 50-50 arrangement between the States and the Federal Government. This aid would have been made available on a voluntary basis to persons over 65 with incomes of less than $3,000 for an individual or $4,500 for a couple, with beneficiaries paying not less than 10 percent of the cost. It was estimated the bill would have cost the Federal Treasury $450 million a year. This was rejected.

The other proposal, sponsored by Senator KENNEDY, would have required an increase in the social security tax. Everyone retired under social security would be eligible for medical benefits at age 68, with no distinction made between those who need and those who don't need such benefits. The cost was figured at about $700 million annually, but it was estimated that the additional tax on everybody's paycheck would total around $1 billion a year.

The Senate, after rejecting both substitute plans, finally passed the Finance Committee bill requiring an estimated $320 million a year from the Federal Government, though some argued that the cost would eventually be higher. The benefits would go only to needy persons over 65 years of age and those on old-age assistance. The States would determine who would be eligible and how big a program would be needed.

There is involved in the issue not only the problem of excessive Government spending but the question of self-reliance and the aid that relatives can give. To transfer to the Federal Government the whole burden of medical care for the aged didn't seem to the majority in the Senate to be wise. It appears the House will take the same view in adjusting in conference the differences between the Senate bill and a somewhat similar measure already passed by the House calling for a smaller total of Federal funds.

It might have been thought that, during a political campaign, the Democrats would take a chance and pass any bill their candidate wanted and then let the blame fall on President Eisenhower, who, it is known, planned to veto any extreme measures. But the Democrats who joined with the Republicans in voting against the Kennedy measure had to look beyond the political game on the national front and face their own constituents who are opposed to governmental paternalism and unnecessary spending.

Does all this represent a setback for Senator KENNEDY, who took his position squarely on the Democratic platform adopted at Los Angeles? He said immediately after the Senate action this week:

"This vote demonstrates that if we're going to have effective legislation in this and other fields, we're going to have to have an administration that will provide leadership and a Congress that will act."

But most of the conservative Democrats are from the South and are either assured of victory in their States this autumn or do not come up this year for reelection. So it is difficult to see how the election of a persidential candidate on the Democratic ticket can change the situation. In fact, the conservative coalition seems here to stay and to vote against inflation whatever the outcome of the presidential contest this year. This is the most important development thus far in the whole campaign.

General of the Armies John J. Pershing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 the President approved House Joint Resolution 640 proclaiming September 13 as a day for all Americans to pay proper homage to General of the Armies John

J. Pershing and to the men who served under him.

General Pershing was born on that date 100 years ago in Laclede, Mo., which is within the congressional district which I am honored to represent.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention of my colleagues to an editorial honoring this great soldier which will appear in the September issue of Army, the magazine of the Association of the U.S. Army.

The editorial follows:

GENERAL OF THE ARMIES JOHN J. PERSHING

Newton D. Baker once observed that the one thing he couldn't understand about John J. Pershing was how a man who had such breadth of vision could become so concerned about the brass on a soldier's buttons. The answer is really simple. Pershing was the product of a versatile army. Most of us think that versatility and breadth of view are new to the U.S. Army; a necessary response to global war and the worldwide menace of communism. This is not entirely true. As Harvey DeWeerd has pointed out, Pershing had a diversity of service before he became commander of the American Expeditionary Forces. "Pershing," DeWeerd wrote:

"Served against the Indians; he taught in the Reserve Officers Training Corps at the University of Nebraska—taking a law degree at the same time. He instructed at West Point, fought in the Spanish-American War, held a post of wide responsibility in the Moro country of the Philippines, studied at the Army War College, and witnessed big-scale war in Manchuria. He went on a mission investigating European armies and led an expedition into Mexico in a state of affairs that was neither war nor peace."

A young brigadier with that kind of education and experience would be considered a singularly well equipped soldier today, just as Pershing certainly was. As for his interest in buttons, it was this obsession with the details of soldiering that made the American Expeditionary Forces the professional fighting force it became in 1918. It was another facet of his soldierly insistence on individual marksmanship and a high standard of discipline. The significance of Pershing today, as we commemorate his 100th birthday, is that he professionalized the command and staff systems, set the Army school system on the way to becoming the finest in the world, and through example set the highest of standards for the leaders of our World War II armies and air forces. Those standards remain in force; they are the measure by which today's officers of the Army and Air Force are judged.

The White Cane as a Right-of-Way and Safety Device for the Blind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in a recent letter to me, Maj. Gen. Melvin J. Maas, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve, retired, Chairman of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, set forth his views on the use of the white cane as a right-of-way and safety device for the blind pedestrian. I have had the privilege of knowing General Maas for a number of years. We served together in the House. I know that he speaks with authority and with deep sympathy concerning the problems of the blind. He has done an outstanding job as Chairman of the President's Committee.

The particular problem about which General Maas writes me at this time has been the subject of considerable discussion in recent weeks, and in the belief that it will be helpful to my colleagues and to others interested in the problems of the handicapped, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from General Maas be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 10, 1960.

Hon. LISTER HILL,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR LISTER: As you know, the President's committee has had, since its formation, a special concern for the removal of all obstacles which arbitrarily restrict opportunities in preparing for employment and in engaging in suitable occupations by persons with all types of physical handicaps, including the blind. This committee accepts as its responsibility the development and carrying out of educational and promotional activities with the above objective in mind.

The committee has consistently included the blind in its program bearing in mind that the employment problems of persons with all types of handicaps will require some special attention. In recent months some efforts have been noted urging publicizing the use of the white cane as a signaling device to give the blind the right-of-way in crossing streets and highways.

As you may know, I have been blind for the past 9 years, after a very busy life in business, military service in three wars, and in eight terms in the Congress. Shortly after I became blind I took the orientation course for the blind, given by the Veterans' Administration at Hines Hospital in Chicago. There I learned to use the "long cane" technique for travel and acquired considerable proficiency in getting about on crowded streets, at crossings and in buildings. The long cane is a very useful guide when properly used to locate obstacles, follow sidewalk contours, locate and follow steps and determine the characteristics of the terrain over which I am walking. I am seriously concerned that using the cane for any other purpose would be confusing and dangerous for the blind person and for others, including drivers of vehicles.

To be any value as a signal device the cane would need to be elevated to the horizontal level at least. This would present a real hazard to oncoming pedestrians and would remove the cane from the area before the user where it is of greatest value thus making it unsafe for the blind person. Also, the cane would need to be of such size and shape as to be readily discernible by drivers of vehicles.

For the reasons just cited I am not convinced that the white cane law giving the right-of-way on street crossings and highways to the blind users is now good legislation. If it were, there are channels of communication which are open to use by proper authorities to inform drivers of the existence of the law. The State Motor Vehicle Departments of every State have two channels which could be used. I refer to the driver license renewal procedures, and to the motor vehicle license tag renewals. Drivers licenses are generally renewed at least every 2 or 3 years and vehicle tags are renewed or replaced each year. Messages to recipients could be sent through these channels and would reach everyone concerned.

When white cane laws were first enacted 30 years ago, traffic conditions were substantially different than the conditions of today. The volume and speed of traffic now would make reliance on identification of the white cane hazardous for the blind. I have talked to many white cane users recently and all have indicated they are quite unwilling to trust their safety to the color of a cane on the street crossings and highways of our country today. You might be further interested to know that many cane users do not use white canes, but use collapsible or rigid metallic ones.

In the hundreds of thousands of miles which I have traveled in this country and in some foreign nations, since I first lost my sight, I have never had an accident. I attribute my safe experience to the training which I received in the use of the cane and not to the color of the cane which I am using. It is my firm conviction that high quality orientation training in the use of the cane is one effective answer to the problem although not the only one. Driving care by vehicle operators will always be an important factor in safety for the blind as well as all other pedestrians. The sole reliance on a white cane for protection in traffic could be disastrous to a user.

Even though this proposal for wider acceptance of the white cane laws for the blind is well intentioned, I am not convinced that the real objective of safe travel will be accomplished.

Cordially,

MELVIN J. MASS,
Chairman.

Let's Face the Truth About Gas and Germ Weapons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I offer the text of an article entitled, "Let's Face the Truth About Gas and Germ Weapons," by John G. Hubbell, appearing in the August issue of Reader's Digest. In the article, reference is made to the hearings and report of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics which studied the problems of chemical and biological warfare during 1959. I call this article to the attention of Members of Congress because the grave problems which our committee exposed last year are just as real, just as pressing today. There is an urgent need for awareness of the size of the threat we face from these weapons in the hands of the Communist powers. Only strong defenses, adequate training in protective measures, and a powerful counter capability to deter the use of these weapons against us or other free world countries is likely to save us from a disastrous blow at some indeterminate time in the future. Nuclear weapons may be a better known threat, but preoccupation with the nuclear threat should not close our eyes to the potentialities of chemical and bio-

logical weapons. The article is as follows:

LET'S FACE THE TRUTH ABOUT GAS AND GERM WEAPONS—CHEMICAL WEAPONS FORM AN ESSENTIAL PART OF THE SOVIET ARSENAL, AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS ARE ON THE WAY; ARE WE PREPARED TO COPE WITH THEM AND, IF NECESSARY TO RETALIATE? HERE ARE GRIM FACTS—BUT FACTS WHICH CANNOT BE IGNORED

(By John G. Hubbell)

When the Allied forces invaded Germany in World War II they discovered something, that, had they known of it earlier, might well have altered our invasion plans. Stored in warehouses, they found, were tons of a new and diabolical gas—a colorless and almost odorless killer called Tabun. It attacked the human nervous system through the lungs or eyes, causing death within 1 to 5 minutes. If the eyes and lungs were protected, liquid droplets of Tabun would rapidly penetrate clothing and be absorbed by the skin, bringing death within 10 minutes to 2 hours. There was then no effective antidote.

The maniacal Hitler had clearly intended to us this terrifying new weapon on a massive scale to stop the invasion. What prevented him? Only the fact that the Allies, suspecting that Hitler might resort to chemical warfare, warned that they were prepared to retaliate overwhelmingly. Though the Allies did not possess a comparable lethal nerve gas, German intelligence was unaware of this. Hence, Hitler's huge stockpiles of Tabun remained untouched while the Allies swept across Europe.

But the story, unhappily, does not end here. When we found the gas, the United States and Britain took most of their share out to sea, and dropped it. The Soviets took their share home, along with the dismantled laboratories where the stuff had been made and the scientists who had made it. They have kept on producing it ever since.

Nor have the Soviets confined their work in the military chemicals field to nerve gas. Intelligence estimates indicate that they have scored breakthroughs across a whole new spectrum of chemical and biological weaponry (CBW).

Soviet leaders have made it clear that in another war they have every intention of using these weapons. In November 1957 Khrushchev told American reporters, "All means, intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine missiles and other means which now exist, will be used in case of armed conflict. This is the logic of war, the logic of struggle." A few days later Defense Minister Malinovsky reported publicly that Soviet forces were being intensively trained in the use of chemical weapons. And it is now known that the Soviets have invested about 15 percent of their armed strength in Eastern Europe in such weapons.

Every Soviet soldier carries in his medical kit a hypodermic filled with 2 milligrams of atropine, the only known and even partially effective antidote for nerve gas. "The Russians know we don't equip our troops to use nerve gas," says Lt. Gen. Arthur G. Trudeau, U.S. Army Chief of Research and Development. "They carry these syrettes to protect themselves against their own gas."

Since the middle of the Korean war, the Red propaganda machine has been flooding the world with detailed reports—all utterly untrue—of how U.S. forces used germ weapons in North Korea. New stories are concocted continuously. Why this barrage of untruth, this singular preoccupation with CBW?

"They may be conditioning their people and as many of the world's uninformed as they can reach to the use of such weapons," says Dr. Howard Wilcox, former Deputy Director of Research and Engineering for the Department of Defense.

"They seem to be working hard at putting themselves in a position from which they could use these weapons without incurring the censure of world opinion. They may intend to use CB weapons, and then say they were forced to use them in self-defense."

The truth is that since World War I neither the United States nor any of its allies have ever used toxic gas or germ weapons, even in training. CB weaponry is regarded in the United States as unthinkably barbaric—something we would never use except in retaliation.

This point of view is perhaps reasonable—if we have weapons to retaliate with. But public repugnance to CB warfare has been so great as to prevent even the research necessary to make our soldiers effective in chemical-biological combat. For years the U.S. Army Chemical Corps has skimped along on a meager budget, unable to do more than develop prototypes of the kind of equipment our men would need.

"While the Reds are hoodwinking much of the world with lies about our activity in the CB field, we have hoodwinked ourselves with our own propaganda," says Maj. Gen. Marshall Stubbs, Chief of the Army Chemical Corps. "We were horrified—and we made sure the rest of the world was properly horrified—when the Germans introduced mustard gas in World War I. We have allowed the myth to develop that few men who were gassed survived, and that few who survived ever recovered their health. The facts don't support this."

To be sure, the effects of mustard gas were ugly. But, according to U.S. Army medical records, of some 73,000 American gas casualties, only 2 percent died; only 7 percent were discharged as disabled. The rest—nearly 67,000—recovered fully. By contrast, 25 percent of our wounded died and tens of thousands were maimed for life.

Nevertheless, U.S. public opinion, which in the final analysis determines how U.S. defense dollars are spent, has been permitted to remain opposed to the very idea of CB warfare. Letters continually flow into the White House, Congress, and the Pentagon from outraged citizens astounded to learn that the Army even has a Chemical Corps. As a result, says General Trudeau, "We do not have a counteroffensive ability to meet a Soviet challenge in the CB warfare field."

Why has the public been allowed to persist in its ignorance concerning CB weaponry? One good reason, perhaps, is that the State Department and Department of Defense have not wanted to release any information which might seem to lend the slightest credence to Soviet propaganda about our CB activity. Another reason, not so good, has been the fear that to tell the American people what can and should be done in the CB field might frighten them too much.

On June 16, 1959, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, its curiosity aroused by a magazine article written by Maj. Gen. William M. Creasy, retired Chief of the Chemical Corps, summoned Creasy, Stubbs and other top-ranking Chemical Corps officers and scientists. In demonstrations staged with cats and dogs, and also with human beings—Army volunteers who have passed rigid physical and mental screenings—members of the committee observed some of the effects that the new chemicals can achieve.

Afterward the committee recommended that U.S. representatives to disarmament talks bear in mind the great potential of CB weaponry. It suggested that the Chemical Corps research budget of $40 million be increased and that the American people be taken into confidence on the growing threat of CB warfare.

Exactly what, then, are these new weapons, and what are the defenses against them?

The newest chemical agents under study are those which do not kill or make men even mildly uncomfortable, but which can, with lightning speed, destroy men's ability to function. One group of them—the psychochemicals—can cause strong men to grow timid, or can create a languorous apathy which renders men utterly unresponsive to the most urgent stimulus, such as attack by an enemy or other danger. A second group incapacitates men physically, without pain. A man's ability to integrate time and distance can be so blocked by a third group of chemical agents that it becomes impossible for him to drive a vehicle or operate a weapon. Or a long, deep sleep can be induced; or the victim can temporarily be made paralyzed or blind or deaf.

Unless administered in unrealistically huge doses, none of these new chemicals is fatal. They are odorless and colorless. Some of the human volunteers did not even know they had been attacked. They recovered within 2 days.

The deadliest chemicals are the nerve and blood gases. Tabun is believed to be the standard Soviet nerve gas. The U.S. nerve gas is Sarin, which is odorless and more potent. This is how it works:

Normally, the muscles of the body are continually tightening and relaxing—expanding and contracting, as though breathing. The tightening process is caused by a substance called acetylcholine and the relaxation by a protein called cholinesterase, which destroys the acetylcholine. Sarin blocks the functioning of the body's cholinesterase so that all the body's muscular systems, including those affecting the heart and lungs, continue to tighten into rigid paralysis. It can be delivered by shells, bombs, rockets, or spraying devices. It can be dispersed either as a vapor, to be inhaled; or as an aerosol—colorless, microscopically small liquid particles—which can either be inhaled or pass through ordinary clothing to be absorbed by the skin.

Two blood gases, hydrogen cyanide and cyanogen chloride, act about as quickly as the nerve gases. These, too, are colorless, but have a peachlike odor. They can be delivered by the same types of munitions and also by the individual soldier using a hand grenade. They literally suffocate the body within 15 minutes of inhalation of a lethal dose by locking oxygen in the bloodstream, preventing its transfer to body tissues.

A third blood gas is arsine, also colorless, but with a mildly garliclike odor. This is a delayed-action gas which destroys the kidneys and liver by robbing them of blood. Depending on the concentration, it may kill within 2 hours or it may take as long as 11 days.

Still another group of gases are the blister agents—distilled mustard, nitrogen mustard, and lewisite. These agents are rapidly absorbed through unprotected skin, and if inhaled will fry the respiratory and digestive tracts, lung tissue, and any other internal organs they reach. They are easily recognized: Distilled mustard smells like garlic and sometimes can be seen as a palish yellow vapor; nitrogen mustard has a fishy odor; lewisite smells like geraniums, and both are dark in color.

The choking gases of World War I—phosgene and diphosgene—still are considered important. Both are colorless and have the same distinctive, new-mown-hay odor. Both burn into the lungs and throat, making men violently, retchingly ill. Though ordinarily victims recover, a heavy dosage can be fatal.

Such are the main combat chemicals. Now let's look at some biological weapons:

Bacteria can infect men with anthrax, bacillary dysentery, undulant fever, cholera, diphtheria, tularemia (rabbit fever), bubonic or pneumonic plague, typhoid fever, tuberculosis. The rickettsiae—bacterialike microorganisms usually carired by lice and ticks—

can induce various kinds of typhus and Rocky Mountain spotted fever; there are viruses which cause several different types of encephalitis, smallpox, yellow fever, dengue fever, hepatitis. A botulinum toxin causes botulism, a painful, paralytic, and usually fatal disease.

Such weapons can be ground into fine, cloudlike mists, powders, or dusts and sprayed out into favorable winds. They can be carried in adapted conventional munitions. Many can be introduced in streams where men would bathe or obtain drinking water. Infected animal life—rodents, ticks, lice—can be parachuted, ballooned, or carried clandestinely deep into enemy territory. While chemical agents create casualties quickly and seldom hang on in an area more than a week, biological weapons which cannot be seen, smelled, tasted, or felt take longer to act, but some can stay alive and potent for years.

The U.S.S.R. is undoubtedly aware that CB weaponry has distinct military advantages over conventional and nuclear weaponry. The user is spared the enormous expense of rebuilding target areas, rehabilitating populations. It offers a wide choice of effects—unprotected troops can be destroyed, or temporarily incapacitated, or made ill. CB weapons can attack targets over wide areas, penetrating fortifications and, since most of the agents used are heavier than air, sinking into foxholes and bomb shelters. And CB warfare can probably be waged much more cheaply than standard warfare.

In World War I, the belligerent nations developed means by which most of the soldiers could survive and fight in a chemically toxic environment. This situation probably still holds true today.

The Army Chemical Corps has developed a lightweight mask that will protect a man aaginst CB agents entering through the eyes, nose, or mouth. An atropine hypodermic for field use by the individual GI is nearing readiness. Should a man lose his hypodermic or fail to make the injection in time, he might still be saved by a new battlefield resuscitator with which one medic can apply artificial respiration simultaneously to a dozen men. A fiber diffusion board is being developed for protection in foxholes and bomb shelters: Charcoal and other filtering materials screen out from the air the tiniest aerosol particles, liquid droplets or toxic vapors. Working together, the Chemical Corps and the Quartermaster Corps have developed some practical items of protective clothing.

Men can be made immune to many of the biological agents. Indeed, the Soviets—who have not been secretive with their people about CB warfare possibilities—not only have immunized their armies but also are embarked on a massive immunization program for their civilians. Already, millions of Russians have walked slowly through rooms sprayed with aerosols of attenuated—that is, live but weakened—biological agents. Several deep breaths immunize a person to the diseases caused by these agents.

For protection against toxic chemicals, one can buy an excellent gas mask in the Soviet Union for about $14. And every citizen is now compelled to take 20 hours of intensive anti-CB-warfare training.

The rumor, nourished by ill-informed press reports, that a few ounces of certain chemicals could kill millions of people, that biological weapons could induce raging epidemics in populated areas, is sheer nonsense It is no more possible to kill millions with a few ounces of any chemical than it is to distribute a few ounces of water among millions.

No known CB agent is fatal if treated quickly and properly, and troops ready for a CB attack can survive it. CB weapons do not take the place of nuclear or conventional weapons: they are an adjunct.

We can no longer afford the luxury of ignoring such weaponry. It is a hard, real fact of military life. We must learn to live with it and see to it that such weapons never are used against us. Says General Stubbs, "The surest way to deter anyone from using them on us is to develop a CB arsenal so strong no one will dare force retaliation."

Congratulations to Janesville (Wis.) Gazette on 115th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday, August 14, the Janesville Daily Gazette, of Janesville, Wis., celebrated its 115th birthday.

Founded in 1845, the Gazette—through the years—has been a messenger of information, news, features, commentary, sports, and other information and entertainment essential to an informed people.

During its 115 years lifetime, the Gazette has covered the wars of the times, including the Civil, Spanish American, World War I and World War II. Of even greater importance, however, this fine publication has made a fine contribution to the peaceful progress of our people and Nation.

Editorially, the Gazette—although I have the pleasure of knowing its present publishers personally—has not always agreed with the senior Senator from Wisconsin; nor has the Senator always agreed with its editorials.

However, this is a "credit mark" for, not against, the way of life in America—providing for freedom of thought and press.

Moreover, I have been happy, in many instances, to agree in principle and purpose with the public policy of the Gazette—as well as upon ways and means for achieving goals in the public interest.

In my judgment, Jaynesville, Wis., and its surrounding communities, are better places in which to live because of the long, outstanding service of the Gazette—now beginning its 116th year of publication.

Reflecting progress of a publication that is creatively carrying forward the fine traditions of journalism in our country, I ask unanimous consent to have an editorial from the Gazette on its anniversary printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEGINNING OUR 116TH YEAR

Beginning Monday, Janesville Gazette readers will find as a part of the masthead of this newspaper the notation "Vol. 116, No. 1—116th year."

Meanwhile, on Sunday, the Gazette will have a birthday. It was founded August 14, 1845, and through economic ups and downs, in war and peace, has been published without interruption since that time. Since 1883, the newspaper has been in the Bliss family, and since 1909 the newspaper has been issued daily from its building at East Milwaukee Street and South Parker Drive. It is the oldest business enterprise in Janesville.

The Gazette centennial was obscured in 1945 when the 100th birthday fell on V–J Day. The end of the war in the Pacific took the big headlines that day.

But the end of that war was only one such incident recorded in the files of the Gazette. It was already 20 years old when it printed the news of the end of the Civil War and shortly thereafter, the assassination of Lincoln. It was 53 years old when Cuba, the *Maine*, and the Spanish-American War were in the news, and nearing its diamond jubilee when World War I ended in defeat of Germany.

Some Janesville families have been readers for three or four generations, and it is this continued public acceptance of the Gazette day by day that has resulted in the 115 years of continuous publication. The publishers and staff are fully conscious of the dependence the public community places upon them and are resolved to justify expectations as the 116th year is launched.

The Crisis on the Commuter Railroads—No. 11

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in recent years there have been scores of proposals for improvement of deteriorating railroad commuter and mass transit systems but few have been adopted with any degree of success and certainly none has produced a practical solution in the New York metropolitan region. A week ago a new proposal was put forth and has earned considerably more attention than most of its predecessors. This is due to a number of factors including economic aspects of the region's commuter problems, feasibility of the proposal, and the steadily deteriorating conditions on the region's commuter systems. As another addition in the series of insertions I have made in the RECORD on the current commuter crisis, and pursuant to permission previously granted, I include three editorials commenting on the latest proposal. The first is from the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of August 18, and the second is from the New York Times of the same date. The third is from the Bridgeport Sunday Herald of August 21.

The editorials:

[From the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post, Aug. 18, 1960]

PLAN DESERVES STUDY

In an effort to solve one of our most pressing problems—commuter service in the metropolitan area—Col. Sidney H. Bingham, noted transportation expert, has developed a practical plan which he has submitted to the Governors of Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey.

An engineer of long experience specializing in railroads, he is thoroughly familiar with the complex commuter problem. Many remedies have been offered in recent years, but these have not been satisfactory and most of them have been shelved, either because they were too impractical, too visionary, or too costly.

Colonel Bingham's proposal would use existing railroad trackage to provide a tri-State high-speed commuter system in the three States. This would involve a minimum of new construction; the adoption of new lightweight air-conditioned and comfortable equipment—the commuters' dream.

The cost of this project would be, in the engineer's estimate, $210 million plus $107 million if the system is extended under the East River to Long Island. Vastly different from the billion dollars hitherto believed necessary to construct a modern rapid transit system to replace the present outmoded facilities.

The venture would be a success, Colonel Bingham believes, because it would bring thousands of commuters back to the rails, abandoning buses and private cars for the daily trip to and from New York City.

We believe the governors should give this proposal immediate attention, or at least name technical and financial commissions to make a careful study of it.

New Jersey's Governor Meyner, after a perusal of the proposal outlined by Colonel Bingham, appeared to give it something of a brushoff on the ground that no adequate plan for paying for the new system had been worked out. But the first stage, we believe, is a study of the merits of the plan, to determine whether or not it will solve the problem. Financing would be another phase. Governor Meyner suggested a campaign to learn whether commuters want such a system. That goes without saying, for there would be no sense in the development whatever if the commuters in one loud voice said they would prefer present difficulties and congested highways to a new high-speed rail system.

The proposal was made by Colonel Bingham as a public service. The Governors should welcome it as such and give it immediate attention. If they do not, they may be overlooking one of the most progressive moves of our time—a solution of the railroads' financial problem and a boon to the thousands of persons who work in New York and live in Connecticut, Westchester, Long Island, and New Jersey.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 18, 1960]

A TRISTATE RAILROAD?

We suppose that, like most dreams of passenger transportation cooperation that involve unified action by Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey, Sidney H. Bingham's plan for a high-speed tristate commuter system will be dismissed by some as visionary.

As the former chairman of the New York City transit system, now a consultant engineer, Mr. Bingham developed his plan and volunteered it to the three Governors as a labor of love. It may possibly have occurred to him, however, that if the plan caught on he might be called in to help. Worse things could happen; Mr. Bingham is a transportation enthusiast, with sound planning and operational background. In the old days here, beset by the insistent problems of things as they were—a wornout, impoverished subway system—he was always yearning for what might be if the best of what was new in technological minds could be installed.

Mr. Bingham is probably right, or near enough right, when he says: "It is reasonable to assume that if a high-speed, air-conditioned, comfortable ride could be made available to the commuter, which would take him to his destination within the city with a distinct saving in elapsed time, he could be weaned away from his automobile or bus on the crowded highway and street." He would do this with creation of a tristate agency, to own or lease and operate a railroad network that used new, lightweight equipment, ran almost automatically with the most modern signal system, had train car entrance flush with the station platforms, delivered passengers nearer to where they wanted to be in midtown, downtown, and elsewhere. It would combine commuter facilities of most present railroads, but not the New York City transit system. It involves a minimum of new construction of right-of-way; it emphasizes modernization for speed, comfort, and convenience. Even if the cost figures are impractically low, or the political prospects of tristate cooperation dim, this is a fresh approach and it deserves openminded appraisal by the Governors and their staffs.

[From the Bridgeport Sunday Herald, Aug. 21, 1960]

STREAMLINED COMMUTER PLAN DEMANDS OUR SERIOUS STUDY

A tristate commuter transit system, operated with speedy, lightweight, air-conditioned trains, tying together Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey, is the quick summary of a plan formulated by Sidney H. Bingham, consulting engineer and former executive director of the New York City Transit Authority.

Tracks would be leased from existing railroads and a tristate authority would supervise and direct the new network. It may seem dreamlike, but vision is required to unsnarl commuter problems, which the New Haven and other railroads seem unable to do, and while struggling with them claim they are being driven into bankruptcy.

Gov. Abe Ribicoff's interest in the proposal has hopeful possibilities. He has invited Bingham to confer with him and the meeting will be held when the engineer returns from a projected South American trip.

On the Governor's instruction, the Bingham proposals, as they relate to the New Haven Road, will be studied by Eugene Loughlin, chairman of the Connecticut Public Utilities Commission.

The plan is too technical to be commented on here, but it doesn't require a transportation expert to agree with Governor Ribicoff, who described it as having appealing and challenging aspects.

Agreement also is not hard to come by with the motivating thinking on Bingham's part, who said: "It is reasonable to assume that if a high-speed, air-conditioned, comfortable ride could be made available to the commuter, which would take him to his destination within the city with a distinct saving in elapsed time, he could be weaned away from his automobile or bus on the crowded highway and street."

If Fairfield County is to share the growth, which has bloomed in the commuting areas of Westchester County, Long Island, and New Jersey, the problem of commuter transportation, now confounding the New Haven and harassing it, will have to be solved by some plan similar to that evolved by Bingham.

Positions of the Presidential Candidates on the TVA and Public Power

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Tennessee Valley Authority is a living example of development of our natural resources which the Nation and Tennessee are proud to display to the world. It has meant untold economic growth to my State and the entire region.

Mr. Lois Laycook has written a perceptive interpretive story, published in the Nashville Tennessean, concerning the positions of the two presidential candidates over the years on the TVA and public power.

Mr. Laycook and his outstanding newspaper have long been champions of our TVA, and I feel that this article is particularly timely as a commentary on one of the important issues which will be debated during the coming campaign.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Laycook's excellent analysis be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Aug. 21, 1960]

WHAT ABOUT TVA?—KENNEDY, NIXON DON'T SAY BUT VOTES INDICATE

(By Lois Laycook)

WASHINGTON—Overlooked in the controversy over civil rights and other hot issues of the moment are the views of the presidential candidates on TVA and the rural electrification program.

Neither Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, the Republican nominee, nor Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY, the Democratic candidate, has had much to say about public power policy since their nominations.

Fortunately, however, both candidates have long voting records on the subject in the House and Senate.

The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association recently conducted a study of the two candidates' records on public power. Here's what it found:

While serving in the House from 1947 until 1950 and in the Senate in 1951 and 1952, NIXON had the opportunity to vote on 19 Federal power, rural electrification and related issues. Out of these 19 possible votes, NIXON voted for public power legislation on only 3 occasions. He voted unfavorably 13 times and was recorded as not voting on 3 other occasions.

The 13 antipublic power votes included 4 votes against TVA legislation.

KENNEDY VOTES FAVORABLY

KENNEDY's voting record spans a 13-year period from 1947 to 1960. Between 1947 and 1952, while KENNEDY was in the House, he had 18 opportunities to vote on power legislation.

Of these votes, according to the association's study, KENNEDY voted favorably 11 times, unfavorably 4 times, and failed to vote on 3 occasions.

On 36 public power issues in the Senate between 1954 and 1960, KENNEDY voted favorably 24 times, unfavorably 8 times and did not vote on 4 issues.

During his 13 years in Congress, KENNEDY has supported TVA legislation on most occasions. However, in 1954, he voted against an amendment to restore $12 million in power transmission funds cut out of the TVA budget by the Eisenhower administration.

On August 9, 1957, KENNEDY was absent when the Senate passed the first TVA self-financing bill by a vote of 61–20. The measure died in the House. When the second self-financing bill came before the Senate July 9, 1959, KENNEDY voted for the legislation. This bill later became law.

KENNEDY voted for appropriations to build the New Johnsonville steamplant on two opportunities while serving in the House in 1948. These key appropriations bills trig-

gered an all-out battle by the private power lobby, which succeeded in blocking funds for the initial TVA steamplant project until 1949.

NIXON VOTES AGAINST

NIXON, who also was serving in the House at the time, voted against New Johnsonville on both tests. He also opposed TVA on two other record votes during his brief tenure as a Senator from California.

On June 3, 1952, NIXON voted for a Republican-sponsored amendment to slash TVA's appropriation for fiscal 1953 by $45,700,000 in an effort to prevent construction of six additional steamplant units. The amendment was defeated by the narrow vote of 36 to 31.

On the same date, an amendment was offered to increase TVA's total appropriation for the next fiscal year from $171,200,000 to $186 million. NIXON voted against the amendment.

These votes give some indication as to the extent the forthcoming election campaign may bear on the Government power issue. Both candidates can be expected to discuss the subject at length, especially during visits to the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest.

Both the Democratic and Republican platforms discuss the power issue and natural resource development in only general terms. NIXON and KENNEDY will be pressed for a full debate on the subject before election days rolls around.

An Import Quota for Iron Ore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. BENNETT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the 85th Congress and again in this Congress, I have sponsored legislation which seeks to impose a reasonable quota on the importation of foreign iron ore into the United States for the purpose of forcing our big steel companies to utilize their domestic sources of supply to meet this country's needs for iron ore. When I first spoke to the House on this subject several years ago, I called attention to the tremendous annual increase in the importation of foreign iron ore and the disastrous effects that this free trade policy is having on a vital and strategic American industry and the workingmen and women who are dependent upon it for their livelihood.

I wish to emphasize at the outset that in sponsoring this legislation it is not my purpose to penalize in any way the steel companies which own and operate our domestic iron mines and also own a major part of the reserves in Canada and Venezuela. My primary aim is to have regulated the flow of iron ore from abroad on a reasonable annual basis so that imports will not substantially injure or completely destroy iron mining in this country. Imports were approximately 9 million tons in 1952 and nearly 36 million tons in 1959. Thus, in the short span of 7 years, the annual rate increased almost four times. If nothing is done to limit or regulate this excessive importation of iron ore, it will ultimately replace and destroy the domestic industry.

The table below, prepared from statistics compiled by the Bureau of the Census, reflects the sharp increase in foreign iron ore imports from 1952 through 1959 with the corresponding decrease in domestic production. The figures for the first 6 months of 1960 show the same trend.

Iron ore imports, 1952-59 [1]

[In thousands of long tons]

	1952	1953	1954	1955
Canada	1,822	1,841	3,537	10,077
Venezuela	1,846	1,950	5,210	7,160
Others [2]	6,093	7,283	7,045	6,235
Total	9,761	11,074	15,792	23,472

	1956	1957	1958	1959
Canada	13,723	12,609	8,293	13,447
Venezuela	9,254	12,293	12,170	13,544
Others [2]	7,434	8,824	7,367	8,623
Total	30,411	33,726	27,830	35,614

[1] During the same period domestic production of iron ore has decreased from 98,000,000 long tons in 1952 to 59,000,000 long tons in 1959. Figures for the first 6 months of 1960 reflect the same trend.

[2] Other countries exporting iron ore to the United States include Brazil, British West Africa, Chili, Cuba, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Iran, Liberia, Mexico, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Sweden, Spain, Surinam, and the United Kingdom.

What is this free trade policy costing the United States in terms of the ultimate destruction of the iron mining industry? What does it mean in terms of lost jobs and lost wages for men and women in my congressional district and in other districts where mining is the lifeblood of the economy? The answers to these questions will shock the conscience of the Congress. For example, if the 35,613,259 long tons of iron ore brought into the country from foreign sources in 1959 had been mined in the United States instead, it would have meant jobs for approximately 5,634 more men; it would have provided these men with 11,268,000 man-hours of work and it would have produced $30,322,188 in additional wages. These figures, obtained from the Bureau of Mines, are based on the national average of production and wages of American iron ore miners for 1957, the most recent year for which such figures are available.

Some of the huge expenditures made in recent years to develop foreign mines, particularly in Venezuela and Canada, could have been far better spent in expanding the iron ore industry at home by exploring, developing, and opening new deposits here. The supply of this great natural resource within the United States is still very vast and untapped—reserves are still numerous.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to its economic folly, both national defense and moral reasons dictate against continuation of the unregulated importation of iron ore. It is not farfetched to suggest that the present policy of relying so heavily on foreign sources of iron ore, with its resultant destructive effect on the American industry, could be tragic to the United States in the event of war or other national emergency. If we replace domestic ores with foreign ores, where would we stand if our foreign supplies were cut off in time of war? Abandoned domestic mines cannot be reactivated overnight. Miners who have been forced to leave mining communities to seek employment in other industries cannot return on a moment's notice. New sources of supply cannot be explored and developed instantaneously. Once abandoned or substantially curtailed, the great American iron mining industry will take months, indeed years, to get back in production. Does it make sense to gamble future national security for a few extra profit dollars today? The present policy is shortsighted; unfair to the American miner and his family; makes no sense economically in the long run; and constitutes a threat to our national security.

No one expects the steel companies to operate their mining properties at a loss and the fact is that the vast majority of mining properties in Michigan and Minnesota have been and still are profitable operations. But the steel companies have favored the exploitation of their Canadian reserves because of the higher iron content and lower production costs. When iron mining commenced in Michigan and Minnesota many years ago, many towns and communities grew up around them. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the steel companies owe at least a moral obligation to their own employees and the people in the communities which surround their domestic operations to continue their activities as long as they are reasonably profitable. My bill is aimed at that objective. It would not stop the development of foreign reserves. It would merely regulate the annual flow of foreign ores on a reasonable basis and thus would permit the continued operations of our domestic mines. I think this is a sound, practical and sensible solution to this problem, one that will injure nobody but will be of substantial aid to millions of our own citizens.

I have spoken of iron ore and the problem of foreign competition as it relates directly to the mining industry.

However, there are byproducts which are of equal importance. This vital issue does not stop at the mine shaft.

Thousands of ship-borne products from abroad pass through our customs houses every week in the East, the West and the Gulfport areas as well as the St. Lawrence Seaway. Many of these are made chiefly, or in part, from iron ore derived metals.

For instance, consider the situation of automobiles—Michigan's leading bread and butter industry. As U.S. auto exports dropped to a postwar low last year of slightly over 100,000, imports went from 21,000 automobiles in 1950 to over 660,000 in 1959. And again this year, foreign manufacturers seem to be doing a brisk business here having moved in over 310,000 autos valued at $350 million during the first 6 months.

Now consider the side effects upon our economy of the importation of this one metal product—the automobile. In terms of American equivalents, one standard U.S. automobile requires about 2 tons of steel which in turn is made from several elements including 1 ton of iron ore. In other words, the ratio of iron ore to an automobile is approximately 1 ton to one car.

Accordingly, for every foreign car which displaced an American car, 1 ton of iron ore remained earthbound. Theoretically, since January of 1959, this would represent over 1 million tons of untapped ore in the importation of one metal product. The same applies to typewriters, sewing machines, dozens of steel mill products, oil tankers, cargo vessels, and so forth.

Furthermore, the chain reaction of imports affects additional industries as well. I mentioned the effect upon ore of auto imports. Continuing the analogy, the effect is similar in coal and steel. For example, a standard U.S. auto requires 2 tons of coal as well as 2 tons of steel in its construction. Consequently, about 1.2 million tons of coal never left the earth last year in the United States, nor, of course, was the order placed for 1.2 million tons of steel.

In northern Michigan, an important part of our economy is related to the mining of copper. A decade ago, imports of copper-brass products amounted to only 21 million pounds. But by last year, imports of such products had leaped to 200 million pounds. Furthermore, the copper problem was further compounded by decreasing exports of copper-brass goods which dropped from 47 million pounds to 16 million last year.

While these figures may sound abstract or cold or of little significance to the man in the street, let me assure you that they affect us all in our daily life in a way which we may ignore only at our own expense.

For example, in the case of steel: To tell you that imports of steel mill products were 4.4 million tons in 1959, valued at $515 million (in foreign value only), might not be as meaningful as to tell an American steel producer that these imports displaced U.S. sales of about $700 million. Or if speaking to a steelworker, I might add that that tonnage of steel imports put 20,000 men to work for 40 million man-hours at wages of about $125 million—but somewhere else, not here at home. The same picture—lost jobs, lost wages, lost sales—can be found in one industry after another including shipbuilding, porcelain, typewriters, textiles, cameras, jewelry, fishing tackle, and many, many more. All of these products are made and made as good or better right here in the United States. But the situation has become so bad that even barbed wire which was first invented in the Midwest is being imported in such quantities that the foreign manufacturer now has the lion's share of our own marketplace.

All in all, Mr. Speaker, our program of unrestricted free trade has proven to be not only impractical and unrealistic, but seriously damaging to important segments of our economy. Formerly, the evil effects of this program were spotty and were felt only by selected industries and mainly on an area basis. Today, the inroads of free trade are being sharply felt in most of the principal productive industries in our country. The basic reasons for this disastrous result lies in the wage differential between what is paid here and abroad. The following are a few examples:

The Japanese woodworker receives about 18 cents; the Italian, 24 cents; the French, 54 cents; the German, 48 cents; the English, 50 cents; the American, $1.98 per hour.

The Japanese chemical worker receives about 37 cents; the Italian, 37 cents; the French, 49 cents; the German, 57 cents; the English, 68 cents; and the American, $2.44 per hour.

The Japanese leatherworker receives about 23 cents; the Italian, 30 cents; the French, 54 cents; the German, 40 cents; the English, 47 cents; and the American, $1.59 per hour.

The Japanese glassworker receives about 26 cents; the Italian, 36 cents; the French, 47 cents; the German, 55 cents; the English, 70 cents; and the American, $2.22 per hour.

The Japanese steelworker receives about 41 cents; the Italian, 46 cents; the French, 53 cents; the German, 59 cents; the English, 83 cents; and the American, $3.10 per hour.

The Japanese machinery worker receives about 28 cents; the Italian, 36 cents; the French, 54 cents; the German, 59 cents; the English, 74 cents; and the American, $2.50 per hour.

The Japanese auto worker receives about 26 cents; the Italian, 46 cents; the French, 54 cents; the German, 64 cents; the English, 94 cents; and the American, $2.69 per hour.

Years ago, we were able to absorb wage differentials because of our efficiency and great productive capacity. Today, largely because of our foreign aid programs, we have provided appliances, machinery and tools to foreign countries so that they can produce as efficiently as we can here. Thus, there is no practical way that our producers can meet the competition of articles produced abroad at much cheaper labor costs.

Incentive Military Pay Bill Needs Corrective Action Now; It Discriminates Against Some Retired Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, among the many bills which appear to be in danger of being lost in the great flood of pending proposals is one intended to restore the traditional relationship between the active duty and the retired pay of our military personnel, H.R. 11318. This bill is now in the Senate. It is a meritorious measure to correct a very inequitable law.

The purpose of the bill is to correct existing legislation which discriminates against many men who fought in World War II and who were recalled to active duty for the Korean war. I hope that it passes.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, entitled "Inequality," on this subject from the August 18, 1960, issue of the Austin (Tex.) American.

The Austin American has done a fine service in calling our attention to this urgent need.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INEQUALITY

Temporarily trapped in the political logjam in the U.S. Senate is a House-passed measure intended to correct inequalities of the 1958 Military Pay Act.

Victims of the inequities in retirement pay during the past 2 years are thousands of officers and enlisted men who retired from the armed services prior to 1958. Many of them are war veterans. Texas, which traditionally has been an attractive homesite of retired service personnel, numbers hundreds of permanent residents and voters.

The corrective measure, H.R. 11318, passed the House May 12 without a dissenting vote. Its fate now rests in a special Senate subcommittee. Pressure to get it moving is being applied by numerous military organizations, including the adjutant generals of the States. As recent as August 9 President Eisenhower appealed that the traditional active-retired relationship of pay scales in the military services be restored.

Under the 1958 Military Pay Act officers and men on retirement pay were limited to a 6-percent increase. But their fellow servicemen who retired after passage of the new law are receiving substantially larger pay benefits. As an example, the retired pay of a colonel of more than 30 years service retired on May 31, 1958, is $90 less than the pay of a colonel of more than 30 years service retired after that date. The 1958 rule altered the formula of computing retirement pay on the traditional active duty pay rates applicable to the several grades and proportionate to the length of service.

Retired service personnel in Texas are eager to point out the speed with which Congress passed legislation to equalize retirement pay of its own members. Spokesmen for the retired personnel claim adequate support on the Senate floor for passage of the measure, if it could be unblocked in the special subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee. Senator STENNIS, of Mississippi, is chairman of the subgroup of which Senators SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, and BYRD, of Virginia, are members.

All we want, writes a retired Army officer, "is to put all uniform service retirees paid under the career compensation act on the same basis for pay regardless of whether they retired May 31, 1958, or earlier with those who retired June 1, 1958, and later."

The inference is that the retired service personnel in Texas are looking at the results with a "voter's eye."

Plain fairness calls for the Senate to end this discrimination, and this sentiment applies to all citizens.

Conference Action on the Social Security Bill on the Senate Amendment Relating to Teachers and Other Public Employees in New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I submit a letter our distinguished colleague and chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. MILLS, has written the New Jersey delegation. It explains the deletion of the Senate amendment in the conference report on the social security bill relating to teachers and other public employees in New Jersey.

The letter is as follows:

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 26, 1960.

Hon. GORDON CANFIELD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR GORDON: This letter is to inform you, as I promised I would, of the conference action on the social security bill on the Senate amendment relating to teachers and other public employees in the State of New Jersey. This is the provision which you had discussed with me and other House conferees on behalf of yourself and the rest of the New Jersey delegation urging that the House conferees accept the Senate amendment. This amendment was deleted from the bill in conference. You were also interested in an exception in the case of New Jersey if any change was made liberalizing the quarters of coverage requirements.

I am sure you are aware of the fact that on August 23 when the Senate amendment was being discussed in the Senate, Senator KERR, who at that time was handling the bill on the Senate floor, stated at page 16008 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD: "I have not had time to digest the amendment; neither have the other members of the committee. However, in view of the fact that they have stated it relates only to New Jersey, I hope it will be accepted and taken to conference. If it is found there to be objectionable, it can be taken out of the bill."

During our discussion of the liberalizations in eligibility requirement in conference the main objection which was raised to adding the changes the New Jersey House delegation was urging was that it was designed to exclude public employees in the State of New Jersey from the liberalizations. Since the social security insurance system is a nationwide system, the eligibility requirements must be the same for all workers throughout the country. The conclusion was reached that this is a matter entirely within the control of the State of New Jersey, and that if the State desires to do so it can change its provisions relating to public employees who are also covered by social security. I hope that you will agree that this is the logical and reasonable way to handle this situation. The Congress in any legislation which it enacts affecting the whole of the United States cannot make exceptions which take into account individual provisions of either public or private pension plans.

I am advised that in 1956 when the provision relating to the age for women to become eligible for benefits was reduced from age 65 to age 62, and certain general liberalizations were made in eligibility requirements, the State of New Jersey did amend provisions of its law relating to public employees in such a way that such employees, both women and men, who had already retired, would not be affected by the liberalizations in these requirements in the Federal law.

The conferees agreed that the above considerations were basic and fundamental and for this reason it was decided that no exception should be made in the case of New Jersey.

I regret that the House conferees were not able to accede to your request, but under the circumstances both in the matter of policy and precedent it appeared that the Senate amendment was undesirable particularly in light of the fact that this is a State matter which can be handled at the State level.

Sincerely yours,

WILBUR D. MILLS,
Member of Congress.

Beware the Erosion of the Free World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under privilege granted to me to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I am privileged to include a speech delivered by Rear Adm. Laurence H. Frost, U.S. Navy, recently at the Dallas, Tex., Council of World Affairs. Admiral Frost is Assistant Chief of Naval Operations—Intelligence.

I am indebted to Mr. Oren Casey, Esq., of Spokane, Wash., for making this timely address available to me.

The address follows:

Today I would like to share some of my thoughts on the world situation with you. There has been a tremendous quickening of pace in international affairs in the last 2 years. The question in most people's mind is how to assess what all this means.

Have the Soviets mellowed? Has the balance of power changed?

Can we look forward to a reasonable peace with justice for the world? Just what is the world outlook for 1960?

As you will see, I am not so much concerned about what we are already prepared for—about the dangers we are already alert to, my deepest concern lies in those areas where we as a nation see no particular threat or long-term danger.

It is for this reason that I stress that we must keep the entire threat in proper focus. Moreover we must bear in mind that there are occasions when we can harm ourselves far more than the enemy can. For we are in nothing less than a crisis of civilization.

Much has been written about this crisis. But it is given to only a few to set its meaning down in a handful of words. That has been done recently by a distinguished American visitor to the Soviet Union, who said:

"God willing, we shall escape war, but we shall not escape the toughest fight we have ever fought. Coexistence is a pleasant term, but one of these systems is going down. It does not make it easier to learn that the weapons of the conflict are of the spirit."

To that insight I would add that we may need at this time not so much a new weapon as a new state of mind. This is no facile turn of words on my part. It strikes deep at the heart of the matter. One of my primary responsibilities is to chart each day the ups and downs of the entire world along with other members of the U.S. Intelligence Board. As occasion permits, I must make an on-the-spot survey, as I did at great length a month ago. The picture that unfolds before me is not the one that leaps from the headlines or the newscast.

It is a world often heaving in struggle, fired with aspirations, and desperate in its desire to reach a plateau of stability and progress. It is a world comprised of touchy and proud nations. Communism is indeed a part of the struggle, but it is not simply the dramatic military aspect of communism. In fact, the most dangerous aspect of communism for each man as an individual is the philosophy of communism as a guide to action and a way of life.

People of the free world have been justly concerned over possible changes in the Communist threat in recent months. On the one hand, there has been an apparent relaxation of certain pressures within the Soviet bloc itself. Soviet leaders have traveled extensively. They talk continually of peaceful coexistence—they allow tourists to visit the bloc, although under many restrictions—and they themselves seem more relaxed and less inscrutable than formerly. All of this has, of course, been greeted with appreciation by a world that desires stability and peace.

But we must remember that talk of peace by the Soviets cannot mask their aggressive talk about West Berlin, or about the entire West, for that matter. It cannot mask the unbridled threats that are expressed with increasing regularity about growing Soviet strength. In fact, no Soviet leader has ever sought to conceal their objective to beat us out at every turn and to bury us. The burial they talk about is the burial of our system, nothing less than our civilization in all its material and spiritual aspects.

Let us take a brief look at the bedrock of the Soviet creed to see what, if anything, essentially has actually changed. In the first place, the Soviet regime is now more confident than ever that it is the wave of the future. In fact, the Soviet regime believes more than ever that it is the unfolding of history. This is not simply an assertion based upon hope. It is the foundation of what can properly be called a secular religion. Moreover, they have enshrined their creed in what they call a science. Regardless of how tellingly we may refute it, unmask its illogical premises, or counter its claims, the fact remains that it is essentially believed by the controlling element and is used as a guide to action.

In 1900, when writing about Communist workers, Lenin stated that the party wanted the whole of their lives. This is the nub of Communist philosophy which sees all of life in one unalterable picture.

Communist belief claims to encompass all of reality in one interrelated sequence—a concept of nature, of man, of society, and of history. The Communist cannot pick or choose or shade the basic elements of this belief—these are set in concrete—these are not movable parts.

Now, most Americans are willing to concede that Communists believe in their philosophy. But we find it incredible that Communists actually live by it on a day-to-day basis. But the Communists who control the bloc do live by it and plan by it. They are masters of organizational control, they know what they want and why they want it. For them there is only one operational problem—how to get it.

We see them in action on a daily basis. But we usually judge them by our standards and our view of the world. This is where matters get out of focus. We must continually examine their conduct and objectives through their eyes. Otherwise—because we prefer a live-and-let-live philosophy—our alertness waxes when they suddenly commit aggression, and wanes sharply when they soothe us with smiles.

You may be interested, then, in my views of how the Soviets look upon the world about them—their ambitions—their inhibitions—the lengths to which they will go to increase their domination over others. At the same time, I shall be stressing what I believe still applies in Soviet behavior behind the campaign for so-called peaceful coexistence.

First, we must remember that whereas we hope that all nations will develop, produce, and prosper in peace under freedom and self-determination, the Soviets consider our system doomed. They can be remarkably offhand and impersonal about this, for they

consider our system simply a stage in history's evolution toward communism. For them we are the bourgeois society—as Marx said—the closing chapter of the prehistoric stage of human society. For them, every society moves to communism. We may resist history and they may give history a helping hand, but nobody can arrest history.

We may hear a good bit about the discontent of the Russian people with the performance of their state—but we find understandably little questioning by them of the validity of the state's doctrine. By the same token, we may distinguish between the party and the people in some matters—but as the country reaches new heights of technical progress, the people seem to accept the system more readily. Why shouldn't they? They have known no other. They tend rather to blame individuals who abuse them under the system.

In short, although there is undoubtedly some curiosity about other systems in the outside world, they are conditioned largely to invidious comparison. For many of them, the outside is an alien world that will sooner or later be wholly surpassed by Russian achievement in every line of endeavor. They consider our system a highway marker which has come into sight on the horizon and which they will in due time pass and leave far behind.

Many Westerners take comfort in the fact that the peoples of the Soviet Union are pathetically anxious for peace. Soviet people seek assurance on this subject whenever they meet Americans today. But an astute observer has warned of one tragic aspect of this. The Soviet regime controls public opinion. By dint of massive propaganda it has for years held itself up as the champion of peace. Consequently, if the day should come when the regime chooses war, the people will be led to believe that the peace they embraced was taken away by America. This is the tragedy of what is known as the closed society—a society for all practical purposes conditioned by its rulers, cut off from freedom of thought and the free exchange of ideas.

The threat to the free world from the Soviet Union is commonly broken down into three categories—general war, limited war, and the so-called cold war.

Actually, from the Soviet point of view, these form a continuous spectrum of conflict. That part of the spectrum known as cold war is a natural medium for Marxism and Leninism.

This is the area of low risk and high security but slow and steady progress. It has aptly been called protracted conflict by Communists. Let us examine Soviet attitudes toward these forms of conflict, starting with the most dramatic and the least probable—general war.

In the history of mankind, conflict has usually taken the form of military forces pitted against one another. We in the West traditionally think of conflict solely in military terms. But in the last four decades we have been decidedly uneasy about the conflict pressed upon us daily by the Soviet Union. Even today the threat against us tends to be expressed by us mainly in the dramatic terms of megaton weapons, bombers, missiles, and submarines. Even here, the maintenance of substantial army, navy, and air forces in the Soviet Union for conventional warfare is generally ignored in public discussion. As a consequence, we focus on one aspect of the threat—the worst possible contingency—an all-out nuclear attack on the United States.

Now ladies and gentleman, far be it from me to lull you into a false sense of security. The world of megaton weapons is real. But we are more alert to and better prepared for this threat than any other—and we must maintain our deterrent strength. It would be folly to drop our guard. Moreover, as each side makes it missiles more secure—in our case by moving them to the seas and by site hardening—the chances for an all-out exchange of nuclear weapons will be considerably reduced.

But let us never lose sight of another important aspect of the missile question. Missiles are but another form of power adapted to an age of rapid technological development. They represent not only physical power but also—perhaps more realistically—they represent psychological power. We all hope they will never be used. When we speak of them we are speaking for the purpose of deterrence and not rabidly brandishing them. More often than not, when we speak of them we are informing, warning, or reassuring the American people and our allies. The Soviet leaders know full well what missile power is. They are well informed and warned.

If we are not careful, we can slip into an artificial game theory of nuclear weapons exchange that is legitimate enough in planning but which threatens to mask out all other aspects of the daily power struggle. We must consider all aspects of this matter, otherwise we can fall into a national neurosis or obsession.

I think it is safe enough to say that the leaders of the Soviet Union are realists. Survival of individuals within the regime itself has in the past raised realism to a fine political art. They are committed to spreading Communist power throughout the world—they will take aggressive action when they think they can get away with it—but they are unlikely by deliberate choice to bring the world and themselves down in nuclear chaos.

It is too often forgotten that we are dealing with men who are imbued with the psychology of revolution—massive radical change. They think in terms of strengthening their base and from that stronghold of eroding all other political and economic systems.

They attempt to sap the will, the energy, the strength and the spirit of others.

But they do not see military activity as the sole way of doing this. In fact, they see it as a possibly necessary way but hardly the preferred way. In short, Marxism-Leninism lives by conflict in one form or another, but military conflict is used where risk is low or uncontrollable situations face them.

Today, then, we are faced with a world in which two superpowers face each other warily. We have made it plain that our strength is in place solely to deter aggression against us and our allies. We are not anxious to use this strength and hope we will never have to. We are interested in deterrence—just as medical science is more and more interested in keeping a disease from ever starting. But beneath the umbrella of deterrence many other things can happen. We have an old expression that there are more ways than one to skin a cat. In their compulsion to expand their power, the Communists must find those other ways. You can be sure that their actions will be calculated to fall short of a direct challenge to our national survival. They will, when they can, slip under the fence of strategic nuclear deterrence.

At this point, we are back in daily life as it is lived routinely each day—the life of the so-called cold war—or protracted conflict as the Communists who wage it have so aptly described their campaign. This is the war that communism has waged all through this century. Its first victim was the Russian people themselves and since 1917—working from one base—it has spread through revolution, the aftermath of wartime chaos, local military aggression, psychological warfare and diplomatic deceit.

Communism chose the cold war and it ordained that the battlefield was to be the free world. The battle, moreover, was to be fought in the vast gray area that lies between the white of peace and the black of war. In Communist eyes, the free world was to be eroded—its physical and spiritual strength turned into weakness and apathy.

It was to be kept in a state of doubt, fear and discontent—without unity, without purpose, without hope.

Ladies and gentlemen, all of this is alien to our spirit. We have lived so long in accepted traditions of Western civilization and blessed by material abundance that we find it difficult to believe that Communist leaders can be so disciplined, intense and unwavering in purpose.

More dangerous, in fact, is the guise of friendliness under which communism now walks. If you judge its actions by still photos, as it were, you will see smiles, offers of treaties, jocular bantering, and sudden candid camera glimpses of the naked threat. But we must keep the whole picture in mind and see it, as it were, in motion picture sequence—starting back in 1917 and coming right up to date.

Seen in this perspective, I am sure that your first question would be: "Why in the world would communism—after unbelievable success—suddenly lose its desire to expand? What power-hungry group unrestrained in creed by ethical standards ever willingly comes to terms with its chosen opponent?" The answer is that the Soviet leaders are choosing this current gambit for their own tactical reasons.

What we are witnessing now is a burst of self-confidence—a cocksureness of attitude—and a greater conviction than ever that Communist power is the wave of the future.

The irony of all this is that the Soviet leaders make no bones about it. The grim import of what they are saying—or threatening—is lost on us because we instinctively contrast the horror of all-out nuclear war with the undramatic sound of so-called peaceful coexistence. Under these rules, peaceful coexistence cannot help but assume rather benign overtones.

The point I would like to stress is that peaceful coexistence may be morally preferable to a nuclear holocaust but we should see it for just what it is.

In the first place, it is a Communist phrase—in semantics and in intent. To the Soviet leaders it means one thing alone—since communism is the wave of the future, it should be allowed to develop and expand without challenge.

The Soviets have recently been unremitting in their efforts to condemn the term "cold war." They ask for an end to the cold war and acceptance of an era of peaceful coexistence. There is only one difference between these two terms—in cold war one party resists the aggression of the other—in peaceful coexistence one party agrees for the sake of peace not to stand in the way of the aggression of another. The Soviets are quite clear about this. As far as they are concerned, this is the only way that peace can come about in the forecordained history of our era.

Even those who must work professionally on this subject on a day-to-day basis have to remind themselves continually to judge the Soviet leaders by what they actually mean—not by the phrases they use—and not by our standards of reasonable compromise, a mutual basis in confidence, or the traditional norms of Western society.

Over the years, the peoples of the West have been rudely surprised by Soviet actions. Time and again, we have granted the benefit of the doubt and hoped that the future would be calm. Time and again, we have been disappointed. We must accept the fact—unpleasant as it is—that the fu-

ture is going to be more challenging than ever. We must look forward to a long period of cold war—or protracted conflict—or so-called peaceful coexistence—the name doesn't really matter. What is important is that as the Soviet Union grows stronger it will grow in self-confidence. With added strength and ill-concealed arrogance it will seek more boldly to penetrate the free world, to keep it in chaos, to turn it against the United States and eventually to draw it into its orbit.

One threat runs consistently through the Soviet cold war strategy: The moral and physical isolation of the United States. In disarmament plans, the Soviet Union always returns to its original stipulation—the withdrawal of all U.S. forces to North America. In their propaganda, we are imperialists—we are the warmongers—we are the threat to the world of nuclear devastation—we are the hardhearted rich—we are the enemy of the poor—we are the diehards standing in the way of the masses—trying to stop history in its tracks.

These themes are stated simply and are beamed around the world every hour of the day. Sooner or later, they fall on the ears of those who are deeply troubled for one reason or another. They offer a scapegoat and hold out a promise. The subtle use of massive psychological techniques can over a period of time pay off suddenly.

The Soviets understand well that the 20th century is an age of revolution throughout much of the world—and they intend to dominate that revolution by deflecting it into Marxist channels. At this time they see large areas—the underdeveloped countries and emerging nations—on the threshold of decision. The entire future of the world will be influenced by the path that these nations choose—the rapid, inhuman way of Communist industrialization—or the balanced, humane way of the West. The future of Africa alone lies in the balance at this moment.

We have now arrived at the point where I must balance up accounts and try to answer the question I posed in my opening remarks—What is the world outlook in 1960?

First, I would revert to the short observation I quoted earlier: "God willing, we shall escape war, but we shall not escape the toughest fight we ever fought." To me this is good realism. It avoids the negative feedback of pessimism as well as the misleading counsel of optimism. It faces the facts squarely—it warns and informs.

It is natural for all of us to think nostalgically of the good old days when geography isolated us from involvement in world affairs. But that era is behind us forever. We are not only immersed in world affairs—leadership, moral commitment and responsibility have settled on our shoulders. Unless we do our level best, vast areas of the world can fall into hostile hands—hostile not only to us but to people as such everywhere.

The threat to the free world can come in three ways—an all-out surprise nuclear attack against us—a series of limited wars which could gradually contract the free world area—or a long-term erosion of the strength of the free world with the United States finally isolated and psychologically inert.

We have done well in our concern about a surprise attack. Providing we maintain our deterrent strength and the Soviet leaders realize what would happen if they unleashed such an attack, the possibility of such an attack will be remote. As the world moves into the missile age, there will be compensations against the suddenness of missile attack. As our Polaris submarines move a truly invulnerable missile punch to the secrecy of the ocean, and as our missile sites are hardened, an enemy will strike only in suicidal madness. Refinements in the missile race may seem now and then to threaten the deterrence balance, but organically the deterrent itself should not be altered.

With respect to limited war or local aggression there is a different picture. The Soviet Union and Communist China are under compulsion to expand their power and their influence. If an all-out nuclear war is incompatible with their interests—as I think they believe—their energies will seek an outlet in something less risky.

Just as our long-range bombers, ICBM's, and Polaris missiles deter them from a surprise nuclear attack, so must our other military strengths deter them from local aggression. We have seen cases in Korea and the Taiwan Straits.

Local aggression is an outcropping of the cold war. It may start as a probing operation to test our interest or will. It may—as in Korea—be a sudden attack in an area which the Soviets consider a power vacuum. But the most important fact about limited aggression since 1950 is that the enemy realizes we are alert to every move he makes. In the years ahead he will watch carefully to see whether we maintain our limited war capability. If he judges that we are talking big but are ill-prepared, he will be tempted to move all around his periphery and, on occasion, to leapfrog into the inner parts of the free world.

With both large-scale and local aggression deterred, Soviet energy will express itself in what we call the cold-war spectrum—political warfare, economic warfare, psychological warefare, and cultural warfare. This is the situation today. From the Soviet point of view, this cold war or so-called peaceful coexistence is a campaign against the free world. The objective is, as I have said, the physical and moral isolation of the fortress of the free world—the United States of America. The means to the objective are the techniques of erosion—erosion of territory, erosion of national ideals, erosion of the will to resist.

Our greatest error will lie in our feeling that since military strength will deter all-out war and nip local aggression in the bud, our troubles are over. If the combined threat of world communism were solely military, I would agree. But until it is thoroughly understood everywhere by our people, that the Soviet threat far transcends the military equation, we shall be vulnerable to attrition.

Erosion of the free world has been going on for many decades. Our alertness since World War II has controlled it somewhat. But this is a process that does not suddenly come to an end. Our freedom—our institutions—our way of life have to be earned every day—all year around.

For this reason we must be sensitive to the significance of seemingly minor happenings around the world. We must realize that when a far-distant piece of the free world slips into the sea of communism, a piece of our own land, our own heritage, our own security has in fact slipped with it.

Department of State: Please Pause and Ponder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, for a long, long time Constantine Brown has been recognized as one of our more astute and able commentators on foreign affairs. Consequently, when he comes out as he did in yesterday's Evening Star with the warning to our Government not to drive the Dominican Republic into the arms of the Communists I think those who shape our foreign policy should pay him heed.

In commenting on the action of the Organization of American States in agreeing to withdraw ambassadors and impose an economic boycott on the Dominicans Mr. Brown pinpoints the real cause for this drastic action as the alleged—and too much emphasis cannot be put on that word "alleged"—attempt to instigate the assassination of President Betancourt of Venezuela which, incidentally, is the country where our Vice President was stoned and spat upon.

Mr. Brown also points to the frightening but althogether logical possibility that the precipitate action now planned in regards to the Dominican Republic may well result in driving Trujillo and Castro together to form, along with unstable Haiti, a Caribbean Communist bloc, thus broadening the base from which Khrushchev can launch his military and ideological attacks on the United States.

I have no defense for Trujillo or any other dictator. I certainly join with Mr. Brown, however, in questioning the wisdom of seeming to tolerate dictators of Communist persuasion while doing our utmost to stamp out the other kind. And whatever else he may be, the strong man of Santo Domingo has heretofore never shown the slightest inclination to do business with Khrushchev and his ilk. I pray that our statesmen will not now involve us in a diplomatic fiasco from which we may be a long, long time in extricating ourselves.

Mr. Brown's disturbing article is appended hereto in full:

NEW RED OPENING IN CARIBBEAN?—OAS BLAST AT DOMINICAN REPUBLIC HIT AS KREMLIN MAKES OVERTURES

(By Constantine Brown)

The creation of a Caribbean pro-Soviet unit composed of Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and inevitably Haiti would have been called a ridiculous phantasy a few days ago. Now it could gradually become a reality as a result of the decisions taken at the OAS conference at San Jose, Costa Rica.

There, by unanimous vote, the government of the Dominican Republic not only has been reprimanded for the alleged attempts to instigate the assassination of President Romulo Betancourt, of Venezuela. Drastic measures short of war, such as the withdrawal of the OAS ambassadors and an economic boycott, have been ordered.

But while President Eisenhower demanded legal authority from Congress to hit the people of the Dominican Republic where it hurt—mostly by withholding the Dominican share of the U.S. sugar quota—Moscow, which seems to anticipate everything, was ready for action. Soviet official agents—the Dominican Republic does not have diplomatic relations with Communist countries—offered to barter whatever the Republic needed for Dominican sugar. Simultaneously, it was announced from Ciudad Trujillo that the Dominican radio station was negotiating for the service of the Soviet news agency Tass.

These first steps may seem inconsequential at first sight. They do not indicate in the slightest that there could be a recon-

ciliation between Cuba's Communist puppet Fidel Castro and the tough dictator Generalissimo Trujillo. But Moscow and Peiping are not interested in harmony between such men. They are interested in establishing as many anti-American areas as possible in this hemisphere.

The Dominican Republic would be a highly important prize, since it paradoxically had been adamantly hostile to alien dictatorships. Before and during World War II Trujillo was bitterly opposed to the Nazis and opened the gates of his country wide to the victims of nazism, particularly the Jews. Since the beginning of the cold war he has been equally bitterly opposed to the Soviet Union and international communism. It took a miracle—such as that performed at San Jose by Secretary Herter and his Latin American colleagues—to induce Trujillo to look toward Moscow for help. Trujillo and even the moderate members of the Dominican Government, as well as the rank-and-file of the people, were reported indignant not only at the harsh treatment they received at San Jose, but also because at the same time, the OAS mildly rapped the knuckles of Castro, who has been guilty of far greater misdeeds, including the confiscation of legitimate properties valued at close to $1 billion.

It seems that the high priests of our diplomacy refuse to learn from the mistakes of the past. In 1946 the United Nations, at the bidding of Joseph Stalin, decided to make Spain a democracy by overthrowing Generalissimo Franco. Since it was inconvenient to send troops into Spain—as Stalin had demanded originally—the U.N. ordered the withdrawal of the ambassadors of its member nations and the establishment of an unofficial boycott. This, it was believed, would bring about another revolution and the demise of Franco's dictatorial regime.

The contrary happened. The Spanish people rallied in support of their strongly anti-Communist leader, buckled their belts, and withstood the hardships of the economic blockade for several years. The cold war followed the short honeymoon between the U.S.S.R. and its former wartime allies. We needed reliable air and naval bases; Washington came to the conclusion that Spain could offer valuable real estate for the defense of the free world.

Not only were diplomatic relations with Madrid renewed and a firm friendship established, but because of the economic ravages brought about by the economic blockade we had to provide Spain with upwards of $1 billion in economic aid. The security of our bases demanded an improvement of the standard of living of the Spanish people. Spain, while still not a member of NATO, has all the same become one of the most important adjuncts in our planned defense system.

There is much talk, though little is done from the practical point of view, about the tremendous importance of Latin America and especially the Caribbean to our security. For the first time in our history, we have an enemy dedicated to our destruction right on our doorsteps. The Iron Curtain has descended upon Cuba. Now there is strong possibility, judging by the most recent developments, that it will descend upon the Dominican Republic as well.

And all this is the result of a misguided philosophy of some of our leaders that while we should tolerate and try to befriend Communist dictators, we must do our best to stamp out the other kind.

Baring Shows National Significance of Port of New York Authority Investigation Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD the following letter written to Hon. Robert B. Meyner, Governor of the State of New Jersey, August 18, 1960, so that all people may know the importance of a full investigation of the Port of New York Authority, and may be apprised of the necessity of their giving expressions of their support to Congressman CELLER so that he may most effectively continue the investigation.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 18, 1960.

Reference: Investigation of the Port of New York Authority.

Hon. ROBERT B. MEYNER,
Governor, State of New Jersey,
Trenton, N.J.

DEAR GOVERNOR MEYNER: Your letter of August 2, 1960 about the Port of New York Authority is quite plausible and convincing except for its vain attempt to suppress the significance of that most important little syllable "bi-".

The port authority need not be claimed a Federal agency to warrant congressional investigation; nor can it hide from congressional investigation by claiming itself a State agency.

The Founding Fathers of our country foresaw this very issue and placed interstate compacts of which the port authority is a bistate example under the control of Congress by article 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

Article 18 of the bistate compact between New York and New Jersey creating the Port of New York Authority acknowledges this responsibility by the port authority to the Congress of the United States.

"Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar's, and unto God the things which be God's."

No contest of power here exists between the Federal Government and a State unless a State seeks to deny things which be the Federal Government's.

Investigation of the bistate port authority does not create any new precedent leading to further Federal investigation of State agencies.

So much for the law.

"It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle," than for the port authority's friends to pretend "the port authority is a local port development agency."

I have noted that the port authority has trade development offices in Washington, D.C.; Chicago, Ill.; Cleveland, Ohio; Pittsburgh, Pa.; London, England; Zurich, Switzerland; Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, and San Juan, P.R., which seek to direct traffic to New York. This international effort may be of considerable value to the port of New York, but it affects the trade volume of other ports in the United States and is no local matter.

I have noted that the port authority paid the expenses of the Governor of New Jersey when he visited the Belgian Trade Fair in 1958.

I have noted that the port authority gave a $10,000 luncheon for 600 guests, including the Governors of the Governors' conference at San Juan, P.R., which is outside the continental limits of the United States, on August 6, 1959, at which luncheon the Governor of New York and the Governor of New Jersey were the guests of honor.

I have noted that the secretariats of the Council of State Governments, Governors' conference, and National Association of Attorneys General are all located at 1313 East 60th Street, Chicago, Ill.

Those organizations have furnished such prompt, similar, and vigorous support in favor of port authority avoidance of congressional investigation as to raise the question whether even they are free from port authority influence.

There is no use in discussing how many record items and proposals to testify have been offered to Congress by the port authority, as long as the port authority continues to select the information to be released or withheld.

The files and data of the port authority have been secret for 39 years.

As long as any record or item is held in secrecy from Congress by the port authority, the port authority is not candid with the Congress of the United States.

What is the port authority hiding?

I believe the only issue raised so far in this matter is the misguidance of public officials who believe they can deny the Constitution of the United States and the Congress of the United States when such denial suits their pleasure, yet enjoy reliance on that same Constitution and Congress when it meets their need for protection against foreign and subversive powers.

Sincerely,

WALTER S. BARING,
Congressman for Nevada.

Communism and the Caribbean

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, as most of us know, we have no better authority on Latin America in general and the Caribbean area in particular than the Honorable Spruille Braden. His intimate association with these critical areas of our hemisphere encompasses nearly half a century.

As a young man he negotiated financing and obtained contracts for the electrification of the railways in Chile. He was our Ambassador to the Chaco Peace Conferences, 1935–39. He has served as U.S. Ambassador to Colombia, Cuba, and Argentina. From 1945 to 1947 he was Assistant Secretary of State for American Republic Affairs. Highly respected throughout Latin America, he probably holds more Latin American awards and decorations than any other of our citizens.

On May 20 of this year, Mr. Braden addressed the Long Island Federation

of Women's Clubs on "Communism and the Caribbean." It is a revealing and alarming account of conditions not far from our southeastern coastline.

I have checked with the Public Printer and find that the estimated cost of printing would exceed the number of pages allowed. It is estimated that the printing will involve 5¼ pages at a cost of $425.25.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at this point notwithstanding the fact that the estimated cost will exceed the amount allowed.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNISM AND THE CARIBBEAN

(Address by the Honorable Spruille Braden, before Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, May 20, 1960)

Always it is a pleasure to speak before the Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, made up as it is, of so distinguished and attractive a group of ladies. I am especially complimented by your kind invitation to address you a second time. Also, it is a rewarding experience, because as I learned last year, individually and collectively, you make your views known in Washington, and they are listened to with attention and respect.

Therefore, to the extent you agree with my theses today, I hope you may be disposed to bring such constructive influences to bear on the administration and Congress, as may compel legislation and measures to wipe out at least some of the dangers now threatening the United States.

Let me begin by saying that I am profoundly worried by the way things are going all over the world. I am alarmed by the growth of collectivism on all sides, and the infiltration of communism into every phase of our national existence.

I used to say that probably I could live out my life in relative tranquillity, but that I was sorry for my children, and much sorrier for my grandchildren. Presently, I am not so sure that major catastrophe may not strike our Nation, even before the relatively few years remaining to me shall have run their course.

The United States, provenly the greatest and finest country ever to rise on the face of the globe, is in mortal peril of being struck down, not by an enemy from without, but by apathy and ignorance, collectivism and treason from within, opening the way for socialism and communism. This is a repugnant, not to say intolerable, thought, yet it is precisely what may happen unless the American public is awakened soon—very soon—to the danger; and through our republican processes, so impresses its views on Congress and the administration, as to force them to immediate and effective steps for the preservation of the Republic and of our way of life.

This morning, it is my purpose to speak with you aboue one of the many threats to our security and, for that matter, to the safety of the entire Western Hemisphere. I refer to the spread of communism throughout the Caribbean beginning at the gateways from the Atlantic, passing Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, to the portals of the Panama Canal, and up to the soft underbelly of the United States itself.

When discussing communism, it is well to remind ourselves of the true nature of the beast. Therefore, with your permission, I shall list on the one hand, some of the many falsehoods and mistaken views, and on the other, some of the basic truths on this subject:

A. We are not confronted, as so many people think, merely by an antagonistic ideology, or soley by a group of evil men who never in the slightest will be influenced by appeals to reason, decency, and morality, as we know these terms. This is a battle between light and darkness, right and wrong, freedom and slavery, religion and atheism. Communism is not peculiar to Russia, China, or any other country. Transcending all frontiers, it is a diabolical worldwide conspiracy, fanatically dedicated to the destruction of faith, of all national existence, individual dignity, and freedom everywhere. In particular, it aims to smash the United States and everything in which this Nation believes. The Communist leaders know that this must be done if they are to dominate and enslave humanity, as is their intention. They will stop at no crime or abomination to achieve their purposes. Testifying to this fact are the tens of millions cruelly tortured and murdered in the U.S.S.R., China, and the satellite countries, now, alas, including Cuba, only 90 miles from our shores.

B. More inhuman than even the Nazis at their worst, the Communists respect and fear only one thing: force—usually physical force—greater than their own. When they have the upper hand, they are unappeasable and relentless; they rant and rage, as do Khrushchev, Mao Tse-tung, and Fidel Castro. But when their bluffs are called by someone with superior power and determination, they plead, they beg, they even grovel, for accommodation, for peaceful coexistence, and pity. This is the experience of all of us who have had the opportunity to deal firmly with them.

C. Like the Nazis, they frequently are fiendishly clever; but similarly, they are not supermen. Both because of and despite their being such adept liars, one should doubt their every word; for my part I even believe false some of their claims about space navigation, including Lunik I and other alleged scientific achievements.

It was easy to identify the Nazis with their race superiority complexes, whereas the Communists shrewdly use the nationals in each country. They hide within other political parties, and are hard to detect or expose. They use well-intentioned idealists, "do-gooders," and other gullible citizens of each country as dupes to propagate their atheistic and materialistic ideology, and their satanic conspiracy. That is happening throughout the United States and the other 20 American Republics and Canada.

D. The so-called card-carrying Communists are the shock troops used for cannon fodder in riots, insurrections, and revolutions. But they do not command. The really dangerous Communists—the Rosenbergs, the Klaus Fuchs, and Hisses, and still more, their bosses—probably never had a card.

I testified before a Senate committee in 1954 as to how Alger Hiss blatantly followed the Red line in an attempt to arouse Panamanian animosity against the United States and to support Soviet charges of aggression against the United States in the 1946 U.N. Assembly. But so securely was Hiss tucked away in an important State Department post that at the time I only thought he had blundered stupidly. I was not so sharp as I might have been, because I failed to recognize until afterward the Communist inspiration and impulse behind his actions.

E. The Communists always are a minority—a small one, even in Russia. Their leaders all over the world for the most part are drawn from the intellectual and bourgeois classes, rarely from the workers. The masses do not go "on the march" of their own volition. They are instigated and led by these cynical, envious, and often frustrated intellectuals, ravenous for personal power. I have met, or been reliably informed about, scores of Communists throughout this hemisphere; but I almost could count on the fingers of my hands those who originally were horny-handed sons of toil.

F. It is not true that the best or the only breeding ground for communism is where there are poverty and illiteracy. On the contrary, it usually flourishes most where there is industrialization and higher living conditions. To mention only two of many possble examples, witness northern Italy and our own great metropolitan areas, as contrasted with the lack of communism in the poor and unschooled regions of southern Italy or the Tennessee hills. Even in Russia and China it was not until after the Communists had seized the large urban centers, such as Moscow and Shanghai, that they were able to conquer and make serfs of the great rural populations; at that, they had to resort to the mass murder of tens of millions of farmers. A similar procedure, on a numerically smaller scale, because there are fewer people to kill, is now underway in Cuba.

Poverty and illiteracy must be eradicated and replaced by improved living conditions and education, not by helter-skelter welfare statism, but only with the utmost care and thought exercised over a considerable period of time—perhaps generations.

G. Instead of meeting these problems intelligently, we have neglected our own needs, including the curing of poverty and illiteracy at home, in order, since 1946, to dash all over the earth, spending $80 billion on what we call foreign aid, or mutual security. Thereby, we neither have defeated communism, nor materially improved the lot of the recipient peoples anywhere. We have set an appallingly bad example of extravagance, waste and corruption, which always are inherent in such a huge bureaucratic operation. As a result, country after country has been pushed toward socialization, an accompanying inflation, and eventual ruin, thus easing the way for a subsequent Communist takeover and destroying the peoples' ambitions for a genuinely representative and constitutional government.

Bolivia offers a fair pattern of the harm we have done. By pouring in close to $200 million to sustain a Marxist regime, we have abetted murder and torture. Thousands of citizens have had to flee for their lives. The Government has confiscated not only Bolivian-owned properties, but also those of U.S. citizens. Washington, in turn, taxes the latter in order to support and keep in office the selfsame Communists and crooks who seized the properties.

The squandering of much of these $80 billion on foreign aid destroys the value of our currency through inflation. It brings us closer to that national bankruptcy which Lenin sought, as a way to destroy our free Republic. Karl Marx, hoping to disrupt all constitutional government said: "The surest way to overturn the social order is to debauch the currency." In keeping with these precepts, both Lenin and Stalin declared that an essential for the spreading of communism was a program to aid underdeveloped areas. By our oversea giveaway system, we, like guileless innocents, have underwritten Communist plans for our own ruin. The Kremlin despots must roar with laughter at our naivete, as they promise to bury us.

H. Communists, to gain temporary benefits, will pact with anyone; with reactionary dictators, nationalists, or sworn anti-Communists. They both try to create new conflicts and to deepen those already existing. They gladly will reverse themselves, sacrifice and kill off their own agents, and always will go back two steps, in order later to take three forward.

Playing both ends against the middle, Communists often pretend to have intra-party disputes, one group supporting and the other opposing a particular government. This happened for a time vis-a-vis Peron in Argentina. However, they also have genuine and desperate schisms, such as arose between the Stalinists and Trotskyites. Such a cleavage may be starting now in Cuba between the older and younger generations of Communists. In this connection, I am not convinced so far of the sincerity of the so-called Movimiento de Recuperacion Revolucionario (the Movement to Recapture the Revolution). It might be a disguised group of Communists, who in an emergency, could be substituted for the Castro gang.

Since they grabbed Russia in 1917, the Communists have shown an almost unbelievable persistence; or, as my friend Bob Welch, of the John Birch Society, puts it, "A patient gradualism has been the most important key to the Communists' overwhelming success."

That has been their history in this hemisphere. After dismally failing to stir insurrection in Chile during late 1931, they attempted to seize power through a bloody revolution in El Salvador during 1932. Twenty thousand people lost their lives, and the Communists were defeated. (Please remember that only a few Communists, by murder and terror, can and have seized many countries.) They have persisted in their attempts to communize the Americas. Within the past year, Argentina, Mexico, and Uruguay have had to eject Soviet and satellite diplomats caught redhanded in subversion and espionage. During the last decade, Communist endeavors have been especially notable in Guatemala, Bolivia, and now, Cuba. It is by these patient, slow and periodic, perservering and insidious infiltrations that they expect eventually to demoralize, envelop, and then take over the United States. They have traveled far along this road.

I. When the Communists wish to seize control of a country, they try at an early stage, if possible, to wipe out the army, especially the officer corps. Certainly the assassination of at least 10,000 Polish officers in the Katyn Forest, largely contributed toward that poor nation's fall. The same procedure was followed successfully in China and other satellite countries. That the armed forces, especially the officers, were not eradicated in Spain, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, Argentina, and Venezuela, so far has saved these republics. But this well-known Communist tactic did prevail in Bolivia and Cuba, with dire results for those poor people.

J. It is foolish, as our inter-American conferences have done, to underscore international communism as the only danger. Any brand of Marxism, international or national, of which there are a wide variety in this hemisphere, is bad: Socialism, the "flop of the century," as it has been characterized by Max Eastman, himself a former Socialist, is merely a prep school for communism.

It is pertinent to observe that so inefficient is socialism, that it only can be made to work at all when propelled and protected by the authority and ruthlessness of a totalitarian police state, such as the U.S.S.R. If it were not for this, the Soviet and every other Communist government, long since would have gone down the drain.

The United States cannot beat communism, coupled with Soviet-Sino aggression and imperialism, if we ourselves sink into the ineptitude, impotence, and waste of collectivism, welfare statism, or that impalpable thing called social democracy. There are only two ways by which we can win:

1. By ourselves becoming the biggest and strongest totalitarian police state, with the consequent abandonment of all morality, liberty, and everything else we hold dear, or;

2. By forthwith throwing out, bag and baggage, the socialism which, as Norman Thomas boasts, has taken over our country, and by returning to the principles laid down by the Founding Fathers. If we will again become the constitutional representative republic which we are supposed to be; if we wholeheartedly will support free, private, competitive enterprise, then we will not only survive, but we can and will outproduce, outsell, and handily defeat any combination of Socialist states, totalitarian or otherwise, who dare to defy us.

Because of the relative underdevelopment, plus the large admixture of Indian (of Asiatic origin) and other non-Caucasian blood in much of Central and South America, the Communists long ago felt that Chinese methods of infiltration and guerrilla warfare would be best suited south of the Rio Grande. In the early twenties, promising young Communists from Latin America were trained in the "Yenan Way" by Mao Tse-tung, Chu Teh, Li Li Siang and their colleagues, in the outskirts of Moscow. Now, with certain exceptions, such as the sabotage school in Prague, the Chinese are becoming increasingly active in the subversion of this hemisphere. They inspire more confidence amongst intellectuals and students—even in the secondary schools—than do the Russians. Also, the Chinese brand of communism has been more readily accepted than the Muscovite. Unfortunately, the Cuban Government now is spreading its Red agents over the entire hemisphere; they are financed lavishly and are proving far more effective than those of any other nationality, including the Chinese. They go in the garb of diplomats, cultural, trade or labor delegations, or as simple tourists.

Castro and the Cuban Communists frankly proclaim their intentions to rule the Western Hemisphere, just as Messrs. Lenin, Stalin and Khrushchev, like Hitler and Mussolini, called their shots in advance. In 1924, Lenin in summary prophesied: "We shall take Eastern Europe; next the mass of Asia; then we can encircle that last bastion of capitalism, the United States of America. We shall not have to take it; it will fall like overripe fruit into our hands. [sic.] The Cuban Communists expect to be the hands.

Eastern Europe and most of Asia are gone. A part of the Middle East is lost, and the rest is wobbling. Western Europe trembles, and Africa is teetering.

The Communist Party claimed a worldwide membership of 4 million in 1937. Twenty years later, this had grown to 33 million—up over 800 percent. But far more serious than this increase in party membership, is the fact that since August, 1945, the Communists have averaged the enslavement of over 7,000 people per hour. At least 1,000 million people, non and anti-Communists, who 15 years ago were as free as you and I, now live in virtual slavery, behind Iron, Bamboo, and more recently, Sugar Curtains.

Washington for years, in an attempt to counter this grim offensive, has squandered the $80 billion I mentioned, and has placed our troops and bases all over the world. It has entered into NATO, SEATO, and other similar alliances. We citizens have had dinned in upon us that the Rhine and Berlin, Korea and Taiwan, and many other far-off spots are our real frontiers, and vital for the defense of the United States.

Yet, no administration since 1948 has given more than a passing thought, or done anything effective to protect our shores and this hemisphere from the very serious threats which have been growing up throughout the Caribbean area.

Repeatedly, from 1942 to 1947 I, officially by cable, dispatch and in person, warned the highest offices of our Government about the Communist danger in Cuba and Latin America, including the Peron regime in Argentina. Later I sounded the alarm about Guatemala. But on October 4, 1957, I went out of my way to tell the State Department that a continuation of its policies inevitably would bring Castro, chaos, and communism to Cuba. My warnings were ignored.

By use of the most dangerous of all Communist weapons, infiltration and subversion, beginning in 1947, power gradually was seized in the Republic of Guatemala by Presidents Arevalo and Arbenz, together with their Communist coconspirators. Fortunately, in 1954, the Communist regime was overthrown. The United States was blamed throughout Latin America for an intervention we had lacked the brains and initiative to carry through in our own defense.

What actually happened was that the President of Nicaragua, Tacho Somoza, had the courage, through his Ambassador in Washington, to buy planes and equipment for the Guatemalan colonel Castillo Armas, who chased the Communists out of his homeland. The State Department did nothing, until a group of ambassadors from the other American Republics in effect said, "You are being blamed for intervention in Guatemala. It doesn't matter what the truth is. You will be considered the culprits and accused of intervention. Therefore, you might as well help out, and quickly, because if you don't, Castillo Armas will lose, Arbenz will win, and then you will find a series of these little Communist dictators cropping up all over Central America."

Only then did we support Castillo Armas. Of course, there is the unfortunate sequel that both he and Tacho Somoza were assassinated, and there is good reason to believe that the Communists had a hand in that.

One glance around the Caribbean shows it is fast becoming a Red lake. The Communist, Jeddy Jegan, is top man in British Guiana. The French islands, such as Martinique, are represented in the Paris Parliament by Communists. Betancourt's government in Venezuela, while admittedly left-wing, nevertheless might be upset by the Communists any time. Panama is weak, and the comrades are infiltrating there, as they are trying to do again in Guatemala. Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic are under severe attacks. Trinidad demands that we get out of our military base at Chaguamaras.

Of all the Caribbean republics, by instinct and experience the least influenced by exotic totalitarianism has been Colombia. Yet since 1948, it has suffered continuously from Communist inspired and directed guerrilla bands operating in outlying districts. As a result in these areas, the national economy has been disrupted, agriculture paralyzed, thus raising the cost of living. The terrorized peasants, have had to seek refuge in the cities where they can find no work. The ensuing chaos has broken down law and order and eased the way for communism. This plan of the comrades has been executed slyly and effectively under the leadership of such Communists as Gerardo Molina and Jorge Salamea.

Because Cuba is the most dangerous spot in the Caribbean, I shall devote the rest of what I say today to the catastrophe which now engulfs that beautiful island and wonderful people.

(Parenthetically I should add that having been accredited as Ambassador to Batista during his first term of office as President, I am intimately acquainted with all of his bad as well as his good points. I also am fully informed of the many atrocities perpetrated during the closing years of his last administration. During that period, the Batista government could be compared to a serious

and painful ulcer. In contrast, under the present Communist regime, Cuba is suffering from a cancer which, with indescribable agony, will kill.)

If, by the grace of God, the Cuban Communist regime could be purged tomorrow, the effects of the economic and social, moral and spiritual evils it has wrought will endure for a very long time. This is part of a "burnt earth" policy always pursued by the Communists. If they cannot rule, they try to ruin.

Even at this late date, when the Communist nature of the Castro revolution should be apparent to a child, authorities in Washington profess to be puzzled by the Cuban situation [sic]. They cannot understand Castro's motives, and even declare that no one can assert that a Communist regime rules that unhappy island [sic].

Well, I do categorically and emphatically assert that Castro, his brother Raul, "Che" Guevarra, President Dorticós, and practically every other important official is a Communist, and that Cuba rapidly is coming just as much under Communist domination as the U.S.S.R., China, and any of the satellites or Yugoslavia. I further assert that this constitutes a grave threat to the United States, to our security, and that positive remedial measures must be taken immediately.

To substantiate my aforegiven assertions, let me briefly review the record for you: I learned quite a lot about Communists, their ways and foibles, while serving as Ambassador to Cuba from 1942–45, because all their activities throughout this hemisphere were directed from Havana by a man named Fabio Grobart—probably a Pole. The only exception was that propaganda among colored people, in and around the Caribbean, was run from Harlem. Grobart traveled under 11 aliases and 9 different passports. He was an extremely important man. He set up and ran the "Caribbean Bureau," which was a section or branch of the Cominform. Castro's so-called 26th of July movement (i.e., his revolutionary movement), is a direct outgrowth and descendant of the Caribbean Bureau, including much of the same membership.

I was fortunate enough in Cuba to destroy a Communist organization known as the National Anti-Facist Front. My action in this particular caused a bit of a rumpus with the Soviet diplomatic representative in Havana. It was then that I learned how a Communist will grovel and demean himself, when faced with superior force.

Some of the then well-known Communists, such as President Dorticós, Minister of State (Foreign Minister) Raul Roa, the two heads of INRA (the Agrarian Reform Institute) and many others, now, as a temporary expedient, pretend, just as Mao Tse-tung once did, not to be Communists, but simply agrarian reformers, seeking only the welfare of the masses. As members of the 26th of July movement, they are every bit as Communist as are Khrushchev and his Kremlin pals.

Also, while I was Ambassador in Havana, the notorious Harry Dexter White, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury of the United States tried to put over an insidious and clever scheme to establish a Central Bank and Cuban currency on such conditions as inevitably would have brought about so severe a financial and economic chaos as to open the way for the Communists. Again I was lucky enough to defeat those machinations and to learn some more about their worldwide conspiracy.

You will observe that our great and noble Russian ally, even in the midst of World War II, by patient gradualism, was trying to get a footing at our very threshold, just as it had been trying to do for more than 30 years previously. Nor is there anything new about Communist endeavors to take over Cuba.

As for Fidel Castro, in the university he was recognized as a Communist by such a distinguished professor as Carlos Marquez Sterling and by fellow students including his own former brother-in-law. He had a rival candidate for the presidency of the student organization assassinated. Even his stanchest advocate in the United States, Herbert Matthews of the New York Times, admits that Fidel, during the forties belonged to a young Communist group, and that he actively participated in the Communist-inspired and directed Bogotazo, which almost destroyed by fire the capital city of Colombia during the Inter-American Conference of 1948. The Bogatá police records are more precise and prove that Castro was a Communist, sent by his party to help bring on that disaster.

Castro trained for guerrilla warfare in Mexico, under the Spanish Communist colonel, now general, Bayo. When the Castro boys and their followers attacked the Moncada Barracks near Santiago in 1953 before being repulsed and captured, they killed, in typically Communist style, with their machetes and knives a dozen or so of the soldiers, who were sick in their hospital beds.

The brothers, while still revolutionaries in the eastern Cuban hills, reportedly received substantial arms and financial aid from the Soviet. During that period they gave another example of usual Communist tactics, when they kidnaped a number of United States and Canadian civilians, plus a score of marines, from our Guantanamo Naval Base. That the U.S. Government not only tolerated this indignity, but sent first one, and then two of its consular officers to the hills, to negotiate with these bandits, is one of the most disgraceful episodes in our history. Our acceptance of this outrage of course encouraged the Cuban Communists to further violence and insults. I might add that some of the scurrilities launched against the United States and President Eisenhower by Castro and his companions via the Havana press, radio and television, are unprepeatable in a polite company.

Fidel described his attack on the Moncada Barracks as the springboard from which he would take Cuba. And later, after Batista fled, he said Cuba would be the springboard from which he would take the hemisphere. In short, he hopes to be the "Mao-Tse-tung" of the Americas, and spearhead of what he calls the continental revolution.

But enough of the psychopath Fidel, and his brother Raul, who with his wife, were trained behind the Iron Curtain. Already too much attention has been given to the Castros, who at the most, are only important incidents in this whole affair. If Fidel continues to lose his influence over the masses and becomes expendable, he will be wiped out overnight, just as have been Beria and so many other top Communists in the Soviet, Czechoslovakia, and elsewhere. But the Communists will remain in power. Having assassinated him they might even blame the imperialistic Yankees and acclaim Fidel as a martyr.

Not only is the present Cuban Government largely manned by Communists, but everything it has done shows its true Red color and is in keeping with the normal, cruel procedures recommended by the Supreme Soviet.

(a) One of the first things it did after getting power was—in cold blood, with Communist-incited popular clamor replacing any pretense of justice or a fair trial—to shoot soldiers and police, mostly officers, and even some civilians. The Castro government admits to something over 600 being murdered in this bloodthirsty fashion. Other estimates range from 5 or 6 thousand to as high as 15 thousand.

(b) Many thousands more—probably upward of 30,000 Cuban citizens—have been imprisoned under the most shocking conditions of suffering, misery and torture.

Political prisoners, no more guilty of criminal or counterrevolutionary activities than are you ladies, are subjected to indescribably wicked and cruel tortures. Ernesto de la Fe, a well-known anti-Communist leader who opposed Batista, and whose forehead was severely cut by a jailer's gunlashing, is imprisoned on the Isle of Pines. He and many others are forced to work all day under the broiling tropical sun, but allowed only the equivalent of a small paper cup of water per day. Their insufficient food is mixed with offal and filth. The prisoners' cells and clothing are infested with vermin. Bayonets are run into the orifices of the body. Or the guards, getting bored, play such games as awakening a prisoner in the middle of the night, telling him his hour has come, marching him off, lining up the firing squad and shooting—but with blanks. What fun, what a sense of humor.

(c) The regular army and officer corps, having been killed, imprisoned, or otherwise disposed of, the usual Communist-led peasants', workers', women's and children's—even 7 to 10 years old—militias have been and are being established, just as has been done in China, Bolivia, and so many other Communist-controlled countries. This is just one more step toward totalitarian regimentation. Including these militias, Castro is mobilizing the largest army in Latin America, to total 135,000 men and women. His May 1, 1960, parade, with tanks, weapons, soldiers, and militia, imitated the Moscow show on a smaller but nonetheless impressive scale.

(d) With the sole exception of the Communists, every other political party has been wiped out. Castro has just proclaimed that he will not indulge the people in what he calls the "antidemocratic farce of elections."

(e) Systematically, private property is being confiscated without any compensation whatsoever, or even a receipt being given. The promise of payment in 4-percent, 30-year bonds has been broken. Up here, we have read of how approaching $1 billion worth of U.S. property has been or is being taken over, or as they call it, intervened, which is the same thing. To this should be added the huge confiscations of Cuban holdings from thousands of small businessmen and humble folk of very modest means.

The Government either has seized, or gradually is acquiring, at least a 51-percent control over all industry and commerce, banking, and business. On April 25, the Bank of Foreign Commerce was created to be the sole importer and exporter of products as may be to the national interest.

(f) The entire public is subjected to intensive around-the-clock propaganda, all with a furious pro-Communist and anti-U.S. content.

This mind conditioning of the Cuban people is good Communist practice. It is designed to prepare the ground for subsequent action.

Everyone, every nation, likes to feel they have friends, even protectors, who will stand by in times of stress. In Latin America, especially Cuba, that always has been the role of the United States. By their hate, hate, hate the U.S.A. program, the Communist hope to replace us with the U.S.S.R. in Cuban minds and hearts.

Parenthetically, this explains Cuba's renewal of diplomatic relations with the Kremlin, the trade agreement with Mikoyan, and the delivery to Havana, in Soviet tankers of oil and gasoline, which Cuba could buy far more cheaply from her neighbor, Venezuela.

(g) Education similarly is being converted to the Communist and "hate Yankee" lines. These themes are driven home in the press and over television and the radio, so that even the small children of respectable, anti-Communist citizens recite them by rote. Brainwashing is at a peak which is not even

exceeded in Russia, China, or any of the satellite countries.

English is no longer taught in the schools, and the history books have been altered to paint the United States as a tyrannical enemy, who for reasons of selfish gain, delayed the final victory in the Spanish-American War, thus sacrificing thousands of Cuban lives.

In all of this there is the additional tragic note that never were any people more warmly friendly to our country, than the Cubans of all classes.

(h) The Cuban 1940 Constitution has been violated in practically every clause by the words and actions of this Communist regime. No longer is there any separation of powers, review of government acts by the courts, nor equality and equity under the law. The judges are told what to do and how to rule or pass judgment. When a judge failed to condemn some aviators, pursuant to Castro's orders, he was shot for his pains. As in this case, the unconstitutional death penalty has been employed ruthlessly and repeatedly, as I have already described. Life, and the security of either person or property under law no longer exist in Cuba.

(i) Fundamental and human civil rights and freedoms are ignored completely.

(j) There is no real liberty of expression and opinion, nor of assembly.

(k) Everyone, including children, is encouraged to denounce members of their families, friends and neighbors for counter-revolutionary activity, which can be made to cover almost anything, such as not attending a Castro meeting. But the prime counterrevolutionary crime for which loss of property, arrest and even the death penalty may be imposed, is the slightest sign of anticommunism, or even noncommunism. Marinello, the head of the Communist Party, Foreign Minister Roa, and Castro all have declared that any attack on communism is an attack on Cuba [sic].

(l) Armed aggressions have been planned and perpetrated against Panama, Haiti, Nicaragua, Guatemala, the Dominican Republic, and even Paraguay, 5,000 miles to the south.

The attack last year on Panama evidently was aimed at the Madden Dam, which if it could be blown up, would close the canal for many, many months or even years.

The Cuban regime actively has pulled diplomatic wires to encourage Panama and Nasser to get together in order to force the United States out of the Canal Zone.

(m) Known criminals are given favors and preferences over political prisoners, and encouraged to beat them up. Sometimes, as a reward, criminals are freed to be given Government jobs.

A notorious criminal escaped from the United States has been naturalized and is a major in the Army. His special delight is sadistically to shoot the finishing bullet into the prisoners' heads as they lie wounded by the firing squad.

(n) Decrees and so-called penal laws are applied retroactively or ex post facto.

(o) No one, without special Government permission, can take out of the country more than $150, in any one year. Far worse than this, those men and women who are permitted to leave, often are stripped and searched in the most intimate and embarrassing fashion. Others can only get out of Cuba by escaping, just as do those fleeing from behind the Iron Curtain.

(p) Very few of the guajiros (peasants) have received the farmlands promised them under the so-called agrarian reform. Those who have, must work their farm under rigid official controls and can neither sell nor leave them to their heirs. Also, they easily can lose them at the whim of any minor government supervisor.

(q) Most of the confiscated lands and other properties have been converted into cooperatives owned and operated by the state. The workers, as in Russia, often receive smaller wages than before, and in all cases, are loaded down with new taxes, such as 4 percent for the Government's purchase of arms. As a result, their take-home pay is considerably less than before, and in a 40 percent to 50 percent devalued peso. As labor increasingly comes under the subjugation of the Communists, who now control the unions, it will sink into serfdom.

(r) Almost the first thing the Communists did on seizing power was to burn the files of the official anti-Communist bureau known as BRAC.

The number two man in that organization, Captain Castano, was a brilliant and highly competent young officer, who had been trained in the United States by CIA. He was completely nonpolitical. Nevertheless, within a few weeks after the revolution, he was shot summarily. It is reported that our embassy requested and was granted clemency for him.

(s) The most important inter-American multilateral treaties have been repudiated publicly by Fidel Castro, because his government did not sign them [sic]. It should be noted that the Caracas Charter, which he denounced, pledged all of the American republics to oppose and fight international communism.

(t) An unsuccessful attempt was made by Castro to subvert some Cuban priests to separate from Rome and form a Cuban Church. His proposition was rejected indignantly; he now attacks the church whenever opportunity presents.

(u) The official Government radio repeatedly has attempted to arouse Puerto Rican animosities against the United States, and even to encourage a Negro uprising in our Southern States. Cuban Communist agents actively are proselyting in the factories of Miami and elsewhere in Florida.

The Cuban regime, having denounced all of the great press associations, such as AP and UPI, as the instruments of Yankee imperialism, has established its own "Prensa Latina," which in reality is merely a branch of the Soviet information agency.

(v) As I have indicated, the Castro revolution, from its inception, has received every possible backing from international communism. Now, Cuba has been pledged a worldwide trade union boycott of all U.S. products, and a blockade of our ships, should we dare to enact any economic or other reprisal for the theft of property owned by our citizens. This proposal originated with the Mexican noncard carrying Communist, Vicente Lombardo Toledano.

(w) Russian, Czech, and other foreign Communist agents have been supplied with Cuban passports to facilitate their travels throughout this hemisphere.

(x) The Cuban Foreign Office has been trying desperately to convene a conference of so-called underdeveloped countries. Those so far invited are largely the Communist or neutralist nations of Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. The more responsible Latin American countries, such as Argentina and Chile, have refused to have anything to do with this proposition.

The intent of this conference clearly is to disrupt international relations, viciously attack the United States, and to demand at least $30 billion from us for development in Latin America.

On April 5, 1960, the World Conference of Young Communists convened in Havana. Four thousand attended, with all expenses paid by Cuba. Speakers from every country vied with one another in damning and insulting the United States and its people.

(y) Great numbers of Russian, Chinese, and other technicians have come to Cuba during the last year. On May 1, the International Marxist Day, Castro was accompanied on the reviewing stand by the representatives of the Soviet, Red China, Czechoslovakia, and other Communist countries.

There is even some reason to believe that the very secret work known to be going on in the Zapata swamps, involves the construction of missile pads under the guidance of some of the Soviet technicians. There are reports that the U.S.S.R. also is installing a submarine base.

(z) Cuba's Communist Minister of Foreign Relations, Roa, was an unmitigated liar when he accused President Ydigoras of Guatemala and the United Fruit Co. of planning an attack on Cuba. This is good Communist procedure: Always to accuse the opponent of what one is doing himself. In view of the timidity shown in Washington, it is pertinent to observe that Ydigoras promptly has broken diplomatic relations with Cuba.

The aforegiven listing of Communist activities by the Cuban Government from "a" to "z," could be extended manyfold. But I will spare you the numerous other harrowing details.

I trust from what I have said that you will agree with me that:

1. Few people in this country or the hemisphere have any real comprehension of the true nature of the vast and complicated Communist conspiracy. They must be alerted and made to take positive and constructive steps for the safety of the United States and all the Americas;

2. The Communists' infiltrations and subversions have produced such fantastic results that they now control 40 percent of the world's population. Even this does not give the full picture because if we could count on all our allies, which I doubt, there still are left among the remaining 60 percent, many hundreds of millions of neutralists, who even if they do not oppose or fight us, never will be of any help;

3. The situation is almost terrifying in its connotations for the security of the United States, especially now that communism is advancing all around the Caribbean, with main objectives being Panama and Cuba, the latter of which now is completely in the enemy's hands. Of course, the ultimate target is the United States;

4. It is apparent that the State Department is utterly oblivious to this major threat looking to the final subjugation of the United States. It either has ignored or treated the situation with timidity and vacillation for years, thus making it all the more perilous. It has forgotten that never in history has appeasement paid and that if Cuban Communists get away with kicking us in the teeth, others soon will follow suit.

Anti-Communists throughout Latin America, because of our pusillanimous attitudes, are discouraged and do not dare force a bold and positive initiative against our common enemy;

5. In self-defense, it is our right, under the Organization of American States and the United Nations Charters, and infinitely more important, under God's law, that we should take immediate and forthright action to end this threat to our Nation and our very lives;

6. Any further delays in saving Cuba may be fatal for them and for us. Among the steps which still can be taken are:

Here at home, get rid of all Communist agents and infiltrators along with their stooges.

Stop paying Cuba nearly double the world price of sugar, or a premium of about $150 million per year. True, the Cuban people might temporarily suffer, but they would benefit in the end by ridding themselves of their Communist masters. This measure should have been used over a year ago, when it would have been far more effective.

Stop all foreign aid to Communist nations, including Cuba, and eliminate all the extravagance, waste, and corruption involved in these foreign aid programs. In other words, we should put ourselves in fighting trim to resist the Communist infiltrations and subversions which now are right at our own front door.

Make amply clear to Khrushchev, Castro, and company, that we will no longer tolerate their insults, robbery of our citizens' properties, and economic or armed aggressions; and that if these things do not stop, we will break diplomatic relations. The mere threat of such action in Cuba, even at the late date, would weaken that Communist government greatly.

Give full support in every appropriate way, to a group of responsible Cubans, who with such aid, can and will free their country from the Communist tyrants, and return it to constitutional representative government.

It is these things to which I trust you ladies will give your support, thereby helping to force the Congress and administration in Washington to courageous and positive action.

God have mercy on our country.

Leadership Where Leadership Is Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to attend the opening session of the 63d annual convention of the Zionist Organization of America, held at the Hotel Statler in New York City.

The principal speaker was the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY. He properly used the occasion for the delivery of a most important statement on American foreign policy. This was not the statement of a candidate for high public office but rather a declaration of sincere and strong-minded principle by one who will seek to implement the ideals he lives by and cherishes.

Senator KENNEDY's full statement is as follows:

President [Abraham A. J.] Redelheim, Rabbi [Abba Hillel] Silver, Mayor Wagner, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored by your generous invitation to speak here tonight. I had the opportunity 14 years ago as a newly elected Member of Congress to hear one of the greatest speeches that I have heard in all of my life given on the cause which interests you so much tonight in the city of Boston by your great guest here tonight, Rabbi Silver.

Prohpecy is a Jewish tradition, and the world Zionist movement in which you have played such a great role has continued this long tradition. It has turned the dreams of its leaders into acts of statesmanship. It has converted the hopes of the Jewish people into the concrete facts of life.

When the first Zionist convention met in 1897 Palestine was a wasted, neglected land. A few scattered Jewish colonies had settled there. But they had come there to die, not to live. Most of the governments of the world were indifferent.

But all this now has changed. Israel has become a triumphant reality, exactly 50 years after Theodore Herzl, the prophet of Zionism proclaimed its inevitability. It was the classic case of an ancient dream finding a young leader, for Herzl was only 37 years of age.

YOUTH NO BARRIER

Perhaps I may be allowed that observation because the Jewish people ever since David slew Goliath have never considered youth as a barrier to leadership or measured maturity and experience by length of days.

I spent 2 weeks in Palestine in 1939. There the neglect and ruin left by centuries of the Ottoman Empire were slowly being transformed under conditions of the utmost difficulty by labor and sacrifice. But Palestine was still a land of promise in 1939 rather than a land of fulfillment.

I went back in 1951. In 3 years this new state had opened up its doors to 600,000 people. The United States, composed of 175 million people, has an immigration of all we can take, we say, of 250,000 a year. Even while fighting for its own survival Israel has given hope to the persecuted all over the world, and it has given a new dignity to those who believe in religious freedom in every part of this globe.

I left with a conviction that though the United Nations had given international status to Israel, nevertheless, Israel had been made a nation by its own exertions.

And it has claims to immortality. Some do not agree.

ATTACKED BY CAIRO RADIO

Three weeks ago I said in a public statement Israel is here to stay. The next day I was attacked by the Cairo radio rebuking me for my faith in Israel and quoting this criticism from Arabic newspaper Al-Gomhouria: "As for the question of the existence and nonexistence of Israel," the paper says, "Mr. KENNEDY says that Israel has been created in order to exist. And we say that Israel will not continue to exist. Time will judge between us, Mr. KENNEDY.

I agree. Time will judge between us whether Israel will continue to exist or not.

But I wish I could be as sure of my prophesy about this November as I am about my prophesy on this occasion.

It is worth remembering at this meeting that the cause of Israel stands beyond Jewish life. In our pluralistic society, as Bob Wagner pointed out, it has not been merely a Jewish cause, any more than Irish independence was the cause merely of those of Irish descent, because wherever freedom exists, there we are all committed. And wherever it is endangered, there we are all endangered.

The ideals of zionism have, in the last half century, been endorsed by both parties, and Americans of all ranks in all sections. Friendship for Israel is not a partisan matter. It is a national commitment.

Yet within this national obligation of friendship there is a special obligation on the party of which I am a member. It was President Woodrow Wilson who prophesied with great wisdom a Jewish homeland. It was President Franklin Roosevelt who kept alive the hope of Jewish redemption in the days of the Nazi terror. It was President Harry Truman who first—my friend Harry Truman—who first recognized (I've only been able to say that since last Saturday, but I'm saying it), who first recognized the status of Israel in world affairs.

And may I add that it would be my hope and pledge to continue this great Democratic tradition, to be worthy of it, to be associated with it, for what is needed now is leadership—impartial but firm, deliberate but bold, leadership instead of rhetoric.

There has been enough rhetoric in recent years about free transit through the Suez Canal to float every boat through it, but there has been no leadership. Our policy in Washington and in the United Nations has permitted defiance of our 1956 pledge with impunity—indeed, with economic reward.

If America's word to the world is to have any meaning, if the decisions and resolutions of the United Nations are to be binding on all parties, if the mutual security amendments, which I cosponsored with Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, is to have meaning, if the clear, thoughtful language of the Democratic platform is to have meaning—the influence of this Nation and other maritime powers must be brought to bear on a just solution that removes all discrimination from the Suez Canal.

A MORAL OBLIGATION

The Israelis surrendered their 1956 victory only because the United States and the United Nations committed themselves to the fulfillment of a pledge of free transit in the Suez Canal. So this is a United Nations resolution, in which we have a particular moral obligation.

We have also had much rhetoric in recent years about the arms race in the Middle East. This rhetoric has not only been empty and negative; even more fundamental is the premise that if the United States and the United Nations are to reject a solution based on force then they must accept the task of finding a solution based on reason and justice.

When I talked with Prime Minister David Ben-Gurion on his recent visit to the United States, he told me of dangerous signs of unrest which existed then under the seeming quiet of the Middle East. For there is no peace in that region today, only an embittered truce between renewed alarms.

American intervention, on the other hand, will not now be easy, for the record is not one to which we can point with pride. The series of incredible American blunders which led to the 1956 Suez crisis, events in which the role of our Government has never been fully explained; the so-called Eisenhower doctrine which had been repudiated by the very nations which accepted our aid, and, in general, a deterioration in our relations with all Middle Eastern countries primarily because neither Arab nor Israeli know exactly where we stand or exactly what we mean.

PUNISHMENT FOR VIRTUES

At times it must have appeared that champions of democracy were being punished for their very virtues by being taken for granted, by a neglectful administration which showed concern only when it was displeased by their conduct.

Peace in the Middle East is not one step nearer reality than it was 8 years ago, and the Russian influence has increased immeasureably.

What can a new President do? Moral weakness and timidity will not do. More stubborn errors, redeemed at the last minute, will not do. Now we must take the risk of leadership and use our influence to compose this ugly situation before it breaks out in a new threat to peace.

And I know we will not be alone in searching for a peaceful solution, if our aims are high, and if they are centered solely on the genuine needs of the people of the Middle East, and on an honorable end to an ancient quarrel.

First, I propose that the new President reaffirm our sincere friendship for all people in the Middle East, whatever their religion or their race or their politics.

Secondly, I propose that we make it crystal clear that the United States meant what it said in the tripartite declaration of 1950 that we will act promptly and decisively against any nation in the Middle East which attacks its neighbor.

MAKE INTENTIONS CLEAR

I propose that we make clear to both the Israelis and the Arabs our guarantee that we will act with whatever force and speed is necessary to halt any aggression by any nation.

I propose that an international effort be made to limit an arms race in the Middle East with a realization—with a realization that if this is not accomplished we shall not permit an imbalance to exist which threatens the right of any country to self-defense.

Once the nations of the Middle East have a firm and precise guarantee, then the need for continuing an arms race can disappear, the easing of tension can follow, and both sides will be able to devote their energy to peaceful pursuits.

Third, I propose that all the authority of the White House be used to call into conference the leaders of Israel and the Arab States to consider privately their common problems, assuring that we support in full their aspirations for peace, unity, independence, and a better life; and that we are prepared to back up this moral commitment with economic and technical assistance.

The offer should be made with equal frankness to both sides and all the world would be watching the response of each side. I sincerely believe that an American Presidential initiative, honestly intended and resolutely pursued, would not be lightly rejected by either side, unless that side was prepared to bear the burden of breaking the peace.

And I promise to waste no time in taking that initiative. The Middle East needs water, not war. They need tractors, not tanks, and they need bread, not bombs.

There is already little enough in that sandy soil to be wasted on a dizzy arms race on both sides, an arms race which could be prevented if guarantees of security were provided. For the original Zionist philosophy always maintained that the people of Israel would use their national genius not for selfish purposes, but for the enrichment of the Middle East.

The earliest Zionist leaders spoke of a Jewish state which would have no military power and which would be content with victories of the spirit. The compulsions of a harsh and inescapable necessity have compelled Israel to abandon this hope. But I cannot believe that anyone in Israel tonight wants to live their lives out in a garrison state. And I cannot believe that the Arab world would not find a better basis for unity in a united attack against all of their accumulated social problems—an attack in which they could benefit immensely from a closer association with the people of Israel.

The people of Israel have brought their blessings to people all over the world, to Burma and Ghana and Ethiopia. Why should the countries of the Middle East which need technical assistance, why should they be denied this opportunity to participate in a great source of future wealth for them and their people?

It is a long and painful step, may I say, from the era of the boycott to the era of peaceful partnership. And that step needs the direct encouragement and help of the people of the United States and the President of the United States. The next President of the United States, whoever he may be, should always be available first to stimulate every experiment in cooperation, from the joint development of a river to a reconsideration of the Arab refugee problem, suggested I think best by the Democratic platform, to the crowning mercy of a final reconciliation that can be brought about by a true peace settlement.

Peace is our objective in the Middle East and peace is the objective of Israel, and peace is our responsibility in part. "Seek peace and pursue it," says the Psalmist. And that we must do—open up our minds and our hearts and we shall seek peace for ourselves and all who share our aspirations: And when history writes its verdict, let it say that we pursued peace with all of our courage, that we did everything that we could do with our hands to make sure that the blessing was brought to our children and all those who think as we do.

We are in this country the youngest of people. But we are the oldest of republics. Now is our chance in this country to extend the hand of friendship to the oldest of people and the youngest of republics.

Community Program Set Up by Junior Chamber of Commerce of Oconto, Wis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the future progress of this country, despite the illusion which, regrettably, has grown over the years that the Federal Government is the major driving force of progress, I believe, rests fundamentally with the communities of our country.

True, Uncle Sam does have responsibilities in major fields of national scope—particularly in defense.

However, there is also basically a need for grassroots support and leadership in promoting progress.

Recently I welcomed, therefore, a report of a forward-looking effort by the Junior Chamber of Commerce of Oconto, Wis., to set up a community development program. Initially, the chamber is conducting a survey of manpower, natural, human, financial, and other resources.

The purpose is to provide a foundation upon which to build a better future for the community.

Reflecting the spirit of independence and enterprise which I have long felt should be revived and strongly encouraged in our country, as well as a brief view of its splendid objectives, I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the Green Bay Press-Gazette printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Green Bay Press-Gazette, Aug. 23, 1960]

COMMUNITY PROGRAM SET UP BY OCONTO JUNIOR CHAMBER

OCONTO.—General and specific goals for 1960–61 that have been drawn up by officers and directors of the Oconto Junior Chamber of Commerce sound interesting for the future of this community.

The general goals are:

1. To bring together the young men of Oconto in an organized effort to serve the community and, at the same time, train members in roles of leadership and organization which is required in some form of all young men.

2. To interest and engage the youth of the community in wholesome, educational activities so that they may find their hometown a good place to live and play.

3. To establish a healthy interest in Oconto by all of its citizens.

4. To encourage new businesses and to assist the established ones in making Oconto the ideal place to work and raise a family.

The specific goals laid down by Oconto Jaycees for the year ahead are:

"1. To conduct a survey among the citizens of Oconto so that we can best determine her needs, her likes and dislikes, and then establish a program by which we can best serve, solve and fulfill.

"2. To strengthen the junior chamber of commerce in the eyes of the community and her members by a planned program of growth and internal development.

"3. To cooperate with and assist, where possible, the State, national, and international organizations with which we are affiliated.

"4. To see that all young men have the opportunity to take part in the Jaycees program and are properly recognized for doing so."

Dan Stemper is the 1960–61 president. J. T. "Terry" Durkin and Richard J. Pinkart are first and second vice presidents. Norman Noah is secretary and Garner Sowle is secretary. Robert Telford, Corliss Lightner and Randolph R. Virgin are directors.

The Threat of Centralized Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Monroe (La.) Morning World, Aug. 21, 1960]

VIEWS OF OUR READERS

MONROE.—It is deeply regrettable, but true—and the recent national conventions of both the Democratic and Republican Parties have clearly pointed up the dangerous trend—that our Federal government is moving, faster and faster, further and further away from the people. Centralized government in Washington is seriously threatening, through shameful responses to political expediency, to literally destroy our constitutional system of government.

Thomas Jefferson, surely one of the greatest men in American history, warned against the danger of centralization as early as 1822. That year, he wrote:

"If ever this vast country is brought under a single government, it will be a government of corruption."

Today, 138 years later, we realize—and even more acutely so now, in the light of the extreme platform declarations of the two national political parties—how justified Thomas Jefferson was. Unfortunately, however, not only are his warnings going unheeded, but they are being repudiated by the ultraliberal and liberal elements in both major parties, who hold the reins of control. And now, therefore, crushing momentum is being applied to the movement to tamper with our Federal system for the short-lived benefit of shortsighted politicians.

A gravely dangerous example of such heedless tinkering with our precious heritage is, of course, the reckless drive—for which both the national Democratic and Republican campaign platforms have declared full speed ahead—to push the Federal Government ever further into the field of so-called civil rights. Certain of the extremist politicians have discovered that the issue of civil rights has all the elements of political magic.

So, these advocates of increased Federal powers are concentrating, as all of us are

well aware, not only on interference with the States' control over the franchise, but also on education and numerous other vital areas of State and local jurisdiction—attacks which, in fact, constitute assaults on the Constitution itself. Once the elections and the schools, for example, should be controlled by Washington, the centralized Government of which Thomas Jefferson warned, would be upon us.

The freedoms we enjoy will endure only so long as our Federal system endures. In order to preserve that system, we must keep the Federal Government out of education—especially. We cannot allow Washington to get a foot in the door of our schools. If it should succeed in penetrating our schools, there would be no stopping point. Conceivably, all the schools throughout the United States would sooner or later be coordinated so as to turn out robots in accordance with Washington blueprints.

Admittedly, we are losing the battle now. But that does not necessarily mean we will lose the ultimate victory.

We must never lose sight of the fact that our great American heritage is worth protecting and preserving. Every generation owes it to itself to safeguard that precious heritage so that succeeding generations may be the recipients of our labors and may, too, enjoy living under the greatest form of government ever conceived by the mind of man.

Our plans, all our hopes, all our dreams—indeed, our very lives—depend on the continued support and defense and maintenance of constitutional government in our country.

In the long run, we will not fail.

OTTO E. PASSMAN,
Member of Congress.

The Soil Bank Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, there have been many articles written about the soil bank program, both as to its virtues and its shortcomings. The most ardent support for the program comes from areas where people have contributed little in the way of placing land under the soil bank program.

I think that Members of the Senate would be greatly interested in reading a thought-provoking letter from one who has had an opportunity to observe this program in operation firsthand. This letter, a copy of which was sent to me, was written by Rev. Richard D. Vangerud, of Bottineau, N. Dak., to the editor of the Atlantic Monthly.

I ask unanimous consent to have Reverend Vangerud's letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with his transmittal letter to me.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST LUTHERAN CHURCH,
Bottineau, N. Dak., August 23, 1960.

The Honorable MILTON R. YOUNG,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YOUNG: Inclosed find a letter addressed to the Atlantic Monthly which is a hasty sketch of the thoughts in respect to the soil bank that cross my mind as I gaze across the prairies of Bottineau County and mix with its people.

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. VANGERUD.

AUGUST 23, 1960.

The EDITOR, THE ATLANTIC MONTHLY,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial in the July Atlantic to me was one of the most fair discussions of the farm situation I have read. The trend to the soil bank that you discuss is a trend that can cause real concern. To be sure this trend is causing real socioeconomic problems in the towns and cities dependent on the rural economy as well as to the open country areas. The statistics are real people caught in these forces. However, the problems that cause me concern are the moral and religious questions involved.

Every vocation needs a religious-moral purpose in which a man seeks to express himself purposefully in serving his God and his fellow men. A man needs to have a feeling of being useful, that his life has a real purpose. If this need is obliterated in reducing a life calling to a mere economic formula the moral, creative worth of the individual is destroyed.

Farming stands high as a vocation with a real purpose. The farmer has the calling to produce food for the human race and to conserve his soil for unborn generations. If this sense of purpose is divorced from his calling his dignity as a creative human being is eroded. If making money is the only goal in life there would be no real moral question involved, but if there is a higher goal the farmer's dignity as a human being is being destroyed by any farm program that does not look beyond mere economics.

To me, it seems, that the soil bank is guilty of destroying the moral-religious purpose in the farmers calling. The farmer is paid for not carrying out the basic purpose of his vocation. There are cases, of course, where taking land out of production may be necessary for the purpose of conservation. There is land that should never have been put into cultivation. In such cases a program of assistance such as the soil bank or something related does serve the religious-moral purpose of conservation, however, the entire soil bank cannot be written off in this sense.

I still feel that the real problem is not overproduction. It is rather faulty distribution. The negative approach of controlling production certainly is not the solution in the world of 1960 where starvation is the rule for the world's people. There is a need for the farmer to produce bread for the hungry, for the hungry are certainly with us. We should not blame the farmer for expressing his God-given purpose in abundant production. The world has a need for this production.

Long-range programs that are positive and forward looking should have priority and not the expedient of the moment. The solutions should not counter the religious-moral purpose of the farmer's vocation. In addition to the problem of international distribution that needs a solution there is the local need of planning to meet the food needs of the future. Perhaps incentive should be given to meet these needs. Water diversion programs that would help transfer areas now limited to small grain production into diversified farm areas merits consideration. This is out of my field, but I am certain that our creativity as an American people is capable of something greater than paid curtailment.

Again, what will be the end result of a farm program that will not let the farmer express his religious-moral reason for being? What will its result be on the farmer? What will its result be on the American Nation as a whole? I feel that a farm program that will stand the test of time should let the farmer creatively express the religious-moral purpose of his vocation—to produce food for man and beast, to conserve the soil for generations yet to come.

Sincerely,

RICHARD D. VANGERUD.

Technical Assistance Program for the United States of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELIZABETH KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mrs. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation (H.R. 13077) providing a new approach to the problem of Federal assistance for areas of persistent and substantial unemployment. I am placing in the RECORD at this point the following news release explaining the bill:

In an effort to break the deadlock between the President and Congress over assistance to economically depressed areas, Congresswoman ELIZABETH KEE, Democratic, of West Virginia, offered this week a new approach to the problem of areas with substantial and persistent unemployment.

Mrs. KEE proposed creating a $75 million area assistance fund within the Department of Commerce to be loaned to States which come up with programs to attract new industries. Only areas with 6 percent of the labor force unemployed over a period of years could qualify for loans.

"The neglect of this serious national program verges on a national disgrace," Mrs. KEE declared.

"On two occasions, Congress has passed what I believed was sound legislation. The President disagreed with this particular approach and vetoed the legislation.

"The time has come to get off of dead center. This new approach offers a plan of effective aid to States which desperately need it, and at the same time should be acceptable to the President.

"There is no reason why Congress cannot pass such a program at this session. Extensive hearings have been held. There is complete agreement on the nature of the problem. The only difficulty has been in agreeing on a program."

Under Mrs. KEE's plan, States would be required to provide at least 25 percent of the cost of any project.

Loans could be used for the purchase and development of land, construction of new facilities and buildings, rehabilitation of abandoned plants, and alteration or conversion of existing plants. Loans cannot be used to finance transfer of establishments if such transfers will result in increase in unemployment in the area of the original location.

Mrs. KEE's proposal also authorized appropriating $1.5 million to be granted to the States to make studies of possible economic growth.

"These are technical assistance grants," Mrs. KEE declared. "It is the same type of activity as that conducted abroad with U.S. funds under the technical assistance program. It has worked aboard and there is no reason why the Federal Government cannot make a modest contribution toward economic rehabilitation in areas of this country which are desperately in need of help."

Mrs. KEE said the program is keyed to creating new jobs to provide work for unemployed persons, and added "In West Virginia, we have an outstanding labor force. These men do not want handouts. They want jobs."

An Unwise Cut in Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "An Unwise Cut in Foreign Aid," published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of August 26, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN UNWISE CUT IN FOREIGN AID

The action yesterday of the Senate-House conference committee on the President's foreign aid appropriations bill comes as a sharp disappointment in view of the wise and vigorous action that had been taken in the Senate only the day before.

Where the Senate had approved a $3,989,054,000 measure, thereby restoring virtually all of the House cuts in the administration aid request, the conference committee agreed to a compromise figure of $3,722,350,000.

This is, of course, better than the original bill passed by the House, which had provided $132,600,000 less. And, in this respect, the conference committee bill represents something of a concession to the administration. But it is a rebuff as well, for it falls far short of the amount of aid the President, as well as Senate leaders, have repeatedly stated was necessary if the United States was to carry out its obligations to its friends in the free world.

As a result, foreign aid supporters in both Senate and House should fight to strengthen the aid bill before final passage.

As approved by the conference committee, the bill does retain two worthwhile features, added as amendments in the Senate, which reflect the growing tension in the Caribbean. One would cut off foreign aid funds to any nation supplying arms or economic assistance to Cuba. The other would apply the same penalty to any nation providing arms to any Latin American country being subjected to sanctions by the Organization of American States—which means the Dominican Republic.

Considering Secretary of State Herter's warning that Cuba was becoming a beachhead for Communist infiltration of the Western Hemisphere, there can be no argument about the amendment aimed at Fidel Castro. And, in the case of the Trujillo dictatorship, that ban should have been adopted years ago.

But so far as the money provisions of the new bill are concerned, Congress owes it to the country and the free world to strengthen the economic defenses of our friends, to help them stand up to Communist blandishments and threats. And, if Congress finds itself in too much of a hurry to do anything about restoring the needed funds before adjourning its bobtail session, it should certainly repair the damage when it reconvenes for a full session in January.

Friendly Relations Between Sewart Air Force Base and People of Nashville, Tenn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CARLTON LOSER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. LOSER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of the letter Brig. Gen. Frederick J. Sutterlin, Sewart Air Force Base, Tenn., received from Mr. Thomas D. Tenpenny, director, retail division, Nashville Chamber of Commerce, which praises the existing relationship between Sewart and Nashville.

The people of Nashville are proud to have this relationship with the Sewart Air Force Base, which is rendering such outstanding service to our country.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the letter from the Nashville Chamber of Commerce which, I believe, will be of interest to you. The letter follows:

NASHVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Nashville, Tenn., July 15, 1960.

Brig. Gen. FREDERICK J. SUTTERLIN,
Commanding General,
839th Air Division,
Sewart Air Force Base, Tenn.

DEAR GENERAL SUTTERLIN: On behalf of the directors of the retail division of the Nashville Chamber of Commerce, I express to you our delight and congratulations on your new command at Sewart. Your record of outstanding service to our country speaks for itself and we are honored to welcome you.

The chamber of commerce has long recognized the vital role that Sewart Air Force Base has played in the development of our area. The past contribution has been tremendous and the future indicates even greater things for all of us.

At the regular November board of directors meeting of the retail division, Colonel Bane attended and presented to our directors a very factual and informative breakdown of the operations at Sewart with particular emphasis placed on your base commissary and post exchange. The retailers of Nashville are, of course, interested in all possible retail markets and the fullest development of their potential. With this in mind, you can understand their keen interest in the commissaries and post exchanges of all military installations in the Middle Tennessee area. Upon completion of his presentation, Colonel Bane extended to our board an invitation to visit Sewart and see first-hand the operations carried on and we accepted this invitation and on March 22 we made this visit.

This not only was a delightful trip but it was certainly informative in every respect giving us a greater knowledge of the excellent program being carried on there. This trip helped us to realize fully the vital role the commissary and post exchange play in the overall operation of Sewart Air Force Base and any misgivings our retailers had concerning these were certainly dispelled. Our directors feel that the money saved by the families at Sewart through shopping on the base finds its way into the Nashville economy and we commend these operations as they now exist exclusively for the military personnel and their families.

It is our opinion that the relationship that now exists between Sewart and Nashville in both a social and business way is the best we have ever known. We here in Nashville are proud of this relationship and we feel that you share these sentiments with us.

Best wishes and kindest personal regards.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS D. TENPENNY,
Director, Retail Division.

Politics and the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virgina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Politics and the Aged," from a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLITICS AND THE AGED

The Senate's action on medical care for the aged should meet with general approval—from the aged, the middle-aged and the young. For the measure which finally was approved, while probably not adequate for the long pull, is at least a substantial step in the right direction. And, of greater importance, it was a step which was politically feasible at this time.

Under its terms, Federal payments will be increased for medical assistance to those on State relief rolls and similar help will be extended to elderly persons who are not on relief but who lack the means to pay their own medical bills. Since this is similar to a House-approved bill, the outlook is favorable for final congressional approval, acceptance by the President and inauguration of the new benefits on October 1. This is more than can be said for the Javits proposal, backed by Mr. NIXON, and the Anderson amendment, supported by Senator KENNEDY. Had the Senate passed either of these, there would have been little chance of surviving House opposition or a presidential veto.

Of all the proposals, the ANDERSON-KENNEDY approach, in our judgment, is the least desirable. It would graft medical aid onto the social security structure, thereby setting up what Senator JAVITS described as a "national program which at the very least, in view of the unequal nature of medical facilities in different parts of the country, must lead to inherent discrimination, injustice and frustrating delays."

Commenting on this, Senator KENNEDY said he thought it would be "most unwise" to accept the principle that the Federal Government and the States "will operate with all the different standards which are going to be set up in the different States, with some States participating and many not participating." Assuming that the Senator is correct in this forecast, we still fail to see why such a procedure would be most unwise. The people of Virginia, acting through their locally elected legislators, may wish to set up standards which differ from those preferred by the people of New York and their legislators. If so, what is wrong with this? Available facilities will vary from State to State, and so will the cost of providing care.

Why should the Federal Government seek to to impose its standards, regardless of local wishes, local costs, and local facilities?

Senator KENNEDY made another comment which is open to question. Medical care, he said, should be placed under a system the people themselves will pay for rather than burden the Federal and State Governments with the cost. But this is hardly a valid distinction. For the people, meaning the taxpayers, are going to pay the costs of medical care either in higher social security taxes or in higher general taxes. In the end, the cost will come out of the pockets of the taxpayers, or, if Senator KENNEDY prefers, the people. The only other way would be to foot the bill through the device of deficit financing, and we don't think Senator KENNEDY would advocate this inflationary approach which, in the long run, would rob everybody.

Our feeling, after reviewing the debate, is that the Senate was wise to adopt the Finance Committee's bill at this bobtailed session. If something more comprehensive is needed, there will be time enough next year. Senator KENNEDY seems to think that the defeat of the Anderson amendment gives him an issue which he can carry to the voters. Whether it will be a good issue, politically speaking, we do not know. But we are quite certain that a better medical care plan, if something more is needed, can be worked out next year when a new Congress will be comparatively free from the harsh pressures of presidential politicking.

Economic Aid to India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, India is perhaps the most important uncommitted country in the world today. Many Americans inside and outside of Government are giving continued and serious thought to means of keeping India on the side of the free nations of the world.

In this connection, economic assistance has been an important consideration.

Last year, one of my young constituents, John McG. Smith, of Waterbury, Conn., now aged nine, wrote his most interesting observations of the Washington scene.

This year he has written a prescription for a means of giving economic aid to India which is a model of terseness, as well as completeness, and could form a pattern for foreign affairs experts of more mature years.

I am including below his contribution:

I think someone who knows the Indian language should go over to India with some farm tools and help parts of India.

He should make speeches and boost up their courage by helping with the tractor. Tell them why they should have schools and hospitals. They could make a big creater with walls around it and catch the water. Then they could make irracation ditches or pipelines to ponds, wells, and fields.

After awhile all India would be on there own two feet and fighting for freedom and they will get it. The trouble is who will do it. I think any brave man should do it for India's good.

Losing the World While Keeping Our Souls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER THORNBERRY
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like very much to commend to the Members of the Congress for attention and study a very thoughtful sermon of deep significance delivered by Dr. Madison C. Scott, pastor of the First Baptist Church, of Austin, Tex., to his congregation on Sunday, August 7, 1960, and again to the members of the Austin Rotary Club.

The sermon, "Losing the World While Keeping Our Souls," is as follows:

LOSING THE WORLD WHILE KEEPING OUR SOULS

(St. Mark 8: 36)

As you can see, the title of this sermon has to do with losing the world. But paradoxically I really want to talk about keeping the world, if possible. Do you remember the typing exercise you used to type in your high school classes, "Now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their country"? I am afraid that this statement is no more a typing exerise. I think it has become an inescapable truth in these times. If there ever was a time when good men—not demagogs or chauvinists—but good men—not men of panic and alarm—but good men of courage and character—should come to the aid of their country, that time is now.

Patriotism has been defined as "love of country; devotion to the welfare of one's country." It could be defined more specifically as devotion to the way of life found in a country. Love of country surely means reverence for institutions, belief in social patterns, and devotion to ideals that are a basic part of the life of a nation. For many a sterling patriot has come from a country that had little to offer physically beyond severe climate, forbidding mountains, and storm-lashed coasts.

Dr. Samuel Johnson did say that patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel," but it may also be the proud belief of a man who feels himself to be brother not only to men in his own country but also to men around the world, for the thoughtful man quickly sees that the ideals and institutions he cherishes in his own home are basically the same which millions cherish in their countries, north and south, east and west, around this earth.

The patriot is forced to look beyond his own national boundaries, for love of country is love of things within that country, and, to be true to himself, a patriot must love these things wherever they are found, in whatever measure they are found. I think it is correct to say that what the true patriot loves is a way of life, if you please, a civilization.

In these days of world turbulence, it is important to define civilization. Will Durant said, "Civilization is social order promoting cultural creation." I think that definition can be expanded. I think it can be said that civilization is human existence that defines man as less than man unless free, as less than human unless morally responsible for others, and as less than civilized unless possessed of the leisure and incentive to make enduring contributions of mind and spirit to those generations that will follow. True civilization provides freedom by which men grow in courage and character and the leisure and incentive because of which men contribute meaningfully to human life upon this planet. And it is for these things that the heart of any patriot worthy of the name beats with excitement. Our patriotism is best when it is a devotion, a force that will keep alive such things as freedom, decency, and human dignity not only at home but around the world.

Yet, there is a way of life upon this earth today, called in some quarters a great civilization, "the new age," that is not concerned with the freedom and decency and dignity of the individual, that is in point of fact, disastrously destructive of these values. Boris Pasternak says of the Communist government in Russia today, "They don't ask much of you. They only want you to hate the things you love and to love the things you despise." And in the famous novel, "Dr. Zhivago," says, "Microscopic forms of cardiac hemorrhages have become very frequent in Russia in recent years. I think its causes are of a moral order. The great majority of us are required to live a life of constant, systematic duplicity. Your health is bound to be affected if, day after day, you say the opposite of what you feel, if you grovel before what you dislike and rejoice at what brings you nothing but misfortune." And another character, speaking of life in communistic Russia, says, "We are ready to betray what is most dear to us and praise what repels us and say 'yes' to what we don't understand." Is this a fit life for man? Is this the golden age? Is this civilization?

The current Reader's Digest carries a condensation of the book about life in Communist Russia. It is a picture of the new, Soviet man, and the title of the book is, "The Future Is Ours, Comrade." One Russian citizen is quoted as saying, "Authority rules millions, so it is entitled to make mistakes where individuals are concerned." It is explained that, when the authority of the state speaks unjustly and brutally, the average citizen is ready to question his own character or to doubt the probity of his wife or parents rather than to challenge the authority of the state. The incredible story is told of a certain laboring man in Moscow who went by a certain metropolitan hotel to pick up his wife who worked there as a maid. He had failed to check the calendar and discovered that his wife was working at another hotel.

"On his way out of the hotel he stopped in the men's room. He bent over while flushing the toilet, and suddenly all his personal papers, his passport, his party card and his union card, fell in and were swept away.

"In the downstairs lobby an agent of the secret police, noticing that the man stood out like a sore thumb among the well-dressed foreigners was patronized the hotel, asked to see his papers. When the man explained his mishap, the agent didn't believe a word of it and took him away for questioning."

The man was sentenced to 4 years in a labor camp. And as he was sentenced in the court, the man accepted it all with composure, only looking about in the spectators for the tear-stained face of his wife. The brother of the condemned man said, "Too bad you couldn't have met him. He was an exceptionally decent man, honest, never did anybody any harm. He loved his family and enjoyed a game of chess. If only he had been healthy, but he has serious stomach trouble and a diseased kidney. If he comes out alive after 4 years, he won't be of much use." The brother was silent for a moment, and then, with anger in his eyes, he said, "Tell me, abroad, where everyone has such toilets, do people lose their papers or money in them? Perhaps the construction is deficient and should be improved?" The au-

thor of the book said "I could not answer him. Possibly valuable papers get lost in toilets, but do people perish because of it?" Is this the society of the future, a society in which a man loses his life because he loses his papers down a rest room facility? Is this the future? If so, they may have it. I don't want it.

In plain truth, there is a life that is not worth living. As Shakespeare says:

"There's the respect that makes calamity of so long life;
For who would bear the whips and scorns of time,
The oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely,
The pangs of despised love, the law's delay,
The insolence of office, and the spurns
That patient merit of the unworthy takes."

There is such a thing as a government, a way of life, an existence making man less than man, taking away his freedom, denying him his emotions, dehumanizing him into a machine, a unit, an integer. It is not just life, existence, that we want, that's worth living: it is a certain kind of life we want, a life of freedom, dignity, meaning. Dr. Zhiago says: "Man does not die in a ditch like a dog—but at home in history. * * *" And it is the feeling of most of us that if man dies in a ditch like a dog, it would be better if he had never lived.

May I come to an important point: Mere survival is not the highest good. Simply managing to survive cannot be the supreme goal of a civilization, because civilization is more than survival, existence. I feel somewhat strange as a minister saying this: There is something worse than nuclear annihiliation—it is enslavement of body and mind and soul.

Recently Dr. Elton Trueblood, a leading religious thinker and former head of the U.S. Religious Information Office, and a Quaker, said: "It's neither good philosophy nor good Christianity to say that extermination is the worst possible event for the human race. To make avoidance of death, even death for everyone, the prime consideration lays the conventional basis for totalitarian oppression, and is contrary to the immemorial ideals of Western philosophy." Socrates once said: "For neither in war nor yet at law ought I or any man to use every way of escaping death. The difficulty, my friend, is not to avoid death, but to avoid unrighteousness."

I am not a military strategist or a world diplomat, but I tell you this: In my opinion, the day that the Communists think we will not die, individually or as a nation, for the things we believe, they will move in, confidently and surely.

Dr. Trueblood further said, "The fear of atomic explosions and atomic fallout has been so great, in many hearts, that the result has been a willingness to accept anything for the sake of survival and those desiring to dominate mankind become the chief gainers." But Joyce Kilmer cried, "What matters death, if freedom be not dead? No flags are fair, if freedom's flag be furled." And what matters life, if freedom be not alive? Who wants to live forever without freedom? It's not the length of life—or of a civilization, God knows—it's the quality. I don't want to live without these things, these things of freedom and faith and hope and love! And—God help me—I am not a warmonger or a chauvinist—if I have to choose between total, nuclear annihilation and existence under slavery without freedom and decency and dignity, I'll take annihilation. I don't want life in which people are destroyed because their papers fell down the drain of a men's room facility.

But, as shocking as this may sound, I submit to you that this is the surest way of preserving the real values of true civilization, namely, loving these values dearer than existence, or life itself, being willing to lose the whole world while keeping our souls. As a matter of fact—and this is a forgotten point of our beliefs and our greatness—we Christians never have believed that everything depends upon the survival of the human race. We have traditionally and figuratively expected that the heavens and the elements would dissolve in a fire and the earth would be rolled up like a scroll. We have always believed that our ultimate destiny lay in the hands and the awful power of God beyond this world and beyond this earth. To believe les than this now will be to deliver ourselves, our civilization, into the hands of those who would enslave us, dehumanize us. To believe less than this now will be to deliver ourselves into the hands of those who would set up as the highest symbol of the human race not the prophet who sacrificed himself, but the lion tamer with the whip in his hand and the beast beaten at his feet.

Congress, Go Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, If any citizen had any doubts about the need for this extra session of Congress, they must be entirely dissipated by now. Whatever has been accomplished by this politically led Congress could have been done before the recess if the Democrat Party with its overwhelming majorities in both Houses had displayed any sound vision and statemanship. It is eloquent testimony to the fact that when our national lawmaking body is dominated by a leadership saturated in partisan politics, the country suffers, and the prestige of our national system of government is lowered. These thoughts are ably expressed in the following editorials appearing in the New York Herald Tribune and the Washington Daily News of August 25:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 25, 1960]

CONGRESS, GO HOME

When his ambitious medical-care plan was defeated, Senator KENNEDY bitterly suggested that if Congress were not in a mood to pass "decent" bills in this and the minimum-wage field, its Members "might as well go home."

Translated, this means that if the Senator is not going to get his way with campaign legislation he'd better hotfoot it out of Washington. Which isn't a bad idea, though for quite the opposite reasons from those Mr. KENNEDY probably had in mind.

Legislative defeat in a Congress controlled 2 to 1 by his own party is bad for the Kennedy image. But legislative politicking—which attempts to ram such programs through a campaign-dominated session represent—is bad for the Nation.

Providing federally financed medical care for the 16 million Americans over 65 (or even for any substantial portion of them) is not only a vast undertaking, but a vastly complex one. Determining whether to do it, and if so how it should be done and what its limits should be, is not a piece of business to be disposed of in a few days of political sniping and maneuver for partisan credit.

The Nation has survived 184 years without such a program. It could have survived another 5 months, until a new Congress could give it the deliberative attention it deserves. It is, as Senator COOPER declared, "cruel and cynical to treat people over 65 as footballs in a political campaign."

When Congress reconvenes after the conventions many voices, including that of the President, called upon it to act in the national interest and not in partisan political interest. Few can really have been naive enough to suppose it would fully heed those voices. Its actions so far—notably on medical care and minimum wage—have been shot through with politicking on both sides of the aisles; votes have been hailed as "Kennedy victories" or "Kennedy defeats."

This is no atmosphere in which to pass laws. It's high time Congress wrapped up the business that has to be done this year, packed its bags, and moved the presidential campaign to the hustings.

[From the Washington Daily News, Aug. 25, 1960]

TIME TO GO HOME

Senator KENNEDY, vexed over the Senate's action on medical care and impatient to hit the campaign trail, says perhaps Congress ought to go home. We second the motion.

It's increasingly apparent there never was any real justification for this postconvention session. As an election-year gimmick it has backfired against its Democratic sponsors, demonstrating they can't hold their majorities in line on their platform pledges.

The health bill finally passed by the Senate is similar to one passed by the House before the conventions. It is far more conservative than those sponsored by the leaders of either party. Its effect simply is to ease requirements for paying relief money to the aged for medical and health bills. It applies only to the destitute and low-income groups.

The plan supported by Senator KENNEDY and pledged in the Democratic platform, on the other hand, would be a radical departure from present practices. It would set up a form of compulsory health insurance, under social security, to pay bills for the well-off and the low-paid alike, regardless of financial need.

Aside from its technical merits, such a plan should be undertaken only on clear evidence that the country, in large majority, really wants it—that the workers are dissatisfied with present health plans and want their pay clipped to pay for a new one.

The campaign offers a chance for the sponsors to explain and promote their plan, also to test public sentiment regarding it. Our lawmakers should wind up this futile session promptly, and get on with the campaign.

The Late Brent Hart, of Kentucky

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Brent Hart a Many-Sided, Useful Man," published in the Madisonville (Ky.) Messenger of July 19, 1960.

The editorial, written by Mr. Edgar Arnold, editor of the Messenger, accurately reflects the opinion of hundreds of Kentuckians who knew Brent Hart and held him in respect and affection.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRENT HART A MANY-SIDED, USEFUL MAN

Funeral services for Brent Hart were held in Louisville yesterday morning, July 18, and thus departed from this earthly scene a Hopkins Countian who for many years was associated with the industrial, civil, political, and social life of our community.

Thomas Carlyle, the Scottish essayist and historian, wrote a hundred years ago:

"It is the first of all problems for a man to find out what kind of work he is to do in this universe."

Brent Hart determined early in life that his career was to be in coal mining, which was a decision of high consequence for our county and for the western Kentucky coal field. For Brent Hart in the many years he devoted to mining developed some excellent producing properties, bought others, and furnished a total of man-days of job opportunity which would be difficult, indeed, to estimate.

Mr. Hart started his career, it is true, with a brief try at newspapering, in the circulation and advertising departments of the old semiweekly Madisonville Hustler. He became business manager of the paper, and in those days business manager of a twice-a-week community paper meant a day of many hours and a day of many responsibilities. Most of all, it represented a day of countless chores, and Brent Hart did his work well.

It is recalled by friends that when Brent Hart engaged in his first coal-producing venture, which was a small mine at Mannington, his motive power was mules. He laughingly said at one time that when he turned his mules out to pasture Saturday afternoon, his overhead ceased until Monday morning.

It was a jest which did not apply for long, for Brent Hart started systematically at the job of putting together a mining business which eventually became Hart Coal Corp., and Hart-Ross Coal Co. The job led to a prominence in the coal business which put Mr. Hart at the top of operator groups and made his influence felt all over the industry, statewide and regional.

In addition to his coal interests, Mr. Hart found time to engage in cattle raising, oil exploration, sports such as golf and hunting, politics on the local and State level, and social activity which made his home at Hartlands, on U.S. 41 south, a hospitable place to which invitations were greatly coveted.

Mr. Hart's activities in behalf of the Republican Party were such that he was mentioned at times for State office, including and candidacy for Governor, and in fund-raising his talents were used in various campaigns. Most recent of these efforts was organiaztion of the Ike appreciation dinner in Louisville, to which, as chairman, the former Hopkins countian brought Republican supporters from all sections of the State.

It is difficult to sum up, in the limited number of paragraphs available for obituary articles in a newspaper, the career of a producer like Brent Hart who went to work early in life, who worked long and hard for small wages and who once, upon hearing a local whistle summoning people to work, vowed—as he later recalled—someday to be the man who blew the whistle.

Brent Hart's determination to blow the whistle, or to be the man who had the whistle blown, worked out well over the years, and worked out well for a community which is dependent in large part upon coal as the source of its economic life.

In pursuance of his policy in the mining field, Mr. Hart made opponents and enemies, many of the latter being people who never on their own ever produced anything in our busy world. Brent Hart had little regard for the free riders who toil not and neither spin, and in opposition to their attempts to hamper him he stood firm for a great many successful years.

A world which needs production needs men like Brent Hart. In all the ups and downs which marked his career nobody ever heard Brent Hart whine, and nobody ever saw him when he looked life he felt sorry for himself. Coal was often difficult to sell, and was often almost given away, in the days when Brent Hart was making his start in the business.

It is a great testimony to his strong character that he started with an exceedingly small operation and wound up with a prosperous and farflung enterprise. Although in recent years he had lived in Louisville and Fort Lauderdale, Brent Hart maintained contact in Hopkins County. He had many friends in his home county who were shocked at his untimely death. Most of them regretted, as we ourselves do, that death called him before he could realize a long-held ambition to make a trip around the world.

Banking's Half-Told Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PRESCOTT BUSH

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Banking's Half-Told Story," written by Arthur R. Greene and published in the June 20, 1960, issue of United States Investor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANKING'S HALF-TOLD STORY

(By Arthur A. Greene, president, Atlas Advertising, Inc.)

The ordinary symbol of a bank is money. Many people do business at a bank simply because the bank—and the credit—are there.

Banking has not won the public appreciation it deserves in serving the public and helping to build strong and prosperous communities from coast to coast.

We know that the unfriendly atmosphere that once was associated in the public mind with banking has been quietly diminishing over the years. The New Look in banking is not only changing the exterior and interior of the physical appearance of banks, but is also changing the spirit of banking itself. Yet most people do not know or understand what banks are doing for them.

Bankers know the many ways in which banking has raised the standard of living for the American family, but the public knows little or nothing about it.

On a compartively limited income, for example, millions of families are able to buy nice homes and cars, and such conveniences as electric appliances and even boats—through bank installment credit. Without consumer installment credit (and banks provide the largest single share) many of the American families' present possessions would have been unobtainable. Indeed, banking has contributed to better living.

Younger American families go to their community bank to get a loan with little more thought about the process involved than when they go to the local supermarket. In one place they buy food; in the other they get money. But at the bank they may have both a fear or a misunderstanding of the complexities of banking.

Although banking is basically a public service, few Americans have any idea of the vitally important role banking plays in their economic security. Consumer bank credit, for example, has made it possible for many families to increase title to their worldly possessions to sizable amounts. And there is room at the top for them, through bank installment credit, a truly significant contribution of the 20th century banker in America. But is this average American consumer aware of this? The answer is "No." Ask him, if you doubt this. He rarely understands how banking contributes to his prosperity.

An imaginative and rewarding image of banking must be created through the bank's advertising and other communications. This is necessary if the banking industry is to compete more successfully in the coming decades for the burgeoning income of the American consumer.

What do we mean by image? Why is it important? Why should bankers be concerned with the public's esteem and confidence? An image is a mental representation, an impression, or an idea. It is only within the past 20 years that the corporate image has become a recognized, large-scale problem for all businesses.

In banking some changes have already begun to occur. In installment credit, for instance, there is now less feeling of borrowing money than of being extended credit. But, even so, the full story of banking is still not being told.

Why should the banking industry be concerned with adopting a more favorable image of itself? Briefly, I will enumerate a few main thoughts:

1. Although banks have been an integral part of the social and economic growth of this country for over 150 years, they have never been properly identified with this Nation's success story in the public's mind. Compared to the contributions of organized labor, and even the politicians, bankers have done more to create jobs, and to help raise the American standard of living than most other groups have done. It is now time to prove to the average American consumer that the high level of prosperity he enjoys is due in a large measure to enlightened banking and bankers. Unfortunately, bankers have hidden their light under the bushel for too long.

In the coming national political campaign bankers and banking will be prime targets of dissenters. For political reasons, alone, it is high time for bankers to give the people a positive and true picture of banking's contribution.

2. Banks are facing more aggressive competition from the growing number of nonbank financial institutions. In 1950 there were 12 million American families with incomes over $4,000 a year; in 1960, there are 36 million families in this group, and this means that more and more families will continue to gravitate upward and become eligible for credit and other banking services. This expanding market is a spur to competition for serving these growing millions.

3. Studies made at the Harvard Graduate School of Business indicate that a company's image is communicated through their advertisements—and especially their institutional advertisements. This type of image affects your bank not only in relation to the public at large, but in the recruitment of the better young men and women your banking will need in the future.

However effectively a banker may have managed to humanize his own institution in the past, he has actually just set the stage for what should be the feature presentation.

Aunt Hepsy likes to think of her bank as strong and solid, but she has little understanding of its importance in her life. Why not take a look at your bank and what it has done in your community in the past 10 years, and tell the story to your community. Discover how many homes and cars you've financed, and then identify this loan volume with employment. Then, you can tell Aunt Hepsy, and her fellow citizens of the community-building role of your bank.

You can tell it in speeches you make to civic clubs, you can tell it through more effective advertising; and tell your customers. Let them know, for instance, how bank credit affects the American economic system, and especially how a customer's own use of credit will help him to assure his own security. How many people's jobs are affected when a new car is bought on credit?—roughly 60, in all parts of the country, in related industries, in rubber factories and in textile mills. How many residents of a community are employed because a loan is given to a man to build a new house? This is the story that banking should tell and a portion of your advertising and business-development budget should be devoted to it.

In recent years a few notable examples of image building among bankers come to mind. Recently the First National Bank of Miami and the Commerce Union Bank of Nashville, among others, have taken full-page newspaper ads with a "Statement of Policy" approach, reminding their communities of what their bank stands for, their responsibility to the community and that as banks they are ready to help—not just to profit. It's this kind of public education that will gain your bank the recognition and image it deserves.

Most bankers are leaders in their communities and devote much of their time to helping advance local charitable, and other worthy causes. There is a real need, however, for bankers to devote some of their time to advancing the cause of banking in their community, too. After all, banking is one of your worthiest causes and one of the most dynamic forces in your community.

Address by R. Lyle Barton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege to hear an outstanding address delivered by R. Lyle Barton, national executive director of Taxpayers, Inc., Galesburg, Ill., before the annual banquet meeting of the South Dakota Taxpayers Association in Pierre, S. Dak., July 30.

I regret that I cannot insert his entire speech in the Appendix of the RECORD because of its length, but I do wish to call to the attention of my colleagues excerpts from it which I know will prove to be enlightening:

EXCERPTS OF ADDRESS BY R. LYLE BARTON

Our American Government and our free enterprise system of economic life are based upon four major documents.

First of all, underlying the whole American structure of life is a faith in God, the facts, experiences and guiding examples of which we find in the Holy Bible.

Second, we have the Declaration of Independence which announced to the 18th century civilization, that here in the New World was a group of people who cherished freedom and abhorred domination from the outside.

Third, we have the Constitution embodying the Bill of Rights, which charts the establishment and operation procedure for the Central Government and defining the separate and exclusive rights of the individual.

A devoted student of the Constitution would, I am sure, find it quite difficult to reconcile the authority granted the Central Government with the final and fourth document, the Budget of the U.S. Government which is a yearly document.

This final document has come to mean so much to you and me, particularly in the last few years, for it is this document which is the physical and practical expression of one segment of the great conspiracy.

Government will consume this year the total of $156 billion. Sixty years ago Government was taking $1½ billion per year. This is quite a jump, but of course our whole economy has expanded during this time. But the tragic story in this picture is that the cost of Government has multiplied four times as fast as has our economy as a whole. In other words we as a nation are four times as socialized as we were at the turn of the century. Another factor causing grave concern is to see how we as taxpayers have been gradually passing over to Federal Government, so many of the activities formerly handled by local or State government. Government is fast becoming a tremendous centralized power. Federal Government spending in 1902 amounted to less than half a billion dollars. This year Federal Government will spend $98 billion. Don't be misled by $80 billion publicized Federal budget—there is extra spending from funds outside the budget—this shows a multiplication of 205 times in less than 60 years. State government consumed $180 million in the earlier period, this year State governments will use $28 billion, which is an increase of 155 times. Local government including schools, city and county government operations was the major activity in the 1900's when they were spending a total of around $900 million. Today local governmental units will be spending $30 billion.

As a taxpayer you are helping to support over 11 million public payrollers. This means every six gainfully employed taxpayers are together carrying one Government employee on their backs.

As a Federal Government taxpayer you are supporting the fantastic total of 28,600,000 who are drawing regular direct Federal Government checks. This list just includes the regular Federal Government civilian employees totaling 2,323,000; the 2,500,000 military servicemen; 4 million drawing Federal pensions and medical payments which includes former Government employees, and the social security payees numbering 19,840,000.

Now I know you aren't going to remember many of these statistics, but I just want you to get a bit of the picture of how big and extensive we have allowed our Government to become. We don't think about these factors nearly enough, and are inclined to shrug off their importance so it is necessary for us to recall these facts once in a while, to get us back on the road to sound thinking and judgment.

I have just thrown on the table six silver dollars in 6 seconds. I could keep this tossing silver dollars for 60 seconds every minute, 60 minutes every hour, 24 hours a day, 365 days a year and I would have to continue for 32 years, to add up to just $1 billion.

Do you realize that today when we are talking of $80 billion Federal budgets and knowing that Federal spending is actually running at the level of approximately $100 billion per year, that this same Federal Government of ours, following the World War I period, never spent as much as $10 billion in a single year until as recently as 1941 when we started gearing up for World War II?

In the fiscal year 1934 during all the pump priming spree of Franklin D. Roosevelt, with the plowing under of the little pigs, leaf raking, NRA, WPA, CCC, PWA and assorted other alphabetical agencies were in full swing, the total spending for that year was $9,550 million, and then in 1941 went to $14½ billion.

Do you realize our Federal Government alone since the end of World War II has spent the staggering total of $1 trillion. That's right. Over $1,000 billion in the 15 years since World War II.

The question is, "Has it all been necessary?" Well, let's look at the record.

The Federal Government has become the largest landowner in the Nation, largest personal property owner, largest employer, largest business organization, largest spender of money, largest lender of money, largest borrower of money.

The Federal Government has 772 million acres of land scattered all over the world in 109 nations; they own 21.5 percent of all land in the United States involving 12,689 different locations. They own one-half of the 11 Western States; in Nevada the Federal Government owns 87.7 percent of the State. Taxpayers through the Federal Government property ownership has $64 billion tied up in real estate and $186 billion in personal property.

Did you know that our Federal Government has a direct treasury indebtedness of $290 billion. But that is only the admitted portion of our debt. On top of this we have $100 billion Federal Reserve contingent liability, $105 billion of legislative commitments which have not been paid for, and $350 billion accummulated social security fund obligations, which brings the total Federal Government liability up to the staggering total of $845 billion.

And we haven't even counted our currency obligations backed up by Fort Knox gold—$19.6 billion gold—and knowing that foreign governments have claims against this gold to the total of $19 billion, a great portion of these claims developed as the result of our foreign aid giveaways throughout the world which have totaled about $150 billion since the start of World War II.

Now, add on top of this $238 billion total indebtedness by the individual private citizen; $236 billion debt from corporations; and $51 billion owed by State and local governmental units and you reach the unprecedented total of $1,370 billion, and the figure is mounting every day.

That, my good friends, is why everything might appear to look so good. It is always well to look around the corner.

The men who worked on the creation of the Constitution all knew that freedom had never existed for long anywhere, and that no nation had ever become a world leader and survived. Twenty world-leading nations had floundered in their own mistakes and eventually had fallen. Washington, Hamilton, Webster and the other framers of the Constiution were determined that the American system should survive and become a world pattern for lasting freedom and human progress. The structure they developed has lasting qualities if each succeeding generation will but understand its workings and safeguard its principles.

Here is a brief review of the taxpayer's national platform. You can think of the reason for each plank in this platform as you review a few of the items we have discussed in this meeting.

1. No new Federal taxes.
2. No increase in Federal debt limit.
3. Reduce Federal Government spending.

4. Establish $40 billion Federal budget ceiling for operations.

5. $5 billion special budget appropriation for Federal debt reduction.

6. Reduce Federal employees to a maximum of 1 million.

7. Income tax reduction in line with reduced appropriations with final action being complete repeal of the 16th (income tax) amendment.

8. Eliminate all new foreign aid and work toward complete elimination of foreign aid program.

9. Curtail subsidies of all kinds. Repeal Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

10. Gradual elimination of all Federal aid to local and State governments.

11. No new Federal Government programs, projects or activities.

12. Post Office Department required to pay its own way through expenditure reductions.

13. Establish "Taxpayers' Lobby" in Washington, D.C.

14. Reduce appropriations for extravagant parties and entertainment.

15. United Nations expenditures, and all other foreign cooperation organizations expense, to be more equally allocated among nations of the world, with United States paying only our proportionate share, rather than present practice of substantially subsidizing all these organizations; with ultimate goal to have United States get out of the United Nations and the United Nations out of the United States.

16. Federal Government to get out of all commercial business operations including power, loans, and financing, housing, manufacturing, etc., excepting such cases as prison factories, the mint, and others where commodities being manufactured are not economically available for purchase from private business organizations.

17. To awaken every American citizen to his responsibility in maintaining sound, economically operated government at every level—local, State, and National.

18. To make every public official in our Naiton realize he is a trusted public servant, charged with the responsibility of providing a service to the people at the least possible cost.

19. To achieve better government at a better price for every American citizen through elimination of waste, extravagance, overlapping, duplication, political payoffs and dishonesty in ever governmental unit in the United States.

20. To halt further new taxes or increases in taxes on State and local levels of government throughout the United States.

21. To help establish stronger and more firm belief in the free enterprise economic system, and our republican form of government with a general public education program to deepen all citizens' convictions on the American way of life.

22. To oppose communism in every possible manner and to further assist the anti-Communist movement throughout America, with particular emphasis in opposing Communists and Communist sympathizers in our public schools and governmental units.

Now we are ready to work on the implementation of this platform. We are down to bedrock, ready to strike for pay dirt. Here is the challenge for you. Every one of you can help to establish a strong local taxpayer committee in your area. We have the full program outline for you to follow in setting up a local committee. The local committee is absolutely essential as it will be the focal point of all activity. The local group will be the educational arm for the training and development of all leadership in our crusade for better government at a better price, and thus will be the action stimulating nucleus through which the citizens will be drawn out of their sleeping, entertainment crazy inertia, and directed into an avenue of positive action designed to force governmental leaders to give us the kind of leadership which will save our freedom.

Here are some further specific personal actions which you may adopt if you are really earnest in helping push this crusade for better government:

1. Gain knowledge. Know specifically what is going on in government. Your taxpayer association office will supply you with information sources. You have the daily papers, magazines, books, radio, and television programs bringing constant information as to what is going on. Read the conservative movement reports and their lists of recommended books. Be alert to reports on Government operations and you will be surprised at the amount of information constantly in front of you.

2. Get some working tools. Pick up a few tools which will help to guide you in your search for new knowledge of government. Here are several which you should have available for constant reference:

(a) Map of the United States.
(b) Map of the world.
(c) Map of your State.
(d) Map of your county and city.
(e) Structure of government charts for Federal Government, State government, and local government, so that you may be familiar with the division of responsibility for various governmental services.
(f) Scrapbooks or files for keeping clippings and articles on government. At least one section each for Federal, State, and local governments.
(g) Copies of budget or expenditure summaries for State and Federal Governments.
(h) Copies of expenditure reports of your local county, city, township, road district, and school expenditures.

3. Get together the mail addresses and names of your government officials including Senators, Representatives, senators and other State officials, local government officials, and board members of city, county and school boards or councils.

4. Start today writing letters to your representatives in Congress letting them know in no unmistakable terms your dislike for the way everything is being operated. Pick out a few specific items to concentrate on. Mention one item in each letter, but make it a habit to write one letter to some Government officials about some specific extravagance every day. Really register your protest where it will be known.

5. Talk to at least one neighbor or friend every day for a few minutes urging him to become active in the crusade.

6. Write at least one letter every day to a friend or business acquaintance in some other area, enclosing taxpayer literature asking him to help in the crusade.

7. Whenever the opportunity is present visit personally with your elected representatives in Congress and other Government leaders.

8. Discuss tax problems among the members of your family, in your job, at your club or business conferences, to give widespread publicity to the seriousness of these problems.

9. Pray to God for guidance in helping you carry out your responsibilities as a good citizen and in furthering the work of the crusade for better government.

In this way, my friends, the world's greatest sleeping giant will be so aroused that weak politicians will tremble, constitutional government will be restored, America will command respect throughout the world, and freedom will be assured for your children.

Dr. Teller, Called Father of the H-Bomb, To Conduct Research, Lecture at Rice University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Texans have long been proud of the exceptionally high academic standards at Rice University—formerly named Rice Institute—in Houston, Tex. Few universities in the Nation maintain the high degree of educational excellence for which Rice University is noted and respected.

Because there are so many wonderfully talented and brilliant students attending Rice, I was particularly pleased to note recently that Dr. Edward Teller, the Father of the H-Bomb and a man who has had a leading, vital role in keeping America's defenses unassailable, will conduct theoretical research at Rice University beginning next February. It is an honor and privilege for Texans to welcome this brilliant scientist, especially when his mission is to instruct our young students.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the August 14, 1960, issue of the Houston Post entitled "Dr. Teller Noted for Nuclear Achievements."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DR. TELLER NOTED FOR NUCLEAR ACHIEVEMENTS—"FATHER OF THE H-BOMB"

Hungarian-born Dr. Edward Teller, 52, a naturalized American since 1941, is renowned among the Nation's scientists for achievements in nuclear physics and quantum theory.

But he is known to the world at large for an idea he had about 10 years ago which is still a hush-hush Government secret to all but the comparative handful of men who made the H-bomb for the United States at that time.

Federal law prohibits the H-bomb scientists from divulging Dr. Teller's famous idea. But, whatever it was, he has since been popularly known as the "father of the H-bomb."

He received his first public credit for his H-bomb work during Atomic Energy Commission security board hearings in 1954 which resulted in denying further security clearance for Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, World War II Director of the Los Alamos Laboratory which produced the A-bomb.

Here's how Dr. Teller's idea was described by Dr. Hans A Bethe, professor of physics at Cornell University and a science adviser to President Eisenhower, in testimony at the Oppenheimer hearing discussing how the H-bomb was made:

"Finally there was a very brilliant discovery made by Dr. Teller. It was one of the discoveries for which you cannot plan, one of the discoveries like the discovery of the relativity theory although I don't want to compare the two in importance—but something which is a stroke of genius, which

does not occur in the normal development of ideas. But somebody has to suddenly have an inspiration. It was such an inspiration which Dr. Teller had which put the (H-bomb) program on a sound basis."

Dr. Bethe, one of the U.S. experts at the 1958 nuclear test ban negotiations with Russia and Great Britain in Geneva, has expressed himself in favor of halting all further nuclear tests if agreement can be reached with the Russians.

Dr. Oppenheimer, now director of the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton, in his own testimony at the hearing described Dr. Teller's contribution as a "brilliant invention."

Dr. Teller has long since disclaimed sole credit for creating the H-bomb, saying, "It took scores of brilliant highly skilled workers" to bring the bomb to reality.

A stocky, beetle-browed man with a shock of unruly black hair, Dr. Teller was born in Budapest of a well-to-do Jewish family. His first scientific studies were at the famed Institute of Technology there. At this same institute studied a number of other emigree scientists who worked on the A-bomb during World War II. He completed his education in Germany, first in Munich and later at the University of Leipzig where he received his doctor's degree in physics in 1930.

While a student in Munich in 1928, Dr. Teller fell under a streetcar and lost his right foot. The accident has not been much of a handicap. He drives his own car skillfully and is well known for the strenuous mountain hikes he has since undertaken.

After Hitler came to power in Germany, Teller left Goettingen where he was working as a research associate, taught at the University of London and later became a Rockefeller fellow in Copenhagen, studying under the great physicist, Niels Bohr.

In 1934, a year before he came to the United States, he married his childhood sweetheart, Augusta Harkanyi. They have two children, Paul 17, and Susan Wendi, 13.

Since he came to the United States in 1935, he has served with distinction at numerous universities as professor of physics. Included are George Washington University, Washington, D.C., 1935–41; University of Chicago, 1946–49, and University of California, Berkeley, from 1952 to date.

During World War II, he worked on the A-bomb project at Los Alamos and elsewhere, becoming an expert in atomic reactor technology. During the war years, however, he also managed to devote a good part of his time to exploring the possibilities of making the H-bomb as soon as the A-bomb was built so it could provide the millions of degrees of heat needed to trigger the superbomb.

He was called back to full-time duty at Los Alamos soon after the Russians exploded their first A-bomb in 1949 to work on the H-bomb. While there, in addition to his "brilliant inspiration" about the bomb, he became a leader in the campaign for the AEC to set up a second nuclear weapons laboratory.

This laboratory, now the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory at Livermore, Calif, was finally set up under the supervision of the University of California late in 1951.

This was too late to help make the H-bomb, the first being successfully exploded in the Pacific in November 1951. But in the years since, the Livermore Laboratory has made substantial contributions to the refinement of U.S. nuclear and thermonuclear weapons by tests at the Pacific and Nevada proving grounds.

Dr. Teller has been with the laboratory from the beginning along with his post as physics professor at the University of California. He served first as staff member, then associate director and was finally director of the laboratory for the past few years until he left that post and returned full time to the University of California in July.

During the past 10 years Dr. Teller has been interested in the work of detecting nuclear explosions on seismographs, when the first bomb was exploded at Eniwetok, he did not attend in person but watched the record of the tremendous blast on the seismograph at the University of California.

In cooperation with Kenneth Watson at the University of California, Dr. Teller is credited with the discovery that nuclear explosions could be set off in large underground caverns or holes with the result that the record they made on seismographs would be muffled and hard to detect.

Next February, Dr. Teller will visit Rice University through a grant of the Robert A. Welch Foundation. Through the remainder of the school year he will conduct theoretical research, advise with graduate students and give a series of special lectures for gifted undergraduate students.

Nuclear-Powered Airplane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I herewith include an article I have written which is entitled "The Story of the U.S. Atomic-Powered Plane Bungle," which appeared in See magazine, September 1960 issue:

THE STORY OF THE U.S. ATOMIC-POWERED PLANE BUNGLE

(By Congressman MELVIN PRICE)

Somewhere in the Canadian polar regions, far north of the DEW (distant early warning) line, a tired airman methodically scans a radarscope. Nothing. He logs the time on a pad at his elbow and turns his attention to the complicated control console which for a year is part of his isolated life in the Arctic. An hour passes; and another, like the many uneventful hours that have gone by and will continue to pass. Once again he focuses his attention on the radarscope and his eyes quickly pass over the fast-moving blip now appearing on the criss-cross screen.

One blip, two—three. "Blips" he suddenly exclaims to himself as the importance of his discovery registers in a quick double-take. The weary cast quickly disappears from his features, replaced by the first flush of excitement—the unknown, the reason for his isolated duty. With one hand he hits the emergency horn, alerting his four sleeping and off-duty buddies. With the other he snatches the red-painted alert phone from its cradle, a radiotelephone he only remembers using twice, and then only during secret tests. But this time he has a feeling this is not a test.

A crisp voice at the other end of the priority circuit acknowledges that a duty officer is standing by awaiting information. At North American Air Defense Headquarters in Colorado Springs, Colo., a second officer is monitoring the flashing alert circuit, awaiting the young airman's report of an unidentified aircraft. So far only a yellow alert has been sounded. Meanwhile, high-speed jet fighters are ready to scramble from any number of points in the huge area guarded round-the-clock by Norad, the joint United States-Canadian Air Defense Command.

But for the excited young airman there's more on his radarscope than just a blip indicating an off-course commercial passenger transport on its shortcut polar flight. While his crewmates are quietly moving to their battle stations in the snowbound control center, the young observer shouts into the phone the reason for his warning alert.

"Unidentified aircraft, a single, bearing * * *," and he quickly rattles off the coordinates before continuing. "Speed * * *," he pauses and inhales deeply, "* * * approximately mach 3."

"Are you sure?" the duty officer 1,500 miles south gasps and repeats, "Are you sure?"

"Bearing changing," the airman shouts into the phone's mouthpiece. "It's definitely flying at mach 3, mach 3, sir, mach 3 at least."

Less than 4 minutes have passed, but the impact of the DEW line observer's report strikes home at Norad Headquarters. An aircraft has been developed that can fly at least three times the speed of sound—faster than the mach 2 all-weather fighter-interceptors that were at that very moment scrambling fruitlessly from Norad bases in Alaska and Canada.

Only the Russians could have developed such a plane so soon. And this one, now reported skirting the entire North American defense perimeter and alerting all DEW line radar stations, has added a new threat to the security of the free world.

At Norad this high-speed bomber covering so great an area meant only one thing: The Soviet Union had developed a nuclear-powered bomber. It was another Russian first; perhaps this was the fantastic new weapon that Premier Nikita Khrushchev boasted about during his annual report to the Supreme Soviet in January 1960.

I cite this graphic illustration as more than just a remote possibility. It may not happen this year; but it could happen, and sooner than we think.

A nuclear-powered bomber lies within the realm of fact, not fancy. This is the dream plane that, in the hands of the Soviets, will give us more to think about than intercontinental-range missiles fired from Soviet bases deep inside Siberia. With nuclear-powered aircraft, the Russian Air Force could surround this Nation with a constant patrol of bombers carrying H-bombs and 1,500-mile-range missiles tipped with atomic warheads. These planes could avoid flying over friendly territory and just patrol along our borders, primed to let go at any time.

These are the unlimited-range aircraft which could blast us at close range while huge ICBM's with less accuracy came streaking in along high-altitude trajectories to devastate wide areas. This would be turnabout, a swing of the pendulum the other way.

For years Russia has complained that we have surrounded her and her satellites with air bases. For years, and at tremendous cost, we have been maintaining Strategic Air Command and other military bases in friendly nations within shooting distance of the Soviet Union, for no other purpose than to check Communist aggression. But if the Russians are first to develop a nuclear-powered plane—and they might well be—they will then be able to flank every last one of our oversea bases with planes that can remain in the air indefinitely.

If this Nation is first with a nuclear-powered aircraft, in our hands this prototype plane would ultimately become a fleet of bombers and commercial air transports. As high-speed, long-range bombers, they will dispense with the problem of forward bases and an expensive airborne alert of B–47 medium-range and B–52 intercontinental jet warplanes. We would no longer need costly tanker planes and additional ships to carry

jet fuel to oversea bases. Perhaps Air Force manpower could even be slimmed down.

All we need is the aircraft engine that will run on a few pounds of fission material. We are close to developing this engine. All that is needed is the money to carry through present research and development in the powerplant and in the aircraft to be flown by this engine. Moreover, a nuclear-powered aircraft engine would be just the beginning of things to come, for the study and development of this powerplant will ultimately lead us to the nuclear rocket engines of the future that will give our space program the boost it sorely needs.

However, at the present rate of research in the problems of nuclear-powered aircraft, the Soviets stand a good chance of flying one first. Russia is pressing ahead with the development of its own nuclear-powered aircraft. There is no doubt in my mind that the first nation to achieve actual nuclear-powered flight will reap an enormous psychological propaganda victory no less important than a military advance. We lost on sputnik. And with that loss went much of the world's confidence in American scientific capabilities. We cannot afford another such loss without risking the gravest of consequences.

Now it's time that the truth is made public about our nuclear-powered aircraft program. These are the facts:

Farsighted military planners as long ago as 1944 began thinking of nuclear-powered aircraft.

Actual research was started in May 1946.

An airborne nuclear reactor was carried aloft in a B–36 in several flight tests back in 1956. However, this reactor was used to test the effect of radiation on air crews rather than to provide an engine for the purpose of flight propulsion.

"We could have had a plane flying on nuclear power in 1957," Maj. Gen. Donald J. Keirn, recently retired head of the Air Force project working on the problems of developing this aircraft, declared time and again. "We could have had it before the Russians put up their first sputnik."

We have the technical know-how to build a nuclear-powered prototype plane, but the administration's budget planners won't authorize the necessary funds.

No matter what the military experience of our top civilian decisionmakers, this is how one man in uniform looks upon the dream plane of the future. According to Lt. Gen. Roscoe C. Wilson, Air Force Deputy Chief of Staff for Development, "the essentially unlimited range of nuclear-propelled manned aircraft can be translated into distance, endurance, or both.

"The impact on operations is significant in several areas. Unlimited range permits zone-of-the-interior (continental United States) basing without the burdens imposed by tanker-aircraft inventories or overseas-base logistics, defenses, and political considerations. Routes of approach to mission areas are no longer restricted. Operational commanders are free to choose inbound and outbound routes of varying tracks around the globe. The possibility of missions of several days' duration permits the effective utilization of as high as 50 percent of the force on air alert.

"Strategically placed around a sensitive area, the airborne alert would be invulnerable to attack and in its close proximity to the enemy heartland would constitute an ominous deterrent. Effective stationing of the air alert forces would provide omnidirectional penetration routes which would tax the enemy defense effort severely, forcing him to defend his entire perimeter in strength. The use of the manned nuclear bomber in a high-endurance weapons system on air alert permits flexible and positive timing, control, and target assignment."

In other words, the nuclear-powered bomber in our hands is a positive deterrent which, on the one hand, will by its very nature save us the expenditure we dispense today to maintain costly oversea bases. On the other hand, this plane will force the enemy to expend more of his resources to counter the threat of the unlimited range bomber powered by the atom.

Few people realize that we have the knowledgeable scientific and technical manpower to build the first prototype nuclear-powered jet engine and aircraft. The Air Force recognized this problem years ago and established an intensive training program for officers and civilians in the nuclear energy field.

Since the ANP (aircraft nuclear propulsion) program began in 1946, a total of $880 million has been parsimoniously parceled out. During the past 10 years $700 million was authorized for an air-breathing ramjet missile called Navaho, a project that was canceled before this weapon even reached the combat readiness stage. The Navy received $440 million for jet propelled Seamaster seaplanes. Sixteen were built. Two cracked up in tests and the remainder were consigned to the scrap heap.

Only a portion of this billion dollar-plus sum was needed along with the right priorities, and America's atomic-powered plane would have been flying long ago. If the administration had given the go-ahead as quickly as it had ordered the Atlas ICBM crash program in October 1954, our first prototype nuclear-powered plane would have flown in 1957. According to General Keirn, the Soviets may have a prototype atomic-powered plane in the air within the next year. Twelve months ago he told our committee that the Russians might have one in 2 years. Time seems to be running out.

Men like former Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson wanted no part of the ANP program. He described the plane we need as a "Shitepoke," a big clumsy bird, all bones and feathers, and not worth a hang for either eating or flying. "It'd be a big lumber wagon of an airplane, too slow," he declared. And I agree. But it would have given us the chance to iron out the bugs so that within 2 or 3 years we might have had the high-speed nonstop aircraft we want before the Russians develop theirs.

Nor was President Eisenhower of any help to the ANP program last year. "There is no usefulness that anyone can possibly see from such a plane," he declared at one of his early 1959 news conferences. "There is no use going into a field where the whole purpose would be to get a plane a few hundred feet off the ground." As a military man, the President wants a militarily useful plane. He doesn't realize that the prototype will be useful and that progress will be rapid after that. We shouldn't be concerned only with military applications, but with commercial applications and the progress of aviation as a whole.

While our country has been doing virtually nothing in the ANP program, the Russians have been reportedly flying a prototype bomber. Almost 2 years ago one of our weekly aviation periodicals reported that just such a plane had been observed flying in the Moscow area. The description of this plane fitted that of a nuclear-powered aircraft. Although I wouldn't go so far as to say that the Soviets are actually flying such a plane powered by a nuclear reactor. I would, however, base credence on reports that a plane has been seen flying in Russia which appears to be a prototype of the atomic-powered plane. It also appears that this airframe was on a shakedown flight. It hasn't been seen since these tests.

We know exactly what problems are faced in designing just such a plane. The Soviets have to overcome these problems, too. Theirs certainly is an all-out effort to do so. I know. I've seen Soviet science in action. The Soviet Union sent its third rocket speeding toward the moon on the day I departed Moscow after my second visit to the U.S.S.R. in 2 years. On October 6, 1957, I had arrived in the Russian capital to find a people jubilant over the success of the first sputnik, which had been launched 2 days before. In the meantime they have scored a direct hit on the moon with Lunik II.

It isn't so important what I found in the Soviet Union in the brief visits, as it is in what I found in the United States in October 1957 and what has happened since. It is better to appraise our own efforts than it is to guess at the efforts of the Soviet Union. There was a sense of urgency in our country in the fall of 1957. It quickly died away. There appears to be a permanent sense of urgency in the Soviet Union in matters pertaining to scientific and technological achievements—there is no indication they will rest on the laurels of sputniks, mechtas, or luniks.

There is every indication they are seeking laurels in the field of nuclear-powered aircraft.

I have seen firsthand the aggressive, unrelenting pressure that Soviet scientists are applying in the struggle for world supremacy. In the scientific fields, unlike in our country, this pressure is consistent and does not fluctuate with the international political barometer.

The Soviet successes undoubtedly are attributed to a priority approach—missing in our ANP program—which marshals together and makes maximum use of their existing and ever-increasing manpower and material resources. Their achievements in space effectively demonstrate the value of this approach. Through these spectacular accomplishments the Soviets have in a few years bridged the gap between the United States and the U.S.S.R. in those scientific and technical fields which are directly related to our Nation's survival. Moreover, the Soviets have reaped a political and psychological windfall by the calculated timing and exploitation of their individual successes.

I've seen what they can do in terms of atomic power research. Soviet installations for peaceful atomic development which I visited lacked the niceties and extra conveniences of many of the laboratories I have visited in the United States. The outside of the buildings are drab and are frequently in need of replastering or repainting. But once inside, where equipment, computers and other hardware are located, it's a different story. Spotless control rooms which give the impression of sterile operating rooms, mazes of intricate wiring, layers of well organized equipment bulging out of each room, all contributed to a feeling that the emphasis is more on substance—on what's done—than on appearance.

But the one thing that hit hardest is the sense of urgency and the controlled aggressiveness of the Soviet scientists who are in charge of these installations.

When I first visited Dubna in October, 1957 the Russians proudly displayed the world's largest synchrophasotron. It was going through a series of test runs. Subsequently stories reached us of the difficulties they were encountering in operating the machine. When I visited Dubna again last year, I found that the problems, such as focusing the beam inside the chamber, had been solved and the machine was functioning within expectations. Twelve Soviet bloc nations participate in the operation of the Dubna center, which corresponds to our Argonne Laboratory. They contribute on a percentage basis both brains and finances to

the institution, although the major financing comes from the Soviet Union.

This then is an illustration of how the Russians methodically go about organizing a solution to a scientific-technical problem. They are probably tackling the nuclear-powered aircraft problem in the same way.

Another place I visited is the Physical Technical Institute at Leningrad established in 1919. Russian scientists began serious research in nuclear physics in 1939. A short time thereafter they had in operation a small cyclotron. Many of Russia's most prominent scientists did their research at this institution, and today the institute lays claim to world leadership in solid physics research. More than 300 scientists out of a total working force of 2,100 work in the most crowded conditions imaginable, but look forward to the completion of a new and more adequate building now under construction.

Does this sound like a nation that's sitting still in the field of aircraft nuclear propulsion?

While the Russians are working toward this "dream" plane, we in Congress have been battling for more money to get the ANP program off the ground. We could cut corners in terms of time if we do something about it—if we would only stop to realize that the Soviets do not have any more scientific knowledge or better technology than in our country.

Time is important. If we have the determination to be the first to fly an atomic-powered plane, we may still beat the Russians. But it will take some doing, and it may take another 3 to 5 years. But even this is time saved if we can utilize an airframe that is presently on the drawing boards. This is the B–70 Valkyrie, a mach 3 bomber powered by chemically fueled jet engines. This plane is sufficiently large enough and designed to take on nuclear reactor engines.

But the administration has seen fit to practically scrap the B–70 program in its 1961 budget. The only provision made is for the construction of two B–70 airframes. Nothing is provided for the development of the complex bombing, navigation, armament, and other equipment that will be required.

The B–70, originally a top secret conception of a breakthrough in the history of aircraft development, for years was referred to as weapons system 110A. In the words of Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, at the time Director of the now scrapped National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, it was in 1957 that "a strange and wonderful thing happened."

"It was as if the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle began falling into place," he reported to the House Appropriations Committee in February 1958. "Almost simultaneously research programs that had been under way at the NACA Labs in Virginia, California, and Ohio began to pay off. The result—this is an oversimplification, but not an overstatement—was that the companies and the Air Force suddenly realized it would not be much harder to design a long-range bomber that could fly its whole mission supersonic than design one that would fly subsonic most of the way, and only a fraction of the flight supersonic. Not only that, but the top speed of the prospective bomber was raised to mach 3—about 2,000 miles per hour."

The Valkyrie—named after the beautiful maidens in Norse mythology who galloped through the heavens on their chargers, choosing those who were to die in battle and bearing these fallen heroes back to Valhalla—to many aircraft designers has the lines of a beautiful woman. Into its construction will go titanium, stainless steel, and nickel-base alloy for a top weight of 250 tons at takeoff. That's about the same as a B–52 intercontinental range bomber now in the SAC inventory. Built into the B–70 performance is a landing speed slower than that of an F–100 super Sabre (now obsolete) with a range and speed to take it around the world in less than 12 hours. Traveling at mach 3, a B–70 crew could eat their breakfasts in New York at 8 o'clock, take off, and arrive in Los Angeles an hour and a half "before" they ate. The B–70 flying west at mach 3, at altitudes of over 70,000 feet or along the deck, could show its crew a sunset in the east or bring the moon back up once it had set in the west.

This is the plane that the experts acknowledge could be the testbed for a nuclear-powered jet engine. However, I'm not suggesting that it be used strictly for the ANP program. It was designed as a bomber and should be developed as such, and in the numbers needed. But it has the design that's also required by the nuclear scientists working on the atomic-powered engine. If we can build the B–70 within the next 3 years, perhaps we'll edge the Soviets by taking to the sky first in a nuclear-powered plane.

I have a letter in my files, more than a year old, written by a scientist who is now spending his 9th year working in the ANP project. He is an industrial manager in the program to develop a nuclear powerplant for a military aircraft. I believe that what this man had to say early last year is still important today. I think his statement is important. It was originally written to President Eisenhower, who angrily answered critics a few months ago in the same "parochial" terms in which he accused them of thinking. In referring to the Nation's defenses he said: "I've spent my life in this and I know more about it than almost anybody * * * because I have given my life to it." It accurately reflects the overriding conviction of our technical people in the field—the people about whose scientific and technical problems nonscientists like the President know little—that this nuclear plane project has got to move forward more vigorously if we are to meet vital needs of national defense.

Speaking for his fellow scientists and engineers out on the firing line—the people who are actually bending the hardware—he had this to say about the present state of technology in the project:

"The powerplant development work is now at a stage where it is ready to proceed at a faster pace. It is true that some solutions in detail (as opposed to feasibility) are required—but these are the reasons why the development is necessary in the first place. Today's situation on the nuclear aircraft program is similar to that which prevailed on the missile programs 3 to 5 years ago. At that time, development work was accelerated on propulsion and guidance aspects of the work; today, we are just beginning to see signs that we will have operational missile systems over the next 2 to 4 years. The same situation can prevail for nuclear aircraft.

"Let's face it. Nuclear powered aircrafts are inevitable. The sooner we get about really facing up to the job in total—including an airframe—the sooner they are going to be a valuable weapon in our arsenal."

The nuclear plane can solve a great many of the problems that crop up in the headlines time and again under Washington datelines. From the military point of view, this is what the nuclear plane can do for this Nation:

It can give us the constant airborne alert that the administration says we cannot now afford. This is the CAMAL (continuously airborne missile-launching and low-level penetrating) weapons system to oppose the Russians. We have the missiles and the military knowhow. The only thing lacking is the nuclear-fueled airplanes to carry the missiles and the H-bombs.

We can do away with most—if not all—of our SAC oversea bases at great national savings and put this money into the development of more and better atom-powered planes for civilian as well as military use. Over a period of time the nuclear bomber flown from bases in this country can save several billion dollars that we ordinarily would sink into SAC bases overseas.

The nuclear bomber would fit well into the present mix of forces. This plane can perform in areas where missiles can't. ICBM'S and IRBM's can hit targets of known importance and location. They do however suffer on two counts—one being worked on, the other out of reach. First, missiles have to possess sufficient protection (underground silos or antimissile missiles) against attack, or quick reaction time to get off the ground before the enemy missiles find their mark. These problems are being worked out.

Secondly, missiles are only able to hit targets of known location and importance. They cannot hit targets of highest priority; namely, those which the enemy has built up, such as troop concentrations dispersed over a wide area, supplies, submarine fleets and so forth. These forces and targets can only be predicted by detailed last-minute intelligence information, the type of intelligence and information which is hard for us to come by. Since missiles cannot act as human eyes and minds, they cannot be recalled once launched nor can they report back what they see or decide when, where, and how to strike.

We need a scientific breakthrough in the area of nuclear aircraft propulsion to bolster our falling prestige stock overseas—and even here at home.

This Nation does not lack scientific know-how to build just such an aircraft. It takes a change of attitude and determination on the part of the administration to give us this plane we sorely need.

The development of a nuclear powerplant will lead to a breakthrough in nuclear-powered rockets for space flight, and longer range missiles for defense and deterrence.

Finally, the development of this atomic powerplant will ultimately filter down to the commercial aviation industry just as military jet fighters and bombers within a matter of years were translated into our present airline jet transports.

This is the background to the problem, and the problem itself. Since 1944, when Army Air Force planners first looked into the feasibility of a nuclear powerplant, 16 years have passed us by. Fourteen years have gone by since we actually began studying the problem technically. Four years have gone by since we flew a reactor in a B–36. One year has gone by since we unveiled plans for a mach 3 supersonic bomber that can serve as a testbed for nuclear propulsion jet engines. How much more time must go by before the Soviets beat us again with their own prototype atomic plane?

It's evident from this brief history that the ANP program has been beset by a multitude of problems since its inception. In my opinion these problems have not been so much a question of technical progress, which has in general been good, but rather involve the problems of ill-defined objectives and administrative indecision. Despite constant prodding over the years, these roadblocks have had a tendency to linger on—to the detriment of all. Particularly vexing after my 13 long years studying and working for the success of this program, is the fact that the ANP project still has no firm target date for the first flight. Moreover, our scientists and engineers in the field still don't know where they stand as to the future prospects for the program. This latter factor has for some time been a bad morale problem in the field, as can be well imagined.

But beyond this, I have had the feeling all along that there has been considerable confusion over this question of so-called military usefulness of the nuclear plane. It's high time we nail down, once and for all,

what is meant by "usefulness" and get on with the job.

From my own point of view, and that of the working engineers in the field, the most useful thing we can do at this point is to test out the propulsion system in actual flight as soon as possible. The engineers in the ANP project claim that the present B–52 can even be converted as a test bed for a nuclear jet engine. Moreover, no one has ever pretended that this first flight would involve a full operational military aircraft. Far from it, this first flight, in line with historical precedent, would be a distinctly limited affair aimed specifically at providing information which is vital to subsequent development of a fully operational aircraft. It is my understanding that we are in fact technically ready to proceed with this limited first flight; and further delay will only put off the time when we reach a fully operational capability.

There is some indication that this concept is finally percolating through to those who have responsibility for making this decision on a flight program—I only hope we're not too late.

Royal Canadian Air Force Base in Northern Alberta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, our neighbor, Canada, is making a great and vital contribution to the defense of the Western Hemisphere. Working hand in hand with engineers from our own Nation, the Royal Canadian Air Force has established one of the largest bases in the world in northern Alberta. An article telling of this outstanding work appears in the current issue of the Police Gazette. I believe it is in the interest of all of us to read about this development. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Gazette be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Thanks to the Royal Canadian Air Force, America now has a powerful outpost next door to the Soviet Union.

Hidden in the dense shrub and brush of the remote wilderness in Alberta, Canada, is Cold Lake Airbase, the world's most fabulous military establishment. Embracing 4,400 square miles, it is four times larger than the State of Rhode Island (1,058 square miles), and is the most potent weapon the Allies now have to answer a Soviet attack. From push button control centers, hundreds of guided missiles can be showered on the enemy within minutes.

But the strategic importance of this airbase, built by the Royal Canadian Air Force and also used by the USAF Strategic Air Command, is not only in its technological miracles; but the fact that its terrain, climate and atmospheric conditions are the same as in the Soviet Union. Here, airmen can be trained and planes and materials tested under conditions that would prevail if the cold war turns hot.

Cold Lake is situated in an area closely connected with Canada's early history. A considerable number of Indians, particularly of the Chippewayan Tribe, live in the area, and there are two Indian reservations on the shores of Cold Lake itself.

In sharp contrast to the underdeveloped area in which it is located, Cold Lake Airbase is a showplace of modern technology. Where coyotes recently roamed, hangars now stand, and jack pine and spruce have given way to one of the largest and most modern communities in northern Alberta. Two thousand service personnel and their dependents, plus civilian employees, bring the total population to about 5,000.

One of the most active subdivisions at Cold Lake is the Central Experimental and Proving Establishment at Primrose Lake, where rockets are tested.

At Primrose Lake, modern and rustic buildings stand side by side in a clearing in the wilderness. Steel buildings, with tiled floors, electricity and showers, rub shoulders with log cabins and clapboards huts. The intrusion of civilization, however, seems to have had little effect on the wildlife of the area. In addition to the countless gulls, loons and ducks that haunt the lake, moose and bear amble imperturbably along its shores. Before the lake became so heavily populated, bears used to break into the camp's refrigerators.

Near the base camp is a rough road leading to the summit of a hill, known locally as "Mud Mountain." Here an 80-foot tower gives an unrestricted view of the test area and incidentally, a panoramic view of the surrounding wilderness. At specific locations along the shores of the lake are a number of instrumentation stations. These States, consisting of a tower and theodolite, are the functional part of the rocket testing system. These theodolites are used for optical tracking of rockets and guided missiles, but with such added improvements as an electrically controlled swiveling device, a 24-power telescope, and a synchronized movie camera. The power of the cameras is such that a picture taken of a plane flying at 30,000 feet clearly shows the aircraft's pilot tube.

Eventually, Cold Lake Airbase may become one of the most populated military camps in the world. Its facilities can be extended to accommodate a population that any extension requires.

Until the early 1950's an airbase so strategically situated to cope with a potential enemy, was an impossibility. The engineering problem was how to overcome the extreme cold winter temperatures, which run as low as 60° below zero. Maintaining aircraft at these cold temperatures requires a steady supply of fuel at the base. Even the oil in the pipelines freezes.

But this obstacle was finally overcome when the Canadian Department of National Defense discovered vast resources of natural gas 20 miles away. A number of American stockholders and Andy McNaughton, who was at one time the chief test pilot of the Royal Canadian Air Force, formed the Cold Lake Pipe Line Co., Ltd., and soon started feeding the natural gas for heating to the Cold Lake base. With this obstacle licked the entire area of northern Alberta can now be developed industrially.

In 1954, the massive hangars were completed and gradually a fantastic "city" in the wilderness sprang up, complete with hospitals, schools, homes, and laboratories.

The development of the Cold Lake Airbase is a tribute to the ingenuity of both American and Canadian engineers. The base, which is the "showplace" of the RCAF, stands as a powerful deterrent to any Soviet military plans, since it can put an umbrella of missiles over the U.S.S.R. within a minute's notice.

In Defense of Abolishing Capital Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Somner Forbes as it appeared in the Connecticut Daily Campus:

IN DEFENSE OF ABOLISHING CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

(By Somner Forbes)

"Hatred does not cease by hatred at any time; hatred ceases by love."—Siddhartha Gautama (the Buddha).

In the movies, on television, and in magazines, the fitting end to a crime story, especially one involving murder, is the death of the malefactor. The viewer or reader is supposed to get the impression that everything has ended happily. There are but a few exceptions to this pattern, where the culprit's death is tragic; the movie "I Want To Live" and the French picture "Rififi" are two of these. Rififi portrays the criminals with their loves and loyalties as well as their lawlessness, rather than as worthless, evil scoundrels as do most crime stories. This concept that criminals are wholly evil and deserve no mercy carries over into actual life; to know this one only has to see the public's behavior in a big capital case such as that of the teenage youths who killed Michael Farmer, or the famous Leopold-Loeb case, at which a bailiff's arm is broken in a courtroom riot the first day. In both these cases the defendants were not executed; in the former because of the youth of the boys; in the latter, because of Clarence Darrow's moving appeal for sanity and mercy. Not so fortunate were four of the eight anarchists who in 1886 were convicted and sentenced in connection with a bomb explosion at one of their gatherings in Haymarket Square, Chicago. The four were sentenced to death and hanged, the others receiving lesser sentences. A few years later Gov. John P. Altgeld pardoned these remaining four on the grounds that the trial was unfairly influenced by public pressure. Even though this was several years after the trial the Governor lost much favor with the people, who maliciously named him John "Pardon" Altgeld. Today many people are exerting pressure to have Carryl Chessman dispatched; even to the extent of trying to impeach Governor Brown.

REVENGE MOTIVE

The people who exert this pressure offer many reasons for their behavior. The most common arguments are those of revenge such as: "Show him the same mercy he showed his victim"; or the absurd "You worry about the criminal; but not about the corpse." This argument fails to take into account the fact that the death of the culprit does the corpse no good at all. The most absurd of all is the quotation: "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." This quotation from the Bible is assumed to carry great weight; however, it is really from Matthew, verse 38, where Jesus repeats the Mosaic concept of retaliation in kind, but it is probably the only source of knowledge of this law which these people have. (The actual passages Jesus refers to in the Old Testament omit the articles.)

It would not be fair to say that all proponents of the death penalty offer cries for

revenge or quote the Bible out of context, perverting the meaning of the passage entirely, for many offer constructive reasons for the retention of execution. These include reference to its values as a deterrent and as a better alternative than life imprisonment. Upon the examination of statistics and incidents which reveal something of the nature of criminals we find the deterrent value of capital punishment to be overrated. Statistics for five European countries, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland, all of which have abolished capital punishment; the crime rate has declined except for a slight increase in Sweden from 1921 to 1935. In the United States, the abolitionist states have had a somewhat lower murder rate than the average. To be fair one has to note that the social conditions are often better in these abolitionist nations and States than those that retain execution. It does indicate, however, that the general public will not regard suspension of executions as the beginning of open season on humans or that man-hide furniture will become the latest fashion for the den. On the other hand, it appears to be a partial denial of the deterrent value of the penalty by its supporters when they forbid public execution, which should, according to their reasoning, fill the crowds with the fear of the wages of sin; actually even executioners indulge in murder, who see executions often and see many of them. The ineffectiveness of capital punishment is further evidenced in the annals of English crime. In the old days when no nonsense was taken from anyone, and people were hanged for stealing food when starving and for picking pockets, shop lifting by starving children was common, and the public hangings proved very profitable hunting grounds for pickpockets. Other people regarded the occasion as an excellent opportunity to dispose of some undesirable relatives. Since its discontinuance in the case of petty crime, and attendant improvements in social conditions, crime of all kinds has declined; the starving child having become almost extinct. In a recent Florida rape case these interesting facts were revealed: in the records of Florida crime there are 30 cases of Negroes who were convicted and executed for rape, usually of whites; on the other hand, in spite of the tendency of the Florida courts to be lenient in these cases, there have only been four such cases of whites attacking Negroes in that State. This seems to demonstrate not only the lack of deterrence in State-killing, but also the importance of social conditions as a determining factor in crime.

NONHUMANITY

Many people say that capital punishment is the less costly and more humane alternative to life imprisonment. The cost of building and maintaining a death house for the relatively few that are executed actually exceeds that of maintaining these people in prison for life. As for humanity of the death penalty, people point out that life in prison is a dreary, dull one of abject despair. This is largely true, though there is always hope of a pardon. These factors however cannot equal the terrors of the death house, where one sits counting his last days; waking up at night and realizing that in a month he will be rotting quietly in his coffin; one day discovering it to be the last Thursday of his life; knowing that in 24 hours he will be entering the death chamber. In Sing-Sing Prison one is lead on Thursday morning to the last minute cell after taking his last shower. That night he receives his last meal; almost always a splendid affair for which he has no appetite; knowing that before it is digested he will be a corpse. Most people feel that when the victim is strapped down and the current turned on that his sorrows are over. In this there is some debate; while some people feel that a good electrocution is painless, the French scientist L. G. V. Rota disagrees, saying that "* * * Death inevitably supervenes, but it may be very long and above all excruciating painful * * * no one killed by electrocution dies instantly, no matter how weak the subject may be." When the current is turned on, the subject convulses violently as the muscles contract simultaneously; the face turns crimson and sometimes the scalp smolders at the point of contact; all rather unpleasant if the vicitim is still conscious. In the case of guillotined malefactors, studies have shown such evidence of consciousness as contortions and apparent attempts to speak made by the severed head. There is no assurance that the pain centers are inactive in these instances. If this is true of beheating it must certainly be true in a well-executed hanging in which the atlas and the axis (the first and second vertebrae) are dislocated; in a mismanaged hanging where the victim is beheaded or strangled, the suffering is increased. The gas chamber is said to bring no physical pain, but it must be rather terrifying to be sealed into a room in which the deadly fumes rise slowly toward one's nostrils.

LATER INNOCENCE

There is even a more important reason than being merciful to the guilty, why we should abolish capital punishment, and more important than the ending of a useless tradition of barbarous ritual. That is providing for the pardon of the victim on the subsequent discovery of his innocence. Aside from the Chicago anarchists heretofore mentioned there is the case of Sacco and Vanzetti, who after 7 long years of legal wrangling were finally executed in Massachusetts in 1927. They are now believed to be innocent, and the trial unfair and biased. Another case is that of the Englishman, Timothy Evans, who was hanged in 1950 for the murder of a woman, I believe his wife. In 1953 the woman's body was found in the walls of another man's apartment. Some will say that these cases are rare and need not cause much worry; in this case murder is no problem either, because it is less common relatively than judical miscarriage. Other miscarriages might be discovered were it not for the reluctance of the courts to review such cases. The pardoning after the revival of these prisoners has many formidable difficulties, as reviving a corpse requires the service of a saint or a magician whose services would be hard to obtain and whose powers would be questionable, to say the least.

The abolition of capital punishment will be a major step toward love, humanity, justice, and sanity. Though there will still be many problems to be solved concerning society and criminals, the abolition of State-killing will help end the concept of justice as revenge and as purging "the innocent blood." We will be following the true spirit of the Biblical passage "an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth" where the Nazarene pleads for love. We will have begun to recognize, as did the Buddha, that "Hatred does not cease at any time by hatred; hatred ceases by love." This is an eternal law.

Foreign Aid for the Congo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able article written by David Lawrence with respect to the $100 million in foreign aid funds for the Congo.

I am in complete accord with what Mr. Lawrence says.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY SHOULD UNITED STATES SUBSIDIZE CONGO SAVAGERY?

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—An amazing item came over the news ticker this week. It read in part as follows:

"The State Department asked Congress today for an extra $100 million in foreign aid funds to help the violence-torn Congo and possibly other new African nations."

Not many days ago the troops of the Congo Government which is to be given American taxpayers' money committed one of the worst atrocities in human history—brutal attacks on white residents, with wholesale beatings of the men, mistreatment of the children, and rape of the women, including at least two American missionaries.

Yet the Prime Minister of the Congo Government has called it all a "lie," and not a word of regret or apology has come from the very government whose troops were guilty of the atrocities—and whose same troops now would be supported with money furnished by the taxpayers of America.

The U.S. Ambassador in Leopoldville reported the facts at the time, and a commission of inquiry created on July 16 by the Belgian Government has just issued a preliminary report that documents case after case. The commission is composed entirely of high judges of Belgian courts and is not under control of the Government. Its report deals only with cases "among those which the commission can retain as established and proved as of now," but presents what it calls "often painful details" of the rapings of well over 100 women, including a number of nuns, most of whom were savagely assaulted not once but over and over again. The commission points out that the press has reported that 291 Belgian women have testified to such treatment.

No word of public condemnation, however, has come from the Department of State addressed to the Congo Government itself or to the press, expressing American disapproval of what has happened. Not so many months ago the same Department of State, however, was quick to interfere in the internal affairs of the Government of the Union of South Africa by issuing a statement condemning outnumbered police because they fired at a mob of several thousand that threatened them. Surely this is a precedent for public expression now about the horrors in the Congo, though there are plenty of precedents in international law, anyway, which say a government may at any time express opinions and take action when the lives and property of its citizens have been impaired.

The United Nations itself is subject to severe criticism for having failed to recognize the right of the Belgian troops to remain in the Congo to protect the lives and property of Belgian subjects and to secure redress for grievances suffered by them. Since the United Nations has taken over instead, then it is the duty of that organization, morally at least, to obtain redress. Yet, so far as anyone knows, the U.N. Secretary General has done nothing to require the Congo government to administer punishment to those troops guilty of rape. So far as the U.N. is concerned, the atrocities have been ignored—as if they had not occurred.

It may be wondered what possible good can be served by giving money to an irresponsible government which has not yet

shown its capacity to honor its obligations to all foreign residents. The State Department insists that the extra $100 million is needed "to restore some of the fundamental conditions that will permit a more normal life to be resumed." But how can a capacity to govern be suddenly acquired by a people hardly emerged from savagery? How can there be any respect for the lives and properties of foreigners in the future if the United States now overlooks the misdeeds of the Congo Government and turns around and gives it money?

But American taxpayers who are expected to foot the bill can still have recourse to their own Congress and insist that not a penny be appropriated to the new Congo Government until satisfactory action has been taken not only to punish the wrongdoers but to safeguard foreigners against similar attacks in the future.

The argument will be made that, if the United States doesn't help with money now, the Soviet Union will. But the truth is that the Communists have their agents in the Congo already and have played no small part in egging on the terrorists so as to create more and more complex problems for the countries of the West. Unless the Congo government is willing to exterminate the Communist intriguers and stop trying to blackmail the West by attempting to play off Moscow against Washington, there is little justification for pouring American taxpayers' money down the drain in the Congo.

Hotel Mayflower's Mack Finds Chance Career Perpetually Interesting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following feature article from the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., of Wednesday, August 17, 1960, the subject of the article being Mr. Corneal J. Mack, general manager of the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mack was born and reared in my hometown of Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and it has been my distinct pleasure to know him and the other members of his family for many years. In fact, when I first came to Congress back in the midforties I made my residence at the Mayflower Hotel and during that period I had the opportunity of resuming my close friendship and association with the distinguished general manager of that hotel, Mr. Mack. It has been a cherished association and we in my congressional district are indeed most proud of the outstanding career that Corneal Mack has carved in the hotel business here in Washington and, in fact, the fine reputation which he has in the industry throughout the Nation.

The article follows:

TALKING OF BUSINESS—MAYFLOWER'S MACK FINDS CHANCE CAREER PERPETUALLY INTERESTING

(By William MacDougall)

The guests were hopping mad and hopping barefoot that day in 1925.

And the management of the newly opened Mayflower Hotel was temporarily at a loss.

Corneal J. Mack, then a bookkeeper at the hotel, remembers the incident well.

"It was our first big convention, the International Parliamentary Union," he explained, "and most of the members were foreigners.

"True to their custom, they had gone to bed the night before after putting their shoes in the hall to be shined—as they do in Europe.

"But our help then was inexperienced, and not knowing quite what to do, collected the shoes in a laundry bag. When we found out what had happened, we notified the guests, spread out the shoes on the ballroom floor and let them come down and collect them."

TIME FOR JOKE

The Mayflower can tell that joke on itself because in succeeding years the hotel has successfully entertained kings, prime ministers, and presidents. Its 800 employees—9 of whom have worked there since the opening—speak 19 languages, and one caterer alone speaks 5.

Last year 100,000 persons spent an average of 2½ nights each at the hotel, which is unofficially reported to have recorded a volume in 1959 of about $7 million. The business is owned by the Hotel Corp. of America., a Boston-based concern.

In testimony to the reputation of the Mayflower's management, the 5,000-member American Hotel Association is slated this fall to elect Mr. Mack to its presidency.

The Mayflower's general manager since 1941, Mr. Mack is one of the Nation's most seasoned veterans of the business. He has provided baked Alaska for Soviet Premier Khrushchev, a rocking chair for Cecil B. De Mille, and a gold punchbowl for the White House—but wisely keeps his hands off public politicking.

CAREER BY ACCIDENT

A Wilkes-Barre (Pa.) boy who came to the Capital in World War I to work for the Government, he entered hotelwork almost by accident.

"I was walking up the street one day," he recalled, "when I passed the hiring office for the hotel before it was opened. I remembered that the treasurer had worked for the same agency I did, and I walked in to see him.

"'What do you know about the hotel business?' he asked.

"'Nothing,' I said.

"'Fine, we won't have to break you in again,' he said, and I was hired."

Mr. Mack has never regretted that impulse.

"It is a life that is always interesting," he said. "You're in on the planning for state dinners, debutante balls, and wedding parties for every sort of person there is."

Some of those persons, who have either stayed or eaten at the hotel, have included President de Gaulle of France, the King and Queen of Thailand, Premier Lumumba of the Congo, the Prime Minister of Italy, the Prime Minister of Japan, Chancellor Adenauer of Germany, former King Peter of Yugoslavia, Emperor Selassie of Ethiopia, the Shah of Iran, and Sir Winston Churchill.

ROOSEVELTS GUESTS

President and Mrs. Roosevelt stayed at the Mayflower for 3 months before inauguration in 1933, and two former Presidents, Herbert Hoover and Harry Truman, are frequent callers at the hotel.

President Truman, incidentally, was asked to autograph a guestbook in the Presidential Dining Room one day. His name and occupation are still on view there. He wrote:

"Harry S. Truman. Retired farmer."

Unlike many hotel executives, Mr. Mack prefers to live some distance from the premises. He has a home in Bay Ridge, Md., where he spends much of the summer months just taking it easy on his hours off duty.

"I'm a member of the Annapolis Yacht Club," he noted, "and the only member who doesn't have a yacht."

He is frequently mistaken for his twin brother, Joseph A. Mack, an employee of the Commerce Department.

There is no mistaking the hotelman's interest in civic affairs, however. He has served as president of such organizations as the Cosmopolitan Club, the Merrick Boys Club, and the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, and as a director of the Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, the Red Cross, the Tuberculosis Association, and the Boy Scouts of America.

He is also a member of the John Carroll Society, the Columbia Country Club, the Alfalfa Club, and the Tavern Club.

An innkeeper immensely proud of this interesting institution he heads, Mr. Mack is glad he took that walk 35 years ago.

"If I had to do it over again," he said, "you can be sure I'd do it about the same way."

The Crisis on the Commuter Railroads—No. 12

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to cope with immediate commuter system problems, the State of New Jersey has adopted a stopgap plan which is expected to both halt further curtailment of commuter services while also improving the commuter systems. It is described as an initial step toward a long-range program, shortly to be disclosed, which would aim at development of an expanded rapid-transit system, which would, in turn, alleviate highway congestion and provide efficient, adequate and safe commuter service. Details of the New Jersey stopgap plan are described in an article published in the New York Times on August 22. The article, in addition, relates the plan to the entire New York metropolitan region commuter system and traffic situations and thereby points up the critical need for relief in other sections of the city's metropolitan area as well as New Jersey. As an addition to the series of articles I am including in the RECORD to help bring recognition to the commuter system problems of our Nation's urban areas and under permission previously granted, I include the article:

BREAKTHROUGH ON RAILS—JERSEY HAILS AID PACTS AS FIRST STEP TO EXPANDED RAPID-TRANSIT SYSTEM

(By George Cable Wright)

TRENTON, August 21.—The spotlight of public hearings was turned last week on subsidy contracts being drawn between New Jersey and eight of its nine commuter rail lines. The hearings posed these perennial questions in a new context: Why is continued rail passenger service important to the social and economic life of the metropolitan area? Are the residents of the area willing to underwrite the deficits that seem sure as long as rail transport is to be sustained? If not, who will underwrite them?

New Jersey's public hearings seemed to emphasize these things:

Adequate rail service for the New Jersey-New York commuter will be available for another year and perhaps far longer.

Much can be accomplished with only $6 million toward meeting the critical metropolitan transit situation.

The contract approach is more acceptable to the hard-pressed carriers than any yet devised in the New York, Boston or Philadelphia region.

A FIRST IN RAIL AID

New Jersey is the first State to offer such contracts. The enthusiasm with which the major commuter lines have accepted them and agreed not only to halt further curtailments of rush-hour service but to improve such facilities has made it clear that a real breakthrough in the commuter rail crisis has been scored.

Dwight R. G. Palmer, State transit chief, hails the acceptance of the contracts by the carriers as a real "foot in the door."

He predicts that a long-range solution to the railroad problem that he plans to propose within 3 months will prove equally acceptable to the carriers and to the public. It will, he says, eliminate the grave problem "once and for all."

The contract system, he concedes, is only a stopgap measure. The pacts to be signed within 10 days extend for 1 year. The signatories pledge to continue all existing passenger services deemed essential by the State for the contract period. Mr. Palmer reserves the right to reopen arbitrarily all contracts at the end of 6 months and to order any service revisions he desires.

Of the nine lines, only the Lehigh Valley rejected the proffered aid. A 10th carrier, the New York Central, was offered a subsidy to reactivate its defunct West Shore service, but it has rejected the offer.

Mr. Palmer's long-range solution will be far less costly than the multimillion-dollar blueprints heretofore unveiled and thus far more palatable to the public, which, directly or indirectly, usually foots the bill.

The plan would extend the Hudson Tube service—with new, air-conditioned rolling stock—west from Newark to Bound Brook and north to Morristown. It would link the tube trains with the New York City subways.

Regional bus lines and parking lots would merge the new rail system with new freeways soon to crisscross the State. To alleviate New York City traffic congestion, Mr. Palmer is expected to propose that trucks be admitted to Manhattan streets only between dusk and dawn.

The public, as a whole, has repeatedly indicated its unwillingness to bear the responsibility of financing such commuter transit projects. Mr. Palmer, cognizant of this, hopes for considerable help from the port authority in financing his long-range project. Some State officials are convinced he will get such aid.

The cost of building enough roads to cope with a sudden collapse of rail transit would be prohibitive, all experts agree. In addition sufficient parking facilities to accommodate the increased traffic are out of the question.

MANHATTAN WOULD SUFFER

The primary sufferers of any rail collapse would be lower Manhattan and the suburbs that house its labor force. Most of these people find it impractical to reach their jobs by bus or auto. These workers constitute the major portion of the city's 225,000 rail commuters.

Most of the men employed in that area and many of the women might be forced to migrate to more accessible residential sectors if rail service collapsed. At the same time a serious labor shortage could result among young women who hold clerical and secretarial posts.

Some idea of what impact a major shift of rail commuters from one community to another might have may be seen in this: Rail commuters in the New York area earn about $4 billion a year.

New York State seemingly has been less successful in solving its rail troubles than New Jersey. Its programs of reimbursing communities that extend tax relief to lines and of underwriting port authority attempts to purchase and lease rolling stock to carriers have run into many snags.

Last year the two States set up a bi-State transit agency to attack the commuter problem. Connecticut was invited to join but declined. Neither New York nor New Jersey, it appears, has yet utilized this agency.

Boston has attempted to solve its transit problem by levies on affected communities, Philadelphia by modest local subsidies. In each instance there has been little evidence of cooperation from the railroads.

THREE SUCCESS STORIES

In Chicago, Toronto, and Cleveland there is ample evidence that commuter rail problems can be solved—and most successfully.

Tackling the problem a decade ago, aggressive executives of the Chicago and North Western and Rock Island roads began to replace all their suburban Chicago rolling stock with new double-deck, air-conditioned cars. At the same time they erected rights-of-way along a local expressway into the Loop.

Now they are integrating their track systems with public garages and parking plazas. The result: their commuter services are annually producing substantial profits.

Problem of Foreign Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to make known that the sharp increase of foreign imports poses a real problem for industry in my district of Connecticut, and when I speak of industry I am referring not only to the businesses themselves but to the loss of jobs and taxes that decreased business may bring.

The brass and copper industry, the major industry in this area, is currently requesting the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information to retain at their present levels tariffs on certain brass mill products.

I appeared before the U.S. Tariff Commission in support of this request and I append by statement on this vital subject herewith:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN S. MONAGAN BEFORE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION AND COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION, FRIDAY, AUGUST 26, 1960

I appear before you today in connection with the request by the Copper and Brass Research Association for a retention of present tariffs on certain brass-mill products.

The Fifth District of Connecticut, which I represent, is known as the brass center of the world and the economy of that whole region depends for its health upon the healthy functioning of the brass industry.

Since the advent of World War II, the brass industry has been seriously affected by the necessary military development of other metals and materials such as aluminum, steel, and plastics. This development has had a marked effect upon the traditional demand for brass products.

Now, in recent years, to this technological change, there has been added the additional adverse effect of an increasing volume of low-wage-produced foreign imports.

Certainly, a reasonable volume of international trade is a necessity in these times, but the sharply increasing volume of brass good imports has reached a point where the security of the industry is threatened.

An example of this increase can be seen in the field of brass tubing where from 1953 to 1959 the percentage of imports to the total shipments of U.S. mills increased from 3.6 to 31.6 percent; the imports themselves increased over 500 percent.

When one realizes (as the briefs which you have been furnished will demonstrate) that these imports are produced in countries like Japan—where hourly wage rates are 33 cents an hour and Germany where they are 59 cents an hour as compared with the United States—where the current straight-time rate is $2.52 an hour, the seriousness of the problem can be better appreciated. It should also be pointed out that the differential between foreign and domestic wages has increased rather than decreased.

I ask therefore that favorable consideration be given to the request of this vital industry.

My interest is not in the companies as such but in their role as providers of jobs and payers of taxes in our area, as well as their availability for defense needs.

The relief which is sought does not involve any new concessions or increase of protection. It merely asks that the present situation be continued and that no further increase in this crippling competition be permitted.

Scovill Manufacturing Co., estimates that in 1959 loss of sales due to imports cost the employees of that company 44,800 manhours of direct labor and $134,400 in wages.

I certainly do not advocate a return to a rigid and high protective tariff, but I do submit that the instant request is reasonable and should be granted.

Tribute to Dr. George Washington Carver

SPEECH
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the late George Washington Carver, noted Negro scientist, was outstanding in the field of agriculture. As the present decade marks the 100th anniversary of his birth, it is, indeed, appropriate that we pause to recall his accomplishments and pay tribute to his greatness.

Dr. Carver, eminent in the field of science, and especially chemistry, was for many years an honored educator at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama. It was Booker T. Washington, great Negro educator, who induced George Washington Carver to join in the work for the youth of his race which he was undertaking.

The boy George Carver, born of slave parents, was taken into the home of kindly people disposed to give room to his eagerness for learning. He learned

from the field and wood and soon developed a sense of deep economy of the trees and flowers. As a young lad he determined to get a good academic education and, further, to take part in the work of educating his people. When he arrived at Tuskegee he was caught up in the opportunity he faced to meet their fundamental needs.

With a zeal almost evangelical, George Washington Carver began right off to try to turn the interests from cotton planting to peanut planting. He knew there was a large market awaiting peanuts; and, besides, it was a plant good for the soil. It was enriching.

Reluctantly the Negro farmers followed him. They raised so many peanuts that subsequently there was no market for them. But Dr. Carver was determined not to betray the confidence of his people in his efforts.

Then followed weeks alone in his laboratory. He had only the crudest type of equipment, but out of his earnest prayers, his unfailing courage, and his skill came forth uses for the peanut that opened up market after market for the planter.

It is not to be wondered that this man became familiar among the world's men of learning and the recipient of medals and doctorates from many learned societies.

His friend Thomas A. Edison once offered him the facilities of the New Jersey Edison Laboratory for his work, but Dr. Carver chose to stay at his beloved Tuskegee Institute. It was there he died in 1943.

Presidents, statesmen, leaders of industry, and the humble called at Carver's laboratory. Henry Ford visited an exhibit in Carver Memorial Museum to view the peanut-oil massage display. In 1936 Dr. Carver experimented with peanut oils as a massage for after-treatment of infantile paralysis. Prior to 1936 he had developed numerous everyday uses for sweetpotatoes, peanuts, cornstalks, and blossoms. For the products of the South's red clay he developed milk, ink, plastics, cosmetics, paper, and paints.

Besides being chief of research and experiment at Tuskegee Institute, Dr. Carver was closely connected with the research work of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

While he was best known for his contributions to agriculture, Dr. Carver was also listed among the artists of his age.

Near the close of his career, Dr. Carver was asked if his labors did not seem arduous, considering how alone he worked to prove his beliefs in his experiments. He denied this emphatically with the following comment:

No, I am just an interpreter. I have only to listen for God's voice, and to do what he tells.

Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to pay tribute to this great American, George Washington Carver, who rose from the ashes of the unfortunate institution of slavery to become one of the world's great scientists.

What Do They Mean—"Family Size"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED SCHWENGEL
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, one of the major issues of the current campaign—the farm problem—is constantly being discussed by farmers, politicians, editors, and so forth. Mr. Frank Nye, editor of the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette, has discussed, on his editorial page, "What Do They Mean—'Family Size' "? I would like to call this article to the attention of my colleagues for their study. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include the article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

WHAT DO THEY MEAN—"FAMILY SIZE"?

The "family-size farm" is one of the major shibboleths of the current political campaign. The Democratic Party is committed to its support and Republicans mention it often with respectfully muted breath.

At his press conference in Des Moines Sunday Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY defined the family farm as "big enough that a family can live on—and make a living on." That leaves as many questions unanswered as it answers. How big a family? What kind of a living—a peasant-type subsistence or a commercial farming operation that makes possible a standard of living comparable to that of the rest of our population?

Nearly 100 years ago, Congress in its wisdom decreed in the Homestead Act that 160 acres was a family-size farm. Under that act the Government, in effect, bet a farmer a quarter-section of land against 5 years of his time that he couldn't carve a farm out of the public domain. In the small part of the Middle West not already preempted, farmers did prove up and win the bet. But in many Western States the plains still are dotted with old basements, scattered stones from a homesteader's chimneys, and an occasional bush or tree planted by a homesick homesteader's wife to brighten the bleak surroundings. Obviously, there, 160 acres was not a family-size operation.

Farmers themselves have been answering the question for a good many years. The answer is a bigger farm than now. The average number of farms in Iowa in the decade 1937-46 was 209,360, with an average size of 165.4 acres. The 1954 agricultural census reports 174,707 farms averaging 193.6 acres.

The big reason for this trend toward larger farms is improvement in farm mechanization and the greater productivity of farm labor. The output per man-hour of work on U.S. farms now is 2½ times what it was in 1944. During the same years total farm production has increased by more than 30 percent. Meanwhile, the number of farm workers has declined from more than 12 million to less than 7 million.

The substitution of machinery for men on the farms has called for much greater capital investment. The economic necessity of making as efficient use as possible of costly machinery adds to the pressure toward larger farms.

The big bugaboo which some politicians and farm organizations conjure up is corporation farming. It is true that very large corporation-type farming operations have moved into specialized fields such as broiler production, cotton and fruit growing in the Southwest and California, cattle-feeding in some western states and the like. In most cases they have moved in to fill a vacuum where family-size farms failed to seize the new technological developments for their own use.

The implication of those backing family-size farms is that someway they will halt this trend toward larger and more efficient operations. Such a governmental policy would mean freezing unneeded people in agriculture, where technical unemployment already is a major problem. It also would mean limiting the opportunities for ambitious and able farm operators to expand their operations to the limit of their abilities. Neither objective is desirable.

It is desirable that American agriculture continue to be made up of individually operated units. The percentage of family-operated farming units has remained practically the same for the last 40 years. There is no indication that any great change is in the offing.

Twenty-fifth Year of Unemployment Insurance System in Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the silver anniversary of beginning of the Bay State's employment security program authorized by the Massachusetts General Court on August 12, 1935, and presently administered by Director Antonio England. Some highlights of its growth and record are outlined in the following article which appeared in the August 1960 issue of the magazine Industry:

TWENTY-FIFTH YEAR OF UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE SYSTEM IN MASSACHUSETTS

(By John P. Sullivan)

The law which established our Commonwealth's system of unemployment insurance here was enacted by the Massachusetts Legislature on August 12, 1935. It provided for the payment of weekly benefits to qualified unemployed workmen for a specified number of weeks. The benefits under the new program were to be financed by a payroll tax on employers of eight or more persons.

The enactment of the new State law resulted from two major incentives held out to the States by the Social Security Act. States which enacted their own law could receive Federal grants for administration if they met certain minimum requirements of the Federal Government. These requirements related largely to the establishment of safeguards to protect the unemployment fund, the payment of benefits through public employment offices and provisions for a fair hearing to claimants who were denied benefits. The second incentive permitted employers who paid taxes into the State unemployment fund to deduct these payments when they paid the 3 percent Federal unemployment tax, which was established by the Social Security Act.

The requirement that public employment offices be used to pay unemployment benefits enabled Massachusetts to merge the new unemployment insurance system with the State public employment service which had operated a chain of employment offices in Massachusetts since 1906.

Integration of the services in 1935 made the administration of the new law easier because two of the major requirements for receiving unemployment benefits were that a claimant must register for work and also that he must be available for work. Combining the systems not only made job registration easier but it also gave the unemployment insurance system job offerings with which to test the availability of claimants for employment.

MERGED SYSTEM HAS ADVANTAGES

The merged system also brought a major advantage to the employment service because it provided a much wider selection of applicants for referral to employers. The requirement that unemployment insurance claimants register for work also meant the employment service would have the largest labor pool in the community for filling jobs in industry. The employment service arm of the integrated program is placing more workers in industry in a single year today than it did in the first 10 years of its existence as an employment activity alone.

The integrated system of paying unemployment insurance and providing job assistance still exists today and is known as the "employment security program." The activities of the program are carried on by the Massachusetts Division of Employment Security under the supervision of Director Antonio England, through a statewide network of 42 full-time and 33 part-time employment offices. Mr. England is serving his second term as director; his record as an administrator includes experience in government, management and labor. Mr. England is sepecially proud of his administrative record with regard to the instigation of the new building program for local office activities.

A major accomplishment of the entire program in this quarter century has been the ability of those administering it to weld these services into a unified program which would meet the needs of the economy in a satisfactory manner. This organizational feat was accomplished during 25 of the most critical years of the Nation, at a time when the system was called on to serve during two wars and two recessions. It also took place while both the unemployment compensation law itself and the economy of the State were undergoing great changes. From a chaotic beginning when business was carried on in State armories with cardboard boxes for files and a hastily recruited staff, the employment security system has become one of the smoothest pieces of machinery in our State government.

EFFICIENCY KEY TO SUCCESS

A key factor in the success of the Massachusetts unemployment insurance system has been the efficiency with which liable employers have been registered, the care with which their records have been kept, and the speedy system for collecting unemployment insurance taxes. The success which the State has had in conducting these operations, while the number of employers subject to the law has grown from 18,000 to 103,000, has been widely praised by the employment security officials throughout the Nation. Probably no aspect of our operations has been studied by more State employment security administrators than our employer registration and tax collecting system. In 1942 the uniform tax on employers was changed to a variable tax. These so-called experience rates of unemployment taxes were made available to employers with comparatively good experience with unemployment.

This new taxing system called for additional detailed information to be posted to the account of each employer and the maintenance of each account in a much more extensive manner. Today, some 64,000 of the State's 103,000 employers have earned experience rates by building up the legally required reserve balances in their experience rating accounts. All States today have some type of variable tax rating system, although a majority of States use that system now employed in Massachusetts. Unemployment taxes are levied only on the State's employers. Unlike the Federal social-security program, the Massachusetts unemployment law does not tax employees. Since the beginning of the program the Commonwealth's employers have contributed more than $1¼ billion, while benefit payments have exceeded $1 billion. The payment of this tremendous sum to the unemployed during this 25-year period has greatly assisted the unemployed in meeting their economic needs and in preserving their dignity while jobless. In addition, it has given an important boost to the State's economy in times of high unemployment.

The unemployment program faced a severe test when, in the recession years of 1949 and 1958, $115 million and $123 million, respectively, were paid to the jobless. In the year of 1949, more than $12 million was paid to unemployed in the city of Lawrence alone.

NEW PAYMENT SYSTEM

The Commonwealth's employment security system can boast of the promptness with which it pays benefits and the speed with which it hears appeals on disputed claims. Today, more than 70 percent of Massachusetts unemployed receive their benefit checks directly in hand when they appear at an employment office in the week following a period of compensable unemployment.

This new system of payménts was introduced last year by Director England and is now in effect in the agency's 23 large employment offices which take claims from more than 70 percent of the State's jobless. The remaining 19 offices will go on the new system as facilities become available. In the meantime, claimants applying at these offices receive their benefit checks by mail, a system of payment which has been in effect since 1938 in all offices. More than 94 percent of so-called mail payments are made within 1 week after a week of compensable unemployment.

In the years since the unemployment insurance law was enacted, the number of workers covered by the program has increased from less than 1 million to more than 1½ million as smaller employers were brought under the system. The present coverage includes about 75 percent of the State's 2 million work force. The major groups not covered by unemployment insurance are farm, State and local government employees; others not included are employees of nonprofit, fraternal and charitable organizations, and persons in domestic service.

Of the 103,000 employers who are covered by the law, some 90 percent are small businessmen with less than 25 persons on their payroll and employing a total of ½ million workers. The remaining 10 percent are the large employers with a total work force in excess of 1 million.

ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS

The record would not be complete without a listing of the various programs which the division has administered for the Federal Government. These include the payment of benefits totaling $144½ million under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the payment of $2¼ million under the Veterans' Readjustment Act of 1952, the payment of $25 million under the Temporary Unemployment Compensation Act of 1958, and the payment of more than $7 million under title XV of the Social Security Act, which provides unemployment benefits for Federal employees and ex-servicemen.

While lessening the hardship of the unemployed through payments under the unemployment benefits program, the employment arm of the program has filled more than 4 million jobs for Massachusetts employers since 1935. More than 2,800,000 of these placements have been made in industry, commerce and trade, while the remaining 1,200,000 have been made on Massachusetts farms.

The greatest activity in the division's employment service came during the years immediately following our entry into World War II when the service was federalized by Executive order immediately following Pearl Harbor. In recruiting workers to staff the State's war plants between January 1, 1942 and December 31, 1946, employment offices filled 796,000 jobs in industry. During this period, it had the delicate and unenviable task of administering the labor priority system and channeling manpower into essential industries and keeping it there. The reconversion to a peacetime economy after World War II was another trying period for the employment service because of the heavy unemployment created by the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy and the difficulty of matching warworkers trained in the production of war goods with peacetime jobs.

Today many of the State's well-known employers regularly call up the State agency in the recruitment of workers.

One of the State's largest employers has staffed every one of several new plants which it has opened in Massachusetts with the assistance of the division's employment service. This has frequently been done after the agency's labor market service had supplied key labor market data when the employer was selecting a plant site. In setting up jobs in newly established plants, many employers invite division job analysts in to study specific jobs before attempting to fill them with new employees. This job analysis is a key tool in plant staffing.

The employment program has achieved the most spectacular growth during these years in the farm labor recruiting service. From a small operation, little known by Bay State farmers, it has grown to such a phenomenal extent that today most of the big tobacco, cranberry, market garden and dairy farmers in the State recruit workers exclusively through the division. In the period from 1942 through 1948, public employment offices filled 24,251 farm jobs. In the period from 1949 through 1959, employment office placements totaled 574,460.

AMENDMENTS KEEP PACE

The tremendous expansion in both the unemployment insurance and the employment service programs were affected in various degrees by the amendments to the unemployment law itself. The expansion of coverage, changes in both the benefit formula and the qualifying requirements for benefits, the introduction of experience rates and a host of other changes had a considerable impact on the entire employment security program. Some idea of the changes in the law which took place during the period may be gleaned from the chart below. Latest benefit amendments effective as recently as December 1959 make the unemployed workers in Massachusetts as well off today as in most other competing industrial States.

A comparison of benefits

	1938 [1]	1960
Waiting period for benefits	3 consecutive weeks	1 week or part of week.
Weekly benefit rates	$5 to $15	$10 to $40.
Duration of benefits	16 weeks	30 weeks.
Maximum total benefits	$240	$1,200.
Partial benefit rates	None	$1 to $39.
Partial earnings disregarded	None	$10.
Dependency allowances	None	$6 per dependent.
Maximum wages used for benefits	$1,200	$3,333.31.
Tax base	1st $3,000 of wages	First $3,000 of wage.
Penalties for major disqualifying acts	4 weeks with 4 weeks reduction of benefits.	4 to 10 weeks without reduction of benefits.
Tax rates	2.7 percent	2.7 percent.
Experience rates	None	0.5 to 2.5 percent.

[1] Figures for the year 1938 are used because this was the 1st year in which benefits were payable.

During the quarter century that the employment security program has been in operation here, it has not only served the jobseeker and the employer, but also the community, the State, and the Nation. During these eventful years these services were taxed to their utmost during war and recession, yet never failed to do the job required.

Today, the program is known and respected throughout the Commonwealth for the high quality of its employment recruiting service, the efficient administration of the unemployment benefits program, and the substantial buffer against wage loss which it provides for the unemployed.

The Desertion of Sergeant York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, Cavalier magazine has sent me an advance copy of a story entitled "The Desertion of Sergeant York," by William Bradford Huie, which will run in the magazine's October issue. This is a very interesting article, is well written, and expresses the views of many Americans about Sgt. Alvin C. York, the great fighter, distinguished soldier, and grand patriot, who lives in the district I have the honor of representing in the Congress.

I have urged that Sergeant York be relieved of his tax assessments and the Internal Revenue Service has agreed to go part way. I see no reason why they should not go all the way.

Under unanimous consent I include the article in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

THE DESERTION OF SERGEANT YORK

(By William Bradford Huie)

In a mountain meadow in the Cumberlands—he calls it the Valley of the Three Forks of the Wolf—the last American folk-hero is dying.

He's the sergeant—Alvin York—direct, traditional descendant of Dan'l Boone, Davy Crockett, Old Hickory, and Sam Houston; mighty men who mastered forests with rifle-guns, inspired ballads, and who at crisis stood fast, slew our enemies and made America great.

The sergeant is old now: 73. He's been "riding a bed" 6 years since a cerebral hemorrhage paralyzed portions of his powerful frame. He's in financial distress; the United States says he owes $29,000 income tax.

But he's not dismayed. The old eyes which once squinted so accurately down rifle barrels still sparkle when he talks of the majesty of America; his voice is deep and unwavering; and he pridefully shows the Congressional Medal of Honor and all its Allied counterparts, along with letters from Foch, and Clemenceau, Haig, and Lloyd George, Pershing, and Wilson, expressing gratitude for services to the cause of liberty.

We'd better take care of the sergeant. For when we sound taps over him on a Cumberland mountainside, his breed will end. Suburbia doesn't grow heroes; and we can't write ballads about Americans who bolt wheels onto Chevrolets, drink beer, and watch "Gunsmoke."

My journey to see the sergeant was an excursion into the simple, sweet, quaint, and slightly unbelievable past. I was born when the First World War was beginning and, with the trouble I've seen, that adventure in world-saving has always seemed to me like a combination holy roller camp meeting and a Boy Scout summer exercise for merit badges.

I drove through Huntsville, Ala.—where men are preparing to visit the moon—into Tennessee, through Fayetteville, Tullahoma, McMinnville, and climbed atop the Cumberland Plateau between Sparta and Crossville.

This is Appalachia, the area which produced all the fabulous folk-heroes, even Abe Lincoln. And here only three battles are ever mentioned—King's Mountain, New Orleans and the Argonne. At King's Mountain, during the Revolution, the British infantry first met the long rifles. Score: 1,200 British dead, 8 riflemen. At New Orleans the long rifles crouched behind cotton bales for Old Hickory and murdered Wellington's veterans. And the Argonne? Alvin York won that one singlehanded. He "teched off" enemies by the score and captured "half the whole damn German Army."

These legends derive from one proud fact: American frontiersmen did indeed invent the world's first accurate gun. The old, long, heavy, homemade, muzzle-loading, "hog" rifles—the Gibsons, the Beans, the Duncans, the Decherds—were the world's first guns with which an experienced user, at 60 yards, could hit a silver dollar four shots out of five. And Dan'l Boone, Davy Crockett, Alvin York—any of them—on a galloping horse, could reload these guns with powder, patch and ball in 10 seconds.

Even today, up to 60 yards, this old rifle may be more accurate than any gun in existence.

In 1918 Alvin York was 29—and the deadliest shot in the mountains. He had hunted foxes for $35 a month, shooting them through the heads so as not to spoil the pelts. And when, on October 8, at Hill 223 in the Argonne, a German machine-gun battalion confronted him, they were just as dismayed by his marksmanship as had been the British infantry at King's Mountain. Every time a German exposed an eyebrow, the Sergeant "teched him off."

When you reach Fentress County and its county seat, Jamestown (Jimtown), you are in York country and everything is named for the sergeant. You ride the Alvin York Highway past the Alvin York Agricultural Institute and the Alvin York Bible School. At a filling station I got my first report:

"You'll find the sergeant in bad shape * * * sick and in debt. He oughta tuk that money."

"That money" is a reference across the years to the day in 1919 when the returning 6-foot-2-inch, 210-pound rawboned barely literate hero reached Manhattan. The city went wild. They gave him the ticker tape, bedded him down at the Waldorf. They didn't try to sell him the Brooklyn Bridge; they did their damnedest to give it to him. Newspaper syndicates, magazines, vaudeville promoters, picture producers—they offered him a million old-fashioned dollars to "show hisself" to America.

But the sergeant was—and is—a Bible man. He belongs to a sect called the Church of Christ in Christian Union. He almost missed frontline service as a conscientious objector. He had fought his war without smoking, drinking, cussing, raising his voice, or accepting any of that French female gratitude. He told them he didn't have "nothin' to sell." He turned his back on the moneychangers, heard the applause of the Congress of the United States, attended a celebration in Nashville, then went home to a vast dinner-on-the-grounds at which the Governor of Tennessee married him to his girl, Gracie Williams.

In the Valley of the Three Forks of the Wolf, where he was born, he accepted his only gift—a house and 400 acres along Wolf River for which readers of the Nashville Banner and the Rotary Clubs of Tennessee paid $25,000. He lives in the same house today, with Gracie. They have had 7 children—6 living—and 15 grandchildren. The house stands 200 yards south of Wolf River bridge, and 50 feet east of U.S. Highway 127. The place is 6 miles for the Kentucky line. The sergeant's address is Pall Mall, Tenn.

Neither the sergeant nor Gracie regrets his turning down "that money." But his neighbors no longer admire him for it: They say he "should'a tuk it when it was handy."

Even in the Cumberlands this is America's Age of Charles Van Doren. A prudent man "just don't turn down hard money." The admired attitude is: "Take it. Spend it or sock it away. But take it."

When I reached the sergeant's house, Gracie met me at the door. "I've come to see the Old Soldier," I said. "I want to write a piece and see if I can help him." She led me to his bedside, we shook hands, and off and on we talked for 3 days about his life since the Argonne.

First: the farm was not a free-and-clear gift. When he moved in, the Banner and the Rotary Clubs had paid only $10,000, and $15,000 was still to be raised. The sergeant had to "work it off" by filling speaking dates which were arranged for him. His fees, sent directly to Nashville, retired the debt.

Hence the first tax question: Was that $15,000 taxable income? Was the whole $25,000 taxable? If you win $25,000 on TV now, it's taxable. Was the sergeant's money a capital gain and therefore taxable at a low rate, or was it straight income and taxable at a higher rate?

One mountaineer said to me: "Hell, it ain't easy to be a hero now, with all these taxes."

Despite turning his back on that first money, virtually all the sergeant's lifetime earnings have been from "showing hisself"—from Americans wanting to see the big, unlettered mountaineer who, according to Marshal Foch, "performed the greatest feat accomplished by a private soldier in all the armies of Europe." The sergeant was a founder of the American Legion; he represented the 82d Division in the organization

meeting in Paris. So inevitably he has been a professional patriot; the star attraction in every Legion parade; the guest of honor at a thousand banquets. Much money has been paid or given to him, but he has poured it into the schools which he has tried to finance.

"When I come back," he said, "I could see how far our mountain country was behind the times. Not having any learnin' myself, I wanted it for the boys coming up. We needed schools and roads, and because I could get in to see Governors, I made schools and roads—and the Bible—my lifework. I raised all the money I could, and as fast as it come in I spent it. For 10 years I signed every check for the York Institute, and I give it my time and whatever money I had. I never had enough."

The sergeant paid taxes. He had a lawyer, and he paid whatever the lawyer said he owed. He remembers paying $10,000 one year, and the Government sent him $4,000 back. Just how his taxes were computed, I was unable to clarify completely.

"I got no education," he said, "so I never tried to understand all that stuff. I sorta figured I owed the Government half of whatever I had left, and that's the way I tried to pay it. I figure now, instead o' being short, I paid too much."

The big money started coming in 1941, from the picture "Sergeant York," produced by Jesse Lasky for Warner Brothers and starring Gary Cooper. The sergeant liked the picture. He spent 3 weeks in Hollywood helping them edit it. He had a percentage deal, and to date he has grossed about $215,000 from it. He still gets little checks when the film is shown on TV.

But the sergeant didn't sock any of this; he poured it into the school. Also by 1941 he was fighting another war. His role was to "show hisself"—to sell bonds, and the Army took him from camp to camp as a "morale builder."

"What'd you tell the lads in the Second War?" I asked.

"Well, he answered. "I just did my best. The boys were so different from the way we were in the First War. We thought we had something grand to fight for—and the boys in the Second War seemed mighty confused. I told them the new war was the fault of us in the First War, we just hadn't gone far enough. We had stopped before we got the job done. We wanted to go to Berlin, but they stopped us. I told the lads in 1942 that I was sorry, but that they'd just have to finish the job that we failed to finish in 1918."

One trouble with the sergeant's finances is this: He worked constantly during the Second World War, traveled extensively, gave everything he had, yet the Government paid only his traveling expenses; he got nothing for his time. Other men in his position were given commissions and pensions, but not the sergeant; he did the giving.

The Army had a pretty good answer for not commissioning him: "How the hell could we commission Sergeant York? He has to be a sergeant: this country wouldn't want any Colonel York. It wouldn't sound right."

Maybe it wouldn't; but the Government found a way to pay everybody else. Moreover, the sergeant has served 15 years as head of his draft board, and he has never been paid even for the gasoline he burned between his home and Jimtown.

I asked him why, in all his postwar travels, he had never gone outside the United States—back to London or Paris.

He smiled.

"A lot of us boys in the AEF," he explained, "we had a sayin', when we were comin' into New York harbor, looking at the Statue of Liberty, we'd look a long time, then we'd say to the statue: 'Take a good look at me, Old Girl, for if you ever see me again you'll have to turn around.'

"Ever' time somebody's mentioned going to Europe to me, I've sorta thought of that," he said.

After talking with the sergeant for an hour, you are suddenly struck by an omission. In all his conversation he has not employed one obscene or profane word, not even slang. In his youth he had some years when he "fought, cussed, chewed, played poker and drank moonshine." But from New Year's Day, 1914, he has not once "raised his voice."

That's the only criticism he has of the Legion.

"I love those old boys," he said. "I've paraded many a street with 'em. But it hurt me—the way some of 'em acted at the conventions. I don't hold with drinking and loud talking."

In the books about him his speech is that of the illiterate mountaineer. But with his experience, he now speaks as correctly as a high school graduate. In all his life, however, he has read only two books—the Bible and "The Life of Jesse James." He looks at TV, and he enjoys most—not the westerns—but Ed Sullivan.

With him, I recalled the time when he was "out-Bibled."

When he was drafted, he walked 40 miles to the railroad at Oneida, Tenn., and reported to Camp Gordon, Ga. He carried his Bible, and he had filed letters from himself and his preacher saying he couldn't conscientiously fight because his church held the Bible was "against it."

The Army was on the point of excusing him from combat when his major invited him to his tent. They talked "man to man."

"I can't fight, Major," Private York explained, "for the Lord says, 'If a man smite thee on one cheek, turn the other.' "

But the major had his Bible, too. He opened it and read:

"He that hath no sword, let him sell his cloak and buy one."

York countered with:

"They that live by the sword shall die by the sword."

And the major fired back:

"For my Kingdom is not of this world; but if my Kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight."

The duel continued into the night, and Private York was so shaken that he took a furlough, went into the mountains and prayed all day and all night, and decided the major was right.

If the major hadn't known his Bible, the AEF would have lost its finest soldier.

The sergeant, after all the years, is still convinced that on October 8, 1918, in the Argonne, the Lord was with him.

"There is no miracle about what I done," he said. "The Lord was with me. He had told me I wouldn't get a scratch, and I didn't. I didn't have nothing to be afraid of."

If anyone else said this to me, I'd probably smile. But the sergeant believes it. And who knows? Perhaps the Lord is with men who can believe He is.

The sergeant's favorite Americans are President Truman, General MacArthur, and General Patton. He doesn't "hold much" with President Eisenhower.

"I'm afraid Ike has let the old country down," he said. "When Khrushchev called him a liar in Paris, he should'a mashed his mouth. I don't believe Khrushchev would'a called MacArthur a liar, or Patton, or Harry Truman."

The sergeant met Truman many years ago in the Legion. "He's a good man," he said. "I've paraded many a street with him."

His only contact with MacArthur was by mail. A Tennessee soldier under MacArthur was sentenced to death for shooting a tentmate. The sergeant asked the general to commute the sentence to life imprisonment.

MacArthur explained that the Tennessean had raised up on his cot and shouted to a reading tentmate, "If you don't put that light out, I'll put yo' light out." When the tentmate continued reading, the irate Tennessean had shot him through the head with his .45.

"The general wrote that he thought the man deserved death," the sergeant said. "He executed him, and I guess he was right."

One of the sergeant's regrets is that he never met General Patton.

"There was a soldier," he said. "When we have to go again, I sure hope we can find more like him."

And the sergeant thinks, sadly, that we will "go again." "Looks like we stopped short the second time, just like we did the first," he said. "The first time we should'a gone on to Berlin. The second time we should'a gone on to Moscow. Maybe the third time we'll finally go far enough."

In 1950 the Government began "hounding" the sergeant for money. They said he owed $35,000; he insisted he owed nothing. They said the York Institute was not a "charitable institution" since it was also supported by the State and county. He said it was a charitable institution. The Government trimmed down to $29,000, but in 1954 the claim became more or less hopeless when the sergeant was struck down by the cerebral hemorrhage. It was massive. A less vital man would have died, but the doctors tapped his spine, drained off the blood, and he has survived for 6 years. But he can never earn another dollar.

Now it's the *United States* v. *Sergeant York*—and what are we going to do about it? Confiscate the 400 acres and the rundown house and barn? Auction off the Congressional Medal and the letters from Marshal Foch? Turn the sergeant out onto Highway 127 and let him die in the nearby cave where his great-grandfather, Coonrod Pile, holed up as the first white man in Fentress County?

The sergeant's neighbors wax sarcastic when they compare his case with that of Joe Louis. Old Joe owes $1,250,000—which the United States can kiss goodby—and much of it Joe gambled away on golf courses. Yet Joe seems to be living comfortably.

How does Joe Louis, as a citizen, compare with Alvin York? Where are Joe's medals, and how much of his money has gone to educate underprivileged boys?

Then there is the case of General Eisenhower. The general got a special ruling from the tax agents on the $1 million which a grateful Nation made payable to him. He didn't pay 50 percent; he paid 26 percent—$260,000 in taxes—which left him $740,000 and rich enough to join the Augusta Golf Club. Yet in two wars against the Germans Ike never got close enough to smell powder.

Those are some of the sentiments of the sergeant's neighbors. They think the United States ought to square accounts with the sergeant and let him live what's left of a gallant and decent life in peace.

And, after spending 3 days with the sergeant and his neighbors, I agree with them.

Perhaps his bookkeeping has not been as accurate as his rifle fire. So what? There is only one Sergeant York; he's broke, and he can't live much longer. Surely a Senator like ESTES KEFAUVER or ALBERT GORE, both of Tennessee, can figure an honorable way for the United States to liquidate this claim.

If there is no better proposal, I suggest this:

On October 8, 1918, in the Argonne, the sergeant "teched off" 28 Germans, after which the whole machinegun battalion of 4 officers and 128 men surrendered to him.

Why don't we figure those dead Germans as deductible at a $1,000 apiece, then allow

an extra $1,000 for all those prisoners? That'll square the tax account.

The Defense Department should then pay Sergeant York a sergeant's wages for 4 years for all that morale work he did in the camps during the Second War. That'll come to $10,000, then add interest at 6 percent for the years between 1945 and 1960. The whole sum will let the sergeant pay his doctor bills and "ride his bed" in peace and dignity.

Finally, since Highway 127 is a scenic route between Chicago and Miami Beach, I commend this route to sun seekers from the Midwest. When you cross the Wolf River bridge, stop at the sergeant's house. Don't go in, for he's old and tired. But slip a card under his door, and tell him you haven't forgotten the Argonne, or Hill 223, or "the greatest civilian soldier of the War to Make the World Safe for Democracy."

Against Toll TV

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, at the request of Philip F. Harling, chairman of the Joint Committee Against Toll TV, I direct the attention of our colleagues to the following items: "Smog Over Hartford," as it appeared in the Bulletin of August 8, 1960; and a column by Allen M. Widem as it appeared in the Hartford Times of August 11, 1960:

SMOG OVER HARTFORD

Ted Leitzell, the indefatigable propagandist for Zenith's over-the-air Phonevision system of subscription television, has just sent out a booklet entitled "Eighteen Questions and Answers about Subscription TV in Hartford." The Connecticut city is to be the location of a feevee experiment.

The Leitzell booklet is a collector's item. Rarely have the true aims of toll-vision been more explicit stated, and rarely has the phony feevee pitch been more obvious.

The first question, for example, asks what feevee will mean for the subscriber. The answer is that he will "see premieres of class A Hollywood motion picture features now seen only in theaters," as well as first nights of new Broadway productions, "experience the excitement of the opening of a grand opera season" and so forth.

You may wish to ask Mr. Leitzell at this point whether he wants to bet on it, particularly on that grand opera bit. But wait. In the next answer, we are told that "arrangements are now being considered by Hollywood's top studios for bringing to Hartford via subscription TV the best of new, motion pictures—feature films of the caliber of 'Ben-Hur,' 'Can-Can,' and 'From the Terrace.' Broadway producers of musicals, and serious dramatic offerings believe that subscription television can bring about a new era for theater lovers and are currently making plans to bring Broadway shows—productions of the quality of 'Sound of Music' and 'Andersonville Trial'—to Hartford subscribers." And so forth.

The phrasing of these promises deserves attention. Note that they talk about films of the caliber of "Ben-Hur" and stage shows of the quality of "Sound of Music." If this isn't a deliberate effort to mislead people into thinking "Ben-Hur" and "Sound of Music" are already scheduled for Hartford feevee, it is certainly careless phrasing.

It is worth pointing out that the toll-vision test in Etobicoke, Canada, is offering a rather steady diet of second-run movies, incidentally, although it too was full of the same kind of advance visions of premieres and first nights.

Movie men may also be somewhat puzzled as to how a spectacle like "Ben-Hur" will look on a 21-inch screen; but then the Phonevision booklet didn't say they would play "Ben-Hur" at all.

It is when we get to the question and answer about program costs, though, that the full import of Phonevision's golden vision becomes discernible. "Even those with a minimum budget for entertainment can afford subscription TV," says the booklet, "since it would enable families of moderate means to enjoy more quality entertainment than is now feasible at high box office rates." Comparing feevee's projected rate schedule with the cost "when a family with two children attends a downtown first-run movie theater in Hartford * * * including transportation and parking," the feevee booklet says that "With subscription TV, this family could enjoy as many as four movies at home for the cost of one evening out." That's the pitch. Don't go to the movies; patronize the cash box in your living room.

Compare this with the comment about existing free television. "Subscription programing will be in addition to what you already see in Hartford. Subscription TV will make your television set more valuable by bringing you the economy and convenience of great box office entertainment in your home."

In other words, you can always switch to the free channels; you just don't have to go out to the movies any more. To spell out this point, the last paragraph in the booklet says that while feevee will be broadcast for a few hours each day, "when we go on the air with subscription programing, we will continue to devote the major share of our broadcasting day to sponsored and sustaining nonsubscription programs at no cost to the viewer."

Here we have it. While Telemeter has been claiming that feevee has had no effect and will have none on theater business, Phonevision is telling its potential customers they won't have to go to the box office any more—"four movies at home for the cost of one evening out."

While Telemeter has been running subrun movies, Phonevision is promising premieres of films "like" the unique "Ben-Hur" and stage shows "like" the equally unique "Sound of Music."

Hartford is not too far from another Connecticut city named Bridgeport. Bridgeport is famous as the home of P. T. Barnum, to whom is ascribed the immortal saying that "There's a sucker born every minute." If, in his abode of eternal rest, Phineas T. Barnum could read the Phonevision booklet, he would doubtless feel that he had died too soon. Feevee must certainly be counting on the accuracy of Mr. Barnum's sucker count.

Who you kidding, Mr. Leitzell?

COAST TO COAST

(By Allen M. Widem)

What is Connecticut theatrical exhibition's view on pay TV and particularly the approaching Zenith-RKO general pay TV experiment on Hartford's WHCT-TV (channel 18)?

By way of background: The campaign against pay TV is mushrooming into a battle of nationwide proportions as exhibitor leaders continue to exhort showmen to extend themselves in every possible way to curb the threat to the Nation's motion picture theaters.

Published reports that the major television networks have changed their stand and now look with favor on pay TV were attacked last week by Philip F. Harling, as completely unfounded and untrue.

Harlin said that after publication of articles from Washington, D.C., stating that the television networks were abandoning their opposition to pay TV, he personally checked each network and obtained flat denials of the report.

He said that each network stood by its recorded statements at hearings before the Federal Communications Commission and congressional committees that it was opposed to broadcast pay TV as being contrary to the public interest.

"It is my belief," Harling added, "that these reports were planted by pay TV proponents in an effort to stampede their opponents. The television networks are just as adamant today against pay TV as they have been during the past decade, and as they publicly stated at various hearings in Washington. The reports are absolutely false."

Harling noted that Marcus Cohn, of the Washington law firm of Cohn & Marks, which has been retained by both the joint committee and the Connecticut Exhibitors Committee, had filed with the FCC a request on July 14 that the Zenith-RKO general application be made the subject of public hearings.

Bernard Menschell, of the Outdoor Theater Corp. (operating the Manchester and Pike Drive-In Theaters), has written the following paragraphs for the Times:

If pay TV ever comes to your house, what will you be able to see for money that you can't now see for free? Nobody knows.

Since 1955 the Federal Communications Commission has been trying to get the various promoters who have come before it to spell out exactly what programs they will show. To this day this question remains unanswered.

As a matter of fact the lawyers for the local promoters of pay TV have pleaded with the FCC not to hold an open hearing where any claims as to programs could be challenged while the promoters are under oath.

The local promoters of pay TV claim, in general terms, they will offer first-run movies, plays, sporting events, grand opera, ballet companies, and symphony orchestras. You can now see most of these types of programs on your TV set for free.

The new movies now available for free TV have never been seen by more than three-fourths of our country's population. To these people these movies are first run. The plays of the "Hallmark Hall of Fame" and similar programs are wonderful and they are on free TV. Would it make a sporting event any better if we had to pay for it rather than watching it for free as we do now?

Grand opera, ballet, symphony orchestras. Now here is something. For those of us who like to watch the long-hair programs, pay TV might be the answer—and perhaps the FCC would nail down the amount of time pay TV must offer this type of entertainment during prime viewing hours to make certain it is not offered 3 o'clock in the morning.

Most of us, however, ask nothing more than being entertained enough to forget our everyday problems plus forgetting the ever-increasing possibility of being clobbered by an atom bomb tomorrow.

We like the "Mavericks," "Wagon Trains," "Open Ends," "Robert Young," and "Danny Thomas" shows. Plus the ball games. And even though we might fall asleep while watching we are in the majority by thousands to one. Our tastes call the shots as to what is now shown on free TV and will call the shots as to what will be shown on pay TV. The only change being, we will have to pay, and pay dearly, for it.

This is so, not because the talented people who make the shows love us, but because

we are where the money is. In fact we are the money in the bank for the mass entertainment business. It is impossible for the golden pay TV dreams of its promoters to be realized without the dollar-a-show of the mass audience.

Just how much will we have to pay for the privilege of watching on our own TV set that which we now see for free?

During the day the boss of the house—the Missus—steals a well-deserved 90 minutes of relaxation—$1.

She can now watch as long as she wants for free. Your kids watch a couple of hours before dinner—$1. They now watch for hours and hours for free.

Now, Dad, it's your turn. You, too, can watch for 90 minutes for a buck. But will you be relaxed? No siree.

You're not going to doze off while that darn box is eating up your dollar. After the dollar is gone you are going to turn the dial to what is left of free TV—a test pattern—and dream of the good old days when the air waves were free.

No matter how they slice it, you have spent at least $3 for 1 day's viewing. Let's say this happened to be a 30-day month. So, good old dad, you have spent $90 for the privilege of watching your TV set a month for actually less hours than you now watch for free. That $90 is just about the same as your monthly mortgage or rent. Good old dad.

If you don't feel at this time that you'd like to double your monthly rent or mortgage payment, drop me a line, saying how you feel about pay TV, include your address and sign it. I'll get it to the proper people in Washington. They are all right down there. They will understand. They have to pay their bills, too. Write me at the Outdoor Theater Corp., 153 Main Street, Manchester, Conn.

FCC—Renewal of Broadcast Licenses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROLAND V. LIBONATI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. LIBONATI. Mr. Speaker, I have received some very interesting correspondence, touching upon legislation before the Congress.

The resolution, passed unanimously by the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists—Chicago Local, affiliated with the AFL–CIO, is especially interesting.

I am certain that the suggestions contained therein are worthy of the consideration of the membership of the Congress.

Under unanimous consent I include the following in the Appendix of the RECORD:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TELEVISION AND RADIO ARTISTS,
Chicago, Ill., August 12, 1960.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am enclosing a copy of a telegram which I sent on August 12 to the Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN.

I am also enclosing a copy of a resolution which was unanimously passed by our delegation to the Washington convention.

We honorably and respectfully urge your support on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

RAYMOND A. JONES,
Central Regional Director, AFTRA.

RESOLUTION FROM THE CHICAGO LOCAL AFTRA

Whereas the license to operate a broadcasting station granted by the FCC is predicated upon the broadcasting licensee operating the station in the public interest, convenience, and the necessity; and

Whereas the phrase "public interest, convenience, and necessity" rightfully means "substantial programing by the broadcasting station so as to aid, foster, and reflect the cultural, economic, sociological, and other objectives of the community in which the station is located," as well as the origination of a substantial number of programs from that locality; and

Whereas many broadcasters in their license applications for the right to operate a station have made certain promises, representations, and warranties as to the programing of the station in the public interest, convenience, and necessity; and

Whereas many broadcasters have failed in substantial measure to live up to their promises as to programing the stations in the public interest, convenience, and necessity; and

Whereas local and network broadcasters have canceled, with increasing and alarming frequency, locally produced programs, therefore terminating services of many local technicians, performers, musicians, and other highly trained personnel; and

Whereas the members of AFTRA, as well as the general public, have a real and substantial interest in the programing of the station in accordance with the promises, warranties, and representations upon which the broadcast license was issued; and

Whereas the FCC is obligated by law to determine the initial issuance of the broadcast license as well as the application for the renewal of the said license; and

Whereas the FCC has the right to examine and hold public hearings on the right of any broadcast licensee to a renewal of its license: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That AFTRA's national executive secretary and national counsel be and they hereby are authorized to take any and all action in Congress, before appropriate committees and the FCC, in cooperation with other affected unions, guilds, and associations in the broadcasting field, to secure the right of AFTRA, and the aforementioned unions, guilds, and associations, and other interested members of the general public to require the FCC to hold public hearings on applications for the issuance or renewals of broadcast licenses where a protest has been filed, so that the broadcaster can be required to prove that he has operated and will operate in the public interest, convenience, and necessity.

AUGUST 12, 1960.

The Honorable EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN,
Senate Committee on Labor and Public Affairs, Washington, D.C.:

Respectfully urge you to drop exclusion of employees of radio or television stations in cities of less than 100,000 population from the provision of the proposed amendment to the Fair Standard Labor Act of 1938. It is unthinkable that announcers, engineers, and other talented and trained personnel get less than $46 per week for 40 hours in America today. I have in my possession brochures published by the company which claims a listening audience of more than a million persons in Chicago, Gary, and Hammond. There are hundreds of such stations which have a studio and transmitter just outside the city limits of large metropolitan areas, which would be exempted under proposed exclusion. I am mailing you special delivery copy of brochure.

RAYMOND A. JONES,
Central Regional Director, AFTRA.

AUGUST 24, 1960.

Mr. RAYMOND A. JONES,
Executive Secretary, AFTRA, Chicago Local, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR MR. JONES: I have received your letter relative to the matters passed upon in the adoption of the resolution for the Chicago local—AFTRA, and have called your suggestions to the attention of Congressman PETER F. MACK, Jr., of Illinois, who is our representative on the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I am recommending the same to him.

Thank you for calling this matter to my attention, I am,

Sincerely,

ROLAND V. LIBONATI.

AUGUST 24, 1960.

Hon. PETER F. MACK, Jr.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: I have received the enclosed communication from Mr. Raymond A. Jones, executive secretary of AFTRA, Chicago local.

I feel that some of the suggestions that are included in this resolution contribute, in a measure, to the solution of many of the problems facing that industry.

Thanking you for your consideration of this matter, I am,

As ever,

ROLAND V. LIBONATI.

AUGUST 25, 1960.

The Honorable ROLAND V. LIBONATI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ROLAND: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 24 and the enclosed resolution from the Chicago local of AFTRA.

Many of us on our committee have been quite concerned about the policies of radio and television stations in overlooking local interest and in the FCC policy of automatically renewing station licenses. I feel the suggestions made in the resolution from AFTRA are extremely appropriate and support the views expressed in reports made by the Committee on Legislative Oversight.

Sincerely yours,

PETER F. MACK, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, the communication received from the Honorable PETER F. MACK, Jr., Representative from the 21st Congressional District of Illinois, is indicative of the acceptance of the suggested changes contained in the resolution from Chicago local of AFTRA.

As a recognized expert in this field, certainly, his recommedations should be accepted.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

Jet Takeoff Noise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 27, 1960

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the jet age has brought a marvelously new means of transportation to the people of the globe. However, it has also brought many new problems, one of which is the extremely unpleasant problem of noise in jet takeoffs and landings. I share the continuing concern of many people who live with me in the State of California with respect to the problem. During the past many months I have been consulting with the head of the FAA, General Quesada, with a view to taking steps which might be useful in eliminating the unsettling sounds of takeoffs when jet planes take off from airports.

General Quesada has issued a series of regulations to deal with that problem. I believe they will be helpful. I have been interested also to note that some $50 million has been allocated by the aviation industry to study the best means of eliminating these noises.

I ask unanimous consent that an excellent editorial on this subject entitled "Quiet, Please!" appearing in the Washington Star for August 21, 1960, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

QUIET, PLEASE!

Disclosure that the aviation industry has spent $50 million during the past 5 years in efforts to solve the increasingly serious problem of airline noise gives a measure of hope to those whose ears and nerves have been blasted by the din of passing planes. Sufferers from the racket in the skies should not allow their hopes to soar too high, however, for no immediate relief can be promised by those studying the problem.

The industry's program of noise research and suppression was outlined by Sir William P. Hildred, director general of the International Air Transport Association, at his headquarters in Montreal. He said the noise problem would be a major issue at the meeting next month in Denmark of the international group. Meanwhile, according to Sir William, an enormous amount of work has been done on both sides of the Atlantic in trying to silence the big aircraft—especially those with jet engines. Waxing philosophical, Sir William added that "people should understand that a certain amount of power in anything makes a noise—and noise is an essential accompaniment of modern life."

Maybe so. But we fervently hope that the aviation people nevertheless will continue to seek effective means of making airplanes quieter. Residents of some sections of the Washington area are finding it difficult enough to be philosophical about the roar of conventional planes taking off or landing at the National Airport. They will be even less philosophical when the big jet airliners start using the new airport at Chantilly.

Federal Aviation Administrator Quesada is no less concerned over the noise problem than harassed residents near airports. He has stated that the FAA is concentrating right now on the problem, which involves not only engineering research on engines and planes but the arrangement of takeoff and landing patterns so as to cause the least disturbance to persons on the ground. Some progress has been made in the latter direction here, although pilots do not always follow the routes laid out. Here is an enforcement problem with which the FAA should deal.

Mr. Quesada wisely has taken steps to cope with the jet noise "fallout" when the Dulles International Airport opens next year. Large buffer zones, each as large as the National Airport, have been established at the ends of each runway. Land that otherwise might have been used for residential purposes and thus become a source of complaints has been taken into these zones. But the breakthrough that some day may silence the jets and bring peace of mind and body to those of us who are earthbound is not yet in sight. Whatever the cost, we hope the aviation industry and the Government will press ever onward in their search for a solution.

House Program for Week of August 29

SPEECH
OF
HON. CHARLES A. HALLECK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

PROGRAM—DISTRICT BILLS IN ORDER ON MONDAY NEXT—CONSENT AND PRIVATE CALENDARS TO BE CALLED ON TUESDAY NEXT

(Mr. HALLECK asked and was given permission to proceed for 1 minute.)

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader as to the program for the balance of this week and as best he can tell us at this time the program for next week, and if he can predict, if he cares to, as to a possible sine die adjournment next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the next order of business today is the deficiency appropriation bill.

Following that will be bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia and I suggest to the chairman of the committee that they bring up today only those bills which in his opinion and that of the members of his committee are not controversial and that the others be carrier over until Monday of next week.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will permit an interruption, I might suggest that he obtain consent at this time to consider those bills on Monday next that are not disposed of today.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Monday next to consider bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. On Tuesday, of course, there will be the call of the Consent Calendar and Private Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Tuesday next to call the Consent Calendar and the Private Calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will permit at that point, may I express the sincere hope that members of any committee which has bills eligible for consideration on these calendars get them in so they can be called on the calendars and not have to be brought up under unanimous consent.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman.

Then there will be called up on Tuesday the bill H.R. 8093, the Merchant Marine Act, Pacific coast shipbuilding, if a rule is filed on it.

Also there will be several resolutions and bills from the Committee on House Administration relative to printing and other matters. A list of these resolutions and bills will be placed in Monday's RECORD.

The bill H.R. 8093, dealing with the Merchant Marine Act, is the only legislative bill I have put down specifically.

Of course I make the usual reservation that any further program will be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

In reference to the sine die resolution, I am unable to state anything in connection with that. The one thing that might delay it would be the length of time the conferees may take on the minmum wage bill and how far the conferees are willing to go in accepting the better bill that passed the other body.

Mr. HALLECK. I was satisfied with the House bill, as, apparently, the majority was.

Mr. McCORMACK. That makes a straight issue between the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Massachusetts. I favor neither bill, particularly, but between the two I favor the Senate bill. But let us not get into that.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be held down to this, but my best judgment is that we may adjourn sine die around Wednesday or Thursday.

Mr. HALLECK. I would like to make one further observation that has been suggested to me. We may have some committee action dealing with extension of the Sugar Act. Any matter, I may say to the gentleman, such as that, we can agree among us to consider, and I will be glad to cooperate in every way I can.

I would like to make one other suggestion. That is that everyone understands as we come into the closing days of the session, if any bills are to be brought up under unanimous-consent agreements, which would involve unanimous consent for passage or for suspension, that there be consultation so we can understand completely what is involved.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is clearly within his rights on that.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

States Rights Found

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 27, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the August 26, 1960, issue of the State, of Columbia, S.C., contains a well-written editorial which makes an excellent point. The point is that the important principle of local self-government, referred to by many as States rights, is quite meaningless to the advocates of centralization of power in Washington until and unless this vital principle can be found to serve a useful purpose for them.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATES RIGHTS FOUND

Four of New York's leading politicos, the present Governor, Nelson Rockefeller, and his three predecessors in office, Averell Harriman, Thomas E. Dewey, and Herbert H. Lehman, have made a big discovery. They have found out that there is such a thing as States rights. And we are glad they have.

It all came about this way: Representative EMMANUEL CELLER, of Brooklyn, was preparing to ask the House of Representatives to cite three officials of the Port of New York Authority for contempt of Congress on the ground that they had withheld information wanted by the House judiciary committee which has been investigating the authority for several months. Since then CELLER has gone through with his proposal and the House has voted to cite them.

A telegram of protest, sent to all House Members, said the four Governors believed "such precipitate and unhappy action would mark the first time in the history of the United States that the Congress ever voted to instigate criminal prosecution for contempt against State officers serving a State agency in a matter that concerns the proper exercise of their official duties." It was charged the Judiciary Committee's attempt to subpena confidential interoffice memorandums—the source of the proposed citation—was an attempt to invade States rights.

CELLER said if the Governors believe that his committee has acted unconstitutionally, the proper way to test the question is to appeal to the courts, and Rockefeller replied that if these officials were cited (which they have been) "of course we shall take it to the courts."

In their letter the four New York Governors said: "We are faced with an assertion of Federal power to control State and municipal agencies which would wrench our system of government from its established foundations. The subpena at issue appeared to us and our legal advisers to constitute a novel intrusion by the Federal Government into areas reserved by the constitution to our respective States and to constitute a precedent which could subject various agencies of State government throughout the Nation to be similarly answerable to Federal authority."

As a believer in States rights we, of course, side with the Governors. But that is not the immediate point we wish to make. We are just so glad that these chief executives have at long last discovered that there is such a thing as States rights. The next step for them would be to recognize that States rights apply not just to New York, but to other parts of the country as well—even to the South. But we guess that would be asking too much.

Can America Maintain Peace?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, one of California's most distinguished State senators, Nelson S. Dilworth, of Riverside County, last year made an outstanding address at the Kiwanis Club of San Diego. The subject, "Can America Maintain Peace?" is one which is of uppermost concern to all of us today and the outstanding quality of Senator Dilworth's effort is indicated by the fact that the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge selected this speech as the winner of its George Washington Honor Medal.

The speech defends the American system of government from the slander and false claims of the Russian dictatorship and is more timely today than it was when it was first delivered at San Diego on August 25, 1959.

Under unanimous consent I include this speech in the Appendix of the RECORD as a portion of my remarks:

CAN AMERICA MAINTAIN PEACE?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your gracious words of welcome and to you, President Cunningham, may I express my sincere appreciation for the outstanding leadership of your organization in clarifying the obligations of citizenship in a free, popular form of government and also your accomplishments in meeting these obligations.

I am sure that you all fully realize that a government, whether good or bad, is made up of people, men and women of varying standards and motives. Our illustrious first President of this Republic often stated in substance and I think in words, "Government is a dangerous servant and a terrible master." What words could be more true or more applicable to our situation today? Shall we keep our government as a servant of the people, doing their will, or allow cunning and malevolent conspirators to seize control and make of our free institutions an instrument for the exercise of their dictatorial will? This is not an idle thought. It has happened to a score of republics in your lifetime and mine. Shall it also happen to us, to you and to me, to your children and to mine? The answer is for us to give.

Centuries ago in the English Parliament Sir Edmund Burke declared, "For evil men to succeed it is only necessary that good men do nothing." Perhaps others voiced that sentiment in earlier years in forums unrecorded. It was true then and it is true now. For evil men to seize our Government and with it our liberties and freedom, it is only necessary that our official leaders do nothing.

For the world Communist conspiracy, to take over and enslave Americans by means of control of our American Government it is only necessary that freedom-loving American officials in public office do nothing to oppose them. Our governmental leaders must resist the Socialist front of the Communist conspiracy, or we will be engulfed as others have been.

The freedom-loving President of Czechoslovakia was not removed from office when the Communists seized the Republic. The freedom-loving majority in the Parliament was not immediately replaced. They were just intimidated into doing nothing to hinder the Communist organization at work. They thought, perhaps, that they could compromise, or coexist with Communists in political activity. Alas, how tragic a mistake. America also can fall into the Communist tyranny while hating it.

The last step in Czechoslovakia that sealed the doom of freedom and the end of the Republic was when the newspapers refused to continue printing the facts developed by the parliamentary commissions exposing the organizational methods of the Communist conspiracy to terrorize non-Communists into submission. The Communists boasted that they would make the non-Communists destroy the Republic and they did. The long sharp blade that drew the lifeblood of freedom from the heart of Czechoslovakia was the stupid participation by non-Communists in organizations directed and controlled by concealed Communists. The Communist Party was only the handle of the blade and the rough hand on the handle was that of the Politburo in the Kremlin.

It is only prudence to consider the fate that has befallen other free governments. The czars of Russia in the evolution of time and progress finally granted to the Russian people a parliament, a duma, in the year 1905. Progressively the elected representatives of the people accomplished faltering but well directed steps toward freedom. In the mili-

tary debacle of 1917 with disaster at the fighting front a harsh reality, the duma set up a republic to be rid of the incompetent hereditary rulers. Political freedoms were declared and political prisoners released from jail. Revolutionary fugitives in foreign lands were permitted to return.

As the new republican leaders rallied their armies to defend their native homeland they allowed opposition parties to organize and even to arm themselves in the name of liberty. In only a few months, as the republic's leaders and soldiers, faced the foreign invader, they were stabbed in the back at St. Petersburg by the organized Socialist Party of Nicolai Lenin, a returned Socialist fugitive. Under Lenin's orders a mob of revolutionary conspirators, rifles in hand, rushed into the duma and made prisoners of the elected representatives of the Russian people. Arsenals and supply trains were raided for arms that should have been in the hands of the armies defending Russia from attack, and before the armies at the fighting front could turn about and deal with the enemy at home, the homeland had fallen into the bloody hands of Lenin's well-disciplined party. And what party was it? It was the Socialist Party. Lenin was a Socialist. As a Socialist he came to power, but to force his socialism on an unwilling people he had to have a secret police system under a released bank robber from the Caucasus. Socialism was made compulsory and extended to the daily details of personal life. It required punishment and terrorism for enforcement on such a scale that no ordinary court system could cope with the volume of resistance. Compulsory socialism, known as communism, cannot be made effective without arbitrary police power to individuals or groups and liquidate them.

The socialism of Lenin was but a high-sounding name to screen a tyranny and oppression never realized under the worst of the czars. And it all happened so quickly, so unexpectedly. It happened in days, even in hours. The transition from freedom to slavery is quick, like passing through a door. The return trip from slavery to freedom takes whole generations, yes, centuries of sacrificial struggle by the noblest and best youth of the land. All the accomplishments of the Russian people in hundreds of years of struggles for freedom were swept away in minutes as Lenin's rifle-bearing revolutionary Socialists rushed into the duma and made prisoners of the freely elected representatives of the Russian people. Nothing remained to stop Stalin from displacing Lenin and setting up rule by violence. Not only can socialism never provide peace, but socialism requires violence and tyranny to exist.

South and west of Russia across the continent of Europe, Lenin and Stalin were copied. A conspiracy was organized within a country enjoying constitutional freedom under the nominal leadership of an indulgent and popular king. Benito Mussolini was allowed to organize to use force by the tolerant government. He marched on Rome and rather than shed Italian blood the government allowed him to take over. And who was he? He was the leader of the Socialist Party of Italy. It is true that he copied the emblem of the Caesars, the bundle of sticks and battleax called faces, and became known as a Fascist, but he built his organization out of the Socialist Party on socialist theories.

Faced with popular dissent and reluctance, he, too, turned to secret police and bathed Italy in the blood of her own sons and daughters. The indolent Italian citizen content to leave the government to others paid a thousandfold in labor, blood, and tears under the Socialist dictatorship for his apathy during his years of freedom. Yes, and in the loss of his sons in the rash military adventures of the dictatorship, the Italian father's aged head was brought low to an unhappy and lonely grave. All because they neglected to make the sacrifice of time and effort to preserve their free institutions when they had them.

Freedom will not operate itself. It must be defended. It is but a chance to achieve liberty for ourselves. We must accept the responsibility and labor to operate our popular government or become slaves. May I repeat that for evil men to succeed it is only necessary for good men to do nothing. Socialism in Italy could not provide peace but plunged the country into reckless foreign wars and maintained murderous, decimating strife in the homeland.

By the time that the people of Italy were ground under socialism's iron heel, a man with a cropped mustache reached for the leadership of the Socialist Party in Germany. With inflammatory speeches and promised glories for Germany he bound to his will the Socialist organization. The German Republic was tolerant. The leaders were hesitant. Their currency was valueless. Adolph Hitler was allowed to organize with military methods.

As a Socialist he came to power by election. To carry out his Socialist decrees in the face of rising resistance of the German people, Hitler too, had to organize a gestapo and secret police, yes, and huge crematories and charnelhouses to liquidate and dispose of millions of his own countrymen, and countrywomen. By the chance of history this Socialist dictator come into political command of the German General Staff, the world's greatest war machine, and plunged the whole world into the mass carnage of World War II. This was Hitler's method of suppressing the German people's discontent under socialism. Enforced socialism cannot keep peace but leads inevitably to war.

And what shall I say of the German people who neglected to keep their constitutional republic and voluntarily chose a fuhrer? In exchange for their freedom they got poverty, destructions of homes and loss of livelihood, wounds without number, death and a national and racial condemnation and dishonor on the unchangeable pages of history. All this was because they would not accept the friendly duties and responsibilities of free popular government under the Reich.

From these examples, and I could give others, I think it is clearly evident that compulsory socialism, or call it communism, it's the same thing, holds no promise for peace or for any advancement of human welfare. Marx called it socialism, Lenin called it socialism, Stalin called it socialism, Khrushchev calls it socialism, and socialism it really is. Under its rule government is a terrible master, indeed. And why should America adopt it piecemeal, a little at a time? Careless officials thrust on us various types of socialism. It aggrandizes their power. It multiplies their control of affairs and control of people. If we allow these officials to put one thin layer of socialism on top of another, they will soon be our masters, and we will be prisoners in the land we failed to protect and save. Socialism on the installment plan is just as tyrannical as any other socialism.

Socialism is never practiced voluntarily by all people. It has to be enforced. Enforced socialism is communism. To enforce socialism in the common, everyday acts of life of the people, a secret police and dictatorship are required. The police state inevitably develops into terrorism and destroys every trace of freedom. It becomes the terrible master that President Washington warned us to beware of. But the father of our country also said the government could be a servant, even if a dangerous servant.

The critical turning point of whether government is a master or a servant is this, "have controls been established so that the people may control the men and women into whose hands power is delivered?" And we must remember that one government has as much power as another, the power of life and death is wielded by every government. In our America let's look at some of the controls that have been firmly established to hold in check any rash and adventurous official who may come to temporary power.

What has our American Constitution enabled the American people to accomplish toward realizing in government the ideals of the great Declaration of Independence, ideals of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness?

First we have accomplished freedom of life. We have established effective curbs on the police and military forces of our country. The citizens cannot be placed in jeopardy for life or liberty by the police or even by any judge without the voluntary waiver of the right to a jury trial. Every citizen may count on this security. The people have withheld from government officials and reserved to themselves in the form of juries the right to judge the innocence or guilt of their own neighbors. Americans have established the greatest consideration and fairness toward those accused of wrongdoing ever known to exist in this world. Even for petty offenses the citizen accused can demand a trial by a citizen jury of his peers within the jurisdiction of the alleged offense. This vital feature of American liberty is not equaled in other governments.

Other great powers are withheld from our Government officials by the people. Leaders of the National Government are powerless to alter the Constitution if they are faithful to their solemn oaths to uphold and defend it. Only by referring proposed amendments to the elected legislatures of the States or to elected conventions can amendments be affected.

The history of liberty the world around has been the story of resistance by the people to the encroachments of their own government. No matter how well intentioned, human beings in public office, some of them at least, tend to expand their power and enlarge their activity. In no other country have the people more safeguards, more weapons to strengthen their resistance by peaceful means to such trespass of the liberties as have been reserved to the people by the Constitution.

In the Constitution itself there are numberless checks and balances to safeguard our people against arbitrary caprice in official acts. Congressional action is subject to Presidential veto. The veto may be overridden by a two-thirds vote in each House of Congress. The President must obey the laws duly enacted and must uphold the Constitution. If he fails, Congress by the process of impeachment may remove him from office. The President may not touch a single dollar in the Treasury without an appropriation by Congress. The powerful House of Representatives is required to come before the people for election or removal every 2 years.

In 170 years no one has successfully subverted our constitutional processes and today our Government is the oldest national government in the world without major change in its basic institutions.

Another check or balance on the Presidential power is that the most important appointments made by the President are subject to the approval and consent of the Senate. Thus the important policy decisions of the American Government are for the most part the result of concerted action of several or even many officals.

Historically the last word in the defense of the Constitution has been the prerogative of the judiciary with the final resort being the Supreme Court. Acts of Congress or acts by any official may be challenged in the courts by any citizen and if the courts find that they are in conflict with the Constitution, the governmental act is void. So

we have a government of laws made by many rather than one official and all subject to the scrutiny of the courts as to their conformity with the Constitution. The security of the American citizen in his constitutional rights is our Nation's most outstanding and unique political accomplishment. Comparable rights in the economic field are enjoyed by the people of America as a result of their active participation in governmental activity and their use of the political safeguards so that in America, government is in fact a servant of the people.

Our Government being under the control of the people should bring about a significant and unique policy in relations with other countries. It certainly has. Although America has become the greatest military, naval, and aerial power on the earth, we hold and rule no conquered land. Along our farflung land frontiers our neighbors dwell peacefully and unafraid without forts or defenses of any kind. The American Constitution is the greatest peace document ever produced by men. Our weaker neighbors pay us not tribute but dwell secure under our protection from the greed of conquest by totalitarian countries. The flow of wealth is not from the weak to this powerful Nation but from us to the weak and underdeveloped countries. All this is in response to the will of the American people as freely expressed in elections. In American elections there is always another name, or place for one, on the ballot to confront our official leaders when they go back to the people for extension of their tenure of office. There is always competition for election to office or the opportunity for competition. Competition in elections is another word for freedom.

There is also competition for business success. In the interest of the public, competition is regulated to insure honesty and fairness, but there is little socialistic governmental dictation. This competition in business for public favor and demand is very real and keen. The public is the umpire and the banker is the scorekeeper. Every time you buy a General Motors car you make that corporation more prosperous. When you buy Texaco gas you promote the growth of that company. You have your choice. You may buy Chevron or Shell gas. That manufacturer will grow. You may buy Chrysler or American Motors. You choose. Competition, the American way, gives you your free choice. Competition lets you, the people, decide what you want. Competition greatly expands American liberty and is another word for freedom. It is what has made America the wonderland of the world.

In the American competitive economic field there have developed many instances of voluntary cooperation that are highly beneficial to the public and to the parties participating. These must never be confused with the politically compulsory socialism that has been so tragically destructive abroad.

Competition exists all around us in the world of nature, between the grasses in our lawn and the trees in our forest, between the wild animal life for survival, yes and even among birds for life itself. Competition is natural in this world and in our political life, competition is the means by which we give the people their choice, their control of government as a servant and not as a master.

Our Constitution guarantees no results. It is primarily a rule of the game, a means of fairly determining the will of the people. Our Constitution will not work itself. We can no more have liberty and peace without effort than we can have bread without toil and labor. Our Constitution is entirely in language of opportunity, a chance for the ambitious to achieve for the people of America.

Today the way to survival in American national official position is to serve the cause of peace among the peoples of the world. This benign competition between the most able and powerful leaders of America is the hope of humanity the world around to escape the unavoidable trend to war of the socialist dictatorships. While foreign dictators compete for power, American leaders compete to make peace more secure and to banish fear and want from the firesides of the world. I can best describe it as the Golden Rule put into practice by our Nation in international affairs. We are trying to do unto others as we would that they would do unto us.

I have tried to show how the Constitution of the United States requires competition for positions of leadership in the American Government and uses this competition as the means by which the people, with their choice of candidates, exercise their control over the policy of the American Government and restrain the over ambitious should they come to power. This control by the people over their officials in Government not only renders civil war unnecessary and preserves peace at home, but in effect selects leaders for our Government who seek peace in relations with other peoples and other nations. Our leaders do this because it serengthens their positions in the political competition for continued return to official position by the people at elections. This is a true and dependable type of peace that is based solidly on the will of the American people.

The wise Forefathers who framed our Constitution understood this point clearly. They wrote a provision in the Constitution that the Federal Government must guarantee a republican form of government to each State. In other words should a State become a dictatorship or a monarchy, the United States must step in and restore a republic. The architects of our Constitution understood clearly that we cannot have a partnership with dictators and maintain freedom.

The least successful phases of government in the American Republic are those municipalities that fall under the power of a political boss. This happens too often but the point I want to observe is that, whenever, a boss gets control of a city political machine, he inevitably corrupts the State government. We cannot permit dictators or bosses within the framework of our free institutions without great harm to our Government and to the people. Neither can we safely go into partnership with foreign dictators in a world government. We are but one-fifteenth of the population of the world and we have one vote in 77 in the Assembly of the United Nations. Conferences with other nations and cooperation for specific goals, yes, but surrender of our Army and Navy to foreign control and yield to aliens at the head of world government the power of taxation and the regulation of immigration to this free land of ours, never. Any such step would end all freedom.

Our unique political and economic institutions have enabled the American people to produce one-third the wealth and goods of the world. We cannot, we dare not subjugate our people and our accomplishments to the control of representatives of the backward peoples, representatives who dominate and oppress their own lands. If it is necessary to fight Communist infiltration in Lebanon, why not in America? If it is necessary to fight Communists in Quemoy and Matsu, why not resist and expose them in America now, while yet we can?

But you ask me, How is America going to stop the Communist world conspiracy short of war? Students of history believe Hitler could have been stopped if the nations had realistically faced up to his announced intentions in time.

And what are the Communist intentions? They have been proclaimed countless times by books, speeches, pamphlets, radio, and periodicals. They are driving for a world dictatorship. A dictatorship of the proletariat they say, meaning dictatorship by the power-mad, self-appointed conspirators in the Kremlin. The Communist official who in person directed the slaughter of 15 million blond, freedom-loving Ukrainian peasant men, women, and children has publicly boasted speaking to the American people that "some day we will bury you."

It is probably true that the majority of the Russian people want peace. Most common people do. But have they the power to keep the leaders of their dictatorship within peaceful objectives?

Only Khrushchev and the Politburo can put names on the Russian election ballots. The peace-loving people are not permitted to place the name of a candidate of their own for governmental office on the ballot, beside the Communist Party names.

The greatest assurance of world peace that I can think of would be for the Russian people to obtain this right to place their own candidates' names on their election ballots and then have a secret vote in an election where they were free to vote as they chose without fear of Khrushchev's secret police and terrorism.

I know of no other way to restrain Khrushchev's insane lust for world power and domination.

And how shall we stand against Khrushchev's intent to bury us? First by truthful and honest national policy with a helpful friendly hand extended to all other national leaders who exhibit good will and who value freedom among men.

Second, by a national and popular return to trust in Almighty God and His Commands of righteous living and devotion to service of our fellowmen. National and ecclesiastical recognition of God is good but not enough. It must be a widespread and heartfelt turning to God and His Bible by our God-fearing people individually, by families, and communities as well as in churches and religious groups. We must preserve our faith as a people and as a Nation in the Almighty God, our Creator. No other defense against communism is as powerful and as universal in effect.

Then having taken our stand on truth and good will and acknowledging our dependence on God, we must be strong, strong militarily, strong economically, strong in the spirit of service to others, strong in our faith in God.

We must rekindle the fires of patriotism and service in the hearts of our youth, our adults, and our aged. There is a duty for all. I warn you that patriotism, like everything else, has to be taught and to be taught effectively it has to permeate all of our schoolbooks and it has to be lived sincerely by both parent and teacher.

I cannot think of a nation worthy of the name but which has been built on the patriotism of its people, particularly its young people. I can name many nations that have been quickly pillaged and destroyed when their people lost the ideals of patriotism and service to their country. When the youth of any land refuse to offer themselves freely in the service of their country the tragic end of that nation hastens on apace. Grey heads can provide the best shock troops in the cold war of the forum and printed page against the propaganda of socialism and dictatorship which seeks to discredit competition and freedom. All our adults of the middle years can be loyal in word and deed. Their social and cultural organizations can assist as agencies for patriotism and service to our country.

We must be strong in research and science and safeguard our new knowledge with great care that our discoveries do not enable our enemy to harm our land and our people.

For their own protection it is imperative that our youth in schools and colleges select the serious hard courses in science, mathematics, and languages. The empty seats in these classes should be filled up by volunteers for service to America, service in peace as well as war. Many are demonstrating great ability and perseverance in these fields, but they are too few in number. Our institutions of national defense are unable to secure enough scientifically trained recruits to modernize our defenses fast enough. This is the only road to peace. Superior knowledge and skills. More advanced research carefully guarded. Greater skill and willingness to sacrifice ourselves in the defense of our country. And demonstrated cooperation between the free nations of the world.

Then, if the evil Socialist distatorships unleash the great engines of war, our young adults must spring to the defense of our country and once again demonstrate that freemen are more brave than the driven subjects of dictators. It may be that, as the Kaiser was not stopped in time, and as the dictators of socialism were not stopped by peaceful means in the thirties, that the oriental madmen of Moscow and Peiping will not be deterred from their course of blood. It may be that the beautiful trees of popular freedom and liberty have to be again defended and watered with the blood of sacrificial service by the American people. Our forebears gave their lives gladly for our freedom. We can do no less with honor in our time.

Whenever liberty has been proclaimed in any land it has been the result of fervent national spirit, of enthusiastic patriotism. Not only does patriotism produce freedom in government but it produces justice, it defends truth, it strengthens morality and it practices righteousness. And what is patriotism, it is love of one's native country, love of one's neighbors and friends, love of the institutions of freedom and justice, love of liberty for youth and aged. Patriotism produces that indispensable willingness to sacrifice one's own comfort and even life itself for others, for country and native land. Patriotism is love's supreme expression best defined 1,900 years ago by the unforgettable words, "Greater love than this hath no man, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

I plead with you to welcome and act on every patriotic impulse in your breast. Read patriotic books. Support the efforts of patriots who are striving to preserve freedom in our conutry. Speak of patriots who are striving to preserve freedom in our country. Speak out for liberty at every appropriate opportunity.

As our honored forebears pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor to the support of the Revolution against the tyranny of 1776, may we now as freely and sincerely pledge our lives, our means, and our secred honor as men and as citizens of America to the equally perilous struggle to maintain our freedom and national independence today.

What Makes Them Communists?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a very timely article on communism which appeared in the American Legion magazine for September 1960:

WHAT MAKES THEM COMMUNISTS?—A FORMER COMMUNIST LEADER DESCRIBES THE TYPES WHO JOINED THE PARTY AND TELLS WHY THEY DID

(By John Lautner)

While relatively few Americans have had the dubious distinction of knowing personally any active members of the Communist Party, everyone has learned about such people from millions of words that have been written and spoken about Communists and their activities.

Thanks largely to investigations, all America has seen how these people have used their positions and their talents to betray their country. They have seen how, in positions of trust, these people have stolen secret documents and plans for use by Soviet Russia. They have seen how highly placed people in Government have used their influence to make foreign policy which has endangered these United States. They have watched with dismay as stars of stage and screen were exposed as having given lavishly of their money and their influence to a conspiracy directed against a nation that made them rich and famous. They have been saddened to find that Communists have used their jobs in schools, colleges, newspapers, and even in churches, to spread their deadly doctrine.

Where do these modern Benedict Arnolds come from? What kind of mentality do they possess? Certainly they were not born Communists, so what made them Communists, willing to do the Kremlin's dirty work in this country?

Having been in the operating leadership of the Communist Party for many years, I think I have a pretty good understanding of what it is that causes people to become Communists and how they are used by the party once they are absorbed into it.

Why does one join the Communist Party? I have heard this question many times in the last 10 years while traveling for the Government on cases dealing with communism. People in all walks of life, judges, Federal grand juries, spectators at hearings and trials, attorneys, Federal agents, and others seek an answer to this question. Even the Communists themselves—but for different reasons—never failed to ask new members why they joined the party.

Party leaders spared no effort, time, or money to get new members. And when the new party member came to his first meeting, the Communists were always eager to find out what compelling reason prompted him to leave his former way of life behind, and step over the threshold into the disciplined ranks of the party.

I had many opportunities to listen to the explanations the newcomers gave. Most of the reasons given by new members for joining the party were primitive and emotionally motivated. The new member usually had only a vague idea as to what Marxism-Leninism—the doctrine of communism—meant to him. Almost invariably he explained his move into the party by condemning the existing social order with its institutions, traditions, and ethical standards. Some of the newcomers did this quite eloquently.

In the course of 20 years of party leadership, I have seen many join the party, who were nonsocial in behavior and weak in character. The party to them meant strength, and they were encouraged to lean on it. Prior to joining the party, these people had no connection with any of the many legitimate social and benevolent organizations that function everywhere in the country. They were not participants in the political activities in their respective communities. At best, the new party members had been tied up with a party-controlled front organization, such as a nationality group, an unemployment unit, the American Labor Party in New York, a left-wing student group, an anti-Nazi organization, or one of the many other front organizations that the party has created from time to time. Some came from the so-called "rank and file" groups organized by the party in the labor movement.

New members rarely realized that the party they joined was committed to the principle of dictatorship and the defense of the Soviet Union. They learned about these obligations later through gradual careful indoctrination. New members had no idea of the strict discipline enforced in the organization. As these conditions unfolded before their eyes, most of them hurriedly left the party. This created an extremely high rate of turnover with thousands sometimes joining and leaving the party at the same time. On the basis of my own experience I would estimate that there are at least a half million individuals in this country who, in the course of 40 years of the party's existence, have at one time or another made out an application card to join the Communist Party.

New party members invariably came from that segment of our society known as dissidents. They were embittered individuals, who found in the party many like-minded people. It was only natural that the Communist Party should get a great many of these bitter and frustrated individuals.

The bulk of the party membership, and notably the party leadership, did not come from the industrial working class. At all meetings in which the industrial composition of the membership came up for discussion, party leaders would warn: "We must change the composition of the membership to become a truly working class party." This, however, never happened, and to date the problem has remained unsolved. When leaders such as Earl Browder ventured to say that the composition of the leadership should also be changed, it was softened with the after thought: "Well, Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin were not workers either."

At the height of its numerical strength, in 1938, the membership consisted of 75,000 dues-paying members with 20,000 more in the Young Communist League. About half of this membership was in New York City. In 1929, when I joined, the party had around 10,000 dues-paying members including the Young Communist League. The bulk of this membership was foreign-born, from central and Eastern Europe, but among them were a few native-born members, who were surging ahead into leadership. The party-controlled press consisted of 10 daily newspapers and 17 other publications, printed in about 20 languages, with a total circulation close to 200,000.

When I joined, the overwhelming majority of the members were people who had split away 10 years before from the Socialist Party, plus some immigrants who had come to this country soon after the First World War. The former leftwing of the Socialist Party, the so-called language federations, had split away on issues related mainly to the Soviet Union, and these formed the Communist Party. They believed in giving all-out support to the bolsheviks in Russia; they endorsed the bolsheviks' methods of gaining state power; and they were determined to seize power in the United States by the same methods. To these wild-eyed leftwingers world revolution was inevitable. They believed in the Leninist way to "the dictatorship of the proletariat."

As these people broke away from the Socialist Party, they could not agree even among themselves. They split again in a scramble for recognition as the sole representatives of Moscow, and organized two

Communist Parties. The Bolsheviks of Moscow then had to step in and force them to merge into one organization to be directed by the Communist International. The merged party quickly learned obedience and loyally carried out the policies and instructions that came from Moscow.

It used to be a common saying in the party that all roads do not lead to Rome, but to Moscow. It was also said that the party leadership in the United States is like the Brooklyn Bridge: it is supported by cables, in this instance cables from Moscow. The former left-wing Socialists, who had made such an outcry that they were gagged in their exercise of free speech by their leaders in the Socialist Party, now meekly succumbed without even a whimper to every directive that came from far-away Moscow.

Soon after World War I, during the years when immigration to this country was relatively simple, some of the newly arrived immigrants found their way into the Communist movement. These new party members had already lived through the 1917–20 revolutionary upheavals in their respective homelands, and after arrival in this country a few who could not adjust themselves to the way of life here found their way into the Communist Party. Many of them promoted themselves into leadership. This was not difficult to do in a party which had a lot of foreign-born members.

The most active individuals, who in a short time became party leaders were: Louis Weinstock, J. Peters (Sandor Goldberger), James Lustig, John Szanto (Dezso Hammer), Sam Milgrom (Mills), "Buck" Lazar, Bill Lawrence (Lazar), James Matles, Steve Nelson (Meszaros), Sam Brown, Louis Roberts (Sass), George Siskind, Joe Roberts (Gubelow), Martin Young, John Steuben (Rizsak), George Powers, Jim Keller (Karl Sklar), Peter Chount, Emil Gardos, Louis Koves, Louis Bebrits, and many others. By 1930 all of them were on the way into the first and second echelon of leaders in the party. They were well equipped to serve the party, and proved to be dependable troubleshooters always available to carry out party orders and decisions.

In all but one or two of the intraparty factional fights of the 1920's these fellows were known as "Jay Lovestone's boys." After all, he was the general secretary of the party, the leader designated by Moscow. But, when the break came between Lovestone and Stalin, the boys did not follow him out of the party. Not that they did not see the absurdity in projecting Moscow-directed Bolshevik methods in the United States, but Lovestone had openly defied Stalin's methods and that was unforgivable. Right or wrong, the Soviet Union and its leaders come above all else, and Lovestone's majority support in the American Communist movement melted away overnight.

When Jay Lovestone returned from his lost battle in Moscow, he found only a handful of his former followers. His whole party was gone, safely anchored in the monolitic structure of the Stalinist Communist International.

With the Lovestonites out of the way, the party braced itself for an influx of new members. It came soon enough with the depression that set in with the 1929 Wall Street crash when the unemployed provided a vast reservoir of potential party members.

Building the unemployment councils, a party front organization operating amongst the unemployed, became the most urgent task of every functionary and member. The kickoff came on March 6, 1930, with demonstrations organized by the Communist International all over the world. Practically all the major cities in the United States witnessed such Communist-organized demonstrations, many of them ending in riots. By the end of 1933 the party had doubled its membership. As a concession and inducement for the unemployed to join, their initiation fee and monthly dues were reduced to only 10 cents.

The rise of Hitlerism in Germany also benefited the Communists in America. They organized the League Against War and Fascism and the Anti-Nazi League, both front organizations of the party, and this made it possible to appeal to a new group of prospects. Many of them subsequently joined the party. During this period, at one of the big outdoor meetings in New York, the principal speaker, Willy Muntzenberg, an internationally know German Communist leader, told his audience that Hitlerism was a historical accident. Within a year or so, he said, it would be shoved into oblivion by the German people led by the Communist Party of Germany. "Have faith in the German party and the international," he said. And many listening to him at Starlight Park near the Bronx Coliseum believed him and joined the Communist Party of the United States.

At the time I was a section organizer for the party on New York's West Side. The boundaries of the section were from West 59th Street to 110th Street and from Central Park West to the Hudson River. It was a densely populated area with a wide variety of inhabitants. The section was organized in February 1933 and activated with 55 party members. When I left that section in April 1936, it had 560 dues-paying members and about 2,000 close party sympathizers in the Unemployment Council, Friends of the Soviet Union, League of Struggle for Negro Rights, International Labor Defense, Icor, Anti-Nazi League, and International Workers Order—all front organizations built by the party in a small section of New York City.

In this period two types of new members swelled the ranks of the party. There were unemployed people from the poorer parts of the section around Columbus Avenue and the lower sixties, and there were native-born, younger professional people from Central Park West; from west of Broadway, and from West End Avenue and Riverside Drive. The latter included teachers, lawyers, dentists, doctors, students, musicians, housewives, and office employees of all sorts. They moved into the party from Communist-controlled front organizations and from street corner meetings. In the course of the 3 years that I was there, at least 1,500 party application cards were signed and paid for in this one section alone. Many who signed never came to a meeting. Some left after one of two sessions; but there were others who stuck for good.

Why did they join the Communist Party? In the party a member had a feeling of belonging. He felt he could express his opinions and they would be listened to. At the Saturday evening house parties, there was a lot of fun as participants raised money for the party. To mingle with others, who had a sympathetic understanding of one's personal problems; to be on the ground floor in a building a new society; to get direction and guidance to run party-controlled front organizations; to sound off against Father Coughlin; to keep abreast of world events through the eyes of the party; to work for the revolution; to have excitement—these were some of the many reasons people joined the party. Front organizations produced new recruits with regularity, but special efforts were made to recruit college and university students as well as workers from industry. Some of the recruited students turned up later in the New Deal administration in Washington.

Getting new members was easier than holding them in the ranks. The joiners were the product of the American educational system, not the foreign-born comrades, and most of them did not stick. The leadership of the party desperately looked for a solution to stop this in-and-out routine.

The answer was found when Earl Browder, the Moscow-appointed leader, "discovered" that the Communist Party had its historical roots in the American soil and in the forefathers of this country. The party brush went to work on Washington, Jefferson, Douglas, Paine, and Lincoln. With a little adjusting here and there the Communist Party of the United States fell into line with the revolutionary traditions of America's illustrious historical figures. Listening to Browder, one would surmise that Jefferson and Lincoln would have been charter members of the Communist Party if they lived today. And to dispel any doubt, Browder made it crystal clear that "communism is 20th century Americanism." For the first time, in addition to singing "The Internationale" at mass meetings, the Communists began to exercise their lungs on "The Star-Spangled Banner."

At the same time, party leaders did not fail to point out that the banner of international solidarity must be held high by every member. They argued that while the party represented the best interest of the American people, it still stood for internationalism, and it represented the future. The party was all things to everybody. "Join the united front—join the party." This line was sweet music to the opportunistic pseudointellectual who had no roots anywhere in American life.

Another big break for the party's leaders came in the spring of 1936 when the Congress of Industrial Organizations came into being in Pittsburgh. For many years William Z. Foster and his cohorts had tried every trick in the book to gain a foothold in the ranks of American labor. On the instructions from Moscow the party set up the Trade Union Unity League (the trade union front of the Communist International), to infiltrate the ranks of American industrial workers. With the aid of a few professional revolutionaries and some unemployed party members they set up skeleton organizations from textile to steel. But there was no rank and file membership.

With the formation of the CIO the party was able to capture leadership with planted Communists in some of the newly formed unions. Somehow they managed to get charters and jurisdiction, in spite of the fact that no appreciable number of rank and file unionists ever joined or ever listened to the party.

Among trade unionists, only opportunists looking for personal advancement ever came near the party. These fellows were the type who would introduce a Communist-tailored resolution for adoption in a local union, or who would raise issues for which they were well-coached by a party functionary behind the scene. This type, anxious to look like a "big shot" in his local union, could never stand on his own feet, so he ran to the party for help and advice. The party, of course, was willing to oblige.

It should be said, and with the greatest emphasis, that only a handful of Negroes ever became members of the Communist Party. The time, money and talent that the party invested trying to get a foothold among Negroes was way out of proportion. But the American Negro, the target of the party for many years, refused to join its ranks.

The party injected itself into such issues as the Scottsboro, Angelo Herndon, Trenton Six, and other cases, but even this agitation did not help. The Negro people turned a deaf ear toward anything that had to do with the Communists. At the present time a handful of frustrated professional Negro Communist leaders are frantically trying to devise a "new line" which will break the

solid wall of Negro resistance to Communist infiltration.

Communist strength and influence started on the downgrade with the signing of the Hitler-Stalin Pact in 1939. A further setback occurred when Stalin intervened through Jacques Duclos, the French Communist leader, to "set the Communist Party in the United States on the Leninist path again."

These two events considerably reduced the influence as well as the membership of the party. The party and the Young Communist League between them had approximately 100,000 members in 1939. In spite of tactics employed during the war, such as their drives for a second front, and the use of the theme that "Russia is our ally," membership fell off. In 1946, soon after the war ended, the Communists could count only 60,000 members, and half of these were in New York City.

The years following the end of World War II did not produce any substantial increase in party membership, and the party concentrated on internal reorganization, reindoctrination of the membership in Communist theory and tactics, and concentration drives on the basic industries of the country. These drives were aimed at getting new members from workers in industries and unions. But in spite of the well-organized efforts and reorganization schemes, and even though thousands of new recruits came into the party, others left in droves. The old problem of turnover of membership continued.

To cite one example: In 1947 in the industrial sections of the New York party, organizers at staff meetings reported a large number of new members recruited. The organizer of the distributive trades section of the party reported 132 new members in May of that year, and pledged 1,000 by the 4th of July in the 16 clubs under his leadership. He almost reached that figure by July 4, but at the end of the year, he showed a net gain of only a dozen or so over the previous year. The same thing happened in all other sections of the New York party, and there was a similar picture in other parts of the country.

The turnover in the party rank and file so frustrated the branch and section functionaries that some of them openly opposed the idea of indiscriminate recruiting. The top leadership of the party singled out some of the defiant functionaries in the Midwest and New York and warned them to carry out their recruiting orders. Those who refused to carry out the orders were expelled from the party. When these functionaries appealed for readmission at the 1948 Communist Party convention they were rejected, to show that the party could not be defied.

Quality versus quantity became the issue, and the national leadership insisted on quantity. The leadership reasoned that they must have quantity first, which could be turned into quality. This, however, did not solve the acute turnover.

The history of the Communist Party, from the early 1920's to 1960, shows that it was not difficult to find people who, indifferent to consequences, would fill out a Communist application card, sign a nominating petition for a Communist candidate for public office, or become part of a Communist front organization.

Such a person, on joining the ranks of the Communist Party, was carefully molded into a loyal defender of the Soviet Union and a "fighter for the cause," to bring about a Communist dictatorship in the United States. He also learned that in the defense of the Soviet Union and the "dictatorship of the proletariat," he must be ready to risk exposure, ridicule, scorn, and sometimes even jail.

However, since 1950, a few events have occurred which have given the partly leadership some headaches. As we have pointed out, the party lost members as well as influence. Steps taken by such Government agencies as the FBI, the Department of Justice, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee and others have badly hampered it. Such action on the part of the Government developed alertness and vigilance on the part of the American people as well. Another handicap has been the public exposure of Stalin's insidious murders of his own cohorts and millions of other innocent people, and Khrushchev's wholesale murders and persecution of the Hungarians, fighting for their freedom against Communist tyranny in 1956. Also oppression of national minorities, particularly Jews, did not help the Communist Party in this country. Recruits have dropped to almost zero, and many have left the party.

It need hardly be pointed out that, even though they live in this country, Communist Party members are in the Soviet orbit. As for those who left the party, it would be a mistake to think that many of them have become anti-Communists. These people are merely waiting to be coaxed by the leaders to get back in the fold. And from time to time such a call is voiced by leaders in the Communist press. The leaders look upon these people as party members who support the party without being organizationally connected with it.

A few years ago J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, made a well-publicized appeal to ex-Communists, asking them to give the benefit of their experiences and knowledge about the Communist Party to the Government. Not many ex-party members took the opportunity to reach for Hoover's outstretched hand. Few indeed are the ones who make a clean break with communism.

In the main, the ex-party member remains the dissident he originally was when he signed the application card to join the party. He is fortified in his defiance by certain liberals who say that the ex-party member should be left alone in regard to the mistake he made. The ex-party member certainly made a mistake against his family, community, and country when he joined the Soviet conspiracy and he would be doing only what decency requires if he gave the benefit of his knowledge about the Communist conspiracy to his country's representatives.

The present Communist Party membership—the open leaders, the hidden membership, and the members at large—carry on their subversion under the slogan of: "One party, one policy, one direction," given by Gus Hall, the present general secretary of the party. These conspirators, like Nikita Khrushchev, dream of the day they will bury us, a free people, living in a country under the best form of government that the human mind has ever conceived.

In a nation of 180 million people it should not be surprising to find a few thousand people who will sign their names to anything without giving it much thought. Some will even join the Communists. What is necessary is that the American public be informed about this problem, so that we can be aware of what these people are like and what they are up to. This is one way, and an important way, in which we can keep the Communists from making headway.

Pollster Gallup Explains His Polls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past few days about polls and how they are made up. Dr. George Gallup yesterday wrote an article for the New York Herald Tribune explaining his method and more particularly the poll recently taken which showed Mr. NIXON today receiving 50 percent of the popular vote and Senator KENNEDY receiving 44 percent, with 6 percent undecided. The article is herewith appended for insertion in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

IN REPLY TO ALSOP AND GORE—POLLSTER GALLUP EXPLAINS HIS POLLS

(By Dr. George Gallup)

Open season on pollsters has arrived, and the shooting, as usual, comes from those who do not like the poll findings. The basic procedures used by the Gallup poll have been described in books and articles. But in every new election many of these criticisms reappear. During recent days these points have arisen:

THE UNDECIDED VOTE

Standard procedure of the Gallup poll is to report what people think today and how they would vote if the election were today. Ask a typical voter how he plans to vote on November 8 and frequently he will say he doesn't know—it depends on what happens between now and election day.

On the other hand, virtually all voters can and will tell an interviewer how they feel at this time about the candidates. As a regular part of the question procedure of the Gallup poll, persons are asked to tell how they "lean" as of today, in those cases where there is indecision. This still leaves a residue of about 6 percent who can't make up their minds as to how they feel today, or are reluctant to tell the interviewer.

The history of polling provides ample evidence that polls can report accurately how people think at the time they are interviewed. Polls go wrong, as they did in 1948, chiefly because they assumed that people would feel the same on November 2 of that year as they did in the middle of October.

THE NONVOTERS

Standard procedure of the Gallup poll is to base its election poll findings on voters, and to exclude as carefully as possible all nonvoters. No poll could possibly lay claim to being an accurate gage of the voting public if its sample were not a sample of the voting public.

An election poll of the whole population which embraces aliens, people who are institutionalized, persons who are not registered and do not plan to register, would be inaccurate and misleading. For example, a sample drawn in New York City might include an area which is heavily populated by foreign-born residents who have not yet become naturalized U.S. citizens. To include these noncitizens in an election poll sample would obviously be indefensible.

Standard practice of the Gallup poll in making its election reports is to include each section of the country in proportion to the number of votes which it casts of the total popular vote.

Any forecast of the popular vote of the Nation would be wrong to the extent that the South—or any other section—failed to be represented at its true proportion of the total popular vote. It must be remembered that today all polls deal with the popular vote—not the electoral vote.

In the most recent national election—the election of 1958—the Gallup poll forecast that the total popular vote for Democratic Congressmen would be 57 percent; for Republicans, 43 percent. In the election of 1958 the Democrats polled 56.5 percent. The deviation of the Gallup poll from the actual result was, therefore, one-half of 1 percentage point. If the South had not been included at its true voting proportion, the error would have been six times as great.

NUMBER POLLED

A favorite criticism of polls based upon scientific sampling is that they reach a small part of the population, and that a switch of a few voters could change the results.

One answer to this oft-repeated criticism of polls is their record of accuracy. Since 1948 the Gallup poll has made election surveys in five national elections. Poll findings have deviated from election results in these five elections by an average of 1.7 percentage points. This is the best answer to the critics who continue to say, "it can't be done," and to those who say they have a better way.

Actually the U.S. Government itself makes great and continued use of small-scale sampling. Many government reports today on unemployment and other problems are based upon samples covering one person in approximately 5,000 of the total population.

During the last 25 years some poll critics have been concerned about the "bandwagon" effects of polls. No evidence whatsoever has been produced that polls have any such influence on voters, and there is a mountain of evidence that they do not. In 1948 every political writer and every poll predicted that the Republicans would win. If people had wished only to be with the winner, then Dewey would have won by the greatest majority in history.

The Gallup poll has never claimed infallibility. No one has yet found a perfect way to forecast human behavior. And at this point, no one can say whether the polls will be right or wrong in 1960. But what can be said is that the Gallup poll is trying to make full use of its experience and of its technical know-how, and to report its finding honestly and objectively.

Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriation Bill, 1961

SPEECH
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on H.R. 11390, which makes appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

I am glad to note that the higher Senate figure of $173,050,000 was agreed to for grants, loans, and payments under the National Defense Education Act of 1958; that the expansion of teaching in education of the mentally retarded grant of $1 million to public or other nonprofit institutions of higher learning and the State educational agencies, pursuant to the act of September 6, 1958, was not disturbed.

I am pleased with the increase of grants to States in accordance with the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to $57,500,000. The substantial increase in favor of grants for hospital construction to $186,200,000 will materially help grants and loans for hospitals and related facilities, including diagnostic and treatment centers and hospitals for the chronically ill and injured.

I am glad to see substantial increases in the appropriations for research in cancer, heart, arthritis, mental health, and other conditions which are affecting our population and which will be eliminated or reduced by continued study.

He Refuses To Conform

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. BERRY. In the totalitarian states of the world, the central government assumes the responsibility for the care and security of everyone from the cradle to the grave. To shoulder this responsibility means that the central government must at the same time be able to regulate the amount of work the individual shall do to compensate for such lifelong security. This is known as the "work norm."

By the same token, if the individual "refuses to conform," the state must have some leverage, some power, or some control to force such conformity. In some states this method of persuasion is called the Gestapo. Others have their particular name for persuaders, but in each the purpose and result is the same. Conformity must be compulsory in a totalitarian state. Any state which guarantees security, which compensates each individual according to his need, must also be able to compel conformity.

TOTALITARIANISM

The founders of this Nation came to these shores to free themselves from conformity. They came here to free themselves from central government security. They came here seeking only opportunity for the individual, opportunity to provide for his today and his tomorrow through the fruits of his own efforts and ability.

But, despite the good purposes of the Founding Fathers, there has grown up within these borders the totalitarian philosophy. Central government planners have moved into each breach and have established their foreign philosophy, not as much through laws passed by Congress, because Congress is responsible to the voters and dare not authorize these steps directly, but instead Congress has given a free reign to the bureaucrats who in turn socialize through the Federal rules and regulations.

THE INDIAN PROBLEM

There are few totalitarian states where the central government forces conformity of the individual more strictly than on the Indian reservations of the United States. This system has created what is popularly known as the "Indian problem."

There is no Indian problem, there is only a totalitarian or "socialist" problem. There are many examples; I shall relate but one.

BACKGROUND

Years ago Congress provided for the allotment of lands on many of the Indian reservations to the individual Indian, this on the theory that the Indian was found on the land and it was assumed that all of them should be farmers and live from the soil.

For years the tendency of the Department of the Interior, which was given guardianship over the property of the individual Indian, was to increase the freedom of the Indian. The Indian was given the right to lease his land and to use the proceeds of such lease rental to help provide his livelihood. When the Department of Interior determined that he was competent to handle his own affairs, he was permitted to sell and dispose of his allotment and to use the proceeds thereof as any individual would.

Then under the so-called New Deal there came a strange philosophy into this free Nation, a move back toward the totalitarian state from which the forefathers had come. The plan of subjection of the individual to the state was slower among the non-Indians because with the return of crops and production and good times, the individual demanded a return of his freedom. The return of that freedom has become a political issue and is the dominant issue in the present election. The voters in the November 1960 election shall decide whether they wish "security with conformity" or whether they want "individual freedom with opportunity."

The Indian, however, has no alternative, he must accept "security with conformity" at least so long as he chooses to live on or near an Indian reservation, or until the Congress repeals the Wheeler-Howard Act enacted in the early days of the New Deal.

EXAMPLE

The Bureau of Indian Affairs at the Washington level is adamant in their stand that an Indian allottee is free to handle his own land so long as he conforms to the regulations, the regulations being that he himself must work his own land unless he turns complete authority to the Bureau.

Under the policies of the Bureau all land on the reservation is classified to determine the best "use" to which such land shall be put. In grazing areas, all land in a certain tract, whether it is tribal or allotted, goes into a "grazing unit" and the allottees in that area must sign a power of attorney authorizing the Department to handle the rental of their land for them.

If an allottee—who by the way is supposed to be a free American—refuses to conform, refuses to give a power of attorney or attempts to revoke one already given, he is required to fence his own land out of the unit and handle the use of that land himself. He dare not rent it. He cannot contract to have the hay put up and sold. He cannot contract to have the work done on shares so that he gets his portion of the crop. He must do the work himself, or he must hire the work done and pay the cost himself out of his own pocket. Then he can sell the crop and pay the cost of having someone who does have the harvesting machinery do the work. If he refuses to conform, the Bureau steps in and forces conformity.

Yesterday, I received a frantic call from an Indian allottee on one reserva-

tion in my congressional district. I shall not mention his name or the name of the reservation for fear of reprisals either upon the Indian or the employees involved. The allottee told me he had hired a non-Indian rancher to cut and bale the hay on his allotment, which he had refused to put into a grazing unit because it was an especially good hay quarter and was worth more for hay than the normal rental for grazing purposes. Those allottees who conform in a grazing unit receive the same rental as all other allottees in the grazing area, regardless of the productivity of the allotment, because under this system, as in all totalitarian states, "equal compensation shall be provided for all."

The allottee told me that he did not have the cash to pay for the cutting and baling of the hay, so he had contracted with the non-Indian to do the work with the understanding he would sell the hay to the non-Indian who owned the haying equipment for $15 per ton, first to pay the cost of harvest and the remainder to be his cash rental return for the production of his allotment.

He told me that the Department had stepped in, taken over the baled hay and was selling it to someone else, proposing to deposit the proceeds of his account in the Agency office to be paid to him as they decided it should be disbursed. He asked me what chance an Indian had to establish his own credit, to get started in the ranching business, if his contracts were to be summarily revoked by the Great White Father at the will of the Great White Father.

When I called the Superintendent I was advised that it appeared the contract with the non-Indian was a fraud, that instead of the Indian making a contract to hire the hay cut and baled, then sold to the rancher at the price of $15 per ton to pay the cost of harvesting the hay and the balance to go in cash to the allottee, it was apparent to the Department that the contract had been made to harvest the hay on a share basis with the rancher taking a certain share for harvesting the hay and then buying the share of the allottee, which the Bureau official advised, was strictly against the regulations of the Department.

I was told that the Bureau was having trouble with this Indian "because he refuses to conform."

I was also advised that this procedure becomes necessary because the Bureau has the "responsibility of protecting the property and the income of the Indian people."

When the Founding Fathers established a system of government which provided the utmost of individual freedom and opportunity, they failed to take into account that certain forces would in later years be at work guaranteeing security to certain groups and that with that guarantee of security comes the responsibility of the "work norm," or the "rental norm" in this case, which compels "conformity" of all, and that with this compelled conformity, individual rights, individual privileges and individual opportunity is sacrificed. Socialism? Totalitarianism? Where? Here in America.

SBA Extends Loan Program for Small Businesses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, the Small Business Administration has announced that that agency has agreed to make loans to local development companies for construction of shopping centers to be occupied exclusively by small businesses.

This worthwhile extension of the SBA loan program was a recommendation of Subcommittee No. 1 of the House Small Business Committee, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman. It is gratifying that this recommendation by the subcommittee has been accepted by SBA and that this new assistance program for small businesses was adopted.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the press release announcing this program in the Appendix of the RECORD. The press release follows:

Philip McCallum, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, announced today that his agency has inaugurated a program of loans to local development companies for construction of shopping centers to be occupied exclusively by small businesses.

He said the loans would be for construction, conversion or expansion—including acquisition of land—for shopping centers. Mr. McCallum said:

"We are pleased to announce a plan within our existing authority, under which the Small Business Administration may be of assistance to small firms so that they can participate in shopping centers, which have been developing significantly across the country.

"The problem has been under study for many months and there have been conferences with bankers, small business owners and civic leaders. The Small Business Administration will welcome the participation of banks and other lending institutions in the financing. However, where private lenders are not in a position to participate, the Small Business Administration will make direct loans.

"A major deterrent to small business tenancy in shopping centers has been a requirement by financing organizations of a top financial rating for the tenants or a guaranteed lease by the small business firm seeking tenancy in the shopping center."

Mr. McCallum explained that under the program of his agency, loans up to $250,000 for each small business to be assisted may be made to local development companies for shopping centers. The number of loans to a local development company would be limited only by the number of small businesses to be assisted, and by the amount of its own funds which the local development company can inject into the project. These companies must have a financial interest in the project, he said.

The SBA Administrator said there are about 3,200 local development companies across the country and that many of them are now in a position to participate in the SBA program to assist small firms and provide jobs.

Loans to local development companies for shopping center projects may be made for a period not to exceed 10 years with an allowance for construction, conversion or expansion times and will be amortized generally on an equal monthly installment repayment basis. All or part of the loan may be prepaid at the borrower's discretion without penalty.

Interest charges on loans to local development companies under this program will be 5½ percent per annum for direct loans by the SBA. Where bank participation is involved, the rate of interest may be fixed by the bank. However, the interest on the Small Business Administration's share of the loan in such cases will not exceed 5½ percent, nor be less than 5 percent per annum should the participating bank elect to charge a lower rate of interest.

Interest on these loans will be on a per annum basis on only the outstanding indebtedness, payable at the time each installment repayment is due.

Regulations to govern granting of these loans are being completed and will soon be available at Small Business Administration regional offices in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Richmond, Atlanta, Cleveland, Chicago, Minneapolis, Kansas City, Detroit, Dallas, Denver, San Francisco, Seattle, and Los Angeles.

Spiritual Values Are Our Basic Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter which appeared in the San Diego Union of August 16, 1960:

SPIRITUAL VALUES ARE OUR BASIC NEED

EDITOR, THE UNION:

America is a great nation founded on principles that have been discovered by mankind over centuries of experience. These principles are basically religious in nature and from this source comes the concept of the worth of the individual.

The U.S. Constitution did not invent the rules of morality and try to fit man to them by Government fiat. The Constitution assumes that the moral code exists as the system of society and sets up a form in which a particular society can pursue its goal of governing itself through free institutions.

The men who wrote the Constitution had a profound regard for the essential truths from Greece and from the religions of mankind. But freedoms written into this document reflect a great truth of Western culture. Understanding of these truths is what we most need today. We must know why we are free to worship at altars of our choice; why we are able to seek and to speak the truth without fear of dictation; why we can work and play according to our own conscience; why we can own property; and why we have the right to our day in court.

In the long history of mankind no other form of government has contributed so much to the happiness and the prosperity of the common man as has our American democracy. No system has given the average citizen greater opportunity to enjoy the fruits of his labor, initiative and enterprise. None has afforded greater protection to a man's own conscience or a freer right to express his own opinions. No other system of government has so fully bestowed upon man the dignity due him as a human being.

The greatest danger to the free world is not from military invasion but from the invasion of a materialistic doctrine which is designed to capture the minds of men. The central feature of this doctrine is that it

contains no belief in spiritual values, no respect for the individual, nothing that even resembles the ideals for which man has died over the centuries.

MALCOLM A. LOVE,
President, San Diego State College.

Independent Voter Groups Back Fields

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MILLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. MILLER of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following portion of the Chicago Daily News, editorial page, "Letters to the Editor," of August 24, 1960, with reference to the situation in the 12th Congressional District of Illinois which I think is of considerable interest to people in Illinois—and especially in the Chicago area:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR—INDEPENDENT VOTER GROUPS BACK FIELDS

In the 12th Congressional District (North Side of Chicago) the Independent Voters of Illinois (IVI) has endorsed Ted Fields, Republican, for Congress, because of his knowledge of foreign and domestic affairs and his liberal and progressive position on issues.

In the interviews conducted by the IVI, Mr. Fields proved to be eminently more qualified than his Democratic opponent.

Mr. Fields was, until last week, also endorsed by the 12th District and Cook County COPE (AFL–CIO political action group).

According to a newspaper story of August 16, a spokesman for COPE said "an earlier endorsement of a Republican candidate by the 12th District COPE was reversed."

Apparently the reversal action was taken because of labor's refusal to endorse a Republican for Congress, regardless of the merits of the candidate.

IVI and all independent voters regret that they must be on opposite sides from COPE in this contest.

Local labor people are now asked to support a candidate they do not favor.

I hope the voters of the 12th District will not be split by this tactic and will vote for the best man, Ted Fields, regardless of party label.

EDWIN ASTRIN,
Chairman,
12th Congressional District IVI.

CHICAGO.

Volunteers for Independent Political Action (VIPA) is an organization of independent voters of the far North Side of Chicago who endorse and actively support selected candidates for local and district offices. Selections are made on the basis of interviews and the qualifications and platforms of candidates.

VIPA has played an important role in the election of liberal and progressive officeholders and is proud of helping this area to achieve a status of excellent representation.

For Congress in the 12th District, VIPA has endorsed Theodore P. Fields, Republican, because of his liberal position on issues. In our interviews and examinations, Mr. Fields proved himself to be far superior to his Democratic opponent.

Mr. Fields has also been endorsed by the Independent Voters of Illinois (IVI) and, until last week, by the 12th District and Cook County COPE (AFL–CIO political action group).

According to the Chicago Daily News of August 16, 1960, a spokesman for COPE said "an earlier endorsement of a Republican candidate by the 12th District COPE was reversed." VIPA regrets that for the first time it finds itself opposing a candidate endorsed by COPE.

We feel that this reversal is regrettable.

IRV. NEBENZAHL,
Chairman, VIPA.

CHICAGO.

Thomas Paine and the Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN B. DOOLEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Speaker, the following address by Joseph Lewis of Purdys, N.Y., recalls to mind the trenchant logic of Thomas Paine and the effects of his reasoning on the lives and thinking of our Founding Fathers.

It is Mr. Lewis' contention that Thomas Paine was the author of the Declaration of Independence. Without "Common Sense" there would have been no Declaration of Independence, Mr. Lewis believes, and without Thomas Paine, its author, there would have been no United States of America.

Thomas Paine's influence was certainly wide and varied. He knew Ben Franklin, who was in close touch with Adams. Even though Paine's contribution "Common Sense" was written anonymously, Mr. Lewis points out that Adams was aware of its authorship.

The statement of Mr. Lewis is so scholarly and so illuminating that I believe it should be printed in the RECORD. His speech follows:

THOMAS PAINE AND THE DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

(By Joseph Lewis)

I want to talk to you today about the Declaration of Independence, which I consider the greatest political document in the history of mankind. I consider July 4, 1776, the day of emancipation of the human race.

And I want to talk to you about the author of that immortal document.

No, it is not Thomas Jefferson, and that is why I ask you to do me the courtesy of listening to what I have to say.

We all know that it was the pamphlet "Common Sense," by Thomas Paine, which fired the first shot for American Independence, and that its influence upon the people; and the Founding Fathers, was both immediate and overwhelming.

But Thomas Paine's contribution toward the establishment of this Republic did not stop with the publication of "Common Sense." To him, that was only the first shot fired.

Following the conclusion of World War I, the proposal was made to establish a League of Nations, for the purpose of settling international disputes by peaceful means. Having been a student of Thomas Paine's life and his writings for nearly a half a century, I remember having read in Paine's works a similar proposal to prevent wars between nations.

However, it was not easy to find this essay in his writings, because this proposal had been incorporated in one of Paine's letters to the American people while he was in France. He called his proposal "A Maritime Compact," and he had sent it to Thomas Jefferson with the inference that if Jefferson wanted to use it as his own, Paine would have no objections to it. The essay is found in Paine's works, entitled: "The Seventh Letter to the Citizens of the United States."

In rereading the "Maritime Compact," I was suddenly struck with the marked similarity of the mode of expression, the construction of the sentence, and the kinship of sentiment with the opening paragraph of the Declaration of Independence. The words of both instruments seemed suddenly to become audible, as if spoken by the same tongue. I read it again and again, and was more impressed each time I read it. Nor is the opening paragraph the only similarity between these two documents.

I then made a detailed comparison of them, and was more than ever convinced that the same man wrote both "A Maritime Compact" and the Declaration of Independence.

I could not dismiss this thought from my mind. It persisted in recurring again and again. I could not down it.

I then began to doubt Thomas Jefferson's authorship of the Declaration of Independence, despite the fact that the only copies I had ever seen were in Jefferson's handwriting.

I made a study of Jefferson writings, and nowhere in his works could I find the sentiments, the political philosophy, the mode of expression, that were in the Declaration of Independence; while, as a matter of fact, I found in Paine's writing abundant similarities of thoughts and expressions.

At the same time, I was somewhat reluctant to be convinced that Jefferson's authorship of the Declaration of Independence was of a doubtful nature, as I greatly admired the third President of the United States. But I said to myself: If Thomas Paine was the real author of the Declaration of Independence, the truth should be told. With this conviction, I decided to make a deeper and more thorough study of the matter, and the more deeply and the more thoroughly I went into the subject, the more convinced I was of my premise.

The evidence I discovered began to pile up to such an extent that it simply became overwhelming, and I was convinced beyond the shadow of a doubt, that Thomas Paine was both inspirationally and literally the author of that immortal document, the Declaration of Independence, America's charter of freedom, and the greatest manifesto ever written proclaiming the rights of man.

Unfortunately, too many people believe that things as they were readymade for them. The benefits we enjoy are only too often taken as a matter of course. Many little realize the struggle that our fellow man has made to secure those benefits that are woven into the very fabric of our lives.

If more people had a better understanding of the price of progress and the precious blood that has been shed for the liberty we enjoy, we would not only have a greater appreciation of our own possessions, and guard them more zealously, but our whole social and moral consciousness would undergo a remarkable renascence. Our conduct in society would then be predicated upon a higher concept of social solidarity.

The American Republic was not always in existence.

It was not created by a divine fiat.

In fact, before the American Revolution, monarchies were considered sacred institutions by divine right, and arrogant and brutal kings wielded their scepters as vicars of God on earth. Their whims and desires were law, and disobedience often meant death.

Less than 100 years ago, slavery was considered, by Biblical sanction, a divine institution, and even today millions over the face of the earth are still living in serfdom.

Government by law was achieved only after a most bitter struggle, and equality before the law—regardless of race, color or creed—is not much older than the locomotive.

Do not think for a moment that these fundamental rights were accomplished easily; not only was it necessary to defeat the forces of reaction to achieve them, but there are thousands of people, even today, who are enjoying these great social privileges who would have opposed them when they were first proposed.

Freedom of speech and freedom of the press are mere babes in arms when reckoned in years, and the right of conscience, to accept or reject a religious mode of worship, isn't much older than the steamboat.

Many members of society use these newly won rights as a matter of course, without the slightest element of appreciation or understanding of their value.

American independence was one of the miracles of history. How lightly it is accepted by its beneficiaries today. Until July 4, 1776, all the people of the earth, with the exception of an insignificant few, lived under the yoke of some tryant. They could not call their minds, their bodies, or their possessions, their own. All that man possesses is the result of man's labor, and much of the misery he suffers is the result of his ignorance, and an unawakened sense of appreciation.

Liberty is one of our youngest possessions and one of the most precious. The Declaration of Independence is the charter of that liberty; and how it came into existence should be known and appreciated by every living being.

Many today consider liberty so essential a part of life, and so necessary to our mode of living, that they cannot imagine that such an obviously inalienable right did not always exist through the simple expedient of commonsense—and commonsense it was.

And without commonsense there would have been no Declaration of Independence; and without Thomas Paine, its author, there would have been no United States of America.

Yes, Thomas Paine's "Common Sense" was the pamphlet which stirred the American Colonies to establish a new form of government, and which was responsible for the Declaration of Independence.

In fact, the Declaration of Independence is a perfect reflection of "Common Sense." It is, in brief, a condensation of its sentiments and principles. It is the very essence of the book. In no volume other than "Common Sense" is there to be found such sentiments regarding independence and their direct applicability to the cause of America; and no writer other than Thomas Paine, living in America at that time, nor anyone else, ever expressed such sentiments in such a manner, and in such language, for such a cause.

"Common Sense" was published January 10, 1776, and 5 months later, to the day, the Continental Congress passed a resolution and appointed a committee to draw up a declaration of the intention of the Colonies declaring their independence of Great Britain. And it was done exactly in accordance with the words of "Common Sense."

These are Paine's words of admonition, as found in his famous pamphlet:

"Were a manifesto to be published and despatched to foreign courts, setting forth the miseries we have endured, and the peaceful methods which we have ineffectually used for redress; declaring at the same time that, not being able any longer to live happily or safely under the cruel disposition of the British Crown, we had been driven to the necessity of breaking off all connections with her; at the same time assuring all such courts of our peaceful disposition toward them, and of our desire of entering into trade with them, such a memorial would produce more good effects to this continent than if a ship were freighted with petitions to Britain."

Certainly Paine met and exchanged confidences with Franklin, and was obviously in close touch with Adams—both members of the committee—at that time. Otherwise, how would Adams have known that Paine was the author of "Common Sense" which was written anonymously, and its author not generally known. This is indicated in a letter which Adams wrote his wife, and which contains this passage:

"The writer of 'Common Sense' and the 'Forrester Letters' is the same pesron. His name is Paine, a gentleman about 2 years ago from England, a man who General Lee says, 'has genius in his eyes.' "

And in a secret pamphlet that Paine wrote anonymously, to allay the fears of those who thought that independence was too drastic a step to make, he said:

"I forbear to argue any further with you. The decree has finally gone forth. Britain and America are now distinct empires."

How did Paine know that "the decree has finally gone forth" unless he himself had written it, since he was not a member of the committee appointed by the Continental Congress?

Let us recall Paine's advice that "a day be solemnly set apart for proclaiming the charter." What charter could it be but the charter of freedom—the Declaration of Independence?

And it was done as Paine suggested. It was proclaimed July 4, 1776.

The American people do not know, and certainly are not aware of the fact that a copy of the original draft of the Declaration of Independence, in the handwriting of John Adams, is in the vault of the Adams family in the Massachusetts Historical Society in Boston, Mass.

It is my firm conviction that the Adams copy of the Declaration of Independence was made before Jefferson made his so-called rough draft, and this copy contains the complete text of the Declaration as it was originally written. In fact, I do not hesitate to say that the John Adams copy of the Declaration of Independence could not have been made from Jefferson's rough draft, and that both Adams and Jefferson made their copies from an original manuscript apparently no longer in existence.

Let me repeat, as emphatically as I can, that it was utterly impossible for the John Adams copy of the Declaration of Independence to have been made from Jefferson's rough draft. And Jefferson himself is authority for the statement that the rough draft is his original copy.

It is also not generally known that in editing this immortal document, Jefferson eliminated more than 30 percent of the original text, and that this 30 percent contained some of the most important principles of this charter of freedom.

In fact, when Adams sent his copy to his wife, Abigail, and when she saw the printed copy, she wrote, and this is highly significant:

"I cannot but be sorry that some of the most manly sentiments in the Declaration are expunged from the printed copy."

And when Jefferson sent a copy of the Declaration, as he had changed it, to Richard Henry Lee who had introduced the resolution calling for a committee to draft the document but who, because of illness, was prevented from becoming a member of the committee, Lee wrote, after having read Jefferson's version, with indignant surprize: "Why was the manuscript mangled so?"—the inference being that Lee had seen the original copy, and was horrified that it had been so outrageously mutilated. Had it not been for this illness in the family of Richard Henry Lee, Jefferson would not have been appointed to take his place on the committee—and what a difference that would have made.

No author would have been guilty of doing such an injustice to his own writing, as Jefferson did to the original draft of the Declaration of Independence.

If the Declaration had been accepted as Paine originally wrote it, his name could never have been dissociated with it, because the language, the mode of thought, the philosophy, the rhythm of expression, and the universal concept of the right of individual freedom in society are unmistakably his, and there would never have arisen any doubt as to his authorship.

Now what were the "manly sentiments" which Abigail Adams said had been expunged from the original? What were the parts that were "mangled so" according to Richard Henry Lee?

I will tell you.

In the original draft of the Declaration of Independence there are three paragraphs dealing with Negro slavery, that, if they had been permitted to remain, would have abolished slavery at the same time that America's independence was won.

Thomas Jefferson was not the author of these three paragraphs; because they were not his sentiments, they were not his convictions. Jefferson did not believe in political freedom for the Negro, and that is why these three paragraphs were eliminated; that is why they were expunged; that is why the Declaration of Independence was "mangled so."

If there were no other evidence, and there is an abundance in existence, the slavery clause alone in the original draft of the Declaration of Independence would be sufficient to justify Paine's authorship of this immortal document. And, at the same time, the elimination of that clause more than justifies the conclusion that Thomas Jefferson could not have been the author of it.

Thomas Paine was the first man on the American Continent to raise his voice in behalf of the abolition of Negro slavery. And here is another significant fact. Paine's "Essay on Slavery," written 2 years before the Declaration of Independence, contains the same sentiments, and almost the same words, as those which appear in the original draft of the Declaration of Independence. They are as alike as image and reflection. The very words themselves seem to echo each other.

The whole Declaration is one great and grand emotional outburst against all forms of tyranny and in behalf of freedom. It is a manifesto of freedom for all people. Paine was right when he said: "We fight not to enslave, but to set a country free, and make room upon the earth for honest men to live in."

Paine posed the question, and he gave the answer:

"Can America be happy under a government of her own? The answer is short and simple, viz.: As happy as she pleases. She hath a blank sheet to write upon."

"Start the slate afresh," Paine told America. "Leave no mark of injustice upon it." And, as a further warning, because he knew that sooner or later it would have to be done, he continued his admonition by shouting: "Put it not off too long." What did he mean by "put it not off too long?" "Forget not the hapless African," he cried.

Let us recall these words from "Common Sense."

"Now is the seed-time of continental union, faith and honour.

"The least fracture now will be like a name engraved with the point of a pin on the tender rind of a young oak; the wound would enlarge with the tree, and posterity read it in full-grown characters."

What a prophetic statement, and what tragic results followed the ignoring of it.

Was not slavery at that time like a "point of a pin upon the tender rind of a young oak?" And did it not "enlarge with the tree" until it became a menace to our liberty and freedom?

Jefferson ignored Paine's warning not to forget "the hapless African," and it was necessary to fight the Civil War, with all its horrors and bloodshed, to wipe out this terrible stain on the "blank sheet" upon which America started to write. If only the slavery clause had remained in the Declaration of Independence, as Paine originally wrote it, the terrible War Between the States—where the blood of the flower of American youth was spilled—never would have occurred.

It should also be known that when Paine wrote the Constitution of the State of Pennsylvania in 1780, he wrote an emancipation proclamation 75 years before Abraham Lincoln; and Negro slavery was abolished, for the first time on this continent, in the State of Pennsylvania.

Here is the concluding paragraph of Paine's Emancipation Proclamation:

"And whereas the condition of those persons, who have heretofore been denominated Negro and mulatto slaves, has been attended with circumstances, which not only deprived them of the common blessings that they were by nature entitled to, but has cast them into the deepest afflictions, by an unnatural separation and sale of husband and wife from each other and from their children, an injury, the greatness of which can only be conceived by supposing that we were in the same unhappy case. In justice, therefore, to persons so unhappily circumstanced, and who having no prospect before them whereon they may rest their sorrows and their hopes, have no reasonable inducement to render their service to society, which they otherwise might, and also in grateful commemoration of our own happy deliverance from that state of unconditional submission to which we were doomed by the tyranny of Britain."

Now there appears in the Declaration of Independence an old English word that was not generally used by the people of the American Colonies at that time, with the exception of the Quakers. Paine, as you know, was of Quaker origin. It is the word "hath"—h-a-t-h. While to some the use of this word may appear to be a trifle, its appearance in the Declaration is highly significant. It is significant for the fact that in the 3 million words which Jefferson claims as his own composition, the word "hath" does not appear even once, while in "Common Sense" alone, a pamphlet of only 50,000 words, Thomas Paine used the word at least 120 times.

The word is used in the Declaration of Independence in this phrase: "and accordingly all experience hath shewn."

In Jefferson's writing he uses continually the phrase in this manner:

"Experience has shown."

And equally as significant is the fact that the world "shewn" is spelled with an "e" in the Declaration, which was Paine's way of spelling the word, while it is always spelled with an "o" in Jefferson's writing, and was the prevalent way of spelling the word in the Colonies at that time.

There is another word in the Declaration which I found that Jefferson never used in his writing, but, on the contrary, it is found many, many times in the writings of Thomas Paine. It is the word "prostituted." The word is found in the slavery clause which Jefferson eliminated, and reads as follows: "He has prostituted his negative * * *." It is inconceivable that Jefferson, who was so precise in his use of language, would use such a word for the first time in the Declaration of Independence; but, knowing the sentiments of Thomas Paine, it was the proper word to use to express his detestation of both the institution of slavery and the Royal Brute of Britain who maintained it. The word "prostituted" was part of Paine's vocabulary, and he used it when he thought it was the proper word to express his thought.

But, perhaps the most significant piece of evidence found in the original draft of the Declaration to prove Thomas Paine was its author is in a "mangled" sentence, the word which Richard Henry Lee used so characteristically to describe Jefferson's callous disregard for the original text. Not only was the political philosophy destroyed, but the sentence itself was so garbled as to make it utterly ridiculous, and on many occasions it has been the subject of heated and oftimes embarrassing dispute.

The text in the original copy of the Declaration reads: "all men are created equal and independent;—semicolon—that from that equal creation they derive rights inherent and inalienable." This statement is unequivocal. It is a political truism. We are all born equal, politically. From both a social and philosophical point of view, the statement is incontrovertible. And when Paine wrote that sentence he had in mind that kings and royalty were not born superior to other people. There was no divine right in the political philosophy of Thomas Paine. To simplify the statement: It meant equality before the law; not equality of person.

Jefferson, in editing the original manuscript, changed the wording, with its sentiments of political equality, to read:

"All men are created equal.—period.—They are endowed by their Creator with certain inherent and inalienable rights."

This is not true. This is merely a piece of pious nonsense. We are not endowed with rights. Political and social rights are acquired as members of society. If we were "endowed by our Creator" with inherent and inalienable rights, then there could never have been slavery nor serfdom nor, for that matter, any form of social and political inequality. We are endowed with certain physical characteristics, such as our eyes, our face, our hands, and feet, or other physical traits—but rights, never.

Nor are we all born equal in the physical and mental sense. The physical and menal inequalities among men are too obvious for comment. One person is stronger than another; one has a better brain; one can run faster; one has a better voice; one is taller; one lives longer than another—but why continue.

Not only that, but when Jefferson changed the original word "inherent" to "certain" he put a limitation upon our rights which is a glaring and outrageous prostitution of the original text and its meaning.

I need but quote from "Common Sense" to prove that Paine means the universal rights of all men before the law, with the statement as he originally wrote it. Paine said: "As the exalting one so greatly above the rest cannot be justified on the equal rights of nature."

The distinction of Kings and Subjects was abhorrent to Paine. He remarked: "How impious is the title of Sacred Majesty?" and again: "All men being originally equals, no one by birth could have the right to set up his own family in perpetual preference to all others."

Not only is the original statement in the Declaration identical with these fundamental rights, which Paine so eloquently expresses, but nowhere in the writings of Jefferson are such sentiments to be found. This is an irreconcilable difference between the two documents. One is a universal declaration of the inalienable rights of man, and the other a provincial statement of the separation of one nation with another. In the face of such pertinent evidence—truly an historical revelation—can there be any honest doubt regarding Thimos Paine's authorship of the original draft of the Declaration of Independence.

And now I want to make but one comparison regarding the similarity of language in "Common Sense" and the Declaration of Independence. The opening phrase of the Declaration of Independence: "When in the course of human events * * *" is not an ordinary statement. It is not the product of a provincial mind like that of Thomas Jefferson, but rather of a literary genius with a world concept. It is worthy of a Shakespeare. And the man who conceived this magnificent sweep of human history also wrote these words. There is a kinship of both language and intellectual passion in them.

Let me repeat them together:

"These are times that try men's souls."

"The birth of a new world is at hand."

"The sun never shined on a cause of greater worth."

"Liberty hath been hunted round the world."

"When in the course of human events * * *."

To hear them is all that is needed to prove that they were written by one and the same man.

I have given you but a rough sketch of the evidence I have amassed in favor of Thomas Paine as the author of the Declaration of Independence.

All I ask is that you judge it with an open mind. Judge it fairly and impartially.

If you do, I am certain that your decision will confirm my efforts to prove that Thomas Paine, the author of "Common Sense," was also the author of the greatest political document in the history of man, the Declaration of Independence, America's charter of freedom, which was proclaimed to the world on July 4, 1776, the greatest day in the history of mankind's struggle for liberty.

Thank you for listening.

August 26—40th Anniversary of the Final Ratification of the 19th Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JESSICA McC. WEIS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mrs. WEIS. Mr. Speaker, August 26 is one of the most significant of all dates in the long struggle of American women to secure for themselves the right to vote, for it was on August 26, 1920, that the 19th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, the "Susan B. Anthony amendment" became the law of the land.

Forty years ago today, after a courageous battle which lasted the better part of half a century, the women of America won the right to vote in Federal elections. No small credit for this victory goes to the woman who devoted her entire adult life to the cause of woman's

suffrage, Miss Susan B. Anthony. Miss Anthony, who was virtually a lifelong resident of my home community of Rochester, N.Y., did not live to see the culmination of her efforts in the final ratification of the 19th amendment, but she is so universally recognized as the leader in the suffrage movement that the 19th amendment has always been known as the Susan B. Anthony amendment.

The women of Rochester are justifiably proud of Miss Anthony's role in the equal-rights struggle, and her Rochester home, Anthony House, has been preserved and maintained by the Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc. I should like at this point to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from Mrs. George Howard, president of Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc., to the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle, captioned "The Great Anthony Crusade":

THE GREAT ANTHONY CRUSADE

Here in Rochester we should remember August 26 as the 40th anniversary of the day the Susan B. Anthony amendment became the law of the land.

This 19th amendment, giving women the right to vote, was named for Miss Anthony because she worked for it the greater part of her life. The crusade for voting rights for women was a great crusade. It was done with perseverance, patience, courage and devotion with the thought that it was a just cause.

Now women voters exceed men voters by several million. They have an important duty in the coming election to vote wisely. Their vote may determine the result. Many women today take the right to vote as natural and do not know at what a cost it was won.

There were many dramatic incidents connected with the suffrage campaign; there were many tense and anxious times, and there had to be much able strategy. Let us mention one tense time.

Thirty-five States had ratified the amendment. It was necessary to win one more. Some Governors said they would not call special legislative sessions to consider it. There were three possible States that would—all in the South. Tennessee seemed the most likely.

The Governor called a special session in August 1920, when it was very hot. The southern men were gallant but there were the suffragettes and the antisuffragettes trying to influence them. It would be a close vote.

A southern belle went up to the mountains of eastern Tennessee to get Mrs. J. L. Burn to write to her son, one of the youthful legislators, to vote favorably. When a roll was called the vote was a tie, 48 to 48. When the next rollcall came, Harry Burn had received his mother's letter and responded with an "aye." As he said it he took from his coat lapel the red rose he wore to signify he was with the "antis." His vote broke the tie and by a majority of one, Tennessee ratified.

But there was still another hurdle. Governor Roberts immediately signed the ratification certificate and sent it registered by special delivery to the State Department at Washington. There was a fear that maybe the legislators might want to reverse their decision.

The Solicitor General had been waiting up all night to receive this letter. It arrived at 4 a.m. August 26, 1920. He stamped it to certify that it had been received and at 8 a.m. Bainbridge Colby, Secretary of State, placed his official signature on the letter. Then there was the formal proclamation.

There should be a small book telling of the work done by women for the right to vote, starting with the first Woman's Rights convention July 19 and 20, 1848, at Seneca Falls. There must be women in this area who can tell stories about the crusade. We wish they would send such accounts to the Anthony House.

MRS. GEORGE HOWARD,
President,
Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc.

Worldwide Recognition of Albion, Ill., Chowder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress is about to close and many of us will be traveling back to our districts. I want to commend to the attention of our colleagues and their secretaries who may be using State Highway 15, or Highway 130, through southern Illinois, that a wonderful opportunity is available by stopping at the fairgrounds at Albion, Ill., Edwards County, on September 1, to enjoy some of the most delicious Albion chowder known throughout the world, unique to Albion as is the bean soup to the U.S. Capitol. This is the eighth annual Albion community chowder celebration, supported by the fine people of this area. The greatly increased attendance each year speaks highly of the chowder and the wonderful entertainment for all in attendance preceding the serving.

"Welcome to the Albion community chowder—free" goes out to the public through various means of communication. I will be personally present if Congress adjourns before that date. The most able mayor of Albion, Major Bailey, in extending invitations has this to say:

In a few short years this event has grown from a few hundred people in the Albion courtyard square to over 6,000 at the Albion fairgrounds last year. The 1959 affair attracted worldwide recognition of being included in the picture section of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Chowder is one of the oldest institutions in Edwards County. In 1958 this county was officially proclaimed chowder capital of the world, and the claim has not been challenged.

You are welcome to come and enjoy the events of the Albion community chowder with us. The entertainment starts at 2 p.m. and over 6,000 quarts of Albion chowder will be served starting at 5 p.m.

Even as I speak today, various citizens' committees appointed by Mayor Bailey are hard at work preparing for this tremendous task of feeding and entertaining some 6,000 people who will attend Operation Chowder, U.S.A.

I am indeed proud to represent these folks in Congress. This chowder is evidence that we have in southern Illinois the finest, most friendly people in the world. If this kind of hospitality and friendship that is evident here in Edwards County could be transported to Washington, D.C., and around the world, we would definitely have a far better world in which to live.

Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, in May 1958 I introduced House Resolution 563, which, under unanimous consent, I include as follows:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that, in order to improve and strengthen United States relations with Latin America through policies and programs authorized by the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, there be conducted by the executive branch, under the direction of the President, a thorough review and study of and inquiry into the policies and programs of the United States and of international organizations in which the United States participates with respect to Latin America, including recommendations on improving and strengthening the relationship, policies, and programs between the United States and Latin America, taking into account the views of officials, press, representative groups of the peoples and the views contained in congressional reports and deliberations.

It is further the sense of the House of Representatives that the President shall transmit to the Congress such study within six months of the adoption of this resolution.

On the day I introduced this resolution I made the following remarks which I insert below. Is it not misfortunate that the Republican administration did not take the advice of many of us Democrats who forsaw the problem arising in the continent to the south at this period in 1958.

This morning I introduced a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on improving and strengthening the relationship, policies, and progress between the United States and Latin America.

My resolution is only a first step in improving U.S. relations with our sister republics to the south. Surely, we cannot ignore the dangerous situation which exists in Latin America. This is a resolution which I feel should have immediate consideration and will have favorable reactions throughout the Western Hemisphere. Whatever the administration may do about it, at least it will demonstrate that the people of the United States, speaking through the U.S. Congress, do not intend to sit idly by in the face of grave danger vitally affecting the welfare of our own hemisphere.

Although it seems clearly established that the ill feeling recently expressed against Vice President NIXON in Latin America is part of an organized Communist scheme, I believe that it cannot be written off simply as Communist inspired.

The United States has neglected being a good partner. The United States has been preoccupied with cold wars in other parts of the world.

Latin America is on the threshold of imminent and radical reforms. It is urgent that the United States exert effective guid-

ance so that these reforms will improve the lot of the people rather than the stature of the Communist Party in Latin America.

The economic, cultural, and political influence of the United States in Latin America is an evident fact. The feeling of mistrust on the part of Latin Americans toward the United States exists.

However erroneous and prejudicial it may be, the misunderstanding of the people of the United States about the Latin Americans and the Latin Americans' misunderstanding about us may be partly our fault. We have failed to show them in a tangible way what we are and that we mean what we say when we exclaim about being good neighbors and good partners.

One of the greatest irritants is the complacency with which we seem to regard them in the mutual security program. To illustrate the neglect of Latin America by the United States as evidenced in the mutual-security program, one need only compare the foreign assistance figures for Latin America with those of just one country in Europe. The amount for total assistance to Latin America this year is about one-half the amount listed in the mutual security bill for undelivered war materials to Yugoslavia.

At this point I wish to compliment our former colleague, Hon. THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut, for emphasizing to the House Foreign Affairs Committee the urgent necessity for paying more attention to Latin America. On March 6, 2 months before the anti-Nixon and anti-U.S. demonstrations in Lima, Peru, Mr. DODD in his testimony before the committee prophetically stated:

"It is essential that there be created within the executive branch of our Government a deeper consciousness of the importance of this area, not only to the United States but to the whole free world, coupled with plans and programs of assistance to Latin America which will meet at least the minimum needs of the 184 million people of Latin America. This is an area seething with a tremendous urge to improve its social and economic conditions, with a population that has since World War II been rising about 2.3 percent a year. People want to be free of disease and hunger. People want to house, clothe, and educate their children. People want medical and hospital facilities. People want means of communication.

"Latin America is a giant which is beginning to stir. How it stirs and to what it stirs depends largely upon U.S. foreign policy, policy translated into programs that will fit the various needs of the people of Latin America, rather than a policy which takes them for granted.

"While serving on this committee and while listening to the various presentations made by the executive branch on the mutual security program, I was impressed with the fact that Latin America was an area which was always treated last by the executive branch. It was always treated, as indeed, it is treated this year by the executive branch, as the "also ran" of areas. There has been a certain condescension about the area—a certain attitude of 'Well, they will go along with us anyway.'

"We must remember this: Even if we should have successful policies toward the Far East, even if we should have successful policies toward Europe, even if we should have successful policies in other parts of the world, if we do not develop and maintain successful policies toward Latin America, the other policies would be meaningless and ineffective. It is abject folly to try to build up a free world without a strong and free Latin America. It is abject folly to hold the line against communism in Europe only to yield it to the Communists in Latin America, or to the Far East for that matter, as we seem to be doing.

"I would respectfully urge, therefore, that there be an end to programs of complacent cooperation. I would suggest that there must be developed a bold stroke of leadership that will catch the imagination and kindle the hope of the people of Latin America."

In his testimony, Mr. DODD further recommended that the deep interest of the United States, in improving and strengthening our relations with Latin America be highlighted in the mutual security bill itself through the adoption by the Congress of language calling upon the administration to mobilize its energy and resources toward the betterment of United States-Latin American relations.

Lower Manhattan Expressway

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter I have written to the editor of the East Side News, a publication with wide circulation in the 19th Congressional District of New York:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 26, 1960.

Mr. ABRAHAM SCHLACHT,
Editor, East Side News,
New York City.

DEAR MR. SCHLACHT: As you are undoubtedly aware, I have been actively opposing the construction of the Lower Manhattan Expressway since December 1959. Since that time I have been in constant communication with the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, the New York State Department of Public Works, the New York City Board of Estimate, and other public officials in an effort to prevent this roadway from being built in our neighborhood. I have introduced legislation in the Congress to prevent its construction, but, unfortunately, the Committee on Public Roads has not taken up this bill.

Building an elevated highway across part of lower Manhattan, when we have finally rid ourselves of the elevated railways, to my mind would create an eyesore in the area and would deface the neighborhood.

It would destroy real estate values, resulting in lower assessed evaluations and lower real estate taxes to the city.

Its construction would create severe hardship to hundreds of small businessmen in the area. In many instances their establishments, representing individual enterprise, foresight, lifetime investments and sheer hard physical labor—generations of hard labor, stability, and sacrifice—would be wiped out.

Most important, it would displace approximately 2,300 families for whom new quarters are not available. Too many public improvements are being undertaken with a total disregard of the families residing in the areas proposed to undergo improvement. Too many families today are awaiting relocation under circumstances that are deplorable. The reconstruction taking place in Manhattan today makes unfeasible the relocation of the aforementioned families. I am more concerned with the peace and tranquillity of these families in their homes than in the convenience of crosstown motorists who would use the expressway to cut across Manhattan Island.

In the course of my protestations and the protestations of Assemblyman Louis De Salvio, State Senator Joseph R. Marro, and City Councilman Daniel S. Weiss, to the construction of this blight, the New York State superintendent of public works advised on February 18, 1960, that "In the case of an urban project such as this one we invariably await the expression of the local officials." • • • "We will move only after we get this approval" (referring to the approval by the board of estimates).

Imagine, therefore, my surprise and consternation to learn by reading the New York Times on August 24, that Mr. Moses in a letter to Mayor Wagner and other members of the board of estimate, had said he had been notified by Federal and State highway officials that the city had had more than enough time to act and that they would not tolerate further delay. Mr. Moses warned that unless the board of estimate approved the expressway at its meeting held on August 25, the project probably would be abandoned and the bulk of the funds would be shifted to other projects, mainly outside the city.

Knowing full well that funds allocated by the Federal Government for such projects are not allocated for specific projects, except at the request of the State, and that such funds cannot be withdrawn, except at the request of the State, I immediately wired to the members of the board of estimate as follows: "Hope you will not be intimidated by the New York Times article insofar as Lower Manhattan Expressway is concerned," and immediately contacted the Federal Bureau of Public Roads for an explanation as to why there was suddenly a deadline to be met, thereby not giving the demand by Acting Borough President Louis A. Cioffi for a survey on relocating the 2,000 families who would be uprooted from the artery's congested route, time for completion.

I was informed by the Bureau that nothing "official had come from the Bureau, either directly or indirectly or informally." Further I was once more assured that "funds allocated by the Federal Government are not allocated for specific projects except at the request of the State and they cannot be withdrawn except at the request of the State." This information I immediately wired to each member of the board of estimate to prevent their possible succumbing to the veiled threat contained in the New York Times article.

I had been in touch with the New York State Department of Public Works to ascertain if the State had requested the board of estimate to bring the matter to an immediate conclusion; but I have not yet received a reply to my request.

In view of the foregoing, therefore, it is apparent that the information in the article referring to notification by the Federal highway officials is not the position taken by the Federal Bureau of Public Roads; and the reference in the same article to the bulk of funds earmarked for the Canal Street Expressway being shifted to other projects, mainly out of the city, is not the information furnished me by the Bureau of Public Roads.

Therefore, I trust the board of estimate will not, at this time, approve the Lower Manhattan Expressway; and I urge every resident of the area to make known his opposition to the construction of the expressway by writing to the members of the board of estimate.

Sincerely yours,

LEONARD FARBSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

"Untouchables" a National Disgrace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy and agitation over the value as a public service of the TV program entitled "The Untouchables."

Recently an article in the Sons of Italy Times calls attention again to this controversial subject.

I believe it will be in the best interest of our country to have this item available for reference when this subject is being discussed, and under unanimous consent I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CROSBY CALLS "UNTOUCHABLES" A NATIONAL DISGRACE AND THE WORST PROGRAM EVER SHOWN ON TELEVISION

In the toughest attack on television since the unhappy day it was invented, Columnist John Crosby this week went after the medium with armored tanks, cannonballs, torpedoes, swords, daggers, knives, hammers, tongs, boulders, stones, and bricks.

He took TV apart tube by tube, antenna by antenna, program by program, director by director, producer by producer.

Crosby, whose syndicated column appears in the Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia, trained his heaviest fire on that awful monstrosity of a program called "The Untouchables."

He called it the following:

1. The worst show on television.

2. The worst show that was ever on television in its inglorious 14-year history.

3. A national disgrace.

"And," he said, "the only reason it hasn't caused any popular outcry is that television has long since been abandoned by decent people of all ages."

Crosby stated that "no responsible people look at television."

"And by no responsible people," he added, "I mean no responsible people—no clergy, no press, no advertisers, no network executives, no Senators, nobody. Noboby but people.

"When you have a vast conglomeration of leaderless people, you have a mob. And when you have a mob, the best place to aim is the groin—which is exactly where most of the high-rated television shows aim."

Crosby also took a shot at Desi Arnez, producer of that mountain of tripe, "The Untouchables," who at 50, still belongs in the "pretty boy" category, along with Pretty Boy Bobbie Stack, the alleged star of the show.

Following is the John Crosby column as carried in the "Around the Dials" section of the Evening Bulletin:

Turning the set back on after a month of almost total relief from the cumulative idiocy of television, I was greeted by: "Rolaids. Each particle consumes 47 times its own weight in excess stomach acid. Result: It slows down the drip, drip, drip of stomach acid."

It was a wonderfully appropriate welcome back to the drip, drip, drip of television which is almost exactly the same action.

The same evening I watched a couple of hoodlums on "The Untouchables" machinegun a young girl. She was running right at the camera at the time and the hoods machinegunned her in the back so that you got the full action like a blow in the face.

They have wonderfully interesting ways of killing girls on this show. Killing men is kids' stuff. No one does that any more. I'm indebted to the Saturday Evening Post for the information that the hoods on "The Untouchables" once gunned down 20 prostitutes lined up on a road—bang, bang, bang—like that.

That leads me to encounter more and more people who tell me they don't look at television but they read about it. Are we getting to the point where television columnists can't bear to look at television and are forced to read about it in the Saturday Evening Post? Did Pete Martin, who wrote the Post piece, see that incident or did someone else tell him about it?

Who looks at bread-and-butter television? Well kids do. But those responsible don't. Do you really think executives at NBC—which is saddled with the dreadful thing—really looked at the 25th episode of "Riverboat"? Do you suppose writers, directors, producers, or actors look at it? Do you even suppose the sponsors sit through it? Don't be silly.

When I first became a radio columnist back in the pretelevision days, I found it passing strange that so few people who earned their living in it knew what was on radio.

In America, no responsible people look at television. And by no responsible people, I mean no responsible people—no clergy, no press, no advertiser, no network executives, no Senators, nobody. Nobody but people. When you have a vast conglomeration of leaderless people, you have a mob. And when you have a mob, the best place to aim is the groin—which is exactly where most of the high-rated television shows aim.

"The Untouchables" is not only the worst show on television; it is the worst show that was ever on television in its inglorious 14-year history. It's a national disgrace, that show, and the only reason it hasn't caused any popular outcry is that television has long since been abandoned by decent people to children of all ages.

In its survey of TV columnists and critics, the Fund for the Republic pointed out that, of all the people who wrote about television, the late John Lardner in occasional pieces for The New Yorker was virtually the only person who viewed and wrote about and tried to analyze intelligently the bread-and-butter television (which is to say "Father Knows Best" in its umpteenth year).

Lardner could view the good guys fighting the bad guys with warm-hearted scientific curiosity like an entomologist looking at an ant hill. But he alas, is gone. I'm going to inflict bread-and-butter television on myself these next few months but I can't be detached about it. I get damned angry.

I have here a letter from a mother that ought to be tattooed on Desi Arnaz's chest for perpetrating "The Untouchables." Says this outraged woman:

"I am trying to teach my children Christian precepts. I am trying to teach them that violence breeds violence, and that we are distinguished from animals by our facilities of reasoning, and our love of our fellows. These things must be repeated over and over and even so it takes years before children truly believe for themselves.

"TV is systematically drilling into them: (1) Think only of yourself; (2) never think before you speak; (3) authority—parents, teachers, church, police, any authority—is a dope; (4) in any argument, use a weapon, not your brains, commonsense or respect for others."

This mother is simply repeating—though she almost certainly isn't aware of it—what George Bernard Shaw said of our movies almost 40 years ago. In America, Shaw said, the solution to all problems is a punch on the jaw.

But that was long ago. Now we have the machine gun and those 20 prostitutes on a road. Drip, drip, drip into the little minds. Hours and hours of violence.

Just a couple of weeks ago, there was a headline "Juvenile Delinquency Increases by 175 Percent." Why not? We teach juvenile delinquency on television—sponsored.

Nanticoke, Pa., Jubilarian

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Wilkes-Barre Times-Leader, Aug. 19, 1960]

NANTICOKE JUBILARIAN

Fifty years ago tomorrow, the Reverend Roman A. Wieziolowski, native of the little Tioga County town of Antrim, was ordained to the priesthood of the Roman Catholic Church by the Most Reverend Michael J. Hoban, late bishop of the diocese of Scranton. On Sunday, a half century of faithful service to God and man will be marked at Holy Trinity Church, Nanticoke, where its pastor will observe his golden jubilee with the current ordinary of the diocese, colleagues in religion, parishioners, and friends participating in a Mass of Thanksgiving, a dinner, and other festivities. It will be a red letter day for Nanticoke as well as for the Reverend Father Wieziolowski himself.

The Blossburg area has produced 25 priests of Polish extraction for the diocese. It was here that the first Polish church in northeastern Pennsylvania was established by newly arrived immigrants. Against this background, it is easy to understand the dedication of the Reverend Father Wieziolowski.

Eight months after his ordination, he was a pastor at Throop. When he was transferred to Nanticoke in 1919, he left behind him in the Lackawanna County town an impressive record as a spiritual leader and administrator, having built a church and a rectory and established a cemetery.

The four decades he has labored at Nanticoke have been ever more fruitful. Holy Trinity, thanks to his able leadership, today has a new church, school, rectory, convent, and cemetery. More important from the viewpoint of its pastor and jubilarian is its spiritual progress as indicated by some 5,400 baptisms and the activities of 10 parish societies.

That does not begin to depict the impact of the Reverend Father Wieziolowski through his extracurricular activities. As a director of St. Stanislaus Institute and a chaplain of the Polish Union of the United States, he has made notable contributions to young and old. But, above all, have been his charities, known but to God and a few intimates. Thousands of refugees (yes, thousands) are indebted to him for shoes, clothing, and other gifts, about which the public has had no knowledge until these lines are printed.

This very humble man has never sought glory, but has been content to remain modestly in the background. His reward has been in the satisfaction that goes with good works and the knowledge that he has earned the affection of his congregation and commanded the respect of others.

Dedication of General Twining Park to Monroe's (Wis.) Illustrious Native Son on July 4, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD T. FLYNN
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, Monroe, Wis., located about 40 miles from the capital city of Madison, lies in fertile green valleys which make up Green County, Wis. It is populated for the most part by thrifty Swiss pioneers who settled here more than 100 years ago and brought with them the knowledge of how to make swiss cheese by hand in copper kettles. This swiss cheese economy has been the basic industrial pursuit of Green County residents for the past 100 years. They still make the highest quality and finest swiss cheese in America and produce many times more swiss cheese than is produced any place else in America.

Monroe is the birthplace of Gen. Nathan F. Twining, and on July 4, 1960, this beautiful city paid its highest tribute to its most illustrious son. Under the direct leadership of the junior chamber of commerce and with the cooperation of every civic organization in all of the cities of the community, the city of Monroe dedicated a 40-acre park which is properly dedicated to Gen. Nathan F. Twining and will hereafter be known as Twining Memorial Park. Dedication of the park was conducted by Mayor Orville R. Evans with response by General Twining who attended in person. The dedication was preceded by remarks made by Col. Bruce Thomas who represented Gov. Gaylord Nelson. There was a review of the F–86D sabre jet memorial project by John F. Kundert, president of the Monroe Chapter of the junior Chamber of Commerce. He also made presentation of the memorial to the city. There was response by A. Lee Mitchell, park board president.

Preceding the dedication, a reception was held at the Idle Hour Mansion. General Twining attended in person and following the celebration, a community dinner was held in honor of General Twining at the Monroe Country Club. I personally had the privilege of attending this celebration and could not help but think of the thoughts that were passing through General Twining's mind as he returned to the beautiful and peaceful small community lying in the heart of a prosperous country land—one of the most beautiful spots that the mind could imagine. I wondered what this man of advanced years, with great responsibilities and world problems weighing upon his mind, must have been thinking as he returned at his present age to the home of his boyhood and as he saw his neighbors of old, few of whom he still remembered, leading their peaceful and pleasant lives in this city which I am sure he has always loved. I feel certain that he must have felt that the local residents were fortunate, indeed, to have the privilege of living in such a peaceful and prosperous community in close association with each other with their families and loved ones—and I am sure that there must have been a longing in his heart for the opportunity in retirement of gaining the peace, the calm, the gentleness, and the closeness to nature that existed in the town of his birth.

I am certain, too, that in the general's mind he was certain, as this park was dedicated in his honor on July 4, 1960, that all the suffering and hardship and death and privation that he had witnessed throughout the world in the various struggles to protect and preserve our way of life and posterity was well worth the terrible price which we have paid to maintain our form of government. There is no better example of American democracy at work and the meaning of the institutions that have made this country great than there is in Monroe, Wis., the beautiful city which is the birthplace of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the United States.

The ceremony was impressive, the dedication was memorable and I am sure that the day will long be cherished and remembered by General Twining and by the proud citizens of Monroe who properly call him their most illustrious son.

Sound Analysis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times of yesterday morning there was an editorial "Perspective in Space," which in my opinion contains a sober and sensible commentary on the space race between the United States and the Soviet Union and which I believe would be of interest to members of the Congress. Under permission previously granted, I include the editorial:

PERSPECTIVE IN SPACE

Whatever else may happen during the rest of this month, it is already clear that August 1960, will go into history as a period of major advance in man's penetration of outer space. Both the United States and the Soviet Union have demonstrated the capability of returning safely to earth objects which had been put into orbit, and Echo I has demonstrated the feasibility of using balloon satellites for communications. Of all these feats the Soviet success in returning safely to earth the living organisms which had been in orbit is technically the most impressive, but our own scientists' achievements were also of first-rate importance. In both nations very rapid and important progress is obviously being achieved.

In all candor, it must be recognized that the Soviet feat this month suggests a continued substantial lead over the United States in a number of major areas of space research capability. The huge size of the latest Soviet sputnik testifies again to the Soviet lead in the rocket power needed to send very heavy vehicles into orbit. And if the Soviet claims that the flying menagerie was landed on earth within a few miles of a preassigned point is true—and there is no present reason to question this claim—then Soviet capabilities in this important respect are obviously greater than the relatively crude recovery techniques which we have demonstrated this month. The Soviet Union, in short, seems closer to manned space flight than we are and it may accomplish that feat before the year is out.

Before the latest Soviet space accomplishment some wishful thinkers had suggested that we had forged ahead in the space race. The more accurate perspective, it is now clear, shows that we are still behind because our competitor is himself moving rapidly even as we forge ahead. Much hard work and much expensive research and experimentation lie before us if we are to make up for the advantage gained in the late 1940's and most of the 1950's, when the Soviet Union created the prerequisites for the space lead it has enjoyed ever since Sputnik I went into orbit.

But we may also hope that some day in the not too distant future the present rivalry will be turned into a fruitful cooperation which will speed humanity's common progress into space and cut the cost for that progress.

Joint Chiefs Escape Paper Jungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958 placed heavy emphasis upon the Joint Chiefs of Staff as the military planning agency at the seat of government. Because the Joint Chiefs of Staff system is the central military planning feature of defense organization, it is extremely important that the system be effective.

While Congress, which established the Joint Chiefs of Staff system in law in 1947, has consistently realized the basic soundness of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and has understood not only its war-proven efficiency, but also that it is in harmony with our form of Government. Obviously, it is important that the JCS function with a high degree of efficiency. This it has done. Consequently, it is reassuring to learn that the JCS system has been brought to an even higher degree of efficiency through the leadership of Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr.

On Sunday, August 14, 1960, there was a very informative article by the distinguished analyst, George Fielding Eliot, appearing in the New York Herald Tribune, entitled "Joint Chiefs Escape Paper Jungle—Via Gates Civilian Decisions at Meetings." This analysis explains how, as a result of Secretary Gates' historic decision to sit personally with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the work of that organization is now completely current, with no backlog of unsettled problems.

As the article points up, the author "has been unable to find a single informed individual who remembers any previous occasions when such a condition prevailed."

Here is another salient example of how our national security has directly benefited from the professional ability and strong leadership of the present Secretary of Defense, Thomas S. Gates, Jr.

Because of the tremendous importance of this enhanced efficiency of the fundamentally sound JCS system, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of George Fielding Eliot's article. It constitutes reassuring reading for all those having an interest in military efficiency, leadership, and the overall defense of our Nation:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Aug. 14, 1960]

JOINT CHIEFS ESCAPE PAPER JUNGLE VIA GATES' CIVILIAN DECISIONS AT MEETINGS

(By George Fielding Eliot)

The Joint Chiefs of Staff have escaped from the paper jungle.

The backlog of unfinished (or unfinishable) business which for years has cluttered their procedures and hampered their effectiveness as military advisers to the President and the Secretary of Defense has been cleaned up.

All their work is now on a current basis and being disposed of with due regularity.

NO PRECEDENT

Some Pentagon old-timers can't quite believe it. It's hard for anyone who has had longtime acquaintance with the work of the Joint Chiefs to think of them otherwise than as men struggling with a mountain of insoluble problems which can be disposed of only by agreeing to disagree, or by logrolling[3] compromises which fall far short of constructive accomplishment.

So revolutionary is the present and far happier state of affairs that this writer has been unable to find a single informed individual who remembers any previous occasion when such a condition prevailed. It's never happened before, say these voices of experience. There have always been hangovers that had to be swept under the rug or stowed away in bottom drawers to await better times, or started on one more circular journey among staff committees and departmental agencies in the hope that somebody might think up some acceptable means of disposing of them.

Yet today—as the writer has confirmed from reliable sources—there are only two major questions pending before the Joint Chiefs, and both of these items are current business.

GATES' DECISION

The magic touch which has accomplished this miracle—and miracle is the word that is being applied to it by more than one old hand who knows the facts—is the decision of Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr., to bring the element of civilian decision right to the Joint Chiefs' council table. Previous Secretaries had sat afar off and waited for the JCS to produce military decisions and send them upstairs for approval—or to send word by their chairman that they couldn't agree.

The hard fact that there is no such thing, at the Joint Chiefs level, as a purely military decision was what caused the accumulation of unfinished business. When you get to the top in this vastly costly and vitally crucial business of national defense, all decisions have economic, financial, and political as well as military ingredients.

That, indeed, is what the established constitutional principle of civilian control of military affairs is all about. Final decisions in our military affairs are a civilian responsibility. The military function in this area of decision is advisory.

CIVILIAN DECISION

What Secretary Gates did was to bring the two elements—civilian decision and military advice—together in close and regular association. He sits down with the Joint Chiefs every Tuesday—and oftener if necessary. He listens to each Chief in the presence of the others. He asks his own questions—with a background of 6 years of high-level Pentagon experience. He takes part in whatever discussion is going on. When decisions are required, he makes them—either on the spot, or after further consideration and another round or two of discussion with the Chiefs. But before he decides, he makes certain that he understands the viewpoint of each of the armed services, expressed through its military chief, so that he has a well-rounded understanding of what he is doing.

It is this simple process which has freed the Joint Chiefs from their paper jungle.

It has done something else—it has made an essentially sound system work as it was meant to work, as F.D.R. and Winston Churchill made it work during World War II, both in this country and in Britain, by themselves providing the essential element of civilian decision.

The result speaks for itself. It comes at a most fortunate time, when the international skies are darkened with threatening clouds.

QUESTION MARK

Some admirers of Mr. Gates' accomplishment, however, are disturbed by another sort of cloud—this one on the political horizon in the shape of a question mark.

Senator KENNEDY, who may become President next January, has appointed Senator SYMINGTON, of Missouri, to head a committee charged with making recommendations as to the reorganization of the Defense Department. This comes just at the moment that the present Defense organization has begun to function more effectively than it has for a good many years. Since Senator SYMINGTON is known to believe that we should have a single military Chief of Staff to make decisions, and since Senator KENNEDY's experience of defense problems is limited, there is evident some anxiety lest another reorganization that would negate the promise of today may be in the making.

One Pentagon veteran remarked that Senator KENNEDY would do more for national defense, and more to give pause to the gentlemen in the Kremlin, if he eliminated any prospect of a decision gap in our military affairs by announcing that, in case of his election, he intends to ask Mr. Gates to stay on as Secretary of Defense.

That might be an idea well worth thinking about.

Statement on Behalf of the California Olive Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to insert my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a statement by Mr. Daryl Hutchins, of the California Olive Industry, which he made before the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity of Information.

This statement points out the dire distress in which this specialized industry in my State of California finds itself due to a series of tariff reductions over the past several years. They are now faced with a possible further reduction at the forthcoming meeting of GATT in Geneva. This all comes about by the constantly increasing cost of production in this country as opposed to the low wage scale paid in Spain, the main source of competition. Many of the California olive orchards are between fifty and a hundred years of age. This represents a substantial investment to bring an olive orchard into production only to have its existence threatened by further tariff reductions.

The lemon industry of California is also in difficulties due to the heavy and unrestricted imports of lemon byproducts from Sicily. While these two industries may be considered specialty crops, they are certainly entitled to the same protection given to other basic crops produced in this country. My sincere hope is that our negotiators going to Geneva will examine very carefully the effect of additional tariff reductions on these American industries.

The statement follows:

On behalf of the olive industry, I would like to place before you data to guide your thinking in any resultant recommendation you may tender the President on this investigation of item No. 744.

The olive industry in planning for needs must take into consideration a period of 8 years in advance for said needs. Production from trees which grow to be over 100 years old do not produce, technically speaking, until 8 years of age. So you see any tariff modification nullifies plans made 8 years ago.

This, of course, pinpoints one particular peculiarity of our industry as against a great number of other agricultural commodities which can switch plant at the end of a given crop season. Eight years of labor, 8 years of costs, 8 years of thought, dissipated as the result of decisions that could hinge on this Board's preliminary findings.

It is conceivable that this Commission may hold a few mental reservations that the industries appearing before it do not have the overall broad view that this Commission may have, but I would like to point out, as a spokesman for one industry that it is conceivable that this Commission's perspective may also have a limited view and that the work of this Commission could have far-reaching effects on the economy of America, because the dealings of this Commission could be compared to one piece of an enormous jigsaw puzzle, and that when the jigsaw puzzle picture is put together there is evidence that it will not reflect the picture of America, eocnomically and socially as we have known it. Let me give you a few factors for consideration as they effect our industry and when considered in the light of the economy as a whole, will convey in essence, the intent of my comments today.

Agriculture is California's biggest commodity. Agriculture in California is greater than any other State. Olives are one of California's biggest agricultural products. Now consider this: I would like to remind the Commission that we in the industry under law are compelled to pay as much in 1 hour to those working our crop as the European counterpart received in 1 full day and on the other hand under another law we are forced to live with a tariff that allows this tremendous labor differential to dictate the destiny of our industry. Unlike other industries that are now feeling the pinch of low tariffs, we have stood idly by for 30 years with a tariff that was set on item No. 744 in 1930, and watched some 27 olive oil pressing plants go out of business, while our country imported unemployed Americans. Thirty cents per gallon as originally set for tariff in

the thirties represents something around the 10-cent mark today. In 1930 it was possible to buy a quart of milk for a nickel, but today it costs 25 cents. Bread and other items were similarly priced. I cite this as an example to show the inadequacy of the 30 cent a gallon tariff in the light of present day values. If the tariff were reduced one-half this would mean our growers would be put to $109 disadvantage per ton. I would like the Commission to know that the industry would like an investigation to be made to bear out our contention that any concessions on tariff would expedite our demise, economically speaking, that we are already beyond peril point, that growth in the industry has been arrested, that the original intent of the tariff, if properly adjusted, would represent 90 cents per gallon as of today. The Commission should realize that we have not kept pace with the original monetary intent of the tariff as initiated 30 years ago.

The industry is faced with a first-class case of fiscal d.t.t.'s. Agricultural land in California is the highest taxed in the Nation. We not only pay local taxes, but, of course, we pay Federal taxes, part of which winds up in foreign aid, to enable our Government to sustain those who would take our very living from us through the vehicles of low tariff, low foreign labor, and all this in the name of reciprocity.

This is just one of the many pieces of the jigsaw puzzle, when considered individually which means very little compared to the broad view, but pictured together, coupled with other factors, can spell a difference in labor conditions as we have known them and will not bring up labor standards in foreign countries, but will bring ours down.

Between the delirium of taxes and tariffs the issue of socialism will be forced upon American labor and agriculture. Whatever benefits may be derived will not beneficially effect foreign labor as such, but will profit, as pointed out in our brief, entrepreneurs and governments at the expense of our farmers and our laborers.

The industry does not appear before this Commission with hat in hand, but does appear to question the economical sanity of pursuing such a course of concessions. When the facts are placed before this body and when the recommendations are considered, I believe it will be obvious that friendships never can be purchased, and that one industry's economical survival should not be used as a bargaining tool, as a tentative benefit to any given country through tariff benefits, but such assistance to foreign countries, if need be tendered, would be better borne by the country as a whole through other instruments at the Government's disposal, assuming that these concessions are to be considered as benefits and handouts, which I believe they are. Our industry has been discouraged by the commercial attaché of countries producing olives and, in fact, have been told they cannot consider importing items which they themselves produce. Is this reciprocity?

We are just an industry fighting for survival against an inequitable tariff and an inequity in foreign labor which is paid some 15 to 35 times less than American labor. An industry that must market its entire crop, an industry where labor costs consume upward of 75 percent of the producing and processing dollar with a product that is handled laborwise more than any other tree product. It would take a good portion of this day to fully orient the Commission to all aspects for harvesting and processing. We cannot compete with foreign labor and maintain our living standards. It is important that the Commission know that we are being forced to divert our own crops to allow the importing of olives from Europe. What other agricultural crop does this?

We are forced to accommodate countries that would not allow us reciprocity. The Government does not buy olives and store the same, such as they do tobacco, wheat, corn, and many other items. We do not ask them to. We do not seek handouts, nor parities, but just an opportunity to maintain our market and through tariff preserve American labor standards for this is wherein they can compete.

Would this Commission ask American labor to accept 90 cents to $1 per day? Would this Commission ask American labor to restrict their diets to roughly 25 percent varietywise to what European labor has? Would this Commission request American labor to live in accommodations such as we had 50 years ago? Would this Commission ask American labor and American farmers to regress 30 years? I think the answers are—No. We request the Commission to cause to be investigated our perilous situation and effect a recommendation under section 3 that an increase in duty and import restrictions be invoked to avoid further serious injury that has already effected the livelihood of the olive industry. We further request that the Commission institute an escape clause investigation to verify that imports of item 744 have been directly competitive with California olives, ripe, not green in color, and the tariff be increased to a minimum of 70 cents a gallon for reasons mentioned herein.

Olives must be considered in a little different light than most items. The best olives go into California ripe olives. Those that are not canned go into oil and some green. In 30 years because of the low tariff on olives, oil, and green olives, some 20 plants have closed down. We must have a tariff adjustment on item 744 because chains throughout America feature the cheaper olive which is the imported olives.

The Commission should consider the following salient points:

That olives must be utilized for canning, bottling, and oil. Divorcing anyone of the trinity can take the farmer's profit from him. The low tariff on oil and green olives has left the American farmers with nothing but the ripe olives and now the low price because of low labor costs of Spanish imports are so directly competitive to ripes that they are periling the one source of processing olives left open to the American producer. To realize profit from olives this tri-cycle of return must be preserved. Two-thirds of the cycle have been disrupted because of low tariff. This must be corrected. The industry is intent on bringing this to the attention of the American public and its elective body, the Congress. We feel it is high time after 30 years of unrewarded patience with this situation which has been arbitrarily thrust upon the industry that it be corrected. That our industry not bear the brunt of coercive diplomatic expediency, to be forced through so-called friendly alliances which have arrested domestic growth, should be apparent to all present.

We do not directly or indirectly approve or disapprove of any Mediterranean policies that may or may not prevail. We are not here for a discussion of such, but it should be said: Let not our American magnanimosity, generosity and benevolency reach such high levels as to only turn upon us and destroy our domestic industries. Vast sums of money have been given to subsidize foreign industries which compete directly with American free enterprise and above all are most perilous and disastrous to us in our most valuable market, the market which we developed, the United States. These funds have provided efficient plants in foreign countries while many of our own plants are not allowed sufficient depreciation to replace obsolete equipment.

We have many strategic bases in foreign countries which could be immobilized overnight by a change in government. We are told that foreign aid is essential to underwrite part of this mutual cooperation. When this foreign aid is under the guise of tariff concessions to specific and strategic areas then it should be called reciprocal treaty and not reciprocal trade.

Congressmen have stated to our industry that the Commission has paid little attention to expressions of views of Congressmen along these lines and there has been difficulty in having the application and the administering of the provisions of our reciprocal trade laws which were designed to afford the protection to American agriculture and industry, which Congress intended in enacting these laws.

As spokesman for the industry, I do hereby express the feeling of the industry that through these laws we have strayed from the original spirit and essence in which they were enacted by Congress and are using them in the nature of a political barter, creating a situation of gambling with economies and nullifying reciprocal trade as such. Can we buy friendship with tariffs? Perhaps recent incidents in Japan can answer this question.

It is our opinion that now is the time for a reexamination of the reciprocal trade and tariffs as they apply to the olive industry, and upon this examination that the Commission recommend to the President that an adjustment in tariffs is in order to protect the domestic producer from inequities of foreign labor from a directly competitive item that jeopardizes the livelihood of the item described in 744.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILTON W. GLENN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. GLENN. Mr. Speaker, I feel honored in being able to extend greetings to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and to its chairman, Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, upon the 20th anniversary of its founding. Though the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is a young organization, the sentiments it expresses and the ideals it espouses so courageously are age old, for freedom is ageless. The committee has dramatized for us the plight of the more than 40 million Ukrainians under the Soviet heel. It has shown us that the Ukrainian cause of freedom plays a vital role in our never-ending struggle against Soviet imperialism.

To the 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry who comprise this organization and to its directors, I wish to express my most sincere thanks for their help in informing our fellow Americans about the heroic struggle of the captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R., for showing us the true nature of Russian totalitarianism and expansionism, and for recommending possible courses of action to cope with these threats to our national security.

I am sure that the Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in my second district of New Jersey join with me in expressing my appreciation for the endeavors of the committee during the last 20 years, and ask for their continuation.

Congressman's Dream About To Come True

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the Congress remember with great admiration their former colleague, Harold Knutson, of Minnesota. I am sure they will all be interested in the following news story that appeared in the Minneapolis Sunday Tribune of July 31, 1960:

CONGRESSMAN'S DREAM ABOUT TO COME TRUE

MANHATTAN BEACH, MINN.—"Neglected unfortunate, deprived and handicapped children" were the concern of the late Representative Harold Knutson, Republican, of Minnesota, when he gave his nearby lake home to the Evangelical Lutheran Church (ELC).

Next Sunday, 7 years after the Congressman's death, Jeannette Holm Knutson Camp will be dedicated to just that purpose.

Among the guests at the camp 30 miles north of Brainerd, Minn., are the blind. So are the deaf. The mentally retarded, too, have come. Children from institutions in five States are brought here for the sunshine and lake life.

They learn to water ski—even the blind. They fish, swim, hike, play, camp outdoors, or just lie in the sun and get tanned.

Among the youngsters coming from children's homes are those with emotional problems as a result of unfavorable family environment. Hence the staffing is especially heavy. And the living arrangements allow counselors to check closely on their charges at all times.

Most of the members of the staff of 10 are college or seminary trained. The Reverend Mark Ronning, a 1960 graduate of Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, is camp director.

To the original summer home, duplex guest house and other buildings on the 45-acre peninsula between Big Trout and Lower Whitefish Lakes, the ELC over the past few years has added the following:

Sleeping cabins divided into compartments of four bunks each, a dining-recreation hall and extensive remodeling. The cabins have counselors' rooms, hot and cold running water, indoor plumbing and heat.

A mile-long shoreline with shallow, sandy beaches invites swimmers. Fishing boats with motors are provided, and a powerful runabout takes the children water skiing and on excursions.

In ceremonies Sunday, the camp will be dedicated to the Congressman's mother who died in 1925. Among speakers will be Dr. Magnus A. Dahlen, Minneapolis, executive secretary of the ELC's board of charities who arranged the gift with Knutson.

Knutson, whose home was in Wadena, Minn., served 32 years in Congress and was chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee at one time. He never married.

The dedication address will be given by Dr. Arthur E. Hanson, Moorhead, Minn., president of the ELC's northern Minnesota district. Participating in the service will be deaf children from Minneapolis, Faribault, Minn., and Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

Significant Remarks on Television Programing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Washington Post this morning a column by their radio and television editor, Lawrence Laurent, that raises a question about the programing of television stations that deserves to be brought to the attention of the Members of Congress. Mr. Laurent's significant observations about the public's apparent lack of confidence in television programing should be of concern to the Congress, in view of the responsibility it holds for the regulation of the industry:

RADIO AND TELEVISION: AUDIENCES TV FORGOT ARE TURNING THE TABLE

(By Lawrence Laurent)

If I were in the business of making up television schedules, I'd begin worrying.

There's increasing evidence of a changing public attitude toward the electronic peep show, a growing conviction that television is a minor vice, something to be viewed in secrecy after one has carefully turned off his brain.

Yes, I have seen the audience survey reports that claim Americans spend more time looking at television than they do at any other activity, except working and sleeping. I suspect the pollsters have confused sleeping with viewing, activities that are increasingly synonymous. I suspect, also, that the same pollsters are hired to prove that an audience in the millions does really exist and one is going to be found. After all, no pollster is eager to prove that there are no noses for him to count.

At neighborhood gatherings, I am being assailed by strangers who identify themselves, first, as someone "who used to watch television." They make TV sound like a stage of development, a phase, something like growing pains and acne, through which every maturing adult must pass.

Just 2 weeks ago, an architect and his wife and their four children came to my home. The architect said that the family television set had not been used for 4 months. The set blew a tube last May and the family, including the kids, had voted against spending money for repairs. The children concentrate on games, music, and the radio. The parents have gone back to conversation and reading. The architect told me that he would never have the set repaired.

What has gone out of the television schedule, for too many viewers, is the magic and excitement that was so much a part of the early years. The networks have arrived at mechanical perfection. The shows come out of Hollywood with a production lustre and a chromatic brilliance. Local programing has been forgotten.

Well, perhaps "forgotten" is not the right word. In years past, a local program was one that responded to the needs and wishes of the local community. It reflected the community's ambitions, its drives for funds or civic improvements, its elections, and its controversial issues. It was produced by a local station, using local facilities and performers who were a part of the community.

Now, a local program is one that is not fed through the network's coaxial cable. A local performer reads the commercials, true enough, but his artistic performance is limited to an introduction of a filmed program that flopped in network competition.

For variety, a local program is a motion picture that was exhibited in theaters sometime prior to the Korean war. Even the commercials are exhortations that were filmed in New York or Hollywood.

We have come, in this second TV decade, to a state that would delight the automation expert: The station can operate almost without performers and the receiving sets can blare without an audience.

The producer and the consumer are on a steady diet of tranquilizers. Neither is interested in stimulation, excitement, or energy. Television has become a ghostly business with phantom viewers feeding on flickering images.

Television, in short, seems to be willing to settle for the role of comforter to the very old and toy for the very young but the ancients are merely taking a sedative and the kids can't be fooled for long.

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CRAIG HOSMER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, this fall the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America will be celebrating the 20th anniversary of its founding. This committee is a uniquely united national organization reflecting the thoughts and sentiments of some 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry.

It is dedicated to the task of serving the national security interests of this country by first, advancing the strategic value of all the captive nations, particularly those in the Soviet Union itself; second, informing the people of this country about the independence struggles of the dozen captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R.; third, exposing the many current myths about Soviet unity in all its alleged ramifications; and, fourth, proposing concrete ways and means to defeat imperialist Moscow in the cold war, the chief mode of which is psychopolitical and propagandistic.

I pay tribute to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America and the Ukrainian people in this country and throughout the world who are dedicated to the belief that freedom is the right of all nations. It remains for us of the free world to help them sustain their faith in God and humanity, in their own survival and in their inevitable freedom. Words of encouragement and sympathetic expressions of understanding of their plight will mean a great deal to these people in their dark hours of desperation.

We must work diligently in support of freedom everywhere so all freedom-lov-

ing people of the captive nations may continue to hope fervently that they may soon enjoy the God-given right of independence with justice which should be the national heritage of all mankind everywhere.

Why There Is a Need for Housing Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the August 27, 1960, issue of Business Week magazine. It points up the need for this Congress to approve housing legislation:

PLYWOOD JAM HURTS OREGON PURSES—OVERCAPACITY, SOFT PRICES, AND LAYOFFS IN THE INDUSTRY ARE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DROP IN THE STATE'S PERSONAL INCOME

The slump in homebuilding is being felt all across the United States, but nowhere is it hurting more than in Oregon, ranking State in the production of lumber and wood products.

In the fir country west of the Cascades and in the pine country to the east, sawmills and plywood mills have had to lay off countless workers and put others on short workweeks as they cut back production closer to demand. Save for the recession of 1958, there have not been fewer workers in the woods and mills during this season in years.

Because of the degree to which the forest products industry dominates Oregon's economy, the slowdown quickly made itself felt. Business Week's measure of personal income [not printed in RECORD] shows, for example, how Oregon's income is dipping at a time when the U.S. total is going up.

Overall, the industry employs around 75,000 persons in Oregon—more than any other sector outside agriculture and half of all manufacturing workers. Thousands of others earn their livelihood selling to the industry or to its workers.

Oregon accounts for 26 percent of the Nation's softwood lumber (particularly fir and pine) and 65 percent of its fir plywood. Both lumber and wood products such as plywood have been hit by the decline in homebuilding, but the hard knocks suffered by the plywood makers have been more dramatic.

Squeeze play: Caught between the housing slump and its own overexpansion, the plywood segment of the industry has had to lay off or put on a short workweek several thousand of its workers. Plywood makers expanded several years ago partly because they needed more efficient mills to ride out low prices. The industry's new, burgeoning capacity enabled it to turn out sheets of plywood faster than it could sell them. Then came the added problem of a downturn in homebuilding.

Early this month, plywood manufacturers took steps to work off their inventories and to stave off further softening of prices. U.S. Plywood Corp., the largest marketer of plywood and one of the largest manufacturers, announced that it would cut production by 20 percent by going on a 4-day week. Several smaller companies followed, and later big Georgia-Pacific Corp. jumped on the bandwagon.

Brighter spots: Of course, not all of Oregon is hurting. Construction employment, ironically, is up, as are services, trade, and government. Electrical machinery shows a gain over a year ago—thanks to the gradual growth of electronics—but in lower paying jobs. Food processing, the second largest employer in the manufacturing sector, has been stable. All of this is helping to cushion the slump in lumber and wood products.

Trouble spot: When you take a close look at Oregon's lumber industry problem, plywood emerges as the real trouble spot.

Production of lumber (mostly softwood) in recent years has zigged and zagged, and never regained the peak it hit during 1955's housing boom. But plywood production has climbed to new highs annually almost without interruption. And while mechanization and elimination of marginal producers have cut employment in sawmills, the number of jobs in plywood and veneer mills also has been setting records.

Plywood production in Oregon almost doubled from 2.7 billion square feet in 1955 to 5.1 billion square feet in 1959. During that period, 23 new mills were built, bringing Oregon's total to 73. Another five were added this year.

Growing demand: In enlarging the total industry capacity to 9.1 billion square feet, plywood makers were motivated by (1) growing demand and (2) growing costs of producing.

The housing boom of the 1950's unleashed a big demand for plywood, but sheer number of dwelling units don't explain the whole demand picture. Plywood manufacturers have been getting more of their product into each house, cutting into the markets of other lumber products. And with a greater percentage of total housing going into apartments, the industry has benefited even more because a multi-family dwelling uses more plywood than a single-family unit.

If the construction boom had been the only spur to building new mills, it would seem that the plywood people were shortsighted in not anticipating housing slumps.

Cost factor: That's where the other factor—the cost of production—comes in. With timber prices rising steadily the manufacturers have to get the maximum yield from their logs. So, to minimize waste and get the most from their byproducts, they had to build more efficient plants.

They started on this wave of expansion at a time when plywood was bringing in $90 or more per 1,000 square feet, also at a time when small independents could make money in the business. Since then, the price has been fluctuating between $64 and $60. At such low prices, the efficient producers have been able to do more than just operate. They have been able to shut down their least efficient mills as a means of achieving a 20 percent cutback, instead of putting all their plants—efficient and inefficient—on a 4-day week. Roseburg Lumber Co., for example, has found it desirable to keep its new capacity running on a 5-day schedule but closed its old one at Bandon to achieve greater saving.

Indefinite cutbacks: The industry made an abortive attempt in May to cut production by prolonging vacation and temporarily going to a shorter workweek. These measures, plus the summer pickup in homebuilding, succeeded in jacking prices up to $64. But orders failed to keep up with production, and increasing inventories forced the price back to $60.

This episode also resulted in some name-calling within the industry. Small operators blamed big plywood producers for bringing prices down by dumping plywood on the market. And the big ones,' in turn, accused the smaller firms of shaving prices because they couldn't afford to keep inventories.

One independent said he thought a number of firms cut prices because they thought they could open new markets for plywood that way, but such efforts were futile. "There has been no increase in business in relation to increase in production," he said. "They have just priced themselves down to where a lot of them are in trouble."

Today, nobody is talking—as they did in May—of the cutbacks being for a limited period. The only concern is to bring production more in line with demand, however long that takes. Many operators feel they can't afford to shut down 1 day a week; others are just as sure that they can't afford not to shut down. This situation is particularly critical to smaller mills, where cash flow is vital. To keep the cash coming, they are prepared to keep operating and cut the price—even to $60 per 1,000 square feet.

Who gets hurt: To an outsider, the difference between $60 and $64 may not seem like much. But plywood men say they can't make any money at $60, while at $64, says one, "we can operate but we can't pay our bills."

So it's clear that while a 20-percent cutback in production may help firm up the price of plywood, it's just as clear that some people may get hurt in the process. The voluntary cutbacks at 60 mills mean shorter work weeks—or no work at all—for 7,500 west coast plywood workers, most of them in Oregon. Their thinner pay envelopes, in turn, mean lost sales in the mill towns.

In Eugene, for example, most of the 17 mills in the area are down to a 4-day week, and the community is feeling it. Retail sales are off from 12 to 15 percent from a year ago, according to the chamber of commerce, and the collections of professional men such as doctors are down 10 percent. Bank debits, which for the first 7 months ran 7 percent ahead of 1959, have fallen to the lower level of August 1959.

First decline: If the production cutbacks continue for an appreciable time—as now seems likely—this could be the first year that plywood production has declined from the previous year. During other housing slumps, plywood stayed level. Even in the first half of this year, when housing starts were off 18 percent, Douglas-fir plywood sales were up 1.5 percent. The fir people aren't exactly sure why this happened, but they point out that plywood is finding more uses in home construction, and is being used more in apartment house building.

Long-range hopes: Although there are signs of an upswing in new housing, the plywood industry doesn't expect to benefit immediately. It is heading into what is normally a slack season. Consequently, it will be several months before the industry will be in a position to work off its inventories, pick up enough new business to sustain higher operating rates, and get its production curve going back up. In the meantime, few people in Oregon would be surprised if there were some structural changes in the industry. There is considerable gossip already about small mills, unable to weather the decline, talking merger with other small ones or absorption with some giants.

Volume Feeding, One of America's Great Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VICTOR L. ANFUSO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. ANFUSO. Mr. Speaker, a very interesting study on volume feeding has come to my attention. This study deals with food consumption outside of

the home and shows what a tremendous industry it constitutes. The study was made by the research department of Volume Feeding Management, published by Conover-Mast.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert into the RECORD a brief release on this study which should be very interesting to all my colleagues:

EIGHT-BILLION-DOLLAR VOLUME FEEDING MARKET ANALYZED IN CONOVER-MAST STUDY

Sales of meals to the public by volume feeding units will total more than $17 billion in 1960, of which $8 billion represents the wholesale cost of food, according to an analysis by Volume Feeding Management, a Conover-Mast publication.

The analysis is believed to be the most definitive yet conducted of an industry which is notably hard to pin down statistically.

The study indicates that at least 20 percent of food consumed in the United States this year will be eaten in some kind of volume feeding establishment—which is defined as any eating place not in the home. The percentage has been rising in recent years and will continue to rise due to the increasing pace and complexity of our economy, Volume Feeding Management concludes.

Restaurants, cafeterias, and lunch counters represent 43.6 percent of the volume feeding market, based on the food cost element. Schools, grade through university, represent 12.3 percent. Next comes taverns, drugstores, department stores, delicatessens, and other places which serve food incidental to other business, with 11.3 percent. Hospitals, nursing homes, and other institutions (including prisons) take 10.4 percent (hospital employees, incidentally, outnumber patients on an eating basis). Other segments are Armed Forces in the United States, 5.3 percent; clubs, 4.5 percent; hotels and motels, 4.4 percent; employee feeding, 4.2 percent; all other, 4 percent.

The survey drew upon statistics of the Department of Agriculture, Department of Commerce, Census Bureau, and other sources. It includes detailed breakdowns of market segments and a projection of the market for 1970.

Communist Propaganda in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, recently while waiting in a barbershop in New Delhi, India, I looked around as one does in our country for something to read.

I picked up a magazine with a beautiful colored front. It was printed in English.

It was called Soviet Land. It was published in Moscow.

I glanced through it quickly. I immediately recognized a superb job of Communist propaganda.

It was not all. There were others in the pile. One was entitled "China Reconstructs." It told of the Red Chinese Communist experiment in vivid and dramatic language. It was published in Peiping. There were still others, all gorgeously prepared periodicals, from Communist satellite countries.

My curiosity was aroused. I was there as a U.S. Congressman, chairman of a committee which seeks to promote American private investment in the underdeveloped nations of Asia and the Middle East, hoping to improve the climate for such investment.

But the literature in the barbershop was a real barrier to my mission. I asked the barber where he got it. He said it came in free every week. I looked around for something to counteract this massive display of Communist propaganda.

There was nothing. Not a single publication from the United States or any other free world nation.

The next morning, I was back at our embassy in New Delhi, asking questions. Our officials there told me I had not seen anything yet. I had not. I was shown a file packed with propaganda—Communist propaganda. It literally amazed me. It was also depressing. I knew that my mission was being hamstrung by such material. I felt that the first thing we must do is to portray our country as it is and not as this propaganda claims us to be.

The Communist propaganda portrays America as a land where a few millionaires exploit the masses by getting rich on the production of armaments, and that the rest of the world is threatened by our warmongering. The Communist countries are, of course, shown as dedicated to peace and progress and capable of producing all the good things of life in a new world Communist society.

The distorted propaganda has a tremendous effect. Such material is a vital weapon, and a firstline enemy, in the underdeveloped lands in the crescent from Turkey to Japan.

The reasons for this are easily seen when one visits these countries, as I did on this tour to encourage investment.

In these countries, the people depend on the media of propaganda for much of their information, and education. The village center with its few periodicals, the community radio, and the small library are the intellectual focus for millions of these impressionable people. Whoever provides the periodicals, the radio broadcasts, the books, has the best chance of winning the minds of these people who do not have the means to pick and choose among a great range of such material.

The Communist propaganda effort can subvert millions of minds. It is a deliberate, conscious, well-conceived, and well-financed campaign to do just that, and in doing so to destroy the correct image of America as a land of political freedom and economic opportunity.

What are some of the methods used by the Communists in this propaganda battle?

Everything.

Periodicals? One hundred and eighteen Communist publications are available in India, and most of them circulate throughout Asia and the Middle East. Soviet Land, my barbershop reading fare, has a circulation of over 1 million copies.

Books? Thirty-seven Communist publishing houses operate in India alone. A quarter of the space in the university library in Thailand is taken up with Communist books. Iran bookstores bulge with Communist titles.

The sum total: Communist publishing aimed at the underdeveloped nations in Asia and the Middle East increased 150 percent from 1957 to 1959.

The free world effort? Only a tenth of this.

An especially dangerous part of this publishing propaganda is a series of books for children which have come from Communist presses and are now flooding bookstores. One hundred titles are available in India alone. The Communists are putting major emphasis on this for obvious reasons.

Motion pictures? Communist films are increasingly competing with American commercial productions in Asian theaters. Communist bloc countries are producing films in Pakistan. Red China has turned out pictures in eight Asian languages.

Radio broadcasting? This country is far outstripped. Communist broadcasting overseas is three times that of our Voice of America. Red China alone beams nearly half as much time overseas as the Voice, all of it to the countries of Asia and the Middle East.

What does it add up to?

Dr. Robert Johnson, president of Temple University, recently estimated the total Communist propaganda effort amounts to $5 billion a year. I can readily believe this. The night skies in Indian cities are lit with great red signs urging people to "Read Soviet Books and Periodicals." Theater marquees invite people to see Communist movies.

The effects of this massive campaign are seen in every strata of Asian life. Attending a reception at an Asian university, I had a conversation with a student.

He told me: "We're going all the way down the path of socialism. Our country will be one of equals, not of very rich and very poor, as in your country."

I asked him how this would be achieved?

"We will break the back of the reactionaries in government, and pass laws. These laws will provide for the needs of the people, but nobody will be allowed to have more than he really needs," he replied.

I recognized the Communist line that is the theme of all the periodicals, the broadcasts, the books and the movies.

What is our response to this? What are we doing to present America as it really is, a nation of peace and democratic processes and of a free enterprise economic system?

Not much, not as much as we must do. In comparison to the Communist propaganda campaign, ours is feeble.

We have two periodicals which circulate in Asia and the Middle East. They are American Reporter—250,000 in India—and the New World—less than a million in 15 countries. We have participated in big international fairs and exhibitions. We have helped provide some textbooks for universities. We have a modest program of book translation.

The total budget of our U.S. Information Agency, our major information and education tool, is about $100 million a year. We support 60 cultural centers in the Middle East and Asia. Many of these are one-room affairs. They are spread thin. There is 1 for every 35 million people in India.

The effects of the big Communist effort shows. The Communist voting strength in India has tripled in the last 5 years. In other nations, the Communists are continually making new gains.

We must join in this battle for men's minds with a positive and sustained campaign.

What are some of the things we must do? I do not pretend to have all the answers. But in talking with knowledgeable people in Washington, including many of my colleagues in Congress, I find some things on which there is general agreement.

A basic need is more financial support.

The answer does not lie in money alone. But more money can be used and used intelligently.

Millions are available, in a form that would not cost the American taxpayer another dollar. These are counterpart funds, money which this country has earned through the operation of several aid programs, notably the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954.

These currencies can only be spent in the oversea nations. There are more than $100 million in such currencies lying idle in oversea banks. Millions more are becoming available every year.

Why haven't they been put to work? Congress has restricted their use. Ridiculous legal restrictions do not allow us to use small amounts for publishing, student exchange, or broadcasting and film production. Only $3.5 million of these funds are budgeted to be spent in 1960.

I have introduced legislation to remove these restrictions. They are vital to our information and education effort. They are needed tools in the battle for men's minds.

The unleashing of these currencies is the first step in our battle. American taxpayers should demand that these funds be put to work.

With this money there are several programs which could be started, others greatly expanded.

For instance:

Publishing: Expansion of our periodical coverage is vital. Further, expansion of the textbook translation program is a key effort to export democracy. I especially favor a program of publishing children's books. All kinds of books, the tools of education and truth, should certainly be a major American weapon in the propaganda battle.

Higher education: We should establish chairs of American studies in Asian universities. We could provide scholarships for students to attend these universities, to take courses designed to show America as it is. We should help in the construction and stocking of college libraries and student centers.

Motion pictures: Educational films, and films showing how America has contributed to the overseas countries, could be produced in the countries themselves, paid for with counterpart currencies.

Science education: New methods of teaching the basic sciences, developed in this country, should be exported to help the growing public school systems of Asian countries. The simple materials used in these teaching methods, and the training of teachers to use them, could be supported by local currencies.

Committee centers: We should support the construction of thousands of community centers in the villages of the Asian-Middle Eastern area. They are the focus of community life and we should have a part in their success.

Educational television: This modern method is being used slightly in colleges and universities in India. It could be expanded to include the public school systems and become a quick means of overcoming the problem of mass illiteracy.

Exhibits: We have made a bit hit with big exhibitions. We should develop a program of small, village-size exhibits for constant use. One such exhibit, on small industry possibilities, is now showing throughout India. It has been praised by Prime Minister Nehru on the floor of the Indian Parliament. Counterpart funds should develop and support other small exhibits.

Exchange: We have developed a great number of exchange programs. But these could be expanded fourfold and still not meet all the needs. We could support thousands of American students, teachers, and technicians with counterpart currencies.

All these programs could be carried on with idle money which this country desperately needs to put to work. This could be done without additional cost to American taxpayers.

To me, this makes sense.

Lodge Quits U.N. to Chorus of Council Acclaim

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 27, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on September 3, Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge will leave his post at the United Nations.

During his tenure of service, since 1952, the distinguished Ambassador has won the gratitude of our country, the admiration of his colleagues in the United Nations, and the respect of those who oppose freedom—for which Mr. Lodge has served as such an effective standard bearer.

As U.S. Ambassador at the U.N. he shouldered well the great responsibility of presenting the U.S. Government's position on a wide variety of issues coming before that body, affecting the interests of peace.

Among the U.N. debates in which Mr. Lodge played an important role were: negotiations at the end of the Korean war; return of 15 American fliers held by Red China after the Korean war; the Suez and Hungarian crises in late 1956; presenting President Eisenhower's U.S. open skies proposal; U.N. investigation of the situation in Laos; effectively battled the attempts to seat Red China in the United Nations; effectively refuted the charges of the Soviet Union against the United States on the RB–47 reconnaissance flight.

Recently, the Christian Science Monitor published an article by William R. Frye entitled "Lodge Quits U.N. to Chorus of Council Acclaim."

The fine article not only reviews the high respect with which his colleagues at the U.N. esteem his capable performance as U.S. Ambassador, but also presents in a new light the character, ability and attributes of the Ambassador, himself. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Christian Science Monitor, Aug. 25, 1960]

LODGE QUITS U.N. TO CHORUS OF COUNCIL ACCLAIM

(By William R. Frye)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—U.S. delegate Henry Cabot Lodge bade a sentimental farewell to the United Nations August 23 and received an unprecedented accolated from all 10 other countries on the U.N. Security Council—including the Soviet Union.

Mr. Lodge has resigned as of September 3, to run for Vice President. Unless the Congo crisis explodes anew, diplomats do not expect any meetings of major organs before that date; hence the early sendoff.

The tall, handsome American representative made what was expected to be his last appearance arguing for the admission of newly independent Cyprus to the U.N.

It was one of his easier tasks in nearly 8 years at the U.N. No one opposed the step. The Security Council unanimously recommended it. When formally approved by the General Assembly next month, Cyprus—long the site of bitter guerrilla war—will be the U.N.'s 97th member.

WADSWORTH STEPS UP

Mr. Lodge's deputy, James J. Wadsworth, will replace him, at least for the duration of the Eisenhower administration. Stepping up into Mr. Wadsworth's shoes will be James W. Barco, who at 44 will be one of the youngest full ambassadors in the U.S. Foreign Service.

The accolade for Mr. Lodge was obviously a surprise to him. It came without warning at the end of a more or less routine U.N. Council session.

Armand Bérard, the white-haired French president of the Security Council for August, said he did not wish to adjourn the meeting without a few words of farewell to his American colleague, who leaves, he said, with "our unanimous regret."

COMMUNISTS INCLUDED

One after another, the other delegates all echoed Mr. Bérard's words. Harold Beeley of Great Britain said the U.N. "will not be the same without him." Eugenio Plaja of Italy declared that it was because of men like Mr. Lodge that the U.N. had "been able to grow and assert its prestige and authority."

Even Platon Morozov of the Soviet Union and Jacek Machowski of Poland added gracious words. Mr. Morozov, who is a new-

comer, said he had heard that there "had been some divergences of view" between Mr. Lodge and Soviet delegates, but that he would "like to think not of that which separates us but of that which unites us."

The American representative, whose deep baritone normally booms out with full assurance, replied with emotion and some unaccustomed hesitation. He began in French, thanking M. Bérard. Then in English he responded to the others, saying he was "really quite bowled over."

PEACEMAKING STRESSED

The world, he pointed out, "is full of tension, full of danger, and full of mystery." Events often require vigorous defenses of national points of view, he said.

"But of course there is another side to this (U.N.) work. It is the side which is expressed in the Holy Bible by the words, 'blessed are the peacemakers,' which I am sure finds its counterpart in the other great religions.

"(This) job of getting common action and of getting consent is, of course, the type of work that epitomizes the best hopes of mankind."

Several delegates had praised Mr. Lodge for, as Sir Claude Corea of Ceylon put it, "tolerance" and "readiness to understand the other man's point of view."

This is a side to Mr. Lodge which much of the public does not know. He has won his reputation as a man who tells off the Russians. But U.N. people also know him for behind-the-scenes conciliation. It is a role he did not appear to come by naturally at first, but one which he learned in the caldron of experience.

These peacemaking activities, he said are "the things, I think, by which posterity will judge us all."

What About Depressed Area Legislation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I opposed the recess which split the 2d session of the 86th Congress into two parts. I am convinced that, had politics been set aside in favor of serious legislative procedure, adjournment could have been achieved without difficulty in ample time before the beginning of the conventions in Los Angeles and Chicago. Perhaps, however, there is a saving grace to the strategy calling for a return to Washington in order that campaign speeches may echo out from the Halls of the Senate. If Congress—at long last—enacts reasonable distressed area legislation, then the split session can be considered worthwhile.

For all too long, the bills to relieve this chronic unemployment have been subjected to political tinkering of ridiculous proportions. Surplus labor regions could certainly have escaped at least 2 discouraging years of dismay and distress. Had not our distressed area bill been loaded down with omnibus amendments to destroy the basic intent of the legislation, we could today be enjoying industrial progress in many if not all of the communities now listed in the surplus labor category. I have been over a large part of the 22d Congressional District in the past several weeks. In some communities and in some industries business is brisk and pay envelopes are plump. What is immediately apparent, however, are the valleys of inactivity and unemployment that mar what would otherwise be a very satisfactory relief map of economic conditions in our business district. You have the same conditions in regions of West Virginia, Kentucky, and in a number of other States.

To correct the situation would not require exceedingly heavy expenditures. I have proposed $75 million for industrial loans and $25 million for public facility loans. By foreign-aid standards, this dispersement would be extremely modest. Millions upon millions of dollars are provided annually by the International Cooperation Administration, whose source of income is the U.S. Treasury, to nations all over the globe for the purchase of materials—everything from soybeans and yarns to scientific instruments and industrial machinery. If you will but glance through a procurement information bulletin issued regularly by the ICA, you will be appalled at the number of listings of six- and seven-figure disbursements that permit the recipient nation to buy his promised trinkets and gadgets and automobiles and manufacturing plants wherever he wishes in the world market. Those are the items in which not a cent comes back to us, because the country enjoying our generosity is automatically relieved of any obligation to purchase the products of American industry and agriculture.

Then of course there is the Development Loan Fund which specializes in making available many millions of dollars so that nations other than the United States might enjoy the fruits of what the American taxpayer sends to Washington. The three brief announcements issued by the Development Loan Fund on June 3 recounted the approval of a $9.7 million loan to Vietnam for railroad cars and equipment, a $20 million loan to India for a thermopower plant, and a $23 million loan to Yugoslavia for a plastics and chemical plant. To a resident of an area where pockets of unemployment abound, such reports are most disturbing, particularly in view of the fact that the United States insists on making dollars available to Communist Yugoslavia at a time when certain American industries vital to the national defense are suffering for want of action by the Government.

An additionally alarming statement was released by DLF on June 13 when it announced that loan applications totaling $3,679 million had been received from 59 countries during the agency's first 26 months of operation. The report proceeds to list numerous categories in which loans have far exceeded the amount to be appropriated in the distressed area bills that I have before Congress.

The money to be used in carrying out the stated purpose of my latest bill would provide the means of getting American workmen back on the payroll. These citizens would buy needed clothing and household materials and equipment from the processing and manufacturing plants of my State and yours. They would employ the services of electricians and plumbers and carpenters to provide long neglected repair work in their homes.

The money to be made available for a resurgence of industrial activity in specified communities and regions would generate business in other areas of the United States. It would not be sent abroad to be spent indiscriminately at the whim of foreign politicos.

While I have never subscribed to the theory that increased industrial and business activity is reflected in direct ratio to the amount of money allotted for public works and/or matching funds for stimulating employment, there is no question but that such appropriations will come back to us in many ways as compared with the donations that go to foreign nations. My proposal will not only make it possible for our people to return to work and once again assume the social and economic status that should be available to all of our citizenry; it will also once more enable them to begin contributing an important share of local, State, and Federal tax revenue. In addition, they will again be able to give to their churches and to charities, as has been their custom until economic inactivity set in.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you and to every Member of this legislative body to put into law as quickly as possible the distressed area legislation which I have proposed.

Airline Service in Tennessee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT GORE

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Saturday, August 27, 1960

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Give Southeast a Chance," published in the Memphis (Tenn.) Press-Scimitar of August 20, 1960, relating to the subject of airline service in Tennessee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GIVE SOUTHEAST A CHANCE

Southeast Airlines, which suspended its service after 3½ years operation, has asked Civil Aeronautics Board for a certificate to help it resume its air service across Tennessee.

Southeast wants the CAB certificate so that it will be eligible to carry airmail and receive a Federal subsidy.

A CAB examiner, after a study of Tennessee's needs, recommended that Southeast be given a certificate months ago. Southeast offered the lowest bid by asking a smaller subsidy than the other bidder. The CAB voted against its own examiner's recommendation and the lower bid and awarded the

routes Southeast was serving to another airline.

Now Southeast asks that the CAB delay its final decision on these matters a year to give Southeast a chance to resume its service in Tennessee without the handicap that lack of a CAB certificate puts on it.

We think the CAB should correct its past mistakes by granting this latest, reasonable request of Southeast. Tennessee needs the service and fairplay requires that Southeast be given a chance to render it.

Civil War Echo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 27, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the entire Nation is participating, during the opening years of this decade, in plans for Civil War Centennial observances of all kinds to commemorate the great conflict which began almost a century ago. Many heroes will be remembered; many battlefields will be revisited; old memories will be revived.

An Associated Press story from Trenton, N.J., on August 24 described just two of those efforts. One concerns a great general, Maj. Gen. Phillip Kearny, for whom a town in New Jersey is named. Another concerns a monument in Salem Church, Va., where troops from New Jersey and Alabama fought in 1863. If present plans are fulfilled, the monument could be rededicated as an example of North-South friendship.

The conflict 100 years ago tested the principles of Americans, as well as their courage. It is a pleasure to read of the growing plans to mark the centennial of that conflict. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL WAR ECHO—PROJECT BEGUN ON PHIL KEARNY

TRENTON.—In a rural country spot in Virginia, behind a house, stands a small plot of ground and a monument.

No one knows who owns the plot. Few care. A tree and bushes have sprung up between the four corner posts.

But the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission decided yesterday to try to provide proper recognition for the monument.

It marks the spot near Chantilly where Confederate bullets killed New Jersey's Maj. Gen. Phillip Kearny, a gallant veteran of four wars, as he tried to rally his Union troops on September 1, 1862.

In 1915 six persons, three from Virginia and three from New Jersey, bought the site of the monument which was erected by the 1st New Jersey Brigade and friends.

But they all have died and apparently did not deed the land to their children. The New Jerseyites were Charles F. Hokkins, of Boonton; Theodore W. Allison, of Newark; and John W. Bodine, of Camden.

TOWN'S EFFORTS

Officials of the town of Kearny, named after the general, have tried to spur interest in the monument over a period of years but had little success. The State commission hopes it can do better.

Members talked yesterday of possibly setting up a nonprofit corporation to buy the site. First, Attorney General David D. Furman will seek to determine if the land has been escheated back to Virginia.

A commission representative went to Virginia to search for it recently and spent all afternoon trying to find it.

Kearny and Maj. Gen. Isaac Stevens of New York were the first major generals to die in the Civil War, he discovered. Both fell the same afternoon as the Union Army was withdrawing after being thrown back at the Battle of Second Manassas.

SALEM CHURCH MONUMENT

The Civil War Commission also heard plans to rededicate a monument in Salem Church, Va., which commemorates the services of the 23d New Jersey Volunteer Regiment in the battle of Salem Church on May 3, 1863.

This monument, a tall spire with the statue of a soldier on top, was erected in 1906 by the New Jersey Legislature.

Oddly enough, it also involves a Union defeat. The northerners were retreating through Fredericksburg when the 23d was ordered to block the Confederates..

The commanding officer, Col. E. Burd Grubb, of Edgewater Park, reported later that the enemy was firmly entrenched in a brick church and delivered "a most galling fire."

Everett Landers, the commission's executive director, said the monument includes a plaque lauding the opponents who met the New Jersey troops.

It reads: "To the brave Alabama boys, our opponents on this field of battle, whose memory we honor, this table is dedicated."

Landers said he is contacting Alabama officials to try to work out a rededication of the monument as an example of North-South friendship.

Why Oregon Men Are Out of Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES O. PORTER
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item which appeared in the August 22, 1960, edition of the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard:

DEMOS BLAME GOP FOR CUTS IN PLYWOOD

Four Lane County Democratic candidates charged Monday that Republican policies relating to tight money and housing legislation are to blame for layoffs in the plywood industry.

This statement was isesued after a complaint was made last week that Japanese plywood imports are damaging American producers and are instrumental in the closure of two mahogany plywood manufacturing mills in Lane County.

In a joint statement, James Weaver, Richard Eymann, Richard Kennedy, and Ed Fadeley, Democratic candidates for the State legislature, said:

"America needs houses and the plywood workers and plywood industry are prepared to help them but the Republicans through their artificial policies are causing industry layoffs."

The candidates pointed out that the Japanese imports may be hurting the hard plywood market and that if this is true something should be done about it.

The candidates said that the vast majority of Lane County's plywood industry is Douglas-fir and other soft plywoods and these products are not being hurt by these imports.

However, the candidates added that "every house not being built because of Republican policies is damaging both hard and soft plywood sales and keeping men out of work."

Harold R. Jones, Eugene, president of Jones Veneer & Plywood Co., said Friday that his firm was shutting mills in Eugene and Junction City, and he blamed heavy Japanese imports of mahogany plywood for much of the trouble.

Recognition of 40th Anniversary of Women's Suffrage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 27, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, 40 years ago the 19th amendment—granting women's suffrage—became the law of the land.

After a long struggle, the women of the United States attained a new privilege of freedom and equality, in keeping with the spirit of our Nation.

Achieving such a fundamental but highly significant change in our way of life required the concerted, dedicated effort of a great many people.

Regrettably, the tide of history, running upon the shores of time, has long stilled the voices of many of those who fought for this well-deserved privilege of citizenship.

Among those who stand out as the symbols of spirited leadership, however, is the life of Susan B. Anthony. Because of her historic effort to make the voice of womanhood felt stronger in the affairs of our Nation, we are today a better country.

Indeed, the voting power—if the women of the Nation exercise the privilege—surpasses that of male voters.

Reflecting the spirit of the dedicated Miss Anthony in her unrelenting efforts for recognition of womanhood, there is inscribed on her bronze bust in the Hall of Fame at New York University, "The time will come when man will recognize woman as his peer not only at the fireside—but also in the councils of the Nation."

More and more, this is coming true—not only in national but also in international affairs.

Yesterday, August 26, marked the 40th anniversary of woman's suffrage. In recognition of this significant anniversary I ask unimous consent to have a brief review of the life and work of Susan B. Anthony—a leader in the suffrage movement—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE OF MISS ANTHONY

She was born at Adams, Mass., February 15, 1820, and passed on at 17 Madison Street, March 13, 1906, in her 86th year. In her early youth she taught school. She was teaching in Canajoharie, N.Y., at the time of the first Woman's Rights Convention in Seneca Falls, N.Y., July 19 and 20, 1848, and also when the adjourned convention was held in Rochester August 2, 1948. Her interest at the time was in organizing Daughters of Temperance, and it was not until 1851, after she had met and talked with Elizabeth Cady Stanton, that she saw the need for woman suffrage and joined her in a lifelong crusade for the rights of women. Soon Miss Anthony became the driving force of the woman's rights movement, assuming the responsibilty of its conventions and of building up a strong woman's rights organization. On May 15, 1869, she organized the National Woman Suffrage Association with Mrs. Stanton as President.

HER WORK

Miss Anthony gave 55 years of devotion with singleness of purpose and unbelieveable persistence for the enfranchisement of women. Through her efforts and those of Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton, woman suffrage was debated on the floor of the Senate in 1866 and a resolution was introduced in 1868 in both Houses of Congress providing that citizenship be the basis of suffrage. In the "Life of Miss Anthony" she says: "I have addressed the committees of every Congress since 1869, and our New York Legislature scores of times." Her friend, Senator Sargent, introduced in the Senate the first woman suffrage amendment in 1878. This amendment was reintroduced year after year through the tireless efforts of Miss Anthony. It was finally adopted as the 19th amendment and became the law of the land August 26, 1920—14 years after her death. Since it was the same amendment for which she had worked so long it was called the Susan B. Anthony amendment.

Because she believed that the movement for woman's rights and woman suffrage should be worldwide, she organized in Washington, D.C., in 1888, the International Council of Women, and in 1904, in Berlin, Germany, with the help of Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, the International Woman Suffrage Alliance.

In 1890, the National Woman Suffrage Association and the American Woman Suffrage Association united, forming the National American Woman Suffrage Association with Mrs. Stanton as its first president. Miss Anthony succeeded her in 1892 and she served as its president until 1900.

Her interests were wide and in addition to directing State and national campaigns for woman suffrage and attending hearings, she never lost an opportunity to speak, write, and work for the advancement of women in education, in the professions, in business, and to win for them full civil rights. Her scrapbooks which she kept for 50 years, she herself gave to the Rare Books Section of the Congressional Library. Each book has a special inscription written by her. These valuable scrapbooks give a record of her life work.

HONORS

The naming of the 19th amendment as the Susan B. Anthony Amendment is most fitting as it was the goal to which she had dedicated and devoted her life. A commemorative 3-cent stamp bearing her profile was issued August 26, 1936, on the 16th anniversary of the amendment. Governors of many States issue proclamations commemorating her birthday—February 15—and calling attention to her and her work.

In the Capitol at Washington, D.C., is the Woman's Monument by Adelaide Johnson. Rising out of an 8-ton base of Italian marble are the heads and shoulders of Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Lucretia Mott and Miss Anthony—who were known as "The Great Triumvirate" in the work for woman suffrage. In the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City was the marble bust of Miss Anthony by Adelaide Johnson. It has been loaned to the Anthony House. There is a bronze tablet to Miss Anthony along the grand staircase of the capitol in Albany.

November 1, 1950, it was announced that she had been elected to the Hall of Fame at New York University in New York City—the first woman to be elected in the last 30 years. On May 18, 1952, the bronze bust of her by the famous sculptress, Brenda Putnam, was unveiled with great ceremonies.

Rochester memorials: Anthony Hall of the Women's College of the University of Rochester; Anthony Lounge in Cutler Union of the Women's College; bronze tablet to the two sisters in the Unitarian Church which they attended; bronze tablet in the chapter house of Irondequoit Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of which she was a life member; Red Oak Tree in Genese Park—near the monument of Dr. Edward Mott Moore—dedicated by the department of parks in 1935; stained glass window in Zion A.M.E. Church on Favor Street; School No. 27—called the Susan B. Anthony School; marble bust in it of Miss Anthony made by Luella Varney, Rome, 1883; Anthoniana in Rochester Museum, Rochester Historical Society Headquarters, Rochester Library and at Library of the University of Rochester; Susan B. Anthony House with State marker on lawn, sponsored by Susan B. Anthony Memorial, Inc.

California memorials: Susan B. Anthony Memorial Collection in Los Angeles Public Library; Susan B. Anthony Tree in Sequoia National Park; Susan B. Anthony Day in the public schools; mementos of Miss Anthony in the Mission Inn, Riverside, Calif.; Susan B. Anthony Memorial Committee.

TRIBUTE

At Miss Anthony's funeral Mrs. Catt gave this tribute: "This woman for a large part of half a century was the chief inspiration, counselor, and guide of our movement. There were women associated with her from time to time, women of wonderful intellect, of superb power, of grand character, yet she was clearly the greatest of them all, the greatest woman of our century, perhaps the greatest of all time. We shall never see her like again."

Publicans, Watch Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 27, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the eloquent Speaker of the House has fought for many good causes in his long service to the Nation. Just the other day he had a few pointed remarks to make about an old abuse.

An editorial in the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., of August 8 commends Mr. RAYBURN and has a few pointed remarks of its own to make.

In order to keep our language pure on at least this one point during the campaign and in order to give a sharp warning to "publicans," I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bergen (N.J.) Evening Record, Aug. 8, 1960]

CAN'T WE JUST SAY WHAT WE MEAN?

Mr. SAM lost his temper. In eruption he is a majestic spectacle. The reporter at the barbecue slipped, and started to ask Speaker SAM RAYBURN, Democrat, of Texas, some question about Democrat candidates. Said the old gentleman:

"Now, damn it, it's Democratic candidates, not Democrat. That's what Republicans always say. I think I'll start calling them Publicans."

In Roman antiquity the publican was a collector of toll or tribute, a minor official often oppressive and greatly detested. "As Jesus sat at meat * * * many publicans and sinners came and sat down with him and his disciples" (Matthew ix: 10). It would not be a complimentary form of address.

Quite a few Republicans, here in New Jersey as well as in wickeder parts, seem to enjoy alluding to the opposition as the Democrat Party. Why they relish doing this, as well as why the Democrats respond so vigorously to the irritant, is not clear; inaccuracy or illiteracy does not always arouse such a flow of bile. Perhaps the Democrats' resentment traces back to Joe McCarthy's use of the term. Or perhaps it is the human reaction to any abuse—the vocabulary may not be clear, but the tone of voice is.

Let's grow up. We have serious things to talk about. We should be trying to preserve the precision of language as a delicate instrument, not using it as a bludgeon. Now, son, what was it you wanted to ask Mr. RAYBURN?

Asia, NATO, and the United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. MOSS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the most pervasive subjects in the world today is peace. It is the persistent hope and dream of all mankind.

The University of Utah has an Institute of International Affairs which offers a program of first, graduate and undergraduate educational training; second, research and publication in the international field; and third, service to the public and governmental institutions.

This institute is performing a scholarly and remarkable service. Recently the institute has published its International Study Paper No. 3, entitled "China, Asia, and the West," by Dr. Helmut G. Callis. Section IV of the study paper deals with Asia, NATO, and the United Nations.

Dr. Callis is a loyal patriot and a recognized scholar. His remarks on the subject are made with such clarity and lucidity that they deserve the attention of all thinking people everywhere. They are logical and realistic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the preface to the paper by S. Grover Rich, director of the Institute of International Studies at the University of Utah, together with part IV of the

paper, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the insertion will make approximately 4¼ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at an estimated cost of $344.25.

I ask unanimous consent, notwithstanding the cost, that the study may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the preface and part IV were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREFACE AND PART IV OF INTERNATIONAL STUDY PAPER NO. 3, ENTITLED "CHINA, ASIA, AND THE WEST"

(By Helmut G. Callis)

PREFACE

Statesmen everywhere shudder at the thought of China a decade from now. Under the domination of an ideology and a government which commands totalitarian control of its vast human and material resources, China is growing rapidly in population, industrial capacity, and military power. It may well come to dominate Asia, the world island, and perhaps the world itself.

Few American scholars are more competently prepared to discuss the vital problems concerning China's new role in world affairs than is Helmut G. Callis, author of the new, widely acclaimed work, "China, Confucian, and Communist," recently released by Henry Holt & Co. Professor Callis was educated, studied, and taught at some of the most prominent universities of Europe and America, notably at Leipzig, the Sorbonne, Geneva, the London School of Economics, Michigan, Yale, and Harvard. He has lived in all the major countries of Asia for extended periods and was for several years a resident of China's historic capital city of Peiping. During the Second World War, Professor Callis served as a consultant to the Far East Division of the Office of Strategic Services in Washington. He has served at the University of Michigan as director of the east Asia area program and at Yale in the Foreign Area Studies and Staff Officers School. Since 1947 he has been professor of history at the University of Utah. He has been the recipient of both Rockefeller and Ford fellowships and will spend the next academic year in India as a research scholar under the Fulbright program.

It is an honor for the Institute of International Studies to bring Professor Callis' contributions on this crucial problem to the American public.

S. GROVER RICH,
Director, Institute of International Studies, University of Utah.

PART IV. ASIA, NATO, AND THE UNITED NATIONS

Some time ago an unnamed official of a European country advanced the idea of creating a large pool of funds to which the industrial countries of the West would jointly contribute each year for a specified number of years. Grants would be made from this fund to underdeveloped countries without strings attached and for any use they want. The soundness of the uses made by each receiving country would be judged by an international team of experts which could include representatives from other underdeveloped conutries, competing claimants for the funds, and further contributions from the pool would depend on the jury's verdict.

However, to enable the West to win the competitive struggle with the Soviet Union for the hearts and minds of the underprivileged in the modern world, the creation of a substantial pool of capital funds needs to be paralleled by the establishment of a pool of trained men available for this specific task of aiding the underdeveloped countries in carrying out the industrial revolution. To attack this task efficiently, many thousands of scientists, engineers, doctors, mechanics, and skilled workers will be required for India alone. If we cannot spare them now (and we probably cannot), or if we cannot at least make them available in the foreseeable future. Russia will have a great advantage. For the Russians have for several years now trained specialists in science and engineering as well as in languages and culture for service in foreign lands.

If we are too shortsighted to see the writing on the wall and fail to take immediate steps to remedy shortcomings, we will have no justification for bewailing inevitable consequences. Time is running against us and the problem is too great and urgent to be solved in the manner of "business as usual." What is required is a large-scale special training program, instituted and financed by the American Government and similar to that adopted by the U.S. Army during the Second World War, which also trained people for specific countries. Other Western governments should do likewise.

In the spring of 1959 the Action Committee for the United States of Europe, under the chairmanship of its founder, Jean Monnet, adopted a policy resolution which contained a proposal for European Community relations with the less-developed countries of the world. The resolution advocates a new approach by the European Community to help raise living standards in these countries by 25 percent in the next 10 years. The Action Committee suggests three major fields of aid by the Community: (1) Recruitment of scientists and technicians to aid in training administrators and economists needed by the less-developed countries; (2) cooperation to stabilize the prices of raw materials in world markets; (3) encouragement to increase the supply of investment funds to the poorest countries. To meet the target of raising income per head by 25 percent in 10 years, the report estimates that the need for outside capital will amount to $7.5 billion. This represents roughly 1 percent of the total national income of the developed countries.

NEW ROLES FOR NATO

The responsibilities and burdens connected with the necessary measures to prevent a further drift of poor nations into communism should not rest on any single government or limited group of nations but on the Western community as a whole. So vast an undertaking should be looked upon as a cooperative task. NATO, which was never intended to be a military alliance only, could be an excellent instrumentality to deal with the problems and exigencies arising for the West in its relations with underdeveloped countries. Under NATO auspices permanent commissions and study teams could be formed to look into critical situations and search for the best ways of pooling Western science, expertness, and resources in a cooperative effort to close the widening gap between rich and poor nations in the modern world. This effort should include a search for and support of effective means of birth control in countries willing to introduce such measures, as for example in India.

Joint deliberations and efforts of the type described, however, should not stop on a technical level. To be really fruitful they must extend to close cooperation in policymaking. It is a well-known fact that serious disagreements in matters of Asian policy have disrupted Western unity and thus weakened the Western position. What is needed is a general clearinghouse for divergent views and interests which would allow Western governments to arrive at an understanding, in a spirit of give-and-take, as to what kind of order they would like to see emerge in Asia so that action need not be haphazardly improvised as unforeseen events take foreign offices by surprise.

It is unpleasant but important to recall that Britain and Canada, though as a rule anxious to work along American lines, have not seen their way clear to do so in the Far East on several occasions. These allies were distinctly unhappy to see the war carried into North Korea to China's frontiers. They dissociated themselves from all American moves which looked to them like participation in the Chinese civil war. They neither became signatories of the alliance treaty with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek nor promised help in case of a Communist attack on the offshore islands.

NATO delegations have also asserted that the United States was not taking sufficiently into consideration the needs and interests of its West European allies. Such feelings are natural and as a rule reciprocal, for each nation easily considers its particular interests to be the most vital for the whole community.

For example, Britain's attitude toward China was definitely influenced by its strategic and economic priorities for Europe and the Middle East as well as by its special interests in Hong Kong and Malaya. On the other hand, because of their commonwealth ties with India and Pakistan and their close historical affiliation with these and other Asian nations, the British have often been able to take a more understanding point of view toward Asian problems than nations lacking this experience in the past. Finally, the United Kingdom in view of its strategic and economic problems was more obviously guided by the belief that in the atomic age military strategy is less important than diplomacy and economic relations.

Adjustment of national interests is never a simple matter and if it is to be peaceful and permanent must always be mutual. Therefore, the more complex and divergent national interests are, the more reason there is for not acting unilaterally but for taking care of them in collaboration with congenial partner nations through organized mutual efforts in specialized agencies of a nonmilitary character under the auspices of NATO. There have been no serious attempts to date to develop the nonmilitary side of NATO envisioned in article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty. Opportunities of initiating common projects of broadly human interest, which alone can make the Atlantic community a reality, have often been overlooked.

In realization of the serious shortcomings in western organization Mr. Dean Acheson, former U.S. Secretary of State, speaking at Godesberg, Germany, in the fall of 1959, suggested a wider Atlantic alliance with broader political and economic goals rather than only military ones, an organization that could embrace such countries as Sweden and Switzerland also.

Mr. Acheson urged the pooling of economic resources and the mutual quest of political aims through the creation of a Western "supercouncil" designed to draw up and supervise joint policy. Acheson pointed out that there have been many international councils in the past but that none of these was a policymaking body. Members of all previous councils have had to await instructions from their governments to take action.

In addition to the supercouncil, Mr. Acheson proposed a sort of control mechanism, a body aimed at keeping the treaty up to date and interpreting council policy. In the economic realm Acheson suggested fresh agreements between Western states in an effort to realize the following three basic aims:

1. To increase the welfare of Western peoples.

2. To furnish help to underdeveloped nations and thus lead to an increase in their own production.

3. To lump together economic resources of the free world in order to strengthen it in its global struggle with present and future offensives of the Communist opposition.

Determined moves in the directions proposed, Mr. Acheson felt sure, would greatly increase the productivity of the whole Atlantic community and also international trade in the rest of the world.

In reference to American reaction to moves toward European integration, Mr. Acheson took the position that the United States and Canada must join forces with Western Europe to pull their economies together and avoid the kind of split that has led to creation of two separate European economic unions.

There was too much of the practice of "going it alone" in the Western World and for too long a time. By indulging in that practice the Western nations have done themselves incalculable harm. For the price of disunity is high: any weakening of solidarity is serious. Indeed the Communists have reasons to fear Western unity even more than Western strength.

SHOULD RED CHINA BE ADMITTED TO THE UNITED NATIONS?

In the Far East, Western policy needs to be more closely defined through organized collaboration among Western states and closer Western contacts with the Asian governments primarily concerned. Otherwise, the split in the free world cannot but remain wide and Western influence in Asia will continue to wane.

There can be no real peace in the world before the serious problems of the economically depressed nations in the Far East, perhaps the most destitute part of the world, are brought under control, and they cannot be brought under control without the consent and voluntary cooperation of Asia's major nations. War, cold or hot, will not solve these problems; it can only make them more horrible and the Communists alone will be its beneficiaries, as they indeed were of the last war, and not only in China.

Economic distress was the underlying cause of China's Communist revolution, and it was also the main cause of the Second World War in the Far East. Asia's economic problems are so vast that they cannot possibly be solved by national efforts alone. Therefore, the only reasonable alternative is to solve them by international efforts. The logical place to bring Asian nations around a conference table for the discussion of their difficulties would be, of course, the United Nations. However, mainland China, in the aftermath of war and revolution is now in disgrace internationally, and is not at this time a member of the international organization—a circumstance which raises the crucial, but highly controversial question: Should Red China be allowed to become a member of the United Nations?

A MORAL ISSUE?

The problem of admission, however, is not the kind of question which can be intelligently discussed with reference only to one state, no matter how large, because its significance is in the principle. The principle has been hotly debated almost every year since the beginning of the United Nations Organization and its predecessor, the now defunct League of Nations. The question of admitting member states to the United Nations is sharply different from that of diplomatic recognition of one state by another. The latter is a unilateral act fully within the sovereign control of an independent government. No government can be forced to enter diplomatic relations with a regime with which, for reasons of its own, it does not wish to deal.

But when it comes to a decision of a member state in the United Nations pertaining to the admission of a would-be member, other considerations than sovereign rights or political standards of judgment have to be taken into account. In voting for or against admission, the member state does so under the provisions of the United Nations Charter. Hence not only the qualifications of the applicant state are to be considered, but also the interests of other states having relations with the applicant state, as well as the population the latter represents, and last, but not least, the interests and purposes of the international organization as a whole.

THE INTERNATIONAL POINT OF VIEW

The principles and other pertinent criteria by which an internationally responsible policy of admission ought to be guided were most aptly and concisely summarized in 1952 by Trygve Lie, then Secretary General of the United Nations, in his annual report to the Seventh General Assembly. Mr. Lie wrote:

"In supporting the admission of states now kept outside I am not proposing a 'deal.' I am proposing real universality. Let us remember that we are concerned with judgments about states, not merely about governments. The conduct of governments of states that are already members is as frequently the subject of strong criticism on one side or another in the United Nations as is the conduct of governments of nonmember states. But the question is not simply one of admitting what are believed to be good or bad governments, but of admitting states. It is the interests of the peoples of the applicant states that should be the main concern.

"I do not believe the remedy for governments one may dislike is to condemn the peoples under them to exile from the world community. This is to leave barred the doors to such influence for peace and freedom and human rights as the United Nations can exercise."

Mr. Lie's statement reflected his belief that only if all existing states are represented in the international organization can the latter fulfill the purposes for which it was created, namely to maintain the peace, to develop lawful relations between states, to strengthen respect for human rights, and to protect the weak and oppressed. In other words, universality of membership is the precondition of a strong organization which is able to function properly.

Hence the point of view of the Secretary General on admission was strictly matter of fact. In a memorandum presented to all permanent United Nations delegations in March 1950, he suggested that any regime that exercised effective authority within a state's territory and was habitually obeyed by the bulk of the population should be seated in the United Nations even though individual members might not recognize it in national dealings. The only necessary and sound criterion for admitting a state to the organization was evidence that the applicant state was "able and willing to carry out its obligations" (art. 4 of the charter).

Obviously, acceptance of this point of view would exclude from membership governments which have lost control over most or all of their territory and are therefore no longer capable of carrying out charter obligations. At the same time, a de facto position on matters of admission would eliminate all uncertainties regarding the legal status of states on racial, ideological, social, or moral criteria. During the days of the League of Nations, no state was denied membership for these reasons, but a few were rejected as not capable of maintaining a stable government over their whole territory (such as Azerbaijan).

THE DIPLOMATIC AND LEGAL POSITION

Until strong political pressures were brought against him as Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles publicly affirmed the de facto position in matters of admission to United Nation membership. He wrote in "War or Peace": [1]

"If the government of China in fact proves its ability to govern China without serious domestic resistance, then it too should be admitted to the United Nations. Some of the present member states, and others, that might become members, have governments that are not representative of the people. But, if in fact, they are governments—that is, if they "govern"—then they have a power which should be represented in any organization which purports to mirror reality."

When this was written the late John Foster Dulles still shared the universalist position which the U.S. Government had taken at an earlier date. For in August 1946, the U.S. representative submitted a resolution in the Security Council recommended to the General Assembly that it admit eight states that had thus far applied for membership, namely, Afghanistan, Albania, Iceland, Ireland, the Mongolian Republic, Portugal, Sweden, and Jordan. He then confessed he had misgivings about some of the applicants, particularly Albania and Mongolia, but he was willing to overlook these in order to support the move toward universality.

At a later date the Soviet violation of the peace treaties led to a shift of American policy from a universalist to a restrictive position in matters of admission; but it should be realized that this change of policy was caused by extraneous motives of supposed national interest and was definitely not in line with an advisory opinion rendered by the International Court of Justice in 1947. For in that year the Court answered the question whether a nation is entitled to make its decision in the Security Council dependent on conditions not expressly provided by paragraph 1 of article 4 (on membership) entirely in the negative.

During his terms of office Secretary-General Dag Hammerskjold has at all times upheld his predecessor's stand on matters pertaining to admission of member states. He has said, in effect, that Communist China—and all other de facto governments—should be seated in the United Nations, because "a truly universal world organization is implicit in the logic of the charter" and such an organization must represent all major antagonists. He called it a "true expression of United Nations principles to bring around the conference table government leaders of all those nations with the greatest power over the issues of war and peace." [2]

PRACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS ON ADMISSION

This line of argument, far from being an excuse for would-be aggressors, should rather point up the enormous dangers of leaving existing states unrepresented in the United Nations, especially, of course, states of the size and political weight of mainland China with its population of 650 million. China is not just another country: the vastness of its territory, the enormity of its distressed population, the magnitude of its other explosive problems make it a concern of the whole world in every respect—political, economic, social, and cultural. As a world problem the existence of China raises precisely the type of questions nobody can or should deal with except the United Nations.

The peace organization was especially created to make possible the peaceful coexistence and cooperation of the world's different social systems. It was meant to be a place to help people to talk out their problems rather than shoot them out. But if a vast proportion of mankind is not allowed to be represented, the United Nations is frustrated in all three of its main functions:

---

[1] John Foster Dulles, "War or Peace" (2d ed., 1957; New York, 1950), p. 190.

[2] Annual Report to the General Assembly for the Year 1953–54.

namely, as a system of international political communication, as machinery for the solution of disputes, and as a forum for the expression of world opinion.

The admission of a state to the United Nations is not a stamp of moral approval but simply a means of communication so that governments can talk to each other. It is not true that talking between states accomplishes nothing. Discussion between governments under United Nations auspices functions as a kind of international safety valve. The tone and subject matter of negotiations may sound the lifesaving danger signal before the political explosion; or discussion may extinguish the sparks which threaten to burn the house down. In the case of Red China we must realize that a nation with a net increase of 14 million a year cannot but expand, peacefully or not so peacefully. The ways and means for making this expansion as safe for the peace of the world as possible can be found only in the United Nations and its specialized agencies. These means include discussions and ultimately agreements in regard to world trade outlets, protection of minorities, immigration, and access to food supplies and raw materials. The last two great wars have proved that the world cannot stay long at peace if agreements on such issues cannot be reached. Yesterday the culprits were Germany and Japan; today it is Red China.

But negotiations, formal and informal, within the framework of the United Nations have not the harshness of unilateral negotiations between potentially hostile powers. If exchanges of opinion take place within the United Nations framework it means, in the words of Secretary General Hammarskjold, that "the United Nations Charter as a whole emerges as the background of the deliberations. It means that the negotiating parties accept as guiding them those basic rules of international coexistence of which the charter is an expression."

If Red China as a member of the United Nations were enabled to negotiate privately and independently with other nations, there would be also a far greater possibility that she would gradually veer away from the influence of the Kremlin. For in the international atmosphere of the United Nations, with the "give and take" of opinions and suggestions, political doors may be opened which otherwise would remain closed. Furthermore, the many-sided international contacts which the United Nations provides are bound to help dissolve calcified thought patterns and the clichés of political orthodoxy.

The admission of Red China to the United Nations, to repeat once more, should not be looked upon as a means of appeasing an aggressive regime. On the contrary, it is advocated here as an indispenable step to prevent aggression and to protect the potential victims of aggression. These victims would include, no doubt, the Chinese people themselves, i.e., 635 million non-Communists whose lives and happiness are now wagered on a neck-breaking race for national power and personal survival. China's masses are no doubt much more interested in being fed calories than Communist doctrines, and any relaxation of international tensions may bring to the hard-working people of China a measure of relief and thus temper their hatreds against the outside world now so easily stirred by Communist propaganda.

In a predicament like that of the downtrodden and regimented Chinese themselves are the foreign minorities living under Chinese Communist rule and brutally oppressed by it, such as the people of Tibet. It is quite possible that if Red China had been a member of the United Nations and had been exposed to the moderating influences of interested neighbors, the sufferings of the Tibetan people could have been alleviated. Moreover, if an alleged aggressor is not a member, the United Nations is greatly hampered in investigating and acting upon the petitions of parties which appeal to the organization for the redress of wrongs, such as the refugee Dalai Lama or guerrilla-infested Laos.

Finally, policies in regard to the admission of states to membership in the United Nations should also in fairness consider the interests of their immediate neighbors who have entered diplomatic relations with a nonmember. In the case of Red China, it should be noted that all the nations bordering on China, including Pakistan, a member of SEATO, have recognized the Communist regime in Peiping, and that the largest of them even vigorously champions mainland China's admission to the peace organization. The powers who have recognized China have not necessarily done so because of lack of courage or political acumen, but because, with a major power of their region not represented in the United Nations, they have experienced an impairment of their political communication system and a weakening of the international support which they as members have a right to expect in their dealings with other states. The states in question have, no doubt, many serious reservations regarding Red China, their big, sprawling, and powerful neighbor; but in spite, perhaps because of these reservations, they strongly feel that their own security is being endangered by leaving regional problems unsolved which can only be solved, or can better be solved, through the United Nations and with the cooperation of the government now kept out of the peace organization.

Instructive in this respect is the wording of a recent letter from India's permanent representative to the United Nations, proposing that the representation of Communist China be included in the agenda of the General Assembly. The letter reads:

"The Government of India * * * have for the last few years sought proper representation of China in the United Nations. * * * No major measures of peace and security can successfully be undertaken without proper consultation with and cooperation of China and in the view of the Government of India all possible efforts must be made to secure the representation of China in the United Nations."

It should be noted that this letter, drafted after and in spite of several border infractions by Communist Chinese troops in northern India, not merely reflects political self-interest but also expresses great trust in the United Nations. It is trust based on the experience that the United Nations has been able to preserve peace and restrain overzealous governments on other occassions in the past; for had the United Nations not been in existence it would have been far more difficult to get the Russians out of Azerbaijan in northern Iran, and it might have been much more difficult to bring about Indonesian independence in circumstances which would not have resulted in a long drawn-out conflict. It is also known that the United Nations was instrumental in the armistice in Kashmir—in stopping the fighting and in obtaining respect for the armistice—and also in Palestine. In all these cases the United Nations showed its potentialities as a peacemaking agency and India and other neighbors of China hope that it will prove its restraining authority again.

However, we should note that in practically all cases in which the United Nations succeeded in settling disputes the parties involved were members of the United Nations. This was to be expected, for it is difficult to see how the peace organization can get a recalcitrant nonmember, let us say Communist China, to cooperate with a United Nations decision.

Especially if the state in question is a major military power, the problem becomes in practice unsurmountable. Red China of today is the fourth or fifth strongest military power in the world; but in a few years, when the Communist Chinese armies will be equipped with the most destructive forms of modern gadgetry for warmaking, China will be second to none militarily. At that time, if not already, any international agreements on general disarmament will be utterly useless unless they have the approval of Communist China. Of course, this will be the case also in regard to other agreements of world importance. But since the only place where such agreements of a truly global type can be sucessfully concluded is the United Nations, it can be anticipated that the political pressures for mainland China's admission to the United Nations will mount steadily and in the long run discredit powers which obstruct that admission. Therefore it is much wiser to prepare in time for the inevitable because in this way there will be no costly loss of political prestige. Moreover, it is difficult to see why it should be considered dishonorable for a democracy to bow to a majority opinion in the world community by abstaining from an unpopular veto in the Security Council.

It goes without saying that admission of Red China to the United Nations need not be granted without some substantial quid pro quo; in fact, it should be proceeded by an understanding of nations concerned in the Far East as to what this quid pro quo should entail. The path toward such an understanding is already prepared by a resolution of the General Assembly adopted on February 1, 1952, which stipulates that in regard to admission to membership it is not possible "to deny candidates the right to present proof" that they are willing to accept and honor the obligations of the Charter. The nations vitally interested in the Far East might well agree among themselves beforehand what kind of concrete proofs they wish to have submitted by Communist China.

Aside from political assurances, such as the renunciation of military force as an instrument of policy, agreement to a Formosan settlement, and the reopening of the door in China to all friendly nations, admisison may also be made conditional on the bona fide granting by the Peiping regime of reciprocal diplomatic rights and personal safeguards which are the bases of relations between civilized nations.

Since Formosa has become the object of an international dispute endangering the peace, the United Nations seems to be the proper agency to deal with this controversy and the only one able to find a practical solution. To deprive Peiping of the argument that Formosa is a security threat to mainland China, Formosa might be placed, at an opportune moment, under a United Nations trusteeship. If at some later date, conceivably after Chiang Kai-shek's death, a majority of the Chinese on Formosa should seek a compromise with the Chinese on the mainland, such a new relationship could be worked out under the auspices of the international organization.[3] Meanwhile admission of Red China might well be made dependent on the latter's acceptance of an interim solution regarding Formosa, and American de facto recognition of Communist China may follow in due course.

To bring real and permanent peace to Eastern Asia without the consent and cooperation of the government that rules more than half of the population of the region is an impossibility. And politics is the art of the possible.

---

[3] Authorities familiar with the situation on Formosa believe it probable that the majority of the Chinese and other groups living on the island would now vote for independence. Thus Stanley K. Hornbeck, former Chief, Far Eastern Division, Department of State, in an article in Foreign Affairs, fall, 1955.

On the other hand, to leave the boiling cauldron simmering in China without controls would mean courting disaster if not provoking it. China in its present condition is a powder keg; it is understandable that its neighbors are anxious to bring the regime administering the world's largest nation to the conference table and under the rule of law. It is also understandable that these nations are apprehensive of the danger of having the powder keg blown up, inadvertently or otherwise, by powers not indigenous to the Far East.

STRENGTHENING OF THE UNITED NATIONS BY REGIONAL ARRANGEMENTS

This acute danger points up the urgent need for strengthening the United Nations by regional arrangements. Many of the explosive situations and tensions in world affairs endangering the peace in recent years can be traced to the fact that the two atomic superpowers, on grounds of their supremacy in industrial strength and arms, attempted to substitute themselves for the world organization as self-appointed global guardians and policemen. Paradoxically, these were the very same powers that stood more or less aloof from international affairs before the Second World War; the United States refused to become a member of the League of Nations, and the Soviet Union was a member for only a few years. Both followed a policy of going it alone practically up to the very eve of World War II.

But after this war was won through the enormous sacrifices of the peoples involved, the governments of the superpowers both switched suddenly to a policy of total and worldwide intervention which could not but bring them into conflict with each other and thus endanger the peace. To complicate matters, in this postwar period regional military alliances were formed which, if in letter, were certainly not in spirit consistent with the purposes of the United Nations. Instead of instruments for settling disputes, they were constructed as powerful agencies for the preparation of war. In fact, their existence has distorted the meaning of the Charter of the United Nations and has hampered the functioning of the organization.

We may argue that the result of these unfortunate circumstances, which is well known to us under the name of cold war, was more the fault of one power than of the other; but it seems obvious that the remedy for this situation cannot be found in copying the irresponsible behavior of another government but in strengthening the rule of law through the moral influence and power of one's own government.

The military alliances of the NATO and Warsaw Pact nations to which we refer here are, of course, regional arrangements of a sort, and the United Nations Charter does provide for regional arrangements in articles 52 and 53; but the organizations the charter contemplates are of a very different kind from the alliances just mentioned. The regional arrangements which the founders of the United Nations had in mind were meant to be auxiliaries to the United Nations and were designed to fortify the peace by setling disputes within a particular world region. They were not conceived to be hostile blocs pitted against other such blocs; they were supposed to be cooperative groups of states in a limited geographical area of the world where neighboring or culturally related nations have more principles and traditions for united action in common than are found in the broader society of the world as a whole.

The wording of chapter III of the charter, dealing with regional arrangements, makes it quite clear that it was the idea of the founders of the organization to leave the settlement of international disputes first of all to the initiative of the States primarily concerned and reserve only disputes of global importance to the jurisdiction of the world organization. The purpose of the charter was to prevent local disputes from flaring into worldwide wars. But this original purpose was perverted in practice by policies of global military intervention and politically motivated patterns of economic assistance, which largely ignore the proper channels and agencies of the United Nations for both the execution of military sanctions and the improvement of economic welfare. In the Far East nonmembership in the United Nations of a nation of the importance of China makes regional arrangements of the kind envisaged by the United Nations Charter impossible. Obviously, China's absence from the United Nations does not allow China's neighbors to settle disputes with the Chinese under United Nations auspices. On the one hand it turns important affairs concerning the region over to powers not indigenous in the region and on the other it does not give the parties primarily concerned a sufficient voice in the solving of their own problems, of which an increasingly powerful and explosive China is one of the most important.[4] In the Far East today there again glows the red-hot spark which may set the world afire. There is no time to lose. Destiny leads those willing to follow it, but drags along those who resist it.[5] The representation of mainland China in the United Nations is the most urgent and inevitable step for ending the cold war and preparing for a just and enduring peace.

THE ORGANIZATION OF PEACE

To function, a world organization which, in the words of John Foster Dulles, "purports to mirror world reality," must be representative. Furthermore, as long as war between the world's great powers threatens global destruction to all of humanity, a veto in the hands of these powers as permanent members of the Security Council, in all questions directly related to war and peace, is necessary to prevent a world catastrophe. The veto as it now stands is nothing but an expression of defacto great power status and as such reflects the reality of world power relationships, which cannot be ignored in our atomic age in any attempt to preserve the peace.

On the other hand, the settlement of regional disputes through regional arrangements is also essential as an expression of geographical proximity and common interests and hence of "world reality." In our time peace has been endangered and the meaning of the United Nations Charter distorted by unilateral policies of global intervention.

For the sake of peace it is absolutely vital that such worldwide interference be henceforth kept down to the absolute minimum and that dealings of the great powers with regions which are culture-alien to them be strictly channelized through the proper agencies of the United Nations.

Some years ago Sir Winston Churchill, then Prime Minister, was asked in the House of Commons what steps he would take toward a revision of the United Nations Charter and a strengthening of the organization, and he made the following impromptu reply:

"If I had had the power, which I should have relished and which I should have been very glad to assume, I should not have made the United Nations organization in its present shape or form. On the contrary I always said that it ought to be based on regional organizations which should aim at drawings the largest and most important minds from large groups of nations and bringing them to a sort of super assembly at the summit. But this view I was not able to put into force at the time, and I have not had any opportunity since."

Sir Winston would probably be the first to agree that the United Nations is still unfinished business and that it is never too early to do what is right and necessary. The strong racial, cultural, and economic ties which bind the nations of eastern Asia together, as well as the similar ties which connect those of America, the Middle East, and Europe, suggest implementation in organized form.

In the Far East, and not only there, regional arrangements under United Nations auspices might well offer the safest framework for the establishment of a fruitful and rightful relationship between large and small neighbors. In regional councils the smaller nations could also be much more adequately represented and could carry far greater weight than is possible now in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

In Asia and elsewhere regional groupings of states naturally interrelated by culture and common interests could become a meaningful substitute for today's haphazard methods of splitting the world into opposing alliances led by great powers in a perpetual cold war atmosphere. In place of armed camps and contentious blocs, genuine regionalism under the protecting wings of a strengthened United Nations Organization could greatly help to create a truly international community in which small nations would live freely under law in an organized relationship with their powerful neighbors. Let us also recall that both the League of Nations and the United Nations were designed to do away with special alliances, that they were to be universal in membership, that they were to protect the smaller nations, and they were to be used, not bypassed on grounds of expediency.

It follows that security arrangements in particular should be made exclusively within the collective framework of the United Nations. As to small nations, lest they become satellites, most fair-minded people will agree that both colonials and Stalinist schemes are thoroughly out of date and ought to be abandoned; but if this is done it will be necessary to contrive other, more reciprocal, more organic relations to express the steadily increasing interdependence of big and small nations in the modern world. Regionalism, within the framework of the United Nations, offers such a possibility.

As long as the world's great powers are not yet politically mature enough to take their international responsibilities with appropriate seriousness, as long as the ways of life of peoples continue to be sharply different, because history made them so, and as long as the economic inequalities between world areas are as glaring as they still are, peace will remain precarious. Given these unhappy circumstances, the superpowers may have to deter each other for sometime from suicidal aggression by the threat of missiles and atomic bombs.

But time is running out on us. In whatever little time is left we must work fast and hard to eliminate the evil causes which endanger our survival and to create the conditions which will assure our lives, liberty, and happiness.

Under the prevailing conditions of a precariously poised balance of nuclear terror the immortal words of Adm. Alfred J. Mahan, America's great soldier-philospher, are of the gravest import for all of us. "The purpose of military power," said the admiral, "is to provide time for moral ideas to take place."

---

[4] For instance, the four-nation factfinding commission on the situation in Laos (1959) consisted of Japan, Argentine, Italy, and Tunisia. Not one of China's immediate neighbors was represented on it.

[5] Translated from the Latin: "Fata volentem decunt, nolentem trahunt."

Humane Treatment of Animals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 27, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, two New Jersey newspapers have given recent editorial support of S. 3570, a bill to help insure humane treatment of animals in those research laboratories that have received Federal funds.

As one of the cosponsors of the bill, which was introduced with the leadership of Senator COOPER, of Kentucky, I was particularly gratified to read the vigorous expressions of support given by the Bergen Evening Record in its issue of June 20 and the Asbury Park Press in its issue of June 14. The editorials point out clearly the need for rational and responsible thinking on the proposed legislation.

I ask that unanimous consent be given to have the editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bergen (N.J.) Evening Record, June 20, 1960]

IN JUSTICE TO A SERVANT

As has been demonstrated by the suppression in the New Jersey Assembly of a bill directing that the slaughter of meat animals be made as humane as possible, there are two sides of every question. And we shall be hearing from both sides about a bill (S. 3570) of Senator COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, whose purpose is to provide for the humane treatment of animals used in research by the recipients of grants from the U.S. Government or its instrumentalities. The measure will exasperate people who oppose all vivisection and diligently choose to deny any relationship between animal vivisection and the century's massive breakthroughs in surgical technique and chemotherapy. It will also exasperate people who deem the animal irrelevant to human welfare and who will consider the bill's Federal licensing and inspection requirements another specimen of bureaucratic meddling. The bill dictates that animals be given a comfortable resting place, adequate facilities for normal exercise, adequate light and heat and food and water, and a surcease from pain through neglect or mishandling, plus merciful dispatch when their own merciful work is done. It may be said that researchers should guarantee these things without having to be told. It would have to be replied that not always do they do so. The bill would put into words our guarantee to living creatures that when in necessary woe they serve us they will not be compensated with cruelty. Great Britain adopted such legislation a century ago at the instance of such distinguished scientists and humans as Darwin, Huxley, and William Jenner. It is time we see that a clear line is drawn between two humiliating extremes.

[From the Asbury Park (N.J.) Press, of June 14, 1960]

ANIMAL EXPERIMENTATION

A bill is pending in the House of Representatives, H.R. 12587, and another in the U.S. Senate, S. 3750, which would assure humane treatment to laboratory animals. These are animals used for experimental purposes in science's effort to find cures for human disease.

These bills do not ban the use of animal experimentation. They merely seek to make it humane as, we assume, every decent person would like to see it. It must be recognized that through animal experimentation stupendous discoveries have been made which have greatly improved man's health and extended his longevity. It would be difficult to rationalize the abolition of such experimentation. It is equally difficult to rationalize the continuation of such experimentation without adequate assurance that cruelty will be outlawed.

The development of sound, healthy bodies and the conquest of disease are goals worth striving for. The physical growth of mankind is of compelling importance, but it is no more important than his mental and moral development. Physical hulks, with no sense of right or wrong, or with no thought for anything but their own well-being, would make a cruel shambles of the world in a short time. It is only as man develops a sense of compassion for other living things that he may be said to have emerged from the brute stage. Kindness to other living things is a mark of civilization.

Thus, the conclusion is obvious. If man can further his battle for survival through animal experimentation he can scarcely be condemned for employing it. But if he does not surround that experimentation with every safeguard against needless suffering he has fallen far short of the destiny he has so confidently assigned himself.

A Needed "Refresher"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
OF ALASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 27, 1960

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, since the abortive collapse of the Paris summit conference last May—and increasingly so almost every day since—the acuteness of the tensions dividing the free world and Russian dominated nations has become more and more painfully apparent to each of us. From both sides of the aisle, and, indeed, from the President himself, we have heard recitations of concern and many suggestions as to how we can best cope with this menacing state of affairs.

However meritorious and virtuous these suggestions may have been—and I do not doubt for a moment the sincerity of my respective colleagues and their motivations—it strikes me that we all could use a bit of a refresher on Soviet intentions, and perhaps, a reminder of how deadly serious the Russians are, not alone in respect to the immediate issues of today, but also concerning those of the future, as well.

It has long been my contention that the hallmark of Communists' successes in all fields—educational, scientific, political, and economic—has been their remarkable capacity for organization. And to combat this great organization of theirs we need to put even better organizations—and a wider variety of them—into the fray.

Accordingly, it was with considerable interest that I recently noted a new book, "You Can Trust the Communists," written by an acknowledged American expert on Communist activities, Dr. Fred Schwarz. At first blush, the title of Dr. Schwarz' book might be misleading. But it is not. His theme is simply to state that no matter how far-fetched, evil, or ambitious a stated Communist program may appear to be, one can most certainly trust them to at least try to bring that program to fruition.

But especially in respect to this matter of organization, Dr. Schwarz has made some particularly pungent comments. It is a short section of the book. I ask unanimous consent to have these few brief passages of Dr. Schwarz' book printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOU CAN TRUST THE COMMUNISTS
ORGANIZATION

Organization is the genius of communism. Communism is the triumph of organization over undirected economic and social forces. It is a truism that organization will prevail over disorganization. An anticommunism program needs organization.

A commonly held view is that unity is the great need in this organized anticommunism program. An argument such as the following is assured of a tumultuous reception with almost any group of businessmen: "Communism is the universal enemy. It is the enemy of every segment of a free society. It is the enemy of both management and labor. It is the enemy of all religions; Protestant, Catholic, Jewish, Hindu, and Moslem. Since it is the enemy of all free political parties, it is the common enemy of Republican and Democrat. Since it is our universal enemy, it should cause us to submerge our differences and unitedly throw ourselves into the struggle against it." Such an argument will be cheered to the echo yet it is as phony as a three dollar bill. When groups submerge their differences, they frequently submerge their motivating forces and the organization so formed is like an automobile without gasoline because the dynamics of action reside in the submerged differences.

Suppose, for example, a joint Catholic-Protestant organization is formed. The liberty of the Catholic conscience necessitates freedom to propagate the doctrines of faith. The liberty of conscience of an evangelical Protestant depends upon his freedom to preach the gospel of Christ. If the Protestant gets into an organization where he must refrain from preaching the gospel, and the Catholic in that organization must refrain from advancing Catholicism, both are embarrassed, and rendered so much less effective. If, however, they are in different organizations where the consciences of both are clear, they can do far more effective work.

The Christian anticommunism crusade held a school for anti-Communists in the educational building of the Tower Grove Baptist Church in St. Louis, Mo. The school was attended by a considerable number of Catholics. After the school, the Catholics were very eager to form a joint Protestant-Catholic anti-Communist organization. I replied that, should we do so, each would paralyze the effectiveness of the other. Each group has a dominant purpose. The emotional attitudes of the members are tuned to the fulfillment of that purpose. Unless the message is in tune with that purpose, it will not produce the maximum result. Opposition to it may be unconscious, but it will be real nevertheless. If the message against communism is tuned to the basic purposes of the organization, it will rally the enthusiastic support of the group. When an organization consists of elements with contradictory purposes, it is difficult

to mobilize the enthusiastic support of all elements. Maybe this should not be so, in relation to such a universal enemy, but as a practical issue, it is so.

I suggested that the Catholics form a Catholic organization so that they could speak to Catholics without the embarrassment of a Protestant leader. Rather hesitantly, they agreed, and formed the Cardinal Mindszenty Foundation. This organization is now doing a most effective work and its leadership is now convinced of the wisdom of the course pursued. Instead of uniting, Catholic speaks to Catholic, and Protestant speaks to Protestant. Information is shared. Joint projects may be undertaken. But organizational unity is not sought. Neither infringes his conscience. Each has the dynamic of his faith, and can be much more effective than if a united organization had been formed.

Organizational unity is a mirage. The great need is multiplicity, not unity. The unity of a free society resides in its diversity. Movements must be formed which conserve the motivating forces within each group and channel them into the struggle for freedom and survival. The Communists understand this very well. That is why they operate through a great number of fronts without survival virtue. They are convinced that the average citizen of the free world is so intellectually lazy and dishonest, so greedy and selfish, so intoxicated with entertainment, so consumed with his immediate problems that no matter how clear the evidence of impending doom, that evidence will never be acknowledged, and the organizational steps necessary for survival will never be taken.

We categorically reject this claim. We are not the helpless victims of our environment, doomed to destruction. The fault lies not in our environment but in ourselves. The political, judicial, educational, and cultural organizations of a free society can function only when the individual citizens have enlightened minds and are dedicated to the foundations of freedom. The basic responsibility rests on each one. The success of this book can be measured by the number of readers whose attention has been redirected from the responsibility of others to their own responsibility; who are asking the question, "What can I do?" Upon such a foundation the political, legislative, and cultural programs necessary can be built.

Material forces alone do not determine the destinies of men. The resources of an infinite God can change the balance of material assets. These resources are liberated through the prayer, the sacrific, and the intelligent organization of people filled with the love of God. Fundamentally, the problem is a moral and spiritual one. The foundations of freedom must be girded with a moral and spiritual revival. As free men humbly seek God and present their bodies, minds, and hearts to their country and the cause of all mankind, we may well believe that tyranny shall not triumph and freedom shall not perish from the earth.

Labor Facing Critical Era

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Saturday, August 27, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the Commissioner of Labor Statistics of the United States recently described the challenges facing the American labor force in the 1960's. At a meeting organized by New Jersey State Labor Commissioner Raymond Male, the commissioner described the need for greater training efforts and greater educational opportunities. His predictions would seem to bear out the arguments of those who claim that this Nation must make more strenuous efforts to provide extensive opportunities for advances in school training. An August 23 dispatch from United Press International describes the talk. I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the dispatch was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR FACING CRITICAL ERA—UNEMPLOYMENT MIGHT BE ON INCREASE

PRINCETON, August 23.—A Federal official said that sharp changes in the Nation's labor pattern could lead to substantial unemployment in the 1960's together with labor shortages.

Ewan Clague, U.S. Commissioner of Labor Statistics, told a group of State labor and management leaders that demands were increasing for trained workers but decreasing for unskilled employees.

He said he anticipated substantial increases in professional, clerical, and sales work.

Clague said there would be no increase in jobs for unskilled workers. He added there was likely to be a substantial continued decline in the number of farm jobs.

Clague said it would become more difficult for workers with only high school educations or less to get jobs.

Clague said more older workers were determined to remain in the labor force and many women over 45, their children grown, would also seek employment.

Clague said a major factor in the changing labor picture was the large number of young workers looking for jobs.

In June 2.2 million young persons sought work, 300,000 more than last June, the Federal official said.

"In summary, industry and labor will both have to face the fact that during the 1960's, the labor force, with respect to age and sex, will not be as well balanced as it has been," Clague said.

He said that unless an effective job is done in education and training, it was likely there would be a shortage of skilled, technical and professional personnel with a surplus of unskilled workers.

"Thus it is possible that substantial unemployment could exist side by side with labor shortages," Clague told representatives of the State CIO and AFL labor organizations, the New Jersey Manufacturers Association, and the State chamber of commerce.

The session was organized by State Labor Commissioner Raymond Male, who is also mayor of Princeton Borough.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Appendix

A Great Newspaper Speaks Out on the Connally Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, it is often charged and lamented that today there is a dearth of courageous and dynamic editors, writers, and newspapers like those of a generation or two ago who are willing to stand up and be counted on the great issues of the day.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of the Members of the Congress and the American people, a letter sent to many of our fellow Americans by Mr. Roger Ferger, president and publisher of the Cincinnati Enquirer dealing with the current campaign to repeal the Connally reservation. With his thought-provoking letter Mr. Ferger enclosed a timely and significant editorial from his paper, together with a series of articles by Mr. Forrest Davis, the Enquirer's able and discerning Washington writer:

THE CINCINNATI ENQUIRER,
Cincinnati, Ohio, August 26, 1960.

DEAR FELLOW AMERICAN: I am certain that you share my interest in the nationwide debate concerning the Connally reservation and its relationship to United States participation in the Internal Court of Justice.

In my judgment, it is a matter of urgent importance that the Connally reservation be retained until there is a universally accepted body of law upon which the International Court of Justice can base its deliberations. A frank appraisal of today's world must lead to the conclusion that no such body of international law exists. It should be equally clear that merely wishing for it will not create it.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing for your consideration an editorial from the August 12 issue of the Enquirer as well as a series of seven articles by Forrest Davis of the Enquirer's Washington staff. The editorial elaborates upon the Enquirer's opinion that the Connally reservation should be retained for the foreseeable future, and Mr. Davis' series is the result of his exhaustive inquiry into the International Court of Justice and its work.

I know that your judgment on the Connally reservation rests upon convictions as sincerely held as mine. But I beg you to weigh your convictions with a realistic understanding of what is best for the United States as the last stronghold of freedom under law.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER H. FERGER,
President and Publisher, The Cincinnati Enquirer.

CONNALLY AMENDMENT AGAIN

There is reason to suspect that one of the items to be called up for consideration during the renewed session of Congress will be Senate bill 94 whose aim is the repeal of the Connally amendment and the end of the reservations to the U.S. participation in the World Court.

First proposed by Senator Tom Connally, of Texas, during his service as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the Connally amendment exempts from the jurisdiction of the World Court any matter that the United States may regard as internal in character.

Ever since its adoption as an amendment to the measure through which the United States subscribed to the World Court, there has been a vigorous campaign for its elimination—a campaign that has been renewed in recent weeks as Congress prepared to resume its work.

There is one crucial difference, we think, between the World Court, on the one hand, and the various domestic courts with which Americans are familiar, on the other. That difference is this: At all levels in the United States, there is a clearly existing body of law for the courts to interpret. In most cases, the law was created first, the court second. On the international level, by way of contrast, there is no unquestioned body of law. Whatever international law the World Court would be called upon to interpret and apply to the solution of specific problems, consequently, would largely be law of its own making.

That consideration—combined with the wholly political manner in which World Court judges are elected—makes it unwise, we think, for the United States to choose this particular moment for giving the World Court unreserved powers in cases in which the United States is a party. The case for the Connally amendment's retention seems doubly strong in view of the fact that the Soviet Union insists upon similar reservations.

The time may well come when there is a real body of international law to which all nations can subscribe without reservation. When—and if—that day arrives, it will be time enough for the United States to take a second look at the World Court and to give it the unreserved support and participation it will then deserve.

CONNALLY'S "SIX LITTLE WORDS" AND THE WORLD COURT—1

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—The prophets of the Republic's decay would do well to lift their sights from fin-tailed, two-toned jalopies to a tendency corrosive not only of the national will but of the traditional good sense of the American people. I refer to the substitution among the liberal enlightenment of cliche, or slogan, phrasemaking for cool, ad hoc reasoning on political issues as they evolve week by week, month by month.

The argument by cliche is especially obfuscating in foreign affairs, which, while vital to every man, woman, and chick, may only be seen by nonprofessionals through a glass darkly on account of geography, the bewildering cultured differences among races, peoples and systems, and the obscurity frequently veiling the interests involved.

The Congo affair looms at the moment as a terrible judgment on the light-minded democratic fetish of one head, one vote. What a caricature of the liberal dogmas of self-determination, the "rights" of all peoples everywhere to enjoy political freedom via the ballot box irrespective of what the process visits in the way of rapine, social disintegration, bankruptcy, and hunger upon the innocent in suddenly liberated areas and their neighbors.

The transcendence of slogans over judgment is no new thing with us. Witness "making the world safe for democracy," under which banner we fought World War I. Witness the stupefying nonsense of Wendell Willkie's proclamation of one worldism. Consider the persistent fallacy that the United States must negotiate with Moscow, whenever Moscow bids, despite the bleak record of successive retreats into which the council table has ushered us since Pearl Harbor. The operative slogan here is that "it is better to talk than to fight," a piece of casuistry flying in the face of the record; a record demonstrating that our defeats at the hand of the Soviet empire have all resulted from talk.

Specifically, I am concerned with the current attempt to cozen and delude the public into a delivery of our liberties to an exotic World Court in the name of such cliches as "universal justice" and "world order under law." Underpinning these chimerical slogans is the extraordinary delusion that permanent peace will come about if, as and when the United States shows the way to the Communist empire by "trusting" the Court at The Hague with complete jurisdiction over its justiciable affairs, domestic as well as foreign.

Should our Senate waive the Connally amendment, the pitch goes, all other States will gladly yield their own sovereignties, the cold war will dissolve as Nikita S. Khrushchev and Mao Tse-tung refer their ambitions in Berlin, the Middle East, Latin America, Tibet, the Straits of Formosa, Korea, etc., to quiet adjudication by the Court of International Justice.

The fact that Moscow contemptuously declines to recognize the Court's jurisdiction whatsoever does not discourage the newly sprung but powerful lobby agitating for repeal of the Connally amendment. The fact that the Connally reservation does not deny the Court's jurisdiction in litigation over issues truly international, merely safeguarding Americans from the Court's intrusion into our domestic concerns, is steadily minimized by advocates of repeal.

What is the Connally amendment? It is a brief addendum, six little words, to a resolution introduced by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, binding the United States to the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. The six little words conclude the amendment, which stipulates that acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction "shall not apply to disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the jurisdiction of the United States, as determined by the United States."

Former Senator Tom Connally, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the Foreign Relations

Committee, introduced the reservation. As amended the resolution carried by 51 to 12 votes on August 3, 1946, the minority agreeing with MORSE that the United States cede to a new, untested court exclusive determination over its competence to hear any or all cases brought against us at whatever cost to our sovereignty.

Because the questions opened in this debate are so vital to the preservation of the American constitutional system, so varied, so affected by the determination of the United Nations bureaucracy to create a universal state, they call for far more extensive discussion than the space of one column affords. The great questions, such as whether the World Court is in fact a court or merely a political arm of the U.N., are to be ventilated hereafter.

WHAT MAKES THE WORLD COURT LOBBY RUN?—2

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—The coincidence of Nikita S. Khrushchev's rancorous renewal of the cold war and the emergence of a powerful lobby in behalf of repeal of the Connally reservation and total submission of the United States to the International Court of Justice at The Hague (the World Court) is perhaps purely fortuitous. Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Democrat, Minnesota, scarcely could have foreseen Khrushchev's squalidly profane provocation at the May summit, when, last December, he introduced his resolution for repeal of the Connally amendment of 1946 reserving to the United States determination of whether matters raised against it at The Hague were of domestic or international import.

Nor could Charles S. Rhyne have been aware that the implacable rift between the two worlds of Washington and Moscow would be so dramatically disclosed in 1960 when he began his lobbying activity for world peace through law. Mr. Rhyne, an energetic, youngish Washington attorney, a former president of the American Bar Association, is chairman of a special committee of the Bar Association functioning under the foregoing title.

Operating munificently under grants of $375.000 from the Ford Foundation and $225,000 from the International Cooperation Administration, Chairman Rhyne has made of his committee an influential force on public opinion. Mr. Rhyne's promise, that lawful settlements of international disputes beat war is fairly unassailable. As president of the Bar Association in 1958, Mr. Rhyne procured the designation of May 1 each year as Law Day. The purpose of the nationwide observance is to inculcate a new public understanding of and respect for the central function of the law to a civilized community.

It is when Mr. Rhyne, his coadjutors, allies and disciples, attempt to apply the precedent of the United States, where recourse to the courts and an accepted body of law are habitual, to a grievously divided, revolutionary and anarchic world, that his counsel degenerates into sheer nonsense. The ideal of a world court founded on a universal concept of law, commanding the trust of all human societies and deciding issues with urbane objectivity, is one which in the obvious nature of things must be long deferred.

The ideal inspires the casual adherence of all men of good will. President Eisenhower, former President Truman, Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON, many other public men, eminent jurists and the academic and communicating intelligentsia subscribe to that ideal. The trouble arises when Rhyne and others attempt the impossible leap from aspiration to here-and-now fulfillment.

Rhyne goes so far as to assert that, but for the Connally amendment, the World Court could now function as a keeper of the peace among nations. That amendment, limiting the U.S. submission to the compulsory jurisdiction of an untested arm of the United Nations, speaking with many tongues out of widely contrasted legal systems, Rhyne describes as a "sham." Thoughtful analysts of Rhyne's exaggerated naievete suspect that it is his refusal to acknowledge the simple facts pertaining to the World Court which constitutes a "sham" before the American people.

The lobby failed last winter in the Senate. Hearings called by Chairman J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of the Foreign Relations Committee on the Humphrey repealer produced such intelligently adverse testimony that the committee failed to act. FULBRIGHT, who swallows every nostrum put forward as a palliative for the cruel malignity of the world struggle, announced the committee's refusal to report with regret.

Yet we may expect new assault on the amendment in the next Senate. The campaign, abetted by the New York Times, the Washington Post, and other liberal journals characteristically mistaking ends for means, is being stepped up. A committee, to which the venerable and respected Judge Learned Hand lends his name, has moved into the field.

What makes the World Court lobby run? What circumstances have arisen changing the Senate's objections to a court for which a power-hungry U.N. bureaucracy is the sole legislature? In succeeding articles I shall endcavor to cite those objections and present the contra arguments of the lobby.

THE OBJECTIONS TO AN ALL-POWERFUL WORLD COURT—3

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—The Court of International Justice, established as an annex to the United Nations in the charter promulgated at San Francisco on June 26, 1945, posed no overt threat to American institutions and historic liberties. According to chapter XIV of the charter, the World Court was to have no compulsory jurisdiction. It was, further, excluded from jurisdiction over purely domestic matters in the member states. Members, indeed, although all could refer international differences to the Court, were ceded the right to specify the extent to which they wished to acknowledge the Court's competence by means of formal declarations of acceptance.

The Connally amendment to the U.S. declaration of acceptance, reserving to this Government the say as to what issues were international, which domestic, grew out of two major objections to compulsory jurisdiction. The first was general, the second specifically alarming.

As to the second, the U.N. itself through the General Assembly alerted the Senate in February of 1946 to a tendency toward power grabbing at the expense of member states. The Assembly successively adopted conventions conferring immunities on the U.N. and its agencies. It thereupon provided for enforcement of these immunities through the World Court. As the Court had been set up it could deal only with disputes between or among states. Moreover, it had no enforcement arm. The Security Council, hedged by the veto, could not enforce Court decisions and, in any case, the idea of mandatory action by the U.N. or the Court outside of narrow limits was repugnant to the text and spirit of the charter.

There was a provision for advisory opinions, meaning just that, from the Court. But the Assembly, seeking to strengthen itself and its agencies, legislated that, in case of a dispute between itself and a member, either side could request an advisory opinion which, when given, should "be accepted as decisive by the parties." This, of course, established a form of compulsory jurisdiction through the back door over all sorts of unpredictable differences between the ambitious agencies and members.

This factor weighed with the Senate in August of 1946. The Senate had adopted the U.N. charter in 1945 with only two dissenting votes. In July of 1946, the Foreign Relations Committee, still taking the charter at face value, recommended passage of a declaration of acceptance moved by Senator WAYNE L. MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon, without reservation. In floor debate however, a more prudent counsel made its appearance and the Senate finally, by 51–12, accepted the amendment offered by Chairman Tom Connally, Democrat, Texas, of the Foreign Relations Committee. Most of the committee had reconsidered.

A more compelling factor, however, was a growing dubiety about the nature and competence of the Court itself. The Court, although consisting of 15 judges politically appointed as to region and bloc, should base its decision upon a recognized body of law. International law, diffusive and organic, had no constitutional nor statutory warrant. It was, in effect, Western law, evolving through the centuries from treaties, conventions, declarations and scholarship assertions. That was the law of consent to which the International Court at The Hague before and after World War I had deferred.

But the U.N. Court contained among its judges two from Communist countries, the U.S.S.R. and Poland, bound to reject all Western jurisprudence as "bourgeois." Two judges were from Moslem lands, Egypt and Pakistan, where Islamic law prevails. Four judges were Latin American, one Chinese, one each from France, Greece and Norway.

Only three of the judges derived from British common law countries: The United States, Great Britain, and Australia.

The question confronting the Senate then and now is whose law will the World Court administer? Additionally, after adoption of the Connally amendment, the U.N.'s agencies launched on a course of enacting international law by treaty, much of which powerfully cut across American concepts and vested liberties. This process we shall examine in the next installment.

RHYNE'S "SOAP" AND KHRUSHCHEV'S "LAW"—4

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—The chief evangel of the crusade to submit American institutions, values, and liberties to the whim of an alien, experimental World Court, is a former president of the American Bar Association, a Washington attorney named Charles S. Rhyne. On July 2, 1958, Mr. Rhyne, urging repeal of the Connally reservation of 1946 on an American Association of Law Libraries convention, identified his crusade with the worthy but inappropriate hucksterism of Madison Avenue, saying:

"There is no reason why peace through law cannot be sold with the same verve and enthusiasm that we sell soap and other products and programs."

Mr. Rhyne's ecstacy proved too much for another Washington attorney, former Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who promptly commented with characteristically mordant pessimism:

"While it may be that peace through law be offered for sale with the 'same verve and enthusiasm' as soap, the chances of a consummated sale seem to me infinitely less. If you think of yourself as ringing Mr. Khrushchev's doorbell with two packages in your hand, you can, I firmly believe, have no doubt as to which is salable and which is not."

Mr. Acheson's reference, no doubt, was to the fact that the Soviet bloc, unlike the United States, has refused with some contempt to acknowledge the World Court's jurisdiction, competence or, indeed, its existence except to station one of its own bu-

reaucrats on the 15-judge panel to look after Soviet interests. A Polish Communist functionary also adorns the Court. Mr. Acheson piled ridicule on commonsense, adding:

"'Whose rule of law?' he (Khrushchev) would ask. You with 'verve and enthusiasm,' 'Rhyne's grade A fancy,' approved by the American Bar Association.

"'You have a nerve,' he shouts back, as he slams the door. 'I'm the proprietor of Khrushchev's rule of Khrushchev, grade triple A, supercolossal, guaranteed to bury you. Use it as a tonic or embalming fluid, or both. Ask the Poles.'"

What Acheson illuminated was the impossibility of reaching a consensus on fundamental law upon which the Court of International Justice could found a jurisprudence. One example of the polar divergencies between Communist and the common law basic to English-speaking countries may be found in the show trial of the reconnaissance pilot Powers in Moscow. As the eminent political philosopher James Burnham noted in a recent National Review, there are in an American court four interests: the judge, the jury, the prosecution and the defense. In a Soviet court only one interest obtains, that of the state. This is to say nothing of the other safeguards thrown about the accused in an American court, notably the presumption of innocence.

Yet over and beyond the wholly different concepts of law as between Soviet and Anglo-Saxon systems and the peculiarities of Islamic law, there is the prospect that, the World Court's judges being selected for regional and political reasons, we may soon find international law being dispensed by jurists from the numerous new African states with no tried and traditional concept of non-tribal law whatever.

Somewhere among the more than 200 conventions, declarations, etc., drawn up by United Nations agencies for ratification by member states, there is a proposal for an International Court of Criminal Justice to try Americans and other nationals for offenses under the UN's treaty law.

It is not, of course, quite accurate to say that the World Court does not have at hand a body of law for its guidance. The U.N. agencies, busily legislating, have provided a complex of laws governing almost every conceivable political, social and economic relationship of human beings regardless of their settled constitutional, statutory and customary ways of doing things within their separate states and societies.

Americans have so far been immune to the U.N.'s domestic laws because, first, the Senate has declined to ratify treaties embodying these laws and, secondly, because the Connally amendment reserves to our Government the right to repel such intrusions via the court. In the next column we shall examine some of the perils to which we would be exposed if a future Senate ratified such law and/or the Connally reservation were repealed.

WORLD COURT COULD IMPAIR BASIC AMERICAN INSTITUTION—5

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—Without the Connally amendment, limiting the World Court's jurisdiction to matters the U.S. Government deems international in character, a citizen exercising his constitutional right to decry personality or policies of a foreign government could be held to answer before the World Court. The American critic could be so haled should the foreign government charge that the comment was "unfair and disruptive of cordial international relations."

That is to say, the vested right of Americans freely to discuss the behavior of Nikita S. Khrushchev, Patrice Lumumba, or Fidel Castro could be put unqualifiedly to question if the Senate had ratified a convention of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights dealing with freedom of information. But in any case, without the Connally amendment of 1946, the World Court at The Hague could entertain an action brought by Congolese tribal chiefs functioning as a government against Joseph Alsop or David Lawrence.

The U.S. Government would then face an ad hoc decision whether to flout the jurisdiction of the World Court or submit its citizens to trial and possible punishment for offenses which could not be offenses under the Constitution and U.S. law.

Plainly, the Commission on Human Rights, whose first chairman was Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, thinks it the business of the U.N. and its judicial organ, the Court of International Justice, to censor the utterances of Americans respecting foreign governments.

Nor is that by any means all. The Human Rights Convention on Freedom of Expression, put forth as treaty law binding all signatory states, seriously abridged the provisions of the first amendment to our Constitution. In deference to the overwhelming majority of U.N. members which hold, contrary to our Constitution, that political rights are parceled out to subjects by the government, the citizen have no inalienable rights, the convention circumscribed the freedoms of assembly, petition, utterance, and religious choice.

That convention would impose a whole new body of law repugnant to our constitutional safeguards, tradition and liberties should it be ratified along with a host of other legislative acts by U.N. agencies in a future Senate.

Nor is this danger academic. President Harry S. Truman urged ratification of the genocide convention in 1948 and he was strongly backed in the Senate and a formidable section of the press. Under that loosely drawn and emotion-charged convention, a citizen could be dragged before the World Court for an offense tainted with racial discrimination and unknown to our law. There has been powerful support for the various Human Rights Commission's conventions as for numerous statutes enacted by the International Labor Organization, intruding on our time-honored and organic practices.

At Los Angeles, the Democratic convention declared for repeal of the Connally reservation. Although President Eisenhower and Vice President RICHARD M. NIXON have been bemused by the slogan, "World Peace Through Law," the Republican convention of 1960 was silent on this issue.

I lack space to thread the maze of legislation offered by U.N. agencies, nearly all of which would unconscionably intervene in our way of doing things, many of them reducing our liberties. An articulate coterie of internationalists, typified by Adlai E. Stevenson, yearns for ratification of these conventions as a means to an world order, obliterating systematic differences between civilized and uncivilized states and putting the United States order on a parity with that of Ghana or Red China. Whether Candidate JOHN F. KENNEDY'S "new frontier" extends so far remains to be seen.

Meanwhile, without the Connally reservation, the World Court could assume jurisdiction over such matters as tariffs, offshore rights, immigration and mutual assistance. The U.N. in various measures has described such questions as international—transcending the interest of the country concerned. Moreover, conforming to Communist protests, human rights legislation is mute on the right to own property free from Government expropriation without due process.

In their arguments, the repealers, as we shall see, ignore these perils, resting their case on wishful rhetoric and invective.

CONNALLY REPEALERS PLAY ON EMOTIONS OF HOPE AND SHAME—6

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—Former President Harry S. Truman and President Dwight D. Eisenhower are on record for dispensing with the Connally amendment (described by an organ of repeal, the Washington Post, as "shabby" and "mischievous") which reserves to the United States judgment as to which cases brought against it in the World Court are international, which domestic in purview. Mr. Eisenhower's generalized espousal of repeal seems merely a diffused response to Charles S. Rhyne's shibboleth: "World peace through law"—a slogan presupposing that a world divided six ways from Sunday in the axioms of law, constitutional or other basic procedures and political philosophies can be brought to concurrence by a judicial arm of the United Nations which is not, in truth, a court of law.

Mr. Truman's advocacy moved him to a false analogy. Suggesting that Kansas and Colorado, if embroiled over Arkansas River water, would not make war on each other but refer the dispute to the Supreme Court, the former President reasoned that the United States could, with equal confidence, appeal its differences with other nations to the World Court.

Mr. Truman ignored the fact that the Supreme Court is at the apex of a vast edifice of constitutional, common and statutory law together with a wealth of Anglo-American precedents which in riparian matters affecting the Arkansas River affords justification for expecting an objectively just decision. As we have seen in this series, the 15-judge court sitting at The Hague, lacks a body of agreed law, its jurists derive from widely varying traditions, it is not obliged to honor stare decisis (indeed it is virtually bare of precedents) and its only statutory references are to the voluminous legislation of U.N. agencies, much of it designed to override our own domestic law.

So much of repeal literature rejects depth analysis. The repealers generally appeal to two emotions: An unwarranted hope that wishing for a world ruled by law will make it so combined with cries of shame against those who insist on facing facts. Charles S. Rhyne, debating the issue with another former president of the American Bar Association, Frank E. Holman, in the Christian Science Monitor of April 28, specifically introduced a fear psychology in behalf of repeal, saying:

"The world today is poised between hope for total peace and fear of total war. Ending war is mankind's greatest need. A frenzied unchecked race is on to improve nuclear warheads and their delivery via intercontinental missiles. * * * A new method is urgently essential to avoid atomic holocaust."

To Mr. Rhyne the Connally amendment blunts the world's hope for peace. To him the fact that the World Court is "empty," having disposed of only 10 cases in 15 years, is due almost solely to the Senate's refusal to code the court blanket jurisdiction over our organic and evolving systems of law and custom. His argument blurs the larger fact that U.N. member states have shown a decided preference for settling disputes through diplomacy and the conference method. It ignores also the Soviet bloc's blunt refusal to accept the court's jurisdiction in any event and our own qualified adherence to it. Mr. Holman soberly replied:

"The causes of war are often political or economic and not usually justiciable. * * * As a result, not only has the court been bypassed but other United Nations agencies also. * * * The reservation has existed for 14 years. Until recently resurrected by Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, a world-government enthusiast, nobody was suggesting that it adversely affected world peace."

Mr. Holman forebore reference to his antagonist's crusade, with its half-million-dollar purse, aimed at lobbying repeal through the Senate. Nor did he mentioned the singular circumstances that internationalist movements, such as Rhyne's, invariably are able to tap the till of the great American foundations. Causes dedicated to preserving our constitutional heritage usually are denied that privilege.

That is perhaps because the latter are unfashionable in certain quarters. As the New York Times tendentiously observes, "Isolationism is almost dead in the United States but there are a few vestiges left." The Connally reservation, as the Times sees it, is just such a "vestige" and "it is past time to get rid of it."

AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION RENT BY WORLD COURT DISPUTE

(By Forrest Davis)

WASHINGTON.—A freshet of the highest forensic talent in the land is scheduled to be loosed in Washington at 2 p.m. on Wednesday, August 31. The scene will be a hotel ballroom, the participants mighty advocates among the house of delegates of the American Bar Association meeting in annual convention. The issue: Shall the American Bar Association recommend to the U.S. Senate repeal of the Connally amendment reserving to the U.S. Government the final say in determining whether actions brought against it at the International (World) Court of Justice, The Hague, are properly international in character.

This crucial debate will in all probability revolve around three reports brought before the house at that hour. First, and most challenging, will be the Rhyne report, so called because Charles S. Rhyne, a former president of the American Bar Association, is chairman of the special committee on world peace through law counseling repeal. Ten days before the debate Mr. Rhyne expected a minority report from his committee adverse to the majority recommendation.

A third report, supporting the Connally reservation, rendered by five members of seven on the bar association's committee on peace and law through the United Nations, likewise will lie before the House of Delegates. As of this writing, it was considered unlikely that the committee minority of two would file a report.

At its 1947 annual meeting, the American Bar Association adopted a resolution favoring repeal of the Connally amendment—an action increasingly regretted through the years as U.N. agencies pursued legislative adventures via the treaty route. Although that resolution was not, through some quirk of apparent misgiving, referred as customary to the Senate, it affords a precedent of which the Rhyne faction has made much. In the intervening 13 years, years during which the American Bar Association was engrossed with the campaign for the Bricker amendment, the Connally reservation found no organized opposition.

The revival of agitation for repeal at a time when, with the abandonment of Western colonialism, the U.N. is being inundated with new, fragmented, and politically immature African States, has an unclear motivation. Bearing in mind the political method by which World Court judgships are awarded to blocks and regions, there seems to many thoughtful observers more reason than ever to preserve U.S. sovereignty over causes deemed domestic by us. The U. N.'s hasty admission of new members from countries by no stretch of the imagination either nations or civilized soon will aggrandize membership to more than 100. Some 30 of these member states will be African, chiefly contrived political entities such as the former Belgian Congo, the Soviet protectorate Guinea, and the unpredictable Ghana.

An Asian-African bloc comprising a majority of the General Assembly scarcely can be expected to exercise moderation in demanding judgeships to which their votes will entitle them. For this reason, if no other, prudence would enjoin against discarding our one safeguard against hazarding our liberties before a World Court inherently hostile to the Western societies. For it should not be forgotten that the eight votes of the Soviet imperium and those of certain neutrals chronically opposed to the West are available to the ambitions of the new Asian-African rulers.

Advocates of repeal, adept at cloudy sophistries, have been less than candid. One gathers from the Rhyne literature that the United States alone obstructs "world peace through law" when, in truth, no great power has unreservedly committed its destinies to the U.N.'s judicial organ. The Soviet States contemptuously deny the World Court's jurisdiction. France pitches its reservation on any "crisis affecting the national security or * * * any measure relating thereto." Great Britain's adherence is modified by nine clauses and further hedged by the express assertion of its right to "add to, amend, or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations" or cancel its obedience to the Court at a moment's notice to the Secretary General.

A study of the repeal arguments leads to the conclusion that they are unsophisticated and illusionary. While the American Bar Association's house of delegates legislates and resolves primarily on professional concerns, it also exercises its right to advise the Government and the country on wider issues. The public, therefore, has the right to expect that this year's conclusions will be sophisticated, judgmatical, and duly regardful of American liberties in a kaleidoscopic and infinitely dangerous world.

Atlanta Flag Dedication Exercises

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on Saturday, July 9, flag dedication exercises were held at the Atlanta Confederate Soldiers' Home under the auspices of the Dorothy Blount Lamar Chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy and the John B. Gordon Camp of the Sons of Confederate Veterans. The highlight of the occasion of the presentation of U.S. and Confederate flags by the businessmen of West End Atlanta and the principal address was delivered by Charles Stelling, staff member of the Georgia Civil War Centennial Commission. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of Mr. Stelling's remarks on this significant occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTA FLAG DEDICATION EXERCISES

(Text of address delivered by Charles Stelling, staff member of the Georgia Civil War Centennial Commission, at flag dedication exercises held Saturday, July 9, 1960, at the Atlanta Confederate Soldiers' Home under the sponsorship of the Dorothy Blount Lamar Chapter 2104, United Daughters of the Confederacy, Mrs. Milton W. Davis, president, and the John B. Gordon Camp of the Sons of Confederate Veterans, Stiles Mellichamp, commander, in cooperation with the Sons of Confederate Veterans represented by National Aide Clyde Boynton and National Inspector in Chief Charles A. Moran)

It is a great pleasure for me to talk to you today about Georgia's role in commemorating the War Between the States.

Like all wars, this was a tragedy—a conflict in which men fought and died for a principle.

Therefore, the 100th anniversary is to be commemorated—not celebrated.

This centennial of the War Between the States is a rebirth of the past, clarifying the concept upon which our democratic freedom depends—that individual responsibility is based on faith in God and service to country.

During the centennial, the spotlight will be on character in men—for war is the ultimate test of character. The stories of conflict and sacrifice are full of lessons for today's living. By the examples set in them, children and adults will be reminded of the moral values upon which our country is founded.

The centennial is not confined just to Georgia. It is nationwide with 41 States involved. It starts January 8, 1961, and lasts until 1965.

The centennial is an opportunity to sell Georgia—and the story of Georgia—to our countrymen. Because of the role it played in the War Between the States, Georgia is a natural for the centennial.

Georgia played a key part in organizing the southern government. It provided some of the Confederacy's most able statesmen.

Some of the most important battles of the war were fought on Georgia soil.

Chickamauga—one of the bloodiest battles of the war—was fought on September 19 and 20 in 1863. The Confederacy lost 18,000 men in this battle; the Union, 16,000.

Resaca, fought from May 13 to 16, 1864.

New Hope Church.

Peachtree Creek.

The Andrews Raid—involving the Great Locomotive Chase—was one of the most dramatic and thrilling incidents of the war.

The Battle—and burning—of Atlanta is known over the world—not only from history, but from the novel, "Gone With the Wind," written by Atlanta's own beloved Margaret Mitchell.

These are only some of the major engagements which answer the rollcall of history in Georgia.

All in all, some 289 actions—raids, skirmishes, and battles—took place on Georgia soil.

Many areas which were not battle sites played important roles in the conflict by sending thousands to the front.

All told, Georgia furnished about one-tenth of the fighting men for the Confederacy.

Georgia was the breadbasket of the Confederacy. Its arms and supplies served the southern cause before these supplies were cut off by General Sherman's incendiary march to the sea.

And certainly not to be forgotten are the Georgia women who did so much for the war effort. Their courage will forever be enshrined in the annals of history.

It is this spirit of sacrifice—and this devotion to cause—that we seek to bring back during the 5-year period of the centennial observances.

And it is important to remember that all the men who fought were fighting for principles.

Far beyond historical features, the centennial will seek to impress the tremendous significance of the spiritual aspects of this great struggle we are commemorating.

For, more than a test of arms, the war was a spiritual proving ground as eternal as the human spirit.

Churches will focus attention on the centennial with special services and sermons on January 8, 1961, when the centennial officially starts.

In Georgia, our centennial commission will strive to accomplish a five-point program:

(1) To honor the valor and sacrifice of Georgians who fought for a principle;

(2) To perpetuate a knowledge of the deeds and traditions of a valiant people;

(3) To educate the public on the campaigns, shrines, and the human story of the war in Georgia;

(4) To preserve the monuments, graves, and ruins of the wartime past;

(5) To locate and preserve valuable documents, diaries, manuscripts, photographs, and other records of the War Between the States.

This is a vast undertaking. It will take the efforts of all Georgians to accomplish these aims.

Believing that this commemoration will remind us of our great heritage—and strengthen us in this time of world strife and turmoil—Georgia begins planning with the thought:

Let us not forget the valor of the Confederacy.

Hugh Bennett Has Passed to his Reward

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to pay tribute to the memory of one of our greatest Americans, Hugh Hammond Bennett, man of the soil.

Dr. Bennett, the first Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, died July 7 at the age of 79 and was buried in Arlington National Cemetery.

Our country, and the people of the world as well, owe him a great debt for his lifetime crusade against soil erosion and on behalf of an action program to conserve our soil resources.

More than any man, Dr. Bennett was responsible for our national soil and water conservation and small watershed protection and flood prevention programs that extend into nearly every corner of the Nation, and for the development of similar programs in some 43 other countries.

Dr. Bennett's great crusade began some 55 years ago when, as a young soil surveyor just 2 years out of college, he identified the process of sheet erosion. This is the gradual removal, with every heavy rain, of a thin sheet of topsoil. Gullies were common and accepted as a "natural" event, but Bennett's theory of sheet erosion—the forerunner of gullies—was a new concept.

The young scientist's concept did not impress anybody, least of all his superiors in the Department of Agriculture.

But young Hugh Bennett was undismayed. He kept at it. He gathered additional data as he continued his regular work—studying the soils of America across the length and breadth of the land. He talked about soil erosion. He wrote about it. He argued. But his road was a lonely one for more than two decades.

In 1928 he finally got his full story into a Department of Agriculture pamphlet, "Soil Erosion a National Menace." That was the beginning. People began to listen. People who counted, such as a congressional committee that called on him to testify and then appropriated a small sum to start investigations into soil erosion.

Hugh Bennett, who almost singlehandedly aroused the Nation to the dangers of soil wastage, was the man chosen to develop and direct a program of research and action in soil conservation.

He directed the early research starting in 1929. He headed the Soil Erosion Service, an emergency depression agency. He headed its successor, the Soil Conservation Service when it was established in 1935 by the Congress without a single dissenting vote. He established the principles and concepts that today guide our national programs. He retired from active service in 1952 after 18 years as Chief of the Soil Conservation Service, and after nearly a half century of magnificent service to his country and to the world.

But Hugh Bennett continued to be a messiah of the soil in the 8 years of his life after formal retirement. He accepted assignments to other nations, as health permitted. He continued to speak and to write.

His last public appearance, where he spoke briefly but with his usual eloquence and humor, was on May 5 at a banquet here in Washington sponsored by the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts in observance of the 25th anniversary of the Soil Conservation Service.

It was my privilege, along with others, to share the platform with him on that occasion.

I knew this man well, and there was no man I respected or admired more. He was simple and direct. He had no time for pompous or scientific posture, yet he was a scientist and a great one. Essentially, this man was an evangelist, who, by the force of his personality, his ability to speak and write simply but eloquently, and his ability to adapt himself to any group or occasion, gained widespread support for a noble ideal—to safeguard our land for present and future generations. He was of that rare breed of men who can translate knowledge into action and achieve results.

It was my sad privilege but I deemed it a great honor to represent the Congress as an honorary pallbearer at his burial rites in Arlington National Cemetery.

As I traveled slowly with the horse-drawn caisson bearing his body to its last resting place, I reflected on the greatness of this man who fought so long and so alone, but who lived, as few men do, to see his dream come true.

And it came to me then that the good works of this man to whom we owe so much should be perpetuated by a memorial for the benefit of generations unborn—the generations that will profit most from his lifetime of service to all mankind.

I understand many of the national agricultural and conservation organizations, soil conservation districts, and conservation farmers and ranchers everywhere want to erect a suitable memorial to the memory of this great and good man.

I hope that their efforts will come together and emerge as a single suitable memorial to the man of whom Louis Bromfield said, "Hugh Bennett deserves the greatest honor from the American people as one of the greatest benefactors since the beginning of their history." Our hearts go out to his wonderful wife and family.

God rest his soul and may the same God who took him to his heavenly home give Mrs. Bennett and family strength to bear the great loss they have suffered in the passing of their dearly loved one.

West Virginia Boasts an Impressive Capitol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. BYRD
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, those who have visited my State of West Virginia need little convincing of the beauty and charm which the Mountain State offers. Writing in the Washington Post, yesterday, August 28, Mr. Walter W. Hubbard describes the attractions the vacationer can enjoy in and around the State capital, Charleston.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR MOTOR TOUR—WEST VIRGINIA BOASTS AN IMPRESSIVE CAPITOL

(By Walter W. Hubbard)

Ninety-nine years ago this summer, West Virginia held a loyal-to-the-Union convention after having previously rejected secession, and 2 years later—while Robert E. Lee's army was marching toward Gettysburg—it officially became a separate State.

Charleston, located at the confluence of the Elk and Kanawha Rivers, became the capital of the Mountain State 90 years ago. Its capitol is one of the most impressively beautiful of any of the 50 State capitol buildings.

The city is 358 miles from Washington over good highways and is the northern entrance to the comparatively new West Virginia Turnpike, shown on the accompanying American Automobile Association map. Charleston was founded at Fort Lee shortly after the Revolutionary War, but it was not incorporated as a city until 1870. It is the center of the largest natural gas region in the Eastern United States.

Motorists will find that three representative views of Charleston are afforded by the three highway bridges across the Great Kanawha River. From the Kanawha City Bridge, recreational Charleston at its best may be observed, including boathouses, neat river craft, the baseball stadium, golf course, bridle

paths for equestrians, tennis courts, and an ice skating rink.

From the South Side Bridge, the major part of the capital appears to be a colorful mass of maples, elms, and sycamores pierced by the gold-leafed capitol dome, church steeples and tall buildings.

From the Patrick Street Bridge, there is an impression of industrial Charleston—tall smokestacks, brick factories, and aluminum-painted towers. The Kanawha Valley region, comprising Charleston and the neighboring communities of Nitro, Belle, Dunbar, and South Charleston, is a world center in the production of organic and inorganic base chemicals by synthesis. These plants are very interesting.

The State capitol, Cass Gilbert's architectual masterpiece, is worth visiting, including the museum in the basement, which contains Indian relics, historic documents, paintings, antiques, and locally made glassware. Other points of interest include Kanawha Airport, 4 miles northeast off State 14; Holly Grove, a postcolonial brick house built in 1815; Kanawha Riflemen's Memorial Park; the site of Fort Lee and the Patrick Street Market.

Traveling south on the turnpike, the motorist passes Beckley, an industrial community surrounded by rich agricultural lands. It is the largest city of the important smokeless coal region of southern West Virginia. Little Beaver Park, nearby, is a popular recreational area and one the youngsters will enjoy. Facilities are available for boating, canoeing, swimming, and picnicking.

Bluestone Canyon, a 14-mile stretch of lovely river country, may be visited south of Beckley on U.S. 19 and 21. Fishermen will find trout and bass in the Bluestone River.

Princeton is the center of a prosperous farming and coal mining country, as well as being the southern terminus of the West Virginia Turnpike. It was burned May 16, 1862, by the Confederates.

Top off your vacation in this part of the Mountain State with a trip to Lake Shawnee, named after one of the Indian tribes which used to inhabit the area. It is 4½ miles northwest of Princeton, and a swimming pool and cozy cabins are available.

Help From Hoffa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARROLL D. KEARNS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that in the current issue of Jimmy Hoffa's new political publication, the Drive Reporter, I have been signally honored with a long and emotional denunciation as a horrible example of what a Congressman should be.

This being an election year and campaign expenses being what they are, I consider myself fortunate indeed to have been given such attention.

I say this, Mr. Speaker, because most of us know what is a horrible congressional example to Mr. Hoffa more often than not is considered the epitome of legislative virtue elsewhere. Modesty prevents my placing this exact interpretation upon the Hoffa remarks and their effect, but I believe most of my colleagues will agree that being inscribed on Jimmy Hoffa's personal political purge list considerably enhances a political candidate's chances.

Without going into detail concerning the Hoffa analysis of my voting record and character, I can say that Mr. Hoffa expresses grave fears as to what would happen in the event the Republican Party were to take control of this body in November.

If the Republicans elect a congressional majority—

The article states—

KEARNS will chairman the Committee on Education and Labor. This they should not inflict on the rest of the Nation.

I can understand that this would worry Mr. Hoffa, for he knows that in the past I consistently have voted to protect the rights of the rank-and-file workingman against abuses by union bosses.

The workingmen and women of my district—many of them members of the teamsters union—are aware of this and are familiar with my work in their behalf. I do not think that they who so recently have been freed of the coercive burdens of labor bossism, will forget.

They will remember that I pushed through for them the first school lunch bill in the history of Pennsylvania. They will remember, too, that I was instrumental in this body, in obtaining the first $1 minimum wage bill.

A responsible union leadership—that of the International Association of Machinists—said at the time that the minimum was raised to a dollar in a miracle of the 84th Congress.

The official publication of the Machinists' Union stated that Representative CARROLL KEARNS, Republican of Pennsylvania, was one of the principal miracle makers.

Mr. Speaker, I believe Jimmy Hoffa is peeved with those of us who have attempted to guarantee the workingman his God-given rights, because among these rights are freedom of speech and action.

These, of course, are two things Hoffa would rather not have in his organization.

I believe he is unhappy, too, because most of the Members of this body banded together in the past year to free the workingman from labor totalitarianism and give him, instead, representative unionism.

He is particularly angry at me, I feel, because I was active in this legislative battle and because I am, as he has noted, the senior Republican member of the committee which drafted the labor reform bill.

He is unhappy because that bill gives equal rights to all union members in the conduct of their union affairs.

He is displeased because that bill allows rank-and-file members to speak up at union meetings without fear of reprisals from union bosses such as himself.

He is irked because union members are protected against arbitrary dues increases under terms of that bill.

He is disconsolate because the labor reform law I helped write protects the union member's right to sue union bosses for abuses.

He is plagued with the reality that because of this legislation he cannot arbitrarily impose fines and penalties on his membership.

His ambitions have been thwarted noticeably by the provision making free and fair union elections mandatory.

He perhaps is spending many sleepless nights because the bill makes it possible for a union membership to purge itself of crooked officials.

He is irate because union funds now are protected and trusteeships are regulated.

He is indignant because I gladly helped in the outlawing of blackmail picketing.

And, most significant, he perhaps is downright enraged because the bill bans hot-cargo agreements in labor contracts, one of Jimmy's favorite weapons of destruction.

He is displeased with my voting record because I have voted in the public interest and against the selfish interest of a labor boss whose operations led to the expulsion of his union from the AFL–CIO.

He is wrathful because Civic Affairs Associates, a nonpartisan organization which analyzes voting records of Members of Congress, has given me a rather high performance rating, as noted in the Pittsburgh Press. On August 13, Douglas Smith, distinguished Washington correspondent for that newspaper, wrote of the Civic Affairs Associates' poll:

The western Pennsylvanian most pleasing to the scoring group was Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, Farrell Republican, who scored .786.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is obvious that what is a horrible example to Jimmy Hoffa fortunately is not that to more responsible persons.

In conclusion, I should advise my colleagues that boss Hoffa is very likely to single out others in the House for attacks of the type made against me. Nevertheless, I am sure that in a spirit of charity all Members of this body join me in wishing Mr. Hoffa a recovery—sometime after November 8—from the condition which produces such outbursts as his intemperate attack upon me.

Prior to that date, however, these outbursts can be a great asset to the cause of good government. They will show the American people that any vote is a vote in the public interest—provided it is a vote directly contrary to the interest of one James R. Hoffa.

Economically Converting Sea Water to Fresh Water Will Mark Important Advance for Mankind; Freeport, Tex., Plant Pioneers Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, if America can be the first to develop a cheap way to give the arid areas of the

world fresh water from salty or brackish water, it will mean invaluable prestige for the forces of democracy. Water which would make the deserts blossom as the rose would mean food for hungry tens of millions and it would dwarf most other technological achievements of recent decades.

One of the important studies in this national program will be carried out in a plant at Freeport, Tex. Dedication ceremonies will be held at Freeport tomorrow.

Another phase of this important research involves experiments to improve the solar distillery process. This work is being carried out at Franklin Institute in Philadelphia.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the August 24, issue of the Corpus Christi Times, entitled "Solar Distillery Problem Solved."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOLAR DISTILLERY PROBLEM SOLVED—WILL REDUCE COST OF MAKING WATER FROM SEA DRINKABLE

PHILADELPHIA.—Franklin Institute says it has solved a key problem in reducing the cost of using the sun to make sea water drinkable.

Institute researchers have developed a new method of using chemically-coated plastics, in place of glass, in the manufacture of solar distilling apparatus.

INITIAL COSTS CUT

By eliminating the more expensive glass, the initial costs of the apparatus—and hence the overall costs of producing the fresh water—can be cut down, an institute spokesman said yesterday.

The Office of Saline Water, U.S. Department of the Interior, is trying to develop large-scale stills that could be used in converting salt water into fresh water in many areas of the country where there is a growing shortage in normal water supplies.

Thus far, all of the big solar stills in operation in the Nation are experimental.

A solar still is essentially a rather simple apparatus. It consists of a container with a black-painted bottom into which the saline water is poured.

Over this container is a roof of glass or plastic—something like the roof of a hothouse.

The solar rays, shining through the roof, heat the water. The black-painted bottom helps to absorb the sun's energy better.

As the water heats it becomes steam, which rises to the top and hits the underside of the roof. Since the roof is considerably cooler than the steam, it condenses the steam back into water—this time into pure water.

The pure water runs down the underside of the roof and collects in troughs or gutters. From them the water is collected in containers and is ready for use.

PROBLEM MET

The problem before the Franklin Institute researchers was this:

Glass is a more efficient material than plastic when it is used in solar stills. It has a "water wettable" surface, which means that the condensing steam transforms itself into a smooth film of water on hitting the glass. This film rolls easily into the gutters.

Plastic, however, does not have a "water wettable" surface. Institute researchers, after a year of study and experimentation, however, came up with the idea of coating the underside of the plastic roofs with a film of titanium dioxide. This is a simple mechanical compound used in white paint.

The titanium dioxide is deposited on the plastic in a transparent sheet, and this sheet becomes "water wettable"—the same as glass.

Hatch Act—Fear Phobia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of this body an incident which, in my opinion, is a most flagrant misinterpretation by the Civil Service Commission of the Hatch Act and applicable regulations thereunder. Recently, Mr. William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, was charged with a violation of the Hatch Act by the Civil Service Commission as a result of his name appearing in an advertisement urging the selection of Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON as a nominee of the Democratic Party for the Presidency. On August 10, I brought this situation to the attention of the Subcommittee on Elections of the House Administration Committee, which has been given the responsibility by this body to conduct a thorough investigation of the Hatch Act and recommend necessary changes in the law or regulations. The trumped-up charge against Mr. Doherty has all the appearances of a reprisal action directed toward him as a result of his fine efforts on behalf of the recently enacted Federal pay raise. I feel this situation demands the immediate attention of the Congress and I would like at this point to include in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Association of Letter Carriers unanimously at their convention this week in Cincinnati:

RESOLUTION—SUPPORT OF PRESIDENT WILLIAM C. DOHERTY

Whereas the officers and delegates to this 42d NALC Convention have read with surprise, resentment, and disgust the specious and politically inspired charge of the Civil Service Commission against President William C. Doherty wherein he is alleged to have violated the Hatch Act; and

Whereas a reading of President Doherty's reply to this charge clearly indicates that he did not violate the Hatch Act or appropriate rules and regulations of the Civil Service Commission, that he did, in fact, act pursuant to his inalienable rights as a free American citizen and in harmony with the Hatch Act to express his opinion freely on political subjects and candidates: Therefore be it

Resolved, That this 42d convention of the NALC soundly condemns this action of the Civil Service Commission as nothing more than an attempt to harass and embarrass President Doherty for his leadership in the recently successful effort to improve wages in Federal employment, the objections of the President of the United States notwithstanding, and be it further resolved that we enthusiastically reaffirm our complete confidence in and full support of William C. Doherty, and pledge to him every assistance required to answer to these malicious charges and to vindicate his good name and reputation.

I would also like to include Mr. Doherty's address to the convention which clearly sets forth how the Hatch Act is being used to intimidate Federal employees far beyond what Congress originally intended when the Hatch Act was enacted.

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM C. DOHERTY, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, BEFORE 42D BIENNIAL CONVENTION, NALC, CINCINNATI, OHIO, AUGUST 22, 1960

Brothers, fellow Americans, deeply cherished friends, I have chosen the foregoing salutation carefully since, this morning, you have once again proven yourselves, in magnificent fashion, to be all three.

Brothers in the most meaningful sense of the word.

Fellow Americans in your passionate and unanimous insistence that the fundamental rights of our citizenship will not be torn from us by greedy and despotic bureaucrats.

And, deeply cherished friends.

Well, frankly, during the 37 years I have had the honor of being a member of the National Association of Letter Carriers I have been blessed with constant assurances of your friendship. I have rejoiced in this; I have even exulted in it. But never in all those years have I been permitted to experience such a manifestation of affection and friendship as I was shown this morning in this hall.

Even if there had been the time to address you this morning I would not have been able to do so. The emotions were bubbling up too close to the surface. Eloquence or even articulate expression would have been impossible. I am not entirely certain that articulate expression is possible now.

So, let me preface my remarks this afternoon by saying, from a heart overbrimming with humility and devotion: Thank you for being what you are, the greatest human beings that God ever made.

It is a new experience for me to stand before you as one accused of a violation of the Federal laws which govern this great land of ours.

If there were a scintilla of truth in the charges preferred against me it would be an unpleasant experience. But, considering the source of those mendacious charges, and considering the reasons behind those charges, I consider the accusation a compliment, a distinction, a proof of my loyalty, my integrity, and my devotion to my country and to every letter carrier in the United States.

And, if this is a new experience for me, it is also a new experience for the U.S. Government.

For, never before in our Nation's history has a Cabinet officer stooped so low in an attempt to achieve personal revenge.

Never before, to my knowledge, has a Cabinet officer wallowed so shamelessly in the slime of personal animosity.

Never before, to my knowledge, has a Cabinet officer attempted to appease his wounded vanity by attempting to pervert the Federal laws, and even one of the quasi-judicial bodies of government, into instruments of personal retribution and persecution.

And, have no fear, my friends, we shall triumph over this vicious attack upon our civil rights. We shall win, even if we have to carry our plea for justice all the way to the highest legal tribunal in the land, the U.S. Supreme Court.

During the 8 years he has served as Postmaster General, Arthur E. Summerfield has been responsible for some notable firsts. Some of these firsts have been highly commendable. But, in the perspective of objective judgment, they will be blotted from the pages of postal history by other firsts which shall live only in infamy.

Arthur E. Summerfield is the first Postmaster General in history to induce four Presidential vetoes of postal pay bills.

He is the first Postmaster General in history to canonize the accountant, and to give complete precedence to statistics and financial statements over the rights and the needs of human beings.

And, now, Arthur Summerfield is the first Postmaster General in modern times to try to make the suppression of free speech a way of life in the Postal Establishment of the United States. He is the first Postmaster General in modern times to consider honest disagreement an act of subversion and the exercise of a man's sacred constitutional rights, a Federal offense.

To me, and to you, those constitutional rights are sacred. When someone attempts to lay a despoiling hand on them, that amounts to an attempt to rip apart the very fabric of our American freedom.

There is no group of individuals more patriotic than the letter carriers of the United States. There is no group which takes the obligations of citizenship more seriously or with more passionate intensity.

There is nothing in the Hatch Act or any other Federal law which holds that a letter carrier must give up his citizenship, with all its rights and obligations, when he joins the Federal service. If there were such a provision, this hall would be empty today since citizenship is dearer to us than any job could possibly be, and nothing in the way of reward or compensation would ever induce us to forego our basic rights under the Constitution so nobly conceived by our Founding Fathers.

Certainly Arthur E. Summerfield is the first Postmaster General to seek to deny those rights not so much on the grounds of partisan political activity on the part of the intended victim, but because of his own partisan political prejudices.

These are the firsts which cry out to heaven for justice, and which will blot the pages of the Summerfield administration with indelible shame.

When I compare the philosophy of this administration with that of previous administrations, I know whereof I speak. As you all know I have written a book, "Mailman, U.S.A.," which is being published officially today. It is a book for letter carriers and about letter carriers and it tells, with all the frankness I possess, the whole grim and exciting story of our long fight to achieve economic equality despite the oppression and suppression of various postal administrations.

There have been some excellent Postmasters General during those years. Not enough of them, it is true, but some. There have been some Postmaster Generals who were mediocre, and there have been some who have been beyond belief and almost beyond the human limits of forgiveness.

During the 19 years that I have had the honor of serving as your President, we have come a long way together, you and I.

I do not say this through any sense of vain glory. We of the National Association of Letter Carriers are a team, the most glorious team of its kind in any comparable field of endeavor in or out of Government. What has been accomplished so far has been accomplished through teamwork, through the combined and exquisitely integrated efforts of your national officers, your State, district, and branch officers, and of every single member of the association. No one person could have done it; no small group could have done it. This required the hard work and the selfless dedication of every letter carrier in the country and every member of their families.

But, you know, during these past 19 years we have been, as it were, climbing a mountain together, with our eyes directed steadfastly at the snowcapped summit of ultimate achievement. We have been concentrating solely on the distance still to be traveled, rather than on the distance we have traveled thus far. So, today, at this convention, for just a few moments before resuming our journey upward, let us imagine for a moment that we have reached a kind of ledge on our mountainside, and as we catch our collective breath, let us cast our eye back over the distance we have already traveled.

On September 6, 1941, when I stood before you and took the oath of office for the first time as your national president, there were fewer than 68,000 members of the NALC. As of today we have more than doubled that figure. We have almost 140,000 members in almost 5,500 branches located in every corner of the land.

In 1941 regular letter carriers were receiving a minimum of $1,700 a year and a maximum salary of $2,100 a year. Worse than that, there had not been a single postal pay raise in 16 years.

For those of you too young to remember, those were hungry years. Those were 16 years of famine and hardship and suffering for letter carriers and for their families.

In the 19 years since that time there have been nine postal pay raises.

Today, thanks to our magnificent friends in the Congress of the United States (many of whom will be here at this convention), we are now receiving a minimum of $4,345 a year and a maximum of $5,605 a year, an increase in pay of more than 250 percent.

In 1941 substitute letter carriers were receiving 65 cents an hour. (Well do I remember that statistic, as well as the day it came into being. The legislation which raised the wage of substitutes to 65 cents was signed into law by President Coolidge on February 23, 1925, 5 days after I, as a substitute carrier in the Cincinnati Post Office, was joined in holy matrimony to my beloved wife.)

As a result of our crusade for economic equality, substitute letter carriers today receive a minimum of $2.16 an hour and a maximum of $2.78. That represents an increase of considerably more than 400 percent.

As you know, I am the last person on earth to claim that letter carriers are receiving adequate payment for the work they perform. But, we have once more advanced within rifleshot of economic parity, and, certainly we have come a long, long way along the economic road since 1941.

But, just as man does not live by bread alone, so we who are in the postal establishment should not count our blessings solely in terms of salary.

Mind you, I'm not minimizing the importance of money. God forbid. But, nonetheless, there have been many other advances during the past 19 years which are not directly connected with your wages, but which have made the job more pleasant and which have made the future more secure.

I would like to list, for the record, just a few.

Uniform allowances. (You all know what a struggle it was to achieve this. The allowance is not nearly large enough, but the principle has been established and the passage of this legislation in 1955 was one of the most wholesome things that ever happened to us.)

The health benefits law of 1959.

The terrifically improved retirement and compensation laws which affect us all.

And, a particular project of my own, our additional annual and sick leave provisions.

This is just a partial list of achievements. But, let me say this in no uncertain terms.

Each one of these improvements was earned through hard work, hard fighting and hard thinking. Not a single one was given to us. If postal management had been allowed to have its way, not a single one of these improvements would have come into being.

And let me say one other thing.

Not a single one of these improvements would have come into being if it had not been for the strength, the courage, the vision and the energy of the National Association of Letter Carriers.

We, and by we I mean you and I and all your officers, spearheaded each fight and implemented each victory.

We did it each time in the past just as we did it in 1960 through our successful and glorious victories in the crusade for economic equality and in operation override.

Oh certainly there were others who took the bows after all the votes were counted and who made expansive claims as to what they had achieved. But, you know and I know who did the work, who got the job done, the National Association of Letter Carriers.

But, that is enough of retrospection. In this business we cannot afford the luxury of basking too long in the warm glow of self-congratulation.

There is always the future; we must never lose sight of the fact, we must never stop planning to face the problems and enigmas that lie ahead.

We have, if you will, hacked out for ourselves a sizable clearing in the forest. We can live and breathe and move in that clearing, but we must never lose sight of the fact that the bureacratic jungle which surrounds us is always proliferating and awaits the opportunity to engulf us.

So, in these final moments of this talk, let us direct our eyes upward to that snow-capped summit called ultimate achievement.

What are the principal obstacles which lie in our way before we can implant the pennant of victory in its virgin snows?

Of course, there is the continuing problem of pay. This is a problem that will always be with us and one that will never be forgotten or ignored.

Second, restoration of multiple deliveries wherever needed. We all know that there can be no meaningful or permanent improvement in the postal service until this is accomplished. The 10 years since April 17, 1950, when Postmaster General raped the postal service by curtailing deliveries, have been a decade of decadence in the postal establishment. The only way we can make the next 10 years a decade of dynamism is to get the service restored.

Third, union recognition. This is an absolute must, not only insofar as our own development is concerned, but it should be, also, insofar as the Department, the service, and the public welfare are concerned.

Fourth, increased annuities and health benefits for retired postal employees. This is a vital step in our march to ultimate achievement.

Fifth, the creation and development of a modern, continuing, and comprehensive public relations program which would bring home to every American citizen the importance and the problems of the postal service and of those who work in that service.

Sixth, limitation of the areas of activity of the postal inspection service.

Several years ago I wrote an editorial in the Postal Record entitled "Back to the Coop, Inspectors." I meant every word of that editorial and I mean every word of it today.

Inspectors are not management. They should be prevented from interfering in the management of post offices and postal operations.

Inspectors are policemen. They are in some ways the equivalent of bank examiners. Their influence and activity should be restricted to these fields exclusively.

I do not want to take up too much time on this subject. I have a lot to say about it in "Mailman, U.S.A." and I sincerely hope you will read it carefully and take it to heart. The entire future development of the postal service depends upon the restriction of the Inspection Service to its true functions. For too many years they have laid on the postal service the cold, dead hand of reaction. That hand must be removed before we can ever give the American people truly modern service. You cannot have a 20th century service if you continue to have 19th century managers.

And, lastly, we must, we shall amalgamate all the postal unions into one big union.

We have been patient. Perhaps we have been too patient.

We have seen, time after time, the clever and coldblooded conniving of certain departmental officials in playing upon the traditional craft jealousies of our fine postal unions in order to divide and conquer us.

And, frankly, we have seen, too often, some other postal organizations who have been riding to legislative victories on our coattails, yielding to the pressure of such jealously and attempting to knife us in the back while still clinging desperately to those coattails.

This is silly. It is wasteful. It is inefficient. If continued it could be disastrous to our hopes.

There is no room in the postal union movement for craft jealously or for any other divisive element.

We all share the same objectives. We all share the same idealism.

The laws which govern us come from the same department and the same committees of the Congress.

In one big postal union each craft and each group would receive equal representation and fair treatment. There would be no submersion of interests, no loss of identity, no compromise of ideals and objectives. But there would be strength; there would be power; there would be unanimity; there would be intelligent consolidation of effort.

Every step we take on our long climb upward is complicated by the diversity of postal organizations, the complexity of union operations which exist today. We must cleanse ourselves of jealousies; we must rid ourselves of unnecessary complications and impediments.

Ever since the earliest days of this century postal union leaders have talked about the pooling of our organizational interests into one big union.

The constitution and bylaws of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, in its second article, has insisted for 50 years that the objective of their organization is to fold all postal workers into one organization.

I say the time has come to stop talking and to start acting. The time is now.

We shall move forward in this area and we shall continue to move forward until we do have a single massive, harmonious and powerful union of postal employees, working with consolidated effectiveness toward a common goal.

So, brothers, fellow Americans, friends, we come to the end of this discourse.

We have come a long way together, we have a long way still ahead of us.

As we gather here today we can see before us a land of unlimited promise, a land of no horizons.

We have conquered in the past the powerful administrative forces which have sought to prevent our passage into that promised land.

We shall conquer these pernicious administrative forces which seek to impede us today.

We shall inherit that promised land because that land is ours. Nothing will prevent the progress of justice and decency and the God-given inheritance of honest endeavor.

So let us rededicate ourselves today to the task ahead. Let us lift up our eyes. Let us march into that bright and singing land and let us march into it hand in hand, and together. From the bottom of my heart, thank you and God bless each and every one of you.

The Anatomy of Cold War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the history of man's progress continues to reveal that, even in a changing world, one of the basic laws of life is that of self-preservation.

Today, we in the free world—as well as the so-called neutral or uncommitted nations—are faced with a severe test to our survival.

Communism day-by-day extends its tentacles—ideological, economic, military—overtly and covertly, in every direction in which it meets no, or too little, resistance.

Technological progress—epitomized in jet power and missiles—has diminished time and space between both friendly countries and those with ideological differences. Recognizing the influences which such power has upon world thinking, the Communists continue to attempt to utilize rocket-missile threats as influence.

To counter the military threat to security, we have developed great jet-nuclear-missile prowess—second to none in the world.

With the resultant military standoff, however, we cannot expect that everything else will be safe and secure. To the contrary, we must develop among our people a knowledge of the widely diversified tactics by which the Communists plan to conquer the world.

Years ago, Nikolai Lenin—the dogmatist of the Communist philosophy—stated:

First, we will take Eastern Europe. Next, the masses of Asia. Then we shall encircle the last bastion of capitalism, the United States of America. We will not have to attack. It will fall like an overripe fruit into our hands.

Today, we find that the Communist policies—adopting variations of the Leninist theme—are aimed at carrying out these objectives. To counter such a thrust, we—of the free world—not only need to be prepared militarily, but also ideologically and spiritually to meet and effectively counter this offensive.

Recently, the San Diego Union, of San Diego, Calif., published a special report, "Communism: The Clear and Present Danger." A crystallization of major factors we must face in the ideological battle with communism was contained in an article entitled, "The Anatomy of Cold War." Among other things, it reemphasizes that only by knowing communism, its goals and tactics, can we effectively stop the outspreading of this ideology and preserve freedom. At this time, I ask unanimous consent to have this informative article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Diego Union, Aug. 21, 1960]

THE ANATOMY OF COLD WAR

The cold war is more than a political phrase. It's a reality, and potentially decisive skirmishes are being fought right now, today, this moment. It's as close as a short jet run, measured in geographic terms. Cuba is only 90 miles from the United States. Since the admission of Alaska, the Soviet Union itself is less than 50 miles from our own borders. Over the pole by subsonic jet, Moscow is 7 hours to New York or Detroit. San Francisco is 30 minutes' missile time from Kamchatka Peninsula. San Diego is 20 minutes from a missile-bearing submarine 500 miles at sea.

But the important characteristic of the cold war is not the physical threat, great as that may be.

What is important is that this war could be won without a single shot. It could be won by encirclement—to the point where the United States is helpless. It could be won by nibbling at our own strength and that of our allies—to the point where we and they are exhausted. It could be won by the invisible softening attack—to the point where an entire nation is brainwashed into believing surrender is proper and regimentation is good.

The Communist threat, like disease, knows no international boundaries. It can—and is intended to—take its toll from within. Within means within the United States as well as within our alliances.

Three facts are vital to understanding Communist strategy. If you don't recognize them, much that happens in today's world will appear all but inexplicable.

Fact No. 1 is the nature of the Communist's prime target. It is not any geographical area. It is the human mind. Communist dogma acknowledges that the only lasting conquest is the conquest of the human spirit. If you conquer a man's spirit, you don't have to fight with him physically.

Fact No. 2 is the nature of the Communist's political tactics. Perhaps of all the things about the cold war, this is the most difficult for the average American to realize, for most of us have been reared in a climate of Anglo-Saxon and Roman law, melded with American frontier and British Victorian concepts of fairness, playing the game. The Communist does not achieve his objectives by normal partisan politics. No Marxist believes in nor accepts open debate and free elections.

When the Communist pays lipservice to democracy and people's republics, he is indulging in an ironic twist of words. Communist dogma has no abiding faith in the people. It states repeatedly that a proletarian elite must make decisions for the people. What Americans and Western allies understand as constitutional and democratic processes are regarded by the Communist as unrealistic.

Realism is permitting a display purporting to be a popular choice only after the election, the cabinet change, the court ruling has been rigged. The Communist only bets on a sure thing, and his tactics are designed to bring that sure thing about. Method doesn't matter.

Fact No. 3 is the nature of Communist timing. The Commnists are playing for keeps, and they are willing to take as much time as necessary, fluctuating with the immediate times whenever it is expedient.

They have alternated between talk of peace and war since the end of World War II, depending upon what best suited the long-range Communist objective—complete domination of the earth. In fact, the only area in the world today that is not a war zone, from a Communist's viewpoint, is Soviet Russia and her satellites. This area covering one-sixth of the earth's land mass is already under Communist control.

Related to this fact of a "protracted struggle" is the very nature of democratic processes. Free choice through free institutions after free discussion can function properly only in a climate of order. The Communists recognize this and go to practically any lengths to maintain a worldwide climate of disorder, violence, and unrest.

This helps explain their jamming of allied broadcasts, their demonstrations in Caracas, Tokyo, and Leopoldville, their barrage of publications into unsettled areas like Latin America, Southeast Asia, and Africa.

Mao Tse-tung, ruler of Communist China, is fond of quoting an ancient Chinese militarist, Sun Tzu, who lived in 500 B.C. Sun wrote: "To fight and conquer in all your battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting." Mao, in his own "strategic problems of China's revolutionary war," quotes Sun again: "Avoid the enemy when he is full of dash, and strike him when he withdraws exhausted." But perhaps the most pointed is this one, quoted by Mao: "Make a noise in the east, but strike in the west."

Colloquy Between Former Congressman Murdock of Arizona and Congressman Toby Morris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOBY MORRIS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. MORRIS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert a recent colloquy between former Congressman Murdock of Arizona and me.

Mr. John R. Murdock is truly a gentleman and a scholar. He holds an AB and a master's degree, and the Arizona State University recently in 1960 conferred upon him the honorary degree of doctor of law. He is eminently worthy of these honors.

Mr. Murdock served 16 years as an outstanding member of the U.S. House of Representatives and was chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in the 82d Congress, during the years 1951 and 1952. He was a great chairman, respected and beloved by all his colleagues.

He has studied, worked, and effectively pushed forward many important bills and programs for the benefit of his beloved State of Arizona and for our entire Nation. For over 40 years he has given intense study and consideration to many matters of public interest and importance, and particularly to Colorado River water problems. He has become and remains one of the greatest authorities in regard to water problems, in the West, and is an outstanding specialist on the great Colorado River and its tributaries.

I am honored and my life has been enlightened and enriched in associating with and in having served on that great committee with him. I herewith set out our colloquy relative to some of the matters with which we dealt:

Congressman MORRIS. In the closing session of the 86th Congress I'd like to get a few statements from you, Mr. Murdock, of mutual interest for the record. What do you think, would you answer some questions?

Chairman MURDOCK. Yes, Judge; gladly if I may ask you some. I agree with you that we should briefly summarize some high points of our long cooperation in Congress, our many joint activities, what comes to your mind as most significant?

Congressman MORRIS. Well, that was my question. I notice you call me Judge. I am proud of that title as a former district judge.

Chairman MURDOCK. Yes, Judge; our many activities together in Congress have been varied. Sometimes they have been regarded as of minor importance, little noticed by the public press. Sometimes they have been strenuously hectic and were spread all over the country by a section of the press, as, for instance, Arizona's struggle with California over water from the Colorado River.

Congressman MORRIS. I well remember parts of that struggle and am proud of the part we played in it, but that is a long story and I fear we could not brief it. What are those apparently "minor" things you mentioned? Perhaps they were not so "minor"?

Chairman MURDOCK. By that I was thinking of the "seed" we placed in the fertile soil of American social and industrial life from which we hoped for great future growth. I like to think of those bills we introduced and hearings we held as "little acorns from which mighty oaks may grow," perhaps long after we are gone. To name a few bills and hearings and only a few: (1) Your bill for rehabilitation of the Navajo and Hopi Indians; (2) my bill and hearings on Dr. Percy Thomas' power proposal; (3) my hearings on several so-called salt-water bills.

Congressman MORRIS. During the 81st and 82d Congresses you and I worked together on several matters of legislation pertaining to the great West. Since then I have gone to other House committees and have not kept full track of the results of our former united efforts. Will you bring me up to date on the most important results of our legislative measures?

Chairman MURDOCK. Yes, Judge, you and I did work as a team, and I believe effectively—during the 4 years 1949, 1950, 1951, and 1952—I as chairman of the House Public Lands Committee and later of the House Interior Committee, and you as a member of that committee and as chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee on numerous bills and proposals. I shall never cease to be grateful for your energetic leadership, especially on Indian bills. So far as action in the House is concerned I am giving you full credit for the enactment of the Navajo-Hopi rehabilitation bill which authorized a $90 million project for those two tribes of Indians in northern Arizona over a 10-year period. Of course there were other measures, too, on which we cooperated. Naturally I was greatly concerned about Indian water problems—on which you helped very much. Water for the vast Navajo Reservation was one of a dozen pressing problems for those Indians which you handled admirably. That $90 million authorization for a 10-year period has come nearer being fully implemented by later appropriations than an optimistic prophet might have prophesied—probably thanks to Senator CARL HAYDEN—and it is a delight to see what improvement has resulted on that big reservation for present and unborn generations.

Congressman MORRIS. It is pleasant to hear you say that, even if exaggerated. I do remember the subcommittee trips to the West and hearings held at Window Rock and farther West, and especially our hearing at Phoenix and our trip to the Papago and the Pima Reservations. I shall never forget Phoenix and its fine Indian school.

THE NAVAJO SHOULD HAVE A FUTURE

Chairman MURDOCK. Before leaving the Navajo, you will remember that we crossed the reservations from Window Rock to Tuba City, and then turned south to cross the Little Colorado River at Cameron. We stopped to get our evening meal at that trading post and I told you then that the suspension bridge at that place was not the only unique thing about that typical western stream—that the canyon river itself, especially the stream's physical possibilities from Cameron 50-odd miles toward the west to the main Colorado River could be an important theme for a whole book of facts, and also another whole book of plausible prophesies. I have given many years of close study to that unique stream—the Little Colorado River in northern Arizona—and you have helped me.

Congressman MORRIS. I remember the suspension bridge way out on the Navajo Desert, but cannot recall much mention of the Little Colorado in our hearings. Oh yes, you wanted a silt control dam, called the Coconino Dam, on the Little Colorado River, which was about the only thing the Californians didn't object to. Is that significant?

Chairman MURDOCK. Yes, as I see it that is very significant, but the Coconino Dam on the Little Colorado is only a starter on that tributary. Turning from the larger question of water in a thirsty land, with all its intricate and agonizing phases of infighting of States and communities to divide a limited supply, as you have suggested, I want to tell you how you helped me without knowing it on an important development that hasn't happened yet, but must happen in some form in the future. Do you remember in 1952 two hearings—one a small subcommittee hearing at which you were present, and the other a full-fledged hearing September 19, 1951—recorded and printed—at which Dr. Percy Thomas and three other high authorities from the Interior Department and the Federal Power Commission stated the proposal of Dr. Percy Thomas to make a highly modern use of windpower? This was especially for conserving water for hydroelectric power production throughout the West.

Congressman MORRIS. Yes, I remember Dr. Percy Thomas and his model powerplants. I was enlightened and amazed at what those men said about possible power that can be obtained from variable and changing winds, as they contrasted their proposals with our well-known small windmills on the farms. How did that help you? Has anything been done with it?

Chairman MURDOCK. No. Not yet. Dr. Thomas at that time was an elderly man, retired after many fruitful years in a department in Government service. He is now deceased. You helped me—in spite of your first doubts about the usefulness of fluctuating and changing winds—by giving me sympathetic support at that first hearing so that I called a full hearing September 19, 1951, in spite of the ridicule which I expected from some committee members. But even the three California members of the committee, who always strained themselves to take a dim view of any proposals of mine touching water, sat up and took notice. The one member most connected with power said: "Sounds good if it works." Well, I am more

and more convinced that on the Little Colorado watershed it would work. That is a great prospect for the future, requiring a book to picture it.

Congressman MORRIS. John, I once heard you say that if you could have your way you would lift the face of northern Arizona. What did you mean by that? From what I've seen nature has already done that.

Chairman MURDOCK. It was a brief way of my saying that I thought man could work with nature in changing the topography of Eastern Coconino County, Ariz., containing the lower 50 miles of the Little Colorado River. It has taken millions of years of running water to carve the canyons of that tributary. I would stop that running water and let nature reverse the process of cutting those deep wrinkles on the face of the land and smooth them out instead. That would be the effect if that part of the Little Colorado Basin could be made into what the geologists call a "closed basin."

Congressman MORRIS. Just what do you mean by "closed basin"? I should think that only nature could do that.

Chairman MURDOCK. Yes, we have numerous "closed basins" in the West which have no drainage or outlets of their waters to the sea. If those great volcanoes north of Flagstaff thousands of years ago had spit out a few more millions of tons of molten lava into the mouth of the Little Colorado it would have accomplished in short order what, I think, man should accomplish through many future years. That would mean sealing off the Little Colorado tributary from the main Colorado River, and that would make its lower basin in effect a "closed basin."

Congressman MORRIS. Would not that destroy the scenic canyons in that part of Coconino County?

Chairman MURDOCK. Well, yes, eventually, but Coconino County has canyons to spare with several hundred miles of such within the Grand Canyon National Park of mile-deep canyons, which are greater by far than the canyons that I would let nature fill up during the next 1,000 years. This stopping of erosion and filling up the canyons on that tributary stream would make feasible one phase of Dr. Percy Thomas' power proposal and, in my judgment, is basic to the water conservation work needed on that watershed.

BEGINNINGS OF SALT-WATER BILLS

Congressman MORRIS. John, when you mentioned salt-water bills you were getting close to one of my greatest interests. What can you remind us that is both pertinent and interesting?

Chairman MURDOCK. One interesting fact to me is that California Congressmen took an early lead in introducing the so-called salt-water bills. Three Members from San Diego, alone, while I was in Congress, introduced such bills, and those Members were from both major political parties. It doesn't take much reasoning to figure out why that was so. On the other hand, some California Members shied away from such bills—and thereby hangs a tale which is too long to tell here.

Congressman MORRIS. Didn't you hold the first hearing on such a salt-water bill in the House about 10 years ago relative to "sweetening," taking the salinity out of salt water?

Congressman MURDOCK. To the best of my knowledge that is correct. It was on August 29, 1950, and you were present and participating. At that time I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation, but the next year I was chairman of the full Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and I as such, backed the legislation which was passed in 1952. I was officially responsible.

In fact, the very fast of my efforts in Congress was to work for the meager appropriation to implement the salt-water bill we had just passed. After midnight of the last full day of the 82d Congress I remember saying to Congressman GEORGE MAHON and Congressman ALBERT THOMAS of Texas—what they already knew and had probably said to me—"The man or set of men who can treat sea water, or saline waters, effectively, and cheaply, will have performed a greater service for mankind than the man or set of men who split the atom." On the following Tuesday, July 8, 1952 I was thanked by Secretary Oscar Chapman for my help on his pet salt-water bill.

Pardon me, Judge, for monopolizing the time on this topic, but I know your interest in it and activities on it and commend them. What a sturdy "oak" this "acorn" has become in 10 years under the fostering care of several western Senators—not now a meager $100,000 appropriation and no pilot plant, as 10 years ago, but now four big pilot plants—located on Atlantic coast, gulf coast, Pacific coast and one in the interior, with millions to finance them, as should be. While this "acorn" through 10 years has become a "sturdy oak," it is still only a sapling. What is it destined to become in the future of our Nation?

Congressman MORRIS. How well satisfied are you with our work together in the 81st and 82d Congresses on the matters we have here briefly discussed?

Chairman MURDOCK. On these three items I am more than satisfied. To change the figure of speech from the acorn and the oak, I truly feel that you and I have presided at the laying of legislative "corner stones" of three magnificent superstructures, the building of which will require years and generations to finish. The designs, though dim, are subject to change, and improvement with greater knowledge and wisdom than we posssessed. These superstructures are certain to be useful to the fast growing State of Arizona and the Nation through a long future.

Peril in Connally Reservation Repeal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE

OF GEORGIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, one of the most penetrating analyses of the basic considerations involved in proposals to repeal the Connally reservation to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice is found in the column by the able and respected journalist, George E. Sokolsky, printed in today's issue of the Washington Post. Mr. Sokolsky correctly points up the vast differences between American judicial concepts and safeguards and those which prevail in other nations and convincingly concluded that to place the United States under the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court would be to make of it "a perfect target for weak and backward nations." I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of Mr. Sokolsky's column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 29, 1960]

THESE DAYS—THE CONNALLY RESERVATION

(By George E. Sokolsky)

When the house of delegates of the American Bar Association meets here this week, one of the questions before it will be the Connally reservation. Of course, the American Bar Association is not the Congress and its determination will be obiter dicta, but it will be influential. The lawyers will understand what a reservation means and that is more than many who favor its discontinuance grasp. Great Britain and France have stronger reservations than we have and there is no movement in those countries to revoke their reservations.

At issue is only one question: Does the World Court or the United States decide what is a domestic question within the United States? The continuance or repeal of the Connally reservation raises no other question. It does not withdraw our membership from the International Court of Justice. It does not lessen our interest in adjudicating international questions by juridical rather than military decision.

Those who favor the removal of the reservation believe that the peace of the world can best be assured if all nations accept the World Court as the final arbiter of international issues. If the world were different than it happens to be, this could be the best device for reducing or avoiding wars.

There are now 82 members of the World Court. The membership will increase. Many of the members represent Soviet states and other anti-Western bodies. There are 15 judges in this court, no two from any one country.

It will take many years before the Court can work out a system of international jurisprudence that will not be based on local custom and tradition, but on written legislation. Meanwhile, we must maintain this one little safeguard, the Connally reservation, to protect ourselves. The statute of the Court is a surprisingly ambiguous document. For instance, it deals with general principles of law as recognized by civilized nations.

What is a civilized nation? If Great Britain, the United States and Canada are civilized, are France, Soviet Russia and Saudi Arabia civilized? The systems of jurisprudence of these countries are not identical nor do they have a common source. Until there is an agreement as to which law is to prevail or if a new law is to prevail, how can any major nation leave its national security to a majority vote among representatives of nations who require obedience?

For instance, an American judge is not regarded as a traitor to his country if he renders a decision against it. Actually, in this country, we have a court of claims for precisely that purpose.

Imagine bringing before a court which makes decisions by a majority of those present, such a question as the seizure of American property in Cuba or the beating up of Canadian officials in the Congo. Only 14 nations have ever accepted the compulsory jurisdiction for a fixed period; without the Connally reservation, the United States would accept such compulsory jurisdiction for a fixed period on all subjects. The United States, as the leading country on earth, would be a perfect target for the weak and backward nations.

The real peril to the United States lies in the Asian-African bloc of nations which is playing for opportunity for growth. Out of 82 members, 29 are in the Asian-African bloc. It is expected that this number will increase to 43. The day is not far distant when such a group can be a majority in the United Nations and that a majority of the judges on the World Court be of the Asian-African group. Can we afford, in the present circumstances, to risk that?

A Monolog of Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGUERITE STITT CHURCH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am proud to insert in the RECORD the amazing and inspiring story of Dwight D. Guilfoil, Jr., who was named Outstanding Physically Handicapped American of the Year. The article, entitled "A Monolog of Courage," contains the remarks of Mr. Mark Evans before the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped, held in Washington, D.C., on May 5 and 6, 1960:

A MONOLOG OF COURAGE

(Remarks of Mr. Mark Evans, vice president, Metropolitan Broadcasting Co., before the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped Washington, D.C., May 5 and 6, 1960)

"This is your life," says Ralph Edwards on television.

The life we're talking about today is not your life or my life. It is our life. It belongs to all of us here in this departmental auditorium; to all the men and women and children walking in the sunshine this May morning, or in school, or going about the housework, or doing whatever men and women and children happen to do before lunch on a morning in spring.

When a life gives us a little inspiration; when it gives us a little extra grace note of hope and courage to meet our daily problems; when it makes us feel just a little better—that life no longer is the exclusive property of one person, its owner.

It becomes a part of the public domain, as the lawyers say. It has no copyright. Copy from it freely, if its lesson will help you.

"This is your life."

It begins in Evanston, Ill., on November 19, 1922.

Or does it? When does life begin? With the first squawl from that tiny squirming red body in the hospital maternity ward? With the mixtures of genes and chromosomes? With parents? Grandparents? Adam and Eve?

What about the owner of this life? In his soul you could find traces of his father, his father's father. Both were heroes.

You can read about the father in the military archives of the United States; how he built bridges under scathing fire during the Meuse-Argonne battle. Do any of you remember how far back that was?

His father's father was a captain of the Iowa Militia in the Civil War. He was killed in action in the Battle of Vicksburg.

And this little fellow, the owner of the life we're looking at today, what about him?

He was an artist. Even as a little shaver, crayoning pictures on the living room wall, he was an artist. And when he got a little bigger, and turned to using paper and torn-apart shopping bags for his artistic endeavors, his folks would marvel—"This kid has talent."

But little shavers have a way of turning into big shavers, and pretty soon this fellow was in school. Lane Technical High School in Chicago, and then thoughts of college. Or for him, something better than college.

The Chicago Art Institute—a dignified building with high pillars, standing in front of Lake Michigan—offered him a scholarship. He studied art.

Two happy events after he graduated. One was that he landed a fine job as a commercial artist. The other was that he landed a charming young lady named Margaret Cullerton, and married her.

So life was sunny for this young man. A good paycheck. A loving wife to help him spend it. And just as a guarantee against having a few bucks left over before the next payday youngsters started to come.

But life wasn't so sunny on the other side of the world. Hitler and his sidekick Mussolini in Europe and Tojo out in the Pacific had some mighty ambitious plans to carve up this globe among themselves. Attack. Invasion. Destruction. Then, that bitter morning of December 7, 1941—Pearl Harbor. War.

Came September of 1942, and this young fellow kissed his wife and kiddies goodby and enlisted in the Army Air Force, a private.

"Off we go, into the wild blue yonder."

Yes, off he went into the skies, an aerial photographer. They didn't keep him a private for long. Three months in service, and they handed him three stripes and made him a sergeant.

And then, 1 year after his enlistment, it happened. He wasn't feeling well. He went to the hospital. The doctors didn't smile. Neither did they pull any punches. They let him have it straight. Spinal meningitis. And infantile paralysis.

Two years in the Army-Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark. Two years of trying to get off your back, trying to pull yourself up from the bed with whatever muscles you have left; of trying to shove senseless legs from the bed to the wheelchair; of trying, trying, trying.

Then, one fine day the wheelchair rolled out the front door of the hospital. He was discharged. He was a paraplegic.

What to do? I'll tell you one thing he did not do—sit around, feeling sorry for himself. He tried freelancing as a commercial artist for a couple of years, but frankly, it wasn't easy. The competition is tough.

Then he put his talent as an artist in mothballs and took out another of his many skills—accounting. He joined the Veterans' Administration Insurance Office in Chicago as a fiscal accountant.

But this man didn't have his mind on his work. At least not all of it. He had an idea. A business of his own. A dream? Perhaps. Not just another business, but something special. A business that would give other handicapped people a break. People like himself.

He started talking it up. Here and there ears perked up. Before he knew it, he was the general of a very exclusive army of 60 other paraplegics, all of them bitten by his enthusiasms; all of them raring to go.

This was a "put up or shut up" proposition—and these men put up. Every penny they could scrape together. Every cent they could go in hock for.

And so it was born: Paraplegics Manufacturing Co.

A one-story factory building; its address, Franklin Park, Ill., a suburb of sprawling Chicago.

Our friend started out as treasurer of the company. Then executive vice president. Then they named him president and chairman of the board of directors.

Right from the beginning, he had some very definite ideas about how to run the plant. Listen:

"We decided from the start" (he's speaking now) "that we were not going to weave rugs or make baskets, or indulge in any of the usual sheltered workshop enterprises."

The firm held to it. Instead, it got into one of the roughest, toughest, most highly competitive areas imaginable. It became an assembler of mechanical, electrical, and electronic parts.

It would be nice to report that money poured in. It didn't. The young firm struggled. It lost ground a couple of years. Then, around 1955, things started to improve. For the last several years, the company has been in the black—way in the black. It has been paying dividends on its stock—but don't ask your broker for any. The employees hold most of it.

Volume of business? Now $750,000 a year. It might, it just might, hit a cool, even million bucks by the end of this year.

Secret of success? There's no secret. Our friend is quite insistent on that score. But pin him down and you'll get these answers:

Hustling does it. And high quality of workmanship. And doing a better job than your competitors. And paying your workers an honest wage, at least as high as they'd pull down elsewhere.

There's no other way, there's no shortcut to Shangri La—particularly for the handicapped. Here's our friend, speaking again:

"Handicapped workers can and must compete in today's mechanized industry—to bring themselves a full measure of self-respect and self-sufficiency."

Is this the whole story of why we are honoring a life here this morning? Far from it. This is just chapter 1. Let me give you the chapter headings of the rest of the book.

President and founder of the Valiant Development Association. This is a private housing development for the disabled. Or rather, it will be soon; it's still in the planning stage.

President of the Paralyzed Veterans of America—a small veterans' organization as veterans' organizations go; but a respected one. When it speaks—you listen.

You fathers who think you deserve a medal because you stay home Saturday afternoons to mind the baby while your wife goes shopping—you hear this:

The man whose life we're dissecting today has seven children, a motherless nephew and a mother-in-law. With that crowd in his house, he still managed to keep calm, collected, and pleasant enough to have been chosen Chicago Father of the Year, several years ago.

He was selected as "Mr. Illinois" in 1957.

He was named one of the outstanding young Chicagoans of 1957 by the Chicago Junior Chamber of Commerce.

The same year, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce selected him as one of the 10 outstanding young men of the United States.

He received the "Human Relations Award" in 1958 from the Dale Carnegie Clubs International.

He was given certificates of merit by the Disabled American Veterans and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

If he paid dues to all the organizations he belongs to, he wouldn't be able to buy shoes for the kids. Luckily, most of them don't charge dues: President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped; Illinois Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped; Industrial Relations Committee of the Illinois Manufacturers Association; Elks; Air Force Association; National Rehabilitation Association; Illinois Commission To Investigate Hospitalization of Paraplegics; Knights of Columbus; Illinois Small Business Committee; many, many more.

This is the life of a man who has been living not for himself; not for his wife and seven kids and nephew and mother-in-law alone; not for the hundred-or-so handicapped men and women who now work at the Paraplegic Manufacturing Co.—but for all the handicapped of this world; for all, whom he considers his brothers and sisters.

This is the life of a man who seems to have been put on this globe to dispense hope to those who need it so much.

This is the life of a man, with all his courage and drive, has never forgotten that he is in the service of a Higher Being; the God of all mankind; a churchgoer each Sunday, even if he does have to take his children in two shifts, since they won't all fit in the car at once.

This is the life of a man who, appropriately and rightly and justly, has been named Handicapped American of the Year—and who is here today to receive his rightful honors.

This is your life, Dwight D. Guilfoil, Jr., Handicapped American of the Year. This is your life.

Cutting Juvenile Delinquency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, we are hearing more every day about juvenile delinquency. The United Nations has recently held a conference on the subject. On this subject as on few others, the United States and the Soviet delegate were able to agree on the need for action in eliminating the problem.

The town of Cohoes, N.Y., has devised one answer. A plan for making well-behaved youngsters honorary members of the police force has had the effect of cutting delinquency in half. The boys themselves welcome the sense of responsibility that their new position gives them, and as a result only three of those who joined have been forced to return their cards for bad behavior since this last January when the idea was put into effect.

In view of the importance of this subject and the success of the Cohoes scheme, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate both the originators and the proud participants of this arrangement. I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Boy Police Plan Cuts Youth Crime in Half" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOY POLICE PLAN CUTS YOUTH CRIME IN HALF

COHOES, N.Y., August 24.—American cities with juvenile delinquency problems might do well to keep an eye on this town of 20,000 just outside Troy.

The police department here has cut the juvenile crime rate 50 percent since last January by making 1,000 boys honorary members of the force.

The youths, all between 8 and 16, are card-carrying members of the department's honorary junior juvenile bureau, the first of its kind in New York State.

The bureau was the idea of Lt. Michael F. Afinowicz, director of the police juvenile bureau, and it was put into operation in January in cooperation with the State youth commission.

SENSE OF DUTY

Since then juvenile crimes and nuisance complaints caused by the 8–16 age group have been reduced to just half of what they were in a comparative period last year. And the police have had practically no new troublemakers to deal with during this time.

The boys themselves are the most enthusiastic supporters of the plan. They are given a sense of duty and responsibility because the bureau operates completely under the honor system.

Almost all eligible youths in the city belong, so it's not a question of the bureau being for "informers" or "goody-goodies."

Membership in the bureau is not automatic, however. To join, a boy must fill out an application and the police check to see that he has not been in any serious trouble with the law.

The youth must continue to meet high standards of behavior and citizenship while he is a member. But the honor code substitutes for police checkup or surveillance.

Only 6 of the 1,000 members have been called in by the police since the bureau has been operating, and of these 3 were given back their cards when they promised to resume good behavior.

The department at first supplied free the boys' photographs which go on the cards, but so many have joined the bureau that they must now furnish their own.

Lieutenant Afinowicz ran the bureau as a one-man operation for a short time but he is now asisted by Detective Sgt. Michael Rogich and John J. Walsh, confidential investigator.

Lieutenant Afinowicz says: "Kids have a natural desire to belong, and it's our job to give them something to belong to which will have a beneficial result in character-building."

The Cohoes plan has been progressing so well that police officials from other cities have been studying it.

Construction Contractors' Difficulty in Obtaining Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the recent article appearing in the magazine Construction Equipment, a Conover-Mast publication, is a most interesting article regarding the construction industry outlining the difficulty contractors themselves often have in borrowing money.

Having worked very closely with the GI housing program I can appreciate how reluctant some bankers are to loan money at current interest rates.

One quote from the Conover-Mast publication says:

If the bankers would take the trouble to learn more about this dynamic industry, they would find that contractors are good risks.

Our GI's have proved to be good risks also. I hope the entire construction industry can be helped.

I direct your attention to the May issue of Construction Equipment magazine and the article on "How To Get Money." A copy of this can be obtained from Conover-Mast.

Progress in the Rural Area Development Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, at recent hearings upon the area assistance legislation, a statement was made that the President's veto message on earlier legislation, S. 722, completely eliminated rural area development.

In his testimony at that time, Secretary of Commerce Mueller offered to submit to the Banking and Currency Committee information on the rural area development program which is in effect by the Department of Agriculture.

As this information may not be brought to light, except in the committee's printed hearings, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, the attached letter from Under Secretary of Agriculture, True D. Morse, in which is given a State by State breakdown of the excellent progress being made under this program.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 22, 1960.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Production and Stabilization, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: In the hearing on the area assistance legislation, of August 18, 1960, over which you presided, certain questions were raised which need to be answered for the record.

Please insert this letter into the record of the hearing at the point where the rural development program was under active discussion.

You stated in the hearing "the rural development program is now carried out by the Department of Agriculture and contains no such provision and consists merely of advice, conversations."

The facts are that many State and Federal departments and agencies, along with many private organizations, are joined together in the rural development program. I refer you to the records of the two previous hearings, over which you presided, in which there is rather complete documentation.

You stated further, "But no loans to assist in the construction and operation of these plants." Please refer again to the records of your hearings. For example, the Small Business Administration is loaning many millions of dollars for just such purposes—and works actively as part of the rural development program.

Senator PROXMIRE said, "There are still 30 pilot counties. We have pleaded over and over again with the Department of Agriculture to step up this program. They have refused repeatedly."

The facts are there have been more than double that number of pilot counties and the work is spread well beyond 200 counties.

Rural development work is going forward in over 30 States and Puerto Rico.

Even though there has been much encouragement and helpful support by Members of Congress, regardless of political affiliation, we have been unable to get full appropriations of the small amounts requested

for the rural development program. This has impeded progress materially.

For the current fiscal year the Department of Agriculture requested $3 million increase for the rural development program. But the conference report of the Congress emphasized the use of the funds for increasing salaries instead of for the program.

Senator PROXMIRE asked for "specific instances"—"positive results."

Here are the facts supplied for the record, as you, Senator DOUGLAS, requested of Secretary Mueller.

It is just 5 years ago that the rural development program was making a modest start. Now, 5 years later, reports show the cumulative results. They are far beyond expectation.

Incomes of low income farm families are going up.

Poor rural nonfarm families are living better—they have higher income.

Entire underdeveloped areas are benefiting—with expanding incomes and more business activity.

There is a new and brighter outlook for the future of people and wide areas for which there was previously no special program—no direct attack on the lowest incomes.

The facts speak. Progress is being reported from all the 30 States and Puerto Rico where the rural development program has been underway. Here is what State, county, and other local leaders are saying at the end of 5 years:

Missouri: Dean J. H. Longwell, chairman of the State rural development committee, says, "Many other areas in Missouri are wanting to know how they can get started in a development program. There is no doubt but that this will be a great stabilizing influence as small farm operators are able to combine farm and nonfarm income, improve their level of living, and add stability to the economy of their community and the Nation as a whole.

"Within the next year, almost 1,000 new full-time jobs and over 300 part-time jobs, with an annual payroll of $2,750,000 will be available to the people in the six rural development counties."

Georgia: Secured the establishment or expansion of industry which provided employment for more than 820 people.

Organized a peach-packing plant which increased peach shipments from 83 cars annually to 390 cars.

Florida: In Suwannee County during the past year four new industries have begun operations and the plant for a fifth is under construction. These employ over 200 workers with annual payrolls well in excess of half a million dollars.

Tennessee: Anyone wanting a boost in their faith in people should visit any of the five Tennessee counties in the rural development program.

New industries are going in, new businesses springing up. Agriculture is bringing in new money; there are new schools and better homes; new health centers, municipal water systems, library service, telephone systems.

In the past year alone new and expanded industry employed an additional 400 people with an estimated payroll of $1 million.

Maine: The total additional annual income realized by Washington County people, resulting directly or indirectly from rural development program activities or emphasis, has been conservatively estimated at $1.5 million.

Illinois: The idea that the program can be used to develop all the resources in the county has begun to catch on with the leaders. A quarter-of-a-million-dollar woodchip mill has been established. Increased off-farm income is beginning to be noted.

Indiana: Has eight pilot counties. Such convincing results come from the original pilot county, Perry, that steps have been taken to use the rural development approach all through southern Indiana where people need more income and greater opportunities.

New Mexico: The rural development program is no longer in the infant stage. It now encompasses 14 counties which cover approximately one-half of the land area of the State.

Arkansas: Batesville is the center of a rural area development program in the Ozark Mountain area. Early this year the area had the opportunity to get a rubber plant. Governor Faubus convened the State legislature and enabling legislation was passed so that areas could meet financial requirements for new industries.

Madison County has several new and expanded industrial enterprises, including a garment factory employing 150 people.

Washington: Stevens County has a new junior college along with new industries and more tourist business as a result of the rural development program.

Nevada: Lincoln County has a new plant under construction that will employ 75 workers.

Mississippi: Tippah County has a number of new industries.

Wisconsin: Price County was among the first to report more industry and off-farm employment.

The foregoing are but a few examples of new industries and additional sources of income for low income people in low income areas, as a result of the rural development program.

The Canadian Government through a Senate committee of its Parliament sent economists and other senior officials to study our rural development results. They investigated the work in seven widely separated States: Kentucky, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Michigan, Washington, Montana, and Maine.

They were convinced "The program has galvanized institutions and people into action."

The Honorable Douglas S. Harkness, Canadian Minister of Agriculture, early this year stated that "A rural development, or redevelopment program somewhat similar to the one you are carrying on in the United States" is one of the parts of the agricultural program for Canada.

The Organization for European Economic Cooperation requested that a U.S. representative come to their meeting in Paris, June 1959, to report on progress of the rural development program and to answer questions. Their response was favorable. Their report said, "Prospects of a better livelihood for low income farmers must depend upon an improvement of the general economic conditions in the area."

People from some 30 foreign countries have visited Butler County, Ky., to see the amazing progress. Foreign visitors study results in other counties too.

Senator KENNEDY, in his Des Moines, Iowa, address of August 21, endorsed the approach of the rural development program that has been underway for the past 5 years. One of the four points for a farm program he stated as "a long-range program for low-income farms, credit, research, and new rural industries."

The rural development program is much broader and more inclusive than "credit, research, and new rural industries," in getting at the problems of low income and general welfare of people in low income rural areas.

As you know, the following Federal departments and agencies work together on the rural development program under a directive of the President's Executive Order 10847:

Department of the Interior.
Department of Agriculture.
Department of Commerce.
Department of Labor.
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Small Business Administration.
Council of Economic Advisers.

The problems of low income rural areas are being attacked broadly—income—both farm and nonfarm, such as income from businesses and industries—credit, education, health, welfare, research, and total resource development.

The Small Business Administration is making large numbers of loans to businesses and industries in low income rural areas.

In fact, with the thousands of local and State development corporations that have loan funds, plus the lending authority of the Small Business Administration, I know of no area that has had the opportunity to get a sound new industry that has not been able to work out the financing.

The great contribution that SBA can and is making toward helping such rural areas, with loans and related services, is well set forth in the address of the Honorable Philip McCallum, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, of August 3, 1960.

Sincerely,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Under Secretary of Agriculture, and Chairman, Committee for Rural Development Program.

What's Happened? They Don't Hate Us—They Love Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL B. DAGUE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, the exclamation with which I have captioned these remarks was reportedly made by a woman spectator at the opening of the Olympic games in Rome this week.

At the opening ceremonies each delegation marched on the field behind their national colors and when the U.S. group moved out with Old Glory borne aloft by Rafer L. Johnson—the first Negro ever to carry the American flag in an Olympic parade—the crowd literally went wild. Cheers followed cheers and, as our reporter implied in his article, the collapse of the summit conference, the Powers trial, the cataract of Communist abuse all seemed to fade into insignificance. Literally, the people—the ordinary folks like you and me—are not mad at Uncle Sam and as DICK NIXON learned in Warsaw there is a wealth of good feeling for the United States. And this fact was further emphasized at the Olympic spectacle when when the Russian athletes marched on the field and were given polite but a very minimum of applause.

It seems that the time is here when political candidates and partisan politicians should stop trying to downgrade the United States and refrain from trying to make it appear that we are hated everywhere overseas. That idea is exactly what Communists are trying to promote both here and abroad and it certainly does us no credit when in seeking political advantage some of our people brand our Nation as a second-rate

power and minimize the influence that both President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON have had in promoting good will around the world.

Styles Bridges: The Man Who Works for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, James P. Lynch, a well known and able editor and columnist in New Hampshire, wrote an article entitled "Styles Bridges: The Man Who Works for America," which was published in the Exeter Newsletter, Exeter, N.H.

I take pleasure in asking that it be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STYLES BRIDGES: THE MAN WHO WORKS FOR AMERICA

(By James P. Lynch)

STYLES BRIDGES—the man who works for America. A fearless leader and a couragerous statesman. Brief but factual, the senior Senator from New Hampshire is a living symbol of a dedicated public servant.

His opponents fear him but they respect him. They realize his fight is in the interest of the American people. His greatness has been earned by his courageous leadership.

There is no compromise between right and wrong with him. Self interest does not take precedence over that which is good for the country.

He is an ardent fighter for legislation that strengthens the Nation in peace as well as war. His record is secondary to none.

FORTUNATE CIRCUMSTANCES

New Hampshire indeed is fortunate to have a man of his stature in the United States Senate. More important, the people of America and the freeworld are assured that in Senator BRIDGES they have a valiant crusader for their rights.

To many in New Hampshire, as well as the Nation, the name STYLES BRIDGES is synonymous with leadership. Yet his foes would like to erase this statesman's contribution to the free world by defeating him at the polls this year.

Let's not take the election for granted. Even with this outstanding Senator with years of service to the public in our midst, there are those who would prefer to replace him with inexperienced candidates.

The motive certainly is not for the betterment of the State or the Nation. Surely no one can convincingly prove that the defeat of the senior Senator would give this State better representation. Quite to the contrary.

STRICTLY POLITICAL

Their plan is strictly political and indeed quite harmful. There is no choice in the senatorial race this year. Replacing BRIDGES would be the most dangerous act ever committed by the electorate in the State.

A victory for BRIDGES' foes would be hailed in the Kremlin not because his opponents sympathize with the Soviet but because a defeat of the senior Senator would erase the strongest voice against the Communists in the U.S. Senate.

STRONG VOICE

No man has ever raised his voice or acted more forcefully than BRIDGES in repudiating the bloodthirsty Kremlin murderers. His voice has penetrated throughout the world and his actions are largely responsible for the world leadership in military power which this Nation enjoys.

While the voice of the opposition has been decrying BRIDGES' exemplary and bold leadership, the senior Senator has been exerting every power at his command to fight that we may enjoy freedom.

IN DUE TIME

History will recognize in due time the contribution he has made to world leadership, but the voters must not overlook the fact that they, too, are making history by keeping STYLES BRIDGES in the U.S. Senate.

History is not fiction but facts, and it is being written today and every day. There is no halt or recess. It continues around the clock. Surely this is no time to attempt to stop the clock by sacrificing leadership for inexperience.

Our world conditions make it imperative that the Nation has the strongest statesmen serving in public office. Men who have been proven through experience; men who have a record for strength and courage should be retained in Washington. Surely the senior Senator has no equal for his outstanding capabilities.

Many of Senator STYLES BRIDGES' great contributions are known to the electorate here and elsewhere. He has frequently been the subject of national recognition for his devotedness to public service.

UNTOLD CONTRIBUTIONS

Yet many phases of his public service are filed away as classified material. This concerns mainly his untiring fight to make certain that this Nation's military strength has no equal.

He has fought valiantly down through the years for air and sea power. In this strategically located state, results of his never-ending battle to keep the Nation strong are vividly demonstrated.

The Senator does not look for credit for his fight. He looks for action. He has achieved results down through the years solely because he placed the security of his Nation first.

MAN OF FORESIGHT

In short, Senator STYLES BRIDGES is a man of foresight. He has proven this time and again. He has never been fooled by false promises from the Kremlin nor will he be caught in their snare.

While some preach appeasement, his uppermost thought has always been strength. He has never been placed in the position of apologizing for this stand as history has proven he has been right on all occasions.

He does not waiver or falter. His position is firm as was evidenced the time Khrushchev came to this country. His refusal to participate in welcoming the Russian illustrated he is a man of wise judgment.

AN ASSURANCE

Senator BRIDGES knows the problems of the Nation and the world. More important, his firm convictions are an assurance that he will continue to fight courageously and fearlessly to make certain that this country will not yield to the opportunists and the appeasers. There is no justification to alter our course.

BRIDGES' answer as to how to face the continuous threat of the Communists was illustrated where it counts, not just in words. He has been a leader in the program for Polaris missile submarines as the record will show.

The stepped-up battle for the B–70 program of the Air Force was led by Senator BRIDGES and in due time, when credit is being given, BRIDGES will be entitled to the greatest recognition. BRIDGES was determined to get the B–70 program underway and this determination was backed by quick and valiant action on his part which spearheaded the successful fight.

The Senator does not boast of his contributions to military might for he realizes that he is battling for all the free peoples of the world.

INTEREST IN MEN IN SERVICE

His interest in the military is not confined exclusively to the weapon and its conveyance. He takes a great interest in making certain that the men in uniform are the best trained and the best equipped in the world. He is concerned with their safety and their well-being.

An example is the interest he has shown for the alert forces who man the bombers and their facilities. A man with a heart, he wants these men to have good quarters while they are serving on alert duties.

His recent successful fight to get the Defense Department to recognize the need for air conditioning the alert quarters at Pease is an illustration of his ardent desire to help the crews who are dedicated to the cause of freedom.

This air conditioning is not a luxury but a dire necessity. As a matter of fact, the Senator has constantly fought for what is needed but frowns on the luxuries.

WANTS THE FINEST

The interest in the B–70 program is typical of his years of interest in having the finest in the Air Force. Most people are well aware of his hard-fought battle to get an installation at Portsmouth. He was determined to win this fight when it was proven that it was a necessity.

It was not surprising that the base was selected as a Strategic Air Command installation. This command is acclaimed as our greatest deterrent to war and daily proves that it has no equal.

REFUSED TO BE PRESSURED

A leader lacking foresight would have yielded to the pressures exerted when a site for this base was being considered. The senior Senator refused to be pressured.

Again, time proved him to be right as it has done on so many previous occasions. BRIDGES, though, is not looking for laurels on the outcome as he prefers that the men and their mission at Pease be given all the accolades.

The senior Senator does not attempt to rest on past accomplishments but is one of the most diligent Members of the U.S. Senate. There is no doubt of his great leadership for he has proven down through the years that regardless of whether the administration is of Republican or Democratic Party he will fight for the cause of the people of the Nation.

NO OTHER INTEREST

He cannot be badgered or pressured by political chieftains. Although many have wanted him to seek higher offices in government he has always felt that the greatest reward was being elected as U.S. Senator from New Hampshire.

He has never failed to represent his State in the best possible manner yet he does not attempt to restrict this matter on a sectional basis. He has always made it clear that he is a Senator of the United States and thus he acts for the betterment of the Nation.

CONVENTION RECOGNITION

BRIDGES does not attempt to push himself to the forefront as was just recently evidenced at the Republican convention in Chicago. Although he played one of the most important roles at the affair he avoided much of the publicity.

His primary objective was to do what he personally felt was in the interest of the pub-

lic. Thus when it became to a discussion on selecting a candidate for the Vice Presidency, party leaders relied heavily on the opinion of Senator BRIDGES.

He was constantly in conference with the top leaders including President Eisenhower and Vice President NIXON His quarters at the Sheraton-Blackstone was the meeting place of many of the Nation's leading Republicans.

PRESENT CAMPAIGN

As a veteran leader the senior Senator is not taking this campaign lightly. He fully realizes the hard battle the GOP faces and he will campaign vigorously.

His fight, though, is not primarily for STYLES BRIDGES. He is campaigning in the interest of the American people for assuredly the BRIDGES' program down through the years has proven to be such.

STYLES BRIDGES deserves another term more than any man in the U.S. Senate. More important though, the people of the United States are deserving of this recognition—a recognition which can be bestowed only by the voters of New Hampshire.

Indeed STYLES BRIDGES is a dedicated man. He works for America.

Conference Report on H.R. 12619

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

The House had under consideration the conference report on H.R. 12619 making appropriations for mutual security and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee I am especially pleased that the contingency fund has been increased to meet the situations as they may arise in the unfolding of independence on the continent of Africa. Our stake in Africa is large because as new sovereign nations emerge they become part of the world to which we belong. It is a world of government for, by, and of the people. It is a world in which the dignity of man and the faith in an Almighty that looks over all men, and all races, go hand in hand.

We are glad that the long reign of colonialism is over, and we take satisfaction in the thought that our country, our Union of States that once were colonies, is a pattern. What is transpiring in Africa today is a reflection in the 20th century of what transpired in our land when we were experiencing birth pains as we emerged from colonialism to sovereignty.

I have never questioned the right or the propriety of any Member of the Congress speaking his mind. Inded, it has seemed to me that in the exercise of that right was the very strength of our representative Government. But I do hope that the peoples in other lands will understand as well as do we in the Congress and, in large part, the American people. Yet I can recall occasions when some Member of the House of Commons in England, exercising his right to speak his mind and of course speaking only for himself, said something uncomplimentary about the United States and the American people did not like it. But the repercussions were not too harmful to the amiable relationships of two friendly countries because we knew that, in the final analysis, the legislator that reflected upon us was just an individual speaking for himself.

I do not criticize, and certainly I am in no position or in the frame of mind to set myself up as censor over another Members' utterances, but I do regret when any Member of the Congress in either body unnecessarily injects the personalities of friendly governments in the heated debates of the Congress. We are too far away and our information is too scant for us to attempt appraisements. Every new country must go through the experience of birth pains. The leaders in those new countries will rise and fall and new leaders will rise and fall according to the appraisement of the peoples of their own respectvie countries. It has been that way in our United States, and so it will continue as long as we have free and independent government. The discussion in the Congress of foreign personalities I appreciate is not so intended, but too often it is interpreted in the propaganda of the enslaved world as interference in the internal affairs of other countries.

As chairman of the African Subcommittee I have had the privilege and the pleasure of meeting many African leaders, and I can truthfully say that without an exception they have impressed me as being dedicated to their tasks. This does not mean that I would approve of everything that they did or that I would approve of everything that they said. Men and women, being human, are not infallible, and this is true in our own country as well as in the new countries of Africa, but the best check on human weaknesses we have found in our own experience comes from the people themselves passing judgment on their own leaders and their own governments. I have said on other occasions, and I repeat it now because it is so important for our people to remember, that the good neighbor in any community is not the one who goes into his neighbor's home to scold but it is the neighbor who runs his own home so happily that he sets a pattern for neighborly deportment that becomes contagious throughout the entire neighborhood.

I am content that the peoples of Africa should work out their own national destiny. They have taken upon themselves the responsibilities of free government, and I think they have taken on those responsibilities with the same spirit of dedication as moved our forefathers, and I have the faith that they will not fail. I shall not attempt to sit in judgment on the qualifications of their leaders. I would not wish them to project themselves into the Second Congressional District of Illinois and to seek to pass upon my qualifications as the representative of my own neighbors. To me the comparison is irrefutable. If we respect the sovereignty of another friendly nation we must show the same respect to the people who select the leaders and who in a democratic world are alone responsible for the governments they place in office.

Mr. Speaker, I speak now for the Subcommittee on Africa. We have faith in Africa's tomorrow. We have faith in the peoples of Africa. We appreciate that the problems of the present, the problems that always will attend the leaving behind of one status quo to gain a higher plateau, we appreciate that these problems will be many and will be trying, but we do have the faith that the problems one by one will be met and will be conquered, and that the tomorrow of Africa under government of, for, and by the people will be as bright as the sunshine itself.

People Talk Peace in Every Land

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as a leader of the free world—attempting to pool its resources to withstand the pressures of communism and to promote progress among its people—it becomes increasingly important that we understand and become knowledgeable of the thinking of people elsewhere in the world.

There are, of course, a great many reasons why this should be done. Major among these is to assure that the policies determining our relationships with other nations—though well intentioned—do not offend, rather than create friendship and cooperation.

Recently, Mr. Frank Douglas, a high school teacher at Janesville, Wis., traveled nearly 40,000 miles in 65 days, around the world. The venture is reflective of many of our citizens who—as they can—are attempting to better understand the climate of global thinking. A major conclusion of Mr. Douglas' travels, however, confirms other reports that—despite world threats of war and serious domestic problems in a great many lands—the people universally want and talk peace.

Recently, the Janesville Gazette published an article by Peg O'Brien reviewing the itinerary of Mr. Douglas. Reflecting an interprising effort by this Wisconsin high school teacher to gain a better understanding of the world about us, I ask unanimous consent to have excerpts of the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Gainesville Daily Gazette, Aug., 26, 1960]

PEOPLE TALK PEACE IN EVERY LAND—TEACHER AT JHS ENDS GLOBAL TOUR

(By Peg O'Brien)

Around the world in 65 days—transported 34,000 miles by plane and 4,000 miles by bus, train, boat, camel, and ricksha—Frank Douglas, 326 North Terrace Street, took a re-

fresher for teaching world geography which is a new subject in Janesville Senior High School curriculum this fall. He taught world geography at Deerfield High School for 7 years before he became a member of the local high school faculty.

His previous travels over the North American continent, World War II service in France, Belgium, and Germany, Europe revisited in 1952, a tour of Hawaii in 1953—and now the Daggett junket from which he returned last week—have convinced him that regardless of diverse cultures people have mutual goals—"health, peace, and some degree of happiness."

Forty enplaned June 17 with Prof. Clay Daggett of Whitewater State College. The educational tour got off to an appropriate start with the group attending United Nations sessions in New York before flying the Atlantic and then across the Baltic Sea to Stockholm, Sweden.

RESTRICTIONS ON PHOTOS

In Helsinki, Finland, 10 of the tourists left the group for the journey to Russia. Frank Douglas was among those who flew to Leningrad with Dr. Henry De Wind, Whitewater history professor.

They had a Russian guide for daytime sightseeing, but at night were able to roam the streets at will. Picturetaking was prohibited at airports, railroad stations, or from planes. They flew in a TU-104 with 110 aboard. Fare for 800 miles was $13 in American currency.

"The Russians were curious about the Americans," said Douglas, "being particularly interested in our clothing. Some men offered to pay up to $5 for American-made sport shirts, which had been purchased here for $2.95.

"Russian children, many speaking English, tried to trade us Lenin medals for chewing gum. While most of the Russians were wearing poorly made clothes, the girl guide in Leningrad was dressed like a Fifth Avenue model."

They attended the ballet in Moscow and on June 21 joined the celebration on the Neva River where at 1 a.m. the sun was still on the horizon. While awaiting the fireworks demonstration the Americans spotted a group of teenagers barreling down the street singing "Rock Around the Clock."

THRILLED BY ATHENS

En route to Africa the group stopped in Greece, where they were thrilled with the ancient buildings of Athens and the beautiful seacoast. The Holy Land and Egypt also were on the itinerary.

In Uganda they saw history in the making, meeting up with Belgians fleeing from the troubled Congo to Mweya Lodge. The lodge, in Queen Elizabeth National Park, is an exotic spot where they saw native boys chasing the elephants off the premises with spears and were awakened at 7 a.m. by servants pulling back the mosquito netting on their beds and greeting them with "Your tea, Sir."

While ensconced in a lovely spot on Lakes George and Edward in southwest Uganda they took game and boat runs to see big game and bush animals and fantastically colored tropical birds.

Walking by the Stanley Hotel in the modern city of Nairobi, Kenya, Mr. Douglas saw a man who looked vaguely familiar. He asked him if he was a Maryknoll Father and learned that he was indeed one of the priests who appeared in "Twelve Tribes of Tanganyika," the film which was narrated by Perry Como. One of Mr. Douglas' students, Jim Tortorici, had brought the film to high school when the class was doing a unit study on Africa.

While in New Delhi the Daggett travelers were invited to the palace to have tea with the President, Dr. Prasad. The President's message for his guests to take back to America was "Tell your young people to become good citizens of your community, of your country, and of the world, and in that way we will eventually have peace."

IMPRESSED BY CEYLON

They found Ceylon truly the "pearl of the Orient" for it has wonderful climate and exquisite topography. They took a drive up Kandy Mountains where they viewed lovely waterfalls and exotic gardens.

"Bangkok, peopled mostly by Siamese and Chinese is the 'Venice of the East,'" said Mr. Douglas. "The floating markets which ply their trade over many canals, the royal barges festooned in gold leaf and studded with semiprecious stones, and the king's palace are out of this world sights."

In Thailand they were introduced to highly stylized native dances, and in Hong Kong they made for the shops where everybody "went crazy buying and ordering custom-made dresses and shirts." A grateful Hong Kong merchant invited them to a 14-course dinner, eaten with chopsticks.

Hong Kong, great center of world commerce in the Far East in a potpourri of many cultures. In the last 3 years more than 1 million refugees have come in from Red China. The British are trying to take care of them by building four-story apartment buildings on the mountainside. One room is allotted to each family.

PHILIPPINES AND JAPAN

On a brief tour of the Philippines the travelers noted the great progress made in rebuilding since the war.

In Japan the Daggett travelers were the first Americans to occupy a de luxe inn in Beppu Bay on the west side of the Inland Sea. Here they slept on floor pads covered with silk sheets and were given "oversolicitous" attention by Japanese maids. They took a boat ride through the Inland Sea, flew over Mount Fuji, and inspected the gardens gleaning the secret of the Japanese gardener—simplicity. While in Japan 9 days they saw highly industrialized cities, ultramodern buildings, and the cutest little kids in all the world.

From Hawaii they took off for the mainland after island hopping to Formosa and Okinawa.

Former Janesville residents Viola Howard, Chicago, and Betty Bull, Joliet, Ill., were among the 40 on the tour.

Small Business Assistance Act of 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it has been always an unquestioned American tradition that this Government shall aid, counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business in order to preserve our democratic system of free competitive enterprise.

That is why I advocated and voted for the passage of the original legislation establishing a permanent, independent Small Business Administration agency. Recognizing the importance of our small businesses in defense production efforts and the national economy I have consistently urged every reasonable Federal assistance and guidance to them throughout my congressional service.

Over these past 2 years I regret to say the fate and the fare of American small business has discouragingly declined, while the Congress concentrated attention largely upon international issues and domestic security. In partial recognition of this neglect this body passed, last June, approved H.R. 11207, designed to increase the Small Business Administration's revolving fund for its regular loan program, to provide for a wider participation by small business concerns in the subcontracting phase of Government procurement and to authorize the agency to set up a small business subcontracting program.

While this bill does not offer the complete assistance a good many of us have advocated it does contain elements of material encouragement and aid desperately needed by small business to survive.

Mr. Speaker, the House-passed measure, together with a Senate-passed version is now in conference. I most earnestly hope the leadership on both sides, in both Chambers, will use their combined influence in having the conferees reach sensible agreement and report the bill back for congressional action before adjournment.

I consider it my conscientious duty to speak here today for the small business people of my own district and the Nation. The only voice they have in Federal legislation is ours and we will be neglecting our obligation if we fail to grant this limited assistance to this patriotic segment of our economy.

Our American Flag—Beacon of Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD I include an address delivered on June 14, 1960, by Daniel Edward Lambert of Orrington, Maine. Mr. Lambert is the district commander of the fifth district of the American Legion, Department of Maine, and his address was presented before the annual Flag Day program of the Bangor Lodge, Elks Club, Bangor, Maine.

Commander Lambert is a four-time wounded veteran of the famed "Darby's Rangers" of World War II, and he directs the American Legion activity in the Penobscot, Hancock, and Piscataquis County areas.

He is a past State chaplain of the Maine Disabled American Veterans, and a member of the Norman N. Dow Post 1761, VFW of Bangor, and the Daniel E. Geagan Post No. 98, American Legion of Brewer. Mr. Lambert is active in the social and fraternal groups in Maine, and he is also a member of the National Ranger Battalions Association and the 1st Armored Division Association.

Mr. Lambert's address entitled "Our American Flag—Beacon of Hope" follows:

My fellow Americans, heraldry is as old as the human race. The carrying of banners has been the habit of both the barbarian and the civilized in all ages. Before we became a nation, our land knew many flags. Columbus carried a Spanish flag across the seas. The Pilgrims carried the flag of England. Native Indian tribes had their totems and other insignia. Immigrants of every nationality and race, in seeking a new allegiance, brought their symbols of loyalty to our shores. During the period of our growth, we have embraced parts of the banners of many countries.

At once, the U.S. flag is a history—a declaration—and a prophecy. It is unique in the deep and noble significance of its message to the entire world. It is a message of national independence, of individual liberty, of idealism, of patriotism. To 177 million Americans it is a mosaic ribbon of beauty and a beacon of hope.

It represents America as it was at its birth and as it is today—a symbol of freedom in a world besieged by the new slavery of communism.

Flag Day, June 14, is a time for us to reflect on our national emblem and its glorious history. Our banner, an honest and righteous one, is the third oldest national flag in the world—older than the Union Jack of Britain or the Tricolor of France.

The U.S. flag was first authorized by Congress on June 14, 1777. This date is now observed as Flag Day throughout America. The original resolution adopted by the Continental Congress in Philadelphia read:

"*Resolved*, That the flag of the United States be 13 stripes, alternate red and white, that the union be 13 stars, white in a blue field, representing a new constellation."

According to many historians, the banner received its baptism of fire at Fort Schuyler (formerly Fort Stanwix) on August 3, 1777, which is presently the site of Rome, N.Y. Supposedly, the officers of the garrison hastily put together a banner using a blue cloak, red petticoat, and a white ammunition shirt. This was flown the following morning in the face of the British and Indian besiegers.

The story of Betsy Ross and her connection with the first American flag has become as traditional in the minds of our American youth as the legend of George Washington and the chopping down of his father's cherry tree. Unfortunately, neither story can be proved as having actually taken place.

According to legend handed down by word-of-mouth, it was in June 1776 that a committee composed of George Washington, Robert Morris, and George Ross called upon Betsy Ross, a young Philadelphia widow who supported herself and her family by her needlework. They described a flag they had in mind and asked Mrs. Ross if she could make one for them. She agreed. This first flag is said to have been made almost a full year before the congressional resolution of June 14, 1777.

If the story cannot be proved to the satisfaction of the historians, neither can it be conclusively disproved. For this very reason it will probably continue to be an essential part of our American tradition.

The colors of our flag may be thus explained:

The red is for valor, zeal, and fervency.

The white is for hope, purity, cleanliness of life, and rectitude of conduct.

The blue, the color of heaven, is for reverence to God, loyalty, sincerity, justice, and truth.

The star is a symbol of dominion and sovereignty, as well as lofty aspirations.

The constellation of the stars within the union (one for each State) is emblematic of our Federal Constitution, which reserves to the States their individual soverignty, except as to rights delegated by them to the Federal Government.

The original 13 stars and 13 stripes were intended, of course, to represent the Thirteen Original Colonies. In 1795, because of America's expanding frontier, two additional stars and two more stripes were added, representing Vermont and Kentucky, which had been admitted to the Union.

It was a flag of 15 stars and 15 stripes, that withstood enemy bombardment at Fort McHenry, Md., in 1814, and inspired Francis Scott Key to write the immortal "Star-Spangled Banner."

Later, when other States were added to the Union, Congress feeling that more stripes would blur the basic design, returned to the original 13 red and white stripes. Since 1818, the admission of each new State has added one more star to our flag. The growing pattern of stars reflects the growing dimensions of our country, as the 13 stripes still reflect the constant strength of our country's tradition.

With the admission of Alaska to statehood on January 3, 1959, a new 49-star flag made its appearance on July 4, 1959. On August 21, 1959, Hawaii was admitted to the Union as the 50th State. The flag which rose over 13 States along the Atlantic seaboard with a population of some 3 million now flies over 50 States, extending across the continent, and over great expanses of water.

On July 4, 1960, the 184th birthday of our country, a new 50-star flag will become the official flag of the United States of America.

Many times we refer to our flag as Old Glory. This name was given to our national banner on August 10, 1831, by Capt. William Driver. History tells us Captain Driver who moved to Nashville just before the Civil War, took with him the flag from the brig *Charles Dogett* that he had commanded. It was his flag which eventually was raised over the capitol there. He is credited with saying "I have always said if I could see it float over that capitol, I should have lived long enough; now Old Glory is up there gentlemen, and I am ready to die."

Old Glory has seen a wilderness welded into a Nation, one and inseparable, united in its spirit of liberty and its ideals of human freedom—not the freedom of unfestraint or the liberty of license, but an ideal of equal opportunity for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Our flag might be interpreted in many ways:

It is the roar of big city traffic in New York and Chicago, and the hissing of molten steel in Gary, Ind.; it is the soda fountain of the neighborhood drugstore or the filling station on the corner; it is the grandeur of the West and the Grand Canyon; it is a fisherman casting a fly, or a farmer plowing his field; it is listening to your favorite radio program or watching a television show.

It is the right to freedom of speech and the freedom of the press; it is the right to feel secure in your home and possessions. It is the protection afforded us by the Constitution.

It is a group of schoolchildren reciting:

"I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands; one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

From the lofty pinnacle of American idealism, our flag is truly a beacon of enduring hope that floats over an essemblage of people from every racial stock of the earth. Its spirit is the spirit of America, and its history is the history of the American people. We are the weavers of our flag and everything that it stands for.

Every member of the American Legion—every veteran—realizes just what love of God and country and respect for the flag mean. Legionnaires consider it their duty to see that the people in their community know how to respect it and how to display it.

In conclusion I would like to remind you of these words by President Woodrow Wilson who said:

"I always have the same thought when I look at the flag of the United States for I know something of the struggle of mankind for liberty. When I look at that flag it seems to me as if the white stripes were strips of parchment upon which are written the rights of man, and the red stripes the streams of blood by which those rights have been made good.

"Then in the little blue firmament in the corner have swung out the stars of the States of the American Union.

"So it is, as it were, a sort of floating charter that has come down to us from Runnymede, when men said: 'We will not have masters; we will be a people and we will seek our own liberty.'"

Right-To-Work States Outgrow the Others

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the August 28, 1960, issue of the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald-Journal contained an excellent editorial entitled "Right-To-Work States Outgrow the Others." This editorial points out that workers in States with right-to-work laws fared better during the 5-year period of 1953–58 than workers in States which have no right-to-work laws.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RIGHT-TO-WORK STATES OUTGROW THE OTHERS

State right-to-work laws are a top-priority target of big labor bosses. The statutes exist in 19 States, principally in the South and border areas.

The objection of big union leaders is that the laws won't allow them to throw a worker off his job for refusing to join their organizations. Compulsory membership is a very effective weapon to enforce big labor's will over a worker or a community.

In 1958, right-to-work proposals were fought out in direct elections in six States. The law won only in Kansas. It lost in California, Colorado, Ohio, Idaho and Washington.

The World Almanac says that the Teamsters alone spent $800,000 to defeat the proposal. In California, it was estimated that unions poured out $1,500,000 to beat the law.

It's no wonder the bosses were elated that Walter Reuther and company were able to get the Democratic platform to declare: "We will repeal the authorization for 'right-to-work' laws."

The intent is to deprive States of their privilege of passing these laws to protect their workers from terror tactics of union organizers.

What has been the experience of States which have adopted right-to-work laws? Have they progressed or faltered in their economic development?

Statistics are available for the 5-year period between 1953 and 1958.

The number of jobs available to workers increased 9.62 percent in those States having the law.

Job opportunities in the other States decreased .35 percent during the same period.

Of course, it might be said that States which have adopted the law possess a general progressiveness not common with the others. That is true. This particular factor is only one of many which produce progress.

But what about wages?

During the same 5-year period, the increase in workers' pay for right-to-work States averaged 25 percent. For those which allow enforced union membership, the increase was 21.5 percent.

Big union leaders have no love for the South. Economic expansion here is a real threat to their domination. Right now, Federal oppression of States rights in the field of labor relations is their best hope of conquering this last stronghold against them.

There is a great deal more at stake in national politics than civil rights, party label, committee chairmanships, and the individual who will be our next President.

Korea's New Reform Administration Speeds a National Reconstruction Program for All the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. John Van Ginhoven, a constituent of mine, has just returned from one of his many trips to South Korea. He has a very interesting report to make on the programs concerning the new administration there. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a portion of this report, which I believe will be of interest to the membership:

KOREA'S NEW REFORM ADMINISTRATION SPEEDS A NATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM FOR ALL THE PEOPLE

The April revolution and recent elections have brought to Korea a long-needed new era of honesty and democratic government, replacing the incompetent and corrupt former administration.

The Korean Government and the people recognize all of their responsibilities to strengthen democracy and oppose communism, typified by President Eisenhower's recent visit to Korea when about two million persons welcomed him as their friend from the United States. Thus, the new government plans a reconstruction and development program which will ensure the country's sovereignty and economic growth. The planned program will embrace the nation's material life from electric power expansion, to agriculture, to industrial growth of her basic industries. This will be accomplished by a self-imposed austerity and America's friendly assistance.

Under the direction and forceful leadership of the Ministry of Reconstruction and Development, industrial and technical projects are being planned in all areas. The first phase of this program should require about 5 years. Electric power expansion, marine shipping, petroleum refining, chemical and gas plants, cement and fertilizer factories, modern agriculture practices, the mining of heavy minerals, rayon, nylon, and textile production are but a few of the economic activities to be stepped up immediately. To overcome Korea's persistent lack of scientific management, technical know-how and long-range economic planning, is a primary objective of the new regime.

For example, the Nation's acute shortage of electrical power has long been an obstacle to her commerce, industrialization and the raising of living standards. To overcome this obstacle, the new Government has energetically adopted a 10-year power development program. The first projected phase of the plan centers around the construction of two massive hydroelectric powerplants at Chunchon and Soyang within 3 years. Aggregate kilowatt plant capacity will be of 140,000 units. The cost of $102 million will be borne jointly by the U.S. Development Loan Fund and Korean national funds. This realistic projection of the country's power needs will enable Korea's industry and materially raise the standard of living for Korean people.

Similarly, the Government has given prompt encouragement to such basic projects as an oil refinery, cement plants, fertilizer and chemical factories, and various expenditures covering a housing development, railroad modernization, public utilities, and telecommunication expansion. Thus, under a Government determined to correct the past abuses and to inaugurate the soundest political practices at the present, the Koreans will be able to establish a sound and workable economy.

Under this new climate of honor and opportunity, the revolutionary progress will continue. This will be speeded by the continuing U.S. grants-in-aid and foreign investments. It will be underscored by the recently assured austerity program to combat idleness, self-indulgence, and conspicuous consumption among certain high-income brackets. The program for economic development will be further strengthened by the state counsel's carefully planned "Policy Measures for Efficient Utilization of Aid Resources." More than anything else, Korea's long-delayed emergence as a democracy in the Orient now seems assured by a combination of a sympathetic understanding by the people in the United States, and by the Koreans exerting skilled statecraft, use modern technology in their industries, and moral fervor to succeed in their efforts to develop a sound economy and to raise the living standards of her people.

Disastrous Underground Fires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Paul Trescott wrote a highly informative column on the serious aspects of coal mine fires and as a native of and Representative from the anthracite region of northeastern Pennsylvania I can personally attest to the terrible consequences of such disastrous and damaging fires. Mr. Trescott's column, which I quote as part of my remarks today, appeared in the Sunday Bulletin of Philadelphia on July 10, 1960.

Mr. Trescott is an editorial writer for the Philadelphia Evening and Sunday Bulletin. His excellent, widely looked-for column appears each Sunday in the Bulletin.

Mr. Trescott is a native of Columbia County, Pa., his ancestors having migrated to adjoining Wyoming Valley, Luzerne County, from New England about 1767. An alumnus of Akron University, Ohio, he worked on newspapers in Akron; several in Wilkes-Barre, Pa., and in Berwick and Bloomsburg, Pa. (city editor of the Press) before affiliating with the Philadelphia Bulletin some years ago.

Authorship apparently is a natural gift in the Paul Trescott family. His wife, the former Louise Adams of Berwick, Pa., is a noted fashion consultant and writer of a nationally published syndicated column.

A son, Paul B. Trescott, associate professor of economics at Kenyon College, Gambier, Ohio, is the author of numerous magazine articles. Recently Dr. Trescott's book, "Money, Banking and Economic Welfare," published by McGraw-Hill Co., received wide acclaim.

But others of the Trescott family are successful in different professions. Alfred P. Trescott is a physician attached to Robert Packer Hospital, Sayre, Pa., as a radiologist. A son of Mrs. Trescott, Clarke Bachman, is a prominent Philadelphia architect.

The elder Trescott of the Philadelphia Bulletin has been active in affairs of the National Conference of Editorial Writers from its inception, and served in several offices.

Mr. Trescott's column follows:

DISASTROUS UNDERGROUND FIRES

(By Paul Trescott)

Fires are often spectacular. But some of the most damaging are not. Throughout the country today some 147 fires are still smouldering away, and no fire chief daresay any one of them is out. One has been burning for more than 100 years.

These are fires in coal mines. They can be even more deadly than the spectacular fires which trap a family or two.

The oldest of the known fires is near Summit Hill, Pa. That started in 1859, and the cause has never been determined. Plenty of others have been going for 50 years or more, and some have taken a terrific toll of life.

One of the worst was in the Jersey mine in Plymouth township, Luzerne County. On September 6, 1869, a mine furnace used to ventilate the Avondale mine ignited a wood partition separating the main air intake from the hoisting shaft. The toll was 110 dead, one of the worst in coal history.

This mine was sealed in 1905, when the fire covered 12 acres, but the blaze was not confined. In 1952, the latest available record, the fire covered 338 acres.

A fire in West Carbondale has been raging since 1940, and its gas fumes have repeatedly sickened people. Another in the vicinity of Mount Carmel has been a source of repeated trouble.

Georgetown Mountain, outside of Wilkes-Barre, has a fire which started before 1907 and is still going. Tower City, in Schuylkill County, has long had what is commonly known as a "burning mountain" even though it might not be a mountain. A culm bank near Tamaqua has also been burning for years.

In 1953, a number of residents of South Scranton were sickened by the fumes coming from a subterranean fire. These fumes are known in many localities as "black damp." They are deadly in seconds.

These mine fires start from a great variety of causes. One near Wilkes-Barre broke out in 1917 when a mule driver left his lighted lamp hanging on a wooden prop. Others have started through forest fires on the surface which have ignited outcroppings of coal, and the fires then have gone underground.

Explosions have started other fires, and they are some of the most defiant in existence. Science still hasn't learned how to cope with them.

Flooding has been tried. Digging out the burning coal has been attempted. Sealing off the smouldering areas with clay and other materials hasn't worked. Neither has the idea of building walls around the underground fires. Millions have been spent, but without results. One fire has ranged more than a mile since it broke out, and has burned through one barrier after another.

The coal veins which have been attacked by fire run up to 40 feet in thickness. Just imagine how much heat can be generated by 40 feet of coal on fire, and you can readily understand why these fires penetrate barriers and are so hard to control. Still, a great many have been put out before they have reached tremendous proportions.

Fighting a mine fire is far different from the attack on any other conflagration. Unless communities and people are threatened, the problem is an economic one. Is the coal worth saving? Will the cost of putting out the fire make it unprofitable to continue mining?

The study of mine fires is an interesting one. An old friend, Jim Corrigan, of Wilkes-Barre, a one-time newspaperman, collects information on mine fires as avidly as some people do stamps or coins, and it was from his private papers that most of this information on mine fires was obtained.

Endorsement by the AFL–CIO and the ADA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, under previous consent, I place in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the attention of the Members of Congress, an article by David Lawrence, which appeared in today's New York Herald Tribune, in which he discussed some of the factors involved in the endorsement of a presidential candidate by the AFL–CIO and the ADA:

AFL–CIO BACKING SEEN AS "LOADSTONE" TO KENNEDY

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, August 28—Some endorsements in a political campaign could mean the "kiss of death" to a presidential candidate among groups of voters who are antagonized by the action.

The AFL–CIO has just endorsed Senator KENNEDY, the Democratic nominee, and so has the radical organization which calls itself "Americans for Democratic Action" but which believes in centralized government.

There are 13,500,000 members in the AFL–CIO and, while the general board which voted the endorsement cannot deliver the votes of its members, the impression sought to be conveyed is that it can. In fact, the AFL–CIO mantains a close watch on rollcalls in Congress and in every campaign points to whether a Member has gone down the line for union labor or has failed to support its proposals.

The citizens are supposed to reward by their votes in the presidential and congressional elections the candidates who have supported the cause of labor. It isn't a bought-and-paid-for arrangement in the sense that a money bribe is offered or accepted, but the truth is that many millions of dollars are collected from union members by the AFL–CIO leaders acting in behalf of supposedly separate political organizations. These funds are contributed to State and local, as well as national, election campaigns in support of those candidates who have a record of doing the bidding of the trade union leaders.

PLATFORM ON JOBS

Senator KENNEDY says he is proud of the endorsement, and one wonders if this means that, if elected, he will feel beholden to the AFL–CIO. The Democratic platform has already pledged that the next Congress will enact legislation taking away from 20 States their right to keep on the statute books—and in their constitutions—a provision enabling a worker to join or not join a union without risking punishment through the loss of his job. The custom is for the labor unions to threaten costly strikes against employers who refuse to sign an agreement to fire anyone who doesn't join a union.

If the National Association of Manufacturers or the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, using the prestige of their positions in the business world, were to announce that they endorsed Vice President NIXON, the labor press would be the first to jump on them as having made a deal with the Republican presidential candidate to help him get elected in return for the support he would give measures they favor.

AFL DIDN'T TAKE SIDES

While many businessmen as individuals will be for the Nixon-Lodge ticket, they do not in their trade organizations make any such endorsement or formally call on their members to support a candidate. In fact, until recent years the American Federation of Labor itself would for the most part avoid endorsement of any presidential nominees. This policy was proclaimed for the AFL by the late Samuel Gompers who, though making no secret of his own preferences, avoided any commitment by his national labor organization.

It is ironical that the Gompers doctrine is now being reversed in many other ways. Thus, Mr. Gompers argued for years that no employer should have the right to make nonmembership in a union a condition of employment, and finally Congress wrote such a prohibition into law. But now the labor unions themselves favor discrimination as long as it is in their favor.

They oppose right-to-work laws on the specious argument that those who favor such laws would be able to interfere with collective bargaining, which simply isn't so, as the present laws guaranteeing the right to organize would not be changed.

Another paragraph in the AFL–CIO's endorsement of Senator KENNEDY has caused a raising of eyebrows among many people who hitherto have regarded that organization as a stanch ally of the anti-Communist cause in America. The paragraph says:

"Quibbles over precise wording cannot conceal the fact that NIXON impunged the loyalty of a Congressman, a nominee for the Senate, a Secretary of State and a President of the United States in his various electoral adventures."

UNIONS ALSO CRITICAL

This is all the more surprising because the AFL's own statements were critical of the failure of various officials during the Truman administration to deal more vigorously than they did with the Communists. To say now that criticism of this kind "impugned the loyalty" of anybody is to indulge in a guilt-by-inference technique which the new AFL–CIO pronouncement itself professes to condemn. One wonders if George Meany really knew who was behind the insertion of that paragraph in the AFL–CIO's statement. For it doesn't sound like anything he has ever said in the past against Communist activities in this country or against those who have pooh-poohed the Communist menace.

As for the campaign of 1950, which is so often the pretext for criticizing the kind of speeches Mr. NIXON made about his opponents, Adm. E. M. Zacharias, a retired naval intelligence officer, wrote a letter to the New York Herald Tribune last week pointing out what many people have not known—namely, that the opponent of Mr. NIXON in that campaign had spoken from the same platform with a known Communist, who organized the meeting, and that it was this which drew the fire of Mr. NIXON at the time.

Baring Questions New York Port Authority Part in Narrows Bridge Promotion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the RECORD the following telegram by a citizen to Hon. Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor of the State of New York, March 31, 1959, so that all people may better examine the association between the Port of New York Authority and the administration of the Federal interstate highway program and may be apprised of the necessity of their giving expressions of their support to Congressman EMANUEL CELLER, chairman, House Judiciary Committee, and to Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman, Special Subcommittee on the Federal-aid Highway Program, so that the investigations of the port authority and of the interstate highway program may supplement each other and proceed most effectively.

I am informed that the statements and charges contained in the telegram have neither been acknowledged nor refuted.

The telegram follows:

NEW YORK, N.Y., *March 31, 1959.*

Re assembly bill introduction No. 1718, Print No. 1726.

Hon. NELSON A. ROCKEFELLER,
Governor of the State of New York,
Executive Chamber, Albany, N.Y.

As explained by telephone today to Mr. William Rand of your legal staff, there has not yet been afforded me sufficient presentation and demonstration time to properly display and explain the rest of relevant data and evidence in support of charges against the port authority, Triboro Authority, New York State Department of Public Works, New York City Planning Commission, and New York City Board of Estimate of misstatement of fact, intent to needlessly destroy public property, misplanning, misrepresentation of traffic and engineering fact, and cooperation in suppression of fact which I have presented.

It is not easy to believe you are correctly reported to intend supporting the objection-

able Seventh Avenue, Brooklyn, approach without your hearing or causing to be heard complete evidence on the failure of the authorities and agencies to show public use and necessity for 12 lanes of capacity on a narrows crossing structure, for 12 lanes of capacity on a Seventh Avenue approach, or for the Seventh Avenue location itself, without your causing the authorities and agencies to supply objective factual statements and reports as a minimum requirement in proposing to provide due process of law in a proposed condemnation procedure to acquire the property which they are seeking, and without your entertaining consideration in this matter of a reasonable and superior liberty bridge-narrows tube combination alternative proposal which will provide equal or up to 12-mile shorter trips for all motorists, first direct freight rail connection from the southerly and westerly transcontinental railroads to the 9½ million people in Brooklyn, Long Island, Bronx, Westchester, and southern New England, all while affording a saving of about one-third billion dollars in public and investment funds.

Respectfully remark desired shore road approach proposed by assembly bill is ideal for narrows tube which provides easier vehicular grade than narrows bridge as proposed. Submit good-faith official request by interested authorities and agencies to U.S. Bureau of Public Roads for shore road approach approval has never been submitted, that in absence of such submission all statements referring to alleged Bureau of Public Roads position in matter are incompetent and invalid.

The waste in public funds involved in the Narrows Bridge arterial program amounts to about one-fifth of this year's entire New York State budget.

The enormous amount of public funds and needless human suffering involved certainly warrant reasonable field demonstration and further interview opportunity, which is hereby respectfully requested.

In view of the existing pattern of misstatements promulgated by the authorities, the opportunity to rebut is also respectfully requested.

HENRY SUCH SMITH.

"Teaching Opportunities in Africa," an Address by Raymond J. Smyke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, America today is standing on the threshold of our relationship with the newly independent peoples and countries of Africa. There has been an energetic drive by Africans for freedom and independence during the past 2 years, and many of them have looked toward the United States for inspiration and leadership. We must not turn them aside. We must be willing to give them the benefits of our own hard fought freedoms, civilization, knowledge, and techniques.

Teaching is the one field that offers tremendous challenges. The majority of today's African political leaders came from the teaching profession. But the newly emerging African countries need many more teachers, both foreign and indigenous, if they are to adequately staff needed schools and train citizens for civil service government posts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have printed with my remarks in the Appendix excerpts from an address entitled "Teaching Opportunities in Africa" given by Mr. Raymond J. Smyke to the oversea service meeting at the 19th National Catholic Students Mission Crusade Convention on the campus of the University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind., August 25–28. Mr. Smyke, who addressed the 57th annual conference of the American Teachers Association at Tuskegee Institute, Ala., on July 24, is the special assistant for Africa for the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession. This is an international nongovernmental organization of professional teachers' associations whose secretariat is in Washington, D.C. Mr. Smyke was formerly associated with the African American Institute in Washington where he organized and conducted the teacher placement program. I am sure that my colleagues will find his address most informative and interesting:

TEACHING OPPORTUNITIES IN AFRICA

(Address by Raymond J. Smyke to the oversea service meeting at the 19th National CSMC Convention, University of Notre Dame, August 25–28, 1960)

The statement that best describes teaching opportunities for Americans in Africa is that countless openings exist in many areas; but for a number of very good reasons it is extremely difficult to place American teachers in Africa.

Difficulties arising from teacher placement are common to both government and nongovernment groups, and while solutions at the present time are governed by resources available to any one group—sectarian or nonsectarian—it appears that a pooling of available resources will provide the only lasting solution to the problem of placing teachers in sufficient numbers fundamentally to assist education in Africa.

For Americans most opportunities are confined, at least for the time being, to the English-speaking areas of Africa. Eventually, of course, teachers must be found for French and Arabic-speaking areas. This is so, not because we consider these areas less important or more backward, but simply to begin where compatibility of language, culture and educational background already exist.

There is at this time no perceptible demand for general subject teachers in Arabic-speaking countries. Openings do exist for teachers of English, especially English as a foreign language. English language instruction in north Africa, as well as in other parts of the world, is ably handled by a group called English Language Services. ELS contracts from the U.S. Information Service and the International Cooperation Administration, both agencies of the U.S. Government, the establishment and maintenance of machine translation English language centers. For example, the Bourguiba Institute in Tunisia operated by ELS conducts a 9-month, double-stream, intensive English course with a capacity of 800 persons. It is reported that those selected generally speak no English whatsoever but come out at the end of the course with very good fluency. ELS is constantly in need of qualified teachers of English, especially those with experience in teaching English as a foreign language. Since the United States is unable to provide Arabic-speaking teachers, the next most valuable contribution is made.

Also active in Arabic-speaking countries of Africa as well as in many other parts of the world is the International Schools Foundation. By maintaining liaison with over 50 international schools it works to circulate teaching vacancies in schools dedicated to the children of the American community in a foreign country. Both ELS and the International Schools Foundation provide peripheral opportunities for teaching in Africa, since the opportunities are definitely limited and involve relatively few teachers.

Teaching positions in large numbers of recently independent French-speaking countries offer a stimulating and interesting challenge. Although vacancies definitely exist for French-speaking teachers in all subjects, Ministries of Education in many cases have not considered requesting expatriate teachers other than from France. Since most of these countries have close links to France after independence, they are hesitant to seek American teachers when French expatriates are available.

In the former Belgian Congo it is quite another matter. French language teachers are in demand and sought after, but the situation is too unsettled to attract interested and qualified persons. The Minister of Education of Léopoldville Province, a teacher of 30 years' experience, is also president of Centrale des Enseignants Congolaise, the largest teacher organization in the Congo. Both organizationally and officially one of the top educational priorities in the Province at the present time is to replace the European educational administrators by retraining Congolese teachers. When the Ministry is able to address itself to other problems the need for French-speaking American teachers will be taken up. Since the African-American Institute has taken steps to establish an office in Léopoldville under the direction of Donald Edwards, a missionary with long experience in the Congo, it can be assumed that teacher placement will play a part in the institute's Congo work. It must be emphasized, however, that there are at present no formal or even informal facilities to place teachers in the Congo, despite the apparent need for them. One quite natural obstacle, from the American point of view, is the tendency of European and European-trained African education administrators to look for teachers with a common educational philosophy, who are coreligionists and generally of the same nationality.

An answer to educational problems in French-speaking areas may soon be found in Canada. Leading educators there, especially in Quebec Province, are taking bold steps to utilize their French-speaking educational resources to assist Africa. The University of Montreal is considering an African program both to train African leaders and provide special courses for French-speaking teachers before taking up assignments in Africa. This, in addition to the generous scholarship assistance provided by Canada to African Commonwealth countries would make the total Canadian contribution in this field second only to the United Kingdom.

The areas in Africa where Americans can make the greatest contribution are the present British territories, and the former British territories now independent. Unfortunately there is no time here to go into the history of Anglo-American educational relations, both in the United Kingdom and in Africa, for these have influenced to various degrees the readiness of Africans to accept Americans as teachers. It is evident that the most receptive areas are in west Africa, where they have had longer contact with America and have larger numbers of men and women who have attended American schools and who go home singing the praises of their respective alma maters. The

recent action by the three governments of east Africa—Uganda, Kenya, and Tanganyika—in appointing an east African liaison officer in Washington to look after the interests of east African students studying here, will go a long way to facilitate the eventual placement of teachers in east Africa. In the Central African Federation the little experience Northern Rhodesia, Southern Rhodesia, and Nyasaland have had with American teachers has generally been good. This opens up future possibilities of more teachers going there.

Teaching opportunities in the area under discussion are practically all restricted to secondary education. Here education is patterned on the British system. The school leaving certificate in the African secondary school is called the Cambridge overseas school certificate or in west Africa the west African school certificate. Teachers follow meticulously a syllabus issued by the examinations council covering each of the five forms or grades. Examinations are set in London for east and central Africa and locally in west Africa. When one considers the historical development of education in England it is not too surprising to note that the Cambridge and West African School Syllabi are almost identical in content with the New York State Regents Syllabus. This gives some idea of the level of Cambridge school certificate work. The school certificate itself is comparable to the average American high school diploma.

Governments are trying diligently to extend the better secondary schools into sixth form schools, the sixth form being a 2-year addition to the normal 5-year secondary school. Thus, the student who goes through sixth form normally spends 7 years in secondary school, the last 2 years being roughly equivalent to the first year of a university course; so that those who pass their higher school certificate examination do not have to sit for the intermediate degree examinations of a British university or university college, but proceed to read for the degree itself. Holding the higher school certificate or its equivalent, the general certificate of education, advanced level, is the way university entrance is gained. In Kenya today there is no facility for Africans to do sixth form work. In almost every country concerned, the difficulty hampering development of sixth form work is lack of qualified staff.

Teaching opportunities are restricted to the secondary or postsecondary level (that is, sixth form) for several reasons. Considering the three main levels of education—primary, secondary, and higher—it may generally be said that primary education is in a comparatively sound position, especially so in west Africa. The government concerned have put a great deal of thought, work, and money into the development of primary schemes aimed at universal primary education; these schemes are bearing fruit. Although the rate of development varies with each country, the intent is certainly there and implementation follows as quickly as local teachers can be trained and money for buildings becomes available. It should be said that educators concerned with primary education, as well as the various ministries of education, are not satisfied with the progress to date: this in itself is a healthy sign. The need for American or other expatriate primary school teachers does not have a high government priority since most governments are increasingly able to cope with the problems in primary education.

University teaching has been adequately cared for by the various British organizations sending teachers to oversea territories, for example, the interuniversity council in London. Where short-term vacancies do exist, American Fulbright and other scholars coming out for a year or more of lecturing and research are able to fill most of the gaps.

There is still a shortage of lecturers in the critical disciplines of the physical and natural sciences and an oversupply of people on the university level qualified to teach only in the social sciences. Since all the university colleges in British affiliated areas are organically linked to London University or some other British university, the primary source of lecturers is from the United Kingdom. Thus, it is quite understandable that most vacancies are advertised in the United Kingdom and that agencies recruiting for university colleges look first to the United Kingdom for qualified people.

When one talks about the areas of critical educational need in Africa the training of teachers always heads the list. Many governmental and nongovernmental agencies such as the World Confederation of Organizations of the Teaching Profession are concerned with this problem, but all available resources concentrated on teacher training would not train adequate numbers of well-qualified teachers for a long time to come; on this there is universal agreement.

The crux of the problem is that, given a smoothly operating system of primary education and given the excellence of the several university colleges, there are not sufficient secondary school and higher school facilities to give those finishing primary school an opportunity to go on to higher education. A definite bottleneck exists in staffing secondary education with no immediate hope of relief.

Since many of the schools in which properly qualified American teachers are needed come under the heading of Government grant-aided schools operated by missions, a teacher's salary, allowances, and in many cases transportation is paid by Government. The minimum academic preparation here is a B.A. and M.A. degree, preferably both in the same discipline.

Let me close with my observations on what makes a good teacher for Africa:

Compared to the United Kingdom, the United States lacks a tradition of overea service. People going out from the United Kingdom in any capacity—as colonial servant, teacher or businessman—have an intangible asset in the tradition for oversea service which has so long been a part of life in the United Kingdom. Most young people who go out today from the United Kingdom have a friend, relative or neighbor who has gone to the colonies, and quite probably there are members of the immediate family who have served in the past. There is an unspoken urge for many people to go abroad to the colonies, and an acceptable climate for oversea service is a part of everyday life in the United Kingdom. Since the total population of the United Kingdom is relatively small, a high proportion have served in oversea posts in one capacity or another. It is quite evident that no such tradition or climate for oversea service exists in the United States. Given our total population, the number of people who have gone abroad in foreign service, business or missionary capacities has been infinitely small. The links that have been established in South America have been so recent and the total numbers involved so small by comparison that it is safe to say a tradition just does not exist here.

For the teacher going to Africa the adjustment is great, and the element called "cultural shock" is very evident. Thus, in the absence of a tradition for oversea service, recruitment and screening processes assume increased importance in order to select only the best qualified people. This is done in several ways. Programs which require candidates to study under observation for a period of 6 months or more are, in effect, self-screening mechanisms. An alternative is to subject the candidate to panel interviews and examinations covering professional, medical, emotional and social suitability for service abroad. This is subjective, and the evaluator finds himself in the position of judge and jury, unable to call upon a large body of information or experience because for the United States as a whole the determination of suitable candidates to serve abroad in any capacity is a most recent phenomenon. People involved in making the final decisions as to who should go and who should not go to backward areas find themselves acting more and more conservatively; for an error in placement resulting in a traumatic experience for the candidate may well affect him for the rest of his life, as well as doing incalculable damage to our relations with the host country.

I am not attempting to paint a grim picture to discourage likely candidates, but simply to emphasize that the answers to many of the questions concerning those who should teach in Africa often are not known.

Among the most needed qualifications appear to be excellent health and a history of emotional stability—and here let me say that the normal test and measurement procedures have proven less than useless. The safest practice developed to date seems to be a depth interview by a psychiatrist with actual experience in the area to which a person is being sent—nothing less. In addition to a history of emotional stability, a candidate must have a real regard and love for people of all kinds; being on an "African kick" is not enough. Patience is also an imperative: patience with the established order and the disorder; adaptibility to changing circumstances; and where required, respect for a superior whose education may not be equal to that of the teacher.

These are the personal and social requirements. Professionally, you must have at least a master's degree. Sometimes a B.A. with long teaching experience will satisfy, but gradually all ministries are adopting the rule that Americans should have an M.A. You must remember that the object of going to teach in Africa is to raise the general level of education. You will be expected to provide educational leadership and assist, formally and informally, less qualified teachers. Thus there is no substitute for professional excellence.

Qualified teachers with the right frame of mind will find the contribution they can make to Africa far in excess of their expectations. The immediate rewards are few, certainly not monetary; and the hazards must be recognized. But the feeling you sense among your students and the community, their wonder and gratitude that you have come from that "Valhalla," the United States, to work with them—in this way a rapport and bond is established that neither of you will ever forget.

Thank you.

Award of Special Citation of the Public Health Service in Vessel Sanitation to Farrell Lines, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS E. DORN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. DORN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as deserved recognition of the outstanding record in maintenance of sanitation achieved by the Farrell Lines, Inc., it is fitting that the attention of the U.S. House of Representatives and of the public generally be called to the special citation awarded by the Public Health

Service, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Especially is it noteworthy that Farrell Lines, Inc., has earned the coveted award for the fourth consecutive year.

The citation was presented to Adm. George Wauchope, executive vice president of the company, by Dr. Arnold B. Kurlander, Assistant Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, at ceremonies on board the company's vessel, the SS *African Lightning*, on Thursday, August 11, at the 33d Street pier in Brooklyn.

The special citation was awarded because, in 1959, each of the 14 vessels operated by Farrell Lines earned a rating of 95 or better on an official Public Health Service inspection involving 166 separate items of sanitary construction and maintenance.

Farrell Line vessels operate between the east coast of the United States and all three coasts of Africa.

America and Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to direct the attention of our colleagues to the remarks made by the Honorable Robert F. Wagner, mayor of the city of New York, at the opening session of the 63d Annual Convention of the Zionist Organization of America at the Statler-Hilton Hotel, New York City, on August 25, 1960.

It was indeed a brilliant address, which I am sure all of our colleagues will enjoy reading:

Reverend clergy, Senator KENNEDY, Mr. Redelheim, distinguished guests, my fellow Americans, 4 years ago the Zionist Organization of America convened amidst great tension and apprehension.

In the Middle East, Communist arms poured into Egypt. Marauders stole across Israel's frontiers, raiding, pillaging, and killing. Forces of hate blocked the Suez Canal in defiance of international law. Torrents of scurrilous abuse were unleashed against all who decried this injustice.

Today, you convene again and we may well ask:

Have we progressed since the eventful days of Sinai, 1956? How far have we come since the free people of Israel rose in rightful wrath to drive the evildoers from their doors?

Have we achieved the international comity and friendship for which all humanity hungers?

The answers are a matter of history. The Suez still remains blocked to Israel. Communist arms still flow—not only to the Middle East, but also to a once friendly island off our southern shores. The quiet imposed on the frontiers in the Holy Land is still an uneasy one.

Regrettably, the dream of a true Zion for all remains unredeemed.

For we are in need today of a great moral renaissance. We must reaffirm the principles that relations between states must be founded on mutual respect for national sovereignty, equality, and territorial integrity.

We must acknowledge the desire of all peoples to build their own free destinies, unencumbered by fears that mighty powers—be they of the left, right, or center—still harbor grasping ambitions to continue economic subjection.

We have watched bastions of liberty crumble or grow weak. We have grown too complacent at times in the comforts of our own household. We have tended, in too many ways, to forsake old friendships, taking them for granted.

We have entered an era of Echo-gazing in heavenly reaches, but appear reluctant to focus our hearts and minds on the plight of millions of underprivileged, hungry, ailing and ill housed on our earthly planet.

Yet, how beautiful and gracious is the dream of Zion, whence brother embraces brother; where each faith lends courage and understanding to its legions; where weary and burdened humanity can once more lift its shining countenance in prayerful hope of peace.

I am keenly aware as I again welcome your great convention on behalf of the city of New York that uppermost in your hearts and minds is your undying devotion to peace and to the eternal spiritual link forged between our beloved America and Eretz Yisroel.

Blessed are those who were privileged to play even minor roles in the rebirth of Israel. Doubly blessed am I indeed, for I know you will understand the pardonable pride I share in following in the footsteps of an illustrious forebear.

I know, too, you will understand my reiteration of a few brief thoughts which it was my privilege to express recently in Los Angeles; recalling how my father brought a heart warming message of hope from President Franklin D. Roosevelt to the Jewish National Fund at a convention of the ZOA in Atlantic City.

The brief words perhaps bear repeating tonight. For the ZOA, just as all great American organizations dedicated to humanity, has always respected and remembered its friends; always remained alert against false entreaties from sources interested primarily in courting friendships for expediency and selfish purposes.

Yes, it was a message of hope—from a friend—which my father brought from President Roosevelt. Hope for what? A homeland in Palestine.

For out of the travail and suffering and darkness of an era of unparalleled bestiality, a people cried out for justice and redemption. Weary, downtrodden, they held fast to their faith. Persecuted as no people have ever been, they stood erect in the face of tribulation and death with the dignity of a Job.

Out of the black hold of frustration and despair they crept, stumbled, walked, fought and then ran toward the light—the light of Zion.

Up from the hell holes of Eichmann's Nazi cruelty they stirred themselves, wrapping their faith around emaciated bodies, lifting their voices in thanks for redemption. It was nobility of the highest order. This was the rebirth of a nation dedicated the principles upon which our own American heritage is founded. This was the glory of the Kingdom of Brotherhood.

It is neither my purpose nor intention to delegate to myself the task of pleading once more with Israel's neighbors to cast aside bitterness and join in a fellowship to restore the glory of the region where civilization first came into being.

But, I would be remiss, if, as mayor of the city with the largest Jewish population in the world, where people of all faiths live together in harmony; where Christian, Moslem and Jew share the blessings of abundant democracy, if I did not again voice my prayer and hope for lasting peace in the Middle East.

I have beheld the wonders of Israel with my own eyes. I have knelt beside tender seedlings in a forest bearing my name in the hallowed hills of Judah. I have seen the glory of a people reborn from the waters of the Dan below snowcapped Mount Hermon in the north to the copper-red hills which fall away gently at Eilat.

I have seen the Bedouin shepherd raise his arms in a brotherly greeting of Shalom; I heard my heart sing as the children of Israel turned empty desert into gardens of honey and vines, of swaying palm trees and golden flowers. For such is the song of brotherhood and achievement one hears in Israel reborn.

You, the ZOA were among the foremost composers of the Song of Israel. No detractor can wrest that glory from you. No enemy can smite you into the dust, for you have borne the cherished burden of bringing hope to an undying people.

As we embark at home on momentous decisions in the months ahead; as we face the future together unafraid with all free people; as new leaders are about to take the helm of America and restore it to its rightful pinnacle on this earth as well as in the reaches of space, I welcome you to the city of New York.

You will, I know, again fasten your dreams to the high ideals which have inspired you since that historic day in Basle in September 1897, when Theodore Herzl envisioned the rebirth of Israel.

Hold fast to your dreams, my fellow Americans. Hold fast to your courage. Together, we shall reach for noble heights for America; for all who wish to share the abundancy of brotherhood and peace.

Dream, my fellow Americans, not of yesterday but of tomorrow; when East shall meet West; when together we shall wrest the best of yesterday, mingle it with the strength of today and build for a better tomorrow.

May your deliberations be fruitful not only for your people; but for all mankind.

Shalom.

John Cardinal O'Hara

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHRYN E. GRANAHAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mrs. GRANAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Philadelphia Enquirer, August 29, 1960:

THE LEGACY OF CARDINAL O'HARA

Philadelphians of all faiths—and peoples throughout America and the world—are grievously saddened by the death of John Cardinal O'Hara on Sunday morning.

He was a kindly man beloved by all who knew him. He was a dedicated servant of God and a compassionate friend of all humanity. He was brilliant and he was also humble.

It was in this city that Cardinal O'Hara rose to the summit of lifelong service and achievement. It was while serving as spiritual leader of the archdiocese of Philadelphia that he first wore the red hat of a cardinal. It is here that his death is mourned most deeply.

The cardinal's good works in Philadelphia will stand for time without end as monuments to his wisdom and selfless devotion to the betterment of man.

As a conscientious clergyman who knew well and at first hand the needs of the un-

fortunate and the ill, the underprivileged and the undernourished, the orphans and the elderly, Cardinal O'Hara mobilized mighty forces of assistance. He organized the annual Catholic Charities Appeal in the Philadelphia area which helps to support a hundred institutions, providing a variety of benefits to persons of all ages. He founded the annual archdiocesan Christmas party that is given for needy and abandoned children.

In the field of education Cardinal O'Hara provided inspiring leadership and performed enduring service of incalculable value to the people of Philadelphia. Every level of parochial education was expanded and improved to meet not only the community's growing needs but the cardinal's high standards. Seventy-four elementary and high schools were newly founded or newly constructed under his direction. Hundreds of existing schools were enlarged. Additions to both the physical plant and the academic curricula of Catholic colleges in the area were promoted and encouraged by Cardinal O'Hara.

His interests in educational and charitable work were combined in numerous projects providing special instruction for the mentally retarded and the physically handicapped.

The cardinal's extraordinary accomplishments in the field of education in Philadelphia were a natural culmination of many years of experience. As a graduate of the University of Notre Dame, class of 1911, he served that institution in successive capacities as instructor, professor, dean, vice president, and president. He founded the university's school of commerce and was its first head.

During his presidency of Notre Dame he directed a broad expansion program that included new buildings and additional courses of study. Emphasis placed in the 1930's on expanding facilities for scientific research and the teaching of science—as well as for liberal arts and other subjects of fundamental education—is testimony to the cardinal's foresight and wisdom.

Cardinal O'Hara was a teacher to the end—a teacher of men and women as well as boys and girls. He taught unforgettable lessons in the goodness of life, by his own example and through divine inspiration.

The legacy of Cardinal O'Hara is his good life and good works for God and man. It is a priceless treasure.

THE EARLY YEARS

A never-ending yen for knowledge and a boyhood desire to be a priest were two of the many facets of the early life of John Cardinal O'Hara.

The prelate was born May 1, 1888, at Ann Arbor, Mich. He was one of five brothers and three sisters.

Cardinal O'Hara's father was the late John W. O'Hara, an attorney. Before embarking on a law career, his father had been a school teacher, a country newspaper editor and a U.S. consular official in South America.

The cardinal's mother, the late Ella Thornton O'Hara, was the daughter of the proprietor of a general store near Logansport, Ind. She also taught school before her marriage. She died in 1944.

The father—son of an Irish-born farm couple—taught school and edited a newspaper at Bunker Hill, Ind., immediately after graduating from high school. Later, he moved his family to Ann Arbor, where he furthered his studies at the University of Michigan.

After completing these studies, the father and his family settled in Peru, Ind. There, the O'Hara children attended parochial and public schools.

In 1950, the cardinal's parents made a decision that was to broaden considerably the outlook of their sons and daughters. Mr. O'Hara accepted an appointment to the U.S. consular service and was sent to Montevideo, Uruguay.

The family often recalled in later years that they "had to lease a whole small ship" to make the long journey.

The other family members also related in subsequent years that Father John—as the prelate always was known to them—discussed at length with them during the voyage his hopes of entering the priesthood.

In the Uruguay city, Cardinal O'Hara attended the Jesuit school, Colegio de Sagrado Corazon. Between sessions, he served as secretary to Edward C. O'Brien, then U.S. Minister to Uruguay.

Ill health interrupted Cardinal O'Hara's activities, however. Physicians suggested that a stay on a ranch would aid him. He regained his health while spending 3 months on a cattle ranch in Argentina.

On his return to Montevideo, the future priest made business surveys for the American Bureau of Commerce.

His father was transferred to the U.S. consulate at Santos, Brazil, in 1907. The family went there with him.

The years spent in South America were to prove fruitful to Cardinal O'Hara throughout his career. He gained a firsthand knowledge of the needs of Latin America and often assisted in programs which aided these countries and their residents.

It was in 1908 that the cardinal returned to this country. The following year—after his father opened a law office in Indianapolis—he enrolled at Notre Dame University in South Bend, Ind.

HIS YEARS AT NOTRE DAME

The gold dome atop the main building at Notre Dame University is said to hold a special lure for young men who show a special love for the Blessed Virgin Mary. John Francis O'Hara was no exception.

From young manhood, the future cardinal proudly proclaimed his "love of God and the Immaculate Heart of Mary." His motto became "Follow her, you shall not go astray."

Cardinal O'Hara entered Notre Dame in 1909. It was natural for a son of two former schoolteachers to show an aptitude along those lines. So while studying for a bachelor of philosophy degree, he taught other students elementary Spanish.

The tall, red-haired future prelate remained as a lay teacher at the school after receiving his degree in 1911. Then, on August 8, 1912, he entered the Seminary of the Congregation of the Holy Cross—the teaching order at Notre Dame.

It was part of a continuing series of events which continued for more than three decades and which saw Cardinal O'Hara and Notre Dame University become synonymous. He devoted much of his great energy to the institution and its thousands of students.

When he left Notre Dame, he did so reluctantly, he often admitted later. But, greater honors were to be his and his greater feats made him the school's most illustrious alumnus.

For a year after his ordination to the priesthood, Cardinal O'Hara was away from Notre Dame. He was ordained on September 9, 1916, in the Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul at Indianapolis, Ind., by the late Bishop Joseph Chartrand.

Immediately, he undertook post-graduate work in Latin American history at the Catholic University of America at Washington.

He also studied banking at the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. While taking this course, he was in residence at St. Francis de Sales Church, 47th Street and Springfield Avenue.

In September 1917, Cardinal O'Hara returned to Notre Dame. He was appointed secretary of the faculty there and also head of the university's department of commerce.

Three years later, he founded the School of Commerce and became its first dean. He also served additionally as professor and prefect of religion.

A skilled writer, Cardinal O'Hara founded the Notre Dame Daily Religion Bulletin.

Written in a down-to-earth style, it put religion in the vernacular and made it a living part of the day-to-day life of the college student. The publication soon became nationally known. Students would send it home to parents or forward it to parish priests or teaching sisters.

Cardinal O'Hara—calling on his expert knowledge of Portuguese and Spanish—also conducted a daily Latin-American news service for a time. His releases went to 75 newspapers.

While a faculty member at Notre Dame, Cardinal O'Hara again visited South America. This time, he established a student exchange program with leading universities there. Later, he started Notre Dame's Latin American course.

Fond of all sports and in particular football and swimming, Cardinal O'Hara was known as an intricate part of the famed teams of the school at South Bend.

The late Knute Rockne—most famous of all Notre Dame grid coaches—often told visitors:

"Here comes Father O'Hara. He's my assistant. He keeps the players spiritually fit."

At its 1933 meeting, the Provincial Council of the Holy Cross Fathers selected the future cardinal as vice president of the university.

The council met again July 5, 1934, and this time picked Cardinal O'Hara as president of the university. He was named to succeed the late Father Charles L. O'Donnell.

In taking the high office, the new president advised the faculty and students:

"Prayer is wise. So is sacrifice."

For much of Cardinal O'Hara's tenure as head of Notre Dame, this country was gripped in financial depression. All colleges found problems multiplying.

But, Notre Dame's president displayed amazing administrative skill. As a result, the university became larger.

A new science building, two new student residence halls and a recreation center were constructed. Various new courses of study were introduced. The student body increased steadily.

In 1936, he conferred an honorary degree on Eugene Cardinal Pacelli, then Vatican Secretary of State. Cardinal Pacelli later became Pope Pius XII.

The late President Franklin D. Roosevelt named Cardinal O'Hara as a member of the U.S. delegation to the Eighth Inter-American Congress at Lima, Peru, in 1938.

While in South America, the visiting university head made special studies of educational systems there. He was especially lauded for his work by President Lopez Contreras, of Venezuela.

The faculty and students at Notre Dame showed mixed emotions when Pope Pius XII announced on December 11, 1939, that the future cardinal had been chosen titular bishop of Mylasa and appointed military delegate, auxiliary bishop of the Army and Navy diocese.

They were overjoyed at the honor bestowed. But, they were saddened at the prospect of Notre Dame without "Father John."

AS A BISHOP

Against a background of medieval splendor, Father John Francis O'Hara was consecrated a bishop of the Roman Catholic Church on January 15, 1940.

The ceremony took place in Sacred Heart Church on the campus of Notre Dame University.

More than a third of the church's hierarchy in the United States attended. They were joined by hundreds of priests and laymen. Many of the latter were Notre Dame alumni, who traveled great distances.

The consecrator was Archbishop, later Cardinal, Francis Spellman, of New York. He was assisted by Archbishop Joseph E. Ritter, of Indianapolis, and the late Bishop John F. Noll, of Fort Wayne. All three were long-time friends of the new bishop.

In a sermon at the time, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas V. Shannon, of Chicago, likened the spirit of the new bishop with that of the school which he had headed.

"Bishop O'Hara has presided over an institution that has always connoted a brave spirit, copartner in the militancy of the church," Monsignor Shannon said.

"We know him to be a man of peace. Storms may beat about him, but his bark is well ballasted. No one can teach others who is not himself taught of God."

In his new high position, the future cardinal headed a special diocese for Roman Catholics in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps.

Under his jurisdiction were approximately 1,000 civilian auxiliary and commissioned Catholic chaplains. His new duties took the prelate to practically every military installation.

He continued these visits as often as possible during the Second World War.

Chaplains everywhere soon considered the bishop to be a close friend. He carried on extensive correspondence with each of them, sending at least one letter a month.

Thousands of soldiers and sailors were baptized and confirmed by Cardinal O'Hara.

Headquarters of the military delegate were in New York. The then Bishop O'Hara was in residence at St. Cecelia's Church.

He found that the parish included a number of Puerto Rican families, newly arrived in New York. His familiarities with Latin-American languages enabled him to learn of their many problems.

Despite his busy schedule, the prelate directed part of his efforts to aiding these families.

On March 10, 1945, the military delegate was named Bishop of Buffalo, N.Y. He succeeded the late Bishop John A. Duffy.

Installation ceremonies were held on May 8, 1945, in St. Joseph's Cathedral, Buffalo. Presiding was Cardinal Spellman.

As head of the upper New York State diocese, Cardinal O'Hara added to his already great reputation as an administrator.

The diocese's educational system was enlarged with numerous new grade and high schools being opened.

An annual campaign for Catholic Charities was begun. Despite high goals, it always succeeded—the only drive of its type to do so in the vicinity. When asked for an explanation, volunteers pointed to the inspirational leadership of the bishop.

On Nov. 28, 1951, Pope Pius XII appointed the prelate as Archbishop of Philadelphia, one of the Nation's largest Sees.

It was the second time the Bishop succeeded to a See formerly headed by the late Dennis Cardinal Dougherty. Cardinal Dougherty had been Bishop of Buffalo from December 1915, until May 1918, and Archbishop of Philadelphia from May 1918 until May 1951.

AS ARCHBISHOP OF PHILADELPHIA DIOCESE

John Cardinal O'Hara's espiscopate in the Archdiocese of Philadelphia was characterized by an active and vigorous administration.

He was appointed fifth archbishop and ninth ordinary of the archdiocese on November 28, 1951. At the same time, he was named Metropolitan of the Ecclesiastical Province of Pennsylvania.

The archdiocese is comprised of Philadelphia and the counties of Berks, Bucks, Carbon, Chester, Delaware, Lehigh, Montgomery, Northampton, and Schuylkill. It covers 5,043 square miles.

In addition to this archdiocese, the province includes the dioceses of Harrisburg, Pittsburgh, Erie, Scranton, Altoona-Johnstown, and Greensburg. It has a Catholic population in excess of 3,400,000.

Cardinal O'Hara was installed at the Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul on January 9, 1952, by Archbishop, now Cardinal, Amleto G. Cicognani, then Apostolic Delegate to the United States.

At that time, the cardinal set forth the keynote for his activities.

"If you will kindly tell me your needs, I shall do my best to meet them," he told the assemblage.

"I know no other way to serve. Working together, with the assistance of God's grace, we can help one another save our souls."

Much of the program he spearheaded centered around education, the home, and charity.

Although the school system of the archdiocese had attained a fine reputation for leadership, Cardinal O'Hara found that additional facilities were needed.

He directed the opening of more than 60 new parish schools and the improving and expanding of 300 existing schools. Fourteen new high schools were constructed to house 35,000 more pupils.

Parochial elementary and high schools in the archdiocese now are attended by approximately 280,000 students.

The seven existing Catholic colleges and universities in the area also were greatly improved. Three new institutions of higher learning—Cabrini College, Holy Family College, and Blessed Sacrament College—were opened.

The cardinal also directed that St. Charles Borromeo Seminary at Overbrook be opened to students for the priesthood from nearby dioceses.

To aid the mentally retarded, Cardinal O'Hara founded four special schools. A new school for the blind was opened and facilities for the deaf and hard of hearing were enlarged.

Nearly 40 new parishes were established, most of them in newly developed suburban communities. The Catholic population of the archdiocese now exceeds 1,500,000. In 1952 it was 1,114,122.

The Cathedral of SS. Peter and Paul was redecorated. A Spanish-speaking center was opened.

Cardinal O'Hara also fostered Catholic action. An information center was opened in midcity. Activities of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine were widened. A new printing plant was built for the Catholic Standard and Times, the archdiocesan newspaper.

Family life was the focal point of an extensive program. Women's groups in parishes, known as the Committee for Christian Home and Family, were organized.

The premarital instructions program was started under the sponsorship of the Archdiocesan Family Life Bureau. Family holy communion Sundays were encouraged.

The practice of blessing babies each Sunday during May was inaugurated. Thousands of children were blessed by the Cardinal and his Auxiliary Bishops at the Cathedral and in various regional churches.

Formation of the Cardinal's Committee for Charity was announced early in 1958. The committee has representation in every parish.

Each year, a campaign for funds is conducted. Most of the money is raised on a single Sunday afternoon when a door-to-door canvass of Catholic families is conducted.

Annually, the appeal has amounted to more than $2 million. It benefits about 100 institutions, child care centers, and homes for the aged.

In December 1956 Cardinal O'Hara held his first Christmas party for needy and abandoned children. It has become an annual event.

To Cardinal O'Hara, the size of the project or the possible difficulties to be encountered never seemed insurmountable.

His characteristic comment usually was: "If it's God's will, and God's work, He'll find the way and see us through."

AND FINALLY AS CARDINAL

John Francis O'Hara had been a priest for 42 years when Pope John XXIII named him a Cardinal of the Roman Catholic Church on November 16, 1958.

"The news made me numb," the new Prince of the Church said at that time.

As a member of the Sacred College, Cardinal O'Hara became an adviser to the Pontiff. As such, he was named to three congregations of the Roman Rota—the Congregations of the Council, of Religious, and of Seminaries and Universities.

Cardinal O'Hara was the second cardinal in the history of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia. His immediate predecessor was Dennis Cardinal Dougherty, who had been created a Cardinal on March 7, 1921.

The reserved and scholarly prelate also became the first member of his religious order—the Congregation of the Holy Cross—to become a cardinal. The order is popularly known as the Holy Cross Fathers.

The cardinal was one of 21 newly designated cardinals to attend a consistory at the Vatican from December 15 to 18, 1958. At a public function, the new Princes received their traditional red hats from the Pope.

At the consistory, Cardinal O'Hara was assigned one of Rome's most beautiful churches as his titular church. It is the Church of SS. Andrew and Gregory on the Celian Hill.

Upon his arrival in Rome for the consistory, Cardinal O'Hara shunned public acclaim and appearance. Instead, he went directly to the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament in St. Peter's Basilica. There, he knelt in prayer.

Thousands braved chill winds for several hours to await his arrival home at Philadelphia International Airport on December 20, 1958. And his brief—yet significant—statement drew loud cheers.

He said simply, after stepping from the airliner:

"It's great to be home."

Tens of thousands lined Broad Street and other thoroughfares in south Philadelphia to greet his motorcade that day. Again, the Cardinal quietly acknowledged the homage.

Then he proceeded directly to the Cathedral to offer mass for the people.

Consumer Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on June 6, 1960, I addressed the 46th Annual International Consumer Credit Conference at Chicago, Ill. My remarks were printed in the Credit World of August 1960 and I have requested per-

mission to have them included in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CONSUMER CREDIT

(By THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri)

Consumer credit has been a subject in which I have been very much interested for many years.

Soviet Russia is now following Western Europe in developing consumer credit. Western Europe has been slow in developing consumer credit; indeed it has been only since the Korean war that consumer credit has assumed any importance there, and yet today there are indications that its growth rate is matching that which has occurred in the United States.

Consumer credit in the United States has been growing at a very rapid rate. At the end of 1950 total consumer credit outstanding was $21,741 million. At the end of 1959 the total was $52,046. The figure by the end of 1960 will be close to $60 billion.

Even in the United States consumer credit may be regarded as a recent and modern phenomena. In 1929 the total consumer credit outstanding was $6.4 billion and in 1945 it was $5.7 billion. It is apparent, however, that World War II stunted the growth of this economic phenomena, because in the 1941 the figure was $9.2 and this should be related to the nadir of 1933 of $3.5 billion.

The most rapid growth has been in personal loans: $2.8 billion in 1950 to $9.97 in 1959, although automobile paper is a close second, $6.07 billion in 1950 to $16.59 in 1959. Repair and modernization loans jumped from $1.016 in 1950 to $2.704 in 1959. Other consumer goods paper rose from $4.799 in 1950 to $10.234 in 1959. Noninstallment credit, though showing continuing growth, is less spectacular. The 1950 figure was $6.768 billion in comparison to $12.564 billion in 1959.

Underlying this growth is its strange imperviousness to the postwar recessions. Also notable is the commendable increase in the installment credit repaid figures which rise from $18.445 in 1950 to $43.239 in 1959. Of course, without this factor, installment credit would not be in a business.

I believe it is about time that consumer credit receive the social and economic analysis that its importance deserves. Much damage can result, indeed has resulted, from a misinterpretation of what consumer credit is in essence.

For example, I believe that consumer credit is really not a proper tool for monetary control except in very short periods of time, and even then only in very specific ways. And yet it is one of the first items listed by economists and monetary authorities when they speak of monetary restraint. When standby controls are mentioned reference is immediately made to consumer credit as one of the major controls to be implemented.

I believe, aside from the evidence before our own eyes in the United States and Western Europe, if a Communist State like Russia is beginning to use consumer credit it must have some real basis in modern economics.

The inherent power behind this economic phenomena has to be very great to break through the Communist ideology which it basically contradicts.

Indeed, this economic force is great. It stems from the fact that an individual's needs and wants do not conform to the years in his life during which he is gainfully employed. Consumer credit is the counterpart of pensions and annuities and insurance. Both seek to spread the earnings of the individual more equally over his entire life, and not bunch it in the years when he is actually productive.

Much has been done in our society by way of spreading income over from the working period of a man's life to the years of his retirement and many devices have been developed to assist him in performing this desirable economic and human function.

Little, however, has been said of anticipating the income of an individual so that the earlier years before the earnings are sufficient may be adequately and economically financed. Yet if spreading income over a person's entire life more equally is important, and I believe it is, attention should be paid to both periods when the income is not being earned the period before it is earned as well as the period after it has been earned.

The income of a man should be permitted, if at all economically possible, to be related to his expenditures. We have learned that business cycles no longer, if they ever did, relate to the number of days it takes the earth to go around the sun. Similarly, we should realize that the individual man has only 40 working years out of a lifetime of three score and ten. The expenditures required of a man when he starts married life, for example, are on the average greater than his expenses after his family has been raised, particularly after he has acquired equity interests in his home, consumer durables, savings, etc.

The income of a man should be spread, if it can be done economically, to cover the period when he is still learning his profession, or trade. I might interpolate that either it is his anticipated income that is used or it is bound to come somewhere from within the society, be it the family, privately endowed institutions or the Government, if we are to have education. Indeed, the correlation between amount of education and amount of income has now been clearly established and money invested in education can be paid off as a relatively small percentage of the increased earnings resulting from the education. Society as well as the individual benefits from this process.

I do not believe our society, based as it is upon the theory that men should be permitted to rise to the limits of their abilities, is well served by an economic system where only those who have assisting parents or inheritance can gain the capital necessary to get the education they can absorb to establish for themselves and their families the standard of living which their abilities would permit. Nor do I believe our society is well served by the alternative system of having a political bureaucracy set up a system of endowments and scholarships and select through whatever procedures they might develop who shall be more fully trained and educated and who shall not. Consumer credit is the way to get off this dilemma.

There is no question of the added value to society from spreading income from the earning years to cover the later years of retirement from earning. This process requires savings. Capital accumulation which is required to finance economic growth is dependent upon savings.

SPREADING INCOME

However, there is this added value to society from spreading income from the future back to the present in order to train and educate the future entrant into the labor market, which I suggest. Furthermore, there is, I have suggested, the value to society from spreading income anticipated in the future back to the present in order to permit young families to have and rear children in an atmosphere and home life of reasonable high standards. To be specific, if a young mother can have a dishwasher and a clothes drier during the period she is trying to raise young children, she can do a much better job of rearing the children, and society definitely benefits from this process.

I believe the economists who look at the increasing amount of consumer credit in the United States with alarm should relax. The rapid growth should be related to the fact that consumer credit in the United States, if it is the economic and social phenomena I believe it is, has not yet matured, indeed it is in its infancy, and it will not mature until three full generations pass. Furthermore, as inherited wealth continues to decline in importance in our society, as I anticipate it will, I expect consumer credit to take up the gap. Consumer credit will reach maturity when the personal income of our society is fully spread both backward and forward relating the earning years to the full years of the individual's life.

There are many faults in our political economic structure which still operate at cross-purposes to the idea of spreading a person's income throughout their entire life as opposed to spreading it unevenly as we do over the working years of a person's life. Our tax laws still do not recognize this desirable feature, although in respect to savings and spreading income into the later years of life through annuities and other devices some recognition has been given to it. However, under our system of graduated income taxes we have no device which permits a person to spread his personal income for tax purposes over a period of years. The result is that those with fluctuating incomes like our farmers or those who amass most of their income for their life in a few short years like athletes and entertainers are taxed at higher rates in the years of great earnings and in the years of little or no earnings they frequently lose even the value of their personal exemptions. Accordingly, a great premium and one without any social values that I can see, is placed under our graduated income-tax laws upon a person with a more even flow of income.

We have seen the great efforts being made by our people to spread their income into their years of retirement through stock purchase plans, pension plans, insurance of all sorts, etc., which seek to avoid the impact of the high tax rate in their years of earning. This era has been one of insurance, one of prepayment, which is good. Now we are seeing an overlapping of a new era, that of postpayment, and it is important to examine it to see if it, too, is good.

I again point out that prepaying—saving—for retirement has received the social and monetary economists' sanction because it carries with it the desirable economic feature of generating savings. It also carries with it the sanctions of mankind's traditions developed over the centuries he has had to cope with economic laws based as they were upon scarcities. Therefore, the progress we are making in encouraging retirement programs has been widely acclaimed.

Unfortunately, postpaying * * * consumer credit * * * has not received this social sanction and indeed it is viewed as being something almost socially undesirable. One reason, of course, has been the thought that this is the reverse of saving. Another explanation is that we have not yet fully realized that base of all economic law of the centuries preceding us has been altered. Through the availability of electric power and technological advancements on a broad front, our society in America today is based upon plenty, not scarcity. But I can even speak to the subject in a traditional fashion and point up arguments which I think make credit respectable.

Some consumer credit may be the reverse of saving, but a great deal of consumer credit is in itself saving. Buying a consumer durable on time certainly is a device for gaining an equity investment in the consumer durable, and to this extent it is savings. Buying a home on time certainly has a large element of saving connected with it. I have suggested that buying an education on time is in essence a capital investment that pro-

duces an ample return on the investment. Therefore, even that has a large aspect of saving about it. Postpaying a trip to Florida or Europe seems to have little element of saving about it, and I can imagine other areas of use of consumer credit which on their face also seem to have little savings in them. Yet, I would not presume to judge hastily what is in reality a capital investment and what not. A trip to Europe to a budding young architect or a linguistic student might indeed be a very sensible capital investment and, therefore, have a real element of personal as well as social saving about it.

The most that can be said against consumer credit saving is that it does not provide accumulated capital for investing in economic growth. But even here we must pause to take stock. We are well aware of the fact that economic growth is dependent on something more than capital accumulation; it is likewise based upon human skills and capital must be used to train the skills if they do not already exist. It is not easy to separate capital from that which capital must be spent for. When we speak of capital being necessary to finance growth we certainly imply that the capital will be spent. Investing money in a company means that the company will use the capital for either building buildings, purchasing machines or in training human skills or at least in gathering together human skills that already exist.

Am I coming through on this subject of consumer credit? If I am, then it should now be apparent why I view with great alarm the idea that consumer credit controls is a desirable social tool for controlling consumer spending. If what we are seeking in utilizing credit controls is to curb inflation then I would urge that we deal directly with what we are talking about * * * prices of goods and services. Much as I dislike the idea of price controls because of the administrative difficulties connected with them and the interference that it imposes in the free marketplace, I would much prefer this type of control to an attempt to interfere with the economic function being performed in our society by consumer credit * * * as I have been outlining it. Nor is it sufficient to state that consumer credit control would be selective. Who indeed is capable of selecting what our individual citizens should have and not have.

However, I would like to go one step further in discussing inflation itself because inflation has been as much misunderstood, in my judgment, as has consumer credit. Real inflation is what I call a blood disease. It exists when we have tampered with the value of money as a measure of goods, services, labor, and savings. I have said "tampered." Perhaps a better statement would be this: when through our ignorance we have failed to preserve the dollar as an accurate measuring device of goods, services, labor, and savings.

ECONOMIC COSTS

Part of our tampering or failure to act wisely in our treatment of the dollar as a "weight and measure" has been our failure to understand economic costs. Our method of measuring inflation has been primarily through the consumer price index, the wholesale price index and other selective series. All of these statistical series though very valuable have obvious defects about them.

None of them measure increase in quality or the cost resulting from increased variety or choice. Furthermore, none of these indexes measures other increased real costs; for example, the economic cost resulting from the depletion of the Mesabi iron ore in Minnesota was bound to increase the cost of steel and this increase unless compensated for by increased productivity was bound to show up in the consumer price index. Yet, it would be economically unsound to refer to this increased rise as an element of "inflation."

The cost of rapid technological advancement is another real economic cost which is not measured in our economic indices set up to measure inflation. We talk about the increased cost of drugs and seek to relate that to inflation or to some group of individuals trying to gouge the public. Both references are equally unsound. Rapid technological advancement springs from increased capital spent in research and development. This cost must be recouped in the price charged for the product. Rapid technological advancement brings in its wake obsolete equipment and obsolete skills. The cost of this, too, must be borne somewhere, usually in the price of the product or service to be sold. Rapid technological advancement requires training of new skills and the purchase of new equipment. These costs too must be borne. The only recoupment of these costs other than in sales price of the articles or services is through increased quality, which is very inadequately measured in our indices and increased productivity which might be reflected in a lowering of the cost.

Consumer controls or indeed price controls will not help to hold in line this economic process, except to damage it. If a wrong diagnosis has been made the only effect of treating this as the disease of inflation would be to curb future economic growth as well as undermine the present standards of living.

MONETARY DISEASE

There is such a thing as inflation—a monetary disease. It occurs when more money is printed than the economic growth up to that point justifies. Credit control is not money control. It can be affected by the amount of money available and it can be controlled by those who have the power to control the amount of money in ways short of credit controls. Unfortunately, in the past those who have the power to control money have confused credit with money and with the economic process which I have attempted to describe. In so doing they have damaged economic growth as well as price stability.

Credit is controlled, in essence, by the judgment of those in the business of extending it. If they—and that means essentially this audience—relate it to the ability of the individual to earn and they look upon this as a method of income spreading then we will keep the process from being abused.

Furthermore, I believe the success or failure of the creditman's business is so wrapped up in making an accurate appraisal of potential earnings of their customers that there really is little danger of their overextending credit. However, as in any business there can be those who enter it to abuse it—to make the fast buck and then to flee. But I regard policing against this kind of operation to be the same as policing against any kind of piracy. We must maintain constant vigilance, but as long as the pirates don't control the police force we are on safe grounds.

CREDIT CONTROL

In this respect I want to discuss briefly a subject where I believe those in the credit control field need to tighten up. A congressional committee has already started looking into this matter. I do not believe I am telling any of you anything. All I am really doing is emphasizing it. There must be an end to this business of using a consumer durable business or any other business seeking to sell goods or services to the public as a front for what really is a business of extending consumer credit. However, these are rackets and like all rackets they cannot stand up against good competition. Indeed, the only way they can survive economically is gouging the public at high prices. I saw a great deal of this operation back in the thirties when I was chairman of the St. Louis Bar Small Loans Committee. And I am happy to state it was the good small loan companies who provided the force needed to curb the abuses and keep the matter in hand.

It is my opinion that you are in a new, growing, exciting and socially valuable economic operation. If you handle it well, as I believe you essentially have been handling it, you will be making a great contribution to the well-being of our society and to each individual who goes to make it up today and those who will be its composition three generations from now.

San Francisco Baseball Giants To Make Centennial Good-Will Tour of Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, may I invite the attention of my colleagues in the House and the Senate to the goodwill baseball tour of Japan to be made this fall by the San Francisco Giants as the sports feature of the centennial celebration commemorating the signing of the first Treaty of Commerce and Friendship with Japan.

After stopping off in our newest and 50th State of Hawaii for a few exhibitions, the Giants will play 16 games in Tokyo, Sapporo, Sendai, Toyama, Osaka, Fukuoka, Shimonoseki, Hiroshima, Nagoya, and Shizuoka.

Most of us are aware of the tremendous interest that the Japanese have in our national pastime. But few of us, I am sure, have any idea of the influence that baseball has had on Japanese-American relations.

BASEBALL IN JAPAN 86 YEARS OLD

Japan is said to be the oldest nation outside of the United States to be playing baseball. Only 30 years after Abner Doubleday is supposed to have originated the game at historic Cooperstown, baseball was introduced to Japan. This was in 1874, so Japanese baseball is 86 years old this year.

Count Nobuaki Makino, one of Japan's most illustrious statesmen and father-in-law of former Prime Minister Shigeru Yoshida, who, probably more than any single individual, gave new Japan its pro-United States orientation, is generally remembered as Japan's first baseball player. Premier Yoshida, as most Americans recall, was the last Prime Minister during the period of the occupation and the first Prime Minister when Japan regained her sovereignty in 1952. He headed a special delegation to Washington this past May to participate in the centennial celebration here. He also headed the Japanese delegation that signed the peace treaty in San Francisco in 1951. Count Makino learned to play baseball when he visited Philadelphia in 1871 as a member of the

Prince Iwakura mission. On his return he introduced baseball, with its special terminology, to a Japan just emerging from its feudalism.

Within 20 years it had become a popular and well-accepted game, largely because of the promotional writings of Shiki Masaoka, who, though known as the foremost "haiku" poet of the Meiji era, is better remembered as the father of Japanese baseball.

In 1878, Ki Hiraoka, who was bitten by the baseball bug while studying in New York City, organized the first team, representing the Shimbasi Athletic Club, built the first baseball diamond in what is now the famous Ginza district in Tokyo, introduced the wearing of team uniforms, and threw the first curve ball seen outside this country.

In its early developmental period, baseball teams represented various athletic clubs or industrial plants. In a few years, however, the schools and universities took up the game and made it the spectacular spectator sport that it is today, when crowds of 80,000 are not unusual for a college championship.

In 1905, Waseda University came to this country to play a number of our colleges and universities. This was the first oversea trip ever taken by any Japanese sports team and was the forerunner of the many exchange good-will tours by various athletic stars and teams in the past half century.

SAN FRANCISCO IDENTIFIED WITH JAPANESE GAME

Two San Franciscans, Herb Hunter and Lefty O'Doul are the legendary baseball idols of Japan. The former helped develop college baseball, while the latter helped to organize professional baseball there.

The first all-star team to visit Japan was in November 1931, which included such baseball immortals as Lefty O'Doul, Lefty Grove, Larry French, Mickey Cochrane, Muddy Ruel, Lou Gehrig, George Kelly, Frank Frisch, Willie Kamm, Rabbit Maranville, Al Simmons, and others. In 1934 Babe Ruth led one of the greatest aggregations ever assembled, every member of which has been enshrined in baseball's Hall of Fame in Cooperstown, N.Y., to Japan, where they played to crowds of over 100,000. Connie Mack, incidentally, was the manager of that dream team, and his assistant was Lefty O'Doul.

Herb Hunter of San Francisco is known as America's baseball ambassador because he remained to coach the game at Waseda and Keio universities after visiting Japan as a member of a group of Pacific coast players in 1920. When he returned to the United States, he persuaded then Baseball Commissioner Landis to authorize major leaguers to visit Japan to conduct clinics to instruct the Japanese in the finer points of the game. Casey Stengel, currently the revered manager of the New York Yankees, was a member of the first contingent, which also included Waite Hoyt, Herb Pennock, Guy Bush, and George Kelly.

Lefty O'Doul, a native San Franciscan, is synonymous with the spirit of American baseball in Japan. While visiting Japan in 1934 with the all-star team, he advised Matsutaro Shoriki, president of the Yomiuri Shimbun, one of the "Big Three" national newspapers of the country with a circulation over 3 millions, in organizing what has come to be known as the Yomiuri Giants, named in honor of the then New York National League entry who are the San Francisco Giants of today. The Yomiuri Giants are known as the Yankees of Japan, however, for their perennial championships. The Yomiuri Giants were the first professional baseball club there, but others quickly followed and their version of a major league was established. Today, there are two major leagues, with the champions of each playing off for the Japanese title every autumn, much as is done in the United States.

As beloved as Lefty O'Doul is in his native city, where he managed the San Francisco Seals entry in the old Pacific Coast League for many years, he is probably better known in Japan, where his humanitarianism in helping orphan children is almost as legendary as his baseball contributions. The two-time batting champion of the National League enjoyed his greatest years in our national game as the star outfielder for the Brooklyn Dodgers and the New York Giants of the late twenties and early thirties.

During World War II, the militarists tried to "wipe out" baseball because of its American origin and its popularity among all segments of the population. After the surrender, baseball was among the first sports to regain its place in the minds and hearts of the people. Gen. Douglas MacArthur, as the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers, recognized its potential as an invaluable instrument in building new Japan into a democratic, freedom-loving nation and issued a directive to assist in its revival.

BASEBALL'S FINEST HOUR

Probably baseball's finest hour, and its greatest contribution to international understanding and friendship, was in the fall of 1949, when Lefty O'Doul took his then San Francisco Seals over for a series of 13 games. That tour is credited with bringing the Japanese and the American people together in a spirit of mutual fellowship, for it was the first time since the end of the war that the defeated Japanese left their self-imposed shell to cheer Americans.

Just before Mrs. MacArthur threw out the first ball at Korakuen Park in Tokyo, for the first time after the war the Japanese Rising Sun flag was raised, and the band played their national anthem. Thereafter, the American flag was raised, and "The Star-Spangled Banner" was played. Also, for the first time, hot dogs and cokes were sold to the Japanese on that day.

Near the conclusion of their tour, Lefty O'Doul was invited to the Imperial Palace to meet the Emperor, who told him:

It is by means of sports that our countries can be brought together. I am glad that I can personally thank you for it.

At a reception for the team at the American Embassy where General MacArthur had his residence at that time, prior to its departure for the States, the Supreme Commander told O'Doul:

This trip is the greatest piece of diplomacy ever. All the diplomats put together would not have been able to do this.

Later, referring to the love and admiration in which he is held by the Japanese public at large, General MacArthur told him:

You've finally arrived home, Lefty.

Two years later, in 1951, Lefty O'Doul returned to Japan with the first postwar major league all-stars, who included Joe DiMaggio, then of the New York Yankees. Since that time, several all-star aggregations and several major league teams, such as the New York Giants, the Brooklyn Dodgers, the New York Yankees, and the St. Louis Cardinals, have played in Japan.

APPROPRIATE TEAM, APPROPRIATE YEAR

In this Centennial Year of Japanese-American relations, it is appropriate that the San Francisco Giants, heirs of the immortal New York Giants' heritage, are visiting Japan.

The American baseball team will be led by Baseball Commissioner Ford Frick, who long ago appreciated the significant role that baseball could play in international good will. It was he, by the way, who in a statesmanlike decree several years ago ruled that major league teams could visit Japan only on alternate years in order that there would not be too much of a drain on Japan's hard earned dollar exchange.

Horace C. Stoneham, longtime owner and president of the Giants, will accompany his team, which is among the most colorful and representative in sports. His Willie Mays is considered by many to be the best player in our national pastime today.

And, of course, Lefty O'Doul will again be with the team, for the Japanese identify baseball with this distinguished native son of California.

Appropriately enough too, the invitation to visit Japan was extended by the Yomiuri Giants, whose president is still Matsutaro Shoriki, recently described by his U.S. biographers Edward Uhlan, Dana L. Thomas, and Bob Considine as the "Miracle Man of Japan." Among his accomplishments are that he is a ranking member of the Japanese Parliament, former cabinet minister, Japan's first atomic energy commissioner, and the individual responsible for making television available to the rank and file Japanese.

Tsuneo P. "Cappy" Harada, an American-born Californian of Japanese ancestry who as a lieutenant during the occupation period contributed much to the revival of baseball after the surrender, served as the liaison in arranging this goodwill tour as the sports feature of this 100th anniversary year of diplomatic relations between the United States and Japan.

As our Nation and Japan begin the second century of diplomatic relations, all of us are aware of the increasingly important role that Japan must play as our partner and ally in the Far East. There are forces in the world today which would destroy the goodwill that

exists between the American and Japanese peoples. And so, in these critical times, I know that I speak the sentiments of the American people in paying tribute to the constructive character of baseball's contributions to Japanese-American friendship and understanding.

May the forthcoming visit of the San Francisco Giants, and their fellow citizens of the city by the Golden Gate who plan to accompany them as special individual goodwill ambassadors, be as successful in promoting goodwill as those in the past, for on the field of friendly competition, with friendly spectators, are sown the seeds of international comity and cooperation that are so essential to the peace and prosperity of the Pacific.

The Arsenals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD E. LANKFORD
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent article appearing in the July-August issue of Ordnance magazine. This article, I feel, makes an excellent case for the retention of the few Government-owned and operated establishments that are today playing such a vital role in weapons production and the development of the weapons of the future.

On April 21, 1960, I addressed the House in a 1-hour special order at which time I described in great detail the situation at the Naval Weapons Plant located here in Washington, D.C. Again, on July 1, 1960, I called the attention of Congress to this fine installation and continued my criticism of the administration, which is deliberately and maliciously destroying one of our Nation's most vital defense installations. Unfortunately, I have been unable to force the administration to change its views on the future of this plant even though I believe I have clearly proved that the action underway is not in the best interests of our defense effort. I do not intend to quit this fight, for I am confident that my position is sound and it is my intention to take the case against the administration to the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Maryland in the forthcoming campaign. I pledge to continue my efforts with the new administration to bring about a fair and impartial review of the situation.

The article referred to follows:

THE ARSENALS—THE POSITION OF THE AMERICAN ORDNANCE ASSOCIATION ON THE ESSENTIAL FUNCTION OF GOVERNMENT OWNED AND OPERATED WEAPONS CENTERS AS THE REPOSITORIES OF ARMAMENT RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, AND PILOT PRODUCTION

(Periodically a hue and cry is raised about our arsenals—those few Government owned and operated establishments where the art of designing and producing our military weapons is conducted by trained military and civilian personnel. Once again the question is being debated in high places. The slogan, "Keep the Government out of business," is being used erroneously, we think, when applied to those noncommercial products (call them ordnance, armament, or weapons, as you will) for which there is no normal peacetime private industry. Since its beginning 40 years ago, the American Ordnance Association has upheld the time-honored place of the arsenals in our national pattern of weapons preparedness. It has maintained always that arsenals, as copartners of American industry, are essential. It has never failed to support the arsenal system as the repository of weapons research, development, and limited pilot-line production together with the training of personnel incident thereto. This position of the association was officially restated to the Secretary of Defense less than 3 years ago. The report, prepared by nationally recognized experts and addressed to the Secretary of Defense, was forwarded by the executive vice president of the association under date of October 10, 1957. It is more timely now than it was then and is published below in the hope that all members of the association will assist in making it known to their fellows.—THE EDITORS.)

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: The "arsenal system" as a functaion of long-range armament preparedness in the United States has been and is a bulwark for the progress of research, development, and production engineering of American armament in time of peace. This is a truth which is frequently challenged and therefore which need restatement from time to time.

By "arsenal system" is meant the traditional organization of Government owned and operated establishments—always few in number—where the art of ordnance design and manufacture is kept alive. In normal times there is no arms industry in the United States.

The position which certain of these establishments hold in our national defense potential is well worthy of periodic review, especially at a time such as the present when new concepts of warfare and resultant new forms of armament are under constant study. Accordingly, with the approval of our board of directors, a group of exceptionally well-qualified members of the American Ordnance Association has reviewed this situation over the past several months, and I am pleased to transmit to you the consensus of their views.

All members of the group have had intimate and lengthy armament experience in peace and in war. The group consisted of the following members of the association:

Lt. Gen. Levin H. Campbell, Jr., U.S. Army, retired, Washington, D.C., a director of the American Ordnance Association and an officer of more than 30 years in the Ordnance Department of the Army who served as Chief of Ordnance, 1942–46.

Walter N. Howley, Morton, Pa., chairman of the Shell Committee, American Ordnance Association, and an authority on the design and production of artillery shell, whose direction of the Gadsden Shell plant, Gadsden, Ala., was an outstanding example of industry-arsenal liaison.

C. Jared Ingersoll, Philadelphia, Pa., a member of the advisory board, American Ordnance Association, and an industrialist who served for many years and during World War II as chief of the Philadelphia Ordnance District.

Adm. Albert G. Noble, U.S. Navy, retired, New York, N.Y., chairman of the underwater ordnance division, American Ordnance Association, and a career officer of the U.S. Navy who served for many years in positions of highest responsibility and who was Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance of the Navy, 1947–50.

The American Ordnance Association proposes the restatement and implementation of the time-honored national policy of maintaining these establishments, their personnel, and their operations as the key to our long-range capability to provide superior ordnance to our Armed Forces in time of emergency.

In its review the Association considered the following basic facts:

Ordnance is the generic term embracing all weapons, armament, and appurtenances for their operation and maintenance, whether land-based on or under the sea, or airborne, including:

All ammunition and its chemical, metallurgical, and atomic components.

All rockets, bombs, guided missiles, torpedoes, depth charges, and mines.

All combat vehicles, tanks, tank destroyers, and weapon carriers.

All vehicles for automotive transport of personnel and matériel on land.

All optical, aerial, mechanical, electrical, and electronic systems for locating and tracking targets on land, at sea, in the air, and in space.

The time-tested pattern of armament preparedness in the United States since our beginning as a Nation has been based upon a corps of trained technical military and civilian personnel in the Army Ordnance arsenals and Naval Ordnance plants.

These career technicians are skilled in the design, development, production, and improvement of all types of noncommercial military weapons. They have been responsible in great degree for industry-ordnance cooperation.

In large measure this also applies to the trained military and civilian personnel of our Air Force depots and matérial areas.

The career technicians and the machines necessary to the art are instantly available to transmit to American industry the techniques of armament design and production in time of emergency.

These men and the machines are the permanent sources of specifications, flow charts, and pilot-line know-how from which American industry can draw for engineering and manufacturing guidance in time of war.

Thus, essential norms of procedure, cost, and engineering detail become available when the services themselves have under their jurisdiction the necessary men, materials, and machines. They are adjuncts to American industry and serve as catalysts to inaugurate all our armament production in time of war.

This military pattern known as the arensal system has existed in our country for more than a century and a half and has provided through every decade of our national existence the skills and leadership essential for armament prepardeness. The arsenal system has maintained these plants and their personnel as the repositories of armament knowledge and art during all the peacetime periods of our history.

The arsenals have furnished the leadership which keeps the art abreast of military demands and, at the same time, consistent with engineering and industrial progress. They have provided the control at all times essential to the superior quality and performance of armament to meet the stated requirements of the military characteristics of the Defense Establishment.

In a word, the arsenal system, throughout our history, has proved these establishments to be an extremely important part of our preparedness program, for it is through them mainly that the art of munitions design, development, and manufacture is perpetuated. They are, when war comes, the guarantee of timely and adequate transition, through their assistance to American industry, in the effective conversion of the Nation from the needs of peace to those of war.

Mindful of the new forms of modern armament and the relatively meager peacetime production of armament by American industry, it is the considered judgment of the group that the basic philosophy of the arsenal system still applies and should be preserved at all reasonable costs to insure our long-range national security.

Accordingly, the association urges that a sufficient number of arsenals and ordnance plants be maintained, staffed by career military and civilian personnel, to accomplish the following objectives:

1. To make certain that there be available at all times military arsenals and plants at which the art of armament design and production is effectively maintained. In so doing, these establishments would not operate other than pilot lines and in no way undertake quantity production which could more efficiently and effectively be performed by private industry.

2. To assure through this means the direct training of officer personnel in all the technical details of armament design, selection of proper materials, and production—from the drawing board to the pilot line itself.

These officers, when later assigned to the administration of armament production and other logistical problems on a national scale, thus have the personal experience with actual working conditions, upon which real leadership and effective management depend.

3. To make certain that a reasonable staff of civilian engineers is likewise constantly trained and available at these establishments, not only for continuity of their operations in time of peace but especially to provide a cadre of trained artisans who can instruct and guide American industry when war strikes, to produce unfamiliar items in vast quantities and in a minimum of time.

These personnel are thus equipped to exercise the technical responsibility of design and production engineering so vital to the inauguration of earliest possible quantity production of special weapons by commercial industry in a national emergency.

4. To have available in these arsenals and plants the facilities where Reserve officer personnel on active duty can be similarly taught and trained in the techniques of armament design and manufacture.

5. To provide through these establishments standards of operating procedure and costs of production which will serve as a guide to alert industry and the Government for the production of equipment in time of a national emergency.

6. To maintain these establishments as sources for the pilot-line production of noncommercial items which, because of their special nature and composition and the small quantities required, could not be obtained as efficiently from private industry. Thus they will continue to be a means whereby the necessary engineering is performed between the phase of research and development of an ordnance item and the phase where private industry undertakes quantity production in time of war.

In submitting the above observations, the American Ordnance Association is not unmindful of our national policy following every war in which the United States has been engaged. We, therefore, urge that a sufficient number of arsenals and ordnance plants, Government owned and operated, adequately staffed and maintained, be kept in operation permanently for the design and pilot-line manufacture for the services in the following noncommercial fields:

Aircraft armament, combat and tactical vehicles, electronic fire-control and guidance systems, guided missiles and rockets, gun ammunition and bombs, guns and gun mounts, military propellants and explosives, small arms, small-arms ammunition, underwater ordnance.

Thus will be provided a safeguard for the technical training of military and civilian personnel which has existed throughout our history and has proved its value time and time again. The arsenal system, by providing continuity of knowledge, was of inestimable value in helping American industry to undertake production of quality armament in the First World War, the Second World War, and the Korean war.

The American Ordnance Association holds that should the arsenal system as described above be materially weakened the long-range armament preparedness of the United States would be jeopardized now and for years to come.

EDITOR'S NOTE.—On the question of arsenals, Lt. Gen. Levin H. Campbell, Jr., Chief of Army Ordnance from 1942 to 1946, states in his book about America's armament effort in World War II, "The Industry-Ordnance Team": "We have all been seriously concerned about the survival of our arsenals during the lean peacetime years when manufacturing orders for our small peacetime Army were few and far between. We have likewise gloried in the wonderful achievements of our arsenals in the war. Were it not for our arsenals, the defeat of Germany and Japan would have been greatly delayed. Industry alone, without arsenal know-how, could not have mass produced the weapons and ammunition in the incredibly short time it has taken.

"The transmission to the plants of industry of the essential know-how depended upon our arsenal employees and, in particular, upon those same men whose salaries, a few years earlier, had been slashed to the bone. If they had resigned back in those lean years rather than suffer severe salary cuts, there would have been a serious loss to our Ordnance Department and to the Nation.

"Just as England and the freedom-loving peoples of the world owe a great debt of gratitude to Britain's RAF, so also are America and the United Nations tremendously indebted to our arsenal military and civilian personnel who kept alive the science of munitions manufacture and who passed on to American industry the techniques required initially to produce, in gigantic quantities, the armament that has given all of us another and perhaps a final opportunity to build a better world.

"In the postwar era the arsenals will continue to serve as training schools for our Regular officers, and for our Reserve officers when they are called for brief periods of active duty. During the years of peace, the arsenals, in addition to preserving the science of armament manufacture, will carry on various types of forward-looking scientific research work necessitated by the successful employment of the atomic bomb.

"Although the arsenals are repositories of armament knowledge and carry forward from one war to another the techniques of manufacturing, their role as producers of certain types of ordnance materiel should not be minimized. Watervliet Arsenal, for example, is the largest cannon manufacturing plant in the country. It not only possesses the basic knowledge of how to use steel in the production of cannon and transmits this knowledge to selected manufacturers who must help increase cannon production in wartime, but it consistently maintains its preeminent position in the field of cannon production and during the Second World War outstripped all other plants. The same is true of Springfield Armory, the largest single producer of the Garand rifle.

"Frankford Arsenal likewise continued throughout the war the production of small-arms ammunition, although there were private plants and Government-owned, contractor-operated plants in the country producing all calibers of small-arms ammunition. Frankford also contributed greatly to the production of optical and fire-control instruments and maintained a production line for artillery ammunition shell cases.

"The arsenals are at all times prepared to supply production techniques to civilian manufacturers who have had no previous experience in the production of ordnance equipment. But it is equally true that our arsenals received many benefits from those industrial firms with which they have been associated. At the beginning of the national emergency, the arsenals were able to contribute their pilot-line techniques to civilian manufacturers. Later in the war, these same manufacturers were able to improve upon initial arsenal techniques, to speed up production, and to lower costs. Volume or mass production replaced laboratory or pilot-line production.

"In the early days of the war effort, our arsenals were thrown wide open to industry. At Watervliet Arsenal, for example, private firms learned for the first time such cannon-manufacturing processes as the boring of deep holes, rifling, and step threading.

"On some jobs it was advisable to have contractor personnel perform the duties of the operator in the arsenal to insure a successful beginning in the civilian plant. Sample cutting tools were made available so that they could be duplicated as to proper material, hardness, clearance angles, shear, lips, and grinding finishes. Facility and operating drawings were provided."

U.S. Citizens Commission on NATO

SPEECH

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the resolution (S.J. Res. 170) to authorize the participation in an international convention of representative citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty nations to examine how greater political and economic cooperation among their peoples may be promoted, to provide for the appointment of U.S. delegates to such convention, and for other purposes.

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Chairman, the breakdown of personal diplomacy in the conduct of our foreign affairs during these past several weeks has sharpened the ideological, political and economic struggle now going on throughout the entire world. The situation is grave indeed, but not without real hope. Perhaps two things of positive good in the interest of freedom and justice across the face of the earth can yet be accomplished as a result of the diplomatic disappointments of the past several weeks: First, it might well be that we have had pointed out to us in a way more dramatic than otherwise might have been possible the aims and tactics of the international Communist movement. Writing in his book, "The Real Soviet Russia," the late Joseph Stalin said:

Words must have no relation to actions—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for the concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or wooden iron.

Certainly the events from Camp David to the ill-fated summit meeting in Paris, to the postsummit events in the Far East, bear out in bold detail this statement. Second, it could bring about at an even earlier date than might have otherwise been thought possible a convention among NATO members to explore further NATO cooperation in the vitally important fields of economic and political action.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that NATO is strong militarily and prepared for the military defense of Western Europe. However, all is not so muscular with other aspects of NATO endeavor and I refer to such matters as the various economic, monetary and political problems of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. These economic, monetary and political factors are equally as important to the functioning of NATO as is the military strength of NATO. All of these facets are interrelated and go to make up the whole pattern of North Atlantic defense. The argument may be put forward, Mr. Chairman, that we have held numerous other NATO conferences and this is true. However, the fact is that these provious conferences have tackled the problem piecemeal and none have tackled them as a whole. If NATO is ever to function as an integrated entity with all its component parts making their own peculiar and significantly needed contribution to this defense alliance, we need a "Committee on the Whole" which will wrestle with the problems involved from the beginning to the end as a whole and not on a piecemeal basis.

I urge affirmative action on this proposal. If we seek strength today in the unity of the North Atlantic community we shall show Moscow that we are in no frame of mind to make huge unilateral concessions. Visible and within our grasp, we have the possibility of building such military, economic and moral strength that the Communists will not dare challenge our position of freedom in the North Atlantic community. We can yet prove this union to be one of the world's most potent influences toward peace.

Active Prosecution as the Key to Air Pollution Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a summary of an article by Dr. W. A. Quebedeaux, Jr., Ph. D., of the Harris County Health Unit, Houston, Tex., entitled "Active Prosecution as the Key to Air Pollution Control."

In the millenia in which man has existed in this world, he has had two vital requirements: pure air and pure water. Now, with tremendous expansion in population and in industrial use of both of these vital, lifegiving substances, the strain on the two resources is becoming almost intolerable and will grow worse with each passing day.

The article, summarized, appeared recently in an address published by Dr. Quebedeaux at the golden jubilee meeting of the Air Pollution Control Association, held in the Sheraton-Jefferson Hotel, St. Louis, Mo.

Dr. Quebedeaux has been an able and outstanding champion against pollution of streams, waters, and the air in his area, and his long experience in this field is carefully synthesized below:

ACTIVE PROSECUTION AS THE KEY TO AIR POLLUTION CONTROL

(By Walter A. Quebedeaux, Jr., Harris County Health Department, Houston, Tex.)

In common with other large cities in this as well as foreign countries, the problem of air pollution control is becoming more acute. It is one which must be solved if the moral integrity of the community is to be maintained and the property values as well as the health of those living close to the plant be protected.

INJURY NOT EXCUSED

Neither the fact that the trade is lawful, nor that it is needful, nor that the injury is unavoidable in the exercise of trade, will excuse its operation in a locality where it inflicts actual injury on others and that place for the operation of a trade is a convenient one, under the law, only when it is carried out where no injury results to others from it. Coupled with these decisions is the one handed down by the supreme court of Texas in 1951, holding that:

"Where the tortious acts of two or more wrongdoers join to produce an indivisible injury, that is an injury which from its nature cannot be apportioned with reasonable certainty to the individual wrongdoers. All of the wrongdoers may be held jointly and severally liable for the entire damages and the injured party may proceed to judgment against any one separately or against all in one suit."

By this last decision it is not necessary for a complainant to prove the percentage of damage from any particular source, but he may file suit against all suspected plants without dividing their responsibility. Therefore, under the above statutes and court decisions, in the State of Texas it has become relatively easy to obtain relief through the courts if desired.

With this legal background, on December 1, 1953, the Commissioners' Court of Harris County, Tex., organized a stream and air pollution control section within the framework of the Harris County Health Unit. The history of the growth of the program has been outlined in another paper. The purpose of this organization was to gather evidence of violations of either the State or Federal statutes which would then be of use in the prosecution of the violators.

A system of gathering this evidence had to be devised since these cases are of a special nature and depend primarily upon the individual citizen notifying the pollution control group of conditions which either are a nuisance to him or interfere with his health, comfort, and well-being. Immediately upon receiving this complaint, investigators of the stream and air pollution control section go to the place from which the complaint originated. At this step of the program speed is of the essence, because it is necessary that the investigator be able to experience and observe the condition of which the citizen complained. From this point it is the investigator's duty to trace the offending material to its source. Sometimes this is difficult or nearly impossible, but in any event, it is attempted. Once the source of the contamination has been determined, those responsible are informed and recommendations are made that they cease the operation which is producing the offending material or pollutant.

FORMAL COMPLAINT FILED

In the performance of the duty described above, the stream and air pollution control section enjoys the trust of both citizens and industries. This situation is aided by an informed commissioners' court who stand ready to help in any manner and, in addition, they take pride in pointing out our particular set-up to their counterparts in other countries.

It is through this citizen group that the tremendous amount of aid has been obtained since they, in effect, are the electorate who control the elections of the commissioner's court and the various judges. It has always been found that when public pressure is exerted the will of free people prevails.

PROSECUTION BASED ON LAW

We believe that another feature of our program is the fact that the prosecution is based on elementary law which for centuries has been passed down through the generations and forms the elementary cornerstone of the democracy of this country. There are no special acts which were passed by the Texas Legislature, and full confidence is placed in the enforcement of our basic law.

One of the distinguishing features of the Harris County program from those of other sections of the country is the lack of stated concentrations which are allowed. Sometimes this is termed as a code of operations, but it is the position of the Harris County group that the concentration or amount of any pollutant being discharged by a given plant is inmaterial until this pollutant interferes with the health, comfort, or well-being of citizens living in the area. It is only under these circumstances that the stream and air pollution control section enters the picture.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURES CAN BE USED

In addition to the basic State criminal statutes covering general nuisance and water pollution, there are several types of criminal procedures which can be used and will result in severe penalties to the defendant if he continues to violate these statutes. Of course, the first one is that which is known as the Habitual Criminal Act. Under this regulation it is possible to quadruple the fines and ultimately declare the defendant an habitual criminal, which automatically places him under an injunction and prevents him from continuing his plant operations.

The next procedure which is possible is that which can be taken by a justice of peace, where he constitutes a court of inquiry. In this situation, the justice of peace will issue subpenas to any individuals who might have knowledge of the conditions and require them to testify under oath as to such knowledge. After such a court of inquiry, the justice of peace then institutes a charge, should he find that there has been a violation of the State statutes.

Another procedure, which probably is one of the roughest, although it is not used to a large extent, is that of the prosecution asking the criminal county court for injunctive relief. Under this situation, especially when cases are filed under the general nuisance statute, the court, upon finding that the defendant is guilty of committing a violation of the general nuisance statute, can proceed in several different ways. A perpetual injunction can be declared and the party may be required to enter into a bond, with secur-

ity, or the judge may deem it sufficient to instruct the plant to conduct its operations in such a manner as not to violate the nuisance statute. The bond which is demanded should be a reasonable amount, as fixed by the court, and should be of such size as to make it unprofitable for that party to continue his violations. If a subsequent violation occurs, the court immediately declares the defendant in contempt and makes such additional requirements or penalties as it sees fit.

In all of the above cited statutes, there are none which are found in Texas law alone. A search of the statutes of other States will probably disclose their existence. It is our belief that with this legal basis there is sufficient basis in the law for stream and air pollution prosecution and that it depends entirely upon the attitude of the control officer involved.

In the prosecution of cases in the criminal courts, it has been our experience that testimony from one or more complaining citizens is imperative. There are decisions from the higher courts to the effect that:

"It is not necessary for the State to prove that there were actually any individuals harmed by the polluting material, but that it is sufficient to show that the polluting material is capable of affecting the health of the people."

Of course, the testimony of the control official and other experts is required. It has been our experience that the usual prosecutor from either the country or the district attorney's office is not familiar with this particular type of prosecution and that it is imperative for the control official to instruct the attorney in the engineering technicalities involved. Ultimately, these prosecutors will become familiar with these cases and will need little or no actual help from the control officer.

It is our opinion that the experience gained in the last 4 years indicates that active prosecution might well be called the "Key to Air Pollution Abatement."

The Expendable Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, for some time many of us have been undertaking to call to the attention of the Nation that there are some in our Government who apparntly feel that our great textile industry is expendable. We have also pointed out that the unrealistic policy of this administration toward the importation of low-wage foreign textiles is taking away the jobs of thousands of our people who earn their living in textile plants in North Carolina and other textile areas.

This feeling of many of our people was expressed in a very excellent manner in an editorial appearing in Southern Textile News on Saturday, August 27, 1960. This excellent trade paper is edited by my good friend, E. D. Lewis, whom I consider to be one of the outstanding journalists in the South. The editorial to which I have referred is of such excellent quality that I feel it should be read by every Member of the House of Representatives and, therefore, request that the same be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of this date:

THE EXPENDABLE INDUSTRY

No serious consideration of long-range effect has ever been included in bureaucratic planning.

Cotton mills represented the quickest way to give employment to the most people in the underdeveloped nations. So, the foreign aid program financed cotton mills.

It was inevitable that the output of these cotton mills would exceed the demand of native populations and that the surplus production would find its way into international trade. This was not included in the thinking of our planners.

We now have a worldwide surplus of cotton textiles.

Native populations cannot afford and have no desire for 98-cent shirts. But the United States is a ready, profitable market for cheap cotton products. In fact, it is the greatest market in the world.

Tapping this market has become the most important objective in international trade. Every member nation of the GATT concentrates on securing concessions from the United States. We are accused of being a high tariff nation. We are charged with being unfair to the have-not nations.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Of 36 major trading nations, the United States ranks eighth from the bottom in average import duties. In the percent of money collected from imports, the figure is only 5 percent of declared values. For most nations this figure is upward of 9 percent with two major European nations ranging as high as 25 percent.

What is important? Up to now the United States has been more than generous to the rest of the world in reestablishing its industrial production, in providing a market for its surpluses. Britain, France, West Germany, Japan, and others are now prosperous.

But their prosperity, their continued existence, depends on the strength of the United States, economically and militarily. Should the United States fade they would be left naked in their opposition to Communist aggression. Diplomatically, they recognize that. Commercially, the United States is their patsy.

It is important that we reassess our position in world affairs and act our age and weight. It is no longer necessary that we give any concessions to any nation. Maintaining the United States in full military and economic strength is the most important objective of the free world. Nothing else counts.

Yet, our planners are willing to play ducks and drakes with the most important segment of American prosperity because some muddleheaded idiot decided a few years back that the American textile industry could be expended in the struggle for world friendship.

Vicious and Unfair Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial as to our current policies on imports of textiles and footwear, which appeared in the Manchester (N.H.) Union-Leader on August 8, 1960:

VICIOUS AND UNFAIR COMPETITION

A matter that should be of serious concern to every citizen of New England is the danger to this area's economy that arises from our current policies on imports of textiles and footwear. Officials of both industries and unions connected with them are expressing increasing concern not only over past trade inequities but also over future prospects.

Leaders of the Textile Workers Union of America recently charged that administration proposals in current tariff discussions "invite the destruction of the American woolen and worsted industry." The union has sounded an urgent call to all woolen and worsted manufacturers to join in all-out opposition to new proposals which, the union says, would provide even less protection than the present formula.

Following closely on the heels of this protest was a demand for higher duties and establishment of quotas to protect the hard-hit shoe industry. In a statement presented to the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information on August 2, Maxwell Field, executive vice president of the New England Shoe and Leather Association, representing 430 shoe- and leather-producing firms, warned of the serious impact of low-priced shoe imports on the New England economy due to the fact that New England mills produce most of the low- to medium-priced women's and men's footwear in the shoe industry.

Mr. Field expressed the association's strong opposition "to any reduction in the current duty of 20 percent ad valorem on women's and misses' and 10 percent on men's and boys' cemented footwear." Field warned that the total of leather and rubber shoe imports has risen from 11,028,964 pairs in 1955 to 80,468,39 pairs in 1959—an increase of 629.6 percent.

Nor does this alarming trend show any sign of stopping. "Imports of footwear during the first 5 months of 1960 continue to rise at an alarming rate—up 165 percent over the comparable period in 1959, reaching a total of 67,500,000 pairs," Field said.

Although the association primarily represents shoe manufacturers producing leather and fabric footwear on conventional machinery, Mr. Field also took time to point out that for the first time in the history of the rubber footwear industry imports actually exceeded domestic production—by 9 percent.

With wages in the footwear industry in Japan and Hong Kong averaging only 10 to 17 percent of U.S. labor rates, and with labor being a major item in production costs in our country—amounting to one-fourth to one-third of the manufacturer's selling price—it goes without saying that the industry cannot long survive such viciously unfair competition.

The New England shoe and textile industries have a right to expect that their interests and the interests of their employees will be given better consideration.

U.S. Citizens Commission On NATO

SPEECH
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the resolution (S.J. Res. 170) to authorize the participation in an international convention of representative citizens from the North Atlantic Treaty nations to examine how greater political and economic

cooperation among their peoples may be promoted, to provide for the appointment of U.S. delegates to such convention, and for other purposes.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, when Dr. Streit appeared before our committee in advocacy of the resolution now before us he referred to the fact that the Constitution of the United States was not the product of a convention of specialists. It was indeed far from that. It is doubtful that a convention composed exclusively of the ablest political economists of the age could have produced the imperishable document that the experience of the decades has proved to be the place among the political documents of the ages of the Constitution of the United States of America. The men who wrote the Constitution of the United States came from all the walks of life, and they had had the experiences of men facing many problems in many activities of human existence. These human experiences gave them understanding, and above all an understanding of good intentions but coupled with human frailties and from this understanding came the Constitution of the United States.

Dr. Streit pointed out two members of our committee, one the chairman and the other a top ranking member of the minority, Dr. MORGAN and Dr. JUDD. They are both pre-eminent in the medical profession and they are both family physicians. It is no disparagement of the specialist and of the great contribution he has made to medical progress, but it is the family physician who keeps the family on its feet and who ministers to its need for medical attention, in minor and in major ailments the clock around and on every day of the calendar.

Dr. Streit's presentment and his analogy made a tremendous impression upon me. What the world most needs today is an assurance of peace. I am 78 and I have very much less to lose than a young man of 18. Yet the young man of 18 is in exactly the same position as am I at 78 if on a flash an atomic war is sprung. I am 78 and I want to live. I do not want my future, however short it might prove along the way of natural causes, made shorter by an atomic bomb. How much greater is the stake of the young man of 18.

Mr. Chairman, you get people together from all of the NATO countries, and this thought I know will be uppermost in their minds. They need not be specialists. The big thing is that they would be human beings with backgrounds of human experiences. They would have no authority to authorize any sort of a program. Their principal function would be to get together and to talk together, and, Mr. Chairman, when you get people with good hearts and with a common interest and from many countries getting together and talking and thinking things out you are going to make real progress in finding the path to peace. That is my faith. If one does not believe in people one cannot believe in God, and if one believes neither in God nor people he is hopeless.

I hope the resolution will be adopted overwhelmingly. It may mean spending a little money. Perhaps as much as the wee fraction of the cost of an atomic bomb or a battleship, a wee wee fraction thereof. But it will be one of the best investments for peace ever authorized by this Congress. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I am 78 and I want to go on a little longer. In voting for this resolution I am voting for something that I think is a real contribution to my chance of not having my life abruptly cut short by an atomic war at the early age of 78.

Medical Care for the Needy Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB H. GILBERT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, until the Congress has the benefit of strong leadership, which would be shown by a Democratic President, there will be no comprehensive, adequate plan to meet the medical needs of our senior citizens. Medical and hospital care for the elderly must eventually be devised as part of the time-tested social security insurance system. I am grievously disappointed in the bill we have just passed.

The measure which first passed the House was meager and miserly; the compromise measure which finally passed has been termed a shabby joke. It would cover some 2.4 million persons over 65 now receiving old-age medical assistance under State assistance programs, plus an estimated million more persons a year classed as medically indigent. Federal assistance grants would be stepped up under the bill to encourage States to develop comprehensive medical care programs. Participation of the States would be completely optional however, with each State determining the extent and character of its own program.

This is a paupers oath type of medical care. We have to wait until 50 different States, with varying abilities to finance such medical care decide what help they will give the elderly. It is believed that many States will adopt the programs and, equally, many will not. There is no guarantee that our elderly citizens will get any help at all in many instances. It means that those desperately in need of medical care might get some help if the States did their part and if the recipients proved themselves too poor to pay their own doctor bills. They will be subjected to investigation through the local departments of public assistance; they will be forced to answer embarrassing questions regarding income of members of the family; all dignity will be stripped from them at a time when they should have medical help free from harassment and worry.

Responsibility is placed on the States and this means that the entire program will be unwieldy and totally inadequate. A wise and efficient plan should have been made a part of our orderly, nationwide system of social security, to insure the medical aid which is sorely needed.

Several excellent plans were proposed, but defeated, and it is discouraging to have to accept a plan which, while it will do no harm, will not do much good, and falls far short of my expectations. The Forand bill would have provided insurance against the costs of hospital, nursing home, and surgical service for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. Such protection is vitally needed, and should be given our senior citizens who now cannot afford such care and cannot obtain or afford private insurance. Inasmuch as they would have helped pay the costs during their working years, under the social security insurance system, they would have been entitled to medical assistance during the years when they need it most, and they would have had such help as a matter of right, rather than to have to beg for it. I introduced a bill identical with the Forand bill, in the House, to indicate my strong support. The Anderson amendment, backed by KENNEDY would have met the medical needs of our senior citizens and would have been administered under a workable, adequate, nationwide system.

As matters now stand, our elderly citizens will continue to be without adequate medical care and will suffer illness and pain without the assistance they should have, and which has been promised them.

I shall continue to give of my best efforts to the end that the situation will be corrected and our senior citizens will be given adequate help, just as soon as it is possible to secure passage of a good, effective medical aid bill.

J. A. Stilwell and Houston Rotarians Becoming Better Neighbors by Breaking the Language Barrier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, we read and hear a great deal these days about various plans to better our relations and strengthen America's friendships with the people of other nations.

One of the programs which has impressed me most as working toward a practical improvement of "good neighbor" relations has been instituted by the Rotary Club of Houston, under the leadership of its President J. A. Stilwell, which with 670 members is the second largest Rotary Club in the world.

In order to better understand the people of Mexico, and their problems, members of the Houston Rotary Club have

begun holding special meetings prior to their regular luncheon meeting to study conversational Spanish.

Recently Rotary President Jim Stilwell wrote a letter to the president of the Rotary Club of Saltillo, Mexico, outlining this study program. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ROTARY CLUB OF HOUSTON,
Houston, Tex., August 18, 1960.

The PRESIDENT,
Rotary Club of Saltillo,
Casino de Saltillo,
Saltillo, Coah, Mexico.

DEAR ROTARIANS OF SALTILLO: Six hundred and seventy members of the Houston Rotary Club join me in sending greetings and best wishes to all Rotarians and our friends in your country.

We wish to tell you about a project we have started which we hope will help to strengthen the bonds of friendship between our countries. The expression of friendship and good will knows no language barrier, yet we feel that we as individual Rotarians may better express our true feelings if we learn to speak the language of your country. We have, therefore, inaugurated conversational Spanish classes at our regular Rotary meeting each Thursday.

The members of our club participating in these Spanish classes arrive at the meeting each week 30 minutes early and are given instructions in conversational Spanish by competent teachers. They then go to the regular meeting and sit at special tables and continue their conversations in Spanish in order to practice what they have learned.

The members of our club are participating in this program with great enthusiasm and we hope that some of you will have the opportunity to visit with us at some time in the future and see this program in action.

Nosotros les deseamos con todo corozón éxito continuado, salud y mucha felicidad en compañía de los suyos.

Sincerely yours,

J. A. STILWELL.

Charity Is a Dirty Word

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of August 24, 1960, entitled, "Charity Is a Dirty Word."

This article comments very wisely and compassionately upon the problem of providing medical care and assistance for our older citizens, while recognizing the necessity for preserving the innate dignity of the individual we seek to help.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHARITY IS A DIRTY WORD

In the days of our childhood there were three things to abide in men forever, and the greatest of these was charity.

For charity, in those days, meant a divine love for man, the benevolence of all men of good will toward their brothers. It was kind. It envied not. It vaunted not itself. It was not puffed up. It was not gained simply by bestowing all one's goods to feed the poor, because it was a thing of the heart without which man was nothing.

So it was a word such men as Thomas Jefferson could use with dignity, deeming it the duty of each man by himself and all men joined together to show it toward their neighbors. It was an honorable word with which to bespeak the responsibility of the whole community for those among it who were old, sick, or otherwise unfortunate.

But not any longer. First the word itself lost its meaning, and those who would translate the message of St. Paul were constrained to speak only of love, a word of so many meanings as to have no meaning at all.

And now, finally, charity has become a dirty word. In newspaper advertisements all across the land, paid from the rich coffers to the AFL–CIO, the word is spat out: Is medical care to be available for the needy as a handout, as public charity? It is a word from which good men shy as they arise to speak on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

There they have been speaking about a simple objective, to see that no old person goes without proper medical care because he lacks the means to provide it for himself. The question is, How?

Now this problem, be it noted, is only how to care for a small minority; among the blessings Providence has bestowed on this country is that those among us who are needy are the few, not the many. So it would not be too costly or too difficult to set up a system—even one run by the Federal Government, if that is insisted upon—under which those in need might have a formal and orderly way to receive aid from the whole community.

But to set a standard of need, we are told, would be public charity, and charity is an evil thing. It demeans a man to have to state that he is in need. So to care for this minority some people tell us we must put the medical care of every old person, fortunate and unfortunate alike, in the hands of the Federal Government.

Well, it's true that men of pride and dignity do not welcome a situation in which they must turn to others for succor. Indeed, it is the desire not to be "beholden" that makes freemen labor and save to provide for themselves and their own. But surely it is not "demeaning" for a man struck down by what he cannot help to be helped by his fellow human beings. There is no shame for the blind in being led by those who can see.

What is truly demeaning is for the hale man, the free and self-reliant man, to be beholden to the Federal Government for his food or his shelter or his care in sickness. For then he lives not by the charity of his fellow men in his distress but simply by taking from them. It is thus that men of good will are shamed.

Yet that is precisely what is proposed by those who treat charity as a dirty word. If all they really sought were succor for the unfortunate, charity would provide it. What they really seek is not succor for the needy, but a way to put all men upon the same level. If they can achieve a system where the Government provides all men with their needs, then no man shall have more than another. We will all, in time, take what Government provides.

We do not know the word for this new spirit. But whatever it is, it has no kindness. It rests on envy and it vaunts itself, puffed up in the belief that it can do for all men better than all men can do for themselves. It is the same spirit that already walks across wide areas of the world, where men are but numbers to be fed, clothed, and nursed for other purposes than humanity. Whatever it calls itself, it is not a thing of the heart.

And we are so old fashioned as to wonder, if charity is to be lost to this new spirit, then how long there will abide faith in every man's dignity and the hope that here we will preserve it?

Philipsburg, Pa., Hails Dr. Walter Roy Heaton, Prominent Centre County Physician, as "The Country Doctor of Today" on the 80th Anniversary of His Birth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a large throng of residents of Philipsburg, Centre County, Pa., aided by many persons from the surrounding area and from adjoining Clearfield County, gathered at Memorial Stadium in Philipsburg on Sunday afternoon, August 28, to pay a well-deserved tribute to Dr. Walter R. Heaton on the occasion of the celebration of his 80th birthday.

Various clubs and civic organizations were represented at the testimonial to one of Pennsylvania's best-loved physicians who during his active medical career has found time to serve as coroner of Centre County for 20 years. The chairman of the program committee, Rev. Harrison Price, pastor of the Woodland (Pa.) Evangelical Church, is among the 4,000 babies delivered by Dr. Heaton during his dedicated service to humanity. The fine program had a dual purpose in honoring Dr. Heaton and the medical profession in general.

During the interesting and enjoyable program, greetings to the popular Centre County physician were voiced by Mr. S. Z. Miller, burgess of Philipsburg, and by over a dozen representatives of business, civic, and service clubs present for the happy occasion. The medical profession was represented by Dr. Lester Luxenberg, of Philipsburg, while music was performed by the Centre County Hymn-Sing Association and the Sandy Ridge Methodist Bible Class.

It was my privilege and honor to deliver the principal address in tribute to Dr. and Mrs. Heaton and the medical profession which he has so nobly represented during his many years of service to Centre County residents.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 20TH DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT THE 80TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION FOR WALTER ROY HEATON, M.D., AT THE PHILIPSBURG STADIUM, PHILIPSBURG, PA., AUGUST 28

It gives me the greatest pleasure to be among my friends in Philipsburg today and to join with you in the celebration of the 80th birthday of one of the most exceptional

members of this community—Dr. Walter Roy Heaton.

I want to give my thanks to those who took part in arranging this event—for I can think of no more fitting way to show Dr. Heaton our gratitude and esteem.

He has served this community as few men have served it.

For nearly 50 years he has been "on call" in Philipsburg and you have all had the opportunity to observe his devotion to the task of relieving pain and suffering.

He has brought a unique spirit of confidence into your homes.

I am certain that everyone here today shares my feeling of deep humility before the productive way in which Dr. Heaton has spent these 80 years.

How many of us approach our chosen professions with so rich a background of experience as did Walter Roy Heaton the practice of medicine?

How many of us continue to take an active interest in civic affairs not having a direct bearing on our more narrow circle of interests?

Dr. Heaton's growing years were undoubtedly instrumental in giving him the broad and vital approach to life which delights us all.

He helped his father dig a farm and dwelling out of timber and brush.

He taught school at an early age and was led to seek out still more knowledge and education.

He studied law, graduated from law school, was admitted to the bar and practiced before the supreme court of the State of Indiana and the circuit court of the United States.

But the call of the medical profession had for Dr. Heaton an appeal which could not be postponed indefinitely—and he left the practice of law to attend Valparaiso Medical School from which he graduated in 1911.

He has practiced medicine in Philipsburg for more than 45 years.

These years have been marked by changes in medicine which are no less dramatic than the other scientific advances which have revolutionized our whole view of the world.

Dr. Heaton has had the opportunity not only to witness the product of these changes but to see their evolution.

I think this gives us all great confidence in the kind of medicine he practices.

Perhaps today we can all consider the transformation of medical science over the period in which Dr. Heaton has practiced in Philipsburg and ponder the advances likely to occur within the next few years.

I think even a hurried glimpse of the developments in medicine can help us to appreciate the enormity of the challenge facing Dr. Heaton and other physicians throughout the country in keeping up with the rapidly changing methods of diagnosis and treatment.

That he has performed his task so admirably is a tribute to his greatness as a human being and as a physician.

I would like to read to you what I consider to be an excellent description of these advances and of others we are likely to experience.

The following is a statement by the chairman of the section on pediatrics of the American Medical Association, Dr. Wyman C. Cole.

He states:

"Any doctor starting in practice 40 years ago might have found it hard to believe there would come a day when such diseases as rickets and scurvy would be textbook ones rarely if ever to be seen in practice, when he would treat pneumonia right in his office and essentially cure it in 24 hours, when he wouldn't see a case of diphtheria or tetanus in 25 years, when suitable formulas for 99 out of 100 babies would be available at any drugstore or supermarket.

"Looking ahead, well within the next 40 years cancer may have become relegated to medical history and the common cold forgotten, a single injection or tablet may immunize against all communicable diseases, many congenital defects will be avoided, and arthritis and other metabolic diseases will be easily controlled.

"I am sure this is only a small fragment of what will actually transpire."

Since the turn of the century and Dr Heaton's years of early practice—we have seen the lifespan of a child at birth extended by a full 20 years.

We have seen near mastery of medicine over the dangers of communicable diseases.

Sulfa drugs and antibiotics—greater understanding of the importance of nutrition—improved sanitation—immunizations—these weapons have helped conquer diphtheria, scarlet fever, whooping cough, typhoid, infectious diarrhea, tetanus, gonorrhea, and syphilis.

Probably no advance is more dramatic than the change in the methods of controlling and caring for tuberculosis.

We have so increased our diagnostic tools and so improved the treatment through various drugs that tuberculosis is no longer termed the "great white plague."

But if we have made great strides against infectious diseases since the turn of the century—the threat from chronic and degenerative diseases seems to increase each year.

Recently we have shown a growing awareness that this problem must be met with the same courage and strength as were the disease threats of the past.

We have constantly expanded our medical research programs; we have attempted to spread widely existing information on preventive measures which can be taken by the public; and we have tried to adapt our health services to changing needs.

I would like to single out some of the major disease threats which Dr. Heaton and his colleagues face today and consider with you both the remarkable progress of recent years and the great areas of hope for future progress.

Of course our vigilance against diseases of the past must be constant and we must not ignore or lessen our use of all methods of prevention and control now at our disposal, but I think that medical advances have freed us to spend more of our Nation's time and resources on the major hazards to our health today.

As you know, various forms of heart disease still account for more than half of all deaths each year.

At the same time we can be encouraged to note that many heart attack victims of a few years ago can be saved today.

Some of the advances against heart damage are familiar to you.

We have been warned of the necessity of preventing rheumatic fever through careful control of strep throats.

Penicillin has been invaluable not only in the treatment of strep infections but also in the prevention of recurrent attacks for those people with rheumatic hearts.

Dr. Heaton has watched quantities of new information pour out each year on ways to prevent hardening of the arteries.

Heredity, stress, high-fat diets, smoking, and lack of exercise have all been singled out as important factors in causing coronary attacks.

To the physicians weapons in this field have been added drugs which have the effect to thinning the blood and preventing the formation of clots.

These anticoagulants have already been effective in preventing heart disease in many who might otherwise have been attacked.

Other drugs have been instrumental in controlling high blood pressure.

The development of heart surgery has been characterized by the Director of the National Heart Institute, Dr. James Watt, as the "one field that you can specifically say is resulting in the saving of life today."

Most of us are scarcely able to imagine the heart operations being performed today.

Who can consider the possibility of the heart's being deliberately stopped so that the surgeon can work on it while the rest of the body is being run by a machine?

Add to this the fact that spare parts such as heart valves and arteries are now available and it seems that medicine has broken nearly every barrier.

We still have a lot to learn.

I understand that the hardening of arteries is a process still not completely understood although it is subject to a limited amount of control.

We can still make advances in isolating the factors which cause various heart ailments and in this way hope to forestall more effectively the toll of heart disease in our population.

Unfortunately, our progress against cancer has not brought us to a determination of cause in this disease enemy either.

But we are all glad to know that instead of only one in seven persons with cancer who could be saved 20 years ago, today we believe that only one in three persons who contact cancer must die.

Surgery and radiation are no longer a physician's only hope.

Drugs have delayed the course of leukemia; seem to have checked Hodgkin's disease; and occasionally have suppressed a rare type of uterine tumor.

The National Cancer Institute in combination with other governmental and private groups has been carrying on one of the most massive research projects ever attempted in order to screen thousands of compounds with the hope of finding a possible cure for cancer.

Air pollution, radiation, tobacco tars, and other substances are being carefully studied as suspected irritants which may cause cancer.

Some research workers are confident that viruses cause cancer and this leads us to hope that anticancer vaccine is not an idle dream.

In addition to encouraging signs in the search for a cancer cure—progress in the development of diagnostic techniques for the early detection of cancer has meant that control of this enemy through existing weapons has improved greatly.

The remarks of a member of the committee of consultants on medical research chosen to advise the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on the level of Government research spending are particularly encouraging with respect to our progress against cancer.

Dr. DeBakey stated at hearings before the Senate committee:

"I think there are two very important areas of progress in this field. One lies in providing a more concentrated attack of the many problems of cancer which will lead to an increase in our fundamental understanding of its causation.

"The other is that in the practical approach to treatment, we have combined several kinds of therapy to be used more effectively in the individual cancer cases."

Dr. Heaton has had opportunity to view developments in still another area, that of mental illness.

The occupancy of more than half of the hospital beds in this country by those afflicted with mental disorders in testimony to the importance of this disease problem.

But in recent years the number of persons discharged from mental institutions to resume normal lives has continued to rise.

This has been made possible in part by the various forms of tranquilizing drugs.

Experimentation with various hospital procedures especially suited to the treatment of mental disorders has also helped return the mental patient to his family with great speed.

We now have "open" mental hospitals with unlocked doors and no bars on the windows.

Night and day hospitals—so-called halfway houses and—in general a more understanding public have helped to bring about these changes.

The more than 10 million sufferers from some sort of rheumatic complaint in this country have watched the medical advances of past years with great interest.

There has been a rapid output of synthetic hormones and steroid drugs and these have provided some relief from the discomforts of arthritis.

We know, however, that these drugs do sometimes have unpleasant side effects, and sure relief for the arthritic is still not in sight.

Diabetics too, have had good reason to be encouraged by medical advances.

Today one out of five diabetics is able to take a pill instead of an insulin injection.

The oral diabetic drugs are unfortunately not useful for all diabetics, and here again future discoveries may further improve methods of controlling this disorder.

Dr. Heaton's years of medical practice have been marked by other breakthroughs.

Today 80 percent of all epileptics can be kept free of seizures with drugs, and surgical treatment has proven valuable for others.

Drugs and surgery are providing relief for Parkinson's disease; cortisonelike hormones are making the treatment of kidney ailments more effective; radioactive isotopes can be used to scan the brain for tumors before surgery; new relievers of pain and itching; scrutiny of possible vaccines for colds and viruses. I think I could go on endlessly simply naming encouraging advances in the field of medicine.

The drama of these medical gains is similar to the drama of other changes in Dr. Heaton's own life.

The frontier village of Philipsburg has given way to the modern community of today.

The railroads, lumber and coal industry, and countless other forces have altered this community.

I feel certain that as I have discussed these dramatic changes in medical practice there comes to the mind of Dr. Heaton and others in the audience another area of change no less pronounced and no less vital.

This is the change which has taken place in the practice of medicine.

Whereas in 1928, 75 percent of practicing doctors were general practitioners, today only about 40 percent are in general practice.

The increase in the demands of the public for specialized medical care, the increasingly technical nature of medical treatment—these and other factors have changed the character of medical practice throughout the country.

Many have raised their voices to plead for a return to emphasis on the art as well as the science of medicine.

This is a subject Dr. Heaton knows well for I am certain that he has never for a moment lost this art.

The importance of this factor was recently given recognition by the past president of the American Medical Association, Dr. Louis M. Orr, who stated:

"The G.P. (or general practitioner) is still the backbone of American medicine and is best able to preserve personal relationships in healing—85 percent of all illnesses are within the skills of the well-trained G.P.

"Consultants are available for the rest."

The personal relationship which Dr. Heaton has established with this community is a unique one.

We can never for a moment forget the lives he has saved, the babies he has delivered, or the suffering he has relieved.

He organized the local Lions Club; served as coroner of Centre County for 20 years; and has for 28 years been a director and vice president of the State Sabbath School Association.

Philipsburg area children have attended his Sunday school classes for well over 50 years.

We can never show our gratitude adequately, but I trust that as his friends gather about him today to celebrate his 80th birthday, Dr. Heaton senses a part of the deep respect and thankfulness they feel for his dedicated service.

I think that another past president of the American Medical Association, Dr. Gunner Gundersen, summed up the unique contribution of Dr. Heaton and others like him in a speech he made 2 years ago.

Dr. Gundersen said:

"In recent years the individual physician has had an increasingly difficult time in trying to keep up with the accelerated scientific advances in medicine.

"Now with man probing into outer space, it appears that our scientific future will be further complicated by the development of still another specialty—space medicine.

"Nevertheless, right here on terra firma it is more than ever true that medicine is a lifelong study, one which actually is just beginning when the doctor receives his doctor of medicine degree or completes his graduate training.

"Meanwhile, we are also reemphasizing the emotional, personal, and spiritual factors in medical care.

"The age-old art of medicine—that intangible element made up of compassion and warmth—is regaining its proper place.

"In medicine, as in all other phases of life, we are rediscovering that philosophy is just as important as technology, that the human personality cannot be subordinated to crisp efficiency."

As I conclude my tribute to Dr. Heaton I wish to join the thousands of his fellow citizens and admirers in not only saluting him as a great American and a credit to the medical profession but a humanitarian who by his consideration of his fellow man has enshrined himself in the hearts of those fortunate to have known him.

Happy birthday, Dr. Heaton, and many more of them.

Bounty Held Key to Crisis in Sugar

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of August 28, 1960:

BOUNTY HELD KEY TO CRISIS IN SUGAR—FINANCIAL EXPERTS SAY THAT JUGGLING OF QUOTAS IS AN IMPRACTICAL METHOD

(By Paul Heffernan)

So far as the crisis in Cuba is concerned, Uncle Sam is not playing the role of sugar plum fairy as effectively as he might.

This is the opinion of realists in the field of international financial relationships. The trouble, it is argued, is that Uncle Sam is finagling too much with the sugar quota and not enough with the sugar bounty.

Even though the Cuban sugar quota was cut 700,000 tons as Cuba confiscated more than $800 million of property owned by U.S. nationals, Uncle Sam is still committed to pay to the Castro Government a subsidy of about $96 million a year above the world price for the 2,400,000 tons of sugar remaining in the Cuban quota.

This means that the Castro grab of U.S. property stands to be rewarded, every 10 years, by a handout from Uncle Sam that matches the amount of the expropriation. Alice in Wonderland rides again.

Uncle Sam is now striving to right matters by further juggling of the sugar quota. Only last month, 322,000 tons of the old Cuba sugar quota was switched to the Dominican Republic. Now Washington proposes to backtrack.

"Since total imports of sugar from the Dominican Republic in 1959 amounted only to about 84,000 tons," President Eisenhower reminded Congress last week, "the statutory allocation would give that country a large sugar bonus seriously embarrassing to the United States in the conduct of our foreign relations through the hemisphere."

But what if Uncle Sam and Cuba got on friendly terms again? Would the old Cuban quota be restored at the expense of the nations which, like the Dominican Republic, now stand to enjoy a windfall at Castro's expense? Can such handout, once bestowed, ever be graciously withdrawn? Is it only Generalissimo Rafael Leonidas Trujillo Molino, head of the Domican Republic, for whom the sugar bell is tolling?

REDUCE BOUNTY NOT QUOTA

To the financial mind, the preferable treatment is simple. Let the bounty to Cuba be reduced, not the quota.

Cuba, it is true, would have her world market enlarged by 700,000 tons. But not at Uncle Sam's bounty price of 5 cents a pound; rather, at the world price of about 3 cents a pound.

U.S. taxpayers would be about $96 million a year better off by the move. And Cuba, her sugar market restored to the old size, could hardly make rational complaint about "economic aggression." If Castro can sell 700,000 tons of sugar to friendly Communist nations at 5 cents a pound, more length to his beard.

The $96 million windfall to U.S. taxpayers could be put to most appropriate use just now. Instead of the money being paid to the Castro government to finance the expropriation of U.S. property—as the Cuban dictator has proposed—a good part of the money can be turned over to the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission to indemnify U.S. nationals for their losses.

Under the statutory limits governing the functioning of the Foreign Claims Settlement Commission, approved claims of $1,000 or less would have to be paid in full before larger claims could be indemnified. With more than $800 million of U.S. property already seized by Cuba—most of it plants of large industrial corporations—it would take 10 years or so for the repatriated sugar bounty fund to build up enough money to pay off the big companies.

Such a prospect, however, would be superior to that handed out by the Castro regime. The revolutionary Cuban Government proposes to pay off owners of expropriated U.S. property with 20-year bonds bearing 4½ percent interest, provided Uncle Sam continues the bounty.

Cuba has outstanding comparable 4½ percent bonds, payable in U.S. dollars. Current-

ly, they are valued at 45—that is, $450 for each $1,000 bond. This means that the indemnity bonds that Castro proposes to issue should bear a rate of about 10½ percent interest, instead of the 4½ percent rate proposed.

The recision of the over-the-market-price bounty for all Cuban sugar would, moreover, have a constructive effect in sustaining U.S. private investment abroad. It would serve as a warning to nations to think twice before embarking on a capricious and punitive seizure of the capital savings that U.S. citizens have seen fit to invest in less developed communities.

Radio Free Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a Chicago newspaper recently asked how much longer the United States can afford to let a tinpot dictator in Cuba get away with wholesale robbery crowned with insults.

The action of the Foreign Ministers of the Organization of American States yesterday in condemning Moscow interference in the Western Hemisphere clearly indicates that people throughout the Americas indeed agree with the question asked by the Chicago newspaper. But the action taken yesterday by the OAS in condemning the Communists will have little meaning unless this information is given to the people of Cuba.

I am proposing today that the American people help organize a privately financed agency to be known as "Free Cuba, Inc.," and whose principal function will be to immediately set up powerful radio transmitters to be known as "Radio Free Cuba" and beam the truth about Castro and his Communist advisors to the people of this island republic.

There is no question in my mind that the Cubans are now being brainwashed with the most bitter hate-America campaign ever staged anywhere in the world by Castro and his Communist conspirators through his tightly controlled press and radio in Cuba.

We must immediately provide a counterforce which will tell our traditional allies and friends in Cuba the truth about Castro.

My suggestion is not without precedent, even though we still maintain flimsy diplomatic relations with the Cuban dictator. The United States maintains diplomatic relations with the Communist regime in Poland and other nations behind the Iron Curtain, but we also maintain our anti-Communist broadcasts into these countries through Radio Free Europe and the Voice of America. I feel that this proposal in no way violates the sovereignty of Cuba or any other nation.

I believe there is a sense of urgency in my proposal. I have been informed by leaders of the anti-Communist underground movement in Cuba that Castro and his Communist advisors are plotting now to carry out the final blow of his anti-America drive, and that is, the seizure of our naval base in Guantanamo. I have it on what I believe reasonable authority that Castro very shortly is going to organize a large group of Cubans to stage a march on the American naval base in Cuba. These will not be Castro's soldiers, but innocent Cuban citizens, while ire will be fanned by Communist agitators. The plot is to make sure that several of these Cuban citizens will be killed during the melée not by Americans, but by the Communists themselves. This incident is designed to give Castro the springboard from which he will brand America as an aggressor in an attempt to drive Americans out of the base.

It is extremely important for us to set up a facility now which will forewarn the Cubans of Castro's plot and will tell them of his true intentions. It is also essential now to tell the Cuban people that some of the outstanding Cubans who helped Castro in his July 26 movement have now turned into counterrevolutionaries who are fighting him because he has sold out lock, stock, and barrel to Kremlin rule.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the American people will support this program as a voluntary citizens movement. I do not believe it should become an official Government function because then Castro would single out our State Department as his target for intensifying anti-America hate propaganda. Instead, this should be a wireless "people to people" program starting at the American grassroots level in our effort to tell our friends in Cuba the truth about their leader. I am confident American industry, the American labor movement, and the American people will help make this a successful venture.

The powerful radio transmitters could be built on one of the offshore islands between Cuba and Miami. I have been assured by the Cuban anti-Communist underground that the people of Cuba not only can but will listen intensely to these broadcasts. One of the things that puzzles the Cuban people more than anything else today is the complete lack of a possible counteroffensive by the American people. We can cure this lack with the Radio Free Cuba project, which I am proposing today.

Mr. Speaker, I am enclosing an editorial from the Chicago Daily News, which I think quite accurately reflects the temper of the American people regarding Castro and his Communist legions in Cuba:

CUBA CROWNS THEFT WITH INSULTS—PATIENCE MAY BE DANGEROUS, TOO

How much longer can the United States afford to let a tinpot dictator in Cuba get away with wholesale robbery crowned with insults?

Up to now, patience has been the watchword in U.S. dealings with Cuba. With one exception—the cut in the sugar quota—our Government has limited itself to ineffectual protests while Fidel Castro and his Communist cohorts have systematically destroyed the fruits of more than 50 years of economic collaboration.

A weekend decree read by the ailing dictator completes the seizure of American-owned property in Cuba valued at nearly $1 billion. There is almost no hope that any of it will be paid for; it is robbery pure and simple.

The fact that the Castro gang believes it can do its dirty work with impunity may in the long run be more damaging than the financial loss. If the Cubans can get away with it, who is next in line to try? The United States has a good many billions invested around the world, and the lineup of greedy politicians willing to grab the loot could get pretty long.

Castro is confident that the United States will do nothing. He derides us as a "second-rate military power." His pal, Nikita Khrushchev, whose hands are still bloody from the butchery in Hungary, has the gall to threaten a rain of rockets on America if we dare to lay a hand on the Cuban hijackers.

It is not fear of Russia, and much less of Cuba, that has restrained the United States from administering a spanking to the Cuban upstart. The one thing we want to avoid is to give substance to the false charge of Yankee imperialism.

But in this case it seems the facts don't matter anyway. Not only the Cubans, but millions elsewhere in the world, are willing to believe the worst of the United States on any crackpot's say-so. At the same time, they disregard the flagrant imperialist aggression practiced by the Soviet Union and swallow the line about peace-loving Communist states.

In leaning over backward to be fair, we run the risk of becoming a pushover. While we seek to gain respect by forbearance, we lose respect by failing to stand up for our rights.

We would gain no points for good behavior if we adopted a tougher line toward Cuba, but if the reward for good behavior is a punch in the nose for Uncle Sam, maybe it is time Uncle Sam took a different tack.

There was a time when an American symbol was a rattler with the words "Don't tread on me." The world has changed some since then, but it surely cannot have changed so much that we have to offer ourselves as a doormat.

Seymour Paul, Former Director of Personnel for the Panama Canal Zones, Dies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on June 30 of this year, Seymour Paul, retired director of personnel for the Panama Canal Zone, died at his home in Harrisonburg, Va. Mr. Paul had a long and distinguished career and his interests in connection with the Panama Canal Zone were varied and active.

The News-Record of Harrisonburg on July 1 carried a very fine obituary which I would like to insert in the RECORD at this point:

SEYMOUR PAUL DIES AT HIS HOME HERE

Seymour Paul, 72, retired director of personnel for the Panama Canal Zone and a native of Harrisonburg, died Thursday morning at his home on South Mason Street. He had been ill for some years.

Mr. Paul and his family returned to his home town in 1950 after 40 years of civil service in the Canal Zone. He went to Panama as a young man and participated in the development of the area. He was an

editorial contributor to the Panama Star and Herald for 25 years and served as correspondent for a U.S. news service.

NEWSPAPER WRITER

Prior to leaving Harrisonburg in 1911, Mr. Paul was a member of the staff of a local newspaper. He never lost his gift for writing and wrote many articles on the Canal Zone. He kept himself well informed on current events and world affairs.

The Panamanian Government honored him with its highest decoration, the Order of Vasco Nunez de Balboa. When Mr. Paul left the Canal Zone, the Panama American paid him this editorial tribute:

"To many persons, Seymour Paul is known as the most polite man in the history of the Canal Zone. He may have lost his temper at times, but no one knew it. Nor did any one ever know of him to speak harshly of another person."

SON OF JUDGE PAUL, SR.

Mr. Paul was a son of Judge John Paul, Sr., and Katherine Green Paul. He was graduated from Virginia Military Institute and received his master's degree from Columbia University. He served in the Army in World War I. His father was also a Member of Congress and a veteran of the War Between the States.

He is survived by his wife, Mrs. Jane Abbott Paul; two sons, Seymour Paul, Jr., and John Abbott Paul; a daughter, Mrs. Theodore Davenport, of Summit, N.J.; a brother, Federal Judge John Paul; and five grandchildren.

A funeral service will be held Saturday at 11 o'clock from Emmanuel Episcopal Church and burial will be in Woodbine. The Reverend Francis B. Rhein will officiate. The body will be taken to the church at 10 a.m. The family requests that flowers be omitted.

Pallbearers will be Dr. Charles Caldwell, D. Wampler Earman, Dr. Claude Morrison, Herbert Simmons, Frank C. Switzer, Frank Whitesel, Capt. George G. Herring, and K. C. Moore.

What's Right About Civil Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. O'HARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if democratic government is to work, it must be based upon an interested and informed electorate.

In the United States today the job of interesting and informing the public is one in which every citizen bears an individual responsibility, but the primary responsibility lies with the press. Their influence is great. With this influence comes great responsibility. The Huron News, published in the small city of Bad Axe in my district, is a publication that recognizes its responsibility in this regard and is for this reason one of the outstanding small city newspapers in Michigan.

Their issue of July 22 of this year contained an excellent editorial on the subject of civil rights which in terse and objective fashion analyzes an issue which has generated much heated controversy. This editorial should be read by all of us.

It is therefore with great pride that I include this editorial from the Huron News of Bad Axe, Mich., at this point in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHAT'S RIGHT ABOUT CIVIL RIGHTS?

Whatever else the Democratic National Convention may have proved, it certainly demonstrated that the issue of civil rights is a rouser. That single issue provided more heat than any other in the platform. If little light accompanied the heat, this is perhaps part due to convention madness and partly inherent in the issue.

We particularly liked the defense of the CR plank expressed by Michigan's own Senator PHIL HART. If you missed it, HART tried to make it clear that CR is not a North-versus-South matter, that some elements of civil rights abuse may be peculiar to Dixie but that other phases are just as glaringly present in other States and sections. Too bad such a sensible and fair consideration elicited scant response.

Civil Rights.—What do they mean? Basically (and, oversimply, we admit), the terms include all the rights of a citizen of these United States. But the term rights of itself seems to confuse if not confound a lot of people on both sides of the issue.

Perhaps, in place of waxing vehement as to who should be granted or denied these rights; instead of indulging in elaborate forensics about why or why not, it might be profitable to begin with two elementary questions: (1) Who specifically is a U.S. citizen, and; (2) exactly what opportunities, privileges, duties and assurances are inherent in citizenship?

As an example of the specious and utterly asinine thinking at this point it is frequently argued that the right to vote should not be granted to certain types of citizen because they are ignorant. The argument, of course, is sheer subterfuge to camouflage racial, creedal or other intolerance, and proof of it is seen in the fact that ignorance is not restricted to one class, color, creed or section. If that argument justifies deprivation of franchise, then we'd better apply it uniformly. And if we do, then there are quite a few of the socially select and economic elite whose ignorance is both obvious enough and revolting enough to bar them from the voting booth.

No, civil rights dare not be based upon superior intelligence, education, economic bracket, color of skin, religious persuasion, social status or any other arbitrary category. We confess that at times we wish holding public office, or owning restricted property and several other so-called rights could be so regulated, but then they would become not civil rights but social, political, racial, religious or some other kind of rights.

Civil rights are irreducibly those rights which are intrinsic to and inherent in citizenship. To argue for or against their bestowal or denial on any other basis, just as Senator HART'S convention appeal suggested, is to desert both logic and American principle.

Like it or not, when we grant citizenship to any man or woman, civil rights are simultaneously accorded that citizen. If that principle is uncomfortable, then there is but one choice among three possibilities: (1) Change the statutory concepts of American citizenship by orderly processes of law; (2) Change your own inconsistency of concept by orderly processes of reason; (3) Change your address by the orderly process called emigration.

Committee on Un-American Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, a patriotic group in San Diego, Calif., has just concluded a 4-day seminar on the dangers of internal subversion by the international Communist conspiracy. The final speaker was Adm. Richard Arens, former counsel to the House Un-American Activities Committee. I have received many wires from those in attendance saying his address was received by a standing ovation of the 1,200 people in attendance.

This is further indication that the general public is in full support of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Internal Security Committee, as opposed to the numerous Communist fronts which are constantly trying to destroy the efficacy of these committees.

Amarillo Girl Wins Top National Prize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the journalistic annals of our era will, perhaps, record that this generation of American youth is substantially one of uncontrolled delinquency. Unfortunately, the case for vibrant, progressive, and enlightened young people who make up the majority of today's teenagers, is seldom noted.

The resultant image has been attacked in an admirable and worthwhile statement by Miss Beryl Jean Ward of Amarillo, Tex., whose essay, "What's Right About American Youth," has been recently awarded first prize in a nationwide essay contest sponsored by the Gilbert Youth Research Co. and the Associated Press. It is with considerable pride that I insert herein an article from the August 26 Amarillo Daily News concerning Miss Ward and the contest, as well as her splendid prize-winning essay:

AMARILLO GIRL WINS TOP NATIONAL PRIZE—YOUTH ESSAY WORTH $500 IN CONTEST

The 17-year-old Amarillo charmer who won first prize in the Eugene Gilbert essay contest attributes her success to an uncharacteristic burst of anger.

A good student with a penchant for poetry and charity work, Beryl Jean Ward was just plain fed up with the way many adults seem to judge all teenagers by the crimes of a few.

When she heard that the Gilbert Youth Research Co., and the Associated Press were sponsoring a nationwide essay contest on "What's Right About American Youth," Beryl saw her chance to strike back. Her blast against the inability of the adult world to understand today's teenagers not only won her $500 and first place among thousands of contestants but enabled her to get her pet peeve off her mind and into print.

"It bothers me," she admits, "to have people put all teenagers in the same category."

Her winning essay was not her first venture into print. Last year one of her poems, "Beauty of the Plains," was featured in a national high school anthology and later published by the American Poetry Society.

And yet, Beryl is not bookish. Pretty and cheerful, she packs a lot of poise into a five-foot-five, 105-pound frame, likes bowling, swimming, and dancing as well as creative writing, which is her favorite hobby.

She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. F. Ross Ward of 5707 Emil. Her father is district manager of a sewing machine company. A sister, Karen, is Mrs. William A. Smith, a schoolteacher in Oakland, Calif.

Beryl started school at Wichita, Kans., and attended schools in Kansas City, Kans., and Denver, before enrolling in Tascosa High School in Amarillo, where she will begin her senior year in the fall.

She likes all her courses, even math which she admits "I'm terrible in," and takes a special interest in English, history, and dramatics, her best subjects.

"She's an excellent student of literature and English, but not a straight A student," confides Miss Maxine Hurley, her English teacher.

Like many youngsters her age, Beryl Jean regards summer vacations as a time of accomplishment and enrichment. Last summer she worked as an unpaid volunteer at the Veterans' Administration hospital in Amarillo. This summer, with rising college costs in mind, she is clerking in Wolflin Village Pharmacy.

Says Pharmacist D. J. Lindsey of her work at the store, "She spends her spare time trying to learn the stock.

"Not too many youngsters take that kind of interest in their jobs these days."

Beryl entered the contest at the suggestion of a friend, while both were reading Eugene Gilbert's weekly "What Young People Think" survey in the Amarillo Daily News.

International Banditry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the editorial entitled "International Banditry," which appears in the September 5, 1960, issue of U.S. News & World Report. This article is a timely one and the suggestion made therein deserves the study and consideration of every Member of the House:

INTERNATIONAL BANDITRY

(By David Lawrence)

Realism today commands us to face up squarely to the fact that there can be no peace in the world, no independence for former colonial countries, and no safety for any free nations as long as international banditry is permitted to rove the earth.

Self-determination of peoples has long been a worthy ideal. America has proclaimed again and again its sympathy with the right of nations, large or small, to choose their own form of government.

But now we see the principle impaired everywhere. Whether it be in Latin America, or in Eastern Europe, or in the Middle East, or in the Far East, and indeed wherever we penetrate the chaos that currently prevails on the African continent, we find one culprit—one enemy of freedom.

The enemy is the Communist dictatorship in Moscow, allied with the Red regime in Peiping.

How long are the nations that are outside the Iron Curtain going to delude themselves with the idea that international rules and customs must be obeyed by only one side—the free world?

How long will the countries now invaded by subversive elements tolerate the presence of agents and provocateurs whose only mission is to stir up friction, thus preventing new nations from becoming democracies and undermining older nations even as they strive to maintain their traditions of tolerance for opposition parties?

The United Nations in its Charter adopted just 15 years ago says:

"All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any member or state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

How long, then, shall the Soviet Union and its stooges be permitted to violate the Charter of the United Nations? It would be better to dismantle the present organization and build a new one than to let defiance of the charter go on. For while this document does not specifically provide for expulsion of a government which represents a permanent member of the Security Council, any group of members can always withdraw and form a new organization. This is what must be done if self-respect and the principles of freedom are to be maintained.

Every day that the Soviet Union is permitted to associate in the U.N. organization with the free nations, the world is, in effect, led to believe that the misdemeanors of the Moscow regime are tolerated.

Last year General de Gaulle made a heroic effort to help former French colonies in Africa to achieve their independence. In an address on December 13 at Dakar, capital of the new Mali Federation, the head of the French Republic said:

"The state of Mali is going to assume what some call the position of independence and which I prefer to call that of international sovereignty.

"I have said that I prefer the latter term, without, however, disputing the attractiveness and significance which the word 'independence' can and must have for any people, and especially for this people. Nevertheless, I prefer 'international sovereignty' because it seems to me to correspond better with the necessities that have always existed and especially with the necessities of today. 'Independence' is a word which signifies a desire, an attitude, an intention; but the world being as it is—so small, so cramped, so interfering with itself—real independence, complete independence does not in reality belong to anyone.

"There is no state, however big or however powerful, which can get along without the others. No policy is possible without cooperation."

But in recent weeks, we have seen one of its two members—Senegal—withdrawing from that federation.

What provoked the attempt at dissolution? What indeed is also behind the disintegration of the provinces of the former Belgian Congo and the civil war now raging there? Mainly the agents and saboteurs—native Africans trained in Moscow in recent years—who now stir up passions and prevent the new republics from achieving independence or maintaining any alliance with their former friends.

As a consequence, national economic structures are being ruined, and innocent people are being deprived of job opportunities. A dozen Marshall plans will not rescue these ill-fated natives. It takes more than money. The answer is to rid Africa of the common enemy, the Communists.

What has happened in Africa has happened in Cuba. The Communist penetration of Latin America is also well underway.

How long will the free nations let the international banditry of the Communist regime continue? The time has come to isolate the Soviets—to withhold from them membership in any international organization, and to insist that every free country get rid of Communist agents and subversives as a qualification for membership in a new League of Freedom.

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRUCE ALGER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following newsletter of August 27, 1960:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman BRUCE ALGER, Fifth District, Texas)

In Congress, the Democrat leadership is caught in a snare of its own making; namely, the reconvening of Congress after the political conventions. It is a fact that Congress could indeed have finished the year's work earlier. Congress' program of work is solely under the jurisdiltion of the Democrat leaders and their preponderant majorities in both Houses. Little that is constructive can be accomplished now in an atmosphere so politically supercharged that objetcivity of judgment and statesmanship is much less possible. The House virtually marks time while the other body, the Senate, engages in a showy political power struggle before hordes of sightseers. The consensus of feeling here is that the sooner Congress adjourns, the better off the political parties and the country will be.

The suspension of section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 by amendment passed overwhelmingly and clears the way for political debates by the presidential nominees. Originally, Congress required that political opponents be granted equal time on television. Now the presidential and vice presidential nominees are to be granted time voluntarily by television stations and networks for the 1960 campaign only. Thus the original danger (which the law sought to correct) of favoritism to a particular candidate or party is reinstated, although the intent of the amendment is to entitle each candidate to 1 hour per week for the 8-week period beginning September 1.

Amending the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 (passed 395 to 3) brought to our attention the fact that millions of pieces of Communist propaganda are being mailed into our country and circulated through U.S. mails to individuals, schools, legislators, and organizations to influence and warp individuals' minds. The amendment therefore was to close the loopholes in the original act to require the registration of agents disseminating such political propaganda and the labeling of it as such on entrance into this country.

The extension of the Library Services Act for another 5 years (beyond the original 4 years) presented another typical congressional action of making permanent in effect the originally alleged temporary subsidy of rural library facilities. Here's the reasoning: Rural communities need libraries; Congress recognizes this need; the Federal Government extends funds (and Federal terms), available if matched by the States. Then it follows that any acceptance by States of this money and program demonstrates the recognition of need and the States endorsement of the program. This, of course, precludes any argument that States endorse a Federal program in order to get money back. Sometimes I wonder if Federal legislators give the States and localities credit for any self-motivation. And so the Federal bureaucracy grows. Debate forcefully demonstrated that the need is already being met, the States can handle the situation alone, the program can be tapered off, and that men must seek the books, not books the men.

House Joint Resolution 615 requiring the consent of Congress for future amendments to the Port of New York Authority Compact brought a sharp conflict between Federal versus States' rights in a unique way. A majority of the Judiciary Committee, headed by Chairman CELLER, brought contempt of Congress citations against three members of the port authority for refusal to submit all data concerning port operation at the committee's request. So the constitutional question was raised whether Congress had the authority to demand the records. New York and New Jersey had made a bi-State compact. The Constitution clearly permits Congress to grant or repeal a compact between States, but Congress does not have the power to supervise or regulate activities between the States. Yet the House voted to cite the port members of contempt and to force the two States to submit to Federal regulation. The 270 to 124 recorded vote shows how easily the Constitution can be reinterpreted by a majority. It is noteworthy that in the 2-hour debate only 20 minutes was allocated to those holding the States' rights position. Strongly worded communications were received during debate from Governors Harriman, Rockefeller, Meyner, Lehman, and Dewey against this instance of the violation of States' rights and centralization of government at the Federal level. As one Congressman put it, thinking of the past liberal activities of these men, "It is so gratifying to see the chickens come home to roost."

Senate Joint Resolution 170 passed 349 to 39 (ALGER against) and becomes more alarming as I think of it. This resolution, apparently innocuous, is to authorize the designation of a Commission of 20 U.S. citizens to meet with other citizens of the NATO countries "for the purpose of developing paths toward greater political and economic cooperation within the alliance" for "non-military collaboration in the political and economic areas." This sounds great but there are no guidelines or goals set out. If it means economic aid, we have already empowered 72 other countires to think up ways to give away U.S. money. If it's political, then we remember that "One-World do-goodism" ends up with loss of U.S. sovereignty. As one Member said, "I can't be for organizations which end up in the United States alone paying the lion's share of the cost, getting only one vote, and giving up sovereignty." True, my suspicions may be groundless, but the Hoover Commission, to which this was compared, had ground rules and goals. It seems to me that this is too dangerous an area for us to take lightly or without proper direction and specific goals.

Twentieth Anniversary of the Founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, the past 20 years has witnessed the growth of an organization dedicated to keep alive the fires of Ukrainian independence and freedom. This organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, has persisted stubbornly despite obstacles, implementing American freedom and the power of the pen to spread truth and understanding about 114 million non-Russians in the Soviet Union, of which 42 million are Ukrainian. The many publications of the organization including the Ukrainian Quarterly and the Ukrainian Bulletin are acknowledged as authoritative literature, read by those who seek greater enlightenment in this area, maintaining the highest standards of integrity in their journalistic campaign of truth. The Ukrainian Congress Committee deserves the congratulations and gratitude of America for their endeavors, keeping our citizens aware of the Soviet rape of captive non-Russian nations in the U.S.S.R. and the struggles of these nations for independence, exposing myths of Soviet unity, and proposing ways and means to defeat imperialist Moscow in the cold war. They have rallied some 2½ million Ukrainian-Americans to the cause of Ukrainian sovereignty. They have refurbished four centuries of hope by the Ukrainian people for the cherished gifts of independence and freedom which were realized in 1918 only to be heartlessly and brutally suppressed by the Soviet, Communist regime. The yoke of tyranny forced upon these people can never be forgotten. The accomplishments of the organization in these 20 years have given the Ukrainian people a new birth of hope that their sacrifices for liberty will not have been made in vain and that the rebirth of one independent Ukrainian state will soon be realized.

It is an honor and privilege for me to join with all Americans in conveying the appreciation of our country for their work. The Ukrainian Congress Committee has not shirked its duty to their brethren across the sea or to the free world. Let us pay for the maintenance of their strength to carry on future endeavors and let me hope for the fulfillment of their dreams for Ukrainian independence.

World War I Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I know there has been much said during this session of Congress about veterans' benefits, both compensation and pensions, and in particular, quite a lot about pensions for World War I veterans. Several bills are pending before this House, and a discharge petition for one of these is on file at the Clerk's desk.

I realize we are in the final days of this session and there is no opportunity to have either further hearings or to complete the needed number of signatures upon the discharge petition for World War I legislation.

However, in the August 25, 1960, issue of the National Tribune-Stars and Stripes, there appears on the front page an address by the Honorable Robert Fuoss, a World War I veteran long identified with the department of Pennsylvania of the American Legion. This address first was given on a Pennsylvania radio station and later rebroadcast over 15 stations of the Allegheny network.

In the furtherance of a pension for World War I veterans, Mr. Fuoss made a stirring appeal, and it is difficult for me to see how Members of the Congress can read this address and fail to see that in comparison with benefits heretofore extended veterans of other wars, the Congress has been grossly negligent in its omission and failure to accord to World War I veterans a fair and just pension. It is too late this session to accomplish anything for these aging veterans, but there will always be another Congress, and I recommend this address to the attention of each Member of the House. Here are several important excerpts taken from Mr. Fuoss' address:

Men and women have rather short memories. History is not always the most satisfactory means of keeping memories fresh since, as you know, vast numbers of persons living today do not bother themselves with history and, of course, those of the younger generation are more deeply engrossed in other things. This is especially true of the events of some 42 years ago—the events of the First World War.

An approximate 4,609,000 men served in that war—brave young men. They were resolved to defend the Nation because they were imbued with the idea that German-Prussian tyranny dared not overrun the free world. An approximate 2,900,000 of that war still live and an estimated 1,109,000 are now past 65 years of age. They are now old and gray and the sands in their hour glasses are fast running out.

Statisticians estimate that the surviving of that war are dying at the rate of 112,000 per year and that by 1970 only a few thousand will be living. These are sobering figures and they point to an existing condition that must be remedied now if these surviving veterans of the war of 1917–18 are to receive the same fair treatment shown veterans of earlier wars—even those of the later wars. We sure shall not make flesh of one and fowl of another. What has been given to one dares not rightly be denied another.

There are those who, for one reason or another, feel that those of the First World War, in seeking this pension, are motivated by selfish reasons. There are others who do not know that the veterans of the war of 1917–18 have not been pensioned as were those of earlier wars and there are, strange to relate, those who actually believe there is no valid reason for pensioning veterans; that they are already well cared for by Government. It is time the record be set straight and that is the purpose of this address.

The history of pensions for American veterans is unique in the annals of the military. It was General Washington who, following the Revolution, helped set a precedent when he said, among other things, that those who served the Nation in times of war were, in a sense, a privileged class; that, by reason of this service, they were entitled to a pension since they had risked life and limb in the preservation of the Nation and the institutions that come thereunder. There is no well-informed scholar who will deny this truth.

It is vital in its relationship to this subject of pensions that we consider the kind of war in which brave young men fought and died during that deadly conflict of 42 years ago. It was fought in trenches filled with blood, vermin, filth and disease. It has been alluded to as "the dirtiest of wars."

Mr. Wilson and General Pershing spoke of that was as "monstrous," "criminal," and "barbarous."

In these trenches men existed, fought, bled and died for the paltry sum of $21 per month. As if trench warfare was not bad enough, the Prussians introduced poisonous gases, the most outrageous and despicable form of warfare and, by all considerations, the most wanton and cowardly. Men lost legs and arms; many were blinded; many went insane and, most tragic of all, were those who were gassed. The few remaining of this latter group—the gassed—still lie upon beds of pain and anguish, eager for the day when a gracious God will free them from their anguish and unspeakable suffering. This is not a pretty picture—it is true, however.

Those of that war who did finally get home returned to no jobs. They were, in large part, compelled to shift for themselves as best they could. The Government did not provide them with $20 per week for 52 weeks while they sought work. For them—those of that war—there was no GI bill of rights; no aid in building homes and not 1 cent for the resumption of their education. On discharge they received $60—enough to buy a suit of clothing and a pair of shoes. That's all they got.

These were, let me remind you, in times of great economic stress and strain. Despite this sad state of affairs, these men now grown old and gray did shift for themselves, doing as best they could. Some made jobs for themselves, reared and educated families. Others did less well and still others simply failed to make the grade. In this latter group were those veterans, hungry, distressed, jobless and disillusioned, who participated in the infamous Bonus March, the very remembrance of which, in the thirties, is one of the darkest chapters of American history and the mere mentioning of it still haunts those who remember it only too well. Let us not forget Anacostia. It was Lincoln who said it was the duty of gvoernment to care for those who bore the brunt of battle. We are today caring for the world. Let us not now disown our own veterans.

Today, after all these many years, certain Members of Congress would do something for these men, these men who served with honor and distinction under Woodrow Wilson and John J. Pershing. Yes, certain Members could do something for them but, strangely, others of the Congress would do nothing for them—would, it seems, even penalize many of them who, over the years, managed through thrift and diligence to save a few thousand dollars for their twilight hours. It is difficult to believe that the basic philosophy respecting thrift has changed but, apparently, some Members of the Congress feel the thrifty veteran is neither a credit to himself, his community or the Republic.

Today, as any sensible man knows, men in their late sixties and early seventies cannot get work—not even part-time jobs. Still they are compelled to pay taxes in addition to meeting the continuing rise of living costs, food, clothing, and such. Many are on small fixed incomes and every increase in the cost of things adds to their misery and their desperation. Congress has not neglected its Members—three salary increases since the close of the World War II and Congress has not delayed legislating pensions for those no longer in public service—it required less than 2 minutes time to do this, too.

The new veteran law which became operative July 1 was never intended to do anything for those of the World War I in the sense of this overdue pension. No Member of Congress will contend for one split second that was either the thought or the intent of the new law which, let me point out, is as unfair and unjust as it is unrealistic and discriminatory. One of the most objectionable features of it is that those things men have earned for themselves count as earned income—social security and railroad retirement, to be specific.

Let us go about our task in earnest, honest effort since it is worthy of our combined endeavors. Just keep this one thing in mind—not too much time is left to us since, whether you know it or not, "it is later than you think."

House Resolutions 606, 607, and 608

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under the privilege to revise and extend my remarks I want to say a few words about the procedures under which we are considering House Resolution 606, a contempt citation against Austin J. Tobin, House Resolution 607, a contempt citation against S. Sloan Colt, and House Resolution 608, a contempt citation against Joseph G. Carty.

By unanimous consent these three companion resolutions were agreed to be considered by the House with the time allotted on the first citation be extended for 1 hour and that the time on the other two citations be reduced to one-half hour each, so that there will be only 3 hours of debate in all, which would be the time ordinarily taken; that the time be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Through an error the Speaker recognized the gentleman from New York for 1 hour and the gentleman from Ohio for 1 hour instead of one hour and a half for each as per the unanimous consent agreement.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] of course is the chairman of the Judiciary Committee which is returning the citation for contempt and the contempt complained of was against a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCCULLOCH] is the ranking minority member of the Judiciary Committee.

Both gentlemen are supporting the contempt citation. Under the rules of the House as they are presently set up time can be allotted according to political parties instead of to those who support the privileged resolutions and to those who oppose the privileged resolutions or there can be no allotment at all depending upon the discretion of the member who originally has the time. In other words an objection to the unanimous-consent request would have done nothing to correct this inequity of having all the time for debate under the control of one side of the question at issue and no time for debate under the control of the other side of the question at issue.

This same rule prevails over other matters which come onto the floor of the House under what is called the hour rule. Apparently, there is no provision under the hour rule as there is under a motion to suspend the rules whereby one who is opposing the matter under consideration can demand half the time available for debate and gain it in competition with a member of the committee or otherwise who is not in opposition.

I am convinced this is a serious flaw in our rules. It cannot possibly be conducive to good debate. I will move to correct it if I am a Member of the next Congress.

The situation in regard to these three contempt citations brings the unwisdom of this procedure to view starkly. Here there is a determined opposition to these three citations for contempt. Minority views have been filed in the committee's reports which preceded the citations. Everyone recognizes that there is an honest and serious difference of opinion on this subject. Everyone realizes that the subject itself is an extremely complicated one. Everyone realizes that the implications of the decision we make on this matter are quite serious. Yet we debate it with the proponents taking over two-thirds of the time and not even granting to the opponents control of what time will be granted to them. They cannot control when they may speak, which ones shall be selected to speak, and how much of the limited time will be granted to each of them to speak. How, indeed, can the opposition effectively present their arguments?

It would be shocking enough if this were done unwittingly, but it passes understanding when we must accept the fact that it has been done deliberately. I personally raised the question of the fairness of this procedure with one of the members who could have corrected it to some degree to no avail. I raised point after I had heard that the proponents had previously raised the question and had asked for fairness in the procedures under which this serious debate was to be conducted.

One of the Members in addressing himself to the substantive merits of the resolutions stated that the dignity of the House was at stake. My colleagues, I am not so certain about that, but I am certain that the dignity of the House suffers when we follow procedures as unfair as these we are following.

On previous occasions I have addressed myself to the point of the propriety and the interests of good action on the part of the House in permitting the committee against which an action of contempt on the part of an individual, has allegedly been committed preparing the report on the alleged contemptuous action upon which the House will consider the matter. The committee involved is bound to be somewhat subjective in its viewpoint. With this in mind I introduced an amendment to the rules which would require the Judiciary Committee or a subcommittee thereof to consider all questions of contempt citations which the House committees might desire to have the House act upon. I think better wisdom dictates that a special committee be set up on a permanent basis to which all matters of contempt citations be referred. Such an independent committee I am certain can make a more objective and meaningful report to the House upon

which the House can act with more assurance that it is doing the right thing than is presently the case. Furthermore, this process I feel would result in some desirable self-discipline on the part of committee members who in their zeal to get at the bottom of an issue sometimes become a bit overbearing in their attitude toward witnesses appearing before them.

I want to make one final comment about the wild charges against lobbying that I have heard uttered. Good lobbying is an essential and good part of representative government. There is, of course, such a thing as bad lobbying techniques. Indeed, it is the bad lobbying techniques that are employed from time to time that bring the entire system of citizens and groups of citizens petitioning the Congress into disrepute. However, it is the bad techniques we should criticize adversely not the system of petitioning the Congress. I heard little about alleged improper techniques on the part of those who were complaining about the actions of the petitioners in this matter. All I heard was the fact that they had vigorously petitioned. I can find no fault in that. Nor can I find any fault in a State agency using tax funds to present the point of view of duly elected or duly appointed State officials on such a vital issue as this which involves the difficult definition of the borderline between State and Federal powers.

I am afraid we have not enhanced the dignity of the House by the procedures we have followed here today or by much of what has been said here today. The dignity of the House and of the Congress is very dear to me, as I am certain it is to all of you. We know that herein rests the living fire of democracy. Changing the Rules of the House as I have suggested will I believe enhance the dignity of the House. However, in the long run it is only understanding and self-discipline of our Members, not rules, which build up respect and dignity for our Congress.

The Robert Taft Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following poem entitled "The Robert Taft Memorial," by Miss Marty Hale, of Steubenville, Ohio:

THE ROBERT TAFT MEMORIAL

In majesty its marble segments rise,
Piercing the blueness of the starlit skies;
Matching the splendor of the rosy dawn,
Clearing the bell-tower when the mists have gone;
Reflecting every shaft of noonday sun,
Or crimson glory when the day is done;
It has its beauty—but has so much more—
It opens more than just a classic door;
It marks a legend that all freemen love,
It stands for peace on earth, and God above;
Open and sincere as the man whose heart
Beat for the land of which he was a part.
An open door to all whose loyalty
Match that of him who gave unstintingly
Of soul and body—the best he had to give,
And left a creed by which we all might live.
Blazed a clear path that patriots might tread,
Forsaking greed, and giving self instead.
He followed where our Founding Fathers led,
Sometimes so much alone—he chose to tread
A path so overgrown from day to day,
That careless men seemed to have lost the way—
Ignoring those who rushed to pick a flaw—
We say: "Bob Taft, you were America."
You stood for us, and with each bell-tower's chime,
Forever more we bow at this, your shrine.

Reds in Caribbean and Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, in my remarks to the House in the Appendix of the RECORD on June 20, 1960, I quoted an informative article by Constantine Brown concerning the threats to our national security by the actions of hidden policymakers in the Department of State.

Since that time, almost daily developments have served to emphasize the parts played by these hidden hands, especially for Africa and the Caribbean, where the prestige of the United States has been seriously weakened with wholesale loss of American properties now occurring in prospect. It is only natural that there should be raised by thoughtful persons over the United States this question: What are the influences in the Department of State that have caused such deterioration?

Another perspective article by Mr. Brown in the Evening Star of August 6, 1960, supplies additional information that should be of interest to every Member of the Congress.

The article follows:

REDS IN CARIBBEAN AND AFRICA—UNITED STATES ACCUSED OF PLAYING OSTRICH TO CASTRO'S REAL OBJECTIVES

(By Constantine Brown)

International communism has implanted itself within the last 2 years in two important strategic areas in the world: The Caribbean and parts of Africa.

The Soviet Union and Communist China have firmly established themselves in the Caribbean through the dictatorship of the Castro kids. And, because we frown on dictatorship, we played an ostrich policy as to the real objectives of the Castros in Cuba.

The administration and news media described the Castros at first as idealists but by no means under Communist discipline. If we handled them tactfully, it was contended, they would inevitably recognize the dangers of Communist dictatorship.

Even the influx of thousands of advisers from the Soviet Union, the satellite countries, and particularly from Communist China into Cuba was taken lightly by Washington. It would be against our beliefs, it was said, to interfere in the domestic affairs of another nation even if it affected the Monroe Doctrine. We heard charges that the doctrine was obsolete in these quickly changing times. When we resurrected it a few weeks ago by a strong statement from President Eisenhower it was obviously too late. Stern words these days are meaningless. Only actions count.

The Reds have paralleled the action in Cuba with similar action in the newly created African republics where full independence has been rushed headlong to areas unprepared for self-government. The tribal system is still very much alive in Central Africa. Hence there can be no national unity. International communism does not bother about such trivialities.

The Communists chose their puppets carefully long ago. Thus, while we courted and treated with utmost courtesy the chief executives of some of the new African states in the expectation that they would stay out of the Red orbit, the Russians and the Chinese had already in their pockets the president and prime minister of at least two key republics.

The Reds exploited the African leaders' antagonisms against the Western "imperialist capitalists" and made them their tools, fully convinced that the rest of Central Africa will fall into the Red orbit if communism is established in two key states. The fact that cannibalism is still a custom in the former Belgian Congo (no fewer than 276 individuals were sentenced by the Belgian authorizies for the practice) did not concern Moscow and Peiping.

When the former French Colony of Guinea became independent, Sekou Toure, a man who as late as 1956 was a card carrying Communist, became the chief executive. A photostat was sent from Paris shortly before he visited Washington where he was received with the same honors as President de Gaulle. He was pleased at his reception but did not change his spots.

The Congolese Army with at least the tacit approval (some say at the instigation) of Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba celebrated its independence with an orgy of murders, arson and rapes against the white settlers. The moral character of Lumumba is well established. A few years before becoming the leader of the Congolese nationalists he was in jail for 3 years for embezzlement. He was thus excellent material to further the cause of international communism in the Congo.

We received Lumumba in Washington with a 17-gun salute and accorded him all the honors due his newly assumed rank. Our policy makers believed we could detach him from his bosses in Moscow and Peiping. While in Washington he protested that he was not Moscow's man, just as Castro did last year. But his actions belie his words. He still is threatening the United Nations with direct intervention of Red troops in case he does not get his way.

A Statement of Position on the National Defense Student Loan Program by the Faculty of Goshen College, Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following statement of position on the

student loan program of the National Defense Education Act drawn up by the faculty of Goshen College, Goshen, Ind., on May 26, 1960:

A STATEMENT OF POSITION ON THE NATIONAL DEFENSE STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM BY THE FACULTY OF GOSHEN COLLEGE

As a participant in the national defense student loan program, Goshen College is grateful for the concern of the Federal Government for the educational welfare of its people, and particularly for the assistance which the loan program is giving to many students who lack adequate financial resources of their own.

Several features of this excellent program, however, are a matter of serious concern to the administration and faculty of Goshen College.

THE LOAN PROGRAM AS A DEFENSE MEASURE

We have no doubt that a major source of strength (in the sense of the highest general welfare) of any nation is an educated, an enlightened, and an intelligent citizenry. It is for the achievement of this end that we are happy to cooperate with the student loan program.

This term, "national defense student loan program," however, as well as the title of the law, National Defense Education Act, is a matter of concern. This terminology would seem to suggest a view of education, primarily dedicated to military achievement, whereas the highest welfare of any nation demands an education which develops and sets free those intellectual and spiritual powers of man which alone can make the Nation great.

Moreover, the extent that the financial assistance provided by the act is directed to education in science and technology, or other subject matter related to defense, in preference to, or at the expense of, the broader concept of education in what is commonly described as the liberal arts, we believe the act tends to promote the narrow view which the title suggests.

We would, therefore, wish that the loan provisions of the act may be rendered equally applicable to other departments of the college curriculum, and that the title of the act may be revised so as to harmonize more nearly with the name of the executive department of the Federal Government under which it is administered, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

THE DISCLAIMER AFFIDAVIT

Goshen College draws on more than four centuries of Anabaptist-Mennonite history in which not only our spiritual forefathers, but many of our contemporaries as well, have frequently been harassed by authoritarian governments demanding many varieties of test oaths and disloyalty disclaimers.

Even though the present disclaimer affidavit may sincerely have been intended as a safeguard against totalitarianism, our own religious tradition tells us clearly that procedures such as this imperil the ways of freedom and democracy; that totalitarianism opposed in this manner will, if pursued to its logical conclusion, but bring a new totalitarianism upon us.

As a means of protection, the affidavit is futile. Convinced Communists or adherents of other totalitarian philosophies would not hesitate to sign the affidavit.

The requirement of the affidavit seems to suggest that the applicant for a loan is suspected of subversion unless he declares himself otherwise. This violates the principle of respect for the individual as embodied in the doctrine of American jurisprudence that a citizen is innocent unless proved guilty.

The requirement of the disclaimer, and of the oath as well, suggest a feeling of insecurity, a spirit of fear and of distrust, unbecoming to a great democracy. A basic principle stressed by the Founding Fathers was the inalienable right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, including freedom of religion, of speech, and of press. It was to secure these blessings of liberty that the Nation was founded. A major purpose of education is the enlargement of character, the increase of knowledge, and the liberation of the human spirit, without which democracy cannot live.

The requirement of the disclaimer bespeaks a lack of faith in the principles upon which our Nation was founded; a distrust of the very democracy which it is supposed to defend; and lack of confidence in the free and diverse character of education which had made American democracy what it is.

Inasmuch as a similar oath and disclaimer are not required of other recipients of Federal loans, such as farmers, businessmen, and others, the present act is highly discriminatory. Its effect is to single out college students, and by implication, the institutions in which they are enrolled, as particularly untrustworthy. This discriminatory feature renders the lack of confidence in American education all the more serious, and serves to undermine a basic foundation stone of American democracy. Recent legislation removing the disclaimer affidavit as a requirement of labor organizations seeking the services of the National Labor Relations Board tends to make the discrimination all the more evident.

In view of these considerations, we would urge that the requirement of the disclaimer affidavit be rescinded, and that in so doing, the American academic community be restored to the position of dignity and respect which it rightfully deserves.

THE OATH OF ALLEGIANCE

Although it is our belief that a declaration of allegiance as a ceremonial act may have a place in the life of the Nation when used with wisdom, discretion, and moderation, we believe that to be meaningful, it must needs be reserved for "moments of high commitment in the life of the political community, such as the induction of an official into responsible office or the naturalization of a citizen."[1] We would urge that the requirement of the oath of allegiance be rescinded from the act.

Respectfully submitted.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND FACULTY OF GOSHEN COLLEGE.

[1] Taken from the Bluffton College, May 10, 1960, Statement of Position on the National Defense Student Loan Program.

Twentieth Anniversary of Soviet Aggression Against the Baltic States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN LESINSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to submit for the RECORD the manifesto issued by the free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians in connection with the 20th anniversary of the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States.

In view of the Communist aggression today, such as in Africa, in southeast Asia, in Cuba and in other parts of the world, I believe it is highly important to call this manifesto to the attention of the American people as a reminder of what has happened and what we might expect if the present patterns of Soviet aggressions continue.

The manifesto follows:

THE 20TH ANNIVERSARY OF SOVIET AGGRESSION AGAINST THE BALTIC STATES—MANIFESTO OF FREE ESTONIANS, LATVIANS, AND LITHUANIANS

Twenty years ago, the Soviet Union attacked the Baltic States. Some 300,000 Red army troops poured into Lithuania on June 15, 1940, and into Latvia, and Estonia, on June 17, 1940. With the protection of this occupation army, the emissaries of the Kremlin—Dekanozov, Vishinsky, Zhdanov—unseated the legitimate governments of the Baltic nations. The Baltic countries were robbed of their independence and transformed into colonies of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union's assault against its Baltic neighbors initiated the Soviet westward march against Europe. Thus, the beginning of today's international tension and threat to peace may be found in the Soviet aggression against the Baltic States in 1940.

By its aggressive acts against Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, the U.S.S.R. broke the peace and nonaggression treaties it had signed with those states as well as other international agreements.

Expropriation, exploitation, pauperization, slave labor, suppression of human rights and fundamental freedoms, Russification, terror, murder, mass deportations—these are the marks of the Soviet occupation in the Baltic States. In committing these acts, the Soviets violated the United Nations declaration embodying the Atlantic Charter, the United Nations Charter, the Convention on the Suppression of Crimes of Genocide, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—all these documents bearing the signatures of the U.S.S.R.

The Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian peoples, historically and traditionally Western in orientation and outlook, placed their hopes in the Western World. Their trust and reliance in the West was strengthened by the declaration of the U.S. Department of State of July 23, 1940; the statement of the President of the United States of October 15, 1941; the Atlantic Charter; the Yalta Declaration on Liberated Europe; the repeated statements by the U.S. Government about nonrecognition of the Soviet annexation of the Baltic States and continued recognition of their diplomatic representatives; and the proclaimed aims and principles of the United Nations.

The Baltic peoples have given active expression to their determination to regain freedom, and have resisted their oppressors, thus contributing greatly to the still continuing struggle for freedom and justice being waged by all captive peoples enslaved by the Soviet Union. Despite heavy setbacks and trials, our peoples maintain their faith in the restoration of their freedom and independence.

This summer the Soviet occupant will unveil a macabre spectacle—a festive celebration of the twentieth anniversary of the enslavement of the Baltic States during which the captive Baltic peoples will be pressed to appear grateful to their conquerors.

We—free Estonians, Latvians, and Lithuanians—are conscious of our responsibility toward our nations and toward history. At this twentieth anniversary of Soviet aggression, we feel dutybound to give voice to the aspirations of our captive peoples:

We accuse the Soviet Union of committing and continuing an international crime against the Baltic States;

We demand that the Soviet Union withdraw its military, police and administrative personnel from the Baltic countries;

We request that the governments of the free world, especially those of the great powers, undertake all peaceful ways and means to restore the exercise of the right of self-determination in the Baltic countries and in the rest of East-Central Europe;

We appeal to the conscience of all mankind to perceive the magnitude of the injustice perpetrated upon the Baltic countries and to support the efforts toward the restoration of the liberty of these countries;

We convey to our people at home our pride in their resolute resistance against the endeavors of the oppressor to destroy their national and personal identity;

We express to our peoples behind the Iron Curtain our deep conviction that the Soviet system—as all tyrannies throughout history—carries within it the seeds of its own destruction; that it cannot and shall not prevail;

We pledge to intensify our joint organized activity in the free world to promote the cause of liberty for the Baltic countries;

We, finally, declare to the free world and the Communist-dominated world, including the U.S.S.R., that, once free again, the Baltic nations will do all in their power to ensure the best possible relations with their neighbors on the basis of mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity.

Vaclovas Sidzikauskas, chairman (Lithuania); Alfreds Berzins, Deputy Chairman (Latvia); Leonard Vahter, Deputy Chairman, Estonia); Members: Jaan Tiivel (Estonia), Eduard Vallaste (Estonia); Adolfs Blodnieks (Latvia), Vilis Hazners (Latvia), Dr. Vilis Masens (Latvia), Juris Siesers (Latvia), Msgr. Jonas Balkunas (Lithuania), Col. Jonas Slepetys (Lithuania), Dr. Antanas Trimakas (Lithuania).

Social Security Amendments of 1960

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the medical care bill for the aged, shot through with weakening compromises, is a bitter disappointment to our 16 million senior citizens.

The United States is scoring breakthroughs in many fields of material research and development. In sharp contrast, that vigorous, pioneering spirit becomes ultraconservative when confronted with the challenge to help our fellow human beings whose working years have come to a close.

When the second session of the 86th Congress convened in January of this year, there were high hopes that a genuine health insurance bill for the aged would become one of its outstanding accomplishments. It would be a self-financing program administered through the social security system.

But those high hopes surrendered to the insistent threat of a Presidential veto. A health insurance bill for the aged was passed, but so drained of real content that it will need substantial transfusions in the next Congress before it can live up to the promise implicit in its title.

Those of us who fought for a "healthy" bill, voted for the anemic version with reluctance. The coalition majority said: "Vote for this 'ghost' bill—or no bill at all. We give you no other choice." At least, a precedent has been established, that we can elaborate upon and strengthen next year.

Health insurance for the aged, prepaid by taxes on employers and employees during the active years when a person is working, is the logical, practical, and inevitable way to solve this problem.

Free Americans should be entitled to this protection in their old age as a matter of right, and should not have to beg for it through a humiliating means test. The conservative coalition, spearheaded by the administration, has temporarily blocked humanitarian progress, but it must know in its mind and heart, that it is fighting the lost cause of the past and its indifference to the needs of human beings.

Now we will carry this issue to the people, confident that they will veto the obstructionists to social and economic progress.

The present health insurance bill is one that pays lipservice to the needs of the aged, but withholds adequate protection from them. It will not, however, deceive the American people.

The voice of public opinion is expressed in the following editorial from the April 6, 1960, edition of the Washington Post:

The one practical way to provide insurance against the health hazards of retirement years is to let people pay the premiums in the form of social security taxes while they are earning wages and are able to do so. This is precisely how they now provide retirement income for themselves under the social security program, and this kind of protection is made compulsory because the lack of it would have a disastrous social impact. Those who denounce this proposal as socialistic without proposing any workable alternative are foolishly doctrinaire.

They might just about as sensibly oppose as socialistic the Nation's public schools, fire departments, and parks because these represent communal efforts financed through taxation. One of the fundamental purposes for which the U.S. Government was established was to promote the general welfare.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of social insurance to protect our people against the health hazards of old age is the future solution that should be in effect today.

The present bill takes us down a narrow, winding side road and away from the direct and open highway that leads to a clear solution of the problem.

With new and confident leadership beginning in 1961, the United States shall find the forward road again and will legislate a program that will achieve security with dignity for all our senior citizens.

World Court Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the annual meeting of the American Bar Association, during which there will be considerable discussion about the Connally amendment, I should like to bring to the attention of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials that appeared in this morning's New York Times and New York Herald Tribune:

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1960]

ABA FACES TEST ON WORLD COURT

At the American Bar Association's convention this week, its house of delegates again faces a fight on the question of repeal of the Connally amendment. The ABA has been on record since 1947 as advocating repeal. Now two conflicting committee reports are due to be presented, one calling for continuation of the prorepeal stand, another, which has powerful support, for its reversal.

The bar association itself, more than the World Court, will be on trial.

The Connally amendment makes sense only if the World Court cannot be trusted to abide by its own charter. This charter specifically prohibits it from taking jurisdiction in any matter essentially domestic. But the Connally amendment says we, not the Court, shall decide whether a matter presented to the Court is within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. It stands as a bald declaration of no faith in the World Court—hardly a fit attitude for the leader of those nations pressing for extension of the rule of law. It is a pernicious, destructive doctrine which has contributed substantially to the tragic weakness of the Court.

It also, in practice, is more likely to work against us than for us. Because we have such a reservation, any other country with which we have a dispute, and which we might wish to hale before the Court, can invoke it reciprocally against us and refuse to accept the Court's jurisdiction. Because the conduct of our own affairs is governed by law, there are few cases in which we should have any reason to fear the Court's judgment. Other nations, such as Cuba, often contemptuously flout the law. But the Connally amendment ties our hands in taking them before the Court.

The World Court represents one of the world's prime hopes in the drive to substitute the rule of law among nations for the rule of force.

As lawyers, the members of the ABA should be the first to proclaim their faith in law. They can hardly do this if they are unwilling to proclaim their faith in the instruments of law, of which the World Court is one of the most distinguished.

[From the New York Times, Aug. 29, 1960]

THE WORLD COURT ISSUE

Under the United Nations Charter the International Court of Justice is designated as "the principal judicial organ of the United Nations." All members of the U.N. are, as the charter says, "ipso facto parties to the statute" creating this agency. Each member undertakes to comply with the decision of the Court in any case to which that member is a party.

Other provisions of the Court statute are intended to insure that the 15 men on the bench be competent and impartial. The judges are nominated by national groups but elected regardless of their nationality from among persons of high moral character. The precautions taken in their selection make it certain that the Court won't run amuck. If justice can be had in any international forum, it is here.

The United States, which held timorously aloof from the League of Nations' Permanent Court of International Justice, could not stay out of the successor Court, but we went in under the so-called Connally amendment, refusing to accept obligatory juris-

diction. This reservation really means that we will accept the Court if we are quite sure we will win our case but will refuse to participate if we suspect we may lose. This is the essence of the word "domestic" as used in the saving clause.

Thirty-odd other nations have been less cautious; they have accepted the Court's jurisdiction as obligatory in legal disputes concerning (1) the interpretation of a treaty; (2) any question of international law; (3) breaches of international obligation; (4) reparations for such breaches.

If we aren't willing to trust the Court with such cases, then the Court, as far as we are concerned, is not a court at all; and no system of effective international law is, for us, possible.

This issue comes up now, not because the Senate is likely to act on it this year, but because the American Bar Association is about to have a wrangle over it at the association's annual get-together in Washington. The ABA has had reports for and against the Connally amendment. The voting may be close.

It does seem strange, however, that men whose business is with the law and who are properly shocked when anybody commits contempt of court should be reluctant to commit their country to an agency, with built-in impartiality, whose only purpose is peace through justice.

Why Profit Sharing Is Booming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, U.S. industry now has at work some 30,000 profit-sharing plans embracing millions of employees. The Internal Revenue Department is approving profit-sharing plans of the deferred kind alone at the rate of 18 plans every day.

In the first quarter of 1960 more deferred profit-sharing plans were approved than were pension plans.

Mill & Factory magazine, a Conover-Mast publication, sees profit sharing as an important answer to the longstanding rift between management and labor. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article which appeared in the Mill & Factory magazine of July 1960:

WHY PROFIT SHARING IS BOOMING

(By Ted Metaxas)

(Many more companies adopt profit-sharing plans to end the rift between management and labor and set the climate for efficiency. Successful plans depend on management leadership and other important factors. Deferred profit sharing proves most popular, having multiplied six times in 9 years.)

"We believe profit sharing to be essential to the ultimate maintenance of the capitalistic system. We have found in profit-sharing firms veritable islands of peace, equity, efficiency, contentment, and likewise prosperity, dotting an otherwise relatively turbulent industiral map. This fact is too significant to be ignored or depreciated in our national quest for greater stability and democracy in industry."

This statement was contained in the 1939 subcommittee report by the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg. Then, true profit sharing was practiced by probably less than 200 firms, of which only 37 had adopted plans with deferred payments to employees.

Today, industry is beset with economic problems graver than in 1939—and how well it can solve them may determine whether America remains industrially supreme. One of the major problems is the continuing divorcement between management and labor that prevents their mutual striving for the common good.

LET'S TAKE CLOSER LOOK

Can profit sharing help end this rift? Many companies believe so. More and more of them are sharing profits with their employes to create a partnership in production. Because of the stature and success of these firms, it may now be necessary to peer more analytically into the workings of profit sharing.

Conservative Senator Robert A. Taft once said that "profit sharing teaches the workingman not to think of himself as a class apart, but rather as an integral party of industry, with a personal interest in its prosperity."

In the past few years, profit sharing has grown swiftly. As reported by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, 8,793 deferred profit-sharing plans were started by companies in the 3 years ending with December 1959.

Deferred plans accumulate cash benefits earned by employees and distribute them in the future. Cash-type plans pay off in the present and are intended as a more direct stimulus on work effort. Combination plans have features of both deferred and cash plans. Traditionally, the ratio of deferred to cash plans has been running about 2 to 1, but may now be 3 to 1.

As of March 31, 1960, U.S. industry had installed 21,445 deferred profit-sharing plans, covering millions of employees. Estimated conservatively, industry now has about 30,000 deferred, cash, and combination plans at work. In the past 9 years, the number of deferred plans has multiplied six times—and currently, Internal Revenue is approving more than 18 deferred plans each working day. Gaining rapidly, deferred profit sharing now constitutes 37 percent of all retirement plans. In the first quarter of 1960, for the first time in history, more deferred profit-sharing plans were approved than pensions. The score was 1,328 to 1,184.

During a Mill & Factory interview, Rear Adm. A. C. Burrows, U.S. Navy, retired, president of the Council of Profit Sharing Industries, said that "profit sharing seems to have passed the turning point to popular acceptance."

THE LOGIC OF PROFIT SHARING

Why the profit-sharing surge? There are several reasons. Industry is entering a more competitive era, which demands efficiency and lower costs. Sour labor-management relations can be most obstructive to productivity.

The old, impersonal way of dealing with labor has not been a brilliant success. It has not been able to oppose spiraling wages and static productivity. Nor has it tempered labor's opposition to mechanization and better methods—strikes, squabbles, and featherbedding; slowdowns and sloth.

With profit sharing, a company can form a production alliance with labor while encouraging it to earn its own retirement or other benefits. This may be preferable to a union-negotiated retirement plan with fixed payments and smaller tax advantages for employee and company.

As stressed by the Council of Profit Sharing Industries, at 400 West Madison Street, Chicago, a profit-sharing plan is not a giveaway program; and without communication of the economic logic that management and labor must work together to prosper mutually, profit sharing will have marginal results. Nor is it a substitute for good management or a decrepit plant.

DIVIDING THE SPOILS

If a company can earn bonus profits with profit sharing, it may find it wise to share them among the employee, the stockholder, the consumer, and the company itself.

Management should strive to invest a higher-than-usual amount in plant modernization and mechanization. In no way should a profit-sharing "commitment" interfere with renewal of the plant.

When a company achieves lower unit costs through profit sharing, it should seek to hold the line or reduce prices of its products. Such a policy will tend to expand sales in markets here and abroad. To compete with foreign industries, U.S. plants must somehow develop the ability to reverse price inflation.

Some of the country's more successful firms can be found on the profit-sharing roster, including Procter & Gamble; Bell & Howell; Eastman Kodak; Lincoln Electric; Motorola; Zenith; Sears, Roebuck; Falk; Signode Steel Strapping; American Velvet; Vendo; Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co.; and thousands of others.

Are profit-sharing companies more successful than others? First of all, firms that do not make a competitive return to shareholders will not long continue with profit sharing. So, it can be fairly assumed that from the investor's standpoint, the profit-sharing plant is at least as profitable as everybody else.

But there is evidence in one field that profit sharers can outstrip their competitors. A recent study by the Profit Sharing Research Foundation contrasted the records of six merchandising companies that had profit sharing and eight that did not.

Said Admiral Burrows: "The study shows that over a 7-year period, 1952–59, from the standpoint of the stockholders, the investments in profit-sharing firms were, as a group, superior by every measure used to judge the worth of investments."

For the profit sharers, certain key indicators had climbed significantly higher. These included: sales, net worth, net income, employee earnings, market value of stock, stock dividends, and growth of invested dollar. Of course, this is fractional evidence and may or may not be applicable to the whole of industry.

EARN NOW, PAY LATER

As indicated before, the deferred or profit-sharing trust plan permits the employee to earn his own security. With or without a trust agreement, profit-sharing funds are segregated for later payment to workers or beneficiaries. Considering labor's drive for security, many companies are finding the solution in profit sharing.

Unlike cash-paying, profit-sharing plans which may lose their punch during long periods of low profits, deferred plans can offer benefits without interruption. They will pay on retirement, severance, disability, death, emergencies—and even layoffs.

Some plans forbid withdrawal of funds but others loan money to finance homes, educations, etc.

Deferred plans are either contributory or noncontributory. Generally, employees prefer the noncontributory plan because it does not add another deduction to the pay slip. Yet, firms with contributory plans rate them as successful because they can offer higher benefits while building a personal stake in the fund. A disadvantage is that employees who contribute may want a role in administering the fund, perhaps pushing for

lenient withdrawals and weakening long-term objectives of the plan.

Though deferred plans do not apply a direct incentive on individual job performance, except in a roundabout way, they will reduce labor turnover, build company loyalty and identification, and decrease strikes and disputes. A successful, well-communicated deferred plan can considerably ease labor's opposition to better methods and mechanization.

The Council of Profit Sharing Industries feels that profit-sharing and wage incentive systems are not competitive. Goals are different. Profit sharing is concerned with the overall climate of labor-management cooperation. Wage incentives are devised to spur the worker to greater output on individual jobs.

The most effective incentive program for labor uses both profit sharing and wage incentives. Exactly this is being done by many plants with deferred profit sharing.

SAY IT WITH CASH

Functioning as a direct production incentive by paying an "immediate" bonus, the cash profit-sharing plans seem to appeal to most workers, especially to younger ones and to women who plan marriage rather than retirement.

Simple to intsall and operate, cash plans offer tangible reward for superior effort. Spirited communication by management of the profitmaking motive can effectively stir up labor's enthusiasm. There's a suspicion that the cash plan is more suitable to the smaller plant, although larger companies have used it successfully. If a factory finds it impossible or impracticable to install direct wage incentives, cash profit sharing can serve as a group incentive.

As has been shown by Lincoln Electric Co., a cash profit-sharing system will function superbly as an individual incentive system. Reported in his book "Incentive Management," James F. Lincoln has conceived a formula to pay profit-sharing bonuses on the basis of personal effort and contribution.

Since cash plans do not provide for retirement needs, a plant with such a system may have to set up a retirement fund anyway.

In the middle ground are the combination profit-sharing plans, which offer deferred benefits while making some current payment. To follow this profit-sharing aproach, a company must share profits more generously.

CALL THE COUNCIL

How does a company enter profit sharing? Not too suddenly, warns the Council of Profit Sharing Industries. Each company must study its specific needs and tailor a plan to fit them. The council's experts are prepared to make studies and recommendations.

Beyond this, profit sharing often entails a drastic change in management attitude. The company should genuinely wish to erase the classic division between labor and management and to welcome the worker as a full-fledged member of the team.

Profit sharing enacted to weaken a union or prevent unionization has a shoddy record. For good results, profit sharing needs sound labor-management relations, a good wage scale, and a significant division of profits. The union should be made an instrument of the profit-sharing program. This can be done by establishing labor-management advisory committees, and full communications.

But it should always be clear that administration of profit sharing is management's responsibility. Never should profit sharing become a negotiable issue. Never, never should profit-sharing funds be diverted to unions for distribution to workers.

FROM THE HORSE'S MOUTH

What are some of the results of profit sharing? Here are the comments of some companies:

1. The Cleveland Twist Drill Co., Cleveland: "Excellent morale and cooperation of employees. Production rose one-third in the plan's first 4 years, with a steady increase since then. Almost no absenteeism and no strikes."

2. Lincoln Electric Co.: "Continually falling costs and higher wages."

3. C. A. Norgren Co.: "Because of profit sharing, the desire of our employees to make a better product at lower cost has allowed us to absorb wage increases of about 200 percent and material increases of about 170 percent with only a 25-percent increase in our product prices. Individual productivity since 1940 has risen 340 percent.

4. Sanborn Co.: "Excellent personnel relations. Improved quality of work. High productivity and increased earnings for employees. Strong loyalty to the company. Employees have, when the occasion demanded, accepted increased workloads willingly and completed them without extra help or overtime. Scrap and spoilage are kept to a minimum. Profit sharing develops in an employee a sense of responsibility and independence, as well as pride and satisfaction in his work."

5. C. H. Dexter Co.: "Increased suggestions from all employees on where improvements could be made and waste eliminated. Machine downtime has been reduced 2½ percent. Dipping machines have been speeded 39 percent." (Other examples of cost reduction were cited.)

6. Motor Castings Co.: "The union local sends us each year a letter of appreciation for its share in profit sharing. Our labor relaitons are definitely improved."

7. Pitney-Bowes, Inc.: "Increased productivity and morale. Prices have been held to within 40 percent of prewar."

Obviously, profit sharing can be a spur to productivity. It has enriched some companies and their employees. Others who have it could probably do just as well without it. How well it works depends mainly on management's willingness to lead.

Help Wanted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, despite all of the emphasis that is being placed on the ever-increasing need for more education and for bigger and better institutions of learning, there are still some areas to be explored if all of our qualified young people are to have the opportunity to gain this higher education. The question of money looms large to many youngsters, and I cite as a case in point the following article titled "Help Wanted," by Louis Sorriero, which appeared in the Hilltop, the quarterly publication of Southbury, Conn., High School—which, incidentally, is in my congressional district.

Louis Sorriero was graduated from Southbury High School last June and anyone who will take the time to read his article will clearly understand the very real nature of the problem this young American faces in his striving for a college education—an education which will at least help make him competitive with the more fortunate youngsters who have no such financial problem.

It is not to be doubted that the situation confronting this young man in Southbury, Conn., is compounded many thousands of times over throughout the country. And it is a situation which should give us pause, for who knows what future great educator, doctor, industrialist—or future Member of this distinguished House of Representatives—might come from the ranks of those young Americans whose only deterrent to a well-rounded education is the lack of sufficient funds with which to procure it. I commend the reading of this article to all thoughtful people:

HELP WANTED

(By Louis Sorriero)

My main ambition throughout high school has been to go to college. If I can go there and graduate, I hope to become a teacher. This ambition would be easily within my reach if it were not for one problem: getting adequate means to finance my way through college for 4 years.

I have tried to solve this problem by working at odd jobs after school and during vacations. The choice of such jobs, especially after school, is limited. Now, as a senior, I have one of the better jobs available to high school students. I work at a supermarket after school and all day Saturday. It enables me to save money for my college expenses, but it has its disadvantages.

One of the more serious disadvantages is the loss of time in getting to my job and getting home afterward. I cannot afford to buy a car because the cost of even the cheapest model would take too much out of my savings. As a result, the only way I can get to and from work now—a distance of 10 miles—is by hitchhiking, a slow and undependable means of transportation. Often I get to work late—even more often I get home very late.

This situation has a very direct bearing on my schoolwork; and that, in turn, affects my chances of getting into college. There are times, especially when I have to walk home, when it is impossible for me to do my homework. By the time I have washed and eaten, it is too late and I am too tired to study.

I am not presenting this situation just because it is a problem I face. I feel that it is worth considering because many students face the same situation. They must earn money to pay their way through college: but in earning this money, they lessen their chances of being admitted. The after-school job is absolutely necessary to the student who lacks means; but every hour this student puts into his job is an hour taken from studying his subjects and doing his homework. This soon shows up in his marks and in his tests for college. Before long, these grades fall below the standards required for admission to the college of his choice or for any college. All the work the student has done to earn the money for a college education is wasted because by working to earn this money, he has lost the time he needed to get good grades.

The students who face this problem are not the only ones who should be concerned about it. We are always hearing about the shortage of highly skilled men and women in this country, the need for teachers, doctors, and scientists. If our Government is truly interested about developing these skilled men and women, why doesn't the Government do something about it?

This problem of the needy high school student could be solved much the same way that it is being solved for college students. Scholarships and loans could be made available to high school students who need and

deserve them. This would give many students the time they require for their homework and the opportunity they now lack to show that they are college material. Some system could certainly be worked out to make sure that such help goes to earnest students and is not wasted on those who do not deserve it.

If a student is college material and is deprived of a higher education or a chance to get it, he will not be the only one who suffers. Our Nation, too, will suffer a loss—and, ultimately, such losses may endanger our free and democratic way of life. Those who recognize this possibility and the need for well educated people should do something to provide the means to develop them.

Ford Town, U.S.A., Flora, Ill.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE E. SHIPLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. SHIPLEY. Mr. Speaker, next month an unusual event of great significance will take place in Flora, Ill., one of the cities in my district.

For 3 days this fall, from September 25 through September 27, Flora will change its name to "Ford Town, U.S.A.," and will become the focal point for a most unusual sociological experiment when the Ford Division of Ford Motor Co. supplies every vehicle owner in the community with a new 1961 model Ford car or truck to test drive for a week.

The event will serve as the national press preview of Ford's 1961 model cars and trucks and more than 1,500 vehicles—worth $3 million—will be involved.

I think my colleagues would like to know more about this program as it symbolizes the efforts being expended by countless small communities throughout the country who are progressive and who want to attract new businesses to their communities.

The citizens of Flora love their community and their way of life. They are determined to attract new industries to their town so that future generations raised in Flora will have solid, good paying jobs to step into when they complete their high school and college educations. They realize that towns which do not move forward in this area usually suffer stagnation and population losses to other, more progressive, communities.

They realize that one of the best ways to attract new industries to a community is to publicize the town's advantages over other competing communities and to have readily available answers to questions that businessmen raise when they are seeking out new plant site or business locations.

So it was natural that the people of Flora wholeheartedly welcomed Ford division's plan to convert their city into "Ford Town, U.S.A."

Flora had already received some national recognition because of its proximity to the new population center of the United States, and its citizens were looking for ways to capitalize on this obvious advantage.

They knew, too, that two main lines of the B. & O. Railroad bisected their town in both north-south and east-west directions and that there was a good balance of agricultural and manufacturing activity in the area divided principally between clover seed, soybean, and pea crops on the one hand and shoe manufacturing, steel products, oil, rayon garments, and dairy products on the other.

Consequently, at a Flora Chamber of Commerce dinner on May 10, when Ford division and Flora's mayor, the Honorable Norman Bryden, jointly announced a unique plan to unveil and test 1961 model cars and trucks in their community, the citizens of Flora responded wholeheartedly.

The community's daily newspaper, the Flora News-Record, heralded the event with characteristic enthusiasm as did all the other media in the area.

Even competing car dealers got into the act with pledges of cooperation in the venture. Several even volunteered to display new model Fords in their showroom windows if their colleague, the Ford dealer, would reciprocate when it came time for them to introduce their respective new 1961 lines of cars and trucks.

This gesture, probably unparalleled in the history of the automotive business, is typical of Flora's merchants and small businessmen who are more than willing to sacrifice personal gain for the good of their community.

On the basis of a secret survey conducted before anyone was told of Ford's plan, the management of Ford division already knows the preferences of each car and truck owner in the community. Thus on Saturday, September 24, when the cars are distributed, the preferences of each car or truck owner will be met. To dramatize the visual impact of 1,500 additional cars and trucks in a community the size of Flora, each car will be painted white and each truck blue.

I was interested to learn that the local Chevrolet dealer will make a 14-acre wheat field available to Ford officials so that the cars and trucks can be lined up systematically for distribution.

The Flora program will give the Nation's news media a preview of the 1961 Ford line and an opportunity to observe an entire community's reaction to the new models.

It will be provide Ford with an unprecedented preintroduction consumer test involving hundreds of typical car and truck owners.

It will dramatize the social and economic roles played by cars and trucks in a community's life.

It will test the effect of doubling the vehicle population on streets, in parking areas and on the community in general.

The large influx of visiting newsmen from the country's wire services, newspapers, magazines, radio and television stations and networks, to say nothing of visiting Ford officials, will give the citizens of Flora some indication of the city's ability to feed and house a large influx of visitors such as they can expect when new industries realize the advantages of this typical American town as a site for their businesses.

Equally important to the town's future will be the mass of information being accumulated about the city and its inhabitants by an IBM Ramac 305 electronic brain which has been installed in Flora by International Business Machines Corp.

Vital statistics about the city and its residents will be fed into the electronic brain in the most extensive analysis of its kind ever undertaken.

Life in Flora will be an open book to any potential businessman or manufacturing facility wanting to know about the town.

Ramac's education on Flora will be accomplished by feeding it the results of the initial survey of every car and truck owner, a second survey after citizens have had an opportunity to test drive the new Ford cars and trucks, the results of the 1960 census, and research on Flora's history and way of life from all available sources.

University sociologists will be using the results of the Flora project as a case history study for years to come and undoubtedly many worthwhile recommendations about the city's future will emerge from these studies.

Even as I speak today, various citizens' committees appointed by Mayor Bryden are hard at work preparing their city for this massive program. Clean-up, fix-up, paint-up activities are the order of the day.

I heartily congratulate my constituents in Flora for their zeal, their energy, their self-sacrificing determination to make their town a better place for the youth of their community to live in and work in.

I am indeed proud to represent these folks here in Congress. It is my sincere hope that their efforts will bear rich fruit in the years to come, and I invite all who are looking for a fine community in which to locate to investigate Flora, Ill., in the heartland of these United States.

Miss Jane Addams and Mrs. Alfred D. Kohn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, 1960 marks the 100th anniversary of the birth of Jane Addams, one of the great ladies in American history. The century since her birth has seen one of the great changes in our national life, and great changes in the world. Some of these changes have been good, others have not. Many of the changes for the better can be attributed to the work of

Jane Addams. This is particularly true for the Nation's working people.

In 1889 Jane Addams chose to make her home in the slums of Chicago because she realized that the rapid industrialization in this country, as in others, was exacting a fearful toll from the underpaid and overworked men, women, and children, who filled the factories of the large cities. She wanted to understand the problems of these people, and through that understanding, contribute something to the amelioration of the pitiful conditions she found all around her. She succeeded. Hull House became a social center where working people could come to participate in the finer things in life which they could not provide for themselves out of their pitiful wages. But Jane Addams soon came to realize that the problems of inadequate wages, cruelly long hours, woman and child labor, housing, and sanitation were too great to be solved by the isolated individual.

Jane Addams became their good friend and their champion in their struggle to organize and to bargain with employers for decent hours and wages. In the great Pullman strike in Chicago she was one of a few citizens who attempted to settle the controversy by means of peaceful negotiation and arbitration. She also helped to organize the women who worked in the sweatshops so that they could free themselves from the 100-hour week.

However, some of their problems were beyond the powers of such organized groups. These problems required the action of the whole society through its laws. Through the efforts of Jane Addams, the Legislature of Illinois passed a number of laws, including a child-labor law, a law regulating the hours which women could be compelled to work, a tenement inspection law, and a factory safety law. She was also one of the leading advocates of woman's suffrage. The residents of Hull House were responsible for the Nation's first juvenile court and the establishment of the Children's Bureau in the Federal Government.

Some of the legislation advocated by Jane Addams was not put into effect until after her death. One of the most important of these is the Social Security Act which is now providing retirement protection to millions of America's workers.

The debt we owe to Jane Addams cannot be measured only in terms of the specific legislation and reforms for which she was responsible. She, as much as any other, is responsible for making the public aware that the problems of the working people are the problems of the Nation, and that the future of the democratic system of government depends upon its ability to meet these problems as they arise.

Much of Miss Addams' greatness, too, lay in her ability to attract competent, understanding, devoted people to her side and to her cause. One of these, still active in the work to which the Addams group was devoted, is Mrs. Alfred D. Kohn, who was recently honored by the Jewish Community Centers of Chicago as a recipient of its Golden Age Hall of Fame Award. At the dinner at which the award was bestowed upon Mrs. Kohn, she was introduced by Mrs. Helen M. Oppenheimer who set forth the many magnificent accomplishments of Mrs. Kohn over the past six decades. Her address is as follows:

For more than 50 years Mrs. Alfred D. Kohn has represented the very finest in citizen participation in the broad field of health and welfare in her city, her State, and her country.

Following her husband's death at the turn of the century, Mrs. Kohn resided for many years at Hull House where the immortal Jane Addams was head resident. At Hull House, Mrs. Kohn was in charge of children's activities and camp work, organized the recreation program, initiated and raised funds for a trade school for girls leaving public school for employment, finally persuading the Chicago School Board to institute such a program in the school system. As a member of the board of the vocational supervision league she helped develop the public school's vocational guidance program.

Mrs. Kohn was an active trustee of the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy and assisted in effecting the merger with the University of Chicago, the first school of social work to be incorporated into a university as a professional school offering graduate education.

Mrs. Kohn served as a director, vice president, and president of the Jewish Social Service Bureau from 1921 to 1941. She was a member of the Women's Board of the Jewish Federation and at one time chairman of the Social Service Board of Michael Reese Hospital. For many years she was on the board of the Jewish vocational and employment service and was instrumental in organizing the workshop for handicapped persons. She served as board member and later as president of the board of scholarship association for Jewish children.

For many years, Mrs. Kohn was active in the legislative field and organized support and lobbied successfully for ratification of the Federal child labor amendment, the 8-hour law for women and children, a division for women and children in the Illinois Department of Labor, the industrial home-work law, the minimum wage law for women and children and the maternal and child health act.

Governor Emerson appointed her on the Illinois Commission of Child Welfare Legislation set up to codify Illinois laws, and Governor Stevenson appointed her on the advisory committee to the State Training School for Girls at Geneva. For 20 years, Mrs. Kohn served as a member of the advisory board of the Cook County Department of Public Welfare.

She was three times a delegate to the White House Conferences on Child Health and Protection, and in 1935, a delegate to the Pan-Americaen Conference on Child Welfare.

Following World War I she attended with Jane Addams the peace conference under the auspices of the International League for Peace and Freedom and in 1929 visited Russia with Julia Lathrop, U.S. correspondents and others.

Today, keen and alert, Mrs. Kohn serves as chairman of the Social Service Committee, a member of the board of School of Nursing of Cook County Hospital, is a member of the auxiliary committee of the University of Chicago Clinics; is a very active member of the advisory committee to the Chicago Housing Authority of the Welfare Council of Metropolitan Chicago; a member of the board of directors of Central Service for the Chronically Ill of the Institute of Medicine of Chicago, and was made a citizen fellow of the institute in 1957 in recognition of her work.

In 1953, Mrs. Kohn received the Illinois Welfare Association award for outstanding achievement and distinguished service in the field of social welfare and civic affairs.

We have cited only the highlights of her many years of devoted service which have benefited our community in so many fields and for which we wish to express our deepest gratitude today.

This is the woman we gather here to honor.

We indeed consider it a privilege to add to her list of achievements as we call upon her to receive this Golden Age Hall of Fame award.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Kohn's response recaptures the exciting, crusading fervor with which the Addams group of ladies carried on their activities. Mrs. Kohn said:

Mrs. Oppenheimer and friends, no one can accomplish things alone. I was fortunate in having had help from many people—among them three Governors—Emerson, Stevenson, and most of all from Governor Horner.

I feel greatly honored to receive a citation from the Jewish Community Centers of Chicago. Their establishment as an affiliate of the Jewish Federation exemplifies the changes that have taken place in the concept of philanthropy. Looking down the vista of a long life I can note the progress from amateur endeavor to professional organization, from the mere giving of relief for economic needs to improvement of attitudes and policies in dealing with complex problems.

I have recently returned from Rockford College, Jane Addams' alma mater, which was observing the centennial of her birth. The occasion brought back memories of my early days at Hull House at a time of heavy immigration, and my early activities at what was then the Jewish charities.

There was a large influx of Jewish families, victims of persecution, who crowded the wretched tenements around Hull House and who were the main concern of the Jewish organizations.

Living in the settlement, I felt very close to the people of the neighborhood and learned to understand their problems and their hopes in a spirit of friendliness. They found at Hull House help in learning a new language and in adjusting to city ways of life, and protection against exploitation. Their cultural and recreational needs were met with classes in literature, art, music, and handicrafts which relieved the monotony of the only jobs offered to newcomers. They also found appreciation of their worth as human beings.

One often wondered how much the participants in some of the classes really understood. I remember a Shapespeare class where some lively, but strange, discussions took place with criticism of the characters and the author for knowing so little about the realities of life. One young woman, who had been silent at all the meetings, at last spoke up and said, that the deadly monotony of sewing pants year in and year out was no longer intolerable because while sewing, the beautiful phrases from Shapespeare were constantly in her thoughts. Was this club not worth while?

Miss Addams did not tell the residents what to do. She believed that, once they knew the neighborhood, they would find out the needs for themselves. Though I was inexperienced when I went there she did not direct me but left me to discover what I wanted to do and what I could do. For example, I came to know Italian children in the neighborhood who worked far into the night making paper flowers, falling asleep in school the next day.

In this way I learned the need for child labor legislation for which I lobbied successfully with much help from Governor Horner.

And yet Miss Addams recognized that good will was not enough in dealing with complex problems and with her colleagues conceived the idea that training of social workers was essential. She helped to found the Chicago School of Civics and Philanthropy of which I was a trustee and which later became the School of Social Service Administration of the University of Chicago. Now social work has become a recognized profession whose graduates have degrees comparable to those in the departments of law and medicine.

Living at Hull House for many years was an inspiring experience and an education in human relationships. The creative and pioneering personality of Jane Addams attracted associates who represented much of the intellectual and cultural life of this and other communities.

I believe it would be appropriate at this time and before this audience to gain inspiration by a brief review of the contribution to human welfare made by our greatest citizen whose centenary the whole Nation is celebrating. If I were to enumerate them all, it would fill many pages. She had the courage to sponsor causes which were then unpopular but which are now accepted, such as woman suffrage and efforts on behalf of peace and total disarmament, for which she later received the Nobel Peace Prize.

I had the great privilege of working with her in many of her efforts for social betterment. Her friendship was not limited to any group or class. She believed in voluntary organizations such as yours, as well as active support of public institutions.

The problems in the field of public welfare are never solved. May we have the courage to follow where she led.

Whereas the settlements of those days were designed to help only the most underprivileged and economically depressed, the community centers of today recognize that the desire for recreational, cultural, and social opportunities is common to all groups—the well-to-do as well as the poor.

Your organization gives recognition to this new concept in a very generous and effective way.

I again thank you for honoring me with this citation.

Mr. Speaker, I know I express the sentiments of the entire Chicago community in paying tribute to one of Jane Addams' first ladies, Mrs. Alfred D. Kohn, for her long and inspiring service in the cause of social progress, and in wishing her many more years of health and continued public service.

National Forest Parks: A New Concept in Recreational Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, last month I made a proposal at a meeting of the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, of which I have the honor and distinct pleasure to be a member. My proposal included the suggestion of a system of national forest parks. This idea has been received with widespread interest. In order to expand somewhat on the thinking which underlies my proposal, I have prepared the following rather brief and informal statement. I will welcome comments and discussion of this concept by my colleagues and by the public and hope that from such a discussion may come more adequate management of our great national recreation resources and new doors into our great outdoors for millions of Americans.

The statement follows:

NATIONAL FOREST PARKS: A NEW CONCEPT IN RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The average American looking forward to a summer vacation in our great outdoors usually thinks in terms of Yellowstone, Yosemite, Estes, or our other national parks. He knows little about those vast scenic areas of his country centered in our national forests. Because of my conviction that the recreational potential of these areas has great national significance and should be fully developed, I have proposed to the National Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission a system of national forest parks. My proposal presented at the Joint Commission-Advisory Council meeting in Jackson, Wyo., on August 2 called for: (1) Establishment of a system of national forest parks within the national forest system, (2) zoning of national forests into three primary zones, (a) full multiple use, (b) limited use wilderness, (c) limited use national forest parks, (3) creation of a national forest park administrative division within the Forest Service.

A fourth recommendation, broader in nature, called for the establishment of a position of National Resource Coordinator under the President to assist him in much needed policy coordination in resource matters. My remarks here will be confined to the national forest parks proposal.

Although the Forest Service has adopted an accelerated recreational development program, its emphasis has been almost entirely based on the expedient development of camp site areas to handle visitation pressures. There has been little, if any, thought concerning the development of nationally significant areas under an integrated concept of park management.

My proposal for the establishment of national forest parks is based upon the conviction that the recreation potential within the Forest Service can only be fully developed through recognition of nationally significant units and through the intensive and integrated development of such units under a park system of management. I believe that such a plan is wholly within the scope and meaning of the multiple use concept which guides Forest Service policies. I am also convinced that such a plan is fully compatible with Forest Service statutes.

The key to such a plan would be recognition through zoning of nationally significant scenic areas within the National Forests. These would be given a separate identity encompassed in a well rounded and professionally conceived park plan with appropriate national recognition and promotion.

Another cornerstone of such a plan would be the recognition of the compatibility of multiple use management and Forest Park objectives. There is no reason why timber management, water protection, and other multiple use objectives should not be incorporated in the management plans of such parks. There would obviously be some limitations on other uses in the most intensively used recreation areas but these would encompass only a small portion of the park area.

Where wilderness exists in conjunction with nationally significant scenic areas, the national forest park and the wilderness zone should be integrated in their planning so as to accomplish full recognizition of the scenic potential of the area. Clearly, the wilderness concept should in no way be violated.

Minimum criteria would establish the standards for national forest park designations. The number of such parks within the national forest system would be determined in large part by those standards. There is no question, however, that within the national forests there are many such park sites. In my own congressional district, comprising approximately the eastern two-thirds of the State of Oregon, there are many, including the high Wallowas, Hells Canyon, Three Sisters, Newberry Crater, Lake of the Woods, and Mount Hood. At least two of these would include spectacular wilderness areas. At the present time the recreation potential of each of these is virtually undeveloped and their national significance little known.

A byproduct of such a system would be the relieving of the tension that now exists between the Park Service and the Forest Service. Such differences stem, for the most part, from the fact that there are many pressures to create national parks out of the most scenic national forest areas because that is the only present means of gaining unique national recognition and of obtaining full recreational development of those areas. The system I have proposed would allow for full development within the Forest Service, maintaining the management integrity, but at the same time allowing for national recognition and full recreational utilization.

I visualize this new concept as the next step forward in the recreation development of America's great scenic outdoors. It would give us sound recreational development within the framework of multiple use and would allow for maximum wilderness preservation while providing for full recreational use. It would relieve the pressure on our national parks and disperse the increasing visitations among new and equally appealing areas. It would open many new doors into our great outdoors for millions of Americans.

The Death Penalty Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with my bill, H.R. 870, to abolish capital punishment, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Hugo Adam Bedau as it appeared in the Christian Century of March 18, 1959:

THE DEATH PENALTY TODAY—A TIMELY SURVEY OF PREVIOUS ACCOMPLISHMENTS AND FUTURE PROSPECTS IN THE CONTINUING EFFORT TO PUT AN END TO A PRACTICE ANACHRONISTIC AND DEPLORABLE

(By Hugo Adam Bedau)

At its general convention in Miami last October the Protestant Episcopal Church adopted a resolution urging abolition of the death penalty. The resolution pointed out that each individual is sacred in the eyes of God, that innocent persons are sometimes convicted, that there is no proof that capital punishment has been a uniquely effective bulwark against crime, and that retention of the death penalty in the face of these con-

siderations is unjustifiable. The Episcopalians' action came after similar resolutions had been adopted last summer by the American Baptist Convention, the Central Conference of American Rabbis and the National Association of Social Workers.

Rejection of capital punishment by these religious bodies is no isolated phenomenon. It is rather the reflection of a rising tide which promises within the next few years to do away with the gallows, electric chairs, and gas chambers in many States. During the past few months many Americans have encountered persistent and reasoned pleas for the abolition of capital punishment and have for the first time given the subject serious thought.

THE ENDING OF A MYTH

The first effective blows against the death penalty in the English-speaking world were struck in Great Britain, where in the 30 years after 1807 the number of crimes for which the death penalty could be invoked was reduced from over 200 to 15. In 1847 the State of Michigan became the first governmental jurisdiction in the English-speaking world to abolish capital punishment for all crimes except treason.

In the ensuing years statistics on the rate of occurrence of formerly capital crimes in England and Michigan led all but the "hanghards" (as Arthur Koestler calls them in his "Reflections on Hanging") to abandon the belief that capital punishment is far more effective than imprisonment as a deterrent to crime. That hitherto firmly relied-on myth simply was not supported by the statistics. Its force has been further blunted by experience in the nearly 3 dozen countries and the other States (Maine, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Rhode Island, and North Dakota) which have abolished the death penalty since Michigan led the way.

Through the past century scientific penology has lent increasing support to the contention that rehabilitation of offenders, no matter what their offense, is not only possible but desirable, and that provision of adequate prisons and of asylums for the criminally insane protects society by preventing further crimes by persons adjudged to be beyond treatment. Capital punishment emerged at last in its true colors: at best, utterly retaliatory when applied to the murderer and harsh beyond any possible justification in cases of treason, rape, kidnaping, and other such crimes. It remains a symbol of all that is violent, vindictive, thoughtless, and futile in our attitude toward criminals and, in the end, toward ourselves. No wonder it provokes impassioned opposition. Despite the fact that fewer persons are being executed than formerly (in this country, the number dropped from an average of 167 during the 1930's to 128 during the 1940's to 74 in this decade), we should not let the practice fade away of its own accord; it should be deliberately stopped.

In England, it was argument along these lines that a decade ago led Parliament to create a Royal Commission on Capital Punishment. The commission was forbidden to consider directly whether the death penalty should be abolished; it was directed only to look into such minor details as, for example, whether electrocution is more humane than hanging (it isn't) or whether the M'Naghten rules defining criminal insanity ought to be revised, they should). But the commission did recommend a number of limitations on future use of the death penalty. Some of these recommendations (but by no means all) were incorporated into the Homicide Act of 1957. It is clear that save for the limiting directive the commission would have recommended immediate abolition of capital punishment, as had other such bodies in 1866 and 1930.

THE STATES TAKE ACTION

The work of the royal commission provoked a flood of publicity all over England. It was followed by a number of articles and books (the best of which is "The Offenders," by Giles Playfair and Derrick Sington), and by public debates and lectures. From the Commission's deliberations stems also the current wave of North American protests against the death penalty. In 1953 the Canadian Parliament undertook a study of capital punishment. In this country a number of interested groups led by the Society of Friends and the American League To Abolish Capital Punishment began to press for legislative action. Two years ago they won a measure of success in California, where, after hearing the report of a study commission, the legislature came up with a recommendation for complete and immediate abolition of capital punishment. This was, however, but a foretaste of what was to come in 1958.

Of the 18 States in which abolition bills were filed last year, Delaware scored the most spectacular success. In April Gov. Caleb Boggs signed into law a bill which abolished the death penalty for all crimes. Although no one had been hanged in Delaware in the previous 11 years, statutory repeal represented a giant step forward. Not since North Dakota abolished capital punishment over 40 years ago had the abolitionist cause been given such a lift.

A lesser triumph was achieved in Massachusetts. There, as in Delaware, there had been a virtual moratorium on executions in the past decade. Such a situation was no accident; it resulted from the constant vigilance of the Massachusetts Council To Abolish the Death Penalty. In 1957 that group got the legislature to appoint a study commission to consider capital punishment. Its lengthy majority report, completed at the end of that year, urged abolition. The recommendation is more significant than it looks on the surface, for through the past 30 years bills calling for an end to the death penalty in Massachusetts had been repeatedly smothered in committee.

However, 1958 saw a number of setbacks. The sharpest blow fell in Oregon, which had introduced abolition in 1914 and abandoned it 6 years later. Oregon requires a constitutional amendment initiated by public referendum before capital punishment can be abolished. In 1957 the legislature passed an abolition bill, Gov. Robert Holmes openly endorsed it, and it was placed on the ballot in the November 1958 election. In the preceding months the Oregon Prison Association worked vigorously to inform the public of the merits of the bill. But the proposal was defeated by 10,240 votes, about 2 percent of the total.

THE NEW JERSEY STORY

In New Jersey, the other State in which a major effort was made last year, the abolition campaign was unsuccessful. That State's experience deserves study, for it could be a foretaste of what can happen in States initiating their 1959 campaigns unless certain precautions are taken.

From January to April 1958 abolition bills which had been introduced into the New Jersey Assembly were ignored by the committee to which they were referred. Then, in response to public pressure, a hearing was scheduled for early June. When the day of the hearing arrived a number of authorities on capital punishment assembled in Trenton. They were there as the result of initiative taken by New Jersey Quakers through their newly formed committee on social order. As the hearing proceeded it became clear that the case against capital punishment was to enjoy articulate, informed, and comprehensive presentation, in contrast to the sincere but inadequate testimony given at a similar hearing in 1957. Moreover, the State's correctional officials, led by Commissioner John Tramburg, expressed their desire for immediate repeal of all capital statutes. Such public testimony by officials was practically unprecedented, though similar opinion is held by many of them. The hearings continued for a second day. Of the 24 persons who testified, all but 2 favored abolition. But there was a hitch: of the committee's seven members, five did not appear at the hearing, and only the chairman heard all the testimony. More damaging, no more than 2 or 3 of the other 74 senators and assemblymen were present at any point in the hearing.

In July, after the assembly had recessed, two Newark television programs carried debates on the death penalty; one was moderated by Gov. Robert Meyner himself. When the assembly reconvened in November the abolition bills received bipartisan sponsorship. But by adjournment time in December they had died in committee—as had similar measures in 1956 and 1957.

WHAT HAD GONE AMISS?

The chief reason for the ignominious end of the abolition bills in New Jersey is simple: the abolitionists had been too long unorganized and too impoverished to conduct the kind of comprehensive educational and publicity campaigns which would have won others to their cause. This lack led to other failures: (1) The members of the committee to which the bills were referred were not approached by the abolitionists. (2) No support was offered by persons in the higher levels of State government; Commissioner Tramburg and his subordinates who spoke up for the bills at the hearing made it plain that they spoke only for themselves. (3) The only Statewide organizations which lent their support to the cause were the New Jersey branches of Americans for Democratic Action and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom. Except for the Red Bank Council of Churches, no church group and only a handful of Christian clergymen and laymen showed any awareness that the issue even existed. Active opposition was offered by the Police Chiefs' Association and the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association. (4) Of the State's urban newspapers, only the Bergen Evening Record came out against the death penalty. Their attitudes ranged from that of the Newark Evening News, which regarded abolition "at this time" as inexpedient, to that of the Hudson Dispatch, which called for more frequent use of the electric chair. (5) Although a few public debates and lectures were hastily set up over the State, none took place in the larger centers: Newark, Jersey City, Trenton, Camden.

The result of all this was that pressure on the legislature to repeal the laws permitting capital punishment was never more than sporadic. However, for the first time within memory the issue was met with something other than complete indifference.

It was not only as the result of the uncoordinated legislative attempts that the spotlight fell on capital punishment last year. A crop of criminal cases dramatized some of the most telling of the abolitionists' arguments. In July a man named Charles Rothschild confessed to a murder for which one James Foster was awaiting execution in Georgia. Foster had been convicted largely on the testimony of the victim's wife, who identified him in court as the killer, and the appellate court had upheld the verdict. It was miscarriages of justice like this that led Wisconsin, Rhode Island, and Maine to abolish the death penalty a century ago. The pious optimism that it can't happen now was rudely shaken by the Foster case. In September the Nation was shocked to learn that Jimmy Wilson, a Negro with a criminal record, had been sentenced to die in Ala-

bama's electric chair for stealing $1.95 from a white woman. Spurred by a deluge of letters and telegrams pleading for clemency, Gov. James Folsom commuted the sentence.

THE ISSUE IS DRAMATIZED

In November young Jack Chester, awaiting electrocution for murder in Massachusetts, hanged himself in his cell 3 days after Gov. Foster Furcolo finally decided to commute his sentence on grounds of insanity. So far as the courts which tried him were concerned, Chester was sane, fit to stand trial, fit to be executed. Thanks to the McNaghten rules defining insanity, they had been obliged to ignore what psychiatrists did not: that Chester had pleaded with the jury to have him put to death and that he had been subject to suicidal tendencies and a pathological guilt complex since childhood. The sentencing of Chester, like the court decisions in the Foster and Wilson cases, illustrates the impossibility of achieving justice under the rules of a penology whose cornerstone is the death penalty. And such cases occur year after year.

During the year the entertainment industry dramatized the evils of the electric chair and the gas chamber. Television programs in Los Angeles ("Thou Shalt Not Kill") and in New York ("The Sacco-Vanzetti Case") were followed by a nationwide "Omnibus" program in which, with Boston Attorney Joseph Welch as guide, viewers were thoroughly exposed to the issue. In candor and accuracy the program set a high standard, and it was widely applauded. More controversial was the motion picture "I Want to Live," whose plot was based on the trial and 1955 execution in California of Barbara Graham. Its dramatic power was heightened by the implication that Mrs. Graham was innocent. Because of its affecting climactic scenes portraying action in the death house, this film—along with the "Omnibus" presentation—performed a useful purpose in bringing home to Americans the horror which surrounds the practice of passionless, deliberate killing of offenders in the name of the state, and in reminding us that capital punishment is administered in our name and that we have the power, through our legislatures, to bring it to an end.

What is the forecast for 1959? Perhaps other church groups—the Methodists, the Presbyterians, the Lutherans—will join the Episcopalians and American Baptists in repudiating the death penalty. The Massachusetts and New York councils of churches have done so. We can expect the American League Against Capital Punishment, under the vigorous leadership of its president, Donal MacNamara of the New York Institute of Criminology, to become more active and more widely known. Statewide abolition societies like those now operating in California, Connecticut, Illinois, New York, and Tennessee will be organized or reactivated. Abolition bills are being considered in California, Connecticut, Illinois, Indiana, New York, Ohio, and Tennessee. In some of these States study commissions will be established and/or public hearings conducted this spring. The Governors of California, Florida, Ohio and Tennessee have appealed to the legislatures of those States to pass abolition bills this year. There is even hope that the powerful American Correctional Association and the National Probation and Parole Association will lend suuport to the movement. When Alaska was admitted to statehood it became the eighth State with no death penalty, having repealed its caiptal statutes in 1957. Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands have taken similar action.

We are off to an excellent start. But there are sobering considerations which should alert those who expect abolition of capital punishment to come automatically within the next few years. Bills have been introduced into Congress which would define the bombing of buildings used for religious purposes as a capital offense. In many States there is continuous pressure to make certain sex and narcotic offenses punishable by the death penalty. Trends in penology, evidence from psychiatry and criminology, practical experience, and the counsels of morality all argue against retention of capital punishment. But how long it will survive depends on how much longer those who are aware of its evils will tolerate it in their midst.

COMMENT ON THIS ISSUE

In many of the States this year legislators are debating the merits of capital punishment as proposals for its abolition or alteration come before them. Just now the Chicago newspapers are bringing the issues before us graphically as the Illinois Legislature considers a measure which would initiate a trial period during which the death penalty would be suspended. The article in which Hugo Adam Bedau of Princeton University's philosophy faculty surveys past successes and failures of advocates of abolition is therefore most timely. In this connection, we suggest that readers review the Ohio experience as reported by a contributor to our "Letters to the Editor" department in the February 25 issue (page 237).

Happy Talk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I hope that no one missed reading an article that appeared in the drama section of Sunday's New York Times, by Arthur Gelb, entitled "Happy Talk." It is about the late Oscar Hammerstein and his work. With the permission of the House, I am extending in the RECORD the full article.

I also hope that everyone saw John Crosby's piece in this morning's Herald Tribune about Oscar Hammerstein. It is a moving tribute:

HAPPY TALK—SINCERITY OF THE LYRICIST'S PERSONALITY GLOWED IN HIS WORK FOR THE STAGE

(By Arthur Gelb)

Not long after "Oklahoma" exploded on Broadway, revolutionizing the concept of musical comedy, Oscar Hammerstein 2d inserted an advertisement in the trade newspaper, Variety. It read: "I've done it before and I can do it again," and listed five flops for which he had been partly responsible in the recent past. A man who believed firmly that dreams came true, that love conquered all and that virtue triumphed, Mr. Hammerstein did not quite trust his luck; it was his way of knocking wood.

Although he did, inevitably, "do it again," he also contrived, within the ensuing 8 years, to collaborate with Richard Rodgers on three more spectacularly appealing and more or less convention-shattering musicals, all of which, like "Oklahoma," have since taken their place as classics of the American musical stage. In a final accounting, which includes "Oklahoma," "Carousel," "South Pacific," and "The King and I," there is no question that the flops will be forgiven.

The time for such an accounting is now unfortunately at hand. Mr. Hammerstein's death last Tuesday, at the age of 65, has put an end to 38 years of happy talk—set, in nearly a thousand songs, to the music of Rudolf Friml, Sigmund Romberg, Georges Bizet, Jerome Kern, and Richard Rodgers.

UNIVERSAL APPEAL

In throwing out the simpleminded song-and-dance formula of the Twenties and Thirties, and substituting a format in which song and dance were an integral part of the book, Mr. Hammerstein, abetted by Mr. Rodgers, began turning the medium of musical comedy into folk art in 1943. Desperately sincere and right-minded, he managed to imbue his books and lyrics with a combination of simplicity, romantic optimism and gentle social consciousness that had a universal appeal. The sincerity of his personality glowed with a bright, golden haze in his work for the stage and brought the audiences flocking. To the majority of his professional colleagues there was a sense of reassurance in his great popularity.

"Oscar Hammerstein was content to say what he thought, simply and clearly and sympathetically, without the spurious adornment of what passes for sophistication," one fo his contemporaries, S. N. Behrman, said on the day of Mr. Hammerstein's death. "He was, to quote his own lyrics, 'as corny as Kansas in August,' by which I mean that he was genuine where others were clever, understanding where others were superior, kind when kindness was needed. He was strong and balanced and sensitive. He had the basic virtues. His contribution to the American theatre was immense, and as much a contribution of personality as of technique. That is why his lyrics are known and loved by millions—because they are a reflection of that singular personality."

BROADWAY ANOMALY

The personality, whose image is permanently captured in the sunny "Oklahoma," the bitter-sweet "Carousel," the poignantly sentimental "South Pacific" and the delicately romantic "The King and I," was an anomaly in the brittle world of show business, where, to score a hit, often means to score it at someone else's expense.

Mr. Hammerstein felt no need to step on anyone's toes, either personally or professionally. The same quality of unaffected decency that governed him in private life impelled him to celebrate on stage the uncomplicated emotions of people who dreamed and loved and sometimes stumbled, but whose hearts, like his, were in the right place.

Not only did he eschew all the mean-spirited stereotypes that were the staple butts of early musical-comedy humor—the stage Irishman, Jew and Negro—but he even attempted, with evangelical fervor, to preach mild sermons of spiritual and racial tolerance; his rueful plea for understanding, "You've Got to Be Taught," from "South Pacific," exemplifies his point of view; perhaps its philosophy is elementary, but incorporating into a Broadway musical such a direct tract about the color of a person's skin was a remarkable thing for a lyricist to do. Mr. Hammerstein wrote his exuberant songs of goodwill with a candor and clarity that went straight to the hearts of millions.

EARLY INFLUENCES

Mr. Hammerstein had two grandfathers to thank for his special blend of theatricalism and euphoria. The first Oscar Hammerstein was a celebrated vaudeville impresario with a compulsive urge to produce opera; he made vaudeville pay sensationally well but he fell on his face with opera. Oscar 2d followed closely on the heels of his grandfather, with one notable exception. He made the song-and-dance musical pay sensationally well during the twenties—as witness "Rose Marie," "The Desert Song," and "Show Boat"—and when, after a period of doldrums, he turned to American folk opera, he made that pay, too.

His maternal grandfather, James Nimmo, furnished the sunshine. Mr. Nimmo was Scottish, but not dour. A retired insurance man with whom Oscar 2d spend a good deal of time in his early childhood, Mr. Nimmo fed the boy sour balls and milk punch spiked with Scotch for breakfast, and taught him, during early morning rambles in the park, that the Devil was a kindly old man with an inexhaustible supply of candy. Mr. Hammerstein did not mind acknowledging that his healthy point of view toward life sprang from his pleasant experiences with the Devil and Grandfather Nimmo.

Perhaps it was also Grandfather Nimmo who passed down to him the unaffected modesty that made him one of the best-loved and least-envied figures in show business.

MODEST FORMULA

Describing his early efforts to learn what constituted a successful book for a musical, Mr. Hammerstein once recalled the formula that had been explained to him by Otto Harbach, and to which he modestly continued to subscribe:

"[Harbach] likened the elements of acting and dancing and all the other parts of a musical play to the ingredients that go to make a fire—logs, kindling, matches, a good fireplace, etc. All these ingredients, he said, are necesasry, but they won't make a good fire unless they are properly assembled. * * * When everything works—logs crackle and the bark sputters, when the blue and gold flame waves and flies toward the chimney and sends out warmth and good feeling to cheer a room full of people, it is because some plodding, perhaps not very brilliant fellow, knows how to put one log on top of another in just the right way."

Mr. Hammerstein knew a good deal more than that. It took something more than plodding to bring the American musical stage to its present state of eminence. It needed the cheerful fires Mr. Hammerstein built.

What Every English Child Should Know About Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, by reason of unanimous consent heretofore granted me so to do, I am pleased to present for your information, and the information of my other distinguished colleagues, the text of an article appearing in the August 1960 issue of the American Bar Association Journal by Hon. Emory H. Niles, chief judge of the supreme bench of Baltimore City:

WHAT EVERY ENGLISH CHILD SHOULD KNOW ABOUT WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Emory H. Niles)

Few Americans know much about the city of Washington; it may be assumed also that even fewer Englishmen learned about it at their mothers' knees. It is therefore obviously desirable that the English guests of the American Bar Association be given at least a dim, even if in some respects misleading, account of the city which is playing host to what is probably the largest gathering of Anglo-American lawyers ever held anywhere. In a spirit of helpfulness, therefore, these few words are offered as a syllabus, or headnote, to the full opinion which any court of competent jurisdiction might render on the grandeurs and miséries of the American National Capital. Let us proceed therefore, historically and analytically, in the footsteps of Sir Matthew Hale, Pollock and Maitland and Austin.

Historically, the Capital owes its existence to two principal forces. The first was the jealousy between New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and other cities, all of which desired the honor of being the "seat of the general government." The second was the fear, not that the Government might be overawed by a pseudo-Roman or Parisian mob, but the reverse, viz, that no State or other local government would be strong enough to protect the National Government—a fear based on the recent experience of the Continental Congress which, in 1783, while sitting in Philadelphia, was threatened by mutinous soldiers of the Continental Army who demanded their pay and marched upon the hall in which Congress was sitting. At that juncture both the city authorities and the authorities of Pennsylvania appeared to be too weak to protect the Congress, which hastily adjourned, first to Princeton and then to Annapolis. After a great controversy it was decided to locate the Capital on the Potomac River, far from any city or any State capital, in an area central to the whole country, and subject to the exclusive control of the Federal Government, where that Government itself could make provisions for its safety.

Constitutionally, the size of the District of Columbia was fixed by the Constitution, which provided that Congress should have power "to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever" over a district not exceeding 10 miles square, which should become the seat of government. Curiously, nothing is said about executive or judicial powers. Nothing is said about citizenship or the right to vote. Actually, Congress governs the District of Columbia through three Commissioners and has withheld the right to vote from residents of the District, many of whom now clamor for that right. Legally the District is for some purposes a state and for some purposes not a State.

Geographically, the District is not a square, 10 miles on a side. The original district laid out under George Washington's supervision was such a square, about half in Maryland and half in Virginia. The Virginia half extended to Alexandria, and included the land on which the Pentagon now stands. But the law provided that the public buildings for the Federal Government should be built on the Maryland side, and, as a result, the Virginians became dissatisfied. In 1846, therefore, Congress retroceded the southern half of the District to Virginia. This act, which accounts for the present unsymmetrical shape of the District was according to one writer, "the wickedest blow ever struck at the grandeur and majesty of Washington."

THE CITY'S ARCHITECT PIERRE CHARLES L'ENFANT

Topographically, the city of Washington owes its plan to a Frenchman, Pierre Charles L'Enfant, who was employed to design a capital city in what was then almost uninhabited farm, forest, and swamp land. L'Enfant was a gifted man. He had studied the plans of Frankfort, Karlsruhe, Paris, Turin, Bordeaux, and other cities. He had the full backing of both Washington and Jefferson, but the task was great; jealousies were strong; and the beginnings were slow. L'Enfant was a proud and difficult man to deal with; he finally resigned. During the 19th century his plan was neglected, but in 1901, under President Theodore Roosevelt, it was revived and restored, so that the present city is essentially an enlargement of that envisaged by L'Enfant.

The innocent Englishman whose mother failed to instruct him with respect to the street plan of Washington may have some difficulty with it; but it is in essence very simple. His first act, whether he needs petrol or not, is to go to a "gas station" and obtain a map (free). From it he will see that the city is divided into four quadrants, northwest, southwest, northeast, and southeast. The White House, the American Bar Association headquarters hotel, most of the other hotels, and the principal shops are in "northwest." The primary street plan is the standard American gridiron of rectangular squares. But superimposed upon these rectangles is a pattern of avenues running diagonally. The intersections of these two patterns or networks form squares and circles. All the streets running east and west are lettered; all the streets running north and south are numbered. All the avenues, running diagonally, are named for States.

There are two great foci: The Capitol and the White House. The Capitol is at the assumed center of both the numbered and the lettered streets, and the White House is connected with it by Pennsylvania Avenue, "The Avenue," running diagonally from southeast to northwest.

There is also a great axis: The Mall, running east and west from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial, with the Washington Monument in the middle. On the north side of the Mall is Constitution Avenue, which should be B Street NW.; and on the south side is Independence Avenue, which should be B Street SW.

A subsidiary axis is 16th Street, running north from the White House. The headquarters hotel is at 16th and K Street NW. Automatically, one knows, then, that when there he is 16 "blocks" west of the Capitol, and five "blocks" north of the White House, and 11 "blocks" north of the center of the Mall.

The White House was named because of a matter which may have been known to those English mothers, but which they delicately refrained from explaining to their sons. After the Red Coats had burned the public buildings in 1814, the "President's Palace" was charred and blackened. To restore it, it was painted white. And although its official name for many years was the "Executive Mansion," it is now officially named the "White House."

WASHINGTON ARCHITECTURE—A GREAT FREE-FOR-ALL

Architecturally, Washington is a great free-for-all. Those Englishmen whose mothers taught them that architecture is a living, throbbing expression of contemporary life, which should not imitate the dead styles of the past, will be disappointed by the great piles of limestone and marble forming the Federal triangle between Pennsylvania Avenue and the Mall, not to mention the earlier buildings such as the Treasury and the Old Court House.

Those Englishmen whose mothers taught them that rectangular blocks of glass, steel, aluminum and plastic do not represent all beauty and all art, and are not necessarily "exciting," will be happy to bask in the shadows of respectable conglomerations of classical elements thrown together to make such buildings as that of the Supreme Court.

Those who prefer the beaux arts may admire the Library of Congress; and those who are convinced modernists may admire the headquarters buildings of several trade unions. As in other areas of the arts, "you pays your money and you takes your choice."

Whatever that choice may be, the same mothers would undoubtedly have approved of the trees which line the Washington streets, and the green spaces which punctuate them, soften and embellish hard geometrical lines, and give some relief from the heat and glare which happily do not afflict London.

WASHINGTON CLIMATE IS INDEFENSIBLE

Climatically, Washington in August cannot be defended. It is hot and it is muggy. If those English mothers did not advise their sons to wear cotton drip-dry suits, it could only have been through excusable ignorance. The advice now offered to every guest is to go straight to a department store and buy a drip-dry suit, made of cotton or a mixture of cotton and synthetic fiber, and at least two shirts of the same. Be sure to get a mixture, not an all-synthetic fabric. The man-in-apron can devise ways of washing these garments. And if he wears them while not wearing his apron, he will be less uncomfortable. A summer tuxedo, anglice white cotton dinner jacket, is also desirable. It is doubtful whether more than a handful of Englishmen could survive an American Bar Association dinner in woolen dinner jackets. Air conditioning at the hotels will help, but the journeys between hotels are deadly.

SOCIAL WASHINGTON IS COMPLICATED

Socially, Washington is complicated. An outsider like the author, even though his mother was American, is incapable of understanding it or of explaining it. Let it be noted that the various strata include the official, the diplomatic, the political, the bureaucratic, the plutocratic and the non-U circles. Glimpses may be had into any or all of these areas, but the English explorer must rely on his own gun and camera to protect himself and his lady. The Washington police are efficient, but the English visitor must not expect miracles such as are performed by their own bobbies.

Finally, it may be said that Washington has in the lifetime of most of the hosts at this meeting, been transformed from a rather ragged, partly down-at-the-heel, medium-sized town into a capital city which has all the elements of future greatness—a city which welcomes its English visitors, and in which it is hoped that the unavoidable lacunae in their earlier education at their mothers' knees may be hospitably remedied.

South Dakota Republican Convention Action an Insult to REA and Farm Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, South Dakota farm families and friends of the rural electric program everywhere were shocked by the recent action of the South Dakota Young Republican State convention when the delegates voted to kill a resolution congratulating REA on 25 years of service to rural America.

The delegate who offered the motion to kill the REA resolution referred to "the socialistic" philosophy of REA and the South Dakota REA newspaper, the Highliner.

It is hard to imagine a more unjust insult to the farm families who own and operate both the rural electric systems in South Dakota and the REA newspaper which the Republican delegates slurred.

The best answer to this attack on REA came from the State president of the South Dakota Rural Electric Association who said:

The record of the rural electric cooperatives in the State is one of which both political parties could well be proud. Rural electrification has brought prosperity to our businessmen on Main Street and comfort to our farm homes. REA has harmed no one and has been good for all America. Surely the GOP will reconsider their recent action.

South Dakota's leading independent daily newspaper, the Mitchell Republic, observed that in view of the weak REA plank of the senior State Republican platform, "these Young Republicans aren't too much to blame." The Mitchell editor further pointed out that the senior State Republican leadership has completely ignored the fact that the present Republican administration in Washington has tried to raise interest rates to REA associations—a move which REA experts say would paralyze rural electrification.

Under unanimous consent I include at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Mitchell Daily Republic editorial of August 24, 1960:

POOR READING UNDER REA LIGHTED LAMPS

South Dakota Young Republicans at a meeting in Sioux Falls last weekend may have pulled the classic mistake of the 1960 campaign when they rejected an innocuous plank congratulating the REA on its 25th birthday.

Details of the YGOP action are vague and conflicting. This much is certain. As originally drawn the platform included the statement that the YGOP congratulate South Dakota's REA's on their 25th anniversary. At least one speaker objected to the plank and after some words it was stricken from the platform.

The chairman of the YGOP platform committee brushed the State convention's action off with the statement that the entire consideration of the plank probably took about 45 seconds. The meat of the argument apparently grew in the opposition of a delegate to the philosophies expressed in the South Dakota Highliner, publication of the State REA organization.

Probably these young Republicans aren't too much to blame. The parent GOP organization at its convention earlier could squeeze through only this simple congratulation to the REA's on their silver anniversary. It ignored efforts of the present administration in Washington to raise interest rates to REA borrowers. It ignored the fact that millions of dollars of revenue to the Federal Government are being lost each year by present policies that provide for dumping of water for navigation.

But for the information of these young Republicans—and their elder brothers in the party—a review of just how the Rural Electrification Administration was born might be wise. REA was not originally a brainchild of Franklin Roosevelt's early administration. It is the illegitimate son of private power companies who refused to accept parental responsibility of providing electric service to all.

The first Roosevelt proposal for speeding electrification of our rural areas was that the Federal Government loan to private power companies money at low interest to expand their lines onto the farms of the Nation. The private utilities, with the cream of the customers already wrapped up, turned down this proposal. The only other solution was creation of farmer-owned cooperatives and thus the REA was born.

In the early thirties candle, gas, and kerosene lights were the norm on farms, particularly here in South Dakota. Today, they are the exception. In the early thirties, coal, wood, or cobs were the norm for providing cooking heat. Today they are almost extinct in this department. In the early thirties a car or horse was necessary to carry on conversation with a distant neighbor. Today, because REA paved the way, a majority of farm homes have telephones.

To reject a simple congratulatory statement for the progress made by REA in South Dakota on the grounds that the newspaper printed by REA for REA customers is fighting for even greater development of this rural electrification program just doesn't make sense. It must have made poor reading under the lamps lighted from rural electric cooperative powerlines.

Dr. Nowak: Man of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS M. MACHROWICZ
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. MACHROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, as former president of the National Advocates Society, I had occasion on August 27, 1960, to attend the last day of the joint annual convention of that organization and of the National Medical and Dental Association of America, held at Bedford Springs, Pa. These organizations include in their membership the lawyers, doctors, and dentists of America of Polish ancestry.

This year the annual Man of the Year Award was presented to Dr. Stanley John Gregory Nowak, of Boston, Mass. Dr. Nowak is a graduate of the Harvard Medical School. He is a consultant in surgery at the Boston City Hospital, the senior surgeon of the Mount Auburn Hospital of Cambridge, Mass., and the consulting surgeon of Mount Desert Island Hospital in Bar Harbor, Maine. He is an assistant professor in surgery at the Harvard Medical School and is a member of the American Board of Surgery since 1953.

He served in the U.S. Navy in World War II with the rank of commander and received an official commendation from the Navy in 1945. He is an honored member of a great number of professional organizations and is a recipient of the Order of Polonia Restituta with the rank of commander awarded to him by the Polish Government in Exile in London, England, in 1958. He has amassed a very valuable collection of Polish literary and historical memorabilia and is presently engaged, in his spare moments, in translating the epic work of the great Polish author Henryk Sienkiewicz, entitled "Quo Vadis" from Polish to English.

His acceptance speech of the Man of the Year Award was a masterpiece which I believe merits bringing it to the attention of my colleagues and of the other Americans who were not privileged to hear it. Under the order of unanimous consent previously granted, I insert it herewith:

Mr. President, honored guests, members, ladies and gentlemen, I am profoundly

thankful to you and your organization for the honor of being selected the Man of the Year on this, your jubilee anniversary.

I am delighted that you have chosen for the Woman of the Year one whose surgical skill and devotion to things Polish are most worthy of her award.

That such a double honor should come to the historic city of Boston will, I hope, not cause disaffection toward a city which confides a sincere regard for other great cultural and educational centers of this magnificant country.

Our city is referred to occasionally as the Athens of America. We accept this compliment with modesty, insisting, however, that, through like simile, its sister cities reflect in the glory of Corinth, Sparta, Troy, Alexandria, Carthage, Rome. Thus we admire you, our sisters, whose tercentennial spirit of the frontier has welded together a nation of great strength and continuing tradition derived from the respected past.

In strength we are confident that we stand supreme. In comparison with the power of the mighty cities and countries of the past, our country could engulf those historic empires with the facility of a giant. The Damascus steel sword would splinter before the blow of sabre of Pittsburgh steel. A Persian galley would crumble before even the smallest craft of our Navy, the Roman stone mortar would collapse like a contrivance of matchsticks before one of our intercontinental rockets launched from Cape Canaveral.

Although America's fundamental destiny was and is, nonmilitary and peaceful, America cannot accept the role of deuteragonist on the Martian stage. For this destiny America sprang from the ancient fountainheads of freedom, a freedom born of the spirit and the body, for it can only germinate, flower and embellish through courage, labor and sacrifice.

America, therefore, is a recarnation of the ancient cultures for through its veins flows the blood of the Athenian, the Roman, the Gaul, the German, the Angle, the Slav, the Jew, the Oriental—a blending which yields a whole greater than its parts.

One of the ingredients of this lifeblood is the maranthine fraction of Polish origin. As its Greek root designates, this crimson element is unwithering, unfading, undying, especially in the cause of freedom. This peculiar Polish disposition is not egocentric but, on the contrary, effluent and generously universal in its outlook as Poland's motto of the centuries attests, "For your freedom and for ours."

We are justly proud of this particle in the composition of the American faith. We mean to honor it while we nurture and augment it. This we can do as individuals, with courage, labor, and sacrifice, especially when we labor without thought of reward.

Your organization has rounded out 50 years of its existence. Although in terms of years this is but a short span of time, yet it has been a period as tumultuous as it has been burgeoning.

In the field of government we have seen the fall of monarchical empires, the democratic liberation of peoples from tyranny only to be plunged into a worse slavery, an unbelievable shift in balance of power, failure of the League of Nations, of the Locarno Pact, the establishment of the United Nations whose collapse is being threatened by a state of universal disharmony, abetted by innate organizational weaknesses, the lack of international legal and military authority, the unwisely permitted veto which I saw personally surrendered in 1945 in San Francisco. The power of the United Nations has been further weakened by collateral deals featuring personal diplomacy, summitry, and by the dominancy of the rodomontade over the prophets of truth. The latter, representing a decay of righteous positivism, is a serious threat to freedom.

The great American poet, Walt Whitman, cried: "When freedom goes out of a place, it is not the first thing, nor the second to go; it is the last. All others go before it."

In the recently published work of Jerzy Andrzejewski, "The Inquisitors," he uses the Spanish Inquisition as symbolic warning to the world today. "Our power * * * is based upon universal fear. Except for a handful who are obedient from choice, everybody must be so afraid that no one is capable of even imagining our existence free of fear. A wife must mistrust her husband, parents must fear their children, superiors must be afraid of their subordinates, and all of them must tremble before the all-knowing and omnipresent punitive justice. * * * We must have many laws and much fear."

Consider the newest of fears, science, which has been as revolutionary as the forces of international change. While it has made beneficent contributions, unheard of in the past, this branch of knowledge has been deviated by sinister forces into a macabre race threatening our very existence.

Above this cauldron of furies a vapor rises, as if a vampire or spectre, of a brave nation sacrificed upon the altar of expediency not in one but in four oblations. Each time it was written: "Finis Poloniae." But the Polish nation through 1,000 years has been indestructible because she remembers her glorious, as well as her tragic past. Thus she hallows the honored dead from Lignice, Grunwald, Raclawice, the Warsaw of the Partitions, the Warsaw of 1939, Falaise, Tobruk, and Monte Cassino.

It has been said that Polish soldiers "drink death like wine."

Poland worships the numerous sainthoods from Adalbert to Andrew Bobola. She pays hommage to her rulers from Mieszko to Stanislaw Powiatowski. She exalts her scientists from Copernicus to Curie-Skladowska, her artists from Matejko to Wyspianski, her heroic commanders from Sobieski to Sikorski, her poets and writers from Kochanowski to Sienkiewicz and Conrad, her musician-composers from Chopin to Paderewski.

The indestructibility of Poland lies in its resilient nationalism and its indomitable spirit. Her sons and daughters in every echelon of its political and social structure stand ready to fill in the breach when one, or more of the lines of defense falter usually through overwhelming external attack or through their own weakness. We see it most strikingly in the period after her final dismemberment in 1795. It was then that the poets of a supposedly erased nation, though exiled to foreign lands, fanned the flame of national courage, prophesied stirring truths and infused undying hope into their people. The beautiful words of these poets are well known to you, every Pole has memorized them, these wreaths of faith by Mickiewicz, Brodzinski, Slowacki, Krasinski. When, finally this medium of Polish expression was cruelly denied them, her invincible spirit gave forth a Chopin and Paderewski.

In 1910, when your organization was founded, a memorable occasion took place in Lwów, Poland; namely, the commemoration of the centennial of Chopin's birth at which Paderewski delivered a historic panegyric, as inspiring, as technically beautiful, as one of his monumental pianoforte readings.

I shall take this occasion to quote several excerpts from this great ode which I have recently completed in, what I believe to be, the first American translation. Bearing in mind the tragic state of Poland during the lifetime of Chopin and the significance of his music to the Polish people, also recalling her still tripartite state in 1910, the words of Paderewski gain increasing significance.

"Through his music Chopin was able," said Paderewski, "to render the undulation of her feelings * * * the call of heroism and rapture of delirium which * * * crumbles rocks and * * * (conquers) despair." Therefore "whether native Mazovsian dances, whether yearning nocturnes, whether brisk echoes from Krakow lands, whether mysterious preludes, whether striding Polonaises, whether the elemental but wonderful etudes, whether the stormy ballades or whether the heroic sonatas (the Pole) (understood), everything * * * for all this (was) Polish. * * * Thus Chopin prevailed as 'a poet, an enchanter, a monarch, a mighty of spirit (who), equalized all states not unto vulgarity but unto the loftiest summit of feeling.'

"Through long years of torture, rack and persecution, through long years of harassed thoughts, the most secret threads were tied to him. * * * Indeed he was a contrabandist, who, in the scrolls of innocent notes, dispersed a prohibited Polonism among countrymen scattered unto the boundaries. Indeed, he was that priest who provided a scattered nation with the holy sacrament of our fatherland."

So spoke the immortal Paderewski in 1910 in the beautiful Philharmonia Hall in Lwów, overflowing in both capacity and emotion.

In 1960 we are to celebrate the centennial of Paderewski's own birth. He too was a genius patriae. If Chopin provided the Sacrament, Paderewski symbolized the saviorship.

Having had the cherished honor of knowing this greatest of men, having the sublime privilege of a place of honor at his bier, and having, 2 months ago, the exalted opportunity to speak at his place of entombment in the Arlington National Cemetery, I would feign if I presumed to utter an ode of appreciation of Paderewski.

On another occasion the illustrious Dr. John F. Finley enshrined him with the following words:

"You've brought from out the air such symphonies
As God with all His earth-orchestral range
From cataract through soughing wind to lark
Could not produce without the skill of man.

Your touch has been transmuted into sound
As perfect as an orchid or a rose,
True as a mathematical formula
Yet full of color as an evening sky.

But there's a symphony that you've evoked
From out the hearts of men, more wonderful
Than you have played upon your instrument
Composed of the praises of mankind.

For what you've nobly done to lead again
To its proved place amid earth's greatest states
Your land that gave the world Copernicus,
And for freedom Kosciuszko gave."

But Paderewski would protest that he was only a fragment in the life of his Fatherland. In his own words of 1910, he would admonish us to "hallow the memory of our fathers * * * (and to preserve) in our Lettish breasts still unquenched particles of ancient faith. * ** * A great person, even the greatest cannot exist above or beyond a nation. He is of its seed, its flower, its grain, and, the greater, the higher born, the stronger, the closer to the heart of the nation."

Nineteen hundred and ten, nineteen hundred and sixty—two great Polish anniver-

saries so felicitously coinciding with your memorable milestones. It were as if the soul of Chopin cried out on his centennial in 1910 for a voice in the new world to take up, as said Paderewski, the unfinished and undecided contests. For music, with its elements, vibrations and throbbing are the elements of life. Quiet but audible, powerful but unrecognized, music exists wheresoever there is life. It blends with the rush of water, with the breath of the winds, with the rustle of forests; it is in the elements of the revolution of the earth, in the mighty movement of planets, in the hidden but inexorable battle of the atoms. It is everywhere and reaches farther and higher than the human word can reach; it rises toward the supernatural spheres of pure feeling, as high as the heavens. Its manifestation, rhythm, by the law of God, keeps order, maintains harmony of the earths. The melodies of God flow uninterruptedly over the starry expanses, over the milky way, over the worlds, into the beyond, over human and superhuman spheres, creating that wonderful union: the harmony of omni-existence.

In 1960 we rehear these words uttered in 1910 by one, who awaiting his Wawellian Valhalla, rests on the summit of Arlington and exhorts: "So let us strengthen our hearts to perseverance, endurance, pattern our minds for deeds, valiant and equitable; let us elevate our feelings to strong faith."

As an American organization you are privileged to speak to America of this faith, of the universal but unheeded lessons of an immolated country with which you are consanguinous and of which you may be justly proud. She has been, and is, the hub of Europe, the pivot on which a delicate balance wheel swings to and fro, marking seconds for a thousand years, and, by God's will, another thousand years.

New Industry to the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, the wise and witty Harry Golden recently discussed with his customary perception the national problem of job migration. His article "New Industry to the South" in the Carolina Israelite for May–June 1960 contains an excellent view on this major issue, which I commend to the attention of every Member, regardless of residence. Mr. Golden's thought-provoking statement follows:

NEW INDUSTRY TO THE SOUTH

In all the Southern States, among the State legislatures, the Governor's mansion, and the chambers of commerce there is a swelling movement to bring down "new industry from the North." The movement has gained tempo with each new success. Each State now has set aside ample funds to encourage this project. Representatives, public relations experts, political leaders visit New York, Chicago, San Diego, and even Frankfort Germany (to entice Volkswagen to set up a distributing center on the Carolina seacoast).

These mass importations of northern industry to the South started shortly after the end of World War II. The first of the immigrees were the garment industries from New York trying to escape from David Dubinsky and the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. Sewing shops are now set up all over the Carolinas, Georgia, Alabama, and Tennessee. "Escape" is perhaps too harsh and castigating a verb. These shops were not only escaping unionization, but let us be fair—they were also attracted to the South because it is the inevitable industrial empire of our country. It has abundant raw materials and a huge untapped source of labor.

New industry from the North is not a total success story. While it is an operations bootstrap it has some alloy of pain. Take a case history: A factory in Johnstown, Pa., is induced southward by promises of tax remittances, rent-free property, cheap labor, and friendly environment. The factory pulls up stakes. The total result is not merely employment for southerners but also unemployment for 400 Pennsylvanians who are unceremoniously dumped on the State unemployment and relief rolls. What is the Nation's gain? This is no conquest.

Multiply this one process by hundreds and you will have an accurate idea of what happens in transferring new industry from North to South.

This sort of criticism cannot stop the inevitable, nor is it intended to. But this sort of criticism ought to help open this problem to serious public discussion. Open discussion of this problem will even accelerate this industrialization of the South.

The Governor's trips to Chicago and abroad, the roving bands of southern chamber of commerce deputies, the enticing allurement seem to me only an attempt at finding an easy way out.

More difficult perhaps, but more valuable to the Nation as a whole would be a southern project to develop home industries. This is the waste, to let the resources of the South be dormant chasing the resources of the North. North Carolina, for instance, is one of the richest States in raw materials. Yet Tar Heels send clay up to New York for a few dollars a ton and it comes back in the form of cups and saucers for which Tar Heels pay many thousands of dollars a ton. North Carolina is a natural for a vast home-established pottery industry. In addition, 10 or 12 counties benefit when new industry relocates; the other 90 counties are left on their own and they are very, very poor and no attempt is made to rescue them.

North Carolina has a God-given opportunity to build an industry in every county beginning with fisheries and canneries on the coast coming through the peach country and the agricultural plain for all sorts of food processing and canning and into the huge industrial Piedmont where I live.

An industrial commission that stays home to build up native and indigenous industries would change the face of North Carolina without causing hardship or unemployment elsewhere.

Registration Is Necessary and Every Vote Is Important

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. RANDALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent to make a few remarks about the general subject of registration of voters, because I think it is a timely subject and deserves consideration just before the general election.

In the large cities and more heavily populated areas of our country, the voter's registration is a legal requirement. There is no requirement in the rural and small community where the election officials personally know and are well-acquainted with the background of each citizen. For reasons of necessity, the statement is literally true that "If you don't register, you can't vote."

Many individuals protest the inconvenience of having to register when they move into a city or within a city, and yet I think they might have no opposition if only the reasons for this requirement were fully understood. The reasons for registration are:

First. An individual's right to vote is based on such qualifications as citizenship—by birth or naturalization, legal age, and certain residence requirements in the State and county.

Second. These qualifications are brought out by questions, and the answers are recorded in a book and verified by the signature of the voter.

Third. This process takes more time than could be crowded into 1 election day.

Instead of a seeming inconvenience, on election day, registration proves most convenient when all you do is to identify yourself, sign your name and cast your ballot.

Registration is actually for your benefit. Do not complain when it is enforced.

I want to particularly compliment the editors of the Building and Construction Trades Bulletin, the official monthly publication of the building and construction trades department, AFL–CIO, for their statement of the need for their members to register to vote. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include excerpts from this article which appeared on the front page of the August 1960 issue of the Bulletin as follows:

THE IMPORTANCE OF EVERY VOTE

In order to win victories, every potential voter must be registered to vote. A nonregistered voter is a vote for the opposition. A more recent example of what a strong registration drive can produce can be seen in the recent primary election in Tennessee. We feel that this registration drive contributed greatly to the renomination of one of labor's stanchest friends, Senator ESTES KEFAUVER.

Both political parties this year are predicting a very close election. Some evidence of this closeness can be seen in the recent election in North Dakota where Senator BURDICK won by a mere 1,000 plus votes out of 208,000 votes cast.

Vice Presidential nominee LYNDON B. JOHNSON, was elected to the Senate in 1948 by a majority of 87 votes.

Other instances of victory by a close margin are well known. For example, in 1948, President Truman carried California and Ohio by less than one vote precinct and was thereby elected President.

In 1944 Senator Taft carried Ohio by less than one vote per precinct.

In 1954 Governor Harriman won by a shade more than one vote per precinct.

In 1950 Governor Williams, of Michigan, was elected by less than one vote for every three precincts.

When the late Senator McNary, Republican, of Oregon, ran for reelection to the Oregon State Supreme Court, he received 34,608 votes while his opponent received 34,609.

Mr. Speaker, the above statistics point out very clearly the importance of every vote and the building and construction trades department, AFL–CIO, are to be congratulated for emphasizing the maxim, "If you don't register, you can't vote." It is quite apparent they realize now is the time to do something about it. Every vote is going to be important on this election day, November 8.

We Must Develop a Strategy for Victory—To Save Freedom—Freedom Everywhere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my very great privilege to introduce the keynote speaker of the Republican Convention held in Chicago the last week in July, our colleague, the distinguished Member from Minnesota, Dr. WALTER JUDD.

Tireless, effective, and fearless, a champion of independence and freedom, he is one of the very rare men in this House of Representatives. For 10 years a medical missionary in China, his penetrating vision recognized the menace of the Japanese aggression in China and the sinister quality of communism a decade before they exploded in our face. Upon his return home, he did his utmost to bring the realization to America.

I do not need to tell anyone here what his rare talents are nor with what consecration he works. His contribution is greatest in foreign affairs, for that is his major responsibility, but he has been the author of important and intelligent legislation aimed at full employment for America's working millions. Active in the field of medical aid for the aging and in measures dealing with vocational rehabilitation and education, he has been a leader in the successful battle of the administration of President Eisenhower to check inflation.

Beyond all else, WALTER JUDD is a man of deep religious faith, a man whose life is based upon the certainty that understanding and wisdom are given to those who ask for it.

I therefore under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, include with my remarks, the keynote address given in Chicago by our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, WALTER H. JUDD:

WE MUST DEVELOP A STRATEGY FOR VICTORY—TO SAVE FREEDOM—FREEDOM EVERYWHERE

(Keynote address to the 1960 Republican National Convention by Representative WALTER H. JUDD, of Minnesota, July 25, 1960, Chicago, Ill.)

Mr. Chairman, fellow Republicans, fellow Americans, as we meet tonight in this Republican National Convention of 1960 I do not believe you want me to indulge in the traditional keynote speech, blaming the other party for everything that is bad, taking credit to ourselves for everything that is good, and promising that if you voters will just elect us to office this fall, we will solve every problem, increase every benefit, expand every existing program, start a whole flock of new ones, give everyone everything he wants—and reduce the national debt at the same time.

The times in which we meet are too serious for that.

The problems we face are too disturbing.

Our country's safety—your safety and mine—are too gravely endangered.

What the American people want to know as they watch us here tonight is: Which party has the greatest capacity to keep this country safe and sound?

Which party is the most alert to and best understands the powerful forces against us, abroad and at home?

Which party best understands the forces for us, abroad and at home?

Which party has the ablest, the most experienced, the best qualified, and the finest men to lead our country through the perilous months and years ahead?

We do not pretend that our party is always right and the Democratic Party is always wrong.

We know, as do you who are listening, that both Democrats and Republicans want a strong, free, and prosperous America in a peaceful and secure world. The difference between the two parties is not over those good objectives, but over the best way to achieve those good objectives—and keep them.

Some Democrats have regularly tried to make it appear that Republicans are opposed to various good ends—such as security for old age, adequate medical care, better education, better housing, protection of the rights of labor, aid to agriculture—just because we do not agree with the solutions they advocate, believing they are not the right way to get what we all want. But it is not because we are against the good ends; it is precisely because we are for them that we oppose measures we believe are unsound.

It is the obligation of the Republican Party and its members to show that loose fiscal policies, while temporarily gratifying, in the end inhibit growth rather than expand it.

Sometimes we are told that to win elections, we Republicans should make more grandiose promises, like those the opposition party made at its convention. Maybe that is a way to win elections; but we repudiate it, first because it would not be shooting square with you, the voters; and second, it would not succeed. For there is no chance of our outpromising the Democrats.

Overshadowing everything else as we meet is the hard fact that a powerful enemy threatens us on every front. It is the most dangerous assault upon us in our history, in part because it is so different from any previous threat.

And without victory in this struggle, there will be no survival of freedom for any of us—Democrats or Republicans.

I

The Republican Party was born in a time of crisis. It was brought into being by the strong free spirits of a century ago, to deal with the gravest issue of the 19th century—human slavery.

In 1860 in this city the Republican Party nominated as its candidate for the Presidency of the United States a man who had risen from the humblest beginings to become a leader in the effort to end human slavery without destroying the Union.

He led the party to victory, the Nation to salvation, and the people to a rededication to the sound principles on which the country had been founded and had grown great.

We want tonight, both to honor Abraham Lincoln and to learn from him.

Please God, we may do as well with our divided world as he did with his divided Nation.

For the gravest issue of our century also is human slavery—this time not men enslaved by other men; but, far more complex and dangerous, masses of men enslaved by governments.

More human beings are in bondage tonight than ever before in human history.

Nine hundred million abroad are denied by their government the right to worship, to speak, to assemble, to join, to own; the right of a man to choose or to change his work and to live his own life with his family and friends—in freedom.

In this total situation, the Republican Party stands today as it has from the beginning—for freedom and against slavery.

You will judge both parties not by promises but by performance. And it is on the basis of our record of solid performance that we proudly present to you in this convention, an honest accounting of our stewardship during these eight years—and a look at the future.

How well we have done what we said we would do when you elected us?

How do we propose to deal with the challenges we face now, at home and abroad?

Why do we believe our principles and proposals offer greatest hope for accomplishing the greastest good and the greatest growth for America in the next 4 years?

II

Let us deal first with our international relations.

We said in 1952 we believed we could get and maintain peace with honor. We have done it.

We brought to an end the fighting in the Korean war which the Truman administration would not win and could not stop.

It did not make sense to continue to enlist American youth and exhort them to fight well in the noblest tradition of America's greatest heroes—but not to fight too well because then they might win, and that might provoke the enemy. They should give all they had, their lives—and over 33,000 did—but they must not win. It was the first war ever fought—so far as I am aware—in terms of trying to please the enemy. To continue that war was madness.

Then President Eisenhower took charge. It took time and patience and skill, but within 9 months, the fighting was brought to a close—without dishonor, without sacrificing the interests of an ally, or weakening our security position in the Pacific. We Republicans are proud of that accomplishment.

In addition, this administration has prevented a half dozen other threats from developing into war—Trieste, the Mossadegh uprising in Iran, Guatemala, Formosa, Suez, Lebanon, Quemoy, West Berlin.

How was it done? Not by sacrificing our principles in secret deals under the table; but by steady, patient firmness and strength in support of principles.

What principles? First, our own historic principles: human freedom; keeping our word; steadfast support of friends and allies. And, second, wholehearted support of the United Nations.

In short, our efforts everywhere have been to help build free nations up; the efforts of the Communists everywhere are to pull free governments down.

III

It does not avail, however, to be firm in support of principles unless we have the strength to back the firmness up. This administration has built up gigantic strength in our own Armed Forces and given vital assistance in building up the strength of other nations standing with us against the common threat.

Ours is a balanced power, not all our eggs in one basket, whether it be a bomber basket, a missile, a submarine, or any other basket.

President Eisenhower will perhaps have something to say on this subject tomorrow night. I hope those who have thought they know more about our armed strength than he and our Joint Chiefs of Staff, will listen in too.

But I am compelled to take notice here of certain charges made by the opposition party.

It is claimed that this administration allowed a missile gap to develop. No, it found a missile gap and has managed to get it almost closed.

When President Eisenhower took office in 1953, the preceding administration had actually retarded work in this field, even though it knew that the Soviet Union was making tremendous efforts.

The Truman administration in 8 years had spent 17 times more for price supports for peanuts than for long-range missiles.

The Eisenhower administration is today putting 40 times as much into such missiles each month as the previous administration did in 8 years.

It took the Soviet Union 12 years to develop its long-range missiles. It took this administration 6 years to get ours operational. Anything wrong with that?

Senator KENNEDY was reported by the press to have said on February 21 of this year, "We have the greatest deterrent force in history and thank God for that." He was right.

IV

But it is not enough to have such vast overall power. Our primary desire in building such striking force is not to fight a war, but to deter one.

It is not just the strength that we have, it is the strength that our enemies, our allies and our own people know that we have, which is our hope of deterring war.

What kind of reckless and irresponsible action is it for anyone to misrepresent the United States as a second-class power, as was done in the Democratic convention, and thereby encourage the very attacks which all Americans profoundly hope and pray can be prevented?

Did you see the movie shown at their convention 2 weeks ago, dredging up scenes of hunger, squalor, and misery in the United States as if they were typical of America? What kind of salesmanship for their country is that?

Can our Nation's prestige be raised by tearing it down?

It is devoutly to be hoped—because it offers our best chance of avoiding war—that Mr. Khrushchev, in making up his mind about our actual military, economic and moral strength, will depend a lot more on the reports of his own agents than on the shameful misstatements made in the heat of the Los Angeles convention.

It is claimed that this administration has not taken the initiative in the cold war, that we have allowed things to drift. Yet the orators condemn the Republican administration for brilliant examples of successful initiative. For example, the U–2 flights. If we had not developed U–2 and had not been using it to keep up to date on military preparations within the Soviet Union, we could properly have been charged with inviting another Pearl Harbor. The fact that our U–2 operations were so outstandingly successful for 4 years should be a source of intense pride to all Americans. The U–2's were not provoking war, they were helping to prevent war.

Again, it has been suggested that the President should have done something different or better about Mr. Khrushchev's breakup of the Paris conference. Will they please tell you what they think the American people wanted their President to do? Apologize, and hand over West Berlin? Blow up and start a war? Of course not.

The facts are that it has been the President himself and Secretaries of State Dulles and Herter who on innumerable occasions have warned the American people against optimism regarding any conference with Communists at the summit in the absence of any evidence of change in their objectives and methods.

Just as Prime Minister Macmillan said a year ago that he thought he ought to go to Moscow to find out if possible just what the Soviets had in mind, so the President invited Mr. Khrushchev to this country, and agreed to go to the Soviet Union; and the Big Three agreed to meet with Khrushchev in Paris—all in the hope of finding ways to get a settlement that might end the cold war without betrayal of our principles, our commitments, or our allies.

At the Paris conference, everybody hoped that the miracle might take place and Mr. Khrushchev would abandon his avowed purpose to bury us—one way or another. Tragically, there was no miracle. Mr. Khrushchev killed the hope.

But his ruthless torpedoing of the Paris meeting was evidence of the failure of his foreign policy, not ours. His strategy for at least 2 years had been the old one of trying to conquer the West by dividing it. He tried his best to set our allies against each other and against us. He came to our country and talked about peace and friendship, trying to whittle down our resolution and soothe us into relaxed slumber. He did not succeed.

When Mr. Khrushchev knew before the Paris conference convened that he had failed to divide, deceive or soften up the free powers, he had no choice but to break up the conference. Otherwise, he would either have had to back down on West Berlin, or actually start a war. Either would have been fatal to him. His scuttling of the Paris conference and his grotesque efforts to pin the blame on us were proof positive, not of our weakness, but of our strength.

With the bald deception of Khrushchev's fake peace posture exposed at Paris by himself, he had to change his tactics and make a different effort to divide and conquer. He is now moving heaven and earth to achieve by subversion among the newer or more vulnerable nations of the free world coalition what he could not achieve by division of the Western Powers. He is trying to upset free governments, one by one, by ordering into action the apparatus the Communists have been systematically building and training in other countries for decades, for the very purposes now revealed so plainly in Japan and Cuba.

Why did the Communists have to cancel President Eisenhower's visit to Russia and resort to such violent measures in Japan to prevent his visit there? Not because of the ineffectiveness of the President's visits abroad, but because of their demonstrated effectiveness. The Red leaders saw the vast difference between Eisenhower's reception in India, for example, and the receptions given Khrushchev and Chou En-lai. They didn't dare let Ike chalk up still another tremendous triumph with millions of people in Mother Russia itself, and in a key country like Japan.

V

It has been charged that no previous Presidents or Vice Presidents ever suffered such insults abroad—as if somehow that is their fault. There are two inescapable answers. One is that as long as two previous American Presidents were willing to give in to Soviet leaders, they got along famously with them. Why should the Communists insult them as long as they were getting what they wanted?

Naturally Khrushchev would prefer not to negtiate with a Republican President who he has learned will not be taken in or intimidated or tricked into any concessions, no matter how innocent looking, that would weaken the free world.

The second answer is that no previous President has faced a Communist conspiracy that was strong and arrogant enough to take such action as Mr. Khrushchev took.

And how did the Communist conspiracy get so strong and arrogant? That cannot be laid at the door of Republicans. Look again at the record.

I would rather not go over the mistakes of the past; there's more than enough to talk about regarding the future. But if Republicans are to be charged with inability to deal with the forces of aggression which those who make the charges helped to build up, then we owe it to the truth to set the record straight.

The trouble we are in with the Communists is exactly the trouble that Republicans warned for years before 1952 would develop if we followed the courses that were followed.

Was it Republicans who recognized the Soviet Union in 1933 and gave it acceptance into our country and world society as if it were a respectable and dependable member thereof?

Was it Republicans who, at Teheran, against the urgent advice of Mr. Churchill, agreed to give the Russians a free hand in the Balkans?

Was it Republicans who secretly divided Poland and gave half of it to the Soviet Union?

Was it Republicans who agreed to the Communist takeover of a hundred million people in Eastern Europe who are not Russian?

Was it a Republican administration which at Potsdam gave the Soviet Union East Germany and left West Berlin cut off from the rest of the free world?

Was it a Republican administration that publicly promised that Manchuria would go back to its rightful owners, the Chinese, and then secretly at Yalta gave control of Manchuria to the Russians?

Was it a Republican administration that divided Korea and gave control of North Korea to the Communists?

Was it a Republican administration that gave to the Soviet Union the Kurile Islands which had never been anybody's except Japan's, thereby endangering both Japan's and our security in the North Pacific?

Was it a Republican administration that rightly put its hand to the plow in Korea, and then when victory was in sight turned back, allowing the Reds to recover so they can make still more trouble for us in the future?

Was it a Republican administration that fell for the Communist offer of a truce in Korea without requiring that the North Korean aggressors lay down their arms and the Chinese Communists get out of Korea where they had no business to be? You know it wasn't.

In summary, it wasn't under Republicans that 600 million human beings disappeared behind the Iron Curtain in the first 5 years after World War II.

In fact, the record will show that Republicans opposed these steps every time they were were taken.

VI

What our Republican administration has done in these 8 years is, with initiative and imagination, to stop the process of retreat before the Frankenstein monster that its predecessors did so much to build up.

We have resolutely opposed anything anywhere that would make Communist regimes stronger—and we shall continue to do so.

That is why, for example, we have opposed and must oppose official recognition of Communist China or its admission into the United Nations, unless or until it will give up in a dependable way its aggressive acts

and threats against other countries; that is, give up communism. Recognition and admission would needlessly present it with smashing victories. Does it make sense to build up an avowed enemy?

But our refusal to give Red China the tremendous boost of official recognition does not mean—as has been asserted by people who ought to know better—that this administration has been hiding its head in the sand, or pretending Red China does not eixst, or trying to ignore 600 million Chinese. The exact reverse is the truth. This administration is acutely aware of Red China's existence and the threat it constitutes to freedom, not only in Asia, but everywhere. It was not this administration which indulged in the illusion that Communists in China are democratic agrarian reformers.

We are not ignoring Red China. We have been negotiating with its official representatives for 5 years. The 99th such negotiation, unfortunately still fruitless, took place just last week.

VII

Surely it is now plain to all that since the Communist world conspiracy remains the same, and since America does not intend to surrender, and since nobody wants a hot war, there is only one alternative left. We must win this cold war.

To do this we must have leaders who understand this enemy and its tactics, and will mobilize all our resources for the struggle.

We must use more effectively our strongest weapons, the values and virtues of a system of government which has given freedom and dignity and better living standards to human beings than any other system ever has.

How many of us understand our own system well enough to sell it to others with contagious enthusiasm, as the Communists are so well trained to sell theirs?

We must let loose in the world the dynamic forces of freedom in our day as our forefathers did in theirs, causing people everywhere to look toward the American dream.

Men have always found ways to bring down tyrants in the past; men will find ways to bring down today's tyrants, if only we don't build up the tyrants.

In short, we have a good strategy for holding. But we cannot hope to win in the end just by holding. We must develop a strategy for victory.

A new chapter has now been opened by Khrushchev. The Soviet Union stands naked before the world today, self-exposed, its objectives and its unchanging methods of deception and trickery revealed by its own acts.

It is going to require stronger approaches, different strategies, new tactics by someone who has proved he understands communism.

America has the brains, she has the wealth, she has the weapons. Who can best harden into rocklife firmness her will?

I am confident that the nearer our people come to election day next November, the more they will become convinced that the course of wisdom and sureness for America is to continue to entrust the destiny of our Nation to steady, competent, experienced, principled Republican hands.

The man who will be nominated in this convention as our candidate will be incomparably the best qualified to deal with the relentless cold war which we have tried our best to avoid, but which we now have no choice except to win.

It has been said by Mr. KENNEDY that the most important issue in this campaign is foreign policy. We agree and welcome the test.

VIII

Now let us take a look at our record on the domestic front. Undeniably this has been overall the best 7-year period in the history of the United States.

What did we say in 1952 that we would do? First, we said we would be a middle-of-the-road government. We believe that middle-of-the-road government is, in the long run, the best kind of government for everyone. For when anybody or any group, whether at one extreme of the other, gets all it wants, it is at the expense of the people as a whole.

We promised we would clean out the corruption that was a scandal under the previous administration and led to more than 20 convictions of high officials. I am proud of the fact that there has not been a single conviction for malfeasance in office of any high official of this administration. That does not mean everything has been perfect. It does mean that whenever and wherever there was any slightest suspicion of impropriety, this Republican administration has not tried to cover up; it has cleaned up. That is what you wanted it to do.

We said we were convinced we could bring prosperity without war—something our predecessors had never been able to do in this century. We succeeded.

The first requirement was to stabilize our economy and slow down the inflation. It was stealing the people's substance—and was especially cruel in its eating away of the value of the pensions and social security benefits which millions of older persons were counting on for the security and serenity they so richly deserve in their years of retirement.

How could inflation best be checked?

The Democrats clamored for more controls.

President Eisenhower announced he would take off the controls.

You will recall how some screamed that the Republicans were yielding to the profiteers, big business, money interests; prices for common people would now go sky high, and so on.

But did they? No. The prices which had been rising alarmingly—48 percent in the 7 Truman years—promptly leveled off and stayed practically stable for 4 years. The total rise in prices in these 8 Republican years is less than 10 percent.

We achieved this stability not by changing our free system, but by using it. It works better than those of little faith in the American people give it credit for.

We said in 1952 that if the Federal Government would stick to its proper function of running the business of the Nation, and get out of trying to manage the affairs of our people, the creative energies of the American people and their millions of individual enterprises would create a vaster expansion of production and trade, with correspondingly greater expansion of jobs, than the Government itself could do. Were we right or wrong? Well, there were 61 million jobs when we took over in 1953. There are 68 million jobs tonight.

And jobs at higher wages. Wages up 39 percent in these 7 years. Do you recall the seven consecutive cost-of-living increases that labor had to fight for, just to keep up with inflation under Truman? In contrast, real wages, actual purchasing power, has gone up 20 percent under this administration.

To buy a standard market basket of groceries in 1945 under the Roosevelt administration, it cost the average worker 13 hours of labor. To buy the same market basket in 1952 under the Truman administration took 13.7 hours of labor. To buy it in 1959 under the Eisenhower administration cost 10 hours.

This is the measure of how much better off rank and file people are today. Does this sound like a party of big business?

Our workers have better food and clothing for themselves and their families, more homes, more automobiles, more refrigerators, more TV's, more free time for study, for recreation, for sports, for travel, for whatever. The record is clear that labor has done better under this Republication administration than in all its previously history.

Personal income, the money that goes into your pockets, has gone up a whopping 33 percent—from $301 billion in 1952 to $420 billion in 1960—and in constant dollars.

Furthermore, a larger share of that higher income, more than 4 percent larger, goes now into the pay envelopes of workers. Anything wrong with workers getting a bigger share of the national income under the Republicans than they ever got under the Democrats?

Isn't it plain horsesense to trust for the next 4 years the leadership which has enabled you to do so well for yourself in the last 8 years?

IX

While the Republican 83d Congress was in power to cooperate with the Eisenhower administration during its first 2 years, we gave the American people the biggest single tax cut in their history—and at the same time expanded the benefits to people; more social security benefits, more for highways, hospitals, health, housing.

And you still have that tax cut. If I may borrow a phrase that you perhaps remember: "Don't let them take it away."

The Republican record in the area of meeting human needs has been one of remarkable action and progress in all fronts, contrary to the image promoted by the opposition that they alone are the party of the people.

Under social security 7½ million more persons are now covered than before. The number receiving benefits has increased from 5 to more than 14 million persons.

Under the vocational rehabilitation program as strengthened by Republicans in 1954, some 400,000 disabled men and women have been returned to active, self-respecting employment and have earned almost $2 billion. This is the true American system of enabling people to do things for themselves.

Deeply concerned with the increasing complexity of the problems of senior citizens, this administration has established a staff for research into their problems and how to use their valuable experience and talents. It has called the first White House Conference on the Aging in our Nation's history for next January.

Bold and dramatic steps have been taken to expand medical research in cancer, heart disease, mental illnesses, and other crippling and killing maladies.

In the 7 years prior to 1953, the value of surplus agricultural products distributed in the school lunch program and to needy persons, institutions, schools, and Indian reservations totaled $263 million. In the 7 years since 1953 the total distributed was $960 million worth—3½ times as much. Anything wrong with that record?

In short, we have moved vigorously whenever and wherever action by the Federal Government is the proper and best way to deal with any problem affecting public safety and the people's welfare.

When before did any government ever take less from the people in taxes and give them more in return?

How was it done? Not by Government orders, edicts, or controls, and not by Government handouts.

It was done, not by changing our principles of freedom of enterprise, but by sticking to them.

It was done by good Republican management of the Government, not management of the people.

Obviously, I cannot try here to outline our detailed proposals for the years ahead. I have not even mentioned vitally important areas like education, health, agriculture, conservation, taxation, and a dozen other issues which would require almost a separate speech each. They will be covered, however, before this convention is over.

X

May I turn, finally, to some basic principles, tested principles of freedom, which we believe it is necessary for us to understand and follow if we are to meet successfully the challenges of the future.

Many Americans have come to think that our two major parties are, after all, just about the same. But it is not so. The main difference between them, as I said in the beginning, is not over good ends. The difference—and it is a profound one—is over means. Which are the right ways to get the good ends?

We Republicans deeply believe that the first function of a good government is to protect the liberty of the individual citizen, not to take it away.

There have never been but two basic philosophies of government—government from the bottom up and government from the top down. Our fathers believed, and so do we Republicans, that most problems can best be solved by the people themselves.

One philosophy puts its primary faith in government officials. The other puts its primary faith in the good sense and the capabilities of our people.

One group begins with the assumption that the more complex and complicated a society becomes the more its control and management must be centralized in an increasingly powerful government.

We Republicans begin with the same premises and come to exactly the opposite conclusion; namely, that the more complex and complicated a society, the more impossible it is for any centrally located group of men—no matter how able or devoted or sincere—even to grasp all the details of the complicated problems, to say nothing of handling those details from Washington.

We are not against adequate Federal Government. There must be such Government to prevent abuses of power. We merely want to keep it limited to its proper fields, so that the liberty of individuals will be protected. The Republican Party stands for liberty.

In the Democratic Convention you heard a lot about Woodrow Wilson. What did he, a real student of government, think on this issue? In a speech in New York in 1912 he said, "Liberty has never come from the Government. Liberty has always come from the subject of the Government. The history of liberty is a history of resistance. The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it."

Nobody has said it better than that. Yet we now see those who claim to be the followers of Wilson insisting that the way to expand liberty is to increase the powers of Government.

XI

How did our forefathers seek to limit Government to its essential functions? By putting the Government under a Constitution. Many regard that Constitution as the means by which the Government regulates the people. No, it is the magnificent means our fathers devised by which the people can regulate their Government.

Why did they insist on having a Bill of Rights in that Constitution? In order to be sure that their Government would take care of them? No, in order to be sure that their Government could not interfere in their taking care of themselves.

Rights are not what our Government must do for us; rights are what our Government cannot do to us. Rights are not guarantees by the Government; rights are guarantees against the Government, even against our own Government, in order to keep it a good government.

We believe also that all men are created equal. In support of this fundamental faith, Republicans work for government that will provide equality under the law for all citizens, and equality of opportunity for all citizens. We believe this is the best way to get the fullest possible rewards for all citizens.

It is because of this Republican emphasis on equal opportunity that the Republican Party is the party to which youth will naturally gravitate, if we make our principles clear to them. For what does youth want most of all? Youth wants to get ahead. The Republican Party stands always for maximum freedom and opportunity—for every man to improve his condition.

This is why it is possible in America for the son of a rich man, like JACK KENNEDY, to become President.

This is why it is possible in America for the son of a poor man, like DICK NIXON, to become President.

Republicans believe that that government is best, not which does most for its citizens directly, but which makes it possible for most citizens to do most for themselves—and then assists with those who, for whatever reason, cannot provide the basic necessities for themselves.

I do not say these things because I am a Republican; I am a Republican because these are the things I believe with all my heart and soul.

I think we can state it as a law that whenever a government does for its citizens that which they have the capacity to do for themselves, individually and in groups, it begins to destroy both their capacity and their incentive to do for themselves. It begins to weaken rather than to strengthen the foundations of freedom and the means of progress.

I can work my girl's arithmetic problems better for her than she can work them for herself. I can get the right answers almost every time. And she would like to have me do them for her. She'd even vote for me if I would. But I don't. Not because I don't love her or want her to succeed—but because I do.

XII

Abraham Lincoln at Gettysburg said, "Now we are engaged in a great civil war testing"—testing, among other things, whether Government of the people, by the people, for the people can long endure.

Lincoln and the Republican Party led our country through that crisis of 100 years ago. Now we are engaged in a greater conflict—the whole planet is in the throes of the mightiest conflict in all history. It is a world civil war. What is it about? It is about exactly the same thing as then: Is government of the people, by the people, and therefore, for the people to perish, literally, from the earth?

During the fiery trial of Lincoln's day he warned solemnly that this Nation could not exist half slave, half free. He and his party succeeded in restoring unity and freedom to the Nation.

Can this whole wide world of our day go on indefinitely half slave, half free? Deep down in our hearts, we know the answer is "No."

The reason why it has not proved possible to get any real agreement with the Communist world all these years is because the Communists are not pursuing the same objectives as we are pursuing. And why are they not pursuing the same objectives? Because they do not believe the same things we believe—about man, about the universe, about God.

If we in America, of whatever political opinion at the moment, are to prove worthy of this most terrible testing in our Nation's life, we too must resolve with Lincoln, "that, under God, this Nation shall have a new birth of freedom."

It was under God that our freedom was born. Only under God can there be a rebirth.

What then is our role to be? Listen again to Lincoln in his message to the Congress in 1862, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty, and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think anew, and act anew. We must disenthrall ourselves, and then we shall save our country."

There it is:

Under God, a new birth of freedom;

A new and deeper understanding of it;

A new and deeper dedication to it.

With such a rebirth within you and me, and within our beloved party, we shall deserve to be entrusted by the people with the awful responsibilities of governing this great land. And they will turn to us and our country will be saved.

And now let us get to work.

How U.N. Fares After 15 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I am inserting into the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a thoughtful article which appeared in the Toledo (Ohio) Blade of Sunday, June 26, 1960, by Miss Judith Laikin, a talented and extremely intelligent writer.

The article briefly summarizes the history of the U.N., and is a careful, brief appraisal of its 15 years existence:

HOW U.N. FARES AFTER 15 YEARS

(By Judith Laikin)

What has become of the great expectations that focused on the birth of the United Nations at San Francisco, 15 years ago today? Have they been justified? Or does the U.N. fall short of the high ideals of its charter?

The heart of the U.N. Charter is article 39, which authorizes the Security Council to maintain international peace and security—or restore it after it has gone to pieces. In a world where nations use force to take what they can get, the ability of the Security Council to keep the peace depends on its having force at its disposal. This was provided for in the charter, too.

The great powers were never able to agree on the composition, disposition, and command of a permanent U.N. force, and it never came into being. On the one occasion when the U.N. went to war—in Korea—the decision was made during the absence of the Soviet Union from its sessions.

Under terms of the charter, the Security Council can act only when all five permanent members agree. At San Francisco, the United States, England, Russia, France, and China each insisted on the right to veto any decision made by the other 4, even if they carried a majority of the 11-member council with them. The U.S. delegation in particular insisted on this point, in order to protect American national interests.

The general hope in the postwar years was that the great powers would all want peace badly enough to be willing to compromise their differences and vote unanimously. In any event, it was recognized that, without

great power cooperation, it would be impossible to enforce any U.N. decision.

The veto power remains with us, not as a hindrance to Security Council action but as a symbol of the deep cleavage between the Communist and non-Communist world, the developed and the underdeveloped world.

It is easier for any nation to compromise an issue in which its own national interests are not at stake. Consequently, the U.N. has had greatest success in resolving disputes among the lesser powers. Fighting between India and Pakistan in Kashmir was brought to halt. An uneasy truce was established between Israel and the Arab States. Indonesia was granted its independence from the Netherlands. In these disputes and others among the smaller nations, the U.N. laid down the law whenever the Big Five agreed to do so.

On the other hand, cases involving one of the Big Five have proved intractable. France dealt with Indochina, and later with Algeria, on a one-to-one basis, defying interference by the U.N. The Soviet Union held that the rebellion in Hungary was a domestic affair, and no concrete U.N. action could be taken. Soviet-United States disagreement on Lebanon prevented U.N. action in that country.

It is true that England and France, permanent members of the Big Five club, were forced to withdraw from Suez in 1956, but this came about because the U.S. and U.S.S.R. were in agreement.

If the U.N. lacks strength to operate in the sphere of great power politics, what good is it?

For one thing, the U.N. has assisted at the birth of a number of new nations. These might have come into existence anyway. But the UN facilitated the process in two ways: by exerting moral pressure on European countries to vacate their colonies, and by providing economic assistance to newly independent countries.

A dozen nations which were not even in existence 15 years ago are now members of the United Nations. More will become independent this year.

More than this, the U.N. has provided a forum in which the smaller nations can be heard. This is at least a start toward diluting the unrestricted power of the Big Five. The General Assembly, where every member is represented and has one vote, is a handy ready reference to the state of world affairs. Since 1950, when the General Assembly was strengthened by the "uniting for peace" resolution, most of the problems that beset the international community have been discussed here, either formally or informally.

The specialized agencies have done a lot for human beings who have never heard of the U.N. The World Health Organization is eradicating malaria and tuberculosis, and thus raising the work capacity of millions of people who had been half sick all their lives. The U.N. Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization is supplying books and teachers to the schools of developing African states. In addition, the older, long established international organizations that we couldn't do without—such as the Universal Postal Union and the World Meteorological Organization—now link up through the U.N.

The existence of these agencies, and of an international secretariat located at the permanent seat of the U.N. in New York, gives some substance to that dream of a world community that has tantalized men ever since the first bigot threw a stone at his neighbor.

For some, there is disappointment that the U.N. is no more than this. They expected world government, and the U.N. gives no indication of becoming one.

Others are equally disappointed that the U.N. has not faded away. They regard it as a possible source of interference in our national politics.

Both idealists and cynics may have misinterpreted the U.N. As a treaty agreement between 82 sovereign nations, the U.N. naturally reflects the world of power politics outside it. If the Security Council fails to act under its charter authority, it is because the Big Five cannot agree what action to take together. If the General Assembly oversteps its bounds to interfere in a nation's domestic affairs, it is because a majority of the nations vote to do so. Enforcement is another matter, and there the veto applies.

The U.N. has its uses, when enough countries agree on what those uses should be. Since almost everybody agrees that it can be a great sounding board for national propaganda, it has become that. What else the United Nations can be, is up to its members.

WHAT PEOPLE AROUND THE WORLD THINK OF U.N.—ACTED AS FIRE BRIGADE, WASTE OF MONEY

What is the image of the United Nations in the eyes of ordinary people all over the world? What do they think of its accomplishments? Do they think it has made the world a better place to live in?

Associated Press correspondents around the globe recently went out to obtain answers to these questions. They focused primarily on the man on the street, avoiding diplomats and government officials.

A composite picture emerged in this general pattern:

A majority of those questioned are still optimistic about the United Nations and believe it has done some good.

"Over the years the U.N. has grown, and this means that people want it," said Basna Chaarawi, an Egyptian university student.

"I think it has worked out pretty well," said Tong Chiu, employee of an import-export firm in Hong Kong. "At least, the world has this place to try to settle differences. Without it, the nations would have no place to do so."

About two-thirds of all the hundreds questioned around the world gave answers like these.

Dissenters gave these answers:

A Polish student of economy, who asked not to be identified, said, "There is no hope whatsoever of world peace and brotherhood because Russia is an expanding nation and will not renounce its hold over the satellite countries. All compromises reached in the United Nations were attained at a cost to the non-Communist countries."

"Problems are never really allowed to be solved by the United Nations," said Antonio de Castro Araujo Silva, a Brazilian seaman. "Both sides use it as a platform for propaganda."

"It's a waste of good money and time. I'm in favor of eliminating it. I don't believe it could be improved," said Thomas D. Brooks a Louisiana employment officer.

"The United Nations has reached a futile stage," said John F. Day, an Australian businessman. "A number of nations are not cooperating and the United Nations will be frustrated by these nations."

Disputes between nations color the views of the citizens of the countries involved:

"India complained about Pakistani aggression in Kashmir," said Pawan Kapur, a student in New Delhi, India. "What on earth is the United Nations doing about it?"

"The U.N. is doing many good things," said Mustafa Osman, a gardener in Cairo, Egypt, "but remember it created Israel. If there was no U.N., there wouldn't be an Israel or a million Arab refugees."

The advantages of the United Nations as a forum where nations can debate their differences were noted by many of those who admire the organization—

"The U.N. is better than no U.N.," said a woman librarian in Tokyo. "It has brought open discussion of world issues before an international forum. It also is an advancement in that it provides a place for new, young, and backward countries to meet, to cooperate, and become stronger."

Critics and admirers alike agreed that the United Nations had been useful in halting some wars and that the probabilities of continued peace today are greater because of it—

"The U.N. has helped in many crises, Suez and Vietnam, for example," said a Japanese clerk.

Lars Nenander, a Swedish policeman, and former member of the U.N. Emergency Force in the Gaza Strip, said: "I believe the U.N. avoided, or let's say postponed, a bigger scale war in 1956 (in the Middle East). The U.N. might be able to stop the civil war in Algeria if France would permit."

"The U.N. did not prevent fighting in Korea or Budapest," said a Polish hotel clerk. "But it has prevented war in the Far East."

"The U.N. has acted as a fire brigade," said Stockholm Restaurant Manager Gunnar Wiberg. "The speed and the efficiency are impressive. The U.N. is not to blame for the failures. The responsibility must be shifted to the nations concerned."

Friends and foes of the United Nations agreed that the organization's greatest problem is misuse of the veto in the Security Council:

"The U.N. hasn't made much progress because the veto is always there to be used to prevent something being done," said Ted Dolly, a London telephone operator.

"The veto power was not a bright idea," said Hans Frese, a Berlin salesman. "A simple majority vote would be better."

"The organization should be strengthened," said a Warsaw bookkeeper, "but I do not see how this can be done unless the veto is abolished."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Orchard Picnic Address by Senator Byrd of Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at my Annual Orchard Picnic, at Berryville, Va., on August 27, 1960.

There being no objection, the adress was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD AT HIS ANNUAL ORCHARD PICNIC, BERRYVILLE, VA., AUGUST 27, 1960

This is the 37th year I have had the great pleasure of greeting my friends at these annual picnics.

Today we pay tribute to Walter Hough, chief entomologist at the Fruit Research Laboratory for this area. I know of no man who has rendered greater service during the 49 years he has served the fruitgrowers so faithfully and well.

It so happens that I planted my first apple orchard 57 years ago, so he and I have grown up together in the apple business.

I had faith in the apple business then and have had through the years. I am still planting on a replacement basis. In the last few years I have pulled out over 25,000 trees, which were not productive or profitable varieties.

We have our problems and they are serious, but we are better prepared to meet them because the apple industry receives no subsidy, bonus or favor from the Federal Government. We stand on our own feet.

When I pass on and my sons and grandsons and maybe great-grandsons continue to operate the apple business, I hope they will do all they can, as I have done, to resist any and all efforts to subsidize and control the apple industry by the Federal Government.

I want to tell you something of my recent trip to Switzerland. It was very educational and at the same time most enjoyable. I went with my friend, Blackburn Moore.

On the day the Democratic candidates were nominated at Los Angeles, we had a summit meeting on the highest mountain in Switzerland—over 14,000 feet. We were enjoying the cool air there and were happy to miss the hot air at Los Angeles.

While in Switzerland we were the guests, for a part of the time, of Mr. and Mrs. Henry J. Taylor. He is our American Ambassador whose home is at Charlottesville.

We saw Switzerland at its best. I was greatly impressed with the cordiality of the Swiss people toward the United States. When we traveled with the Ambassador in his car flying the American flag, the people would clap their hands and smile, indicating their friendliness.

The Swiss has never received a dollar of American aid, and would not take it if we offered it to them. Perhaps that is why they like us so well.

I venture to say that in many areas where our contributions have been sent, instead of applauding our flag, they would hiss and condemn it and shout their disapproval, as has been shown in recent instances.

It is time that America learns that we cannot buy friendship with dollars. So far, we have expended over $80 billion in foreign aid, and much of it has been wasted and squandered in the most shameful fashion.

Incidentally, all of this $80 billion has been added to the public debt for future generations to pay.

The last foreign aid bill was more fantastic than any other because it included $100 million for the Congo, where there has been wholesale rape of the white women of Belgium and the killing and murdering of the Belgians who have accomplished such development as there is in that area.

It is peculiarly difficult to understand this. When the Senate passed this bill, the Congo was in the act of defying the United Nations; but this shows to what extremes fallacious policies can be extended.

I was deeply impressed with the Swiss Government. It is a combination of direct and representative democracy. Emphasis on local and Canton rule makes it close to pure democracy. I had a long conference with the President and his Council.

The executive power of the National Government is placed in a 7-man board known as the Federal Council. The Council is similar to our National Cabinet. The President is chosen from among the members of the Council, and serves 1 year.

Their taxes are reasonable. They have no debt. But, at the same time, they maintain a well trained army of 600,000 men out of a population of 5 million, and have a powerful air force with jet planes.

The Swiss people have lived amid wars on the European Continent for generations, without permitting violation of their territory. The mighty Hitler had this in mind during World War II, but he did not attempt it. The Swiss have a remarkable record of permitting no interference from other nations no matter how powerful.

Swiss law provides that when a member of a family is sick or needs help, the others in the family must take care of their own as far as possible. There is no Federal public assistance such as we have developed in this country.

Swiss bankers are perhaps the ablest in the world. I was deeply interested in my conversations with them. The economy, the business and the Government of Switzerland are based on free enterprise and individual liberty.

We landed at Zurich after a flight of just 6½ hours from New York. We went to Geneva, and on to Bern where we were guests of Ambassador Taylor. From there we went to Lucerne and St. Moritz. We drove back to Zurich through Liechtenstein and Austria.

I wish everyone could visit Switzerland. You would see some of the most superb scenery in the world and the hotels are wonderful. You would become acquainted with fine sturdy people. You would be inspired to fight for individual liberties and States rights.

These liberties and rights are among the fundamental principles which have made our country, in a brief span of time, the greatest democracy in all the world. These principles must be protected and preserved; and there are serious indications that we need to be reminded of this.

I say this with all the sincerity of which I am capable: if we undermine our fundamental principles, and impair our fiscal solvency in the next 25 to 30 years as we have in the past quarter of a century, I cannot believe our democracy will survive.

Perhaps it is the inspiration of Switzerland that leads me to some observations which I believe should be made today. Certainly, there is an element of contrast. This leads me to comment briefly about what has been going on in this country.

The people of Virginia have been extremely generous with their confidence in me. I have held public office almost continuously for more than 40 years. They have allowed me to represent them in the Senate of the United States for nearly 30 years.

I think I know the views of the citizens of our great Commonwealth, and the principles for which they stand, and I have always fought for them. I shall never stop fighting for them. It is a source of deep regret that I have been unable to do more.

I say this as I think over the trends toward centralization in the Federal Government over the past 30 years; and we must keep this trend in mind as we attempt to act intelligently on public matters which will affect the lives of all of us in the future.

Perhaps the two greatest foundation stones of our form of government are individual liberty and State sovereignty. These are the greatest deterrents to centralized government. Centralization of government leads to socialism.

Our great free enterprise system depends on individual freedom and States rights. Free enterprise will diminish as centralization of government and socialistic trends increase. These are vital truths to keep in mind in our efforts to preserve our form of government.

Looking to the future, against the background of trends over the past 30 years, there is reason for concern; and more important there is need for awakening. The trends have been toward centralization of government with the inevitable fiscal and socialistic deterioration.

We have had Federal deficits in 24 of those 30 years. Only 8 of the 24 deficits occurred in war years. There have been 16 peacetime deficits. And during the 22 peacetime years the increase in the Federal debt has averaged more than $2 billion a year.

In these 30 years the Federal debt has been increased by $270 billion. It is now more than $286 billion. And in these 30 years interest on the Federal debt has cost the taxpayers of this country more than $114 billion.

Federal taxes 30 years ago took only about 4 percent of the national income; today they are taking nearly 20 percent. And with these increases in debt and taxes the value of the dollar has been reduced to less than 47 cents.

Along with this fiscal deterioration has come continuous centralization of government. Federal programs are embracing an ever-widening area of our economy and endeavor. Federal subsidies are going out through all kinds of loans, grants, and payments.

There are now Federal subsidies for business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, health, education, States, localities, and individuals.

Subsidies are under bureaucratic control; to take them means giving up a measure of independence and freedom.

Some 40 million people will receive payments from the Federal Treasury this year totaling some $40 billion, including social security. With their families these 40 million people could easily reach a number equivalent to half of our population.

Federal payments to people on so-called public assistance rolls are now totaling more than $2 billion a year. Thirty years ago such payments were unknown. Over the 30-year period Federal payments through programs of this type have totaled about $25 billion.

The Federal Government is now subsidizing housing in the form of grants, loans, guarantees, insurance, etc., to a total of more than $10 billion a year. The first significant Federal program in housing was the HOLC established in 1933. Since then gross Federal housing subsidies have exceeded $110 billion.

Federal payments through various programs in the field of education are now totaling over $1 billion a year. Thirty years ago the total was less than $10 million. During the 30-year period Federal payments in various forms of educational benefits have totaled about $25 billion.

Federal payments to States, localities, and individuals under numerous health programs now total $500 million a year, exclusive of huge direct Federal expenditures for related programs. Thirty years ago Federal activity in this field was negligible. Over the 30-year period Federal payments to States, localities, and individuals in the field of public health have totaled $2¼ billion.

Thirty years ago there was a mere handful of Federal programs for payments to States, localities, and individuals, costing about $100 million. Now there are at least 90 of these payment programs, and expenditures total $9.6 billion a year.

The programs I have cited are domestic-civilian, with little or no relation to military preparedness or foreign aid. They do not include tremendous subsidy areas in the fields of agriculture, industry, merchant marine, power, transportation, small business, etc.

Think of the increases I have mentioned in terms of percentage, and compare them with an increase of about 45 percent in our population over the period, an increase of about 245 percent in our industrial production, and an increase of about 432 percent in our national income.

When you analyze Federal programs in search of expenditures with subsidy aspects, the results are astonishing. It is disheartening to realize what this means in terms of centralization of government and trends toward socialism.

Thinking of Switzerland's fine example of sound democracy at work, at this 37th picnic I want to emphasize my belief that our great democracy can and should live throughout the ages.

I have confidence in our future if the citizens of the Nation will oppose those things which are destructive of the principles underlying our form of government, our free enterprise system, our individual liberties, and our national solvency.

A City With a Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to bring to the attention of the Congress that there is located in the 14th Congressional District of Texas, which I have the honor to represent, one of the most progressive and thriving cities to be found anywhere in the United States. I refer to the city of Seguin, the county seat of Guadalupe County, Tex. This is a city of rapid growth, of great industrial potential, and exceptionally broad economic base.

The August issue of the Texas Industry, the official magazine of the Texas Manufacturers Association, is dedicated to the city of Seguin and contains, among other things, an excellent article describing the many economic blessings enjoyed by this wonderful city, and points out the exceptionally bright future which it holds.

Under unanimous consent I insert this article in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, including extraneous matter:

SEGUIN

Seguin led the way when America's first successful satellite blasted off Cape Canaveral on January 31, 1958, to orbit the earth every 114.8 minutes. For the nose cone of that bullet-shaped Jupiter C missile was made of laminated Fiberglass woven on the looms of a Seguin industrial plant, the Coast Manufacturing & Supply Co. Integral parts of that satellite, Explorer, also were comprised of elements originating at the south-central Texas plant.

Big news? Not to the industrial cosmopolites of bustling Seguin.

They knew the Explorer's nose cone and component parts weren't the first Seguin-manufactured products to orbit the earth. Everything from canned goods and hats to furniture and steel had already found markets throughout the world.

Situated 33 miles east of San Antonio and 55 miles southwest of Austin, the progressive Seguin community is united in its efforts to pave the way for the establishment of more industries in its area. Its 15,000 city residents and the 50,000 residents in the immediate labor and trade territory have long recognized the value in the slogan: "Seguin is good for industry, and industry is good for Seguin."

Nature, a cooperative citizenship and city government, and an advanced Seguin Industrial Foundation have combined to offer a perfect formula for industry. Important elements of this formula include a good town to live in, a large and friendly labor supply, favorable geographical location, excellent transportation and freight systems, and, last but not least, a fine public attitude toward industry.

The city administration, for example, had as one of its election planks the promise to assist new and current industries in any way possible. Mayor Wintford Owen is an outspoken advocate of increasing industry for Seguin, and he is taking a leading role along these lines. Other men who have long taken leading roles in the Seguin industrial picture are included in the membership of the Seguin Industrial Foundation, an organization dedicated to continuing, successful industrial development of the Seguin area. They subsequently purchased a 40-acre industrial plat adjacent to the Southern Pacific Railway lines, and today the railway is committed to providing rail spurs for each additional industry requiring these added shipping facilities.

A variety of developments has since taken place within the tract.

A furniture factory, a large cotton warehouse, and a continually expanding Fiberglass plant have taken over various sections of the plant. Mr. R. E. Merritt, president of the Coast Manufacturing & Supply Co., recently announced a $300,000 expansion program for the Seguin plant. He further stated, "The employee-management relationship in our plant here in Seguin is the best we've ever seen. Choice of Seguin for locating this plant has proven a very happy one for us. The local relationship of our plant is excellent, the attitude of the people is wonderful, and the spirit of the town is very good. I had enough faith in Seguin to buy stock in the Seguin Industrial Foundation. I've never been more well pleased."

Louis Saegert, current president of the Seguin Industrial Foundation, explains, "Our area's potential for caring for more industry is so great that we have a long program ahead of us before we even scratch the surface."

The progressive board of directors of the Seguin Industrial Foundation includes a good cross section of area business and professional men. They are Clark Core, D. W. Reneau, Fred Fuhrmann, Andrew Traeger, and Laud Walters, industrialists. Members who are bankers include Walter Fey, Leo Freis, and Oscar Weigang. Retainers are Bernard Lenowitz, Louis Glaeser, H. E. Stautzenberger and J. D. Jamison. Remaining members include W. L. Ray and Paul Willmann, insurance, Stan McKenzie, advertising, E. W. Bartholomae, retired businessman, and attorney Saegert.

Seguin has been designated as a labor surplus area by the Texas Employment Commission. In fact, Seguin could immediately staff a new industrial plant with some 3,000 employees, or a combination of new industries requiring that many workers.

Seguin's reputation as being good for industry is beginning to be accepted throughout the Nation. A recent report by the General Electric Co. revealed that firm had considered only two Texas cities for construction of a new million-dollar plant. One of those cities under consideration was Seguin, the other Houston.

Seguin is a beautiful, popular city located along the winding banks of the ever-flowing Guadalupe River. Seguin's geographical location proves an excellent one for most industries, being very close to large market areas.

Railroads and superhighways throughout Seguin and Guadalupe County provide excellent transportation for the shipping of products.

Other industrial attractions in Seguin include:

A favorable tax situation.

An unlimited water supply is available.

An unlimited power supply is available.

A big labor market exists.

Two recent exhibitions of Seguin's capabilities, meanwhile, were the successful passing of an $875,000 school bond issue and a $600,000 city sewer bond issue. Both issues were approved by Seguin voters within a 6 months' period.

The educational facilities include a completely new, model elementary and high school system. Over $2 million has been spent during the past decade to build new schools in the Seguin Independent School District. The school system comprises: Five elementary schools which had a 1959 enrollment of 2,048, 2 high schools with an enrollment of 1,438, a parochial school and a rapidly growing senior college, which is Texas Lutheran College.

Seguin recreational facilities are the pride of this end of Texas. In fact, within the city of Seguin itself there are 190 acres of beautiful parks.

An abundance of fishing and hunting for quail, dove, duck, deer, turkey, bass, catfish, crappie, and perch is available in the Seguin area.

Farsighted developers have taken advantage of the Seguin area's abundance of natural resources for recreational facilities. These developers have built a semiresort area near Seguin with the emphasis on leisurely living and wonderful recreational facilities.

The Richmond Development Co. has developed an island in Lake McQueeney 5 miles

west of Seguin. The company has captured the imaginations of south Texas residents by naming the area Treasure Island. Beautiful homes—ranging from modern sprawling ranch-style homes to oriental and early American—winding roads, canals waterfrontage for every home and a beautiful clear blue lake with a constant water level are features of the luxurious island.

Three modern medical clinics and a 26-bed hospital, 12 physicians and surgeons, and 6 dentists comprise the medical protection for the Seguin area. There is also a city and county health department with a staff of two doctors and one nurse.

As far as the housing situation is concerned, Seguin has 40 apartment houses and several hundred rent houses. During the past year, some 70 houses were constructed, including 95 percent on the inside of Seguin city limits and 5 percent outside the city limits. Local living quarters are also aided by nine hotels and motels in Seguin which have a total room capacity of 115. There are also some 21 eating establishments with a total seating and eating capacity of 300.

Another organization playing an important role in helping to maintain a good industrial climate in Seguin and Guadalupe County is the chamber of commerce.

The organization, with Jack Stewart proving to be an industrial-minded manager, was highly toasted by last year's president of the South Texas Chamber of Commerce in these words: "I pay tribute to the accomplishment of the Seguin and Guadalupe County Chamber of Commerce in helping to advance its area industrially in a diversified series of strategically important local industries."

One of the essential ingredients in Seguin's industrial development is the support of Seguin's banking institutions. Knowing the full value of industry to a community, the three Seguin banks have often been instrumental in obtaining industry. Two prominent Seguin families head the city's banking and financial institutions. The industrial-conscious Henry Donegan family heads the First National Bank. Henry Donegan, Sr., is president of the Nolte National Bank while son John is the chief executive officer of the First National Bank. Henry Donegan, Jr., is president of the Seguin Savings and Loan Association, an institution that lends great weight to the acquisition of industry. Seguin's other banking family is the H. H. Weinert family. The Weinert family operates the Seguin State Bank & Trust Co. Mrs. Hilda Weinert was recently elected Democratic national committeewoman from Texas, a position she has held previously. The influence of these two prominent families and their financial institutions has been an important factor in the Seguin industrial growth story.

The Seguin industries run the gamut of diversification.

Those current industries include:

Briell-Rodgers Cotton Goods Co., work clothing; Coast Manufacturing & Supply, Fiberglass cloth; Coca-Cola Bottling Co., soft drinks; Crump's Woodwork, door frames, window units and other millwork, and the Faber Furniture Co., furniture manufacturing.

Also, Guadalupe County Publishing Co., publishing and printing; Guadalupe Locker Storage Corp., fresh meats; Guadalupe Tortilla, tortillas; and E. L. Haner Co., leather products. Also, Hey's Potato Chips Factory; Lardies Interiors, drapes, custom household furniture; Palm Braids Products Corp., straw hats; Rank Sheet Metal Co., metal fabrication, and Ready-Mix Concrete Co.

Also, Seguin Baking Co.; Seguin Cotton Oil Co., poultry feeds; Seguin Milling Co., wheat flour, corn meal, livestock and poultry feeds; and Seguin Publishing Co., publishing and printing.

Also, Seguin Venetian Blind Co., Seguin Welding & Machine Works, small drilling rigs; South Texas Printing Co., commercial printing; Structural Metals, Inc., steel reinforcing bars, and Texas Pecan Co., shelled pecans.

And including Frito Co., Mexican food and bean dip; Traeger Milling Co., corn meal and prepared feeds; United Cotton Goods Co., men's duck, coats, pants, smocks, and so forth; D & D Bumper Works, steel fabrication, buildings, truck bumpers, and Stahmann Mobile Structures, homes, offices, buildings, and beach cottages.

Seguin Milling Co. is the oldest industry in Guadalupe County. The mill, which carries the "White House" label, has the world's shopping counters as its market. Seguin men playing important roles in the growth of the mill include Joe Gibbs, Walter and Eugene Nolte, J. T. Holmes, H. Troell, Sr., Otto Troell, Edgar Nolte, and E. B. Camiade.

Faber Furniture Co. currently produces between 300 to 350 furniture suites for Sears' southwestern area per month. The founder is George Faber.

The Frito Co., founded by the late William Chambers, produces a complete line of Mexican foods and specialty items which total up to 17 different products.

Seguin Baking Co. is another industry that was envisioned, planned, and worked by a Seguin family, the Keller family.

Reneau Bros. Produce Co.'s advance from a few barnyard chickens to the opening of a $350,000 poultry plant this year.

Coast Manufacturing & Supply Co. is currently in its sixth year of operation in the Seguin area. Almost $1 million have already been invested in the plant, and more expansion is being blueprinted for the future.

Structural Metals, Inc., has an employment of 160 men and a half-million-dollar payroll. The backbone of this organization is a host of progressive Seguin stockholders. The plant is operated by President B. B. Bunting and Executive Vice President Marvin Selig.

It's been pointed out that the surface to Seguin's industrial potential hasn't been scratched. But members of the Seguin Industrial Foundation are planning and working night and day to spread the Seguin gospel. And more and more industries are eyeing Seguin as a home for their new plants.

Address Delivered by Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, on the Acceptance by Him of a Distinguished Service Award

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on August 29, 1960, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] delivered a magnificent address before the Section on Insurance, Negligence and Compensation Law of the American Bar Association. The address is worthy of the attention not only of the lawyers of the country but also of the people of the United States as a whole.

Senator BYRD is one of the greatest citizens in our Nation today, and I feel that any statement by him is worthy of note by the people of this country.

I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA, ACCEPTING DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARD, BEFORE THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION SECTION OF INSURANCE, NEGLIGENCE, AND COMPENSATION LAW, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 29, 1960

I am honored by this award from the American Bar Association Section of Insurance, Negligence, and Compensation Law. I am not a lawyer, but my father was; and from him I first learned the sources of sovereign power, the principles of our system, and the reasons to respect the law.

I want you to know that, coming from you and coming in these times, this occasion is doubly rewarding. You are an organization of many of the Nation's finest and most responsible citizens. And these are times when friendly public reference to a conservative is rare indeed.

I am a conservative; I have been called unreconstructed. I wear the label with pride if it marks me as one who fights for the fundamentals on which we have developed the finest system of government ever known. I fight for these fundamentals because I believe in them.

I believe sound progress should be the primary purpose in every man's life. Sound progress is the source of strength. But progress is not sound unless it is based on sound financing; this is another application of checks and balances which have been so useful in our Government.

I believe that in the United States we are blessed with all the elements for sound individual progress and, therefore, for national progress. We have the people, resources, climate, and geography; and our system of government was designed for freedom, including freedom to work with incentive.

I believe the character of our governmental system stimulates enterprise and strength. It is a system characterized by local autonomy, State sovereignty, and a central government in three separate, coordinate branches—each limited in power and authority by the Constitution.

I believe that under our system we are the greatest and most productive Nation in history. The principles on which we have thrived must be preserved, and they must be defended wherever they are attacked. They guarantee our freedoms, nourish our free enterprise, and make sound progress possible.

I believe it is the sound productivity and strength developed under this system that have brought us to world power in relatively for generations. Historically, lives of nations are measured in hundreds of years. I want the life of this Nation to be the longest and the best.

I believe continuing centralization of government will destroy our freedoms and our strength. We have already gone too far. Excessive centralization inevitably leads to excessive central edict and regulation, and to excessive Federal competition and taxation. In short, it produces the evils of State socialism.

I believe our people want our system perpetuated and strengthened. Basically, the requirements are: simple honesty and individual initiative; self-reliance and willing work; constructive production and free competition; and progressive development and sound financing.

I believe that with responsible citizenship, good government and fiscal soundness there would be no fear for the future. But without these, there will be neither solid progress nor security with military preparedness. I think we face these alternatives today.

We are in a new era of atomic energy, rockets and space. Our population is increasing. Our resources are great. Our pro-

ductive know-how and capacity are unsurpassed. In such conditions representative democracy with free enterprise should thrive soundly for the good of all mankind.

But I have a feeling of anxiety, and I suspect most of you know it too. Our Government is being challenged from abroad and undermined at home. This Nation is showing signs of weakness when it should be strongest. The reasons run back over 30 years and they can be documented.

Our strength is being sapped by the paternalism of Federal bureaucracy grown too big, usurpation of power by the Warren court grown too mighty, and force of labor leaders grown too arrogant. These are undermining our system, changing our attitudes, and hobbling our will for freedom.

We have deficits and threats of continuing deficits; we have debt, and inflation; we have foreign trade balance trouble and dwindling gold reserves; there are Communist gains in their race against the free world in the scientific, military, foreign relations, and economic fields. These are serious weaknesses which must be reversed.

I have been a Member of the U.S. Senate since 1933. I have seen the reasons for most of these weaknesses develop. I have tried to prevent them. I wish I could have done more. I am still trying.

It may be of interest to you to look briefly at the 30-year record since 1930 for signs and areas of weakness; and it should be noted that in this period our population has increased about 45 percent; industrial production has increased 240 percent; and national income has increased 432 percent.

But, in the same period the number of Federal agencies has increased 100 percent; Federal employees have increased 300 percent; Federal debt has increased 1,700 percent; Federal tax collections have increased 1,800 percent; and Federal expenditures have increased 2,300 percent.

Thirty years ago Federal programs for grants to States and localities could be counted on the fingers of one hand, including those for highways and land grant colleges. Federal expenditures through these programs at that time totaled about $100 million.

Now there are 60 listed Federal programs for grants to States and localities, and Federal expenditures through them are totaling $6.4 billion. And while Federal grants to States and localities have been increasing 6,300 percent, State and local debt has been increased $40 billion, or nearly 300 percent.

Through programs of grants to States and localities—and payments to individuals—Federal subsidies are now flowing to business, industry, private finance, agriculture, transportation, power, housing, health, education, States, localities, and individuals.

Nearly 40 million people will receive payments from the Federal Treasury this year totaling some $40 billion, including social security. With their families these 40 million people could easily reach a number equivalent to half of our population.

While these conditions have been developing over the past three decades, private debt in the United States has been increased nearly 250 percent; inflation has reduced the purchasing power of the dollar more than 53 cents; the value of the dollar is now 46.9 cents by the 1939 index.

It is a mistake to blame all this fiscal deterioration and socialistic growth on war. The combined duration of World War II and the Korean war was 8 years. In the other 22 years without war there were 16 Federal deficits, and the increase in the Federal debt averaged more than $2 billion a year.

The total annual cost of the Federal Government has gone up nearly $16 billion since the Korean war. This is an increase of nearly 25 percent. It may surprise you to know that the great increases in this period were not for military and foreign aid. They were in domestic-civilian programs.

Federal expenditures for these domestic-civilian programs have increased 86 percent in 7 years; they are now totaling $36 billion. These programs too frequently involve multi-year or permanent commitments for heavy spending in the future, and increases in these programs are continuing.

These are some of the signs of weakness, socialism and centralization to be found all around us—but not all. The Federal Supreme Court has undermined our system of government at all levels. This can be traced back to the Roosevelt administration when the President started packing the Court.

Judicial usurpation of power has reached a peak with the Warren court. Its decisions have invaded homes, handicapped police protection, disregarded State sovereignty, interfered with the authority of the executive branch of the Federal Government and usurped the powers of Congress.

You are familiar with the case documentation. For my purposes today, I rely on the chief justices of State supreme courts throughout the Nation. In their 1958 conference at Pasadena, they found reason to urge the Warren court to restrain itself in the exercise of vast power.

The action was taken in the 38 to 6 adoption of a report by 10 eminent jurists. The report was based on intensive study of recent decisions indicating general trends in the area of Federal-State relationships. I shall quote only two brief excerpts. The report said:

"Second only to the increasing dominance of the National Government has been the development of the immense power of the Supreme Court in both State and national affairs. It is not merely the final arbiter of the law; it is the maker of policy in many social and economic fields."

And then the report said further: "It has long been the American boast that we have a Government of laws and not of men. We believe that any study of recent decisions of the Supreme Court will raise at least considerable doubt as the validity of that boast."

It seems to me that there can be no doubt that the Warren Court is undermining our system of government, contributing to centralization of power and authority; and thereby it is sapping our national strength. This makes us more vulnerable to destructive forces at home and abroad.

From experience we have learned that the more government is centralized, the more easily it is influenced—if not yet controlled—by leaders of organized pressure groups. Certainly the political target areas and the ruling officials of the government are more concentrated.

We have learned that the more government is centralized in Federal bureaucracy at Washington, the more it is susceptible to the arrogant influence of labor leaders. Call the roll, Reuther, Hoffa, McDonald, and so on. Make no mistake; these are ruthless men.

Even now there is talk of the Federal Government outlawing State right-to-work statutes. In this connection, think of this fact. In the past 30 years strikes in this country have prevented nearly 3 million man-years of work; that is a loss of nearly 3 million man-years of pay, and nearly 3 million man-years of production.

I have always conceded to good citizens in the rank and file of labor unions the privilege of organizing. I have conceded to legitimate labor unions the privilege of collective bargaining when they represent their members. But, I also concede to men and women the right to work if they choose.

You have seen the parade of some of the labor leaders before the McClellan committee. You have seen them make a mockery of the fifth amendment. Wherever and whenever I could, I have fought against giving such labor leaders power and placing them in position of Federal influence.

Power breeds power, and labor leaders are insatiable in their demands for special privileges and immunities. Federal nullification of all State right-to-work laws is high on their present list of demands.

They want the Federal Government to force membership in a union as a condition of employment. Nearly 50 million, or more than 70 percent of those employed in the United States are not now members of the big national and international unions.

Generally speaking, State right-to-work laws provide that the right of individuals to work shall not be denied on account of either membership or nonmembership in labor organizations.

The Taft-Hartley Act recognizes States rights in this field. Labor leaders want this provision repealed. Without it we could expect the Warren court to strike down every State right-to-work law in the country.

Twenty States to date have enacted right-to-work laws, eight of them with constitutional amendments adopted by referendums. If they are not desired, the people in the States who approved their enactment could bring about their repeal.

But the labor leader pressure is at the Federal level. They want Federal action for wholesale nullification of the States rights these laws represent, and the individual liberty they protect.

I regard the right to work as I do the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. States have the right, the responsibility, and the duty to protect this fundamental freedom. This is my position and I shall fight for it.

I am the only Member now in the Senate who voted against the Wagner Labor Act of 1939, giving special privileges to labor unions and therefore to their leaders. I voted for the Taft-Hartley Act and against the Truman veto. I supported strong labor legislation last year, and I will do it again.

When irresponsible labor leaders have the power virtually to shut down the country, our national security is imperiled. When they have the power to stop production and wages, our economy is impaired. When they have the power to force wage increases without increased production, they create inflation.

You have been good enough to mention my 40 years in public service. I thank you again. I shall try to merit your confidence in the future. In conclusion, let me say that I think our system of government is being menaced by three subverting trends which must be stopped.

These trends are: (1) Increasing Federal paternalism with fiscal deterioration; (2) increasing usurpation of power by the Warren court; and (3) increasing arrogance of labor leaders in their influence over Federal authorities. Reverse these, and I have no doubt about our strength to meet any foreign challenge.

I pledge my unrelenting effort in this direction. But these changes will not come in an attitude of tolerance. There will be no status quo. There will be change.

It is up to all who believe in our system to fight for progress without destroying the fundamental principles of our Government which in a short space of time have made us the greatest Nation in all the world.

Hon. Edward H. Rees

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to associate myself with all the remarks which have been made about ED REES. I think so often, on the American scene today, the American people fail to appreciate the kind of service and the kind of dedication a man gives and has when he serves his nation as has our beloved gentleman from Kansas. Those of us who came to the committee early in our career called him affectionately "Mr. Chairman." I see in him a great lawyer, a great statesman and a great legislator; and I think of the old adage, "We are part of all that we have met." So that, as we go through life, with whatever burdens we bear, we will be better men, better citizens, and better legislators for having known this distinguished gentleman.

I wish for him and Mrs. Rees every happiness deserved by a great citizen and his noble helpmate, conscious of the fact that this country is the better for his service, these generations inspired by their exemplary lives.

Problems of the Airlines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS COTTON
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, a most thought-provoking article on the problems of the Nation's airlines appeared in the New York Times for Sunday, August 28, 1960. The article sets forth some of the problems which plague the airlines and which may have a profound effect on their future. As a member of the Senate Aviation Subcommittee, the article was especially interesting to me, and I believe it merits the attention of the entire Congress.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. AIRLINES FACE DIFFICULT FUTURE AS LOSSES MOUNT—BIG PROBLEM IS FINDING NEW BUSINESS TO MEET SOARING COSTS—WALL STREET WARY

(By Robert E. Bedingfield)

The Nation's airlines, emerging from a spell of stormy financial weather with less damage visible than had been expected, still have plenty of rough flying ahead.

One of their biggest problems for the next year or two will be finding enough additional business to meet the greatly increased costs that they have incurred by their plunge into the jet age.

With faltering Capital Airlines about to save itself by merging with United Airlines, industry observers are inclined to feel the worst may be over.

Those who feel this way believe Capital's narrow escape from bankruptcy will chasten the regulatory authorities. They believe the authorities may feel constrained to adopt a more realistic attitude toward routes, as well as rates, and that things will get better from now on.

Things could hardly get worse.

Six of the twelve domestic trunklines had operating losses in the first half of this year. Despite a 9.1-percent increase in gross revenues to $937,835,131, collectively the 12 trunklines showed an operating loss of $4,863,096, in contrast to last year's operating profit of $58,907,146.

ADVANTAGES QUALIFIED

For the domestic air traveler, the industry's present plight promises a few years of eager service at less than cost, perhaps. But any satisfaction over such a windfall, according to students of transportation, should be qualified by these reflections:

What the passenger may save as an air traveler he may more than lose as a taxpayer, considering the commitment of the country to a lavish network of airlines at almost any cost in subsidy.

Service at less than cost, given by the railroads, finally resulted in a minimum of service as freight revenues dwindled. The airlines have not yet built up freight revenue enough to support passenger deficits, so they may reach the point of deterioration of service a lot quicker than the railroads did.

FARE RISE APPROVED

The airlines now derive 6 percent of their revenues from freight and the rest from fares. They have been working diligently to obtain more freight, and a number of lines are converting former first-class passenger planes to freight service. However, the full potential of the freight market is not expected to develop until an economical new design of cargo aircraft is developed.

The Civil Aeronautics Board, which has the responsibility for promoting the industry as well as for regulating it, recently approved what amounts to a 5-percent increase in fares and announced that it would allow the industry to set rates that would permit it to earn an average "fair" return of 10.5 percent on investment. However, no carrier is expected to achieve such a result this year. In fact, the last previous time the industry showed such a return was in 1955.

One member of the Civil Aeronautics Board has proposed an expedient for restoring profits to the airlines. This method has been given a thorough trial by a number of railroads. The idea is to aim fares and services at getting passengers out of their automobiles. The railroads that have tried this have been uniformly unsuccessful and have wound up moving just as few passengers in bright new cars as they did in dingy cars.

The CAB Commissioner who so strongly favors the promotional fare attack is Alan S. Boyd. Mr. Boyd concedes that the airplanes have taken about all the passengers they can hope to get from the railroads and the buses. In fact, the airlines now handle more business in intercity service than the railroads and buses combined.

The remaining riders on buses and trains, Mr. Boyd says, "today either want to use those modes of transportation or cannot reach their destinations by commercial air carriers."

FAST SERVICE BACKED

Mr. Boyd's formula for luring the private automobile driver into the airplane is fast, ontime service, with no frills. This is what the airlines' coach services were designed to provide, but the airlines are finding that the coaches, instead of dragging people out of their automobiles, are dragging them out of the higher-fare first-class seats.

This has developed to the fullest extent with the industry's conversion to jet airliners, which, because of their speed and size, can carry three times as many passengers over a given period as the latest models of piston planes.

In July the trunk airlines flew 2.2 billion first-class seat-miles and 2 billion coach seat-miles. However, only 55.44 percent of the first-class capacity was occupied, while 70.43 percent of the coach capacity was sold.

Wall Street has taken due note of the airlines' deteriorating financial status and so have investors. Albert H. Gordon, senior partner in Kidder, Peabody & Co., stresses the flight of capital from the airlines, particularly on the part of the investment trusts.

"A compilation of 67 investment management groups," Mr. Gordon observes, "showed substantial liquidation of airline holdings in the first 3 months this year by trusts previously owning such shares."

Mr. Gordon notes that among the more prominent transactions by the trusts was the liquidation of 131,300 shares of American Airlines by 8 funds, 5 of which sold out their positions completely.

CONFIDENCE SHAKEN

Moreover, Mr. Gordon stresses, investors' confidence has been so shaken that, with the exception of Northeast Airlines, now in merger discussions with Trans World Airlines, the common stock of every trunk line recently was selling at varying discounts from book value. This has never happened before in the industry's history, Mr. Gordon says.

Some industry experts say that arithmetic shows that what the airlines need is not more seats on more routes but fewer seats—at least fewer empty seats—and perhaps fewer routes. The last year that the airlines generally made money in habit-forming amounts was 1955, when 64.05 percent of all the seats that were flown were filled. This year, with less than 60 percent of all seats occupied, the industry has been losing money at an alarming rate.

Whether the good sense of cutting back service to meet demand can overcome local pressures and empire building on the part of airline executives and Willard's law, which states that no executive voluntarily merges himself out of a job, is what investors are waiting to see. In any case, more and more Wall Streeters are taking the view that the industry will continue to be plagued by insufficient earnings and that some other weaker carriers may disappear or be forced, like Capital, to take the merger route.

The problem in essence continues to be: Too many airlines are flying between too many places, many of them the same places.

OVERLAPPING ROUTES

For example, today nine airlines fly between New York and Washington. Five lines serve Chicago and New York and six connect Boston and New York. There also are six serving Detroit and New York and seven Tampa and Miami.

Whereas at the end of the war only one line flew between Detroit and Pittsburgh, today four compete for the traffic. Three lines serve New York and Los Angeles and three serve New York and San Francisco.

Remove the Patent Monkey from NASA's Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the world was forcefully reminded of the crucial competition for national superiority in the field of space and astronautics—and I say "crucial"

because it is now conceded that space exploration is becoming a prime influence in the idealogical struggle between the free world and the Iron Curtain countries.

The reminder came in the form of Russia's Sputnik V, reportedly a 5-ton satellite containing almost a menagerie, which circled the earth for 24 hours and then was successfully brought back to land at a selected point in the Soviet Union. While the time involved was too short for Western scientists to check the truth of the Soviet claims, there appears to be no reason at present to doubt them.

Assuming they are correct, therefore, it is obvious that the Soviets are not far away from successfully placing man into space. Many experts, in fact, are predicting that this will take place within a month or two. If so, both the scientific and political ramifications of the feat will be very great indeed.

The reason for my brief review of the situation is to emphasize two things:

One is that, no matter how we rationalize it, we cannot get away from the fact that America's national space effort is vital to our security and our prestige and that we cannot afford to be second in this effort to the Soviets or anybody else.

The other point is that, in spite of the recognized importance of our space program, we are still indulging in an incredible sort of public myopia by forcing the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to operate under provisions of patent law which hamper its efforts to improve space technology.

Mr. Speaker, I do not at this time care to get into the argument of how the United States stands vis-a-vis the Soviets in the so-called space race. As I have pointed out, the Soviets are very formidable. Nonetheless, in a relatively short time United States achievements have been remarkable and it would be idiotic to downgrade the worth of such recent ventures as Tiros, Transit, Pioneer V, Discoverer, and Echo. I note that Britain's eminent astronomer and space authority, Prof. A. C. B. Lovell, has said in just the past few days that the Russians "undoubtedly have a lead of several years over the Americans in their ability to put extremely heavy objects into orbit and also in the precision of their guidance. But, on the other hand, the Americans, from the extremely wide scope of their scientific experiments and their ability to extract fundamental results, have a considerable lead over the Russians."

This is not to suggest that our space program is all it should or could be. I have been critical of that program in some aspects in the past. I expect to be so again in the future. That is part of the function of the committee which I have to honor to chair. But I hope our criticisms will always be constructive ones leading to the fulfillment of our basic objective—which is to help make the American space effort as sound, effective, rapid, and economical as possible.

And it is in connection with this basic objective, Mr. Speaker, that I again emphasize the need to change NASA's organic act in order to free the Space Agency from its unduly burdensome patent provisions.

I am at a loss to understand the logic of continuing to require NASA to function in a condition of partial paralysis.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 forces NASA to take the entire right, title, and interest to patentable inventions made by contractors in the course of their work with the Space Agency. Worse, it does not allow anyone to receive a patent on any invention which may have significant utility for aeronautics or space unless the inventor can prove that his brainchild was developed without the aid of Government money.

Is it any wonder that NASA has difficulty in getting the best research available and getting it economically?

In most cases, all the Government really wants, needs or can use is a permanent royalty-free license to inventions made under space research contracts. And this right the Government always obtains under NASA contracts. So why do we demand that the space agency clutter and foul its vitally important contract processes with patent provisions which are anathema to private enterprise and generally useless to the Government and the public? Why NASA—when other Government agencies (with the exception of the Atomic Energy Commission) are free to contract for research and development as they please?

Mr. Speaker, the committee on Science and Astronautics, through its patents subcommittee headed by Representative ERWIN MITCHELL, of Georgia, and in full committee, investigated this complex patent problem for nearly a year. We found that the provisions tended to retard the conduct of the national space effort. And we agreed with the contention of NASA that the law could be amended in a manner to permit far greater contract flexibility and at the same time continue to safeguard the public interest from any flagrant misuse of government rights and funds.

We very carefully drafted a new provision which eventually drew the approval of Government experts, of industry, of the patent law profession and of small business.

That provision was contained in a bill—H.R. 12049—amending several parts of the Space Act. It was debated in the House for 2 days last June. At that time any arguments of potential dangers to the public interest, alleged by some to be inherent in the new provisions, were conclusively shown to be without foundation. The House passed the bill by the overwhelming vote of 235 to 31.

Now I freely acknowledge that Federal patent policy as a whole may need review and perhaps revision. But this will be a time-consuming matter for the proper authorities to investigate and weigh. Meanwhile, I cannot subscribe to the view that the U.S. space program should be made to suffer during this long interim, particularly when the recommended changes have the approval of our most knowledgeable Government patent officials and when authorities such as the Comptroller General of the United States express doubts that it will ever be possible for all Federal agencies to follow precisely the same contractual patent policies.

In my opinion it is folly to procrastinate where our space effort is concerned.

I do not know what plans the other body may have for considering the changes in the Space Act which the House has approved. But it is my earnest hope that those changes will become law in the near future.

Studies of South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the center of world attention is today deep in the middle of Africa. The difficulties that the Congo is facing have dramatized more effectively than anything else could have the problems that the whole continent of Africa is going to have to face in the next few years.

Nowhere are these events being followed with more attention than in the Union of South Africa, virtually next door to the strife-ridden Congo. The South African policy of apartheid, under which 2 million whites are the absolute masters of 10 million blacks, has gradually cut South Africa off from the rest of the free world. Now, on the eve of a referendum as to whether the country should remain technically under the rule of the British monarchy or become a republic, there is increasing evidence that South Africa may not be permitted to rejoin the British Commonwealth should she choose to become a racialist republic.

No one could deplore more than I the policy of apartheid in South Africa with its bitter legacy of racial hatred. South Africa stands today on the threshold of a complete withdrawal from the 20th century policies of increasing freedom and responsibilities for all races.

In view of the importance that South African policies have to the rest of Africa, and therefore to the rest of the world, I ask unanimous consent to include the following articles in the Appendix of the RECORD. Dr. Cornelis W. de Kiewiet is the president of the University of Rochester and a well-known authority on the Continent of Africa, where he was brought up. He has recently been attending a national education conference in Durban, South Africa. Dr. de Kiewiet's remarks are thoughtful and penetrating. I hope many of my colleagues will have an opportunity to read them, as well as others in this series which I hope to include later. I ask unanimous consent that the articles entitled "Race Policy Reaction Makes Whites Feel Friendless," Country Sits on a Volcano," and "U.S. Wisdom Is Helpful; U.S. Folly Is Harmful," all written

by Dr. de Kiewiet, and an editorial entitled "Dr. de Kiewiet Gives Us the South African Reality," all published in the Rochester (N.Y.) Times-Union, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RACE POLICY REACTION MAKES WHITES FEEL FRIENDLESS

(By Dr. Cornelis W. de Kiewiet)

JOHANNESBURG.—We flew over Africa at a height of 35,000 feet. Far to our left Mount Kilimanjaro rose from the brown plain. Our great height made it look unimpressive, although it is over 19,000 feet high.

Very far to the right was a hazy mass, barely visible, of great mountains. Behind those mountains the Congolese were at that moment busy changing the history of Africa, and maybe of the world.

We circled over the splendid hilly suburbs of Johannesburg. Beyond them lay the drab sea of native housing settlements, 30 square miles of servants' quarters.

That night we sat in a beautiful home looking at the bold stars of an African night. For every star there was an unblinking light on the ground below. It was an impression of wealth, strength, and security. But what we talked about was race conflict in the Congo, everywhere in Africa, in the brilliant city right at our feet.

My host was a wealthy industrialist. He was an intelligent and levelheaded man.

"Why are the Americans so down on South Africa?" he asked me. "You have race problems which you cannot solve, yet your State Department rebuked us before the whole world after the shooting of Africans by the police at Sharpeville."

The man in the street is angry and resentful at Secretary Herter. He blames American journalists for bias and prejudice. He accuses them of not understanding his problems. Now, of course, he points to the Congo and says, "This is what you Americans do not understand. These people cannot govern themselves. If you give in to them, you give in to barbarism."

A minister of the Dutch Reformed Church with the coldest blue eyes said, "All of our troubles come from across our borders. Americans are setting the fires in Africa, and we must put them out."

The president of a national association of manufacturers asked, as if the answer were obvious, whether America were extending her imperialism to Africa.

My answer that America was genuinely interested in political and economic stability for the sake of peace, left a puzzled look in his eyes.

I had a 2-hour conversation with the top leadership of the United Party. They were most superior people, but their numerous questions about America's role in Africa showed their anxiety about America's disposition to the white populations of Africa.

This is a lonely land. Not fear, or anxiety but loneliness is the predominant feeling. They feel lashed and expelled and friendless. To those who dislike South Africa's racialism this is a torment.

But to those who approve, worldwide criticism brings a strange comfort. It is the comfort of a small band of resolute men face to face with danger, knowing that they must depend on their own courage.

More gently than Mr. Herter, the British Prime Minister rebuked them too, when he talked to the South Africa Parliament about the "wind of change" in today's world.

A very astute observer told me that between them, Mr. Herter and Mr. Macmillan may be responsible for turning the tide of public opinion in favor of becoming a republic. There will be a referendum on this issue next fall.

The average South African is frightened. The Congo is in his background. Black African nationalism hates South Africa's policies of radical racial segregation. He is also angry because his American and Britsh allies of World War II are not standing by his side.

So he is beginning to listen to the grim stubborn men who rule South Africa, and who have made his lovely and livable land into a country of the tensest and most explosive race relations in the world. But they are also uneasy. Some admit that they are wrong. Some are leaving the country. There is a crisis of conscience in the land.

COUNTRY SITS ON A VOLCANO

(By Dr. Cornelis W. de Kiewiet)

JOHANNESBURG.—South Africans are angry at American criticism of their racial policies, yet the respect and admiration for America are very great. Two years ago the waiting list of South Africans who wished to migrate to the United States was quite short. Today a South African must wait 8 years before his name comes up, so many want to leave this country.

I have talked to whites and blacks and Indians, to Englishmen and Afrikaners, angry men and frightened men. How bad are things? The answer depends on the man with whom you are talking.

How dangerous are things? Everybody agrees that the country is sitting on a volcano. When the police fired on a mob of native demonstrators at Sharpeville, killing a large number, the country was probably on the brink of a disaster. The unrest broke out at widely scattered points.

A leading authority on race relations, who disagreed totally with the Government's policies, told me that the demonstrations at three or four points could have turned into a wildfire of insurgency and rapine.

Those who blame the Government for the harsh policies that provoked the unrest, do not blame it for its firm handling of the crisis itself. Before the crisis Hendrik Verwoerd, the Prime Minister, had so many critics that his leadership was shaky. Today, and especially after the attack on his life, he is firmly in the saddle.

Just what is wrong? Instead of generalizing about the crazy economics, the harsh laws and the selfish politics, one can find and see the answers in simple people and simple situations.

A stunted little stoneworker from Basutoland is fined nearly a month's wages for not having his papers in order.

"This country too much trouble, boss," he said. "Ooh! This country hard, ooh! I go back Basutoland, no trouble there!"

A gang of 15 Africans are working on a construction job wheeling brick and cement. One of them gives a sudden call. In a flash everyone has disappeared. They have dived behind rocks and under bushes. Round the corner comes a police pickup van.

It is the government game of cops and robbers in the world: In a hospital lies a man paralyzed from the waist down. He is the victim of the gang fighters who have learned to sever the nerves that control the lower body.

The little Basuto stoneworker keeps a couple of dogs in his shack for protection against the thieves that roam the night.

In the infant ward of a hospital there are two and three children to a single cot. Sick women lie on the floor between beds and in the corridors. I ask the doctor what is the most common disease. The answer is malnutrition. It is so bad that growth is stunted and mental development permanently impaired. The head of a federation of industrialists admits that low wages keep a large proportion of the native population below the breadline.

One evening my host nodded in the direction of a babble of sound. It came from the terrible African slums called Alexandra. "Eight men were murdered there last night," he said.

If you want a German camera, a Swiss watch, a set of tires or a nylon shirt, you can get it from one of the Alexandra fences, or he will arrange to steal it for you. On paydays, knife-carrying thugs roam the trains carrying African workers to the townships outside of Johannesburg. An employer of 30 Africans told me that in a 12-month period everyone of his workers had been held up at knife point and robbed.

"It is the war of the African against the African," an African clergyman explained to me. Because the police are so severe and the laws so stringent, crime has become an assertion of freedom. It is an ugly assault upon control, restraint and law abidingness. The enemy of the criminal is any African who cooperates with the prevailing order.

Bitterly an African leader exclaimed, "We ask quietly to be heard on our legal rights and are called agitators, and clapped in gaol. And so our followers are intimidated by the men of violence and crime. What do they think the future will be?"

It is worried South Africans who take me to see these things or tell me about them. They are ashamed and want to do something. This is the good side. The uprising at Sharpeville has paid off. The white man has suddenly seen the black man as a fellow human being and a fellow worker who has learned to want dignity and a share in the good things of life. Thus there is hope yet.

Critics of the government are saying that the worldwide protest against the shooting and clubbing of Africans has virtually disarmed the government. A policy of repression and control based on Sten guns, tanks, and mobile police has been bankrupted. Now they stand emptyhanded before the nonwhites.

U.S. WISDOM IS HELPFUL; U.S. FOLLY IS HARMFUL

(By Dr. Cornelis W. de Kiewiet)

DURBAN, SOUTH AFRICA.—The conference in Durban which we are attending is a national event. More than a thousand of the country's leading educators and civic leaders attend the lecture and discussion groups.

A reference to the U.S. Supreme Court decision on school segregation is a daily event. This is the other side of the coin.

What the United States does is of capital importance in their eyes. They may be angry or pleased but it always matters. The picture which we give of ourselves is the most important force in our foreign policy.

In the worldwide competition for the mind of peoples it is impossible to exaggerate the beneficial effects of American wisdom and generosity, or the harmful effects of American foolishness and selfishness.

These people are not impressed by military power. Because they are on the painful receiving end of history they are hungry for wise leadership. A Johannesburg businessman even said to me, "You must give us the answers. There is nothing we can do."

The events in the Congo have put all Africa and 200 million people on the knife edge of destiny. The Soviet Union has jumped in with both feet.

We are beginning to see the shape of post-U-2 Russian diplomacy. The offers by Khrushchev to the Congo have brought Africa into the center of the world struggle. His offer of military aid was probably a bluff. It is not anything to worry about. But he put the United States into a cleft stick. Our predicament is far worse than it is in Cuba. For Africa there is no Monroe Doctrine.

The colonial powers are pulling out, and their decisions cannot be reversed.

In a real crisis in the Caribbean the United States has local friends in Canada and some of the states of the Organization of American States. If the need is desperate unilateral action is possible.

In a strict sense America has no more or no better rights in Africa than the Soviet Union. That is why it is now vitally necessary to work with and depend upon the United Nations. There is no sound or safe alternative.

A crisis in the heart of Africa has given Russia her greatest opportunity since Korea. Perhaps not in a strictly military sense but in almost every other sense, she can circumvent our policy of containment and get in behind our bases. Nobody can now question the urgent need for the most painstaking review of the bases of American foreign policy.

In Washington there are some rueful faces. During the present session of Congress, the State Department and the International Cooperation Administration had been pleading for funds to help plug the holes left by the departing colonial powers.

OTTO E. PASSMAN, Democratic Representative from Louisiana, has heaped scorn and insult on Government spokesmen. Mr. PASSMAN cannot be blamed for the events in the Belgian Congo. But had the United States had a far more vigorous and well-established aid program for the newly emerging Africa States there would be less question about our influence now.

The South African newspapers are giving the news from the Congo an exhaustive coverage. The fire is in their backyard, and they are deeply worried.

The Afrikaner nationalist press is bitter about the Belgian folly in ever giving self rule to the Congolese. Even though Belgian refugees are being invited to settle in South Africa there is a touch of contempt toward them because they did not fight back.

* * * * *

There is a rumor that the Portuguese, the South Africans, and the Rhodesians may take some formal steps to close their ranks against African nationalism and Russian intrigues. The supporters of apartheid feel that the Congo has proved the wisdom of their position. They are going to be much more stubborn.

For the United States the closing of the ranks of the white man in Africa raises a difficult problem. So far it has been encouraging political concessions to the black African as a means of relieving the tensions between black and white. From now on the white communities will be skeptical about this argument. Therefore, American policy is open to the risk of offending either white or black public opinion.

Some of the English-language newspapers have attacked the Belgians for different reasons. Compared with the British and the French colonial rulers, they have failed to train the Congolese for responsibility.

The uprisings of a race of servants and ignorant men are always cruel. There are not as many as a dozen university graduates amongst the Congolese, not a single fully qualified doctor, not a single competent army officer.

The Belgians are not being punished because they acted too soon, but because they did too little too late in preparing their subjects for the inevitable outcome of the dramatic new age in Africa.

The argument is telling, and provides the only possible answer for America. An increased program of American aid to build up the competence of the new African States in education, administration, economic and technological leadership is a priority we can neglect only at great peril.

A headline in an Afrikaner newspaper tonight gives part of the reason, "Look Out. The Russians Are Going To Take the Congo." If they do, I predict that Northern Rhodesia will march into the rich Katanga Province and that South Africa will back them. World war III could now break out in Africa.

DR. DE KIEWIET GIVES US THE SOUTH AFRICAN REALITY

For once, the headlines coming out of the African continent do not involve the Union of South Africa. It is the Belgian authorities, and not on this occasion the exponents of the policy of apartheid, who have been standing at the bar of world opinion.

But the Congo is very much in the minds of the South African people. For it is the fear of being overwhelmed by the blacks that lies at the root of their behavior. And some vivid testimony to this fear is being given us by one of our own citizens, Dr. de Kiewiet, president of the University of Rochester, now lecturing and traveling in his homeland.

* * * * * *

Like a stubborn man who reacts to criticism by becoming stubborner still, the South African has been pricked by a hostile world into a determination to stick to his course. "The South African is angry because his American and British allies of World War II are not standing by his side," Dr. de Kiewiet wrote in his first report. "So he is beginning to listen to the grim stubborn men who rule South Africa."

One result of the ostracism to which Spain was subjected in the 1940's was that the people closed their ranks behind Franco. And something of this sort has happened in South Africa. Many of the white population are resentful because other nations take them to task without understanding the harsh realities they face.

There is something in what they claim. Safely removed as we are, it is very hard for us to appreciate how important an influence is the sheer pressure of Bantu numbers on the white South African minority.

There was a time in our own country when the southern American felt a little the same way. It was said that slavery was not always a cruel institution, and it's true that the bonds between slave and master were sometimes warm and affectionate. Nevertheless, it was a system calculated to preserve white superiority.

Just as the South African today is goaded by outside criticism, so the southern whites often claimed that the North was precipitating trouble by forcing changes that ought to be gradual. And we know from our own experience in the North in more recent times that it is easier to call for action on a problem that exists elsewhere.

Nevertheless, the principle of equality for others is not one to be compromised with. This was why the Civil War was fought. And this is why the outside world deals so roughly with South Africa.

The fact that we still have race difficulties of our own does not disqualify us from being impatient with South Africa. For the point outsiders do not always appreciate about the American Negro problem is that outbreaks of trouble occur within the context of a situation that has been slowly improving for a hundred years.

The same cannot be said of South Africa. In these days of rapidly emerging nationalism, a policy of apartheid is a step back into darkness. But we can at the same time try to understand the forces that are abroad in the Union. And this is where Dr. de Kiewiet can help us.

A Report to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as has been my custom, throughout my public life, I desire to include at this time a summary account of my activities and speeches during this 86th Congress.

NEW REGULATIONS

In accord with your direction on speech limitation, and the current regulations of the Joint Committee on Printing on "retrenchment in extensions," I shall necessarily be restricted in my objective. I will observe the rules of the House, which I always have, while doing my best to comply with the duty I have.

A MORAL OBLIGATION

In my conscientious conviction, the Biblical mandate "to render an account of the stewardship" imposes upon every responsible public officeholder a moral obligation. It is an obligation that I have always and consistently attempted to fulfill.

Realizing the thousands of bills that were introduced in this Congress, and the several hundred public laws enacted, it is obviously impossible to completely cover the whole record, especially in view of the new space and time regulations, however, I shall, herein, try to present and reveal my personal pronouncements and actions upon some of the more important and more widely publicized legislative issues of this 86th Congress.

AN EXPLANATORY WORD

Mr. Speaker, in the past "stewardship accounts" I have given here, it was my custom to accompany the inclusion of my remarks upon particular measures and issues with an outline of what I felt to be the background and significance of each bill. Today I am confronted with a restriction on that custom and the task I am attempting here is a little more difficult on that account; however, I shall probably have opportunities to enlarge upon my report here after the adjournment of the Congress.

Meanwhile, I think I can best carry out my duty, under the circumstances, through revealing my stand on some of the prominent legislative issues by reviewing the speeches and remarks I made on the particular occasions. The listing will be made not so much in any chronological order, since the report summarizes a 2-year period, but more in an effort to present problems in accord with the importance the general public appears to attach to them. Any necessary accompanying remarks will be kept as brief as possible. Of course, the great majority of our people are aware that most of our important legislative actions these days are for the continuation and amendment of laws that are

already in effect and which are expanded or modified, by our determinations here, through the succeeding years.

Military Security and Communist Containment

Guaranteed defense appropriations, yes; extravagance and waste, no

(Thursday, June 9, 1960)

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of the unhappy collapse of the Paris summit meeting, and the apparent cancellation of the U–2 intelligence information flights, there is much talk about the necessity for increasing the proposed military budget of $39.3 billion.

Indeed, there is no question about the imperative necessity, in the light of the beligerent attitude of the Kremlin, of our military forces being fully prepared to protect the security of the United States against any surprise move by the Soviets. It would seem logical in the consideration of our recent experiences with Russia that the proposal to maintain an airborne alert at all times to be reexamined, and that our research and development activities in the space field be accelerated.

If these, and other proposed military security provisions, require additional appropriations, over and above what the House has appropriated, then, of course, such additions must be seriously entertained. It is evident from the recent actions of the Senate Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, that the Members of that body feel that the Nation's military power should be boosted.

When the House returns to the consideration of this grave subject, in the near future, I most earnestly hope we will not be of a spirit to disregard the necessity for including every reasonable safeguard against and restriction upon wasteful and extravagant military spending that we can. Thirty-nine and a third billion dollars is an awful lot of money and its very enormity provides an avenue for careless and negligent expenditures.

As you all realize, this House levied a 3-percent cut in the $13 billion military procurement fund in the bill in an attempt to force the Defense Department to adopt more economical and frugal procurement practices.

On this score the Comptroller General, in his recent report, pointed out the existence of waste and inefficiency, by the Defense Department, in its management of electronic supplies of the military services.

He revealed that a recent review disclosed that electronic equipment valued at $2.5 million was being unnecessarily repaired at a cost of $680,000 when usable items were available in large quantities in the other services.

He indicated that unnecessary administrative costs were being incurred because there are six independent organizations performing the same or similar stock management functions.

In past reports multitudinous examples of extravagance and waste by the Defense Department have been disclosed through the use of negotiated contracts instead of competitive bidding and confused and antiquated bookkeeping methods.

Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of the Congress, and of the administration itself, to insure that the purse strings operated by the various departments of the Defense Department are kept sensibly and economically tight. Closer supervision of negotiated contracts to prevent exorbitant profits and a wider use of competitive bidding practices would do much to save the taxpayers' money.

A more strict adherence to the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950, and a better organized central procurement unit would go far toward preventing duplication and waste.

Adequate national defense is indeed vital but the people of this country are seriously disturbed by the continuing revelations of wasteful and extravagant spending by the military without regard to the fact that each and every penny spent comes out of the hard earned, and highly taxed, pay of the overage American workingman and business. The duty of the Defense Department to guarantee our security does not carry with it any license to indulge in loose and careless financial practices.

With past experience in mind, and with due respect to whatever action the Senate may take, I hope that this House will continue to impress upon the Defense Department that economic frugality and wise spending can be a mark of efficiency in the military field as well as it is of an enterprising business.

If and when an emergency hour should come immediate authorization can always and readily be given to place the military on an actual war spending scale.

Mutual Security

(Tuesday, July 28, 1959)

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Chairman, as I see it, this debate on the reduced and reasonable continuation of our mutual security aid program should begin with a concrete demonstration of our deepest concern for our overburdened American taxpayers.

That legislative concern should be even more concentrated and emphasized because of the factual evidence in the record, by the Draper Committee, the Comptroller General, himself, and our congressional committees, "of waste and extravagance—a pattern of loose, lax administration through the entire complex of foreign aid—and refusal of the ICA to provide information."

I earnestly hope that in the phases of the program where this extravagance and waste has been displayed the recommended reductions will be approved.

The divisions of this program which appear to have been operated and projected in the best interests of ourselves and the advancement of our foreign allies are the technical assistance and Development Loan Fund extensions. I hope that these features will be adequately supported as their worth has been substantially proven.

Let us strive today to conscientiously enact a measure that will provide reasonable assistance to our allies, in the fields where such help is most needed, while we insure elimination of those parts of the program which have been proved wasteful and worthless.

(Friday, August 26, 1960)

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, when we have been debating this mutual security appropriations bill, I have emphasized my belief that the parts of the program, which have proved of substantial worth by experience, such as technical assistance to underdeveloped countries and Development Loan Fund operations, should be adequately supported, and the most careful examination, in the interests of the American taxpayers, should be concentrated upon those phases of the program in which impressive evidence has been demonstrated in revelation of great waste and extravagence.

I very greatly fear that, particularly these days, we too often overlook the fact that without the existence of a high morale among our own citizens neither this program, nor any other, will ever accomplish their full objectives. The only legislative way in which we can encourage the morale of our own people is by proving to them that we intend to fulfill our responsibility of protecting this foreign investment for them, and by showing them that we are not neglecting their domestic needs because of loose and extravagant spending abroad.

The Communist Captive Nations Must Never Be Abandoned

(Monday, May 2, 1960)

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this resolution, designed to influence the restoration of the fundamental freedoms and God-given rights of the subjugated peoples now existing in Communist captive nations, I most earnestly hope this House will promptly and unanimously approve it.

As we all know, in numerous and repetitive documents and agreements, the great powers of the world, including Soviet Russia, have pledged and promised the persecuted peoples of these nations, the return of their national freedom and personal liberties. The United States has consistently attempted to have these promises carried out but Russia still denies these countries the right of free elections and independent sovereignty.

To my mind the adoption of this resolution will add substantial strength to the position of the President when he meets with the Soviet leaders at the approaching summit conference. The Communist rulers, by our action, will be emphatically reminded that it is the sense of this Congress that no firm and lasting agreements for peace can be made while the world remains practically half free and half slave. By our action the rest of the free world can be concretely convinced this Nation will not abandon her traditional principles of free government for all peoples and the captive nations themselves will be further inspired to remain adamant in their determination to reject any Communist entreaties for cooperative existence under the Soviet system.

The fact and the truth is that the Russian Kremlin is solely responsible for the inhuman slavery being imposed upon the brave peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, and all the other captive countries. It is also unfortunately true that we have suffered many disastrous propaganda defeats at the hands of the Russians.

Not the least of the purposes of this resolution is an attempt to meet the Russians in their own most effective field. Unlike their multitudinous and skillful distortions for propaganda purposes, we are telling the truth. If the Kremlin leaders want to prove their sincerity in seeking peace in the world then let them simply declare freedom for the captive nations. That is the first and fundamental step that must be taken before there can be any reasonable hope for the achievement of a peaceful world.

Let us then promptly approve this resolution to encourage the Soviet rulers to take this first, just action and then proceed, at the summit, to the adoption of agreements for all of us to live, in good will and good faith, in a world at peace.

Domestic Progress and American Morale

Mr. Speaker, it has been my growing fear over the last several years, and I have repeatedly expressed it here, that in our concentration upon foreign affairs and Communist containment measures, we are tempted to entirely neglect or unwisely retrench domestic programs primarily designed to keep American progress on the march and retain the morale of the American people at a high level.

Many times I have here emphasized my deep conviction that it would be ironical, indeed, to overexert ourselves in retaining the friendship of foreign allies, while at the same time we encourage the decline of morale among our own people by neglecting their essential needs.

I have felt it my duty to continuously point out to this body that at a time when we are telling the world of our better way of life, as opposed to Communist regimentation, it could be dangerously impractical to eliminate or cripple any of those public services and programs whose contribution to the progress of the country have been nationally recognized and which sustain the vitally important high morale of our people to determinedly endure the sacrifices required to win the cold war.

This is the basic thought contained in my remarks upon such recognized legislative programs of domestic progress as social security expansion, medical aid for the elderly, appropriations for health, education, and welfare, aid to economically distressed areas, adequate American housing, fair labor standards amendments, and a host of other measures fundamentally intended for the good of all Americans.

Extracts from my speeches in the House on these various subjects follow:

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS

(Wednesday, June 22, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately it is quite evident there is much fear and distressing doubt in the minds of a goodly number of Members here that this proposal, H.R. 12580, the Social Security Amendments of 1960, is as reasonable and realistically responsive as it could and should be, to the needs and the desires of the great majority of American citizens. Under such circumstances we are, unhappily, because of the closed rule under which we are operating, permitted to vote only for or against the whole bill, without modifications.

Being restricted, then, to these two choices, I intend to supjort the bill because it does provide an extension and expansion of a limited number of benefits to those people whose needs are most urgent.

For instance, the bill removes the age 50 eligibility requirement for disability benefits; it liberalizes the eligibility requirements of old age, survivors, and disability benefits; it makes certain improvements in the social security benefit protection for children and extends benefit eligibility to more widows; it effectuates certain improvements in the administrative financing and solvency provisions of the unemployment compensation system, as well as extending its coverage; it extends coverage to groups that were not before included. All these improvements are good and they have already been carefully and thoroughly explained by the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee.

Unfortunately, the committee has not seen fit to recommend other advances and improvements which a great many of us have been advocating with the earnest hope that they would be included in this measure. Chief among these would be provisions to reduce the retirement age, especially for women, and particularly for widows; to increase the minimum benefits in accord with rising living costs; and realistically raise the outmoded and outdated basic income limitations.

TITLE XVI

Of course, the major fears and doubts about the substantial worth of this measure are concentrated on the most controversial new title XVI, which would initiate a new Federal-State grants-in-aid program to help the States assist low-income aged individuals who need help to meet their medical expenses. In my own opinion this title, and its provision, and its provisions, fall far short of adequately and equitably assisting our older citizens in the desperate financial distress they tragically encounter from the ills and the sicknesses so common in the later stages of life.

It is my earnest hope, that after this measure is considered, and probably changed, in the Senate, we may yet have the opportunity to repair and strengthen this title so that a far more equitable and effective program of medical service and hospitalization treatment assistance may be granted to the millions of aged Americans so desperately and despairingly in need of it.

MEDICAL AID FOR THE AGED

(Thursday, June 9, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, despite our vaunted boast of high living standards and Christian concern for the well-being of all our people it remains a fact that the United States is the only major industrial country in the world without some form of national medical insurance for its elderly and retired citizens.

From the overwhelming evidence in the record, contained in economic statistics and the testimony of experts, it is painfully obvious that our aged people are in imperative need of some type of Federal medical aid.

According to Dr. Porterfield, Deputy Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service, out of the 10 million persons in the Nation who have heart disease, 4 million are 65 or older. At any given time, some 750,000 persons have cancer and most of these are persons over 65. Almost 3 million individuals have diabetes and the aged account for the majority. This is also true of the 5 million suffering from arthritis and the 6 million who are affected by related rheumatic disorders. Each of these diseases brings with it the high costs of medical and hospitalization treatment as well as the need for expensive drugs. In considering these dramatic and disturbing figures let us not forget that medical costs have increased 46 percent in the last 10 years.

The economic distress caused by these advanced medical costs is even more impressive when we realize that 74 percent of the aged have income of nothing to $1,000; 11 percent have incomes from $1,000 to $2,000; and only 15 percent have incomes of $2,000 and more. These statistics make us consciously appreciate that illness among the elderly is truly a staggering and discouraging financial burden.

There is no commonsense in any attempt to deny or gloss over this obvious national problem, and the urgent necessity of promptly dealing with it. The administration itself has openly admitted its existence. There remains only the legislative task and duty of designing a measure acceptable to the Congress and the President, which will extend the fullest and most equitable Federal insurance possible to the desperate aged in their gallant fight against the economic distress and discouragement of costly sickness in their declining years.

Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope this session of the Congress will not conclude until those of us, in the Congress and the administration who have the responsibility, have fully discharged our duty and obligation to the elderly citizens of this blessed and bountiful country.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR AND HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL

(Tuesday, March 29, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, it was the unanimous judgment of our Original Thirteen States, as expressed in their Independence Declaration, that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In my opinion there is no measure coming before this body, more fully designed to promote the enjoyment of these rights to American citizens than the appropriations bill, now under consideration, for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961. The basic units and activities of these executive departments are more closely connected with the lives of our citizens than any other agency of our Government "for the people."

That is why I would feel remiss in my duty if I did not urge you all to approve and accept the appropriation here unanimously reported and recommended to us by the distinguished Subcommittee on Appropriations directed by our esteemed colleague, the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, of Rhode Island. The recommendations of the subcommittee are unanimous and represent the best compromise decision of reasonable and capable men.

Mr. Chairman, to attempt to either regulate or improve the health and happiness of human beings in terms of dollars and cents is a most difficult, if not impossible task. We are all, I am certain, agreed on the necessity for practicing economy in Government expenditures and to preserve our financial stability and world position. However, I think we are further agreed that gestures of doubtful economy at the expense of lowering national standards of working conditions, health protection, and educational advancement is most unwise and impractical, more especially in these days of communistic competition.

For that fundamental reason, I most earnestly hope that no crippling reductions will be attempted during our action on this bill; indeed, it is my deepest hope that the moderate increases recommended by the subcommittee and the chairman, principally in the fields of hospital construction, vocational education, assistance to the schools in federally impacted areas, grants to States to build waste-treatment plants, and research at the National Institutes of Health will be unanimously accepted.

I would like to emphasize that the subcommittee has not advocated general increased in all the areas covered by this bill. The subcommittee adopted the very sensible approach that there are certain selective and essential areas of public need that can and must be met in the national interest. It would be most difficult to justify any wide disagreement on these specific activities the subcommittee has chosen for their special attention.

The fundamental objective of the subcommittee, so obviously and patriotically revealed in their report, was to keep all of the many and varied activities of these two major public service departments of Government in operation at their highest economically efficient level while encouraging a selected few activities to moderately advance their scope of service in response to particular and proven expanding public needs.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriations we grant under this measure are designed to continuously improve the Christian, civilized working conditions of our people and to protect and advance the health of all our citizens, particularly children, women, and the aged. It is obvious, therefore, that this appropriations bill is of the greatest importance to the progress of our national welfare and that is why each of us have the highest obligation to devote the most conscientious attention to it.

At a time when we are generously granting billions of dollars to aid our foreign allies, let us not be neglectful of our own citizens. At a time when we are telling the world of our better way of life, as opposed to Communist barbarism, let us not dangerously reduce any of these public services whose contributions to national progress have been universally acknowledged. At a time when we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle with the curse of communism, let us take no unwise chances of disrupting the high morale of our own good people. In conscience, let us vote in support of the con-

tinuing and full functioning of these units and agencies whose services are, indeed, in the national interest and emphatically good for all Americans.

FEDERAL AID TO DISTRESSED AREAS IS URGED

(Thursday, June 9, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as you are well aware, the whole matter of depressed areas was thoroughly explored and debated during our recent House approval of the aid-to-depressed-areas bill, and I am not going to, at this hour, unnecessarily belabor the subject.

The Department of Labor officially testified to the existence of multitudinous pockets of economic distress and decline throughout the country, and we have our unhappy share of them in the New England region and within my own home State of Massachusetts. It has been demonstrated that the economic distress in these areas cannot be alleviated by the resources of area industries and municipal authority alone.

Unfortunately, the President saw fit to veto the bill to extend these areas Federal aid and the Congress did not override the veto. However, the President did express his hope "that suitable legislation would be enacted at this session of the Congress."

Mr. Speaker, on that hope, and in that spirit, I most earnestly urge that the leadership, together with administration representatives, will work out compromise legislation that can be presented and acted upon by the Congress before adjournment.

ADEQUATE HOUSING FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Thursday, August 27, 1959)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, this is, we might say, the "second time around" on housing legislation, so there is no need to inflict any repetitive recital of statistical information upon you.

In my own opinion the evidence and information provided to us in proof of housing deficiencies in this great country and the essentiality of an adequate continuing program has been overwhelming. The distinguished chairman of the committee, and his diligent associates, have worked tirelessly to bring a sound measure before us, and both he and they deserve our deepest thanks and congratulations. They have made a substantial effort, in good faith, and in accord with high principles, to present a revised bill to reasonably meet Presidential objections.

As you are all aware, the measure still contains, and I earnestly hope they will be retained, provisions for loans and grants for slum elimination, college dormitories and classrooms, housing for the elderly, nursing homes, and an additional $8 billion of authority for FHA to continue its mortgage loan insurance program. If these features, yet more limited than many of us think wise, are not in the best national interest, then I confess I do not know what is.

As you all further realize, this new measure represents a reduction in Federal housing grants of 27 percent below the amount in the previously vetoed bill and a cut of 17 percent in loans.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my colleagues that we have been urged in the past and we will be called upon again in the future, ironically by many of the same people who desire to cripple this housing bill, to approve the granting and the loaning of billions of the American taxpayer's money for the rehabilitation of foreign nations and assistance to underdeveloped countries. If we can afford to continue and expand that gigantic program, then certainly we can afford to carry on a moderate housing program to alleviate the desperate needs of our own citizens for decent housing, slum clearance, and college facilities.

I hope you will all give your most conscientious consideration to the compromise merits of this bill and pass it without stifling amendments.

FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

(Thursday, June 30, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge unanimous approval of this bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act by increasing the minimum wage and otherwise providing progressive changes in the present act.

Primarily I urge approval of this bill because it is clearly another advance toward fulfillment of the declared policy of the original Fair Labor Standards Act, "to correct, and as rapidly as practicable, to eliminate labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers."

According to a study made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics among 34 cities in the country, the basic budget required for a minimum standard of living, for a family of 4, varied from $3,812 to $4,454. Even with these admittedly low budget figures and estimates it would require a minimum wage of $1.91 per hour to earn enough to meet the barest needs for a decent standard of living as defined by this study.

In dwelling upon this problem let us not forget the most impressive lesson of the unfortunate depression of the early 1930's, that lack of purchasing power in the hands of our lowest income families, who necessarily spend the most, brings about widespread unemployment, hardships, and economic stagnation. It profits us nothing to possess the greatest industrial production potential in the world if low wages and low consumer income prevent millions of Americans from buying these products.

Mr. Chairman, we are here obligated to enact laws designed to assist, not hinder, all those who are patriotically and conscientiously trying to be fair, honest, and decent in their employment obligations and industrial operations. We are here obligated to enact laws primarily designed to advance the general welfare. In compliance with and in the spirit of that high duty I urge you all to approve this minimum wage raise legislation now, while we, at the same time, pledge ourselves to be continuously and conscientionsly concerned with the further advancement of American living standards and national economic progress.

LEGISLATION FOR THE GOOD OF ALL AMERICANS

Mr. Speaker, over the past 4 years, as international tensions mounted, our country and the Congress have increasingly recognized that we can not hope to retain our boasted leadership in advocating freedom and liberty for all peoples everywhere if we continue to deny certain rights and privleges to some of our own citizens, including the right to vote in our State and National elections without harassment.

It became clearly apparent that we were losing much prestige among many peoples, particularly in Asia and Africa, because of this obvious contradiction and being subjected to embarrassing criticism and ridicule by the skillful propaganda organs of Communist Russia.

It was my privilege on May 21, 1956 to favorably report, on behalf of the House Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, H.R. 627, of the 84th Congress, a bill which was known as the Civil Rights Act of 1956. With some amendments, this measure passed the House in 1956, but was not reached by the Senate before that Congress concluded.

At the beginning of the 85th Congress in 1957, this measure, under a new number, H.R. 6127, passed both the House and Senate and was signed by the President. It is identified as Public Law 315, of the 85th Congress, and was called the Civil Rights Act of 1957.

I am modestly proud of the cooperative part I played in providing the background that resulted in the passage of this law, which was characterized by authorities as the first real step forward in the field of civil rights in almost a century. This law, I am pleased to say, was improved and expanded in this 86th Congress.

Extracts from my remarks on this important legislation when it was presented to the House, and on other measures affecting the progress and welfare of all Americans follow:

CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1960

(Monday, March 14, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, as we are about to begin the day of decisive action on civil rights, reflecting that the Senate is entering its fifth week of deliberation on this subject, it may be pertinent to remind ourselves that the fundamental business of the Congress is to legislate.

Let us emphasize, further, to ourselves that our primary obligation in fulfilling this business to protect and expand the basic rights and freedoms guaranteed to our American citizens under the Constitution; paramount among such is the right to vote.

Our primary purpose here today is, then, to enact the best legislative measure that reasonable men can devise to insure every qualified individual in this Nation can exercise the right to vote in the fullest freedom.

We all realize that the legislative action along these lines that occurred in 1957 was the first real step forward in this field in almost a century.

In my own opinion, our exhaustive efforts should be exercised to have included in the final bill we approve provisions to effectively protect the right to vote through a system of either Federal registrars or referees; to eliminate the vicious and un-American hate bombings; to erect requirements for the preservation of voting records; to provide Federal education for children of service personnel in areas where public schools are closed; and to effectively prevent unwarranted and illegal obstruction, in any form, of duly issued Federal court orders in school-desegregation cases.

The encouraging eyes of all American citizens are directed upon the Congress today; the questioning eyes of allied and hesitating peoples abroad are centered upon us during this debate; the cynical eyes of the Kremlin leaders are fastened on the legislative capital of the world, waiting, with propaganda fangs exposed, to see if we can and will grant to each of our own citizens the rights and privileges we claim to espouse for all peoples everywhere. This is a fateful hour in the destiny of our blessed country, and the Congress is faced with one of the greatest legislative challenges of our history.

There is vital need for us to exercise restrained emotion, subdued prejudice, heightened conscience, and supreme patriotism for the welfare and preservation of America and the free world.

Let us be patient with each other, let us be tolerant of one another's deepest convictions, and let us resolutely unite in devotion to duty.

Above all, let us legislate. Let us decide that when our work is done we shall have enacted another milestone, for all the world to see, in advancement of the traditions upon which this great Nation was founded and upon which, the Creator willing, it will endure as the free world's leader against every provocation and every challenge of the Communist government of atheistic Russia.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE ACT

(Thursday, May 26, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, because of the overwhelming evidence on record showing the urgent need of improving school facilities throughout the Nation, I rise in support of this bill granting reasonable Federal assistance to the States for such purpose.

There is no need for me to reiterate the testimony of the multitudinous officials of States and municipalities demonstrating that their various States are wholly unable to provide, from their own drained resources, the urgently required improvements in school facilities.

The two basic factors involved are the need for school improvements and the inability of the States to construct them. Since these two factors have been proved beyond question, it appears to me that there should be no reasonable doubt that this measure should be approved.

With full realization of the consequences that may follow from the collapse of the Paris summit meeting, there ought to be no uncertainty about the imperative necessity of accelerating our preparations to meet the Russian Communists on every front, including the educational front. Realistically admitting our past mistakes and factually facing the import of a long, continuing cold war atmosphere, let us wisely now take the steps to guarantee that our youth will be adequately trained to meet and beat the Communist challenges in the future.

There can be no better or wiser economic planning for the future security of America than a reasonable investment for the superior schooling of the country's children. Let us endorse and approve that practical investment today.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT REPORTING AND DISCLOSURE ACT

(Wednesday, August 12, 1959)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, for the better part of 2 days we have been dutifully listening to the sponsors and proponents of these several labor-management reform proposals explain the substance of their different intends and designs, down to their last technical meaning and application. I think they should all be commended for their earnestness, sincerity, and painstaking efforts, even though we may not fully agree with each of them.

The fundamental that we should scrupulously recall is the basic axiom that punitive, extreme legislation, emanating from emotion, prejudice and misguided fervor is the worst sin that any legislative body can commit. All the pages of legislative history disclose that axiom and on it all legislative authorities agree.

Let us forcefully remind ourselves that the original intent and patriotic objective in dealing with this problem was to enact legislation that would rid labor-management operations of "crooks and gangsters," eliminate certain corrupt practices, while at the same time insuring that the rank and file American workingman and women is not deprived of the rights and benefits developed for themselves and their families through the legitimate activities of labor and management within our economic society. There are no irreconcilable provisions within the Senate passed measure and the proposals before us that cannot be sensibly fused and compromised by reasonable men.

Let us then look into our hearts, our minds, and our consciences in patriotic devotion to our duty of enacting a Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act that will effectively cure the evils that we all decry while it preserves and strengthens the stability of our economic household, which, divided against itself, in adamant controversy, will surely fall an easy prey to the Communist enslavement design, almost on the eve of the visit of the chief Communist dictator to this Nation which proudly proclaims itself the cradle of justice.

SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE ACT

(Monday, August 29, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it has been always an unquestioned American tradition that this Government shall aid, counsel, assist, and protect the interests of small business in order to preserve our democratic system of free competitive enterprise.

That is why I advocated and voted for the passage of the original legislation establishing a permanent, independent Small Business Administration agency. Recognizing the importance of our small businesses in defense production efforts and the national economy I have consistently urged every reasonable Federal assistance and guidance to them throughout my congressional service.

Last June this body approved H.R. 11207, designed to increase the Small Business Administration's revolving fund for its regular loan program, to provide for a wider participation by small business concerns in the subcontracting phase of Government procurement and to authorize the agency to set up a small business subcontracting program.

While this bill does not offer the complete assistance a good many of us have advocated it does contain elements of material encouragement and aid desperately needed by small business to survive.

Mr. Speaker, the House-passed measure, together with a Senate-passed version is now in conference. I most earnestly hope the leadership on both sides, in both Chambers, will use their combined influence in having the conferees reach sensible agreement and report the bill back for congressional action before adjournment.

VETERANS LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

(Monday, August 29, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, as you and the Members are aware, it was my privilege, upon entering this House, to serve for 4 years on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. My activities, here and on that committee, on behalf of our veterans, their families, and dependents, are well-known and have been publicly recognized. Personal commendations, for these efforts, have been conferred upon me by the Disabled American Veterans, the Order of the Purple Heart, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion, as well as several other veterans organizations.

This Congress devoted considerable time to measures affecting our veterans and the record shows that more than 30 such measures were enacted into Law. Prominent among them, which I supported, were measures to extend for 2 years the VA direct loan and loan guarantee program; to increase the presumptive period to 3 years for service connection for the disease of multiple sclerosis; to expand the program of assistance for severely disabled veterans in acquiring suitable homes; to reimburse State veterans facilities to a maximum of $912.50 a year per veteran for care of veterans who would be eligible for treatment in VA hospital or domiciliary centers; to modify the educational training regulations to permit veterans to change their program under certain conditions to attain high educational degrees; and to authorize payment of service-connected death compensation to certain eligible widows of veterans.

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

(Tuesday, February 9, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I earnestly hope that this House will accept and approve this conference report without undue delay and extended debate.

The very title of the bill, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, is indicative of its whole purpose to protect the lives and safety of American citizens and assist our various American communities in constructing the necessary sewage treatment projects. Certainly any program that has to do with the prevention of wholesale dangers to the lives of our citizens is of substantial economic worth.

The amount of money this bill would anually provide for the objectives that are outlined is within reason, and the objectives are of vital importance to the communities concerned.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER WORKERS

(Thursday, June 9, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, there is still time and I most earnestly hope we will be granted the opportunity to act before adjournment on one of the many bills, including my own, H.R. 12106, which have been introduced and are designed to eliminate discriminatory employment practices on account of age by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of contracts with the United States and the District of Columbia.

The reluctance or refusal of employers to engage older workers is a national handicap. The report by the U.S. Department of Labor, conducted in 1956, disclosed that 58 percent of job openings had some upper age restriction; 52 percent barred workers 55 and over; 41 percent barred those 45 and over; and 20 percent barred those 35 and over.

There is then, Mr. Speaker, the obvious need for the establishment, now, of this public policy, and approval of this legislation ought not to be further delayed.

All of the measures proposed are in full accord with our basic American tradition; they are all economically feasible, and they are all in the best national interest. The impact of this proposed legislation is entirely reasonable and includes provision for formal hearings, judicial appeal, and the exercise of Presidential discretion.

In patriotic consideration of the national welfare and in Christian concern for our older workers, I sincerely hope that this proposed legislation will soon be placed before the Congress for action.

EXCISE TAX REDUCTIONS

(Wednesday, June 8, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to make it plain that I have no objection against title I of this bill, providing for a temporary increase in the statutory debt limit, as requested by the administration. If that was the sole title and provision of this measure I would vote in favor of it as I have done in the past.

However, and unfortunately, title II of the bill, providing for the continuation of certain existing excise taxes presents a conscientious challenge to me and many other members of this body. It involves a matter of keeping faith with ourselves and the general public, as well as affording some little relief to persons and industries suffering severe economic distress. As you all know, when this subject was being acted upon just about a year ago the promise was made that certain excise

taxes, particularly in the field of telephone service and passenger transportation would be reduced and repealed.

These taxes, and others, were imposed during the World War II period, as emergency measures, and it was even then intimated they would endure only through the war duration; that time has long since passed. Today most of these taxed articles and services cannot be considered luxuries; they are closer to the nature of necessities. In many areas they create unusual and severe economic hardships upon persons and industries and there is real doubt about their overall economic soundness and wisdom.

Under these circumstances, together with the word that was made and the promise that is on the record, I am constrained to vote against this bill with the hope title I may be hereafter presented for separate consideration.

WORCESTER FLOOD DIVERSIONARY TUNNEL

(Monday, August 29, 1960)

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it was a matter of very great, but humble, personal satisfaction to me, to attend recently, on July 8, last, the dedication exercises marking the operational opening and completion of the Worcester flood diversionary tunnel.

This flood diversionary project, primarily designed for the preservation of the lives and property of my fellow area citizens, is one of the most important things accomplished during my service in the Congress and I can assure you there was nothing upon which more concentrated work was expended.

In the pursuit of approval for the enabling and continuing appropriations legislative action necessary, covering nearly 5 years, I appeared three times before the House Public Works Committee, four times before the House Appropriations Public Works Subcommittee, and spoke several times in the House Chamber in support of this tunnel.

Its completion may well be considered a monument to those who lost their lives and family fortunes in the frightening flood waters and an inspiration to continue our united and persevering efforts to prevent the recurrence of such natural disaster tragedy from ever being visited again upon American citizens in this area, this State, or this blessed Nation.

I am pleased to include a statistical account of the yearly appropriations that were approved for the tunnel completion.

Yearly appropriations for Worcester flood diversion tunnel

Fiscal Year	Amount	Purpose
1956	$60,000	Surveying and planning.
1957	840,000	Begin construction.
1958	1,760,000	Continue construction.
1959	2,534,000	Complete construction, estimated June 1959.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. Speaker, limited as this summary neccessarily is, it would be even more inadequate if a partial list of some of the measures I introduced in this Congress were not included; they follow:

House Resolution 109, a resolution calling upon Congress to take effective action against the spread of inflation and the high cost of living.

House Concurrent Resolution 36, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of armament.

House Concurrent Resolution 677, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming tariff negotiations under the provisions of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958, and for other purposes.

House Joint Resolution 429, a joint resolution to authorize the issuance of a gold medal in honor of the late Prof. Robert H. Goddard.

H.R. 2395, a bill to provide for the establishment of a U.S. Foreign Service Academy.

H.R. 2471, a bill to establish the Federal Agency for Handicapped, to define its duties, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2472, a bill to protect the right of the blind to self-expression through organizations of the blind.

H.R. 2473, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a 30-percent credit against the individual income tax for amounts paid as tuition or fees to certain public and private institutions of higher education.

H.R. 2474, a bill to provide for unemployment reinsurance grants to States to revise, extend, and improve the unemployment insurance program, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2475, a bill to provide assistance to communities, industries, business enterprises, and individuals to facilitate adjustments made necessary by the trade policy of the United States.

H.R. 2527, a bill to provide for programs of public facilities construction which will stimulate employment in areas having a substantial surplus of labor, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2529, a bill to amend section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, so as to provide that all quota numbers not used in any year shall be made available to immigrants in oversubscribed areas in the following year, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2868, a bill to reaffirm the national public policy and the purposes of Congress in enacting the Robinson-Patman Antiprice Discrimination Act entitled "An act to amend section 2 of the act entitled 'An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes,' approved October 15, 1914, as amended (U.S.C., title 15, sec. 13), and for other purposes," and to clarify the intent and meaning of the aforesaid law by providing for the mandatory nature of functional discounts under certain circumstances.

H.R. 3161, a bill to incorporate the Paralyzed Veterans of America.

H.R. 8905, a bill to provide a health benefits program for certain retired employees of the Government.

H.R. 11113, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the payment of pensions to veterans of World War I.

H.R. 12033, a bill to provide for adjusting conditions of competition between certain domestic industries and foreign industries with respect to the level of wages and the working conditions in the production of articles imported into the United States.

H.R. 12106, a bill to eliminate discriminatory employment practices on account of age by contractors and subcontractors in the performance of contracts with the United States and the District of Columbia.

H.R. 12872, a bill to create and prescribe the functions of a National Peace Agency.

CONCLUSION—TIMELY COUSEL FROM A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. Speaker, the words of wise authority remain forever as comforting beacons of guidance in troubled, distressing hours. A counseling message to all Americans is contained in the following extract from a speech given at Harvard University graduation exercises on June 30, 1910, by the late great Chief Justice Charles Evans Hughes:

"The most important agencies of democracy are, after all, not the organs of government, but the influences that shape public opinion. • • • Democracy must prize its public life. It has stripped it almost altogether of ceremonial and of meaningless and absurd forms. It has placed the public officer in a position of power, to be used for service. • • • Having surrounded him with none of the pomp which makes appeal to the thoughtless and ignorant, it must invest him with the higher honor which should be the reward of fidelity. Those who cultivate the true democratic spirit will be as earnest in their support of faithful officers as they are unsparing in their condemnation of the faithless."

Crispus Attucks, One of America's First and Noblest Heroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, John Wesley Dobbs, grand master of Georgia of the Ancient, Egyptian, Arabic Order, Nobles of the Mystic Shrine for North and South America, addressed the annual meeting of that body on August 16. His subject was "Crispus Attucks, One of America's First and Noblest Heroes," and was a testimonial to a great hero and to Negroes generally.

In his address Mr. Dobbs discussed the war record of Negroes, who have served in every war of this Nation, beginning with service in the Continental Army, under the leadership of Gen. George Washington. Theirs has been an outstanding record of service to our Nation, and deserves the commendation of all.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Dobbs' address be made a part of these remarks and be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRISPUS ATTUCKS, ONE OF AMERICA'S FIRST AND NOBLEST HEROES

First, I would like to commend our imperial potentate, Hon. Booker T. Alexander, and his officers, for so wisely planning this commemorative testimonial program to a great hero. Next, we sincerely appreciate the splendid manner in which the city officials of the great city of Boston, Mass., have cooperated in making this event such a big success.

Crispus Attucks was undoubtedly one of America's first and noblest heroes. The New Standard Dictionary describes a hero as a man distinguished for valor, fortitude, or bold enterprise. That description correctly fits the subject of this discussion—Crispus Attucks.

The American Colonies had been having trouble with the English King, George III, about taxation. The Boston Tea Party, and subsequent events, had very definitely set up the issue in the minds of the Massachusetts colonists that "taxation without representation was unjust." Everybody knew what the issue was. Two regiments of British soldiers were sent over to help coerce the Boston people. Their presence on the Boston Common only made the situation worse; so, on March 5, 1770 a detachment of these British soldiers was called to King Street (now State Street) to preserve order. Instead of preserving order, and without just provocation, they

wantonly opened fire on the Boston citizens in King Street.

Crispus Attucks, a mulatto Negro, former slave, along with two of his compatriots were killed outright. Crispus Attucks was the first to fall. Eight others were wounded; two of whom died, bringing the total number of deaths to five. These five American citizens died because of their undying belief in the fundamental, bedrock principle of early American democracy—"taxation without representation is unjust"—that was the issue then, and it is still the bedrock issue in every world democracy today.

The people of Boston, and Massachusetts, had become obsessed with this spirit of liberty and freedom. They were in that frame of mind as they faced the British soldiers in King Street on March 5, 1770. The Boston Tea Party, and related events, had served to strengthen their zeal and fervor.

CRISPUS ATTUCKS

Not enough is known about Crispus Attucks. However, we do know that at the age of 27 he was listed as a runaway slave from the custody of Deacon William Browne of Framingham, Mass. Mr. Browne advertised in the Boston Gazette, October 2, November 13, and November 20, 1750, offering a reward of 10 pounds for the apprehension and return of Crispus Attucks. But Crispus Attucks was not to be found in 1750. He was not heard from again until 1770, 20 years later, when he was 47 years old. Where had he been? Where did he hide? Or where did he go? We do not know. Neither do we know where Jesus Christ spent 18 years from 12 to 30 years old. We only know that the time was well spent. Crispus Attucks might have gone to sea; he might have visited foreign lands; this we do not know; but, we do know that he was very much alive on March 5, 1770, when he showed up in King Street, Boston, Mass., with a big stick in his hand ready to die and to become one of America's greatest heroes. He died defending the honor, integrity, and self-respect of all American citizens, living then, and the ones to be born later on.

Crispus Attucks was practically unknown at the time, so his funeral was held from Faneuil Hall. He was buried in the famous Granary burying ground on Tremont Street. This monument, erected on Boston Common, was built to honor and commemorate all patriots who died in the Boston Massacre. I would have you bear in mind, however, that this event occurred 5 years and 3 months before the Battle of Bunker Hill; 6 years and 4 months before the Continental Congress at Philadelphia released the immortal Declaration of Independence, and broke the Liberty Bell, proclaiming to the world "that all men are created equal." Two things Crispus Attucks did at Boston, March 5, 1770:

(1) He firmly established himself as a man of valor, fortitude, and bold enterprise. He believed in that most precious American heritage of freedom.

(2) He made the downpayment on liberty and freedom for all members of his racial group who were to live after him in this fair land as American citizens. Crispus Attucks made the downpayment for you and me at Boston when he died with a stick in his hand.

NEGROES IN AMERICA

Today we have close to 20 million Negroes who call America home. We have been here just as long as anybody else. We have truly paid a very dear price to stay here.

Black men first came to the new world with the early explorers. Black seamen were with Columbus in 1492; Balboa 1513–15; Cortez 1518–21; Desoto in 1540; and with Menendez at St. Augustine, Fla., when in 1565 he built the first city in America.

Jean Baptiste Point DuSable, a black fur trapper from the West Indies, built the first house where the city of Chicago now stands.

In 1537 Estivineco (Big Steve), a black Spaniard, led 600 men across the Texas frontier and opened up the great Southwest region of our country now known as Arizona and New Mexico. Big Steve, 6 feet 3 inches tall, a black Spanish doctor, was the leader of this expedition sent out by Cortez from Mexico.

From 1492 to 1619, a period of 127 years, black men came to the New World with the early explorers, and as freemen. Chattel slavery was forced upon black men and women beginning at Jamestown, Va., in 1619. This diabolical system lasted until January 1, 1863, for a period of 244 years. These terrible circumstances and conditions were almost inhuman and unbearable. Negro men and women worked and suffered for 244 years, without a payday. Nevertheless by the help of Almighty God, their descendants have still survived. Today they are calling for their civil, economic, and political rights.

THE DOWNPAYMENT

Crispus Attucks made the downpayment for us at Boston on March 5, 1770. Peter Salem made another payment at Bunker Hill, June 17, 1775, when he turned the tide of battle by killing the British commanding officer, Major Pitcairn. Since then the Negro has paid with sweat, blood, and tears, all the way from Bunker Hill to Korea—and has not produced a single traitor to the flag.

OUR LABOR

The sweat from the brows of our ancestors fell in ricefields, cotton plantations, railroad cuts, in the forests, and along the mountain sides. Negro labor became famous by the way in which it helped to build America. The work song about John Henry symbolizes the Joe Louis of labor dying with his hammer in his hand.

OUR WAR RECORD

Approximately 5,000 Negroes saw service in the Continental Army under Gen. George Washington. In 1812 black men were with the Marines, and in the Navy. They were with Perry on Lake Erie. They helped Gen. Andrew Jackson save the day at New Orleans, January 8, 1815. During the Civil War (1861–65), 178,975 were enrolled in the Union Army. Thirty-six thousand, eight hundred and forty-seven Negro soldiers lost their lives in this struggle, winning their own freedom and preserving the Union of the States. The 54th and 55th Massachusetts State Militia were the first Negro units to be mustered into the Union Army. Col. Robert Gould Shaw left Harvard College to lead the 54th. He was killed in action in South Carolina. Don't leave Boston until you see his monument in front of the State House done in bronze by Augustus St. Gaudens, one of America's outstanding sculptors.

After the Civil War, and during the Spanish-American War, the 9th and 10th Cavalry, and 24th and 25th Infantry were organized as Negro military units to be officered by white men. These black soldiers gave a good account of themselves, at all times. In Cuba, Black Jack Pershing was a Captain in the 10th Cavalry at San Juan Hill. Theodore Roosevelt, who was with the famous Rough Riders, said Pershing was the bravest man he had ever seen under fire. After reaching the White House, as President, Roosevelt promoted Pershing, by an executive order, from the rank of captain to that of brigadier-general.

In World War I, 404,348 Negroes served in the U.S. Army. Of this number, 1,353 were commissioned officers.

In World War II (Dec. 1, 1941 through Aug. 31, 1945) approximately 920,000 Negro personnel served in the U.S. Army and Air Force. Of this number 8,600 were officers. Today, we have a West Point graduate, Maj. Gen. B. O. Davis, Jr., commander of an American Air Force squadron based somewhere in Europe.

Thus you see the American Negro has truly paid the price. That is exactly why the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments were placed in the U.S. Constitution. They deserve to be there and deserve to be obeyed. American Negroes are fighting for, demanding, and dramatizing today, for the full and complete enforcement of these amendments. They have been in the Constitution for 90 years, or longer. Our Negro college students, often assisted by white fellow students, are walking picket lines, and staging "sit-in" demonstrations for these rights. Again, a moral issue is at stake. These college students will not be willing to wait supinely serene, like their fathers did, for lo these many years; but they are protesting to High Heaven, and in God's name, for justice—right now—if not sooner.

They know that the world rises on protest. They know that the Protestant church was built on protest and sacrifice. They know that Paul and Silas had to dramatize a jailhouse demonstration before they could worship God at Phillipi.

Thus, my friends, will the American Negro continue to protest against old man Jim Crow, and racial segregation, until they are driven from every American public place, North, South, East, and West. For as the poet says:

"The World Rises on Protest—and, to sin by Silence,
When we should Protest—Makes Cowards out of men."

Unfinished Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article about Robert Frost, which appeared in the Boston Sunday Herald, on August 28, 1960:

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

(By Donald Culross Peattie)

I suppose everyone who has been privileged to talk a while with Robert Frost has come away treasuring a memory of that conversation fruity with wisdom. After such an hour with the great but easy old poet, beside the hearth at his Vermont farm, I found the casual words above to linger longest in my thoughts.

Roll them about in your mind, you worried and hurried ones. Savor the richness of time and patience, of hope and faith, that lies in this simple utterance. For there is much in the business of our lives that we cannot hasten, for all the urgency of speed that today devils us. There is much—and this is true of the most important of our affairs—that cannot be concluded in a day, or a week, or a month, but must be let to take a guided course. We are too prone to bring it with us to our rest, and thrash it over uselessly. So I, for one, over and over, give thanks for the slyly sensible remark by Robert Frost.

He was, when I come to think of it, living as nature lives. When an acorn fallen from an oak at last splits husk, sprouts, and begins to take root, how much unfinished business lies ahead of it. It has

no contract with the sun and rain to have become an oak tree by a certain date. But with their help it will grow until it towers and spreads shade, in the good time we call God's. We ought as trustingly to let our plans and problems ripen to solution, knowing there is another Hand in the business beside our own. To leave a question to unfinished business is not to abandon the task. It is to attain the serenity which will give us strength to carry on with it when the call to effort comes.

Retreat Under Cover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORGAN M. MOULDER
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. MOULDER. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Post Dispatch is one of the few remaining great and independent newspapers in the United States. The editorials of this paper are highly respected and the following editorial is an example of this paper's understanding of our national and international problems:

RETREAT UNDER COVER

The net of the new controversy over the military budget appears to be that the administration has yielded to Congress in agreeing to spend more money on certain functions, but has thrown up a cloud of gobbledygook which obscures the full picture. Apparently the purpose is to give an impression of greater military effort without actually increasing it very much.

Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, who had demanded to know what the administration planned to do about the $661 million which Congress voted beyond the President's defense budget, is convinced that the administration still intends to freeze some $621 million of the extra funds. President Eisenhower denied this at his press conference, but was not convincing. Senator JOHNSON is probably right in saying that the President failed to understand that funds designated by the Pentagon as in an unallocated status or available for future requirements are really frozen, as of now.

If true, this means that the total military effort, as presently planned, is not going to be much greater than it was originally intended to be. That is not enough, and Senator JOHNSON is justified in saying so.

The new spending plan presented by Secretary Gates in response to Senator JOHNSON'S prodding apparently contemplates for developing airborne alert capabilities of the Strategic Air Command $170 million, just double what the administration originally proposed. But it does not use $100 million of extra funds which Congress made conditionally available. In practical terms this means that 60 bombers will have alert capabilities next March instead of 160.

Similarly, the new plan contemplates using only half of the extra $200 million Congress voted for developing the supersonic B–70 bomber, allotted $75 million in the original administration budget. In practical terms this means developing the B–70 as a nonmilitary prototype instead of as a complete weapons system.

Army modernization likewise gets only part of the funds Congress voted for it, and so on. Furthermore, the administration has not told Congress and the public what programs it intends to cut in order to make the funds available for these expanded programs. If Senator JOHNSON is right, and the total military effort is to be close to the original budget, then obviously substantial cuts must be contemplated somewhere.

We believe Congress has a right to demand full and explicit information from the administration, and the duty to keep prodding it for a stronger military effort. The changes so far made amount to an admission that the original administration budget was inadequate in certain specifics. This raises a strong presumption that it was also inadequate in total, and should be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, the Constitution of the United States delegates to Congress the power to:

Provide for the common defense and the general welfare of the United States.

To raise and support armies.

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States.

The Congress not only has the right to demand full and explicit information, it is the duty of Congress to perform the authority delegated by the Constitution.

Progress Report of Subcommittee No. 3 of the House Committee on the District of Columbia on S. 1456—A Bill To Provide the Appointment of Two Additional Judges for the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, August 28, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and report:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 30, 1960.

Hon. JOHN L. MCMILLAN,
Chairman, Committee on the District of Columbia, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I submit to you herewith a progress report of Subcommittee No. 3 on Senate bill, S. 1456.

The subcommittee is planning to meet during the congressional recess for further consideration of this legislation and the information we have gathered.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES C. DAVIS,
Chairman.

PROGRESS REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 3 OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA ON S. 1456—A BILL TO PROVIDE THE APPOINTMENT OF TWO ADDITIONAL JUDGES FOR THE JUVENILE COURT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AUGUST 28, 1960

During the 85th Congress H.R. 7785 was introduced providing for the appointment of one additional judge to the juvenile court of the District of Columbia. This bill was approved by the House Committee on the District of Columbia, passed by the House of Representatives, and was amended and passed by the Senate. The bill did not emerge from conference committee in time for final passage before adjournment of the 85th Congress.

Following the opening of the 86th Congress, S. 465, calling for the appointment of an additional judge to the juvenile court was introduced in the Senate. The Senate Committee on the District of Columbia held hearings on the bill in February 1959. Later, the committee favorably reported S. 1456 calling for the appointment of two additional judges of the juvenile court of the District of Columbia. The bill was thereafter passed by the Senate.

In July 1959, this subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia held hearings on S. 1456. Hearings for 2 additional days were held in December 1959. Evidence was received showing that the one-judge court had disposed of cases more rapidly than the rate of new cases filed and had reduced the court backlog by about 10 percent during fiscal year 1959. This fact, along with other information developed during the hearings, dictated the need for further study before any decision was reached on the two-judge bill. Committee staff was directed to develop more fully information on the past history of operation of the court, its caseload and organization, coupled with statistical data on at least part of the court's operation for fiscal year 1960.

Preliminary figures for fiscal year 1960 indicated a reversal in the trends shown by the court in 1959. With the very recent availability of final statistical information for fiscal year 1960, the subcommittee now has before its sufficient data, testimony, and evidence of record on which to reasonably gauge the problems of the juvenile court, its needs, and what legislation may be necessary to assure an adequate, efficient, and effective juvenile court in the District of Columbia.

PART I—TESTIMONY AND STATISTICAL RECORDS

Extensive testimony on the operation and needs of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia is a matter of record, in hearings before the House Committee on the District of Columbia, the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, and the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Juvenile Delinquency, in addition to statistical reports. Many prominent persons from District of Columbia courts, law enforcement agencies, and community organizations testified regarding S. 1456. Most witnesses expressed their sincere belief that the enactment of S. 1456 was the principal need of the juvenile court. Some witnesses urged other amendments to the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia.

Testimony of record before this subcommittee and the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia indicates that the support for the appointment of two additional judges was premised mostly on the following: (1) The great volume of hearings in the juvenile court; (2) the heavy backlog of cases pending in the court; and (3) population comparison studies with other cities relating the number of sitting juvenile court judges in those cities to the population.

1. Volume of juvenile court hearings; witnesses testifying before the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia in February 1959 on S. 465 expressed the view that the volume of court hearings alone was persuasive that two additional judges were needed and that "the single statistic of some 13,000 hearings" was sufficient to prove the point.[1]

In July 1959, following the passage of S. 1456 by the Senate, this subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia held public hearings on the two-judge proposal. Again principal witnesses referred to the number of hearings as being a most significant factor in support of the bill. However, the number of hearings was then placed at 10,000 for the previous year.[2]

Footnotes at end of speech.

In December 1959, for the 2 days of committee hearings, there was available to the subcommittee the first annual statistical report of the juvenile court which had been issued in October for the fiscal year 1959. Table 21 of this document, reported that the total of all court hearings on juvenile and adult cases for the year was 5,192. Included in this figure were 149 court trials and 32 jury trials.

Thus within a period of about 10 months the reported hearing load of the court, as represented to congressional committees dropped successively from 13,000 to 10,000 to less than 5,200. This indicated the need for further study of the operation of the court.

2. Backlog of cases: Prior to the change in the judgeship in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in May 1957, there had been no backlog of cases for several years, either as to juvenile or adult matters. During those years, when the court kept its docket free of any backlog, there was an average of 450 more cases filed with the court per year than during the fiscal years beginning in 1958. The court kept its caseload current.

No tabulation of the juvenile court backlog, which began accumulating in fiscal year 1958, is available prior to September 1, 1958, shortly after the end of the fiscal year. At that date, the backlog was 270 juvenile cases and 552 adult cases for a total of 822 cases.[3]

During fiscal year 1959, the juvenile court reduced its backlog by about 10 percent and ended the year with a backlog of 235 juvenile and 510 adult cases for a total of 745 cases.[4] During fiscal year 1960 the number of juvenile and adult cases filed with the court increased by 337 but the backlog rose to a total of 1,667.[5] The increase in the court's backlog exceeded the increase in cases filed by 585.

The relation between the backlog of cases in the juvenile court and the need for additional judges must be weighed in the light of the following: (1) That for fiscal years prior to and including 1957, with a substantially greater number of cases, the court had no backlog accumulation; (2) that during fiscal year, 1958, with 500 fewer cases filed than for the average of the preceding fiscal years, the court suddenly accumulated a backlog of 822 cases; (3) that with 3 percent fewer cases filed in fiscal year 1959 than in 1958, the court reduced its backlog by about 10 percent; (4) that during fiscal year 1960 with an increase of approximately 350 in the number of cases filed, the backlog increased by more than 900 cases for a total of 1667.

3. Comparison of the District of Columbia with other juvenile court jurisdictions: Determining the need of judges in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia by comparing juvenile courts in other cities, brings into consideration many factors which cannot be accurately weighed for such purposes. The jurisdiction of courts in other cities may be broader or narrower; the age limit may be lower; in some cities juvenile problems are handled by family courts with similar or broader jurisdiction than that of the juvenile court in the District; in some cities, all juvenile complaints are transmitted directly to the juvenile court while in others, of which Washington is one, juvenile complaints are screened by a juvenile division of the police department and only those cases involving other than minor offenses or second time offenders are transmitted to the juvenile court; also, the number of offenders per thousand population may vary considerably on different cities.

In hearings before various committees of Congress, testimony is on record comparing the population of the District of Columbia with that of other cities and relating the population comparison factor to the number of judges in the particular cities to establish the basis for additional judges in the juvenile court of the District of Columbia.[6] Studies made by the subcommittee staff indicated that if a three-judge court proposed by S. 1456 were established in the District of Columbia, and the same formula applied to the other cities, it would be necesasry to appoint additional judges in the cities used for comparison if they were to conform to the population-judge ratio proposed for the District in S. 1456. To illustrate, the juvenile court in Cleveland, Ohio, serves the metropolitan area within Cuyahoga County.[7] Placing the population of the District at 800,000 (the 1960 census shows substantially less) and applying the three-judge formula of S. 1456, the Cleveland court should have six judges since it has twice the population to serve. Cleveland has three judges, the third being appointed just about 2 years ago.

PART II—AUTONOMY AND MANAGEMENT OF THE COURT

Under the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia, the juvenile court is autonomous. It operates solely under the authority of the sitting judge and there is no supervision of its functions or management by any other judicial official or administrative official in the District of Columbia.

Under these circumstances, the effective and efficient operation of the juvenile court calls for the application of multiple skills. In addition to an understanding of the responsibilities and duties placed upon the court by the Juvenile Court Act, an understanding of juvenile court law and procedures, and the exercise of judicial capability, the judge of this court must likewise have the capacity to cooperate closely with agencies whose functions may be related to the court, and the capacity for supervising and managing a considerable staff of employees.

The closest relationship the juvenile court has with any other body in the District of Columbia is with the municipal court of the District by reason of provisions of law calling for the assignment of judges from the municipal court bench to the juvenile court in the absence of the judge or the event a vacancy exists in the juvenile court.

Early in fiscal year 1958, management studies were started looking forward to the reorganization of the juvenile court.[8] The management office of the District of Columbia assisted the court in this work. Visits were made to juvenile courts in other cities to study their operations and discover methods which might be advantageously used. As a result of these management studies, the court procedures were streamlined. Duplicate operations eliminated where possible, recordkeeping mechanized and simplified, and other changes made to relieve the judge of burdens and to facilitate the smooth functioning of the court at staff levels. The court was given an administrative division, not found in the organizational structures of other courts in the District.

Appropriations were increased in excess of $250,000 between fiscal year 1957 and the current fiscal year and 22 new positions were authorized. Despite these facts, and with a decrease in the average number of cases filed, the court backlog rose from zero at the beginning of fiscal year 1958 to 1,667 at the end of fiscal year 1960.

The Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia gives to the juvenile court the exclusive jurisdiction in determining the paternity of illegitimate children and concurrent jurisdiction with the U.S. district court in criminal nonsupport cases.[9] The handling of these adult cases, is not only directly related to the well-being of those for whom support is ordered by the court but also to the financial burdens of the department of public welfare. The statutory function of the court is to determine legal obligation and necessity of the support and to enforce its judgments.

In connection with criminal nonsupport cases, the court at one time discontinued scheduling such cases for court action. The court has indicated that such cases are given lowest priority rating of all matters within its jurisdiction.[10]

Collections in adult cases involving support matters increased steadily through the end of fiscal year 1957, when court collections totaled $945,677. Beginning in fiscal 1958, and even with the reorganization of the court, collections declined each year to a point approaching $450,000 less than the amount collected in fiscal year 1957.

In connection with the justification of requests for appropriations for the court for fiscal year 1959 to provide additional positions, it was stated that certain additional employees might increase the court's collections by about $200,000 per year.[11] The new positions were authorized and within a few months thereafter the intake section handling support cases was abolished, the employees transferred, and the workload shifted to the Office of the Corporation Counsel who was compelled to request additional employees to assume the additional work. Collections thereafter continued to decline.

At Appropriations Committee hearings the following year, explanation of this action was requested.[12] Discussion was had concerning the transfer of adult cases from the juvenile court, and testimony was taken concerning the effect of court's action on the operations of the Office of the Corporation Counsel and the Department of Public Welfare. The court there and elsewhere expressed its "chafing" under the adult problem imposed by the Juvenile Court Act.[13]

The following tables present in summary form, the essence of statistical figures concerning the operation of the juvenile court in the years preceding and including fiscal year 1957, and the 3 succeeding fiscal years to the present. Table 1 deals with appropriations, personnel, caseload, backlog, and court collections. Table 2 relates the appropriations or cost of operation of the court to the amount of the court collections on a per case filed basis. The figures used are extracted from hearings before Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate, hearings before the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and from the statistical reports of the juvenile court for fiscal 1959 and the quarterly reports for fiscal 1960, by quarter or cumulatively for the year.

CHART I

Statistics relating to cost of operation, cases filed, case backlog, and collections, District of Columbia juvenile court

Fiscal year	Appropriation	Number of authorized positions	Number of cases filed			Backlog of cases			Collections
			Juvenile	Adult	Total	Juvenile	Adult	Total	
1954	$327,000	72	2,057	1,407	3,464				
1955	347,000	74	1,757	1,516	3,273				
1956	407,000	80	1,877	1,797	3,674				$785,000
1957	428,000	81	1,846	1,878	3,424				945,677

Footnotes at end of speech.

CHART I—Continued

Statistics relating to cost of operation, cases filed, case backlog, and collections, District of Columbia juvenile court—Continued

(Present judge took office at this point)

Fiscal year	Appropriation	Number of authorized positions	Number of cases filed			Backlog of cases			Collections
			Juvenile	Adult	Total	Juvenile	Adult	Total	
1958	$490,900	86	1,870	1,027	2,897	270	552	822	$626,415
1959	573,000	95	[1] 1,840	993	2,833	235	510	745	511,931
1960	620,000	97	1,685	1,485	3,170	502	1,165	1,667	506,040
1961	689,700	103							

[1] Comparison of the statistical reports of the court for fiscal years 1959 and 1960 indicates that the method of reporting was changed in 1960. There was no table in the 1959 statistical report showing new petitions filed with the court. The 1959 figure of 1,840 for juvenile petitions used in chart 1 may be slightly in excess of the total number of new juvenile petitions filed in the court. The figure of 1,685 new juvenile petitions filed for fiscal 1960 is a cumulative total taken from table 9 of the quarterly reports. However, the cumulative total of table 1 shows an intake of 3,243 individual juveniles. Table 7 shows disposition of 2,030 new juvenile petitions. As to new adult petitions, the cumulative total of the quarterly statistical reports of the court shows in table 9, 1,485 new adult petitions. Table 8 shows a total of 1,720 new adult petitions. The Assistant Corporation Counsel's Office indicates a total of 1,390 new adult petitions filed.

CHART II

Fiscal year	Net difference between court collections and court operating costs	Net difference per case filed	Backlog of cases
1956	+$378,000	+$102.88	None
1957	+517,677	+151.19	None
(Present judge took office at this point)			
1958	+$135,515	+$46.77	822
1959	−61,069	−21.55	745
1960	−113,960	−35.00	1,667

The essence of these charts is that through fiscal year 1957 the juvenile court, with a significantly great number of cases filed, operated on less money, had fewer employees, greatly increased collections, and had no backlog. From fiscal year 1957 to date this court has been reorganized, received increased appropriations, given additional personnel, had fewer filed cases, but collections have dropped precipitately and a large backlog has developed. All steps which might be expected to improve the operation of the court seem to have had the opposite result.

Related directly or indirectly to the autonomy and management of the court are the conflicts and confusions which have developed between the court and other District agencies. Mild to severe conflicts have been noted in the press and have been the subject of attention by House and Senate Appropriations Committees. Involved have been the Office of the Corporation Counsel, the Youth Aid Division of the Police Department, and the Department of Public Welfare. Conflicts related to the handling of adults charged with contributing to delinquency, handling of support cases, control over juveniles committed for rehabilitation, referral of juvenile first offenders involved in very minor infractions, and other problems. To minimize such incidents, clarifying amendments may be necessary.

PART III—AMENDMENTS TO THE JUVENILE COURT ACT

The subcommittees feels that the foregoing parts of this report indicate a court that is in genuine difficulty. In no other facet of the judicial system do delays have more far-reaching consequences to the community than in a juvenile court. The decision of the Congress must be such as to bring the caseload in the juvenile court to current status and insure that it be kept current. The loss of more than $400,000 per year in court collections must be corrected.

First considerations leading to legislative action to assure an efficient and effective court are: (1) Will additional judicial personnel alone provide efficient handling of the court load? (2) Should the juvenile court continue as an autonomous body? (3) If supervision is needed, should the juvenile court become a branch of the municipal court or a unit within the domestic relations branch of the municipal court of the District of Columbia?

Subordinate to the above major issues, but meriting attention, are other amendments suggested to the subcommittee or which have appeared as closely related to juvenile matters.

1. Referees: Referees are used in many juvenile courts. The referee usually handles less serious offenses and places his findings and recommendations before the judge for final action. Under procedure instituted by the court about 2 years ago, the Director of Social Work conducts hearings. This procedure closely parallels that used in courts served by referees. These director's hearings have reduced the caseload handled by the court since a substantial portion of juvenile cases have been disposed of at that level.

2. Waiver by the court: Under terms of the Juvenile Court Act, the judge may waive to the U.S. district court the case of any juvenile 16 years of age or older who has committed an offense which would constitute a felony. Pending court action or after disposition, the same juvenile may be brought before the juvenile court for another offense. If the offense is a misdemeanor, the case cannot be waived and the same juvenile has cases pending before both the juvenile and adult courts. Waiver of the child rather than the offense would prevent such a contradiction wherein the same person is a juvenile offender in one court and an adult criminal in the other court.

3. Determining sufficiency of complaints at intake: Complaints against juveniles referred to the juvenile court are not evaluated for their legal sufficiency at the time of referral. After a complaint has been investigated and a full social study made, a determination is reached as to whether the case shall be petitioned to the court. If it is to be petitioned, the legal sufficiency of the complaint is determined by the Assistant Corporation Counsel. If there is inadequate legal basis for action, the case is dropped. Power in the hands of the Corporation Counsel to determine whether a complaint shall be petitioned to court before other disposition and determine the legal sufficiency of complaints at intake may better protect the interests of the public, the juvenile, and save staff time and effort.

4. Jury trials for juveniles: The juvenile court of the District of Columbia must grant a jury trial to a juvenile when request is made under terms of the Juvenile Court Act. This may be the only jurisdiction where such right is provided in law. The Judicial Conference of the District of Columbia recommends that the jury-trial provision for juveniles be repealed.

5. Waiver of incorrigible habitual offenders: The repeat offender, demonstrably not yielding to rehabilitative efforts, and whose offenses remain misdemeanors, is beyond the benefit of services offered by the juvenile court. Power to the juvenile court to waive such offenders for commission of misdemeanors to the municipal court would remove them from contact and association with other juveniles who might be influenced to their detriment.

6. Lowering of age limits: The present age limit for juveniles is 18. The great majority of repeat offenders and hardened young criminals are found between the ages of 16 and 18. Lowering the age limit below 18 for all offenders or only repeat offenders, for felonies or felonies and misdemeanors, would remove those beyond probable help by the juvenile court rehabilitation resources and minimize their potential of detrimental influence on other juveniles.

7. Opening court records: Present law closes the records on juvenile cases to the public and the press. In consequence the press refrains from printing names of juveniles involved in crime regardless of the source of information. Strong authority is found on both sides of the issue of secrecy of juvenile files. Whether secrecy has helped to promote increased delinquency or whether it has been a brake on an increase which would otherwise have been more rapid cannot be demonstrated by any proof. Opening records of juveniles 16 and over may merit examination in the light of present trends and beliefs of juvenile experts.

8. Juvenile traffic cases: The juvenile 16 years of age enjoys the status and privileges of an adult as to driving a car with the exception that he must go to the juvenile court for any violation of traffic regulations, including those minor violations for which an adult may post collateral. It is questioned if such minor violations constitute delinquency. Removal of such minor violations from the court's jurisdiction will lighten the court's load without increasing delinquency rates in the District of Columbia.

---

[1] Hearings—Senate Committee on District of Columbia Feb. 11, 1959, transcript pp. 58, 61 (statement), 65 (statement), 167, 176.

[2] Hearings—House Committee on the District of Columbia, July 23, 1959, p. 15; p. 6.

[3] Hearings—House Committee on District of Columbia, Dec. 11, 1959, p. 121; hearings, Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, Feb. 4, 1959, p. 121.

[4] Hearings—House Committee on the District of Columbia, Dec. 11, 1959, p. 120; Statistical Report of Juvenile Court, 1st quarter fiscal year 1960, table 9.

[5] Statistical Report of Juvenile Court, 4th quarter 1960, table 9.

[6] Hearings—House Committee on the District of Columbia, July 23, 1959, p. 18; hearings—House Committee on Appropriations, 1961, p. 416 (District of Columbia Appropriations—1961); hearing—Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, Feb. 4, 1959, pp. 44, 46, 65 (statement).

[7] Population comparisons in this instance used as a population figure of about 900,000 correct for metropolitan Cleveland. However, the Cleveland Court serves the entire population of Cuyahoga County which is approximately 1,600,000. Hearings—House Committee on the District of Columbia, July 23, 1959, p. 19.

[8] Hearings—House Committee on Appropriations, District of Columbia Appropriations, 1961, pp. 408–419.

[9] As a matter of practice, the juvenile court is exercising exclusive jurisdiction on

criminal nonsupport cases since the U.S. district court has exercised no jurisdiction in such cases for several years. Municipal court for the District of Columbia enforces reciprocal nonsupport laws in the District and reports a growing volume of collections within the District. Funds so collected, however, accrue to the support of persons located outside the District of Columbia.

[10] Hearings—Senate District of Columbia Committee, Feb. 4, 1959—p. 12; Hearings—House Committee on Appropriations, District of Columbia Appropriations 1960, p. 515.

[11] Hearings—House Committee on Appropriation, District of Columbia Appropriations 1959, p. 395.

[12] Hearings—House Committee on Appropriations, District of Columbia Appropriations 1960, pp. 509–517.

[13] Hearings—House Committee on District of Columbia, July 23, 1959, p. 20.

The Kelly Amendment to the 1955 Federal Voting Assistance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT BY NEIL M. LIEBLICH, DIRECTOR OF THE DIVISION FOR SERVICEMEN'S VOTING OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 8432, INTRODUCED BY THE HONORABLE EDNA F. KELLY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 10TH DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

I am deeply honored at the privilege accorded me today to present my views on the subject of the amendment to the 1955 Federal Voting Assistance Act proposed by the Honorable EDNA F. KELLY in her bill, H.R. 8432. I am the Democratic member of the Division for Servicemen's Voting of the State of New York, a bipartisan body established for the purpose of cooperating with and assisting the U.S. Army, Navy, and Air Force, postal authorities, and any Federal agency which may be created for the distribution and collection of military ballots.

Ever since 1942, the Legislature of the State of New York has been in the forefront of those patriotic and interested Americans who have been determined to safeguard the sanctity of the ballot of our citizens serving in the actual military service of our country. Each year the New York State Legislature has passed enabling legislation to facilitate voting by New York State residents in the Armed Forces, as well as their spouses, parents, and children who may be traveling with them and who are qualified to vote in the general and special elections held in the State of New York.

I mentioned that I am the Democratic member of the two-man division in New York State. My Republican counterpart, the Honorable Herman Winner, joins with me fully in support of the Kelly amendment. In brief, both major political parties in New York State believe that it would be to the best interests of the servicemen and any eligible relatives who may be with them if section 203 of the 1955 Federal Voting Assistance Act were amended to provide for "in hand" delivery of applications for military or absentee ballots by the proper officers of the armed services instead of the present inadequate provisions of the Federal law which make such applications available upon request.

During the past 18 elections, when our Nation was both at war and in peace, it was very evident to my Division for Servicemen's Voting and to its predecessor State War Ballot Commission that the thousands of servicemen who wrote to us were sincere in expressing thanks to us for having provided the machinery whereby they could apply for and vote by mail military or absentee ballots while they were stationed away from home. Some were thousands of miles away from the local election polling precinct in which their ballots were counted. It was wonderful for their morale. It is wonderful now for their morale because it accentuates the fundamental concept of Americanism—the right of franchise, the right of a free people to select the governing officers of their village, city, State and Nation by a secret ballot, without fear or restraint. Men and women in service who are accorded the facility of voting by making a written application by mail for a military or absentee ballot are the beneficiaries of the great American way of life. Certainly the records in New York State clearly evidence that we have made a wonderful impact upon the servicemen of our State by what we have been able to do for them in the area of voting during these past 18 years.

Before the enactment of the 1955 Federal Voting Assistance Act, we strongly urged the inclusion of the provisions for the "in hand" delivery of applications to every male and female in the service of the United States within and outside the continental limits of our country. We based our suggestions upon actual experiences. We knew, and hence we recommended, that only by "in hand" delivery of applications for military or absentee ballots could we be assured of the participation of the greatest number of servicemen and their relatives in each general election.

To illustrate: In 1944, a year when the Federal law mandated the armed services to deliver an application for a military or absentee ballot into the hands of every man and woman in the service of our Nation in and outside of the United States, more servicemen in the State of New York voted in the presidential election that year than ever voted before or since in any general election during war or peace times. Not only was the number that voted that year unprecedentedly high but the percentage of participation by servicemen was greater than at any time—before or since. Thereafter, when the provisions for the mandatory delivery of applications in hand was eliminated from the Federal voting laws, and instead provision was made for the availability of applications upon request, fewer and fewer servicemen participated each year. Here is the record in New York State from 1945 to 1950, after 640,809 servicemen applied for military ballots in 1944 and 413,225 actually voted:

Year	Applications	Voted
1945	41,645	26,816
1946	1,987	1,491
1947	1,702	1,318
1948	3,768	3,203
1949	880	737
1950	3,945	3,092

Investigation revealed that the announcement or announcements that the applications for military or absentee ballots were available were not meaningful to the members of the Armed Forces. The importance of thereafter asking some voting officer for application was never stressed. Reliance by servicemen upon receiving an application—and then not getting an application—resulted in subsequent disappointment to them because they felt they had been deprived of their right to vote. Our office in New York was flooded with complaints that they could not vote. We are unable to help them because they had never filed applications for military ballots. When we so advised these servicement, they demanded to know why they had not received applications.

It is our belief in the State of New York that the reason for the tremendous falloff in the number of applications was the passage of Public Law 348, 79th Congress, on April 19, 1946, when the provisions for the "in hand" delivery of applications to servicemen were deleted from the Federal voting laws and were replaced by the provisions whereby applications were made available upon request. Suffice it to say that we felt so strongly about it that we prevailed upon the gracious gentlewoman from New York, the Honorable EDNA F. KELLY, to introduce a bill at that time to amend the Federal voting laws once more to mandate "in hand" delivery of applications. The Kelly amendment was passed at the 2d session of the 81st Congress and became the law on September 29, 1950. It is obvious that the lateness of the passage of the amendment that year could not have more than a token effect upon the number of applications received in New York State. We were delighted to process 3,945 applications in 1950—more than 3,000 in excess of the number received before "in hand" delivery was mandated.

With in hand delivery during the year 1951–54, New York State servicemen participated in greater numbers in the general elections. The number of applications rose to 10,147 in 1951; to 84,547 in 1952, a presidential election year; and fell off in an off-year 1953 to 4,870, which was a year comparable to 1949 when only 880 applications were received in New York State; and up to 15,047 in 1954.

When the present Federal Voting Assistance Law was a bill pending in the Congress in 1955, we were surprised to learn that the mandatory provisions of in hand delivery were being eliminated. We urged that in hand delivery be mandated. Mrs. Kelly sought to amend the then proposed bill. Our efforts were in vain—and, in the opinion of the directors of the Division for Servicemen's Voting in New York State, without any reason or basis therefor. We can safely say that every voting official with whom we have ever discussed the problem during the past 18 years has been in agreement with us that we should have in hand delivery of applications to servicemen. That does not mean that we have to line our servicemen up and march them to a polling place. That does not mean that we have to force servicemen to vote. All it means is that we, the civilians, make it easy for the serviceman if he wants to vote to be able to apply for his military or absentee ballot by mail. If the voting officers had to hand deliver the applications, and not merely make the applications available upon request, it would not create an insurmountable program for their positions nor a problem to achieve in practicality. Perfection is not the criterion. Delivery would not have to be made to an isolated post 8,000 miles from civilization, but delivery would have to be made where humanly possible, feasible, and practicable.

The present Federal voting assistance law repealed all previous laws and became effective as Public Law 296 on August 9, 1955. Its first real impact was in 1956, a presidential election year. The Federal Coordinator under the Federal Voting Assistance Act estimated for us at that time, and we so reported to the Legislature of the State of New York, that in 1956 "those eligible to vote in the 1956 election from the State of New York was 249,000." Only 52,649 military voters applied for military ballots in New York that year. It was gloomy to compare this with the results of 1952 where

with "in hand" delivery, we received 84,547 applications from an estimated 215,000 servicemen eligible to participate.

In the annual report made by the directors of the division for servicemen's voting on January 10, 1957, we said at page 68 of Legislative Document No. 103 (1957):

"It is impossible for the directors to reach all of these members of the Armed Forces and their spouses and dependents and furnish them with the New York State form of post card application for military ballots. Thus it became extremely important to have a wide distribution of the Federal post card applications made to the residents of the State of New York. In those years when 'in hand' distribution of Federal post card applications was made, the Federal post card applications constituted about 90 percent of all applications received. In the 1956 election, however, only about 65 percent to 70 percent of all applications received were on the Federal post card application forms. The balance were received either on the post card form furnished by the Division or in letters or other forms of applications which were acceptable."

In our annual report on January 13, 1958, we again stated:

"There was one material and radical change made in the new Federal Voting Assistance Act. It eliminated the distribution of these post card applications during years when Federal officers were to be voted for. As a matter of fact, the distribution of post card applications 'in hand' to all members of the Armed Forces was done away with entirely.

"This change has greatly militated against the use of the Federal post card form of application and this became very apparent during the 1957 election. From time to time a check was made of applications received from servicemen and it was ascertained that less than 10 percent of those applying for a military ballot used the Federal post card form."

We have reviewed the facts insofar as they relate to the State of New York. We deem it important to accentuate the difference between the "availability" of applications at a post, camp, base, installation or station and the "in hand" delivery of applications at these places. Indubitably, more servicemen will participate in the elections if every effort is made to facilitate their getting their voting applications. This has nothing to do with their eligibility. Each State has the sovereign right to determine the qualifications of their voters. If, however, a serviceman is eligible to vote and wants to vote, we should do everything within our power and scope to make it easy for him to do so.

I strongly urge your support of the Kelly amendment to the 1955 Federal Voting Assistance Act. I strongly urge its passage in time for use at the 1960 presidential elections.

Thank you for the privilege of appearing before your body.

Good Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped recently presented a meritorious service citation to the Pan American World Airways, which now employs more than 500 handicapped persons. The company has provided leadership in this nationwide program and moreover is furnishing distinct evidence that hiring of the handicapped is good business. I have long supported programs advocating this principle and am gratified to see that recognition is being made in instances where businesses have put the principle to practice. I am pleased that a constituent of mine, Mr. John S. Woodbridge, of Darien, Conn., the comptroller of Pan American, who has done much to further the company's program of hiring handicapped persons, was chosen to accept the citation on behalf of the company, and under permission previously granted include Mr. Woodbridge's remarks in accepting the citation. The remarks:

REMARKS OF JOHN S. WOODBRIDGE, COMPTROLLER, PAN AMERICAN WORLD AIRWAYS

In receiving this citation from your noble organization, with heartfelt thanks, I want to leave a militant message for those of you who are employers and prospective employers of people, a message which I trust will be widely disseminated and actively productive.

In general, a disabled person makes a good employee, and frequently a superior employee. Nature has a way of compensating structural failure with additional mental ability. Further, these employees generally are steady workers, not given to frequent change of job but desirous of continuity of employ.

Employment of the disabled is thus not a one-way street, beneficial only to the employee, but is also valuable to those employers who have become aware of this excellent source of talent.

When this refreshing concept is augmented by programs for supplying the disabled employees with incentives for living and for disregard of their afflictions, the divine sparks of hope and joy of living can be rekindled within those in despair, resulting in a truly practical contribution to our country, the finest of all, the United States of America.

Baltimore Milk Market Order 127

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS F. JOHNSON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. JOHNSON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Max Chambers, editor and publisher of Maryland's foremost farm newspaper, News and Farmer of Preston, Md.:

Last Wednesday and Thursday the courthouse at Cambridge, loaned for what was expected to be a USDA quasi-judicial hearing, turned out to be no hearing at all, but a shocking example of what government power has done to us.

The "hearing" was requested by Eastern Shore independent dairymen and farmers so they might try to prove that the Eastern Shore should be taken out of the Baltimore Milk Market Order No. 127.

Refused to be heard. What a travesty on the intelligence of the people of the Eastern Shore or any other part of the United States. The county courthouse since the founding of the 13 colonies has been the meeting place for the discussion of public questions. Here and now on the Eastern Shore in Dorchester County, a public and personal question can't be discussed because a Benson "dairy dynasty" bureaucrat and examiner say "No. Little chimney—heated hot."

Following 1½ days of effort, counsel for independent milk producers and bottlers requested the U.S. Department of Agriculture to recess the "hearing."

Counsel, for Mills Dairy, Shiloh Dairy, Twilley Dairy, and a number of independent farmers in adjoining counties, very ably at the outset set forth what they planned to present as new evidence and that they proposed to prove that the Eastern Shore should be taken out of the Baltimore Federal Milk Order No. 127.

Milk orders were originally set up to protect farmers' prices on raw milk. Today Baltimore milkmen have frankly said that the 127 Milk Order controls the retail price of milk (where the milk is sold) not where it is produced.

At considerable expense counsel for the dedendants brought together some 50 witnesses to try to convince the USDA that the 127 order is not needed, not wanted, and that farmers will get less money for their milk, consumers will pay more, independent dairymen (bottlers) will be put out of business and the economy of the Shore will be impaired. This $15 million business received no consideration of its viewpoint.

This is the general history of most milk orders. The Eastern Shore isn't the only place suffering from USDA "Dairy Dynasty" pressure. Iowa and several other States are hard hit.

The House Agriculture Committee Milk Order hearings in Washington May 18–20 of this year brought out some startling evidence. And it is heard that there is more to come.

But now the Eastern Shore has a real economic problem. The Governor and his Economic Development Commission might carefully look into this one. Politicians, except Congressman JOHNSON have not been "on the ball" on this local farm problem.

It should be made clear that the USDA "jumped the gun" and hauled five bottlers into Federal court before they had an opportunity to get the 15A petition hearing, which they have been asking for, to prove they should not be under the Baltimore Order No. 127.

They say the USDA is dead wrong when it tries to put any man in jail before giving that man a full and fair hearing on its own Department rules. Eastern Shore men say they haven't had a fair hearing and that the USDA is trying to force them to comply with its order or put them in jail before giving them a fair hearing.

Where is the justice in a case when a man is tried for not complying with an order before he has a chance to try to prove he should not have to comply with it in the first place?

Eighteen witnesses were put on the stand but not one was allowed to give any testimony. The only way counsel for the Shoremen, James K. Knudsen and Ben Melnicoff, could get any testimony into the record was by counsel saying what the witness would have said by proffer.

The Examiner said counsel could only show that findings of the Secretary in issuing the order were illegal. New evidence has come up since the order was promulgated, but counsel was not allowed to present it.

The attorney for the USDA, Joseph A. Walsh, consistently objected to every ques-

tion and procedure and was consistently sustained by the Examiner, who compared himself to a judge in a court of law, but did state that he was an Examiner under USDA administrative law.

The entire 1½ days were tense with both lawyers for the defendants and the Examiner speaking loudly and pounding on bench and table. At lunch time the Examiner was berated by several persons involved in the so-called hearing. In fact there was so much uneasiness in the court house that the Cambridge city police officers felt it necessary to be present prior to the lunch hour on the second day and remain until the hearing was recessed.

Attorneys for the local petitioners saw they were getting nowhere and requested that the petition be referred back to the Secretary of Agriculture or to the Chief USDA Judicial Officer. The Examiner refused and indicated that he was hearing the case and whatever recommendation he made would most likely stand.

He consistently said he would not listen to any testimony other than arguments on the testimony given the original hearings on the Federal milk order in Baltimore about 2 years ago. He said that it was a waste of time.

Even a life-term murderer can get a new hearing on new evidence! There are a number of instances throughout the United States where men have been proven innocent and released—and paid for time served.

Yet, businessmen and farmers on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, after 8 months of asking, cannot get a fair and full hearing before the Department of Agriculture—not a commentary on the democratic system.

The whole mess at Cambridge is a sad commentary on the Democratic system.

It's a shame that more thinking Eastern Shore men could not have been present and seen this performance which dairy farmers present were in no mood to experience.

Could it be that this case at Cambridge would have its counterpart in Ralph Waldo Emerson's immortal "Concord Hymn", sung April 19, 1836, at the Minute Man Monument?

"By the rude bridge that arched the flood,
Their flag to April's breeze unfurled,
Here once the embattled farmers stood,
And fired the shot heard round the world!"

Message to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on Its 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following message to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on the occasion of its 20th anniversary:

MESSAGE TO THE UKRAINIAN CONGRESS COMMITTEE OF AMERICA ON ITS 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Tyranny has never been a stranger to the courageous people of the Ukraine. Long has it been their lot to be the victims of expanding empires, and to suffer at the blood-drenched hands of the invader.

The Ukraine has particularly fared ill at the hands of Russian imperialism. Though claiming to have cast aside the tenets of prior Russian expansionism and though picturing itself as the new savior of the masses, the Soviet Union became the most vicious oppressor in the long and hard fought saga of the Ukraine. Within 5 years after it had taken power the Soviet Union realized that a major stumbling block to her plans for world conquest lay in the nationalist strivings of the Ukraine. Repression of Ukraine culture, massacres of innocents, mass deportations to Siberia—all have been used to consolidate the power of the U.S.S.R. over the Ukraine.

In the past the Ukraine has always emerged triumphant with her enemy destroyed. Years might have passed but victory in each case was ultimately and gloriously hers. Yet in the periods of arduous waiting, years of fearing the every knock on the door, years of starvation and persecution, hope remained alive. It had to if ever the Ukrainian people were to become free again.

It is such an organization as the Ukrainian Congress Committee of American which provides the captive nations with this potent weapon against the Communist aggressor. The committee goes even further for it realizes that hope alone cannot defeat a historic imperialism and a modern totalitarianism. That is why the program of the committee, its splendid publications, and the unflagging efforts of its membership of two and one half million are all fulfilling a highly commendable and active service to America, to the free world and to the enslaved multitudes under the Soviet heel. That is why, on behalf of the millions in the dozen captive nations and on behalf of America I wish to congratulate and to thank the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on its 20th anniversary.

Radio and Television Programing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the concern of our Nation with the uses being made of radio and television has been reflected many times in discussions conducted on this floor. I know that our citizens recognize the fine work of this Congress to insure that the vast resources of the radio and television media would be used constructively.

Last fall, I was among many who spoke out against the indifference to the public interest revealed in certain TV and radio practices. At that time I urged the listening and viewing public in my Connecticut community to insist upon an improvement of radio and television programing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe we should continue our concern with our national, educational, and entertainment media; I believe citizens should expect that the great power of the airwaves be used in behalf of the public good. I believe that this concern should be expressed not only by criticism of what is bad but also acclaim for what is praiseworthy.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to a unique program being developed by the national broadcasting system. Recognizing the urgent need for widespread public participation in defining America's national goals and purposes, the National Broadcasting Co. will begin a weekly television series this fall that will deal with vital current issues through live discussions and debates. The program, entitled, "The Nation's Future," will premiere on November 12.

As a Representative from the State of Connecticut where the town meeting still flourishes in many communities, I am particularly pleased with the unique approach which this program will make to subjects of pressing concern to each citizen and to the Nation. These discussions will be led by statesmen in public life, including world leaders, Members of Congress, ambassadors, economists, and idealists, as well as leaders from management and labor. Recognizing that every citizen has a personal stake in these issues the National Broadcasting Co. will arrange for these programs to be integrated with local activities so as to stimulate discussions in local, civic, fraternal and educational groups. Research and study material will be sent to these groups in advance of each weekly program. The National Broadcasting Co. will also arrange and organize the participation of the air of representatives of these local groups. Through the cooperation of the National Broadcasting Co. affiliates in each area, the Nation's future will give countrywide scope to our traditional town meeting system.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the National Broadcasting Co. is to be highly commended for its efforts in originating a program of such vital national importance which will give our people an opportunity to reexamine their ideals and aspirations and utilize the facts for making informed opinions and judgment. I know that the Nation's future will generate a deeper conscience of the American way of life and the values of democracy and freedom as well as the importance of safeguarding these values not only in our country but the world over.

This is television programing at its best. This is the kind of programing America needs, and I am certain the success of the Nation's future will prove it is what America wants.

A Cuban on Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to call to the attention of the House the following which appeared as a letter to the editor of the Christian Science Monitor. Since this letter was written by a Cuban, I believe it is especially significant and would recommend its careful study by all Members of this body.

The letter follows:

A CUBAN ON CUBA

To the CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR:

Please allow me to congratulate you on your editorial of June 9, "Cuba: Restraint But Not Inaction."

It is certainly encouraging to realize the importance your newspaper gives to the tremendous menace a Communist regime in Cuba offers not only to the United States but to all the Latin American countries. However, your answers to your own question, What can be done (about this serious danger to our democracies)? fall short of the right solution.

Have you, or the American people stopped to consider what would happen if Cuba and Russia sign a mutual security treaty? And you can bet that this is in the making. Perhaps some naïve people believe such a treaty will provide the right "excuse" for the United States to use the Monroe Doctrine, which would permit an American intervention in Cuban affairs. However, they better think twice about the consequences of such action after a Russian-Cuban agreement has been signed. There will be no way to break it up, except by risking a third world war.

Let us not forget Russia's grip on Hungary, Poland, and the rest of the Soviet satellite countries. What would happen if we try to liberate any of these countries? The same goes for Cuba after it has signed a security pact with Russia.

Cuba, as a new "Socialist State of the People" will be the trampoline from which a more direct Communist infiltration in Latin America will bounce off. Russian planes and submarines will be watching our shores, waiting for the right moment to act. Ballistic missiles will not be hard to set up, and at only 90 miles from us. And, worst of all, democratic governments in Latin America will fall one after the other. The end, then, is obvious.

It is because of the above-mentioned premises that the United States must act now, before it is too late.

Among the things, the United States should do, as of now, the following are paramount:

1. Break off diplomatic relations with Castro's government. (The rest of Latin America will follow because they know that in this struggle between democracy and communism there is no middle ground, and they know their place is with the United States. After all, for less reasons Colombia has broken up diplomatic relations with the Dominican Republic; and Guatemala with Cuba; and many a Latin American country has broken up diplomatic relations with another Latin American nation for practically no reason.)

2. After this initial step, all Cuban delegations and consulates, and 26 of July Clubs in the United States will have to pack up and take their Communist propaganda with them. This, at least, will stop men such as the director of La Gaceta—a Spanish newspaper published in Tampa—from saying that the President of Cuba is not a Communist, when it is well known by all of us (Cubans) that the President of Cuba ran for Representative to the Lower Chamber of Cienfuegos (Cuba) in the Communist Party in the elections of 1944; and that he was an officer of the Communist Party's local committee of said city of Cienfuegos during 1940–44; and that he was personal secretary of Juan Marinello, No. 1 Communist of Cuba for more than 30 years.

3. It will be very easy then (for the United States) to cut off the tremendous subsidy paid to Cuba's sugar industry, which will be forced to sell its sugar to Russia at the price they are so proud to brag about, little over 2 cents a pound. Certainly, the Cuban people will suffer. But they stand to suffer 10 times more under the Communist regime of Castro.

Then, let Castro bring petroleum from Russia—after the three American and English refining companies have finally pulled out, even if, they lose millions of dollars (they are going to lose them anyhow). Eventually, a new and democratic government will take over in Cuba. And with it, and with the rest of the democratic governments of Latin America, the United States can go back to its job of closing the gap between its tremendous high standard of living and the tremendous low standard of living of most, if not all, of the Latin American countries.

RAFAEL LECUONA.

TALLAHASSEE, FLA.

Address by Hon. Francis E. Walter Before the Texas Department of the American Legion

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE M. KILGORE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, recently our colleague, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, addressed the Texas Department of the American Legion on the occasion of its annual convention in Dallas, Tex.

I obtained a copy of Mr. WALTER'S speech and read it with great interest. It is so timely and so cogent that I know many others will want to read it.

The speech follows:

ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN FRANCIS E. WALTER, DEMOCRAT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TEXAS DEPARTMENT, THE AMERICAN LEGION, DALLAS, TEX., AUGUST 12, 1960

In glancing at the correspondence which I had with Commander Peters in response to the invitation to speak to this convention, I noticed that I addressed him as "Dear Comrade." To those of us in the Legion, this salutation has special significance, because as comrades in arms we have shared common dangers and as Legionnaires we are dedicated to common objectives.

How curious it is that even this salutation "Comrade" has been appropriated and perverted by our Communist enemy who debauches language itself.

Masquerading behind a facade of peace, they have brought to this planet total warfare, in which every weapon—military, psychological, diplomatic, political, and economic—is employed.

In the name of freedom they have imposed slavery on one-third of the people of this globe. Under the banner of humanitarianism they have brought more suffering and human misery than any force since the dawn of time. Under the guise of the more abundant life, they have reaped a harvest of death and destruction— and the end is not in sight.

That in the course of 50 years a devilish conspiracy should evolve and should gain such momentum as to encircle the globe with its tentacles, is sobering indeed. That this conspiracy should pretend to be Messianic in intent and purpose is diabolical, but comprehensible.

What is incomprehensible, however, is that notwithstanding their publicly announced program of world domination and the plain, obvious record which they write in human blood, even now they continue to dupe those whom they would destroy. Even those who have faced them in mortal combat on the field of battle are among the victims of their deceit.

A 5-year study made by a special committee selected by the Secretary of Defense, of the conduct of American prisoners of war during the Korean conflict reveals that one out of every three American prisoners of war collaborated with the Communists. Their collaboration included signing Communist appeals, participation in Communist propaganda broadcasts, and writing articles commending communism and life under communism. Seventy-five American prisoners of war committed themselves to become Communist spies against the United States. Almost two dozen agreed to relinquish all ties with this country and to remain in Communist China. The report of this special committee also reveals unprecedented breakdown in the morale of the American prisoners of war, including fraternization with the enemy.

I brought with me to this convention motion picture films depicting the Communist-led student riots during the recent hearings of the committee in San Francisco. That these riots were the results of Communist infiltration is clearly demonstrated, not only by the films, but by the factual material contained in a report made to our committee by the FBI, which we just published and which confirms beyond a shadow of a doubt that these student riots were inspired and directed by trained Communist agents. In the words of J. Edgar Hoover, "The Communist success in San Francisco in May 1960 proves that it can happen here."

How do we account for the sordid disclosures contained in the report on the conduct of American prisoners of war during the Korean conflict? What interpretation is to be made of the fact that a great many students here on American soil defied lawful authority and openly rioted against a duly constituted committee of the U.S. Congress?

In attempting to assess the reasons for the conduct of the Americans who betrayed their cause during the Korean conflict, the special committee appointed by the Secretary of Defense states:

"When plunged into a Communist indoctrination mill, the average American POW was under a serious handicap. Enemy political officers forced him to read Marxian literature. He was compelled to participate in debates. He had to tell what he knew about American politics and American history. And many times the Chinese or Korean instructors knew more about these subjects than he did. This brainstorming caught many American prisoners off guard. To most of them it came as a complete surprise and they were unprepared. Lectures, study groups, discussion groups, a blizzard of propaganda, and hurricanes of violent oratory were all a part of the enemy technique.

"Ignorance lay behind much of this trouble. A great many servicemen were teenagers. At home they had thought of politics as dry editorials or uninteresting speeches, dull as ditchwater. They were unprepared to give the commissars an argument.

"Some of the POW's—among them men who became defectors—had heard of communism only as a name. Many had never before heard of Karl Marx. And here was communism held up as the salvation of the world and Marx as mankind's benefactor.

"The committee heard evidence which revealed that many of the POW's knew too little about the United States and its ideals

and traditions. So the Chinese indoctrinators had the advantage.

"The uninformed POW's were up against it. They couldn't answer arguments in favor of communism with arguments in favor of Americanism, because they knew very little about their America."

And what of the large number of students who engaged in the San Francisco riots? Shortly after the publication of the FBI report in which appears the identification of trained Communist agitators and the techniques which they employed in agitating to action the students who were engaged in the riots, a number of the rioting students joined in the issuance of a public statement denying any cognizance that they had been led by Communists.

The fact is that of those who participated in the riots in San Francisco not more than a dozen were Communists, but they were trained in the techniques of incitement to riot. They spent weeks in laying the groundwork. They knew they had material to work with which had been conditioned by clever propaganda. They were organized for action and at the proper time they pulled the switch and then lurked in the background while the students did their dirty work.

One month before the Communist-led student riots in San Francisco, we read of riots in Korea in which large numbers of students joined mobs led by Communist agitators to force the abdication of a stanch anti-Communist regime. At about the same time, an estimated 100,000 British young people jammed London's Trafalgar Square in a Communist-oriented "ban the bomb" rally.

Within days after the San Francisco student riots, we read of a Communist-led student rally of 20,000 in Bologna, Italy, to protest U.S. bases there, and we read of similar rioting student demonstrations in Indonesia, in Laos and Brazil. A few weeks later, the proposed visit of the President of the United States to Japan was canceled as a result of demonstrations by hundreds of thousands spearheaded by Communist-led students.

I surmise that in each of these riots—as in all Communist enterprises—only a handful of Communist agents who knew their business as agitators were directly responsible for the demonstrations of the multitudes.

This brings us to consideration of one of the dangerous fallacies which many people entertain in attempting to appraise and evaluate the threat of communism. It is often said by people of unquestioned patriotism and of good faith that we in the United States have little to fear from communism or from Communists because they are counted only in the thousands in a population of 180 million.

Time and time again the Committee on Un-American Activities has pointed out that the strength of the Communist movement in any of its ramifications bears little relationship to the number of its members; that instead, its strength and effectiveness are in direct ratio to the intensity of the efforts of the few who are trained and disciplined agents. It was with only a relative few that Lenin seized control of the government of Soviet Russia. Even today only 3 or 4 percent of the captive nations are Communists. It is estimated that of the 33 million Communists in the world today probably not more than 10 percent, some 3 million, are the hard-core trained zealots and yet these 3 million control absolutely 900 million and are masters of the world conspiracy which has tentacles on every continent of the globe. To attempt to appraise the strength of the Communist movement in terms of numbers, then, is like appraising the threat of cancer to the human body by comparing the size of the cancer with the rest of the body which is sound.

Permit me to dwell briefly on one phase of Communist subversion which is illustrated by the student riots which demonstrate the power of a few trained agents, namely, Communist infiltration of youth. At the outset, let me say that the overwhelming majority of the young people of this Nation are of unquestioned patriotism and dedication to all that is good and noble in our society. But this most not beguile us into feeling that the threat from Communist infiltrators among our youth is insignificant. The fact is that today the Communist conspiracy has given a top priority to infiltration and subversion of youth over the world and is right now concentrating on its program of subversion of the youth of the United States.

Here is a resolution passed last year at the national convention of the Communist Party:

"The national committee within a period of no more than 30 days after the adjournment of this convention, shall appoint a full-time director of youth affairs and establish a functioning national commission on youth affairs composed of youth and adult members. This commission, amongst other things, shall issue a regular national party youth bulletin. We urge that in a brief period of time those State committees which have not done so, shall establish political and organizational responsibility for youth affairs."

About a year ago the Committee on Un-American Activities began a series of hearings on Communist activities and propaganda among youth groups. Let me recite to you some of the factual material developed in these hearings.

Officials of the U.S. Bureau of Customs of the U.S. Treasury Department displayed to the committee samples of typical Communist propaganda periodicals published abroad and sent into the United States destined to student groups in schools and colleges. These officials testified that every school and college in the United States is directly or indirectly the recipient of some of these Communist propaganda publications. A spot check of Communist propaganda destined to schools and colleges in this country was made at New Orleans which is one of the lesser ports of entry of approximately 40 ports through which Communist propaganda is entering the country. The result of the spot check made at New Orleans showed that at least 300,000 packages of Communist propaganda destined to schools and colleges in the United States were processed there during a 12-month period and that from 5 to 15 separate publications were contained in each package.

This propaganda emanates from two major international Communist-controlled youth organizations, the World Federation of Democratic Youth, and the International Union of Students. These organizations publish at least 40 different periodicals which are disseminated regularly in schools and colleges over the world, including the United States. None of these publications bears labeling as Communist propaganda, however, in accordance with the requirements of the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

In the United States, tied in with each of these two major international Communist-controlled youth organizations are student groups which, wittingly or unwittingly, are conduits for Communist poison.

Running parallel with this Communist operation there are now infiltrating among youth groups, trained Communist agents under the immediate direction of Hyman Lumer, educational director of the Communist Party. These Communist agents, who are masters of perversion, attempt to turn the legitimate concern of our young people for peace, freedom, civil liberties and the whole area of humanitarianism into an acceptance of the Communist program which is served up under false labels. At the same time, with diabolical cleverness, these Communist agents arouse student groups into an attack against law enforcement agencies of the Government which are portrayed as instruments of oppression.

And let me say, that in this program of Communist subversion, the plain fact is that Communist agents are frequently assisted by the professors in the classrooms. And the American Association of University Professors has a consistent record of censorship against schools and colleges which fire Communist instructors.

"Wait * * * I refuse to accept an award from an organization I cannot respect." So said young Stephen Bayne recently in refusing an American Legion Post citizen award. Those of us who are constantly engaged in surveying the operations of the Communist conspiracy and the impact which this monolithic force has on all segments of our society were not shocked at this statement, because the brainwashing technique of the Communists has not been confined to prisoners of war or to the leading of students in rioting. I dare suggest that the statement by young Bayne is only a symptom of a disease which results from a deliberate infection.

We are today concerned about building more schoolrooms with better equipment for training our youth, but our curricula are almost void of training regarding the machinations and operations of the world force which threatens freedom everywhere. I have frequently observed that the most appalling fact of our time is our own ignorance respecting the Communist menace and we are beginning to reap the harvest of our ignorance.

The American Legion is to be commended on its "Back to God" program which emphasizes basic beliefs in the Divine and in spiriutal values. But this is only a start. If the forces of freedom are to survive on this globe, we need desperately to inculcate in our youth the virtues of patriotism and a recognition simply that treason is wrong. We need to reemphasize the sources of strength of our own free society and then we need to present to our youth a critical study of communism, its ideology, philosophy and communism in action. This analytical study of communism which I suggest must not, of course, be confused with advocacy of Communist doctrine. In other words, I am suggesting study of communism in the same manner that the criminologist studies crime—not for the purpose of emulating the criminals, but in order to cope with crime.

The Committee on Un-American Activities and your own Americanism Commission of the Legion, as well as other non-governmental patriotic organizations are constantly publishing authoritative reports and other documentation which are excellent source material.

This program which I have outlined might well be a pilot project to be undertaken by the American Legion of Texas, to urge and assist every school and college in this State to equip its students to cope with the greatest challenge in history—a challenge which we shall either meet or perish.

Christ and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as we move toward adjournment, the fall campaign and election in November, I re-

call the Lutheran Hour broadcast of July 10, 1960.

The speaker was the Reverend Lambert Brose, known to many Members of both the Senate and House, because of his work with the Armed Services Commission of the Lutheran Church, Missouri Synod.

Because Lambert Brose's message is as timely now as when it first was delivered, and will be as timely in November, when our people will cast their ballots, I ask unanimous consent that his address be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHRIST AND POLITICS

(By Lambert Brose)

"What do you thing about the Connally amendment?" I asked that question of six of my friends recently.

Five of them looked at me dubiously and either asked, "What's the Connally amendment?" or quickly changed the subject. Only one stopped to discuss the matter—and he was a political columnist.

From now until November people will be interested in the presidential election campaign. They will be interested in how sincere the candidates' voices sound, or whether or not they "look like a President should." And there will be great interest on the part of certain groups in issues that will affect them very obviously, health insurance for those over 65, for example. But, judging from the past, most people will probably not know much more about the issues in general than did my friends about the Connally amendment.

And, in those years when we do not have a presidential election, the political ignorance of most citizens is appalling.

Is this too pessimistic an appraisal? Let me point out that these people I asked about the Connally amendment were all very active members of Christian churches. When one realizes how much the successful functioning of our democratic form of government depends on an informed citizenry, it's appalling when any considerable number of citizens are ignorant of political issues. But when church people—whose religion teaches them to be good citizens, and all that that implies—are that way, it's disturbing indeed.

A Washington clergyman once made a statement in this connection which sounds a little shocking, at first. He said: "Anyone who isn't interested in politics isn't much of a Christian." But when you think about it, there's a lot of truth to it. Politics affects almost every area of a Christian's life—first, in his role simply as a citizen. The food he eats, for example. You wouldn't think there would be much politics involved in that. However, millions of votes this November may hinge on how much—or how little, if any—the presidential candidates say the Government ought to guarantee farmers for the food they grow.

Or the air we breathe. And think of the politics involved in passing antismog and other antiair pollution laws.

I doubt that you can think of a single day-to-day activity of a Christian that isn't vitally affected by politics.

However, it is the religious motivation for a Christian's participation in politics that we would like to stress in this message on "Christ and Politics."

Christ's great mission is not, obviously, a political one. That is clear to us today. But when He walked upon this earth as the God-man, He had to tell the people that again and again. They were looking for a political messiah who would lead them in a political revolution against the Roman Government. Jesus had to tell them forcefully that His Kingdom was not of this world.

Christ came into the world to live, suffer, and die so that men might have forgiveness of sins; that, believing in Him, they might live eternally in heaven. He came to seek souls. His interest in politics was purely a subordinate one. But it was there. And it is important.

Jesus was interested in politics because it is political government which can make this world a more orderly place in which to live—so that the all-important work of preaching the Gospel, of preparing men for lasting life, might be hindered as little as possible.

Christ, as true God, ordained that order in the world should be maintained by government. He did not ordain what form government should take. That—and seeing to it that whatever form of government we choose is as efficient and good as we can make it—that is what Christ expects of His followers. And that we do through our participation in politics.

Let's see how this ought to work out in our lives today. The Savior has told us that our great mission in life is to "preach the Gospel to every creature." There is no mention here of politics. But the implication that Christ's followers are to participate in politics is here, nevertheless. Because, in order to preach the Gospel as efficiently as possible, we must try to clear away all obstacles that are barriers to preaching the Gospel.

War—for example. War, on balance, is certainly a hindrance to worldwide missions work. A Christian wants to do everything he can to do away with war, individually and through his church. But think how much more effective it is when the entire machinery of his government is set in motion for peace—peace which will further conditions favorable to teaching men about eternal life. Consequently, a Christian assuredly has the responsibility of doing all he can politically to influence his government toward working for peace. Not a cowardly peace which would allow godless communism to take over the world bit by bit, destroying men's souls as well as their bodies, but a just peace.

Or take the problem of world hunger. It is often said that three out of every five people in the world go to bed hungry every single night of their lives. A Christian wants to help these people out of sheer humanitarian impulses, of course. "For God so loved the world," says the Bible. That includes men's bodies. But a Christian has a far higher purpose for feeding the hungry than merely to give them bodily comfort—just as God has a far higher purpose. The Christian says: "It's hard for a man to listen to the Gospel of Jesus Christ when his empty stomach cries out so loud he doesn't hear the preaching." Hunger stands in the way of teaching a man about the salvation of his soul.

A Christian wants to do all he can to allay the world's hunger through secular agencies, through his church. But again, think how much more effective it is, how infinitely greater the number of people who can be reached when our Government throws open its huge granaries of surplus grains to feed the world's hungry. There are perplexing problems involved, of course—such as the danger of upsetting the world grain markets. But that's where a Christian's political responsibility comes in. He is to do the hard work of studying this subject in the light of the complex problems involved, and then seek to influence his government—through his representatives in Washington, through his vote—to do what he thinks best to clear away this obstacle to the preaching of the Gospel.

When a Christian realizes how extremely important political action can be in making the world a better place to live—not only for a safer, more pleasant life on earth, but especially in facilitating the work of preparing people for life in eternity—then he assuredly will want to undertake the hard work of participating in politics.

Then he'll be willing to take on the hard work, first, of informing himself on political issues. It is hard work. It takes a great deal of willpower to break habits of years standing—the habit, for example, of skipping the editorial page in order to get to Li'l Abner, or Dear Abby, or the sports pages as quickly as possible.

Then he'll want to take on the hard work of trying to be informed on both sides of the issues. Almost everyone, I suppose, wants to be known as an "openminded" person. But it's very difficult. I wonder how many listening right now make the effort, for example, of reading a daily paper expressing a political viewpoint that's different from the paper they usually read.

Most important, a Christian then will want to vote—not only in national, but in State and local elections. After all, it is you and I—the citizens of this Nation—who, in the long run, govern this country, through our votes. A democratic form of government functions successfully only when its citizens function successfully—by voting intelligently.

Yes, a Christian, feeling that God has given him certain special gifts and abilities, may decide that it is his responsibility to run for public office. The results of a recent survey show that 73 percent of American parents interviewed do not want their children to run for political office, mostly because they think that politics are dirty. When you realize how much our system depends upon good men in government, that's a frightening situation. Of course there's dirt and graft and corruption in politics, just as there is in business, and unions, and in any human endeavor. A Christian's job is to do what he can to clean up the dirt—wherever he finds it—including in political life. "Evil triumphs when good men fail to speak," said Burke.

As we said in the interview before, a Christian can be a tremendous influence in politics. In his own family, by informing himself on the issues and voting responsibly; in his community; and the higher he goes, the more influence he can exert. Sure, I've heard the old cliche that the last word in every politician's speech is "God." Undoubtedly religion is used as a cloak of hypocrisy by many a politician, just as it is by many a businessman, union leader, farmer, or professional man. But when a Christian politician really lives his Christianity, he can be a powerful leaven in the affairs of men.

There is one other matter—and it is the most important—that I would like to call to your attention in connection with this subject, "Christ and Politics." The activities mentioned so far can be engaged in by any qualified citizen, Christian or non-Christian. But one thing only the follower of Jesus Christ can do. Only he can pray to Christ, the almighty God, who has the power to change human hearts.

When the Holy Spirit enters a man's heart through the Scriptures, and gives him faith that Jesus Christ, by His sacrifice on Calvary's cross, has forgiven his sins—when a man really believes this—his whole life is changed. Out of love to his Saviour he tries to lead a better life in every area of his activity, including his political activity. And the more the gospel is preached, the more human lives it changes, the stronger the family, the community, the Nation become.

What an incentive this is for us in this day of widespread juvenile delinquency, of admittedly low moral standards on every level of society, in the age of the payola. No matter how gloomy things seem to be, a

Christian is an optimist. He has hope. He is assured that the Gospel "is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Nothing can stand against the Gospel of Jesus Christ when it is loosed upon human hearts. Not even the gates of hell shall prevail against it.

So let us pray. Let us pray frequently and fervently that this Gospel may come into the hearts of more and more men and women. Let us pray that God will help us as—with that goal in mind—we try to do our part in helping run our Government through a wholehearted participation in its political life. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ, our Saviour. Amen.

Tribute to Hon. Paul Brown

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILBUR D. MILLS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, it was with keen disappointment and regret that I learned of the intention of our beloved and esteemed colleague, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, to retire after the close of this session of Congress.

It is needless for me to say that his warm friendship, his advice and counsel and his wisdom and judgment after his 27 years of dedicated service to his Nation, his State, and district will be sorely missed by all of us. His legislative accomplishments are many; his friends here and throughout the Nation are legion; his loyalty, his integrity and his high statesmanship are matters of public record.

I was especially fortunate when I first came to the Congress on January 3, 1939, in being assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House on which PAUL BROWN was then a high-ranking Democratic member. Thus, as a new Member I became the recipient of his wise advice and counsel and the kindness and consideration which he extended to all new Members of this great body. It was my good fortune to serve with him in the Banking and Currency Committee until nearly the end of 1942 when I became a member of the Committee on Ways and Means. I am thus aware of the great contributions which he made to Federal housing and Federal banking laws and to the many other projects within the particular jurisdiction of the committee on which he served for such a long time.

I join with other Members of the House who have paid tribute to the diligent, conscientious, and forthright manner in which PAUL BROWN always tended to his duties here on the floor and placed himself on record on the many issues which came before the Congress during his 27 years of service here. Probably no Member of the House of Representatives has a higher record of attendance and of recorded yea-and-nay votes on legislative issues which have transpired.

May I extend to you, PAUL, and to your family, my very best and most sincere wishes for a well-earned and highly deserved period of relaxation from the incessant and heavy legislative duties which you have handled for so long and in such a faithful manner.

Every Vote Counts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, earlier this year, I introduced a resolution to establish a National Voters Day. The purpose of the resolution would be to increase voter participation in elections—now at a deplorably low level.

As we recall, the measure, Senate Joint Resolution 186, was passed by the Senate earlier this session.

However, the House of Representatives has not yet taken action on it.

Again and again, I have contacted the House Judiciary Committee urging that this matter be given favorable consideration. Although I know time is getting short, I sincerely hope that this can still be done prior to adjournment.

I well recognize, of course, that the mere designation of a special day cannot do the whole job of increasing votership. However, a major underlying purpose is to focus attention on the necessity of voting, and to encourage special efforts in this direction.

I am deeply gratified, too, by the fact that across the Nation, a great many efforts—by labor, management, civic-minded organizations, and others—are being made to encourage more people to become knowledgeable on the basic issues and the candidates in the election, and to exercise their precious heritage of voting.

As a fine example of the kind of encouragement being given, I ask unanimous consent to have an article by Joseph J. Delaney, general president of the International Operating Engineers entitled "Every Vote Counts"—published in a recent edition of the International Operating Engineer—printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERY VOTE COUNTS

The three most important words in the 1960 election campaign are: Register, work, vote.

In setting forth the duties of citizens—and especially of union members—we don't want to sound repetitious, but we must repeat and repeat the entreaty: register, work, and vote. We can't emphasize these three jobs too often to our members and to all members in unions in the American labor movement.

Before going into detail on the problem and figures on voting, I would like to make a few general observations on the 1960 campaign.

Most of the election publicity in the public press and on television and radio will be devoted to the faces and fortunes of the Presidential candidates and their vice presidential running mates. Since these personalities will receive more than adequate attention, I should like to invite attention to some other offices.

LABOR WANTS FAIRPLAY

The party which wins the Presidency will control the Executive Department of the Federal Government. We would not minimize the importance of this fact, especially since the controlling party has the say-so on who will be named to commissions, agencies, the Cabinet, etc. It is most important that we have the right kind of people on these regulatory and administrative agencies. I don't need to point out that a National Labor Relations Board which can be strongly pitched against labor can be a real problem. Organized labor has never said that it wants an uneven or unfair advantage before our Federal or State regulatory agencies. All we want is an even break and fairplay. Impartial administration and regulation of laws and the rules governing the conduct of all affairs which affect unions and union members are all that we seek and all that we ask.

Although primary focus is directed toward the top election tickets, and while we would not downgrade their importance, we invite attention to other candidates before the electorate.

This year one-third of the Members of the Senate and all the Members of the House of Representatives are standing for election. It is important, indeed, that we elect a Congress which will be fair and unbiased. A Member of the Senate is in office for 6 years, and so when the voters name a man for that office in his State they either enjoy the fine service of a good man who is fair as a Senator or they are stuck with an untrustworthy one on whom they cannot really depend. It is up to the voters to name the right kind of men to the Senate.

REELECTION IS A PROBLEM

The Representatives' office term is only 2 years, and this often means that the Member has to spend about half his time, the last half, politicking in order to get reelected.

Congress is especially important with reference to laws which affect all the people. Regulation of labor is, of course, the one big item with which labor unions are most familiar. The lives of unions and their members have become a great deal more complicated and regimented since the passage of the Taft-Hartley law in 1947 and the Landrum-Griffin law (Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act) of 1959. We will get more of this type of legislation unless we elect the right kind of candidates and insist that they stick to their preelection pledges.

Too often union people neglect State elections in which members of the State legislatures are named. Many of these elections are decided on personal or local issues, most frequently having nothing to do with labor or its problems.

On the other hand, many problems come before State legislatures which vitally concern organized labor and working people generally. We all know about State right-to-work laws and how damaging they can be. Any threat of a right-to-work law should be a big red flag to all union voters and their families. But there are other items on the legislative agenda affecting labor.

State minimum wage standards, educational appropriations and regulations, unemployment insurance allowances, standards of workmen's compensation, safety regulations, and a host of other subjects are within the province of the State legislatures. If the working people want a decent break in these areas, they must elect the right kind of candidates to State office. They should not become wholly preoccupied with the presidential race and neglect State contests.

Labor can take a licking even in cities through oppressive regulations passed by a city council. Some of these regulations can hamper some of labor's most basic activities in the way of organization and conducting its business at the local level.

Thus we see the importance of voting and voting intelligently at every level, city, State, and Federal.

These observations bring us to the concept of the importance of every single vote. In 1944 the late Senator Robert A. Taft carried Ohio by less than one vote per precinct—one vote per precinct. A smiliar victory for another Senator, the late Richard Neuberger, in Oregon, was chalked up in 1948—a margin of one vote per precinct.

EIGHT TEN-THOUSANDTHS OF 1 PERCENT

In the State of Texas a total of 494,191 votes were cast for LYNDON JOHNSON for the U.S. Senate in 1948. He defeated his opponent, a former Governor, who received 494,104 votes. This was a margin of 87 votes out of 988,295 votes cast. Don't tell any partisans of LYNDON JOHNSON that their votes didn't count when the figure 87 vote-margin represented eight ten-thousandths of 1 percent of the total.

Former Gov. Averell Harriman won in 1954 by slightly more than one vote per precinct and 1950 Michigan's Gov. Mennen Williams was elected in 1950 by less than one vote for every three precincts.

The closeness of the 1948 presidential election is recalled by all, but many may not recall that President Truman won Ohio by one vote per precinct.

In looking at these close votes we might well examine the scorecard on voting by States. What States do the best job of getting out the vote? Idaho ranks at the top or did in the 1956 presidential election with a figure of 77.3 percent while Mississippi had the dubious honor of being the low man on the election totem pole with 22.1 percent. The table below, compiled by the American Heritage Foundation, shows the rank of States in voting percentages in 1956.

SIMPLE LAWS ARE GOOD LAWS

In this connection we should note also that the high-ranking States are those with election laws which make it easier to vote while the low-ranking States are those with difficult and complex laws. In Idaho, for example, it is possible to register up to 3 days before an election and voters enjoy permanent registration. That State requires only 6 months' residence in the State and 30 days in the county.

By contrast the lowest State, percentagewise, Mississippi, requires 2 years' State residence; has a poll tax, and allows no registration after the first week in July and also has a literacy test. Some of the low ranking States, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and South Carolina, do not permit mail balloting by civilians.

These facts on our poor showing at the polls should be enough to stimulate a better job by all this year. The stakes are high and I sincerely hope that every member of our organization realizes the importance of getting his family all registered and when election day comes getting them to the polls to vote for the right candidates.

How States ranked percentagewise in civilian voting in 1956 presidential election results

National average—60.4

Rank	State	Percent voting
1	Idaho	77.3
2	Connecticut	76.6
3	Utah	76.1
4	Massachusetts	75.3
5	New Hampshire	75.2
6	Rhode Island	74.6
7	Iowa	74.1
8	Illinois	72.5
9	Indiana	72.4
10	West Virginia	72.4
11	Montana	72.3
12	South Dakota	72.2
13	Delaware	71.5
14	Washington	71.4
15	New Jersey	70.1
16	Colorado	69.6
17	Wyoming	68.9
18	Vermont	68.6
19	Oregon	68.5
20	Minnesota	67.8
21	Kansas	67.7
22	Missouri	67.5
23	Michigan	67.1
24	North Dakota	67.0
25	Wisconsin	66.6
26	Nebraska	65.9
27	New York	65.5
28	Pennsylvania	65.0
29	California	65.0
30	Ohio	64.9
31	Nevada	64.7
32	Maine	64.6
33	Oklahoma	64.0
34	New Mexico	62.1
35	Kentucky	56.7
36	Maryland	54.8
37	Arizona	49.7
38	Florida	48.3
39	North Carolina	47.7
40	Tennessee	46.0
41	Arkansas	39.9
42	Texas	38.1
43	Louisiana	37.3
44	Virginia	34.2
45	Georgia	30.4
46	Alabama	28.5
47	South Carolina	24.6
48	Mississippi	22.1

The Port of New York Authority

SPEECH

OF

HON. LAURENCE CURTIS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 23, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, we are told that the Port of New York Authority has not properly conducted its business. We are told that it has made errors in the awarding of contracts and in other respects. Certainly there should be adequate supervision of this great enterprise, but that is the responsibility of the States of New York and New Jersey. It is not the responsibility of the Federal Government or of the Congress.

The Port of New York Authority is not substantially different in its legal structure from the Massachusetts Port Authority, except that it was organized by two States instead of by one. As in the case of the Massachusetts Port Authority, its functions are State functions. They are State functions performed by an agency of two States instead of by an agency of one State. That fact does not justify a greater exercise of Federal power over it than over the Massachusetts Port Authority.

It is argued that the Federal Government has greater power over the Port of New York Authority because it was formed under an interstate compact which required the consent of Congress in accordance with article I, section 10 of the Constitution, which reads:

> No State shall, without the consent of Congress, lay any duty of tonnage, keep troops or ships of war in time of peace, enter into any agreement or compact with another state, or with a foreign power, or engage in war unless actually invaded, or in such imminent danger as will not admit of delay.

This clause of the Constitution does not grant Congress any power of continuous oversight over State agencies formed under an interstate compact to which the Congress has given its assent.

Those who support the Federal investigation, however, rely on the reserved right of Congress to alter, amend or repeal its consent to an interstate compact. It is argued that if the Congress has the right to alter, amend or repeal its consent to a compact, it must necessarily have the right to investigate operations under the compact in order to determine whether it should exercise such right.

This reservation of the right of Congress to alter, amend or repeal its consent is a part of the resolution of Congress granting its consent. If the reserved right of Congress to alter, amend or repeal its consent carries with it the power of continuous supervision over the affairs of State agencies formed under an interstate compact, it greatly broadens the Federal power over such agencies.

But how can this broadening of Federal power be based on a resolution of the Congress? A grant of Federal power cannot be made by Congress, but must have its justification in the Constitution itself.

The words of the Constitution requiring the consent of Congress to an interstate compact cannot be construed as carrying with them the right of Congress to alter, amend or repeal its consent. This additional right would in turn carry with it a grant of Federal power of continuous supervision over agencies formed under a compact.

The above quoted article I, section 10 of the Constitution was clearly not intended to include such a grant of Federal power. To hold otherwise would be to read the article as though it also provided, following the requirement of consent to an interstate compact:

> And the Congress shall have power to alter, amend or repeal its consent and look into the operations of State agencies operating under the compact in order to determine whether such consent should be altered, amended, or repealed.

Had the framers of the Constitution desired to include such a provision they could have done so. And if it is claimed that these words were included by implication, why is it necessary for the Congress in the resolution granting its consent to include a reservation of its right to alter, amend or repeal its consent?

The Federal power cannot be so broadened by any such implication.

Even if it be conceded that the constitutional requirement of the consent of Congress to interstate compacts gave it some rights to look into the operations

under the compact, it is clear that those rights should be regarded as strictly limited. They should be construed as relating to such broad questions as to whether the agency was exceeding the rights which it could properly exercise under the compact.

They should not be construed as vesting in Congress the right to control the internal management or daily affairs of the agency, or to pry into such matters. The Port of New York Authority contends that the documents which it has refused to produce relate only to such matters.

The present controversy arose in connection with airport construction. The Port of New York Authority had occasion to study the need for a new airport in New Jersey. Its activities were preliminary, as it has no power to construct the airport without first submitting the project to the legislatures of the two States and securing legislative enactments authorizing the construction.

As a result of opposition to this project, a question was addressed to a committee of the Congress as to the extent of the powers and jurisdiction of the Port of New York Authority, and the committee undertook an investigation.

It is clear from the record that this investigation was not confined to determining whether the authority was exceeding the rights which it could properly exercise under the compact. The investigation sought in addition to look into detailed operations and internal management of the authority including such matters as the ways in which contracts for supplies had been negotiated and employees had been engaged.

Upon receipt of the demands for the production of this type of material, the Port of New York Authority referred the question to the Governors of the States of New York and New Jersey. After full consideration, the Governors authorized the Port of New York Authority to make available to the committee a mass of material indicating the nature and range of its activities, including the official minutes of the port of authority commissioners, its annual reports, and financial reports, and annual audit reports of independent outside auditors.

The Governors instructed that the materials relating to the internal structure, organization, and administration of this agency of the States were not lawful subjects of the investigation by the committee, and they directed the port authority not to produce such material. Three officers of the port authority refused to produce such material and were found in contempt of the committee, and resolutions citing them for contempt of Congress are now before the House.

I have urged that if the constitutional requirement of consent carried with it any right of Congress to investigate operations under the compact, that right should be regarded as limited to such broad questions as whether the agency was exceeding the rights which it could properly exercise under the compact. If so, a refusal to produce documents bearing only on the internal structure, day-to-day administration, and similar matters relating to this agency, was justified, and the resolutions before the House should be defeated.

Up to this point I have been discussing the constitutional requirement of consent to interstate compacts as justifying an investigation into the affairs of the Port of New York Authority.

Such right of investigation is also sought to be justified by the constitutional power of Congress over interstate commerce. I believe that the commerce power furnishes no such justification.

The power of the Federal Government over interstate commerce is not exclusive. Unless and until the Federal Government has seen fit to provide by legislation for Federal regulation of a State activity affecting interstate commerce—either specifically or under the doctrine of preemption—the power of the State to regulate that activity remains plenary and undisturbed.

The Massachusetts Port Authority and other port authorities deal with matters directly affecting interstate commerce, as does the Port of New York Authority. But we have been told by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], that "all other ports in America are the creation of State legislatures and are subject to the exclusive jurisdiction and control of State laws."

They all deal with matters affecting interstate commerce, and when it is a question of the right of Congress under the commerce power and not a question of the right of Congress under the alleged power flowing from its consent to a compact, it is hard to see why the same standards should not be applied to a bistate agency as to the agency of a single State.

It is a common misapprehension to assume that once it appears that a certain activity relates to interstate commerce, that fact justifies every kind of Federal intervention.

One of the acknowledged leaders of the House on constitutional law matters, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], does not rely on the commerce power as justifying the investigation of the Port of New York Authority. He justifies it on the power of the Congress to alter, amend or repeal its consent to the compact under which the authority was formed.

But other members, and also the committee report, have relied on the commerce power to justify the investigation. The fallacy of this argument is shown by the fact that practically everything they said regarding the interstate aspects of the activities of the Port of New York Authority would apply equally to the Massachusetts Port Authority which, according to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS], "under the exclusive jurisdiction of State law."

I stated above that certainly there should be adequate supervision over the activities of the Port of New York Authority, but that was the responsibility of the States of New York and New Jersey, and not of the Federal Government or of the Congress.

It has been suggested that the States of New York and New Jersey lack adequate power to investigate and control the Port of New York Authority. But the record shows that the Governors of New York and New Jersey had very complete control. It shows that the activities of the Port of New York Authority had to be approved in the minutes of the board of the authority, and that the Governors of New York and New Jersey each had the right of veto over such minutes, and thus over the activities of the authority.

The proper forum for complaints about the operations of the Port of New York Authority was before the Governors or legislatures of these two States, not before the Federal Government or the Congress.

The States of New York and New Jersey have ample power to investigate the activities of the board, and no investigation by the Congress of the internal management and day-to-day activities of the Port of New York Authority is justified. Nor is the demand by the Congress for production of documents bearing on such matters proper, and the citations for contempt now before the House should be defeated.

Houston Post Reports Nationwide Survey Points Up Great Value of Parks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, a recent survey by the U.S. Department of Interior gives interesting figures to illustrate how, from a dollar standpoint, parks are of great value to the Nation and the State. Padre Island National Recreational Area is badly needed now.

Putting aside the great inspirational and recreational value of parks, it is clear that good parks are good business.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on this subject from the August 17, 1960, issue of the Houston Post entitled "Nationwide Survey Points Up Great Value of Parks to States."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONWIDE SURVEY POINTS UP GREAT VALUE OF PARKS TO STATES

The value placed on parks by States is graphically revealed by a study of State park statistics for 1959, made by the U.S. Department of the Interior. It shows the comparative park expenditures by States, the sources of funds, park attendance, area and acreage, and personnel.

Park expenditures last year ranged from $21,757,342 in California, $17,006,098 in New York, more than $3 million each in Illinois, Ohio, and Pennsylvania, more than $1 million in 17 other States, on down to $553,986 in Texas (much more than the average, because of permanent improvements), and smaller amounts in some States.

The harvest reaped from the expenditures is reflected in the number of park visitors. California parks registered a total attendance of 22,195,000 for the year—nearly four times

Texas' attendance of 5,768,000. New York parks reported an attendance of 31,310,000—nearly six times as many as ours. True, these States are two of the principal meccas to tourists, but their parks were major factors in building up the tourist trade. Michigan offers no more tourist attractions than Texas, yet Michigan spent nearly four times as much on its parks, and drew nearly four times as many park visitors. Ohio spent $3,419,858, to Texas' $553,986, and had 17 million park visitors, to Texas' 5,768,000. Oregon spent $1,980,718 and enjoyed a park attendance of 10,235,665. Even Oklahoma, with about one-third of Texas' population and certainly no greater proportion of tourist attractions, spent more than $2 million on its 33 parks, and had a park attendance of about 9 million.

All of which leaves the big question: What are tourist park visitors worth to a State? Well, most of them are tourists, and no one has yet evaluated them more expressively than the Dixie chamber of commerce manager who said, "A tourist is worth a bale of cotton, and is twice as easy to pick." Their total spending makes State expenditures on parks a tremendously profitable investment for the State and the localities visited. If it did not, those progressive States that support their parks so well would not keep it up.

Potentially even more important is the emigration of citizens with their businesses and industries to a State which has impressed them as tourists. Texas' charms in this department are as great as in the scenic or recreational.

The Texas Legislature's niggardly support of this State's parks, as reflected in the foregoing figures, has not enabled them to draw half as many tourists as would come if their improvements, facilities, and services were on a par with those of States that support them decently. For instance, Texas has only 70 year-round employees to operate its 50-odd parks. Compare these figures with the statistics of a few other States that have thrice as many employees and no more park areas, if as many:

Kentucky, 27 parks, 280 employees; Michigan, 56 parks, 227 employees; Ohio, 54 parks, 226 employees; Oklahoma, 33 parks, 338 employees; Tennessee, 20 parks, 233 employees. Some States have far more personnel.

When is Texas going to awake to the fact that good parks are good business? The Department of the Interior's comparative statistical study should be an eye opener to them.

Carpenters Buy $2½ Million Worth of FHA, VA Mortgages

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and happy to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress, the farsighted and enlightened position the Bay Counties District Council of Carpenters has taken with respect to the investment of some of the pension plan funds of the organization.

By plowing them back into FHA and VA home mortgages, they not only stimulate home building but demonstrate their confidence in the future of America.

The Bay Counties District of Carpenters by this action is making a sound contribution to democracy and are to be congratulated and commended.

I wish to quote an article appearing in the East Bay Labor Journal published in Oakland, Calif., on August 26, 1960.

CARPENTERS BUY $2½ MILLION WORTH OF FHA, VA MORTGAGES

Carpenters unions in four Bay area counties have been investing $400,000 per month in FHA and VA home mortgages for the past 6 months as a means of stimulating homebuilding industry.

Investments to date total around $2,500,000, acording to C. R. Bartalini, executive secretary of the Bay Counties District Council of Carpenters.

The council is the central policymaking body for 29 affiliated carpenters unions with 24,000 members in Alameda, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Marin counties.

Bartalini explained that the money being invested comes from the pension plan funds of the various unions and is being poured back into the areas in which the unions have jurisdiction.

Only a portion of the pension plan funds is being invested in mortgages, however, Bartalini said. Other sums are invested in stocks and bonds which offer a lower rate of interest than mortgages.

Aside from serving to stimulate the industry which provides bread and butter to carpenters and other building trades workers, the buying of home mortgages also results in a balanced portfolio of investment for pension plan funds, Bartalini said.

He indicated he thought the total amount of pension money to be invested in home mortgages will not be much greater than the $2,500,000 already poured in, and that the $400,000 monthly allocations will shortly be discontinued.

Bartalini said that the carpenters unions of the four counties are currently paying out $35,000 per month in retirement benefits. The first retirement benefits were mailed about 15 months ago, in June, 1959.

At the present time, approximately 700 retired union members are receiving monthly pension checks of $50 each, Bartalini said.

Bartalini, in addition to serving as executive secretary of the Bay Counties District Council, is president of the California State Council of Carpenters.

Life Magazine Uses Carriers for Home Delivery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CARLSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, from time to time we hear criticism of the alleged postal subsidies received by some of the larger newspapers and magazines in this country, despite the fact that postal rates on second-class mail have been raised approximately 90 percent since 1951. Furthermore, according to the official records of the Post Office Department, second-class mail will be producing approximately $100 million in revenue for the Post Office Department once the 1958 Postal Act has fully run its course. The last increment of increase on second-class mail goes into effect January 1, 1961.

Because of the emphasis on the pound rate in the second-class rate structure, the bulk of these revenues fall on a very large newspapers and magazines—less than 1 percent of the total of 25,000 newspapers and magazines with second-class entry.

As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have been fearful that our rate structure may lead to driving some of our more prominent publications from the mails and thus deny them equal advantage because of their bigness. I believe this concern is fully justified because in the August 20, 1960, issue of Editor & Publisher I note that Life magazine is now experimenting on a system of home delivery outside the mails.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "New Jersey Weekly, Life Join on Delivery Deal" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY WEEKLY, LIFE JOIN ON DELIVERY DEAL

Life Circulation Co. started this week making home deliveries of Life, Time, and Sports Illustrated in the northern New Jersey area in a tie-up with the carrier system of the Freehold (N.J.) Transcript, a weekly.

John Hallenbeck, Life's circulation director, and president of LCC, a subsidiary, described the deal as the latest development in an experimental program of home delivery by the Luce publications that started last March. So far confined to suburban New Jersey and Staten Island, where LCC is recruiting its own carriers, Mr. Hallenbeck said the step-by-step development of the experiment contemplated contracts with daily newspapers.

"We have in mind that our plan could be worked well with a combined morning and evening daily," Mr. Hallenbeck said.

Basic sales method for the foreseeable future, however, is most likely to be through LCC's own carriers, according to Wendell Forbes, circulation manager of Life and general manager of LCC.

"This is different than the classical idea of selling magazines by boys," Mr. Forbes explained. "It is a system of carrier delivery rather than sales."

DIVERSITY ESSENTIAL

"We believe a diversity of marketing methods is essential to magazines like ours. We think that the experiment is working out well, and will have no bad effect on newspapers."

The Freehold deal was made by William Pike, of LCC, with Michael J. Torpey, general manager of the paper. All transactions are between the magazine and the newspaper rather than with the carriers individually. Mr. Pike, formerly suburban circulation manager of the New York Times, was engaged by LCC last November to give this home delivery system a try.

The Transcript has 41 carriers. Soliciting for Life, Time, and Sports Illustrated home delivery on a week-by-week basis is all done by salaried personnel of LCC. The boys get a commission of 4 cents a copy on each magazine. Life sells for 19 cents a copy on the newsstands in this area, the other two magazines for 25 cents. The Transcript sells at 10 cents a copy, of which the carriers also get 4 cents.

LCC telephone solicitors have been furnished with a master list of Transcript car-

riers and their routes. No calls are made to areas in which the Transcript is not being delivered. The Transcript is now delivering between 8,500 and 9,500 copies weekly, of which 1,000 are for sampling purposes.

The boys are being furnished with two metal paper carriers that fit on each side of their bicycles, marked with the name of the paper and those of the three magazines.

"DROPS" AT TRANSCRIPT

Drops of the three magazines are made at the Transcript office, where they are divided among the boys for delivery. Delivery is made Thursday with the Transcript. Prize contests among the carriers will be part of the plan, according to Mr. Torpey.

In the case of other sections of suburban New Jersey where LCC is recruiting its own carriers, drops are made to drop points from which copies are relayed to the boys. The Hackensack News Co. and the Hudson County News distributors deliver to the drop points according to Mr. Pike. On Staten Island the magazines come direct from the Philadelphia printing plant.

LCC has established branch offices in Teaneck and Bloomfield, N.J., to supervise the operation.

"We are creating our program as nearly like the newspapers as possible. Naturally we are abiding by all State and local community regulations," Mr. Pike said.

Mr. Pike said LCC has had no trouble recruiting boys. Generally they are in the 14- to 15-year age bracket. Some are as young as 12. The commission they get for the weekly deliveries is sufficient to interest them working the 1-day a week—Wednesdays. On that day they deliver magazines dated the following Monday.

Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, to meet the growing health needs of the Nation, the Eisenhower-Nixon administration has pressed forward in the fields of research and training of personnel and of stimulating State, local, and private agencies to expand and improve their facilities and services. Government action which has resulted in major improvements in public health has been of a character which neither discourages nor destroys private effort to combat disease and to lighten the costs of serious illness.

First. Public Health Service appropriation more than tripled in the last 7 years.

Second. National Institutes of Health appropriations increased from approximately $59 million in fiscal year 1953 to $400 million in fiscal 1960.

Third. Health research supported by the National Institutes of Health at outside scientific institutions increased nearly sevenfold—9,166 grants-in-aid amounting to $142,627,000 in fiscal year 1959 compared with 2,054 grants amounting to $20,936,000 in fiscal year 1953.

Fourth. Facilities for health research expanded under new legislation providing $30 million annually to non-Federal public and nonprofit private institutions to help finance construction of health research facilities.

Fifth. Manpower skilled in medical research increased. Seven thousand three hundred regular fellowships and 6,300 in other categories awarded by the National Institutes of Health between 1954 and 1960.

Sixth. Water pollution control program made permanent in 1956. In return for Federal grants amounting to $178 million, 2,100 communities have been stimulated to put up $854 million to build new or to improve existing water pollution control system.

Seventh. Federal program of research and technical activities established to strengthen control of air pollution.

Eighth. National Health Survey initiated providing data for developing more disease research and control programs for planning health facilities and services.

Ninth. National Library of Medicine founded—will be the Nation's most important source of medical literature.

Tenth. Polio vaccine and inoculation of children carried out by Federal program of assistance to States amounting to $53,600,000.

Eleventh. Grants have been increased for Maternal and Child Health and Crippled Children's Services.

Twelfth. Broadened the program of Federal aid for construction of hospitals and outpatient facilities to include chronic disease hospitals, nursing homes, rehabilitation facilities and diagnostic and treatment centers. Current appropriation for hospital and outpatient facilities is $150 million—double the appropriation of 1953.

Thirteenth. Government action in the health field has been of a nature to stimulate rather than discourage private efforts to provide health services and to protect the American family against the costs of medical care.

As for essential services, note the following increases in public service sectors of the Federal budget between fiscal year 1953 and fiscal year 1961—proposed: Veterans, up 28 percent; labor and welfare, up 91 percent; natural resources, up 27 percent; General Government, up 27 percent.

In addition, State and local governments have expanded spending on services greatly—up well over 50 percent since fiscal year 1953. As for interest charges, these have been an essential cost of carrying the high public debt which the Republican administration inherited. The only way to bring down the cost of the public debt is to resort to the loose-money, low-interest policy of the Democrats which cut the value of the dollar in half during their period in power or to reduce the size of the debt, which Republicans are pledged to do.

Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Hon. George J. Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, before the platform committee of the Republican National Convention in Chicago, Ill., on July 20, 1960.

Mr. Burger's comprehensive and constructive statement, made on behalf of an organization representing small independent business and professional people from American enterprise, deserves the serious consideration of Congress and the next administration.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS PLANK FOR PLATFORM

(By George J. Burger)

I am George J. Burger, vice president, National Federation of Independent Business. We are an organization of small, independent business and professional people from all vocations of American enterprise. We have the largest directly supporting membership of any business organization in the Nation, with chapters in almost all of the Nation's 437 congressional districts. We are the only organization that makes it possible for business-professional people to take an active interest in Government affairs by means of personal ballots voted in national polls, with signed opinions sent directly to the desks of lawmakers at both Washington and in the States.

We have a single aim: "That our Nation remain the land of opportunity by giving small business fair consideration." Very definitely this eliminates any selfish pleading, for it goes right to the taproots of our freedoms: the personal dignity of each of our citizens, which is based in great part on the basic individual human right, rooted in the natural law and reflected in our Constitution, to acquire, hold, and use private property consistent (be it noted) with disregard for the rights of others. In a real sense, this right to private property implies a right to independent enterprise opportunity. Without the latter, the former is meaningless. Thus, our aim is not limited, but very directly touches on the welfare of all our people, on the basic freedoms and strength of this Nation under God.

By "fair consideration," our members mean they want only honest enforcement of the rules of business fair play, equitable tax treatment, minimum Government interference and competition, equal consideration with all other segments of our Nation in policy-making. They seek neither "special privilege" nor handouts. They are independent enterprisers, and want only to stand on their own two feet.

We are here for one purpose only: to urge you to commit your party to a strong independent business program that will further add to the fine progress registered over past years. Small businessmen are far from out of the woods. But they have taken heart from the fact that the parties have honored 12 of the 18 major action pledges made during the 1956 presidential conventions. Our members deeply appreciate this, and hope only that you will frame a constructive 1960 platform that will provide a springboard for further securing independent business opportunities in the years ahead.

Before going further, let us make this clear: the recommendations we are about to make on behalf of our members are based directly on the personal, signed opinions in our national polls * * * inshort, we speak the voice of small business itself.

ANTITRUST

Our members urge continuation of the trend toward stronger antitrust enforcement which has marked the past few years, be-

cause this is basic to independent business opportunities. Let an independent enjoy ideal conditions in taxes, labor relations, etc. * * * Yet without first having fairness in competition he is doomed to failure. Just as well try to fill a sieve with water as to enact constructive independent business programs without first providing fairness in competition through effective antitrust enforcement. Our members recommend especially three major steps to strengthen the bite of these laws: (1) freeing the chief official of Justice Antitrust Division from political and other pressures by making his a semipermanent position like that enjoyed by Federal judges, with sufficient tenure to lay out action blueprints and follow them through, (2) revision of laws to provide that manufacturers who sell both through independent outlets and their own factory chains be required to grant their independents the same buying price consideration as they do their factory retail outlets, and (3) further sharpening of the teeth in antitrust penalties by providing that officials of firms convicted of repeated unfair, monopolistic price discriminations may be disbarred from business executive positions, the same as lawyers and doctors may be disbarred for unethical practices. Let us face the facts honestly. Too many most important antitrust cases have died on the vine because of shifting direction over a period of various administration. Too many independent business people today are exposed mother naked to destruction of years of building because their manufacturers have installed competitive retail factory-owned outlets that can sell, and are selling, at or below their buying costs—a situation that's entirely outside the pale of corrective antitrust enforcement. Too many high officials of giant businesses today rank antitrust threats to questionable practices as nothing more than another golf course obstacle because penalties (though stricter than before) are little more than slaps on the wrist. Our members feel the three foregoing recommendations can make much needed corrections. Additionally, they urge extension of antitrust law coverage to both labor unions and cooperative-type organizations.

GOVERNMENT REPRESENTATION

Experience has proven to our members that progress in sound small business programs is proportionate to study and attention in this field. They have hailed continuation of the temporary House Small Business Committee, advancement of Senate Small Business Committee to permanency, and action that has made Small Business Administration permanent in the executive branch. They feel that now, however, the Small Business Committees are out of their swaddling clothes; and, if they are to do the job that must be done, must be granted full, standing committee status to consider and report legislation to the floor of Congress, just like committees representing agriculture, labor, and other important segments of our economy. They have heard all the arguments against this, that "it will involve jurisdictional problems, and so forth," but feel that just as Congress in its wisdom heard and ignored these in expanding its committee system in the past to provide representation for other important parts of our economy, it should be able to do the same for independent business, which is the backbone of our Nation. Further, our members feel that Small Business Administration is a big boy now, capable of running its own show, and that it should be made independent in fact as well as name, by eliminating the Loan Policy Board and vesting full control in the hands of the Administrator subject directly to Congress, as is the case with other independent agencies. Finally, they feel there is need for the President to appoint a Secretary of Small Business in his Cabinet, to cap this program of providing adequate independent business representation in Government. For details, see appendix B.

TAXATION

Needless to say, our members are very pleased with the $260 million first-step Small Business Tax Adjustments Act and with the recent action by Congress to grant the self-employed the same private retirement benefits as have been enjoyed by corporation executives and employees, which have flowed from the 1956 platforms. They hold a good start has been made, but much remains to be done. Our polls show they think it time for action to reduce the direct income tax load on smaller corporations, to provide tax deductions for improvements in small businesses, and to provide the same fast tax chargeoffs on purchases of used equipment as are allowed on new equipment, as well as many other projects covered in appendix C–1, attached.

Of course, as practical businessmen, our members realize that financial soundness is a must for a nation as well as a family or a business. They have voted time and again for measures to tighten up equitably on the tax treatment of cooperatives, for elimination of all Government competition with independent business (which will at once reduce Government costs, and enlarge the area of tax-generating private business), to increase Government income. Same time they have voted for measures to reduce the multimillion dollar subsidies Government pays out to big businesses and big farmers, for reduction in or elimination of foreign-aid expenditures (especially to nations which are on their feet), for greater economies in Government purchasing (which directly involves all possible action to provide fairer opportunities for independents to compete freely for Government contracts), and surplus property disposal (as outlined in the Hoover Commission reports), and for reduction in Federal redtape reporting procedures (which at once add to Government paper shuffling costs and to the overhead burdens of businessmen), to reduce Government spending. Between the two, room can be made for the badly needed small business tax reductions. Recommendations in these fields are itemized in appendix C–2.

LABOR-SOCIAL WELFARE

Our members, many of whom have risen from the ranks of labor and still proudly carry union cards, have enthusiastically greeted action by the 86th Congress which provides greater fairness in dealings between businessmen and labor unions. They urge that you and your party commit yourselves to further progress along these lines. For instance, they believe our laws should restrict bargaining to the local level. They feel nationwide wage pattern bargaining is unreasonable. They believe unions should draw pickets from struck businesses only, and no union should be permitted to picket a business unless it has the support of one-third of the employees of the business. The foregoing and many other suggestions are fully covered in appendix A–1.

As to social welfare, there are no people in our country more sensitive to the needs of our citizens than independent businessmen. However, our members must be practical. They are taxed now until it hurts. They want to avoid being taxed until it kills. Bankrupt enterprises benefit no one. For that reason they ask that you avoid commitments in this field which involve additional tax burdens, as are set forth in appendix D–2.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Our members realize that helpful efforts have been made by Congress since 1956 to provide tariff laws which will promote fairer competition in international trade, and that will protect higher cost American businesses against cutthroat competition from lower cost foreign goods that are sold in our markets. They realize that this is a competitive world, and that to live we must compete and trade. However, they have seen giant American firms relocating overseas to take advantage of more favorable cost situations, possibly with the intention of selling back into America, they have seen employment in almost entire lines and communities dry up due to lower priced foreign competition, and they have reason to believe that this situation can become worse. They realize that all competition implies some damage, but they object to being sent into the ring with one hand tied behind their backs. They feel that steps must be taken in this area as soon as possible to provide greater fairness for American firms competing with foreign products in our markets. For their votes on these problems, see appendix E–1.

HIGHWAY-POSTAL PROBLEMS

Our members have consistently opposed further increases in either Federal excise taxes on gasoline or in postal rates, as totally unfair additions to their personal and business overhead costs. They do not feel that gasoline excise taxes should be raised to pay for highway programs when so much of other automotive-industry-generated excise taxes are going for general spending. Further than this, they believe that when Government, in the name of the people, compels businessmen to relocate due to highway construction (incidentally, the same would go for urban renewal situations), Government assumes a duty to assist in making relocations financially possible, where necessary. As to postal rates, chief pressures for increases have been on first-class mail, some 75 percent of which they use for business purposes. They flatly oppose any further increases in this field, which is more than paying its way, so long as users of other classes of mail are being effectively subsidized by the Post Office Department. Particulars of their votes in these fields are found in appendix F.

STATE-FEDERAL RELATIONS

Our members believe in a just division of powers between the National and State Governments. They realize the need, in this day and age, for strength at Washington. At the same time they realize that the taproots of our country's strength are still with the individual citizens in the towns and cities and States of the country. They believe that there are definite dangers to our individual freedoms in any development which might tend to make our State governments mere shadows of Washington, D.C. For that reason our members have consistently opposed all measures which have seemed to take just powers away from the States and repose them at Washington, but equally they have opposed all measures which have seemed to take just powers away from Washington and repose them with the States. For instance, our members recently favored a bill which proposed that the Federal courts be prohibited from ruling that Federal laws override State laws except when the Congress specifically directs. Equally, our members opposed a move by the States to tax the income of out-of-State firms, not only because of the effect on small business interstate sales opportunities, but also because this seemed to represent a State effort to tax interstate commerce, an area specifically reserved to the Federal Government. Appendix G–1 will furnish you a closer view of their votes in this important area.

CONCLUSION

Believe us, it has been a pleasure and privilege to appear here and counsel with you, just as we did with your platform committees in your 1948, 1952, and 1956 conventions. We do appreciate all the progress that has come of your resolves in those years. We look for further advances in the years ahead.

Finally, may we say that this current business of yours and ours is most serious. Not so long ago, the Kremlin's Prince of Darkness declared that communism is the wave of the future. He prophesied that our children, in time, will live under Communist dictatorship.

Let's not kid ourselves, this could happen, unless we take action here and now to bulwark the only rock against which this wave will not prevail: the individual dignity of each of our people in full enjoyment of all their rights as found in the natural law and reflected in our Constitution.

We are, thank God, and thank our forebears for all their dreams and sacrifices, a free people. Let us maintain our freedoms by further strengthening one of their most important underpinnings: The right of each and every last one of our people to independent enterprise, fair consideration, and opportunities.

The Record—On an Expiring Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in defense of those who in good faith attempt to analyze the public record we have written during the past 2 years by listing the issues voted upon and giving our votes upon them, even though I come out on the short end of some of the published lists. Their conclusions are reached by applying standards of measurement which to them seem just for the particular group or organization which makes the compilation.

I am sure you will all agree that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will never be a best seller. It is endlessly written, and it is said that it is not read completely by anybody. Yet, as an annal, it has something for everyone. In it may be found from time to time: nursery rhymes, poetry, the weighed philosophy of men in thoughtful debate, and the error, innuendo, and anger of thoughtless controversy. Here one may perchance find the best and the worst decisions on the problems of today and of tomorrow. Those who use the RECORD in their day to day affairs may, by laborious effort, trace the public record of any individual Member of the Congress. Truly there is something for everyone in the RECORD.

Unlike a slate which may be wiped clean, once written, our RECORD becomes permanent. In this it is unlike men's minds which sometimes change. The finality of the RECORD is, therefore, a matter of concern to all of us while it is being written.

In this age of efficiency and precision, individuals and groups interested in the matters which come before the Congress have devised various means of categorizing or cataloging the acts and actions of those of us who are Members. They like to put us under a microscope of inspection; they like to come up with results which can be measured and which provide a basis for comparison according to their standards of measurement upon the issues and our votes upon these issues. The list should itemize the issues and our votes upon them so that anyone can see just what it is all about.

If one were to compare the record of two or more Congressmen, how would one equate a speech on foreign policy with a speech on acreage allotments for cotton, tobacco, or wheat? How would one compare the merits of service on the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with, for example, membership on the Committee on Rules, or any other committee? If speeches, committee service, and votes could all be properly weighed and equated, our people could have the best possible measure of Members of the Congress; but obviously such a task would try the judgment even of a Solomon.

Those who attempt to judge our work here must, therefore, base their judgments upon our recorded votes. There is no better way, because our voting record reflects our final judgment on the major issues upon which we have had the opportunity to express ourselves.

In my opinion, published voting records if made in good faith make a distinct contribution to the processes of democratic government. While they are not infallible, they make it possible for individuals and groups, be they politicians, political parties, or other public-interest groups, to bring before the voter the record of each Member of the Congress on a given issue or set of issues. For some of us, the results may sometimes be discomforting.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for June 27, 1960, a colleague complained about a voting record published by the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association. The National Rural Electric Cooperative Association and other groups who maintain records are researchers who jot down our votes on issues on which their members have taken positions.

I have tried to be a friend of the rural electrification program. I base this on my personal conviction that rural electrification is good for the country, especially rural America, and I have followed this conviction by supporting legislation which I believed good for that program now; and good for it and our country in the future. I have supported legislation to guarantee that the Administrator of Rural Electrification shall have full authority for making REA loans under a broad policy without first having to check the loans individually with the office of the Secretary of Agriculture. I have supported bills which provide adequate loan funds in order that the program may bring the blessings of electricity to every rural home in our land. I have supported Federal wholesale power projects — multipurpose dams—which would supply many rural electric systems with abundant power at reasonable cost; and I have supported other legislation which I thought would help our people stay on the farms and make a decent living.

In my opinion, these are the types of issues which are important when one attempts to find the friends of rural electrification in the Congress. I suppose if one were to obtain the percent of times I voted "favorably" according to NRECA's compilations of our votes, my record would be favorable among Congressmen whom they consider to be rural electrification's friends.

I have examined the NRECA compilation of my votes on measures on which the members of this national organization of the rural electric systems have taken a stand and find it correct with respect to my votes. I am always happy when I find it showing me voting with the rural electric systems' positions a majority of the time.

I am always glad to take my record as reported by NRECA back to my constituents. The NRECA compilation makes no attempt to rate Congressmen. They just list the votes, note the position of the rural electric ssytems on each issue, and let the reader form his own judgment.

As we go home from this session of Congress, perhaps we should remember the words of Abraham Lincoln who in his second annual message to the Congress said:

We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the last generation. * * * We—even we here—hold the power and bear the responsibility.

Favoritism by Port Authority Highlighted by Santangelo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALFRED E. SANTANGELO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. SANTANGELO. Mr. Speaker, when I was a member of the New York State Senate in 1954 I offered a resolution, calling upon the New York State Senate to examine thoroughly into the operations of the Port of New York Authority. My resolution died in the finance committee. The choking off of this resolution was due to pressures and influences exerted by officials of the port authority.

This was not the first time nor the last time these officials stifled and killed efforts in the New York State Legislature, and in the New Jersey Legislature as well, to inquire into the operations of the authority and to spread upon the public record the nature of their operations. I herewith give you a partial list of other examples. Following are some of the bills introduced in both State legislatures calling for audits or examinations of the port authority's finances and operations, all of which were frustrated and sidetracked:

NEW JERSEY

New Jersey Senate Joint Resolution 18 (1933): A joint resolution creating a commission consisting of three members of the senate to be appointed by the president of the senate, and three members of the house of assembly to be appointed by the speaker thereof, who shall constitute a joint com-

mission to inquire into matters relating to the Port of New York Authority. (Introduced March 9, 1933, by Mr. Powell and referred to committee of the judiciary, New Jersey Senate Journal, 1930, p. 356.)

New Jersey Assembly Joint Resolution 12 (1935): A joint resolution creating a commission consisting of three members of the house of assembly to be appointed by the speaker thereof, three members of the senate to be appointed by the president of the senate, and three citizens of the State of New Jersey, to be appointed by the Governor of the State of New Jersey, who shall constitute a joint commission to inquire into matters relating to the Port of New York Authority. (Introduced January 28, 1935, by Mr. Giuliano, and referred to the committee on miscellaneous business, minutes of the New Jersey House of Assembly, 1935, p. 223.)

Mr. Giuliano, chairman of the committee on miscellaneous business, reported assembly committee substitute resolution for Assembly Joint Resolution 12 (1935).

Mr. Giuliano moved that the clerk be directed to read in full the assembly committee substitute resolution for Assembly Joint Resolution 12. The title of the committee substitute resolution is as follows:

"A resolution creating a commission consisting of five members of the house of assembly to be appointed by the speaker thereof who shall constitute a commission to inquire into matters relating to the Port of New York Authority."

The New Jersey House of Assembly adopted the assembly committee substitute resolution for Assembly Joint Resolution 12 on February 5, 1935. (Minutes of the New Jersey House of Assembly, 1935, pp. 293–295.)

On February 11, 1935, the speaker appointed five members of the house of assembly to this commission. (Minutes of the New Jersey House of Assembly, 1935, p. 325.)

New Jersey Assembly bill No. 391 (1950): An act authorizing the director of the Division of the Budget and Accounting of the Department of the Treasury of the State of New Jersey and the comptroller of the State of New York and their legally authorized representatives to examine the accounts of the Port of New York Authority and to make reports thereon.

This bill was enacted into law as chapter 90 of the session laws of New Jersey, 1950, pages 163, 164. (N.J.S.A. 32: 2–33.)

New Jersey Assembly Joint Resolution 4 (1952): A joint resolution creating a commission to be known as the New Jersey Interstate Facilities Commission to study the subject of interstate tunnels, bridges, and facilities, and the interstate and port authorities and commissions in which New Jersey is interested, particularly in relation to the financing and refinancing of the said facilities and their construction, maintenance, and operation, and also in relation to the benefits obtained, the economies effected and the actual and potential returns from the said facilities, and also in relation to these interstate facilities as a source of revenue to the State and its political subdivisions; to provide for reports and recommendations by the said commission to the Governor and the legislature, and making an appropriation for the expenses of the commission.

New Jersey Assembly Joint Resolution 4 (1952) was introduced on January 21, 1952, by Mr. Musto and referred to the committee on interstate cooperation. (New Jersey Minutes of Assembly, 1952, p. 77.)

On March 24, 1952, Mr. Musto, pursuant to rule 68, gave 24 hours' notice that he would move to relieve the committee on interstate cooperation of further consideration of Assembly Joint Resolution 4. (New Jersey Minutes of Assembly, 1952, p. 501.)

New Jersey Assembly Joint Resolution 3 (1953): Joint resolution creating a commission to be known as the New Jersey Interstate Facilities Commission to study the subject of interstate tunnels, bridges, and facilities and the interstate and port authorities and commissions in which New Jersey is interested, particularly in relation to the financing and refinancing of the said facilities and their construction, maintenance, and operation, and also in relation to the benefits obtained, the economies effected and the actual and potential returns from the said facilities, and also in relation to these interstate facilities as a source of revenue to the State and its political subdivisions; to provide for reports and recommendations by the said commission to the Governor and the legislature and making an appropriation for the expenses of the commission.

Assembly Joint Resolution 3 (1953) was introduced on February 2, 1953, by Mr. Musto and was referred to the committee on the judiciary. (New Jersey Minutes of Assembly, 1953, p. 130.)

On March 25, 1953, Mr. Musto, pursuant to rule 68, gave 24 hours notice that he would move to relieve the committee of judiciary of further consideration of Assembly Joint Resolution 3. (New Jersey Minutes of Assembly, 1953, p. 547.)

NEW YORK

An act creating a temporary commission to investigate the relationship between the port authority and the respective municipalities wherein is situated property of the port authority and particularly the subject of taxing such property; to confer thereon with a similar commission when and if appointed by the State of New Jersey and to report its findings to the legislature; and making an appropriation therefor. (New York Session Laws, 1925, ch. 1, p. 1.)

An act authorizing the comptroller of the State of New York and the comptroller of the State of New Jersey and their legally authorized representatives to examine the accounts of the Port of New York Authority and to make reports thereon. (New York Session Laws, 1929, ch. 648.)

On January 26, 1956, Mr. Composto introduced in the New York Assembly a bill entitled "An act in relation to the examination of the books and accounts of the Port of New York Authority by the State comptroller" (Int. No. 1624), which was read the first time and referred to the committee on ways and means. (New York Assembly Journal, 1956, p. 292, 293.)

On January 26, 1956, Mr. Hults introduced in the New York Senate a bill (Int. No. 1214) entitled "An act in relation to the examination of the books and accounts of the Port of New York Authority by the State comptroller," which was read the first time and by unanimous consent was also read the second time and referred to the committee on finance. (New York Senate Journal, 1956, p. 251.)

On February 7, 1957, Mr. Composto introduced in the New York Assembly a bill (Int. No. 2043) entitled "An act in relation to the examination of the books and accounts of the Port of New York Authority by the State comptroller," which was read the first time and referred to the committee on ways and means. (New York Assembly Journal, 1957, p. 400.)

On March 18, 1957, the New York Senate sent to the assembly for concurrence the following bill entitled "An act in relation to the examination of the books and accounts of the Port of New York Authority by the State comptroller" (No. 1797, Rec. No. 587), which was read the first time and referred to the committee on rules. (New York Assembly Journal, 1957, p. 2473.)

On February 7, 1957, Mr. Hults introduced in the New York Senate a bill (Int. No. 1714) entitled "An act in relation to the examination of the books and accounts of the Port of New York Authority by the State comptroller," which was read the first time and by unanimous consent was also read the second time and referred to the committee on finance. (New York Senate Journal, 1957, p. 376.)

This bill (pr. No. 1797, Int. No. 1714) was passed by the New York Senate on March 18, 1957. Secretary was ordered to deliver this bill to the assembly and request their concurrence therein. (New York Senate Journal, 1957, p. 1922.)

Mr. Speaker, you will note that one of these measures, New Jersey Assembly Joint Resolution 4—1952 was enacted into law. Nevertheless, the New York Port Authority escaped scrutiny. Nothing was done.

In most of the above instances, as far as I can ascertain, the excuse offered by the port authority officials who squelched these efforts, was that the port authority was a Federal agency having to do with Federal matters and therefore was immune from State scrutiny. Although I am now told by port authority spokesmen that I must have been misinformed, that is what I was then told. Today, when Congress seeks to inquire into its operations, the authority, in order to pry itself loose from congressional observation, claims it is a State agency immune from Federal scrutiny. The port authority wants the Congress of the United States to fall between two stools.

Among other matters which I had hoped to clarify in offering my resolution was a question raised by the reiterated charges that one insurance brokerage firm, J. S. Frelinghuysen Corp.—having no connection incidentally with PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., Congressman from New Jersey—has a monopoly on the placement of all insurance upon the assets and operations of the port authority. My bill would have permitted a check upon these charges to ascertain their validity. The brokerage from the placement of all insurance on the port authority's assets and operations would be a tremendous windfall, particularly when one considers that the assets of the port authority total nearly $1 billion and its operations yield yearly a revenue of $100 million.

It would be well to discover whether the port authority does not thus favor one firm as undenied charges seem to establish. If so, the people should know why the port authority thus favors one firm, whether the premiums charged are equitable and fair, and why there has been no competitive bidding on such a large chunk of business. It would be well also to discover with which companies Frelinghuysen places this vast amount of insurance and what the value of the brokerage involved amounts to.

Resolution of these questions becomes even more important when one considers that the cost of all operations of the Triborough Bridge Authority represents only 17 percent of revenues whereas cost of the port authority operations totals 46 percent of revenues. In the face of this comparison one wonders as to the validity and reasonableness of some of the port authority costs.

Yet, the answers to all of these questions will not be forthcoming unless the Celler committee gets the records it seeks. Otherwise these questions will be about as useless to the public at large as a dog's bark.

Should We Let the Caribbean Go Red by Default?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DALE ALFORD
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. ALFORD. Mr. Speaker, a copy of an outstanding and thought-provoking speech by Maj. Gen. R. E. Truman, retired, has just come to my attention. Entitled "Should We Let the Caribbean Go Red by Default?" this address was delivered by General Truman at a meeting of the Military Order of the World Wars in Springfield, Mo., earlier this year.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including a copy of this address which I commend to the Members of the House:

SHOULD WE LET THE CARIBBEAN GO RED BY DEFAULT?

(Speech by Maj. Gen. R. E. Truman, retired, Springfield, Mo., before the Military Order of the World Wars, January 28, 1960)

A part of this talk was made before the State convention of the American Legion in Kansas City on July 25, 1959, but it is still as true today as it was then.

My subject today is to be "Should We Let the Caribbean Go Red by Default?" Our answer to this question should be an emphatic "No." Should our Government permit Cuba to go red all of Latin and South America will join in this move.

The island of Cuba, on which U.S. soldiers and sailors gave their lives in 1898 to help Cubans gain their independence from Spain, is now facing a greater danger than at any time in its history. Cuba is now threatened with communism and the present regime is loaded with known card-carrying fellow travelers, many of whom hold the most important positions in the Government. While Fidel Castro claims not to be a Communist, a person is usually judged by the company he keeps.

This island is only 90 miles from the United States. Should the Communists gain full control of the Cuban Government the United States is faced with a severe threat, for this will be the stepping stone to invade all of the countries whose shores are washed by the waters of the Caribbean.

Your speaker is familiar with conditions in Cuba. I was one of the more fortunate foot soldiers that fought before San Juan and Santiago in 1898. Since 1955 Mrs. Truman and I have made one or more trips to Cuba each year at our own expense in an attempt to bring about the restoration of the great battlefield before Santiago. This project invisioned the establishment of this battlefield as a Cuban-American National Monument. We did not spend our time visiting the casinos and night clubs. Most of our time was spent in the Provinces visiting with the people. While I am not unmindful of the criticisms leveled at the previous government, no one could visit Cuba without being impressed with the tremendous building activity and program of public improvements. In March and April of 1959 we again visited Cuba during the aftermath of a revolution and found everything at a virtual standstill. Over 1 million people were reported out of work and more being laid off every day. In 1 week while we were there 5,800 Government employees were dismissed from their jobs, 2,800 of these were schoolteachers who had been teaching English. It was reported at that time English would no longer be taught in the schools, but Russian would be substituted therefor. The population of Cuba is only slightly over 6 million, but the importance of Cuba cannot be measured in these terms alone.

People who had worked hard all of their lives to accumulate some property were being thrown out of their homes with nothing except the clothing on their backs. Bank accounts were being confiscated or frozen. Many who had assisted the Castro regime, financially or otherwise, are now being dispossessed or put in prison. We found the majority of the Cuban people fearful for their lives, even though the average Cuban citizen hates and fears communism.

The abortive invasion of Panama in April of last year originated in Cuba, was headed by Cubans and was an attempt to overthrow the legitimate Panamian Government and the right of the United States to control the Panama Canal. Information about this invasion was obtained while we were in Havanna. This invasion was timed to take place during Fidel Castro's visit to the United States in order that Castro could say he knew nothing about it. Had it not been squelched by the Panamian armed forces, backed up by the Organization of American States, we would have lost the Panama Canal, our vital link between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. There have been other incidents of this kind since then and will be more in Latin America which have been and will be sponsored by agents of foreign powers.

During our last visit to Cuba we heard reports that the present regime was going to make the U.S. Government give up our vital naval base at Guantanamo. Should we lose this vital naval base we have lost the naval base required to support our fleet in the Cribbean and the South Atlantic. Besides the millions of dollars the U.S. Government has invested in this base, American business has a huge stake in Cuba. American investments on this island run into the billions of dollars. All of these businesses are being harassed by slow down strikes and sabotage in an effort to take them over. Many thousands of acres of land belonging to Americans has already been confiscated and the owners have not been paid. While Castro calls this an "agrarian reform" program to give landless people land, his regime is setting up large collective farms such as they have in Russia and Red China. We are informed these farms are being supervised and administered by those who have received their training in Russia or Red China. The supervisors of these farms are soldiers, so-called, armed with submachineguns and grenades.

The Cuban Telephone Co., which is almost wholly owned by Americans, and the Cuban Power Co. have both been taken over by Castro's followers and the American managers ousted from their jobs, consequently both concerns are in bad financial difficulties. These are only two of the many American businesses that have been taken over without payment.

It is reported on good authority that most of the top officials in the Castro government are Communists. Osvaldo Dorticos, who is now the president, is said to have been a card-carrying Communist for the past 20 years and was the head of the Communist Party in Cienfuegos prior to being elevated to the presidency. Manuel Urritia, who was first made president, was not a Communist and that was the reason he was removed, your speaker has known him since 1955 when he was a judge in Santiago.

Ernesto "Che" Guevara, who is now the head of the Cuban banking system and military director for the armed forces, is a known Communist from Argentine. He is a murderer and a thief, according to the records, and is the hatchetman for Castro.

Raul Castro, Fidel's brother and the head of the armed forces, was trained in Russia and has always been anti-United States. His wife is more of a fanatic than he is, if that is possible.

The heads of all of the labor organizations in Cuba today are Communist trained.

Armando Hart, minister of education, is well known for his Communist activities, he has set up Marxists schools in every barrio on the island and Russian is now a must in every school to the exclusion of English.

There are 30,000 Chinese in Havana alone, they own and control many of the better stores and shops throughout the island, consequently, Red China has a very potent force at its command in this island.

The greatest mistake made by President Batista was when he pardoned Fidel Castro after he had been convicted and sentenced for leading the attack on the Moncada Barracks at Santiago in 1953. Castro was among those responsible for the riots in Bogota at the time Gen. George Marshall was there on a state mission several years ago.

Senator GEORGE SMATHERS, of Florida, has recommended a naval and air patrol of this entire area be set up by the Organization of American States. The Senator suggests this could be a mobile unit that could protect the threatened area "While the issue was being settled, as it should be, around a conference table."

In most circumstances the conference table is appropriate, but when it appears a Communist beachhead is being attempted in this hemisphere, there can be little to confer about. As stated recently in an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post: "In the end such a challenge would have to be met by this country on the principle that, as the Monroe Doctrine stated it in 1823, we would "Consider any attempt on their part to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and safety."

Moreover, it is still true that, as the pre-Castro Havana Post stated, "All that stands between any individual state upon which Communist Russia might have designs is the United States of America, without whose military power the target country would be defenseless." Perhaps peace and cooperation in the threatened area would improve if that simple fact were realized.

These are the facts as they are known to be, I am sorry to say the majority of our news media have not been giving the people a true picture of what is and has been happening in Cuba and South America. Castro has now taken over most of the newspapers that have been critical of him and his government and making it harder for us to get a clear picture of conditions as they are.

Battle Against Reds Needs Every Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Diego Union, Sunday, August 21, 1960:

BATTLE AGAINST REDS NEEDS EVERY CITIZEN—SUBTLE COMMUNIST DRIVE SEEKS OUT SOFT HEADS, SOFT HEARTS, SOFT WILL

The problems freemen face in combating the global threat of international commu-

nism are shown graphically in the articles, maps, and charts in this special section of the San Diego Union. It is a threat so sweeping and so broadly projected that it will require the enlistment of every man, woman, and child in this Nation to meet it. There must be a response from our people to match experienced leadership.

This newspaper believes that it is later than we think, that the softening up tactics used by international communism are every bit as dangerous as naked and open aggression. Indeed, those who have been fighting communism since it took its first great leap forward in 1933, say that it is "H-hour minus five on the battlefield of the war of minds."

That is why what happens in Venezuela, in Africa, in Tibet, in Cuba, or in any nation where Red ideology has a foothold, is of such personal importance to all of us. There is no deferment for anyone in this bitter fight. All must enlist in the fight against communism; survival itself is at stake.

We are fully aware of the Communists' military threat, of their relentless diplomatic offensive, of their fanatical dedication to the goal of world domination. We know that they have toppled free governments, eroded others to the point of collapse. We know that they are busy on our own doorstep in the Caribbean working themselves into easy missile range of this country.

But the military threat and the diplomatic pressure are obvious to all who read a newspaper, listen to the radio, or watch television. It is what we do not see—the psychological quicksand and the thin ice of apathy—that can destroy us. Communism is like an iceberg; its greatest danger comes from the part that does not show above the surface.

Communism is always close to us. It is never farther away than the complacent citizen among us. It is never farther away than those citizens who do not vote, or the schoolchild who lacks comprehension of and instruction in our history and the mechanics and meaning of our free system. Communism is as close at the teacher who fails to emphasize what is good and fine about this country. It is as near as the politican who would further appeasement, and who questions his Nation's motives, policy, and posture.

Communism cannot succeed against a people who are alert to its stratagems, who understand its workings and its thought processes. The Reds do not want to take us to war if they can subvert us, destroy our will to resist and cause us to rot from the inside out.

In President Eisenhower's words: "Vigilance must still be our watchword. Continuing strength—military, economic, and spiritual—must remain our reliance."

The citizen who enlists in the anti-Communist fight is putting those words into practice.

Lockwasher Manufacturers of the United States Urge Tariff Commission To Limit Foreign Imports Now Menacing the Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, among the many manufacturers appearing before the U.S. Tariff Commission was Mr. Paul A. Miller, general manager of the Reliance Division of Eaton Manufacturing Co., Cleveland, Ohio, as spokesman for 11 companies which comprise the Helical Lockwasher Manufacturers.

In his statement, Mr. Miller pointed out the destructive effects foreign imports of lockwashers are having on the American manufacturers. Mr. Miller's statement follows:

TESTIMONY BY PAUL A. MILLER AT U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION AND COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION AT WASHINGTON, D.C., AUGUST 30, 1960, ON BEHALF OF HELICAL LOCKWASHER MANUFACTURERS

My name is Paul A. Miller and this testimony is given in regard to tariff paragraph No. 330, "Spiral Nutlocks, and Lockwashers, of Iron or Steel," hereinafter referred to as "Lockwashers." My position is general manager of the Reliance Division of Eaton Manufacturing Co. whose general offices are located in Cleveland, Ohio, with the Reliance Division offices located in Massillon, Ohio.

Appearing with me today at this hearing are representatives of the following companies who have designated me to speak in their behalf: Hobbs Manufacturing Co., Worcester, Mass.; The Mellowes Co., Milwaukee, Wis.; Harper Manufacturing Co., Maumee, Ohio; The Positive Lock Washer Co., Newark, N.J.; George K. Garrett Co., Inc., Philadelphia, Pa.; Butcher & Hart Manufacturing Co., Altoona, Pa.; Philadelphia Steel & Wire Corp., Philadelphia, Pa.; Eaton Manufacturing Co., Reliance Division, Massillón, Ohio; The National Lockwasher Co., of Newark, N.J., and Milwaukee, Wis.; Standard Lockwasher & Manufacturing Co., Inc., Worcester, Mass.; Unit Rail Anchor Corp., Beall Tool Division, East Alton, Ill.

These gentlemen represent the companies who produce 100 percent of the lockwashers manufactured in the United States.

On or about June 17, 1960, the Reliance Division of Eaton Manufacturing Co., as well as other manufacturers of lockwashers, requested to appear at the public hearings of the U.S. Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information. We are concerned about the possibility of this product being placed on any official bargaining list of the General Organization of Tariffs and Trades meeting, referred to as GATT, to be held in the near future.

We intend to present today, specific facts bearing out that the U.S. manufacturers of lockwashers are not only being placed in further jeopardy if additional tariff concessions are granted, but also are in a precarious position because of the present low tariffs.

The lockwasher industry has 11 manufacturers, many of whom have been producing lockwashers for the past 50 to 80 years. In comparison to other industries, we are not a large industry; our combined sales are approximately $10 million annually in the manufacture of iron or steel lockwashers. Inasmuch as our industry is not large, imports of our products do not require large quantities or sales value before imports have a serious effect on the domestic manufacturers. During the many years that the members of the industry have been in business they have on numerous occasions participated and cooperated with members of the Armed Forces and various technical societies in regard to technical information and the supplying of lockwasher products. The past few years show a gradual decline in the use of our products and we present today information relative to our industry's downward trend in production, employment, prices, decline in sales, and increase in imports. We believe that not only is our industry being seriously injured but that it is faced with further serious injury and the possible extinction of many manufacturers if further concessions are made to foreign countries.

The lockwasher industry is affected both directly and indirectly by foreign imports: indirectly by the increasing numbers of imported finished products, such as automobiles, cash registers, machine tools, sewing machines, agricultural equipment and many others. It would be impossible for us to estimate the total loss to the lockwasher industry by reason of these imported finished products. However, we offer this example:

(1) In the calendar year of 1959 the countries of Great Britain, West Germany, Italy, and France exported to the United States 634,207 automobiles. During this same period of time the United States exported to those countries only 2,027 automobiles. In analyzing the visible lockwashers used on a German Ford; namely the Taunus, we find an average of 235 lockwashers per car. Using this average as an example on the 632,180 automobiles imported from these countries on the net, excluding the exports from the United States, a total of 148,562,000 lockwashers were imported through this indirect channel. I believe it important to note that the total effect of imports on the lockwasher industry cannot be measured only by the imports of lockwashers as a separate finished product.

(2) We realize that the United States is still the largest seller and also the largest buyer in the international market and we are sympathetic to our U.S. State Department's objective to support the economies of foreign countries by trade. We are, however, concerned about the large proportion of the increased exports from Western Europe and Japan being consigned to this country. In addition to the new competition offered U.S. products, the upsurge in Western European and Japanese exports produced in 1959 an alltime record of $15.3 billion of foreign imports by the United States.

The Commission knows that the U.S. exports have increased very little from the $15.3 billion in 1947 to the $16.3 billion in 1959, or an increase of 6.5 percent. In comparison imports have increased from $5.7 billion in 1947 to $15.3 billion in 1959, or an increase of 168 percent. We are alarmed about the increase of imports since in our industry the imports are accelerating faster than the average of all imports.

(3) * Year	Imports of spiral nut locks, and lockwashers, of iron and steel	
	Total pounds	Approximate pieces
1955	109,152	50,069,700
1956	647,444	296,992,600
1957	598,521	274,550,900
1958	879,400	403,394,400
1959	1,707,572	783,289,900

Using the 1955 figures as a base, foreign imports on lockwashers have increased 1,464 percent from 1955 through 1959. Statistics show that imports on these products for the first 5 months of 1960 are continuing at an even greater annual volume than in the calendar year of 1959. It is also important to note that the pounds imported do not give the full effect on the industry since nonferrous lockwashers are not included in the import figures. In the first 5 months of 1960 a total of 697,162 pounds have been imported, in comparison to 5 months of 1959 of 580,651 pounds, or an increase of 20 percent. In our opinion the large tonnage of lockwashers imported in 1959 was not due to the recent steel strike since at no time was any manufacturer in short supply of steel for the production of lockwashers.

We would like to point out that one of the members of our industry states that the 1958 imports were approximately 60 per-

cent of their total operation's shipments; in 1959 imports were approximately 90 percent of their operation's shipments; and if the 1960 imports on these products continue it could equal 100 percent of their entire division's shipments for 1960. More important is the fact that on August 1, 1960, the American Nut & Bolt Fastener Co. of Pittsburgh, Pa., was forced to liquidate and their official statement was they could no longer compete with the foreign competition.

Similar information is available that points out the fact that the 1959 imports were equal to the total shipments of some of the industry manufacturers. It is notable that in 1958 the U.S. lockwasher manufacturers' total production decreased 22 percent from the 1957 level, whereas foreign imports on these products increased 46.9 percent for the same period of time.

Lockwasher manufacturers in part are also in the so-called fastener industry. Although the figures that we present today referring to lockwashers are specifically for that product, we believe that unless the rising tide of imports is checked we will experience the same results as the fastener industry.

(4) Statistics show that although the fastener imports were a mere 16 million pounds in 1953, they increased to 34 million pounds in 1957; 70 million pounds in 1959; and are forecasted to exceed 200 million pounds in 1960—this being an increase of 1,150 percent between 1953 and 1960.

During the week of May 25, 1960, the following quantities of screws, bolts, nuts, rivets, and lockwashers were shipped into this country:

Bolts: 853 cases, 140 tons, 634 drums, 280 casks.

Lockwashers: 55 kegs, 24 drums, 16 cases.

Rivets: 213 cases.

Nuts: 1,024 cases, 2,032 kegs, 10 tons, 546 drums.

Screws: 1,265 cases, 121 barrels, 197 drums, 277 kegs.

Gentlemen, the imports for this 1 week of May 25, 1960, on lockwashers only represent the equivalent of 7,594,000 pieces, or 16,554 pounds.

(5) Industrial fastener imports are valued at approximately $300 per ton, in contrast to an estimated valuation of $660 per ton for overall domestic production.

The total imports of the products mentioned exceed 1,000 tons of all types of fasteners during the same week. The seriousness of the foreign imports' impact on domestic production of lockwashers we believe to be true and factual and supported by recent bills introduced in Congress and the appointment of investigating committees. We refer to Mr. VAN ZANDT'S bill, H.R. 9841, introduced in the House of Representatives January 21, 1960; Mr. DIRKSEN'S bill, Senate Joint Resolution 208, introduced in the Senate June 18, 1960; the Foreign Commerce study to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, April 25, 1960; Senator KEATING'S bill, S. 2663; and others we may not be aware of.

Although total export figures for the U.S. lockwasher manufacturers are not available, I believe these examples indicate that U.S. exports have all but vanished in the past few years. In the calendar year of 1955 the Reliance Division of Eaton Manufacturing Co. exported 3,513,000 pieces, and in 1959 exports were only 22,000 pieces, or a decrease of 99.4 percent since 1955:

Reliance division exports

	Pieces
1955	3,513,000
1956	2,259,000
1957	531,000
1958	223,000
1959	22,000

In another example, the Butcher & Hart Manufacturing Co. of Altoona, Pa., reports that 20 years ago 25 percent of their sales of lockwashers were exported overseas. Today these markets have all but evaporated; in their opinion principally due to the high duty, the entrance of manufacturers of lockwashers in oversea countries, and the continued increased labor costs in the U.S. industry. The comments from several of the U.S. manufacturers are parallel in regard to exports. Although the export market for these products has practically vanished, we would like to refer to the Foreign Commerce study, a report of which was made April 25, 1960, to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, U.S. Senate:

(6) "With the approaching end of artificial quota and exchange restrictions, the tariff wall confronting U.S. exports becomes an even more critical factor in judging our European trade prospects, and the formation of these two trading blocs—comprising together over 85 percent of our transatlantic market—will give an increasingly greater tariff advantage for our chief competitors for a large range of goods. Thus, the American automaker, appliance manufacturer, or machinery exporter who seeks a market in France must compete against German products, for example, whose labor and transport cost advantage will be further magnified by a tariff differential. And as a truly mass market develops, European manufacturers are certain to turn more and more to volume production, thus minimizing the remaining competitive edge which U.S. producers have traditionally enjoyed. It has been estimated that 32 percent of our exports to the common market—mostly industrial goods—will be adversely affected, and another 27 percent—chiefly farm products—may be affected depending upon the treatment which these countries eventually accord to each other's agricultural exports."

We believe as a result of the foreign commerce study, conducted by reputable public and industry officials, that the lockwasher manufacturer can expect little assistance by reason of increased foreign exports.

The lockwasher manufacturers serve major industries such as, the automotive, appliance, farm implement and jobber trade. Although we do not claim the entire reduction in the lockwasher production to be due to foreign imports, imports in 1959 were approximately 5.2 percent of the domestic production, or 1,707,572 pounds, or approximately 783,289,900 pieces.

Let us remember that 5.2 percent is representative of a 1,464-percent increase in a few short years, and unless the trend is reversed imports could very well be 15 to 20 percent of domestic production 2 or 3 years hence. This in our opinion represents a sizable contribution to our decline in sales, employment, and profits.

(7) Total lockwasher products of iron or steel produced in the United States, 1955 through 1959, were:

	Pieces
1955	7,985,218,000
1956	6,441,386,000
1957	5,954,198,000
1958	4,636,116,000
1959	6,595,128,000

Between 1955 and 1959 our total production decreased 1,390,090,000 pieces, or 17.4 percent, while the foreign imports for the same period increased 1,464 percent. It is important to point out that the lockwasher industry is responsible for the employment of employees in other industries. This is by reason of our purchases of basic steel, gas, electricity, supplies, facilities, and other products.

In the calendar year of 1959 the lockwasher industry consumed approximately 33 million pounds, or 16,500 tons of steel. (8) Based on information from the steel industry approximately 16 man-hours are required to produce 1 ton of steel. This represents approximately 264,000 man-hours required to produce the steel for the manufacture of the 1959 volume of lockwashers. (12) In addition to the man-hours to produce the basic steel 679,800 man-hours were required in the fabrication of the product in the lockwasher industry.

Therefore the production of lockwashers was responsible for employment in the amount of 943,800 man-hours for the 1959 volume of production. Converting the 1959 imports of lockwashers into man-hours, or 1,707,572 pounds, or 854 tons, we find that the lockwasher industry lost approximately 35,184 man-hours and the steel producers lost approximately 13,664 man-hours, or a total man-hour loss in the industry of 48,848. Although the man-hours lost in 1959 due to imports may seem relatively small in comparison to some industries, we would like to again point out that this loss of 48,848 man-hours occurred in the space of 5 years and, in effect, has caused the unemployment of over 5 percent of the employees required to produce domestic lockwashers.

The annual sales volume in the industry has decreased from $11,500,000 in 1951 to $10,885,000 in 1959, and so far in 1960 the entire industry has been depressed with lower volume, although imports continue to rise.

During the past 9 years steel prices have risen 64.4 percent, labor wages 49.1 percent, whereas the increase in the selling price of lockwashers has amounted to only 37.1 percent. The industry, as you can see, has not been able to recover increases in labor and raw material through selling prices and this difference has come from profits which today are the lowest in our history. There seems to be a continual discussion on the effect of the low wages paid in producing imported products and we in our industry do not feel that this can or should be ignored. After personally spending 60 days in Europe and visiting some 30 manufacturing companies I do not share the views of many that European industries have less efficient equipment or that productivity is less than that in the U.S. industries.

Several companies that I visited had far more efficient equipment and operations than similar companies in the United States producing the same competitive products. (10) The Chase Manhattan Bank offers the following information, and I quote:

"Although wages are rising faster in Europe than in the United States, they are not likely to reach U.S. levels.

"American manufacturers cannot hope for European competitors' costs to rise to match ours. The French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies recently reported Western European hourly wage costs range from 57 cents in Holland to $1.08 in Sweden compared with $2.68 in the United States."

(13) There are indications that oversea producers have significant cost advantages over their American competitors. This is particularly true of those operating in Western Europe where the modern equipment installed since the end of the war is as good or even better than that used in this country. The evidence collected by the National Industrial Conference Board indicates that operating in Western Europe does offer clear cost advantages. Because of the labor cost advantage that foreign producers have, they are able to turn out goods requiring considerable processing by skilled labor at a lower total cost. In the fabricated metals industry, according to the study conducted by the National Industrial Conference Board, production costs are lower in 13 cases, the same in 4 cases, and higher in 4 cases, indicating that in our type of industry costs are predominantly lower. Cost advantages in some instances are due not only to lower wage rates but also to superior producing industries. Some of the war-devastated plants in

Germany, for example, had to be rebuilt completely. This is also true in Japan, who now have facilities to equal the best in U.S. industry.

(9) Sweatshop labor conditions are prevented by law in the United States. The rapid expansion of American foreign trade in recent years in effect permits foreign industries, in which wages and working conditions are below American standards, to compete with domestic production in which wages are significantly higher and in which minimum wages and working conditions are set by the laws of the United States and several States. The U.S. minimum wage law is $1 per hour and pending legislation that could increase the minimum wage to $1.25 an hour provides far greater labor costs than those of foreign manufacturers who produce the same product that we must compete with, although no domestic manufacturer is paying the minimum wage in the United States. The approximate average hourly earnings of the employees in the lockwasher industry in the United States is $2.25 per hour. We cannot expect to compete, even with our advanced technology, in the manufacture of these products with foreign producers paying average wages in Germany of 67 cents an hour; United Kingdom, 80 cents an hour; Belgium, 75 cents an hour; and Japan, 41 cents an hour. The wage differential between foreign competition and U.S. manufacturers is real and has a serious effect on the selling price of domestic manufactured products and the possibility of export.

We offer the following examples as proof of the fact that the low average wages in competitive producing countries permit them to undersell domestic produced lockwashers;

(11) *Selling prices of foreign lock washers against selling prices of domestic lock washers*

[Price per thousand]

SAE medium	Japan	Germany	United States
CARBON			
No. 8	$0.34	$0.56	$0.81
No. 10	.28	.56	.67
¼ inch	.45	.78	1.09
⅜ inch	1.34	2.12	2.18
½ inch	2.64	4.17	4.24

SAE medium	Foreign	United States
STAINLESS		
No. 6	$1.10	$2.10
No. 8	1.15	2.35
No. 10	1.30	2.26
¼ inch	3.05	5.34
5/16 inch	5.15	8.81
⅜ inch	7.35	13.58
½ inch	15.95	23.52

In summary, we would like to repeat that during the past 5 years the imports of lockwashers have increased 1,464 percent to more than 800 tons annually and have all but eliminated the possibility of domestic manufacturers exporting their products. These imports have in effect reduced the employment in our industry more than 5 percent, with a resultant effect on the employment in the steel industry. It has affected the consumption of an already import-effected steel industry, the usage of gas, water, utilities, equipment manufacturers, and others. In our opinion there exists certainty of further serious injury being done to the U.S. manufacturers of lockwashers. We feel that either or both an increase in duty or additional import restrictions are required to avoid further serious injury or even the possible extinction of more domestic manufacturers of these product lines.

We thank the Commission for the opportunity to present our views on this subject and trust that your recommendation will be favorable in behalf of our industry.

Moral Rearmament Program To Fight Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in the struggle for survival and progress, the free world faces the task not only of combating the aggressions of communism against the integrity of nations, but also of strengthening the spirit of man to enable him to best meet the challenges of these complex times.

If our way of life is to survive and the aspirations which we feel are basic to human progress are to reach their highest plateaus—then we must of course defeat this astheistic, materialistic ideology.

In the effort, however, we are—if not ignoring—at least failing to fully utilize one of the great fundamental things which freedom itself has to offer mankind—that is—the opportunity to believe in, and adhere to, those spiritual principles which for each individual have a meaning in life.

These forces—of themselves—are intangible. In the long run of history, however, they may well be the determining factors in the tide of the battle against a materialistic ideology that denies the freedom of the human soul, of individual integrity, and of the right of each man to seek, within an orderly society, a self-determined destiny.

Currently, at Mackinac Island, Mich., men and women—of nearly all faiths—devoted to spiritual principles, from all over the world are meeting to attempt to fashion new tools to fight the Reds and to lift the life of man to new planes of dignity.

In addition to the combating of Red ideology, effort is underway to build a strong foundation upon which to conduct the battles of life against poverty, prejudice, disease, illiteracy, malnutrition and other historical enemies of mankind.

Reflecting endeavors by dedicated individuals to expand their perspective of life; to better understand the struggle between communism and freedom; to extend the spheres of moral influence; and to cut across the lines of prejudice and bigotry that have traditionally obstructed men's effort to work together for common good. I ask unanimous consent to have the articles entitled "MRA (Moral Re-Armament) Fashions New Tools To Fight Reds," from the Milwaukee Journal, printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Aug. 28, 1960]

MRA FASHIONS NEW TOOLS TO FIGHT REDS—DEVOTED MACKINAC ISLAND GROUP BELIEVES THAT THE WORLD MUST BE REMADE WITH MORALITY; "WEAPON" A WEEK IS GOAL

(By Richard H. Leonard)

MACKINAC ISLAND, MICH.—Devout men and women who feel that World War III is already here are making this lovely island a launching pad for new "weapons" designed to destroy communism.

These fighters fly the banner of Moral Re-Armament (MRA), an organization started in 1938 for an ambitious crusade: To remake the world by putting honesty, purity, unselfishness and love into the hearts of men and the policies of the nations.

Certain that Russia fully intends to spread communism throughout the world, MRA scoffs at talk of coexistence. It is working urgently to counteract the Communists by telling people to listen to God, strive for freedom and practice brotherhood.

NEWEST WEAPON: MOVIES

Its latest weapons are wide screen, color movies. Produced in the imposing MRA studio on their island arsenal in Lake Huron, these films carrying the MRA message straddle the seas and sweep across continents "We're trying to produce a weapon a week," said Stewart Lancaster, an MRA leader, as he stood before the new studio, incomplete but already in use, at Cedar Point, on the southeast end of the island. "We want to put the free world on the offensive in the war of ideas." "We decided to build the studio so that MRA could be on every movie and TV screen in the free world in a year," said William F. Stubbs, an engineer from Atlanta, Ga., who was general superintendent of the building project.

MEN OF MANY FAITHS

A total of 145 volunteers with this same determination came to Mackinac (pronounced Mackinaw) last winter from 23 nations to build the studio, and many are remaining to produce the films. There are men of many faiths, black men and white men, young men and elderly men, rich men and poor men, Europeans and Asians, Africans and Americans working shoulder to shoulder.

Less than a dozen had ever done construction work. They regard it as no less than a miracle that they were able to build the four-story studio and the three-story tower atop it.

The publicity director for Screen Gems in Hollywood, James Hardiman, recently inspected the main sound stage, 120 by 80 feet, and pronounced it "technically perfect." He said he was not aware of any in America that approached it.

This summer the construction crews have been joined by other believers in MRA—Hollywood actors and actresses, statesmen from near and far, military men, labor leaders, writers, and industrialists are among them—for the annual world assembly at this North American headquarters. (There is another MRA headquarters at Caux, Switzerland.)

A staff of MRA volunteers shares the work in the residence halls, as comfortable as the finest hotels; the main kitchen or other kitchens that turn out special dishes for Asians or Africans, or kosher meals; the dining rooms that can seat 1,200 persons at once and give them service comparable to a first-class restaurant, or the tastefully decorated theater, assembly rooms and lounges overlooking the lake.

The multi-million-dollar headquarters abounds with interesting persons.

In the main kitchen, Mrs. Michael Barrett, granddaughter of David Lloyd George, former British prime minister, cuts up peaches, and Matsuko Kabayama, great-granddaughter of the founder of the Japanese Navy, shells peas.

In a dining room, Miss Frederika Bull, daughter of the Canadian Ambassador to Japan, waits on tables and Mrs. John Hallward, a niece of the British statesman Lord Halifax, guides people to their places.

YOUTHS TRAIN FOR MISSIONS

The great-granddaughter of Cornelius Vanderbilt, Mrs. John Henry Hammond,

entertains at the piano in Great Hall, the main assembly room.

Sharing the physical work has real meaning for youths being trained for MRA missions.

"It's part of the ideological training," said Jerry Nelson, 31, a former University of California at Los Angeles student who is now directing the operation of the film studio. "If you can't wash dishes together, you'll never make out when you sit down at the conference table together."

Everything at MRA headquarters, from the food on the table to the tapestries on the walls, has been acquired through donations of goods, services or cash. The contributions include rugs from the Shah of Iran, rice from the Prime Minister of Thailand, fruit from Japanese-American farmers in California and decorations for the reception room from Prime Minister U Nu of Burma.

GOD CALLED ANSWER

Stated simply, it is the mission of MRA, which was founded by Dr. Frank N. D. Buchman, a Lutheran from Pennsylvania, to rearm the world morally, to convince statesmen and ordinary men everywhere that the directing force of God is the answer to the confusion and strife found in the world today.

Buchman, now 82, is attending the MRA assembly at Caux this summer. He was ordained as a minister and worked as a professor before undertaking moral rearmament on a worldwide scale.

America has a special role in remaking the world because it is so powerful and influential, MRA believes.

MRA operates in several ways:

Some 2,000 full time workers who have been trained at Mackinac and Caux are now carrying around the world the message of honesty, purity, unselfishness and love. They present plays built around this message. They sing it at public performances and on radio and TV. They discuss it in confidential conversations with statesmen and other influential persons.

MRA literature is distributed in great quantity in many languages, and now films are being distributed widely.

Persons who can be effective in helping to remake the world are invited to Mackinac and Caux to relax in a peaceful setting (most MRA people do not smoke or drink), to learn of MRA and to seek answers to problems that divide men and nations. They sit silently in what is known as a "quiet time," and seek guidance from God.

ASSEMBLY STARTS DAY

There is no reveille at headquarters, but at 7:30 a.m. there is an assembly in great hall, a striking circular room shaped like a giant tepee. The walls are supported by huge logs of Norway pine that rise from the wall to wall carpeting to the tip of the cone, almost four stories high.

On a typical morning recently, about 400 men and women from 27 nations filled the folding chairs that faced a panel of half a dozen MRA leaders. One of them, Stewart Lancaster, 34, arose and quoted Premier Khrushchev of the Soviet Union:

"'The choice for America is war or coexistence.' Is that true?"

"No," roared the audience.

Lancaster agreed and spoke briefly on the impossibility of coexistence with communism. He said Russia was using the coexistence theme to lull America into a state where Communists could take over.

A chorus of 30 young men and women from many lands then hurried from the audience and assembled before the seated panel. They sang, beautifully and with determination, "America Needs an Ideology." A piano, bass, and guitar added rhythm and the music swirled up to the apex of the Norway pines.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS TOLD

Then it was time for individuals to take the platform and give personal messages about MRA accomplishments.

A Maori from New Zealand, Rei Jones, led his carpenter crew—which included a newspaperman, a French aristocrat, a wheat farmer and a white South African—onto the stage, where they performed a Maori war dance.

The daughter of Prime Minister Charles Assale of the new Cameron republic of Africa was accompanied by an interpreter. Speaking in French, Bettina Assale said:

"My father was going to launch a war to get independence from the French, but this never came about because I was in a group of students invited to Mackinac. One morning, in my quiet time, the name of my father came to me as one who should come to Mackinac. I wrote to him. It looked impossible. But he came for a weekend and stayed 6 weeks—and changed completely. Later he was invited to the United Nations. People knew he was an enemy of the French and the French delegate had prepared a speech attacking him. But he didn't know my father had changed.

APOLOGIZED TO FRENCH

My father got up and apologized to the French. The French couldn't believe their ears. They asked him to repeat his statement. My father said the world was in terrible confusion because we had forgotten to listen to God.

He said God had put on earth white and black and yellow persons to live together, not to kill each other. The French delegate put away his speech and didn't say a word.

At 9 a.m. it was time for breakfast. After that, the staff went to work. Some acted in the studio. Some washed dishes. Some made beds. Some began making lunch. Some picked up tools to complete the studio.

In the afternoon that was an MRA movie, "Men of Brazil," which told how Communists were defeated on the docks in Brazil. At night there was an MRA play, "The Real News," which told of a newspaper reporter who listened to God and saved a government from collapse.

Many men could be found in widely different roles as the day progressed. Allan Hardie, from South Africa, for instance, sang with the chorus in the morning and then went to work with the carpenter crew. Harold Sack, boss of the concrete crew, had a leading part in the play at night.

Their ability to erect buildings, make movies, sing, act or do seemingly anything that has to be done stems from the force of their conviction to remake the world, many MRA people say.

The idea for a new film, "The Crowning Experience," came from a quiet time. One morning singer Muriel Smith, a Negro who played the leading role in "Carmen Jones" on Broadway, emerged from her quiet time with determination to make a musical motion picture that would be an answer to "Porgy and Bess." She felt that the latter picture had not properly portrayed the Negro.

"The Crowning Experience," starring Muriel Smith, was the result.

Another star of the film is Vernon Slaughter, 38, a Negro housepainter from Detroit who visits Mackinac on weekends. When congratulated on his performance, Slaughter replied, "It was God's guidance. It must have been guidance—I never knew anything about acting." There are no prayers at MRA assemblies. MRA is not a religion, its leaders insist, but a movement for all of mankind interested in fighting communism, fascism or any form of tyranny and making a better world. They say that there is no hierachy, no ritual, no membership cards, no rules. This contention that MRA is not a religion has met with opposition from some Catholics. The bishop of Marquette, Mich., has forbidden members of his diocese to participate in MRA on the grounds that it is a religious movement, with principles contrary to those of the Catholic Church.

CATHOLICS AMONG SUPPORTERS

A commentary prepared at St. John's Seminary, a provincial seminary of the Boston Catholic archdiocese, has stated that any movement is religious "which rests upon the data of divine revelation, and which assumes that God has spoken to men and that He invites them to follow His guidance."

"In urging the members of each religious sect to become united in a common moral life, moral rearmament implies that the dogmatic truths about which religious sects disagree are of no importance," the commentary said.

However, some of the strongest supporters of MRA, including Chancellor Konrad Adenauer of West Germany, are Catholics. There are Catholics at MRA headquarters here and in Switzerland, and MRA has been praised by Catholic writers and Catholic publications on many occasions.

"Because I am a Catholic, because I wish to participate in the realization of the vision of the future of Pope Pius XII, I hope I shall be permitted to be a crusader, to be a fisher of men, under two banners, that of the Catholic church and that of Moral Re-Armament," said Don Salvador Araneta, president of the Order of the Holy Sepulcher in the Philippines.

"The great strength of Moral Re-Armament seems to me to lie in the fact that it is restoring tangible sociological effectiveness to the Christian moral code," wrote Dr. Werner Schollgen, professor of Catholic theology at the University of Bonn.

Dr. Buchman has, of course, always been the leader of MRA. But beyond him the day-to-day operation of MRA is a team effort with decisions being reached at group meetings, leaders say. The leadership changes at Mackinac as new people come into MRA and others leave the island on MRA missions.

Through most of the day and into the night, when the sun sets somewhere behind the Mackinac Bridge and passing ore boats turn on their lights, these leaders are indistinguishable from the hundreds of others on Mackinac who are fighting to build a better world.

The Untried Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from a recent issue of the Marion Star points up, briefly and clearly, why there has been no legislation for the relief of the farmer. Everyone who has been concerned about the fate of the farmer in the present session of Congress ought to read it:

[From the Marion Star, Aug. 24, 1960]

THE UNTRIED FARM POLICY

For all the ranting that has been done about the farm problem in this (and every) election year, it remained for Secretary Benson to pierce the smokescreen and put his finger on the real trouble.

It is not that the Benson farm policies have failed. The trouble is that the Benson farm policies have never been tried.

The blame for that belongs to Congress, but all Democratic and some Republican Congressmen are making the Secretary the scapegoat. And those Republicans who are helping the Democrats make him the scapegoat are probably the same ones who helped the Democrats sabotage his proposals on Capitol Hill.

The farm situation, after years of dictation from Washington, is a mess so sticky and so murky that nothing short of a total revolution in farm policy will solve it. That was what Secretary Benson had in mind when he took the thankless agriculture post in the Eisenhower Cabinet in 1953.

Recognizing the complexities of the farm problem, he conceived his solution a a whole, with each part coordinated with and dependent upon all the other parts. Executed as a whole, it might have worked. It never got the chance.

For too many farm-belt Congressmen, with their eyes focused on the short-term dilemma of garnering votes, are like amateur whittlers who have no clear idea of what they are going to create when they set to work with the knife. They carve a little here and chip a little there, sticking in a wad of putty when they make a slip that throws the whole thing out of proportion.

When it is finished, it looks like what it is: A hacked-up piece of wood.

That has been the fate of the Benson farm programs in Congress. Not once has Capitol Hill accepted an entire set of Benson proposals aimed at accomplishing an overall goal. Instead, the proposals have been torn apart, distorted, deformed and then put back together in a shape that bore only the slightest resemblance to the Benson program.

But shrewdly, the Congressmen labeled their creation in such a way as to make it appear that Mr. Benson was the author. Thus, they are able to accuse him of instituting policies that have been miserable failures.

The whole performance is an example of legislative provincialism at its worst.

Mr. Benson is not the system's first victim, nor is he likely to be its last. Yet he himself holds out some hope for a change in the future.

He suggests that, despite the Democratic nominee's efforts to detect a rift between the Secretary and Vice President NIXON, the Republican standard bearer's farm policy will be built on the same foundation fostered by Mr. Benson.

If Mr. NIXON can successfully pit his political talents against the provincialism of Capitol Hill, the Secretary's policies may yet be tried and proved correct.

Hon. Leo E. Allen

SPEECH
OF
HON. THOMAS J. O'BRIEN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. O'BRIEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, LEO ALLEN and I came to Washington after the election of November of 1932 to begin our congressional service as members of the 73d Congress. LEO came as a Republican at a time when Republican Members of the Congress were dropping like frost-bitten leaves, and everyone knows that I am and always have been a Democrat. LEO went through the elections when things were bad for the Republicans and when things were looking up. I want to say that the Republicans were fortunate in having LEO ALLEN on their ticket. I have been fortunate in having LEO ALLEN as a colleague and as a personal friend. However, much we may have differed on partisan matters and on philosophical approaches, when it came to things of concern to Illinois, LEO ALLEN was always on the firing line, just as he was in France as a sergeant of the famed 33d Division in World War I. I shall not forget the help he gave Chicago on the Rules Committee with the Lake Michigan Water Diversion bill. LEO ALLEN has served his district, and the State of Illinois with tireless industry and with great distinction. Illinois is proud that it has contributed to the House of Representatives Speaker Cannon, a Republican, and Speaker Rainey, a Democrat. It is proud that in LEO ALLEN, now voluntarily retiring from public life after years of service it has made a contribution to the Republican leadership of the House, both when his was the majority party and when it was the minority party. There are few Members of Congress who have been privileged to enjoy such distinction. LEO and I, of opposite political faiths, have worked together as warm personal friends for near a quarter of a century, and my warmest good wishes go with him in the years ahead.

Letter From a Veteran

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, all Members of Congress receive a great deal of mail, much of it mass produced and group inspired. I ask leave to insert a letter received from a constituent into the RECORD, without any comment on my part, since I consider it one of the most thought provoking, penetrating, individualistic communications I have received in some time:

AUGUST 25, 1960.

Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Today I received my Illinois Korean veterans' bonus check for $100. This was a measure I had voted against. I felt that any unnecessary additional tax imposed on the people of Illinois certainly should be vetoed. The generous grand sway of politicians and veterans' pressure groups took any virtue out of this supposed "thank you" by the people of Illinois.

Maybe you can tell me, Mr. DERWINSKI, where I have gone astray. I felt that I had already been thanked by the people of Korea. Maybe I'm in a strange old world which I don't understand. Let me tell you why I feel this way. I was a marine, a machinegun sergeant, who went ashore in the Inchon invasion, through Seoul, around through Wonson, up to Hagaru-ri at the Changjin Reservoir, fought back out in the epic battle, went back to Mason, up to Pohang, and on up the central Korean valleys and mountains to Inje. I was lucky. I came away with a profound sense of satisfaction and many new understandings which have been more than worth the minor physical ailments suffered now. They will always bother me as remembrances of the Korean war. Certainly my experiences are not unique. That you know only too well. What bothers me is the fact that politicians and veterans' groups feel they must reward something as fine as fighting for human freedom with a small monetary reward spread out to thousands of men drafted into the services who had nothing at all to do with the Korean war.

I volunteered for military service because I love my country. I felt I had an obligation, a duty, and I didn't have to be bribed by an indiscriminately administered GI bill. I was due to get out of the Marine Corps, but I volunteered to go to Korea because I hate any kind of tyranny. I know it sounds strange to find an intellectual with strong ideals willing to give up everything nowadays.

When I was discharged, I didn't draw my GI bill for education. I'm an odd ball. I worked my way through both college and graduate school and supported my wife and daughter with my wife's help. Now I teach American history in a south suburban Chicago high school. My salary is only $5,000 a year, yet I'm highly educated; but I'm a nut who believes in this country and in freedom for all people.

Yes, I'm a real crackpot—a young man who loves his country, loves freedom for all the world, and is willing to give his life if needed, yet feels the opportunities of this country are a sufficient inducement.

I think that if our people and our Government could understand my strange thoughts and actions, we would get along much better with the rest of the world. After all, it only wants what we have, the opportunity to live in freedom and to struggle for the rewards of helping each other attain a better life spiritually and materially.

Yes, I love people, all people, and this bonus check for $100 will buy a lot of food and school supplies for the Wonju Sung Ae Orphanage in Korea. Sure, I need the money, but they need it more. This is my way of saying thank you to a backward country and its orphaned children for teaching me so much about love and life. I only wish other Illinois Korean veterans would send their checks to these kids. They need us so much.

Well, Mr. DERWINSKI, what's WRONG, or is it that I have really found out what life is about, and have decided to live in spite of our sloppy, lazy "give me" culture?

Yours truly,

GRAYDON A. LANDAHL.

P.S.—You have my permission to do anything you desire with this letter, including filing it in the wastebasket.

On the Occasion of the 20th Anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America I would like to pay tribute to the Ukrainian patriots who through the cen-

turies have fought the good fight for national independence.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America helps us see that the fight is far from over. It serves to remind us of the plight of the dozen captive non-Russian nations. It makes us take a more sober view of the stakes involved in the cold war of today.

The chairman of the committee, Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, was instrumental in obtaining congressional approval for a Captive Nations Week observance this year. This observance showed Khrushchev that we in the West were aware of the Soviet tyranny which oppresses the captive nations under his sway. It also gave hope to the subject peoples by showing them they were not forgotten. Most importantly, it proved that ideas can pierce through the curtain of terror that encircles the Soviet Union and its satellites.

I would like to offer congratulations to the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on its anniversary but, in a way, it seems to me as unseemly to congratulate the committee on this occasion as it is to congratulate a man on the anniversary of his mortgage. I would rather save my most joyous congratulations for the day the mortgage is all paid up and burnt, for the day the captive nations have once again taken their rightful place among the family of free nations. In the meantime I wish the committee the very best in its endeavors.

Greetings to the Ukrainian Congress Committee on Its 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker I am pleased on this occasion to salute the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America on its 20th Anniversary.

The land and other natural resources of the Ukraine—the tremendously fertile land with acres upon acres of wheat, the rich coal and iron deposits of the Donets River Basin, the power of the Dnieper River which when harnessed helped now to power Soviet industry—all are used to serve the purposes of the Soviet Union. But there remains one invaluable resource of the Ukraine that cannot be harvested, nor extracted, nor harnessed by the brutal conqueror, and that is the people of the Ukraine, a people schooled in adversity, a people rich in national culture, a people of heroic epics. And the Soviet Union now finds, as have all the previous tyrants who have held sway over the Ukrainian people, that nothing can quench the indomitable spirit of independence of the Ukraine.

We can learn much from the history of the Ukrainian people. Their sacrifices perform a valuable service to us. The tribulations they have endured at the hands of Russian imperialism, the horrible massacre at Vinnitsa where the executioners of the hated N.K.V.D. killed 12,000 Ukrainians in cold blood, the violated pledges of the Soviet Union, and the continuing tyranny of Soviet rule over the captive nations—these help us better to see the truth and help us to rid ourselves of delusions about our common enemy.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee of America continually brings these truths to light. It helps keep hope in the hearts of those on both sides of the Iron Curtain that one day Ukrainian freedom, as well as the freedom of all captive nations, will no longer be a phrase and a hope proclaimed by such as I on an anniversary or on some other occasion of sorrowful reminiscence but instead, a living reality.

Upstream Benefits Bill, H.R. 7201

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my taking this time today was to discuss a piece of legislation which has been needed in this country for many years. Unfortunately, at the very time Congress is hard at work on legislation introduced for the purposes of benefiting this country, selfish interests, which are too often present, misinform the public of this country in order to delay the legislation, defeat it, or serve their own selfish purposes.

The legislation I refer to is H.R. 7201, known as the upstream benefits bill. Many people have asked me about the legislation. I realize it is technical legislation because it deals with the question of firm power, firm energy, hydroelectric physics. It also deals with problems about which both public and private power are concerned. Public and private power, each and both, are today in great need of the hydropower, the river coordination, the reservoir utilization and control, this legislation will produce.

I have been impressed at the opposition to the legislation by those who claim they are trying to do something for their country, because the initial impact of the legislation would have been to provide that insofar as the storage facilities of this country are concerned, the maximum benefits on release of that storage capacity would be required in order that we have the maximum electric power from the available storage and waterpower.

There were some who said: "Well, this is legislation to benefit the private power people." Some people wanted to believe that rather than to look into the facts. Then there were others who said: "Well, you are going to raise the rates of the REA's and other public power people"; and some people wanted to believe that because they were told so. It will not cause a raise in REA rates. The fact of the matter, however, was, is today, and will be tomorrow, whether or not this legislation is passed next year, that this legislation is needed. It is needed by REA's, PUD's, and private power. The report of our committee, which I suppose very few people have read, shows public and private power alike crying for the legislation.

The public utility districts out on the Columbia River are crying for the legislation because under the present law there is no way to make any private power company upstream release the storage in such way that the public utility districts could be guaranteed the firm hydropower it need to meet consumer demands or attract new industry.

In Oklahoma, in the great district of my friend who sits at the debate table, we have a great public power authority desperately needing this legislation.

There were some who said this looks like a windfall to the private power people. When we put the testimony into the record and the statistics into the record they showed that on the Columbia River system alone the United States would benefit $1 million per year. Then the opposition tried to find some other excuse.

Then, I went to my friends from Tennessee realizing some others might go to them and say this would hurt the Tennessee Valley Authority which it will not. I found that in the Tennessee Valley the public and private power interests do just what this bill wants them to do all over the Nation, and I found that there is a great aluminum plant on the Tennessee River system solely because of the fact—solely because of the fact—that public and private power people cooperate and coordinate.

Then I went to some other people who are trying to fight this legislation to try to reason with them because certainly I do not believe I have sponsored anything unreasonable here, and I said: "How about backing this legislation?" One gentleman from Alabama said: "I am just afraid you are going to upset my cost-benefit ratio." So I went to the Department of Engineers of the U.S. Army who are the people who determine the cost-benefit ratio, and asked them about it. They gave me a letter which I gave to interested Alabama people which said that it would not disturb the cost-benefit ratio.

Then, lo and behold, I find that the opposition began to come from headquarters of the National Rural Electric Cooperatives Association. It just so happens I know something about the REA. It is a great authority. REA has meant a lot to this country; it is going to mean a lot in the future. But the people I know who direct the REA's are the farmers and businessmen of my area, people who are not inclined toward any socialism. They are people who recognize that the REA is pretty much indispensable to them. REA did what private power would not do.

It has been very definitely proven that public and private power both need competition. The private power people

need the public power competition, and vice versa, because it keeps them both on their toes. The REA directors over the country are farmers and businessmen who still believe in the private enterprise system. They correctly think of REA as organizations of private citizens to do a public job and they do a magnificent job of providing rural power. But the directors did not object to the legislation. They are neither selfish nor blind. The directors I know are God fearing, honest, independent and patriotic. The opposition did not come from them.

On June 27, 1960, expecting this legislation to come up and hoping it would come up before the end of the session, I put in the record some remarks on H.R. 7201. Included in those remarks were statements and documents to point out to the country at large the fact that certain opposiion had come from the general manager, I believe is the way the gentleman signs himself, of the National Rural Electrical Cooperative Association. This man had not even testified in connection with the legislation. I felt at that time, and I feel today, that if the people in the REA's were told the truth about this legislation they would be for it. The reason I put that statement in the record was because of the fact that on a bill called H.R. 3, which was a bill called the States Rights bill, rights which in the Constitution even though it is not in the hearts of as many men as I would like, this man had taken a certain part. I documented it. In fairness to the gentleman, may I say he wrote me back a letter and said I had not represented him correctly and asked if I would put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a certain letter. I am going to put it in today because, above everything, I want to be fair. He said that my remarks were personal because I had documented a certain situation. Of course, my remarks were not personal. I have never seen any Member of the House feel that way. We just documented what we thought was the truth.

Now, I do not control the REA magazine, and I have no access to it, but I challenge that gentleman right now to put my remarks of June 27 and these remarks in their magazine, if he wants to be fair, because I am putting them both in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I could go on and say something not only about the fact that the farmers of my district and the farmers in my State believe in States Rights—they do not want the NRECA dabbling in States rights, and when he does dabble he is not representing their views or their wishes.

A number of my homefolk directors were in my office, a number of them, and I said "Is this what you want?" They said, "Heavens, no, deliver us from that sort of thing." Even the manager of the South Carolina co-op came up and said "No, I am a States Righter." I said "I am glad that exists in the hearts of men somewhere."

I could talk about a bill that we voted on the other day involving farmers, a bill in which there was involved the migratory farm proposition. It had to do with the migratory labor. Somebody asked, "Are you going to vote for it?" I said "Of course I am." I saw some of my friends from Arkansas and other places here, and that their farmers are in trouble. Let us go out and vote for them. But I am not going to comment on the fact that once again the manager of the NRECA took a stand against the farmers. He was against that.

The reason I am documenting that today is I am going to tell lots of people about this. If the NRECA is for the rural people of this country, let them begin to speak for the rural people and get their nose out of other people's business and quit trying to block farm legislation to help farmers in other parts of the country, quit trying to block States rights legislation. All of us are for the REA. I have voted for it every chance I had. Now, to have this sort of thing happen is almost beyond my comprehension.

In this particular letter, which I am including out of a sense of fairness, they said they thought I had no personal interest. And, I have none. I have never yet owned one share of power stock in my life. I have never represented a power company as a lawyer, and I do not believe I have ever been in the office of a power company except to pay my light bill. They say that the South Carolina Gas & Electric Co. had an interest in it. I think they did. But, the officers are not in my district. I think they had one dam in my district, but that is not affected by this legislation. Not a soul in my district would be adversely affected. Yet the inference here is that because somebody from South Carolina had asked me to come in and examine the merits that I was protecting their interests. I want you to read it. It is on page 3. This letter I am going to put in to be fair, and I challenge the REA magazine to place this letter of June 27 in their magazine, because they have put me in an unfavorable light.

Here are people who are supposed to be specialists in the power business. I do not claim such erudition. They say that under the present law you can accomplish all that H.R. 7201 seeks to accomplish. If it could be accomplished, read my remarks of June 27, if you do not believe it, and I document in there the letters from the people out West who are suffering.

Here is the situation. Section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act as it presently exists provides that a downstream owner, whether public or private, can require the public upstream owner to release the water in a beneficial way, but if the upstream facility is a private power company, the Government facility cannot make them do it. Now, it is a two-way street, and all we are doing is saying if the private power company operates upstream and they have the capacity to help the downstream public facility by release of water—if the upstream can hold his storage and then release it beneficially, the downstream fellow can demand it if he pays for it. But, it will be distorted. I know as I speak today that this speech will be distorted when it is reported, and I expect it, and I make the speech knowing it.

Then he quotes from certain testimony of a Mr. Williams, which they took out of context or, at least, reported it in a manner to reflect something that I do not actually think it reflected.

Then we went on and talked about the payments under the Federal Power Act. Under this particular legislation we have a provision—and it may sound silly to you—it says that if I furnish you some power that I have not been furnishing you, hydropower, I want you to pay for it; you cannot make me furnish it now, but if I furnish it to you and you can profit by it you have to pay for it. But, this legislation also says that if I have the water and I let you have it, I cannot charge you for it unless you can benefit by it and make a profit on it.

Now, that is a simple premise. It has aroused much propaganda among the REA people. They say they are going to raise your rates. Well, I went into that question very fully with the Federal Power Commission and with the Department of the Interior, which was interested in it, and I got a letter from them dated February 29, 1960, in which it says that costs would be increased by only in accordance with benefits. However, these charges would be a very minimum and only of the magnitude of those now being charged non-Federal interests under section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act. And, looking over here, I find that the United States this year will lose $1 million, and these public utility districts will not get the power or the water they need. They are going to lose and the country at large is going to lose.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a letter from the Federal Power Commission dated February 29, 1960.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., February 29, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HEMPHILL: Your inquiry concerning the effect of the headwater-benefit-charge provisions of H.R. 7201, H.R. 7404, and related bills, amending section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act, has come to me. A question naturally arises as to whether under this amendment customers served by Federal powerplants would find their rates increased by reason of the payment by the United States of annual charges for power benefits received corresponding to the annual charges paid by non-Federal power developers.

If the United States is required to pay annual charges for power benefits which it now receives without charge, it is obvious that the operating costs would be correspondingly increased by the amounts so paid. However, these new charges would be very minimal and only of the magnitude of those now being charged non-Federal interests under section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act because there is presently no provision for a guarantee of firm capacity such as would be authorized in the bill. Correlatively, the payments to the United States under section 10(f) at the present time are equally minor in the Pacific Northwest and will continue to be so as long as there is no agreement for storage releases which will add firm ca-

pacity at the downstream powerplants. You understand, I am sure, that the bill would not impose any retroactive obligation upon the United States since as to constructed powerplants of the United States the bill would impose a liability only from the date of its enactment.

One of the major purposes of the new provisions is to assure downstream powerplants of new firm capacity which would be made available by upstream facilities by reason of the water control exercised. This new firm capacity would be obtained at the downstream powerplants without any additional capital investment or additional labor costs.

Also, during some years, the stream flow is so high that practically no storage at these upstream reservoirs is used for downstream power production and the payments to the United States under the present law become relatively insignificant. Under the bill, however, if an agreement is made for payments for firm capacity, as anticipated, the United States would receive payments even during a high-flow year, similar to the high flows in 1958 in the Columbia River system. These firm power payments must, by the very economics of the situation, be greater than would be the costs to the United States for the benefits now being received from non-Federal storage releases.

The only section of the country where the charges paid by the United States would be substantial is in the Columbia River basin where large storage reservoirs are the rule. In the other river basins where there are Federal powerplants, it happens that the power benefits from the storage and release of water at non-Federal reservoirs are not substantial, and, therefore, the payments could not be material.

Specific testimony on these points was given when Mr. Farley (Chief, Division of Licensed Projects, of our Bureau of Power) testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on S. 3434 in the 83d Congress, 2d Session, June 9, 1954. He said (hearings, p. 38 et seq.) that the Commission's engineering staff had studied the Columbia River basin with conditions as they would be about 5 years from that time when all of the projects under construction would be completed except The Dalles, which would be practically completed. Under those conditions they estimated that the United States under the terms of the bill then proposed would pay about $300,000 a year to non-Federal owners of reservoirs who would be providing benefits, and that in that area the United States would receive $435,000 a year in payments from non-Federal agencies. None of the $300,000 is presently being paid, of course, but he said that amount is about four-tenths of 1 percent of the revenues of the Bonneville system, or in terms of the cost of kilowatt-hours it would be about one-one-hundredth of a mill. In his opinion, this would be far too small to enter into the rate picture. At the McNary power project, for example, he said that with full operation the payments by the United States would amount to half of 1 percent of the annual cost of the project, which is beyond the realm of accurate estimate.

It is my opinion, therefore, that the United States has far more to gain from the passage of this legislation than it has to receive under the present law. This legislation would not only be of direct financial benefit to the United States, but in providing impetus for more practical cooperation between Federal and non-Federal power interests, the legislation would be of genuine benefit to the economy of the country, especially in the Pacific Northwest where so many of the municipalities and public utility districts are urging its enactment.

Sincerely yours,

WILLARD W. GATCHELL,
General Counsel.

Mr. Speaker, on page 9 of this letter which I am going to include in the RECORD in a spirit of fairness, he says that H.R. 721 is itself a club with which the investor-owned company seeks to subjugate the United States. There was not any testimony like that. There was objection to the legislation, and that is proper. But if that were true, where was the REA when we had the hearings? Where was the gentleman who wrote the letter?

I could go on, but my time has been taken in many instances by gentlemen who needed the time for other purposes.

All we want here is reservoir coordination. The Tennessee Valley boys will tell you that they have it. If it is wrong, tell me why it is wrong. The REA's are not going to suffer. They are going to benefit, because if you take the question or the answer and turn it around, if an REA facility gets some water it has not been able to get, and if it can market that water they can make money for REA. Do you not know that hydropower as compared to steampower can be manufactured at much less cost? And that means that the domestic facility has a generator and a generator is moved by waterpower instead of by steampower and the cost is less. And, of course, the power is marketed at the same price.

I do not know what is wrong with the efficient use of water in this country. I am a little bit appalled at the trend of affairs. We find that the steel companies now are producing only 50 percent of their production and that should be a matter of concern to every American. We find that many firms, businesses, are closing their doors in many areas of the country. And my friend from West Virginia would point out that their people are destitute. Americans either were betrayed by the policies of this Government or were just plain let down. And here we find a situation in which what we are trying to do is to increase the productive capacity of this country.

I know what we are coming to. I know what we are coming to, and it is later than you think. You can talk about socialism all you want to. We are going to come face-to-face with this proposition in this Nation in the not too distant future. Either you want a completely welfare state with every national industry nationalized, or you do not. Either you will return to the private enterprise system which has brought us to greatness or you will let down future generations by saying that we want the Government to do everything for us.

What we have done with this legislation is withdraw it because it did not have any hearings in the Senate. It is going to be presented next year to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the House. We are going to make sure at that time that everybody who wants to be heard will be given a chance to be heard and those who did not come before will get a chance to be heard. We are going to make sure, and we are going to take apart this propaganda about rates, REA rates, and about windfalls. We are going to take that apart. We have had to do it here on the floor.

We are going to ask these people to build up a record. We are going to ask the people of the House to read it, as well as the people of the Senate, and I am satisfied if that be done that this Nation will demand the legislation.

I want to include here my response to a certain premise made to Members of Congress June 1, 1960.

First. The ultimate effects of this bill on the various river basins of the Nation, and the ultimate cost to the Federal Government has never been fully evaluated.

Neither are the ultimate or even the current effects of present section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act known after 40 years of operation under this act.

Second. In the Columbia and certain other river basins, H.R. 7201 would make the Federal Power Commission the "water master" of the river, and would assign to the Commission considerable jurisdiction over operation of river projects—an operating function not suited to the FPC's regulatory responsibilities.

Under the provisions of H.R. 7201 the Federal Power Commission would have the normal authority of the Commission in approving coordination commitments and agreements to determine if they meet the requirements of this bill with respect to coordination, determination of charges and other factors and also act in a reviewing capacity if hearings are involved. These functions of the Commission are not those of a "water master." The determinations as to how coordination is implemented on a day-to-day, month-to-month and year-to-year basis will be up to the utilities involved as is now done under power pooling arrangements in the Northwest and other areas.

Third. This proposed legislation would provide windfall benefits to the Idaho Power Co., the Montana Power Co., and other organizations owning upstream dams built under Federal licenses which, in some cases, already require coordinated operation.

Benefit payments to licensed dams and reservoirs of the Idaho Power Co. and the Montana Power Co. by downstream Federal and non-Federal project owners would be on a cost basis as if the downstream owner also owned the portion of the upstream dam and reservoir contributing the benefit and not on a market value basis. Such payment would, in effect, be for service performed in storing and releasing water, which service is made possible by the upstream dam and reservoir owners investment. It is true that the licenses for headwater projects in some cases have provisions requiring coordination, but such provisions do not state that coordination must be performed in a particular manner or that it is required at the detriment or financial disadvantage of the headwater proj-

ect owner. The bill does not in any way disturb existing license provisions. Thus, the payments for benefits would be for services performed and actually at less than the non-Federal headwater project owners costs. Under such conditions and the actual intent of coordination provisions in existing headwater project licenses it seems misleading to call the payments for benefits windfall benefits. The provisions of section 28 of the Federal Power Act—which remain in full force—are as follows:

That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved; but no such alteration, amendment, or repeal shall affect any license theretofore issued under the provisions of this act, or the rights of any licensee thereunder (41 Stat. 1077; 16 U.S.C. 821).

Fourth. H.R. 7201 would require the Federal Government to make upstream benefit payments on the basis of private investment and operating costs, while the non-Federal project owner would make payments on the basis of lower cost Federal financing, giving the non-Federal owner a 3-to-1 advantage over the Federal Government in payments for comparable benefits.

This statement ignores the fact that payments for coordination benefits under the bill as proposed for amendment would be on the basis that the Federal Government would pay for such benefits received by it at the Government's costs and the non-Federal project owner would pay the Federal Government on the basis of the non-Federal project owner's higher costs. Thus, the Government would pay for such benefits received by it at a lower rate than the non-Federal project owner would pay for such benefits as they would receive from the Government.

Fifth. H.R. 7201 could place downstream project owners, Federal and non-Federal, at a disadvantage to upstream project owners, since subsection (c) on page 4 permits the upstream owner to file a plan of coordinated operation, on his own terms, with the FPC such plan to go into effect unless disapproved by FPC within 6 months. It is highly unlikely that FPC would make a full and equitable study of such a complicated river basin operating plan within 6 months, especially since the Commission has spent years studying similar problems under the present section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act and still has not resolved all questions.

The factual situation would be that a coordination plan of a headwater project owner must assure benefits to the downstream project owners and under such conditions the downstream owner should pay for these assured benefits. With the requirement in the bill that a coordination plan provide for production of optimum firm and secondary power at the downstream plants and with the headwater reservoir owner having right of ownership and operation of his project it is unrealistic to consider an arrangement for a downstream owner to initiate a coordinated operation with a headwater owner. The headwater owner owns and controls his storage and his right of ownership is not compatable with having another project owner require him to conform to a particular method of operation. In addition, it is at least questionable whether a downstream owner or anyone else can legally force a reservoir owner to operate in any particular way.

With reference to the question raised over the 6-month provision for approval of a coordination committment by the FPC, it is very important that prolonged delays not be permitted in bringing about actual coordinated operation after a commitment is filed with the Commission. Any increase in the 6-month period for approval could possibly result in correspondingly longer delays in bringing coordination plans into operation. Also the determinations that must be made by the Commission within the 6-month period are only those relating to the proper form of the committment and plan and do not relate to the more complex and time consuming determinations of annual charges and so forth.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7201 is good legislation. It is good for the present of this country and it is going to be good for the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in my remarks a letter directed to me from the Federal Power Commission dated June 30, 1960; a letter directed to me by Howard C. Elmore, assistant manager of Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County, Wenatchee, Wash., dated August 18, 1960, including a copy of a letter, written by Mr. Kirby Billingsley, manager of Public Utility District No. 1 of Chelan County to Mr. Gus Norwood, executive secretary, Northwest Public Power Association, Vancouver, Wash., and another letter by the same gentleman dated August 18, 1960, addressed to our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. Moss]; also a letter dated July 25, 1960 sent to me by Clyde T. Ellis, general manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The letters referred to follow:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, June 30, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HEMPHILL: This will confirm your telephonic conversation with Mr. Stewart P. Crum on June 30, 1960, relative to H.R. 7201—a bill to provide for the comprehensive operation of hydroelectric power resources of the United States, and for other purposes.

I understand that you have informed Mr. Crum the authorized Federal Millers Ferry and Jones Bluff projects on the Alabama-Coosa River are marginal from an economic point of view, and that objections have been raised to H.R. 7201 because these two projects would be rendered economically infeasible if they are assessed for benefits provided by privately-owned headwater improvements.

At present the Alabama Power Co. owns and operates three hydroelectric developments, namely its Lay, Mitchell, and Jordan developments, under Federal Power Commission license on the Alabama-Coosa River upstream from the aforementioned Federal projects. These three privately-owned plants provide pondage only, and it is believed that they would provide little, if any, benefits to the two downstream Federal projects. Consequently, the three existing privately-owned plants would have practically no beneficial effect on the two downstream Federal projects.

The Alabama Power Co. now has under construction its Weiss hydroelectric development with 135,000 acre-feet of usable storage capacity on the Alabama-Coosa River upstream from the Federal Millers Ferry and Jones Bluff. Construction of the Alabama Power Co.'s Kelly Creek development with 56,000 acre-feet of usable storage capacity, also on the Alabama-Coosa River upstream from the two Federal projects, is scheduled to be commenced this year. The Weiss and Kelly Creek projects are licensed by the Federal Power Commission. Owing to the regulatory storage capacity to be provided by the two projects, it is believed that they will provide benefits to the two downstream Federal projects. If this is the case, under H.R. 7201 the Federal projects would be required to make payments for headwater benefits. However, such payments would not be more in any case than the value of the benefits received. In other words, the margin of benefits over costs would not in any case be reduced. Hence, construction of the Weiss and Kelly Creek storage projects could not adversely affect the economic feasibility of the downstream Federal projects, and would probably improve their feasibility.

Sincerely yours,

HARRY J. TRAINOR,
Executive Director.

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1
OF CHELAN COUNTY,
Wenatchee, Wash., August 18, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT HEMPHILL,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: For your information in support of H.R. 7201, forwarded herewith are copies of two letters which I believe are self-explanatory and which might be of some value to you. One letter is dated August 1, 1960, and was directed by us to Mr. Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association. The other letter, dated August 18, 1960, is directed to Congressman JOHN MOSS. Both of these letters attempt to answer unjustified and erroneous statements concerning H.R. 7201.

Reports reach us here that the bill will be debated in Congress on August 23. As you know, we are vitally interested in this legislation, however, if there is a possibility that the bill might be defeated in Congress we believe it would be better strategy to not consider the bill during the remaining period of this session. It appears to us that the possibility of getting favorable action on this legislation during the next session of Congress would be greatly improved if we did not have a record of a defeated bill in the House. We know, of course, that you will exercise your best judgment in this regard.

Your interest and cooperation is most appreciated.

Very truly yours,

HOWARD C. ELMORE,
Assistant Manager.

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1
OF CHELAN COUNTY,
Wenatchee, Wash., August 1, 1960.

Mr. GUS NORWOOD,
Executive Secretary, Northwest Public Power Association, Vancouver, Wash.

DEAR GUS: You have forwarded me a copy of your letter to WALT HORAN, dated July 26, 1960, in which you quote a statement by WALT as published in a recent issue of the Wenatchee Daily World with reference to

H.R. 7201. WALT should, of course, defend his own statements; however, since you have sent a copy of your letter to me, I am taking the opportunity to comment.

You disagree with WALT's statement that "We're wasting on the Columbia River a great many dollars for failure to properly regulate the flow of the river." You state that "This surprised me so much that I double checked with BPA. They cannot point out any basis for the report. They do not know where or how any dollars are being wasted; neither do I." You further state that we may know where this report got started.

We believe you should know well where the report got started.

In our work on this legislation, among the first questions raised during and following the congressional hearings last year by you and others was for specific information on what this legislation could be expected to bring about in the way of payments to the Federal Government and payments to the non-Federal reservoir owners for benefits created downstream as a result of the form of coordinated operation visualized by the proponents of the legislation. To answer this question, you are aware that Jack Stevens prepared a study, the results of which were given wide distribution and made a part of the Senate committee hearings on S. 1782.

In spite of the fact that you and others have questioned the study, no one, to my knowledge, including Bonneville, has come up with any analysis that could be used to factually or conclusively disprove its assumptions or conclusions. One of the conclusions of the study, as you know, was that if coordinated operations worked as envisaged in the legislation the Federal Government would receive in payments something over $900,000 annually over and above any payments that the Government would be required to make. This would be revenue to the Government which is not now received.

Perhaps someone can come up with an analysis that shows a different answer, but until a different answer is produced with some basis in fact, it seems to me that from the evidence at hand it is entirely correct to say that something is going to waste on the Columbia River.

It does not seem right that you should claim ignorance on this point since the Stevens study as well as considerations in the legislation, have been worked out to answer critical questions and accusations as to the possible bad results that might be expected from the legislation and you have considerable familiarity with all this.

We have never made any "pie in the sky" claims for this legislation. Many thing have been said for and against it that are entirely misleading. We are only concerned with the fundamentals involved and these, we think, are properly being taken care of.

One is that we now have to operate our plants on the Columbia River without assurance in advance as to how headwater storage is to be released for use in our plants. Our resulting benefits from headwater storage on such a basis are, in effect, uncoordinated as far as we are concerned and do not have firm power value. We want coordination on a firm basis to produce firm power and we see no reason why the Federal Government should not desire and be willing to commit itself to operate on such a basis for its own benefit and for the benefit of others, including ourselves. Existing section 10(f) of the Federal Power Act is entirely inconsistent with this principle, since it recognizes only payment for benefits received on an after-the-fact basis without assurance in advance that they will be received downstream, and, of course, there is the further barrier to full coordination in the exclusion of payment by the Federal Government for benefits received from non-Federal reservoirs.

Secondly, we do not know what our costs are or what they will be for these indefinite after-the-fact benefits. We need to know what we can expect to pay for firm benefits.

Thirdly, we believe that there is real urgency in doing something legislatively on this matter because of the impending Canadian Treaty settlement which could, we think, adversely affect the type of legislation that might be passed if such legislation does not precede the treaty settlement. The Canadian Treaty will make it imperative that powerplants in the U.S. Columbia River Basin be coordinated in dealing with Canada and that we have legislation making it possible to carry out this on an overall basis, and also to establish a principle for payment for benefits created by U.S. Federal and non-Federal reservoirs.

We have discussed these various points with you and in your presence many times, and it seems somewhat redundant and repetitious to restate them here. However, repetition seems to be necessary to answer questions being raised against H.R. 7201 that have the appearance of being deliberate, misleading attempts to give the legislation some sinister purpose and associate those of us working on it with some sort of a plot to increase the cost of Bonneville power or take the Federal Government out of the power business or some other such ridiculous ideas.

Sincerely,

KIRBY BILLINGSLEY,
Manager.

PUBLIC UTILITY DISTRICT NO. 1
OF CHELAN COUNTY,
Wenatchee, Wash., August 18, 1960.

Hon. JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOSS: Your letter of July 20, 1960, to Mr. Alex Radin, executive director of the American Public Power Association has been forwarded by Mr. Radin to members of the association, including ourselves. We believe it our obligation to answer the erroneous and unjust statements and claims made therein discrediting needed legislation that is definitely in the public interest. The bill, H.R. 7201, now before Congress provides for needed amendment to the Federal Power Act. To make certain that the intent of the bill is clearly expressed Congressman HEMPHILL is proposing two amendments to the bill. One of these amendments would add the optimum production of secondary energy as well as firm energy to the requirements for coordinated operation of hydroplants and the other would provide more specific language on the determination of how payments for storage and coordination benefits shall be determined. It is with these proposed amendments in mind that we wish to comment on your letter, however, even without consideration of these amendments our comments in most instances are valid.

Your letter states that H.R. 7201 would amend the Federal Power Act and would "drastically impair some of the best and most firmly established principles of this Nation's water resources." We believe that amendment of the Federal Power Act with reference to section 10(f) is essential. Also, contrary to your contention the bill is intended to operate and would operate in accordance with the best principles of water resource development. The people of the Nation are certainly entitled to the greatest possible use of the Nation's water resources. They are so entitled whether the manmade improvements on our waterways are constructed by the Federal Government, by local governmental agencies, or by privately financed corporations. When the Federal Water Power Act was enacted in 1920, the value and necessity of operating facilities in concert, with such facilities under multiple ownership, were not clearly recognized. The Congress did provide certain standards for the construction of such facilities by licensees, but it did not take the additional necessary step of providing the machinery and proper inducement to procure the now essential coordinated operation of such facilities. H.R. 7201 will provide the additional step of bringing about the sensible and proper operation of existing projects so that all of the people may realize the full benefit that a river allows regardless of who owns the projects. It does not in any way violate principles of water resource development or conservation; it implements those principles by providing for sensible operating procedures and a fair distribution of the benefits of such operation to all consumers.

An accusation is also made that the bill would provide a subsidy to private utilities and a drain on the Federal treasury. This is completely erroneous. Perhaps the best explanation of the true facts relating to the effect the bill would have on the Federal Government and on private utilities is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 1960, at page 13568. On the Columbia River system alone the Federal Government will receive a net payment of some $927,000 per year. There is no possibility of the United States realizing such an income under the present law and practices on the Columbia River. On the other hand, the private utilities on the Columbia River, as a group, would receive a net payment of less than $50,000 per year for the benefits they provide. Additionally, the general counsel for the Federal Power Commission testified that the Federal Government has far more to gain than it has to lose under H.R. 7201. Further still, the Federal Government is not responsible for any sum of money under this bill because every cost involved is an obligation of the rate payers. Therefore, the tendency of the bill is either to reduce Federal power rates or bring money into the Treasury of the United States. It cannot by any stretch of the imagination result in a subsidy; it is a revenue measure.

You claim that the bill would impair multiple purpose functions of Federal projects and that it would require the Federal Government to pay more than others for the same or lesser benefits. Neither of these claims has any foundation in truth.

The Department of the Interior at one time considered that the bill did not contain sufficient specific language to insure that Federal project functions other than power production would remain unimpaired. The Department, together with the Federal Power Commission, drafted language to provide such assurance. Such language was accepted by the House Committee and is now in the bill. Also, the sponsors and proponents of the legislation have at all times in the development of language in the bill intended that the Federal Government would in no case be required to pay more than it receives for equal benefits. You must certainly be aware that the proponents, rather than those who claim the Government would pay more than others, have prepared an amendment to the bill to make it specific and clear that no such situation shall result. It is important to note that the opponents of this bill, who have apparently advised you in this matter, have studiously avoided admitting the obvious—that the Government will in fact receive a higher payment per unit of benefit conferred than it will be required to pay for benefits conferred on the Government.

You criticize the procedure for bringing about coordinated operation in the event that contractual negotiations fail. The bill does not allow an upstream owner to bind a downstream owner to do anything at all merely by the act of filing a plan. The

commitment filed by the upstream owner (such as the Bonneville Power Administration which is by far the most important upstream owner in the Columbia River system) merely (a) obligates such upstream owner to operate his facility for the overall good of the region, and (b) activates the legal machinery by which the Federal Government, acting through the Federal Power Commission, decides what amount, if any, of the appropriate reservoir costs must be contributed by each downstream owner for the benefits conferred upon him. Thus the upstream owner can only impose an obligation on himself. The Federal Government imposes the obligation on downstream owners in accordance with standards set forth in the bill.

Under present law, the Federal Government, acting through the Federal Power Commission, is charged with the responsibility of establishing charges which must be paid by downstream owners. However, under present law, a reservoir owner may be entitled to a federally enforced contribution even though he does nothing whatsoever except operate his facility to meet his own needs. Under H.R. 7201, a reservoir owner is not entitled to receive any contribution from downstream owners and consumers unless and until he obligates himself to operate for the best benefit of the unit composed of himself and everyone who will be expected to contribute to his costs. In either event, the Federal Government establishes the amount, if any, of the payments to be made. It is true that, under present law, the Federal Government is not required to make any contribution to the costs of a reservoir owner even though the Government receives benefits made possible through the expenditure of such costs. Under H.R. 7201 the Federal Government would be required to make its fair contribution to such costs. The reasons and necessity for including the Federal Government within the purview of this obligation is conclusively shown by the testimony in the hearings on this bill, and the official position of affected Federal agency is in support of this basic principle.

Your letter also alleges that neither the Commission nor the downstream owners have any meaningful opportunity to challenge the coordination terms. We are sure that the Congress will realize that the interested parties have the right to challenge the proceedings at each stage. The Federal Power Commission has the power to throw out the whole plan and the additional power and responsibility to establish the amount and allocation of all required payments.

You state that the bill is anti-conservation in its impact. This position, like most of the other matters contained in your letter, is a repetition of statements made in the minority report of the House Committee. You apparently base this position on the same reasoning contained in the minority report, i.e., the erroneous assumption that the Federal Government will be required to pay more than it receives per unit of benefit. The error in this assumption has been discussed above. Suffice it to say that the whole intent and effect of the bill is to secure the maximum in perpetual benefits for every affected consumer and prevent the existing waste of hydroelectric power resources. It is a conservation measure in every sense. We agree that it is essential that the full meaning of this bill be brought to the attention of the American people. For that reason we are writing you in answer to your July 20, 1960 letter, with the hope that the erroneous conceptions about H.R. 7201 that are being formed might be viewed in the light of the facts and the true conditions.

We are writing you in behalf of the public utility districts of Grant County, Pend Oreille County, Douglas County and our own district. All of these districts have generating plants on the Columbia River or its tributaries either in operation, under construction or being engineered. We are speaking from the standpoint of our particular interest which is not in any way contrary to the broad public interest even though some individuals and organizations have attempted to make our position appear as a selfish one.

We sincerely hope this will be of value to you in taking a constructive look at the problem.

Very truly yours,

KIRBY BILLINGSLEY,
Manager.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., July 25, 1960.

Hon. ROBERT W. HEMPHILL,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HEMPHILL: This is in further reference to your statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 1960, concerning the position of this association on H.R. 7201. As you know, I sent you a telegram on June 28, 1960, regarding the personal references you had made about me in your statement. However, 30 days later, I have had no response from you. The text of the telegram was as follows:

"I have just read your speech entitled, 'Upstream Benefit Bill,' in June 27 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and shall write you next week on issues involved.

"Meantime, however, I hope you will reconsider, in light of all the facts, your references to my 'individual honesty and integrity.' I cannot bring myself to believe any Member of Congress would make such unwarranted accusation against a citizen, no matter how divergent the views held on the issues, if all the facts had been clear to you.

"You charged me with falsification and what amounts to perjury, and you did this on basis of an obvious misreading of the record. You have done me a great and grave injustice and I hope your honesty and fairness will impel you to correct it and place a statement to that effect in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

"Apparently you confuse the sequence of the communications you quote on page 13561 of the RECORD. Actually you omit one date altogether. Here is what I did and when:

"June 16: I signed a letter to five Congressmen in regard to what I feared would be effect of H.R. 3 on rural electrification program.

"June 25: I sent a wire to Mr. Shiflet, stating in part: 'I did write five Members of the House in the hope of getting an amendment to exclude matters affecting the rural electrification program from H.R. 3 and such an amendment was offered on the floor.'

"July 9: (note this is the next month) I wrote Congressman PILCHER, stating in part: 'Prior to the day on which the letter was written, I personally had no knowledge of the contents or purpose of H.R. 3.' The letter here referred to was the June 16 letter.

"It is apparent from this sequence there are no inconsistencies. My statement to Mr. Shiflet was true and my statement to Mr. PILCHER was true. There is no inconsistency.

"Nor is there basis for your statement: 'There is no question but what Mr. Ellis has impeached himself because these two statements from his own mouth are inconsistent. One of these statements must be false. For in one he contends he did send the letter in the hope of getting an amendment. Now he says he had no personal knowledge of that bill. If he had no personal knowledge, how could he have been hoping for an amendment?'

"To leave no doubt, I did not say that I: 'Had no personal knowledge of that bill.' But that: "Prior to the day on which the letter (June 16) was written I personally had no knowledge of the contents or purpose of H.R. 3.' On that day, June 16, the matter first came to my attention and on the same day I signed the letter to the five Congressmen.

"This is a very serious charge to make without any basis. You say: 'Had these inconsistent statements been made under oath in a court of justice, the consequences would be serious indeed.' I shall be glad to make the same statements under oath, for they are true.

"You are aware, I know, that in a court of law the accused is always given equal opportunity to present his case with equal force and effect. For such simple justice I am forced to depend upon your honesty and fairness. I value my character as much as I am sure you do yours and I appeal to you for the justice of which you speak by correcting the RECORD.

"Regards."

I still appeal to you to correct your incorrect and unfair statements in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Now, as to the issues involved in H.R. 7201, I would like to discuss various points that seem significant to us.

As you know, the membership of this association passed resolution No. E-14 at our 1960 annual meeting in St. Louis opposing H.R. 7201. The NRECA staff is bound by this resolution to employ all ethical means to persuade Congress that it would be in the national interest to defeat H.R. 7201.

You may recall that during the morning of February 25, 1960, at the very time our membership was considering the 1960 annual meeting resolutions, I took a call from you at the stage telephone in Kiel Auditorium, St. Louis. You asked us to contact you immediately upon our return to Washington concerning H.R. 7201.

On Tuesday morning March 1, 1960, Mr. Dick Dell, Mr. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., and I called at your office. You expressly informed us that you had no personal interest in this bill, and were supporting its passage to help those members of the House committee who were directly interested in it. We explained our opposition to you. But not until we read the printed hearings later did we learn of the interest of the South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. And not until we read your House floor speech did we learn of your strong feeling toward the national organization of the rural electric cooperatives.

H.R. 7201 provides, among other things, that the owner of a headwater storage dam may go to the Federal Power Commission, and, upon agreeing to coordinate its project with downstream projects for a 5-year period, require the Commission to assess against all downstream projects annual charges payable to the headwater project owner for such benefits as its coordination may confer upon downstream projects. The bill, however, does not confer parallel procedural rights on the downstream owner resulting from its coordination with the upstream project. However, the downstream owner cannot require that FPC order a headwater licensee to operate his project on a coordinated basis. We suggested to you during our March 1 meeting that our opposition to the bill might be lessened, though not eliminated, were it amended to allow downstream Federal projects to require coordinated operation of the privately owned headwater projects. We talked particularly of the Columbia Basin.

You then said that you had no desire to impose any inequity on Federal projects. You asked us to prepare a suitable amendment in this regard.

Within 3 days we wrote to you and enclosed the requested amendment. To this day we have received no reply, nor have we any in-

dication that our amendment was ever considered by you or by anyone else.

Benefits to South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. You accuse us of misrepresenting the facts in stating that Mr. Arthur Williams, Jr., vice president and general counsel of the South Carolina Electric & Gas Co., indicated in his testimony that H.R. 7201 would benefit his company by some $1 million per year.

In support of our assertion in this particular, I submit the following information:

On July 27, 1959, Mr. Williams appeared before the House subcommittee and testified in part as follows:

"South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. has maintained on this river, for approximately 50 years, a hydroelectric facility known as the Stevens Creek plant. Shortly after World War II, the United States, acting through the Army Engineers, completed a dam and hydroelectric generating station a few miles upstream at Clark Hill.

"Acting in accordance with authority embodied in the act, and permit from the Secretary of War issued pursuant thereto, under which Stevens Creek Dam was constructed, the Federal Power Commission moved in 1952 to assess the annual charge to be paid by our company to the United States for alleged benefits derived by Stevens Creek plant from the Clark Hill facility.

"We were then informed by representatives of the Federal Power Commission that their studies over the period 1950–1956 inclusive, had resulted in these significant figures: (a) The benefit to Stevens Creek from Clark Hill amounted to $247,498; (b) the benefit from Stevens Crek to Clark Hill amounted to $318,000; and (c) the damage to Stevens Creek from Clark Hill amounted to $896,900.

"Thus, it can be seen that if either the damages resulting to our facility from the operation of the Federal facility, or the benefits from our facility to the Federal facility could have been used in computing the annual charge, we would have been relieved of paying anything" (p. 80, House hearings).

I submit that the following three conclusions can be reasonably drawn from the above statement: (1) That the Stevens Creek project is 50 years old, that probably a major portion of it has already been amortized by the company's customers and that any payments large or small, annual or otherwise, made by the Federal Government to Stevens Creek would, therefore, constitute windfall profits. (2) That in claiming payments under H.R. 7201, South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. intends to rely upon the $896,900 damages which it asserts have been imposed on Stevens Creek as a result of Clark Hill operation.

And, concerning damages, it appears to us that the bill is entirely susceptible to just such interpretation as evidenced by the language of the Minority Report appearing at page 60 of House Report 1414, 85th Congress, 2d session, which reads as follows:

"(e) Furthermore the language of subsection (d) authorizing the Commission to allow the owner of a hydroelectric facility suffering a detriment 'such offset charges assessed under subsection (b) of this section as the Commission shall deem to be equitable,' is quite unclear. There is no provision in subsection (b) for the assessment of offset charges."

(3) That the benefits and detriments mentioned by Mr. Williams which amount to over $1 million will be claimed on an annual basis. And I call your attention to the words "annual charge" used by Mr. Williams himself as mentioned above.

It is quite true that subsequent to his direct testimony before the House subcommittee, the following exchange took place between Congressman AVERY of Kansas and Mr. Williams at page 85 of the House hearings:

"Mr. AVERY. I think I understand the general premise you are working on. It is a little hard for me; I am trying to understand with no larger reservoir than that how you could account for that large damage. That is an annual damage?

"Mr. WILLIAMS. No, sir. That is over a 6-year period, from 1950 to 1956.

"Mr. AVERY. That would make a little difference then.

"Mr. WILLIAMS. The other two I had put annual. Those are the figures I corrected orally. I should have made it even stronger by saying that all three of those figures represent the time during the Federal Power Commission study which covered 1950–56." (There is no record of any oral correction.)

"Mr. AVERY. In other words that is a 6-year loss.

"Mr. WILLIAMS. That is correct, sir.

"Mr. AVERY. Mr. Chairman I have one more question. I do not seem to find it right now.

"Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me say this: That a 6-year period, during the first couple of years they were still filling the reservoir up at Clark Hill. I think they started in 1950.

"Mr. AVERY. So actually it would amount to a 4-year period.

"Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that is correct."

Therefore, during the House hearings Mr. Williams stated under questioning that the period involved might be 6 years or 4 years despite his direct testimony to the effect that it was 1 year.

But, the very next day, on July 28, 1959, Mr. Williams appeared before the Senate subcommittee. We must presume that he is a competent lawyer and had well in mind his cross-examination on the preceding day. Nonetheless, during his presentation to the Senate subcommittee, he made exactly the same direct presentation, talked of "computing the annual charge," and never mentioned a 4- or 6-year period.

When he completed his Senate testimony on "annual charges," Senator THURMOND of South Carolina asked:

"Senator THURMOND. Do you have anything else you would like to say in addition?

"Mr. WILLIAMS. Nothing, except to thank you for your courtesy and time, Senator."

This presentation I think is significant in view of the fact that at the present time, South Carolina Electric & Gas Co. and the Department of the Interior are engaged in an FPC proceeding to determine the benefits and detriments which flow between Clark Hill and Stevens Creek by way of reservoir storage and reregulation.

It is our opinion that Mr. Williams wants to play both sides of the street so that his company will not be precluded from claiming the largest possible payments.

And, any person who happened to read the Senate hearings, and not the House hearings, would draw only one conclusion; that the company intends to claim $1 million per year under the bill.

Will H.R. 7201 increase hydro capacity? You state at page 13563 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 27, 1960, that:

"The net effect of the proposal is to assure 1,268,000 kilowatts of firm energy from coordinated use of the different owners' storage on the Columbia River system, alone, as an example, a large part of which could not otherwise be guaranteed firm."

This figure seems to have increased substantially during the past year. During the House hearings held on July 16, 1959, Congressman LEE METCALF, of Montana, who introduced the bill, stated:

"When Senator MURRAY introduced S. 1782, which is an identical bill, he said that the mere passage of this legislation would create from 500,000 to a million extra kilowatts of firm power without building another dam on the Columbia."

Your figure of 1,268,000 kilowatts is apparently taken from a letter submitted to the Senate committee by Mr. Jack Stevens, a consulting engineer of Seattle, Wash., who testified in support of the legislation. This letter, which appears in the printed record of the Senate hearings at page 36, is dated March 18, 1960; 8 months after conclusion of the hearings. There was, therefore, no opportunity to cross examine Mr. Stevens nor was any Federal agency asked to comment on his estimate. No comparable figure was presented orally by Mr. Stevens during his personal appearance before either the Senate or House subcommittee.

And, immediately after Congressman METCALF's assertion before the House subcommittee to the effect that H.R. 7201 would create 500,000 kilowatts in the Columbia Basin, we wrote a letter to him asking that he apprise us of the assumption upon which his assertion was based. To this day we have not been favored with a reply. A copy of our letter to Congressman METCALF is attached.

As a matter of fact a major portion of any possible increase that would be made available by this legislation in the Columbia Basin is already realized by the existing Northwest Power Pool. Assistant Secretary Aandahl testified on H.R. 7201 before the House subcommittee in part as follows:

"And I might say that the pooled operation on the Columbia River which is not reduced to contract but is voluntary day-to-day operation carries sizable elements of coordinated operation. In fact, that is the secret to the fact that by voluntary coordinated operation without a contract, the usable kilowatts in the Pacific Northwest, I believe, are now close to a million above what they would be if there were independent operation of each of the facilities by their respective owners" (p. 152, House hearings).

Therefore, it appears to me that the benefits which you ascribe to the affect of H.R. 7201 on the Columbia River system are very much too large and are based upon biased testimony submitted after the hearings were concluded.

Costs to the Government under the proposed legislation. At page 13568 of the RECORD of June 27, 1960, you refer to a table thereon contained, which purports to indicate that under H.R. 7201 the United States would realize a net income of $927,700 from headwater benefit payments in the Columbia Basin. This figure, and the chart upon which it is based, were submitted to the Senate committee on October 9, 1959, more than 8 months after the conclusion of that committee's hearings by Mr. Jack Stevens to whom I have previously referred. Mr. Stevens' estimates, in our opinion, simply do not agree with the facts.

Under the Federal Power Act as it now stands, the Commission is empowered to assess against downstream non-Federal projects annual charges related to the benefits conferred upon such projects by Federal dams. The record shows that for the Columbia River Basin the Federal Government was paid a total of $21,100 in 1957, $15,900 in 1958, and $53,400 in 1959. This is indeed a far cry from the $927,700 net income which Mr. Stevens claims will be available under H.R. 7201, although that legislation must, it seems to me, reduce rather than increase the income to the Federal Government in view of the fact that the Federal Government is not chargeable with any downstream benefit liability at the present time.

H.R. 7201, as it now stands, would require the Federal Government, in making headwater benefit payments to non-Federal projects, to pay three times what a non-Federal project would pay a Federal project under the same circumstances. This is true simply because investor-owned fixed charges are about three times Federal fixed charges. In this regard you commented in a letter of June 25, 1960, which you sent to Members of Congress:

"Clarifying amendments will be offered to H.R. 7201 on the floor which will assure that the Federal Government will pay no more than the cost of furnishing such storage had it owned all of the storage in the river basin. These amendments will satisfy the major objection of the American Public Power Association in its resolution of May 5, 1960."

This declaration is, you must concede, an admission that H.R. 7201 is deficient in its present form. Whether the proposed amendments, which you say will be offered on the floor, would resolve this problem, we do not know. I have not seen copies of the proposed amendments, and I suggest, that in view of our extensive interest in the legislation, we might have been given a chance to help formulate and/or review them.

Can H.R. 7201 actually achieve its purpose? You say at page 13562 of the aforementioned RECORD that:

"The essence of the solution is that Federal, private, and non-Federal public reservoirs be operated in concert to assure the most efficient utilization of water for power generation. As things now stand, each dam owner is free to operate his reservoir without regard to the needs of the other owners' downstream dams, and there is now no real inducement to operate in any other way."

The Federal power marketing agencies already possess full authority to enter into voluntary coordination contracts with other hydroelectric project owners. In fact, this has been done to a great extent in the Northwest. In those cases where no coordination agreement has been executed, it is, in large measure, I think, due to the fact that the investor-owned utility companies demand a lion's share of the benefits, leaving only the dregs to the Federal Government.

Under such circumstances, the Federal agency involved understandably refuses to enter into a voluntary contract. This bill purports to confer authority on the headwater owner to have the Federal Power Commission require that the downstream Federal projects coordinate facilities and pay for such headwater benefits as may be bestowed upon them by the upstream owner. To secure this domination of the Federal Government, the upstream owner need only agree to provide such benefits for 5 years. H.R. 7201 is, therefore, a club with which the investor-owned companies seek to subjugate the United States.

If I may be very presumptuous, let me say that there is, however, in my mind, very serious doubt as to whether this bill could actually achieve this purpose at all as a matter of law. The Federal Power Commission has authority to require its licensees to operate their projects in coordination with all other hydroelectric projects in their river basins. This requirement has been placed in some licenses. But it has been omitted from many.

Article 6 of the Federal Power Act provides that licenses may be altered only on mutual agreement of the licensee and the Commission. And article 28 of the act, which reserves to Congress the right to amend the act, expressly states that no amendment of the act shall affect any license theretofore issued or the rights of any licensee thereunder. Moreover, section 2 of H.R. 7201 provides that—

"Nothing contained in this act shall in any matter affect any right * * * which vested or accrued prior to the effective date of this act."

To now require a licensed project to operate on a coordinated basis against the owner's consent would certainly "affect" its vested right, except where the license already requires such operation. So also would an order to a licensed project to pay for benefits from upstream projects on a basis different than that prescribed in the present law.

Accordingly, I submit that by its very terms H.R. 7201 could not apply to many existing licensees without their consent. It follows very logically that the bill could not achieve full coordination.

If the bill could not achieve full coordination, and yet would impose on the Federal Government headwater benefit liability, it would be nothing more than a subsidy for non-Federal headwater project owners.

In closing we want again to emphasize our strong conviction that enactment of this bill will saddle the rural electric systems and their consumer members with extra costs in tribute to the power companies, costs that will go on and on for decades. Furthermore, we are convinced that passage of this bill will destroy or impair the feasibility of Federal hydro projects.

Congressman, we value very highly your support of the rural electrification program in Congress, and your record of generally supporting the Federal wholesale power program. We wish you could agree with the rural electric systems on H.R. 7201. We hope that our disagreement on this issue can be maintained on a professional level because neither NRECA nor you can possibly gain by either attacking the motivation or personal character of the other.

I, of course, have no access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and cannot, therefore publish my arguments against H.R. 7201 in the same way that you published your support of it. In fairness, therefore, I request you to place this letter in the RECORD.

Again, may I say we appreciate your record of support in the past and we hope we can be privileged to work with you in the future. We stand ready to talk with you further on H.R. 7201 at your convenience.

Since Congress is in recess, I am sending a carbon copy of this letter to your office in South Carolina.

Sincerely,

CLYDE T. ELLIS,
General Manager.

NATIONAL RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., July 30, 1959.

Hon. LEE METCALF,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN METCALF: I was very much interested in your recent testimony in support of H.R. 7201 before the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

As you probably know, we have not taken a position on this legislation this year. We are, however, attempting to work up a study of the effects to be anticipated should H.R. 7201 or similar legislation be enacted. As I recall, you stated that one such effect would be the development of an additional 500,000 kilowatts of power on the Columbia River system without the necessity of building additional dams. I feel certain that our study of this matter would be substantially expedited if you would be willing to make available to us the basic data which you used in the preparation of your testimony.

Sincerely,

RICHARD A. DELL,
Director, Legislation and Research Department.

Twentieth Anniversiary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, this fall 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian descent will be celebrating the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. I am honored and pleased to extend my wholehearted and sincere congratulations to this nationwide organization with its dedicated principles and ideals.

In the early twenties the political as well as cultural and economic independence of the Ukraine was subject to Red Russian imperialism. As one of the captive nations which was forced into the spurious federation called the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Ukraine's large population of non-Russian people was submerged under the despotic and dictatorial rule of the Bolsheviks. Her land, rich with coal and manganese, became important captive resources under the Red flag.

By means of a psychopolitical and propagandistic machine during the cold war the Communist leaders have manufactured a myth of unity which they say encompasses their country. Only the reality of truth, with which the Ukrainian Congress Committee attempts to imbue the hearts and minds of these captive people, will smash this legend.

For 20 years the Ukrainian Congress has sought in a purely educational manner to lead their organization in the task of serving these Ukrainian people who do not wish to be a part of the U.S.S.R. It is to this strong and faithful group which reflects the thoughts and sentiments of its followers that I express my appreciation for its heroic objectives toward independence, freedom and justice for the 42 million people that embody the Ukraine as well as for its efforts toward the liberation of all the non-Russian nations of the U.S.S.R.

Tribute to Gustave Fast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of a district largely industrial in nature, I deem it highly appropriate to call to the attention of my colleagues that 1960 is the 75th anniversary of the birth year of an inventive genius whose work in the advancement of applied science was one of the most important factors in the development of industry in America, and indeed, the world, as we know it today.

I refer to the late Gustave Fast, a native of Sweden, whose adult life for the most part was spent in the city of Baltimore and in the State of Maryland. Mr. Fast came to America just 50 years ago after thorough training as an engineer. His father before him was a noted engineer and was decorated by the Swedish Government with the Distinguished Service Medal for his engineering work.

It was while living in Baltimore in 1918 that Mr. Fast designed a power-transmission coupling that was to make him world famous and which made it pos-

sible for industry—then in the throes of changing from steam to electric power and from belt to direct driven machinery—to make the transition and go on to undreamed of heights of productivity.

Until Fast invented his coupling, industry had been plagued with breakdowns in the vital link between electrical motors and the machinery they were designed to drive. No device then known could long hold up under the stresses and strains of the inevitable misalinement between the driving and driven members. The devices of the time were made of flexible materials and fell victim to metal fatigue.

The late Ernest Von Hartz, writing in the Baltimore Sun, described the situation in this fashion:

With the birth of the machine age, industry found itself confronted with the problem of misalinement between the directly connected shafts of driven and driving machinery.

The problem was not so serious in the early days with relatively slow speed machinery, but with present-day high-speed machinery this condition became acute. It was found, for instance, to be a physical impossibility to connect two shafts in perfect alinement. The misalinement caused wear on the bearings of the two shafts and other mechanical deficiencies in the machines.

To compensate for errors of alinement, flexible couplings were employed. But the solution itself was subject to limitations. Flexible materials when subjected to constant bending and twisting suffer from fatigue and failure.

Failure, of course, meant shutting down the machinery and replacing the coupling.

Gustave Fast already had made a name for himself with the invention of reducing gears and power drives used on Navy patrol boats in World War I when he concentrated on the design of a power coupling that would be flexible, yet be made of nonflexible materials that would last indefinitely.

As Mr. Von Hartz wrote:

The coupling invented by Mr. Fast solved this problem in that it does not depend for its flexibility on flexible materials. It is all metal and is based on a simple mathematical principle taking the physical form of completely meshing two spur gears with internal gears of an oil-encasing floating sleeves. Thus the entire power is transmitted through an oil film, which effectively separates the metal surfaces. This is the important discovery by Fast, for it has reduced to a practical minimum the wear on couplings.

Just how well Fast succeeded is history. Nearly 1 million Fast's couplings have been manufactured by the Bartlett Hayward Plant of Koppers Co., Inc., in Baltimore, and placed in use throughout the world, notably in the steel industry. At any given moment of a working day the Fast's couplings in use transmit more than a billion horsepower and from the very first ones manufactured they have outlasted the machinery they connect.

Mr. Fast died nearly 15 years ago but his couplings installed 30 and 35 years ago are still functioning perfectly in their original installations.

Most noteworthy of all, however, is the fact that that Fast's couplings manufactured today are basically the same coupling this great Swedish-American engineer designed more than 40 years ago. What a tribute to his genius it is that in all these years no one has been able to improve his invention.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere belief that American industry and the world owe much to Gustave Fast. He was honored in 1928 as the recipient of the John Price Wetherill Medal from the Franklin Institute of the State of Pennsylvania in recognition of his mechanical genius, but this adopted son of Maryland should not be forgotten.

A Tribute to John J. Pershing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. R. HULL, JR.
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, Americans will pay homage to the memory of the great American soldier, General of the Armies John J. Pershing, on the 100th anniversary of his birth, September 13.

An unusually fine article concerning General Pershing appeared in the August issue of the American Legion magazine written by James Warner Bellah, and under leave to extend my remarks, I include this article:

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN J. PERSHING, GENERAL OF THE ARMIES OF THE UNITED STATES

(By James Warner Bellah)

A century has passed since Pershing's birth and more than a decade since his death, and yet his memory stands tall in the land and his name rings firm in the historical echo of his times. By an odd twist of circumstance, General Pershing is the First War; and the proof of the thesis lies in the fact that after 43 years no other general's name comes readily to mind when that war is mentioned. Try to think of one.

Not so in other wars. On September 13, 1860, Pershing was born into the opening fanfare of the golden age of Grant, Lee, Sherman, and Jackson—four names that will stand linked forever before the fact of the preserved Union. Again, he grew to manhood and as a junior officer served under Generals Nelson A. Miles, Adna R. Chaffee, John M. Schofield, and William R. Shafter—four men indelibly associated with the march of America across the shrinking plains, to Cuba and the Orient while the 19th century wound its way out and the Century of Great Wars came upon us.

In the First World War, however, Pershing played his part without a peer—standing alone in his time as history would have it, with no one to share the responsibility and no one to share the fame. Can you even recall offhand who the Chief of Staff was in 1917? 1918?

Then Pershing grew very old and lived on to see the new men come to flower—MacArthur and Eisenhower, Patton and Stilwell, all of whom he ranked by an active commission as General of the Armies by act of Congress as long as he lived—but there was no old wife in Pershing. Never once did he attempt to put a finger in the New War pie. Like a wise old soldier, he spent the Second War quietly fading away.

In 1944, when I was in Walter Reed, the Old Man was 84 years old and he had been living up on top of the hospital in his specially built set of quarters for the 3 years that the Second War had been going on. The Old War was pretty far back in history in those days; yet it was a mark of the stature of Pershing that his nurses scheduled receiving hours each morning for seldom less than three or four people who felt impelled, by right of past association and present desire, to call and pay their respects on passing through Washington. It was a mark of the gallantry that never dies in old cavalrymen—one supposes—that the comelier nurses would grin at times when they came off duty and rub themselves where they swore they'd been pinched.

Old War have I said? Pershing's earliest toddler memories were of Southern bushwhackers raiding his hometown of Laclede, Mo., and shooting up the village. He was 5 years old when Lee surrendered at Appomattox Court House. Thirteen years before the Spanish-American War began, Cadet Captain Pershing commanded the Corps of Cadets when it crossed the Hudson from West Point to Garrison to stand at "present arms" parallel to the New York Central tracks while the funeral train of Ulysses Simpson Grant rolled slowly by.

A group photograph of officers of the 6th U.S. Cavalry, taken on the club steps at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., shows among them the very junior Second Lieutenant Pershing, a blue kepi cocked on his light, blond head and a kid's grin on his face. For 4 years in the desert Southwest he was on active service against the last of the Apaches. In 1890 he helped put down one of the final Sioux uprisings in the Dakotas when he was in command of the Indian Scouts at Pine Ridge and as an officer of the 10th Cavalry. In the Spanish-American War he wangled his way back into the 10th, foregoing infinitely better appointments on the staff. He served throughout the Santiago Campaign fighting at San Juan Hill, where he was cited for gallantry July 1, 1898, and subsequently awarded the Silver Star Medal—and was, in the words of his commanding general, S. M. B. Young, "the coolest man under fire that I ever saw."

In September of 1899 he was ordered to the Philippines and as a junior-ranking captain, he commanded three successful expeditions against the Moros of Mindanao. They were mixed commands, varying in strength from a battalion to a brigade. The expert handling of these expeditions had its Washington repercussions, and in 1903 Mr. Elihu Root, Secretary of War in Theodore Roosevelt's Cabinet and the father of the Command and General Staff School at Fort Leavenworth, went on record to Avery D. Andrews: "If your friend Pershing doesn't look out, he will find himself in the brigadier general class very soon." In the face of the angry mutter of Regular Army "soreheadism" when Pershing was eventually jumped four grades on the promotion list, it is only decent to state that the Secretary of War made this remark 3 years before Captain Pershing met Senator Warren's daughter and 4 years before they were married.

In 1905 Captain Pershing was appointed military attaché to Japan and spent most of his tour of duty in Manchuria observing the Russo-Japanese War. In 1906—the Army still being hogtied by officer promotion within regiments so that the bright young men were buried deep in the system if they didn't resign—President Roosevelt promoted the 45-year-old Captain Pershing over the heads of 862 senior officers, and he was commissioned a brigadier general. There was ample precedent. President McKinley caused Leonard Wood's promotion from captain in the Medical Corps to line stars, and Tasker H. Bliss was promoted to brigadier from his majority in the Commissary Department. Frederick Dent Grant and Frederick Funston were promoted to brigadier in the Regular Army from volunteer commissions only, and Capt. Albert L.

Mills of the regular cavalry was promoted to brigadier general just ahead of Pershing. All of those promotions were made in the considered interest of Army efficiency at a time when the service was moribund by passively dug-in rank, living on the inertia of seniority.

General Pershing went back to the Philippine in 1906 as Commander of the Department of Mindanao and Governor of the Moro Province—and served as such until 1913.

In 1914 he was sent to the seething Mexican border in command of a brigade with headquarters at El Paso, leaving his wife, Frances Warren Pershing, and his four young children—Helen 9, Anne 7, Warren 6, and Mary 3—in quarters at the Presidio of San Francisco. His appalling personal tragedy occurred there on August 27, 1915, when the quarters were destroyed by fire and Mrs. Pershing and the three little girls died in the holocaust. Only his son, Warren, survived. What that will do to a man, no other man can ever say. At best a part of him must seal itself up forever, wherein the dead never grow up nor grow older, only the broken heart that holds them in lonely anguish.

That tragedy was a part of the great and natural dignity of Pershing, of which Heywood Broun once wrote: "They will never call him Papa Pershing." It was dignity that impelled only the long-service soldiers to call him "Black Jack" as a subtle accolade, not in derogation. Pershing never married again.

In 1916 he organized and commanded the Mexican Punitive Expedition, a combined arms force of 10,000 men that penetrated 350 miles into Mexico and broke up Pancho Villa's armed revolutionaries, severely wounding the bandit himself. There is a prophetic photograph surviving from those days: a picture taken at Nogales of Generals Obregon and Villa with Brig. Gen. John J. Pershing. Behind Pershing and to his left stands his aide—1st Lt. George S. Patton, Jr.

Old war indeed. Before Pershing fought World War I, he had seen or fought in nine older wars. The story of Pershing's appointment to the command of the AEF is not generally known, for it is loosely assumed that he fell into it naturally when Gen. Frederick Funston died. But this is not so. Newton D. Baker, Wilson's Secretary of War, had had no previous acquaintance with Army matters before his Cabinet appointment. The Chief of Staff in 1917 was Maj. Gen. Hugh L. Scott, a distinguished and capable officer but in his 64th year—facing statutory retirement in a matter of months. When it became imperative to select a field commander, Secretary Baker took home the complete records of all general officers and spent 48 almost-continuous hours examining them minutely against each other. Like a machine records selection, the answer came out "Pershing"; and, like the first America's Cup race, "There was no second" on the record.

There was no American Expeditionary Force for him to command either. The Regular Army ran to possibly 25,000 men all told in 1917. There was no divisional organization except for the hastily scratched-up 1st Division, elements of which (the 7th Field Artillery) were still landing in St. Nazaire in early July, 3 months after the declaration of war. There was no Reserve as we know it today except the officers' training camps of the Plattsburg movement. And to attend one of these camps prior to the declaration of war a man had to buy his own uniforms, pay for his food and incidentals, and transport himself to and from his home. For which he received no pay, but he could get an Officers' Reserve Corps commission and wear ORC in bronze on his collar. The National Guard outfits in most States were separate-company deals that quite possibly had never trained in regiment. And a long enough time had elapsed since the Spanish-American War to allow State politics—rather than qualification—to creep back into the selection of senior officers.

From this potential, General Pershing had the unenviable task of producing a completely organized army. Given a free hand fortunately, he was able in 18 months to produce an integrated fighting force of 2 million men and to fight it himself as field commander in the last few months of the war.

Nobody but the Regular Army ever trained progressively for war in the United States before World War I, and the Regulars never trained on the mass scale that European armies had been going in for since the days of Frederick the Great. If war came, you just blithely sprang to arms overnight in the fatuous but golden words of William Jennings Bryan—never mind what arms you sprang to, or who fed you breakfast the next morning.

Pershing was not an overnight springer. Having previously commanded four brigade-sized expeditions in hostile territory, he was a respecter of the supply and administration which come before all glory and without which there is no "military diversion of fighting a war"—again, Frederick the Great. Furthermore, Pershing was a trainer from away back. The two-sided manpower was modestly born in his time into U.S. Army doctrine at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., in 1886 when Gen. Nelson A. Miles instituted raiding games wherein one cavalry troop took the part of raiding Apaches and the others countered their efforts. Pershing carried the method to the Philippines—building training into pyramidal structure from the individual, through unit to combined arms—and then physically opposed maneuvers of two counterbodies of troops.

As sketchily as they began in the National Army of 1917–18 (some men were overseas 2 weeks after induction and division-sized units sailed in a matter of a few hours after closing on each other at the port), the methods and training programs that Pershing inaugurated early in 1917 were the beginnings of the masterfully refined mobilization training plan of 1941–45 that produced the finest, most farflung army the world has ever seen.

It has been said of Pershing that his greatest contribution to the war effort was to maintain the intactitude of the U.S. Army—to keep it a unified force in France. Pershing had no army when he landed in France, but he did have uncoordinated units as a basis of making one and he did have American manpower flowing in behind him. But no general in command of an expeditionary force—on paper at first but in increasing fact as the months unrolled—is going to let it slip away from him. Certainly a man of Pershing's military record was not going to allow himself to be euchred out of the tools of his trade.

It is true that by 1917 the French and the British had a strong proprietary interest in that war and were fed up to the teeth with it. And when Pershing was in London on his way to Paris in June of 1917, he was officially asked, with British blandness, whether his place would be with the British or the French or between the two. Pershing made a diplomatic reply. He said that the President had not yet made a final decision. Again, it was ambassadorial-level opinion that the French had periods of great war weariness and that there was a very real danger that they might get tired and stop—that they might quit and make a separate peace with Germany. Therefore, the psychological effect of Pershing's arrival in France was immeasurable.

But there was a natural trap a lesser man might have fallen into. This was a modern war that the British, French, and Germans had developed and the United States was a newcomer to it. So much of a stranger that we were landing with obsolescent 3-inch field pieces—shortly to be replaced by the French 75 mm. and supplemented at corps by G.P.F. We were landing in felt campaign hats, shortly to be replaced by the British tin hat. Almost at once, the outward and visible profile of our troops was beginning to change. There was an insidiousness in this natural process of modernizing items of our supply from the established Allied sources of supply. But there was a war in progress. So what better places to train for it than in the rear of established French and British sectors? Once you borrow facilities from another army, there is grave danger you may be absorbed.

Pershing did allocate some American troops on a rotational basis to the Toul sector for combat training with the British, and some to the French. His pilots (who were Signal Corps officers in those days because the observation balloons McClellan had used at the Seven Days' Battle before Richmond in 1862 had telegraph instruments in them and army communications is a Signal Corps function, what else?) were trained individually with the Royal Flying Corps (the Royal Air Force after April of 1918), with the Italians, and with the French. It would have been easy to have made the combat-training trade permanent and to have lost the identity of the entire Army.

Pershing took this chance coldly, made it work to his own ends of training and producing an eventually planned army of 3 million men. It took time, it took patience and intestinal fortitude, and it did almost try the Allied patience to breaking when the German attack of the 21st of March 1918 began to go through them to a point of near-disaster. This is where the greatness of Pershing stands tall before the world. With his plans not yet at fruition but with almost a year absorbed by them, he offered to place his entire force at the disposal of Marshal Foch. The crisis passed in late summer; and at St. Mihiel in September the first all-United States operation was launched, followed by the Meuse-Argonne offensive under Pershing's personal command—and the resulting record is inscribed in the bronze of history forever. The impartial verdict from the British viewpoint: "If the attainment of its aims was slow and more costly than had been expected, Pershing had accepted the actual battleground (the Meuse-Argonne) in deference to his allies and against his own preference for a blow at Metz. Even so, it is probable that he underrated the difficulties of breaking through a strongly organized trench system, as well as the causes that had sapped the offensive spirit of the French. He had a Grant-like ruthlessness, similarly lacking the personal magnetism which leads men to lay down their lives gladly, but he had the character which compels men not only to die but to work, grumbling perhaps but respecting him." (B. H. Liddel-Hart.)

American soldiers as a class do not readily come by a love for their generals. There is no record of any great soldier love for Washington. For a time the army of the Potomac seems to have had a deep emotional enthusiasm for General McClellan—but for no one else who commanded. The 3d Army did not love Patton; they respected him. Nobody loved Stilwell; they admired him for the odds he was up against. The exception is the love that the army of northern Virginia had for Lee.

Therefore, the rule must be that if the character of an American general officer commands respect, that is enough for him to function on. You can hate his guts; but if you will follow him, that is the mission. The converse is that most of us have to employ a compensatory gut-hating technique in the face of strong character at a crisis

of history—for there stands the antithesis of our own weakness.

On a maneuver in the Philippines years before World War I, the final movement of the problem called for a bridge across a swollen river. An Engineer lieutenant reported to Brigadier General Pershing that because of high water it was impossible even to get the first rope across the river. Pershing's answer was: "I never ask the impossible of any officer or soldier of my command. When you get an order, you must find a way to execute it. Now come with me." The general then rode to the stream, fastened a rope to his saddle, and swam his mount with it to the other side.

You can't love such a man because he has made a fool out of you—forevermore in your heart. But you would have to respect him, because he proved himself right.

The Grant template is what they are after at West Point, not success in a popularity contest. That is why, at times, they are a hard breed for a non-West Pointer to understand.

In September of 1919 Congress gave to Pershing a rank previously held only by George Washington. As General of the Armies of the United States he outranked all the generals and admirals of World War II. In 1921 he served as Chief of Staff and as such laid down the permanent framework of our modern Army. When age began to come upon him, he met it in the cool dignity that had always marked his intercourse even with his most personal friends. He wrote no carping, critical books. He did not sell his retired sword to commerce. He made no particular effort to inflict his aging mind upon the Nation as a senior citizen. There was a humanity and an earthiness to the man that caused a whisper now and then but always fell short of scandal.

Of all men of his time, he seemed to have an unerring instinct for just exactly where he fitted into the scheme of things. He was, in essence, a dirt soldier who came up the hard way but loved his profession dearly enough to continue the pursuit of excellence in it—also the hard way. A dignified man by nature and by virtue of the period he was born into, he inherited the further dignity of Germanic stock. He never dramatized that dignity beyond its natural limitations—nor beyond the needs of the personification of the sovereign dignity of the United States, which he did, so ably, represent.

So that when his time came, on July 15, 1948, he folded his cloak about him—and quietly departed, almost a stranger to the new war that had come upon his country and to the newer threats still that growl beyond the horizons—but forever a part of the careful building to meet those threats—that will bring victory once more—when the time comes.

The Town Crier Eulogizes Joseph Ryan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. OSTERTAG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, while the House of Representatives was in recess last month, a warm and understanding friend of many in my area of the country passed away. He was Joseph M. Ryan of Batavia, N.Y., who earned real distinction as a civic leader and State official for many years.

The Town Crier of Radio Station WBTA, Mr. E. T. Gamble, paid sincere tribute to Joe Ryan in a recent broadcast, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include this portion of his broadcast:

It was less than a month ago that we were in the Lexington Hotel in New York and, as is our custom, we dropped by the hotel barbershop to say "Hello," and inquire after the health of Joe, the boss barber. His last name we've never known, though we've known him for 20 years or longer. His greeting was the same as it has been through the recent years: "How is Joe Ryan? Tell him I'm not feeling so good myself and he better come down and see me."

Joe, the barber, walks with halting step, sits down as often as shop traffic permits, but he's still at the chair he has tended for something over 35 years. We are sure that of the tens of thousands of people who have visited the Lexington Barbershop over the years, no one is so well remembered as Joseph M. Ryan, of Batavia, whose death this week at 63 ended a life of many accomplishments, and countless services to his friends, his community, and his State and Nation.

For 10 years Mr. Ryan was a weekly visitor to New York as a member of the New York State Liquor Authority. About 15 years have passed since he was a frequent visitor to the city. It's the same with all older members of the hotel staff. When you register from Batavia, N.Y., if the desk clerk isn't a youngster, you are sure to be asked: "How is the commissioner?" Or, "Have you seen Mr. Ryan lately?" From management down to the phone operator, waiters and bellboys, the hotel's veteran employees have never forgotten their valued acquaintance with Commissioner Ryan.

A farm boy and 1 of a family of 13 children, Joe came from stout stock and his strength and stamina were displayed in high school sports, where he starred in track and football. His fellow team members still remember him as "strictly a team player," rather than an individual star. He played the game clean and gave it everything he had.

It was to be expected that he would be one of the first two men in Batavia to enlist for First World War service. As an artilleryman attached to the famed 1st Division, he was in a number of the major engagements of the war—was wounded three times and suffered a gas injury—returning to frontline service each time after hospitalization. He never took much part in postwar veterans affairs, and did not talk about the war except on a rare occasion when he encountered a buddy from 1st Division service.

The war gas left him with an aggravating cough that plagued him through life and led to the cruel and tormenting lung ailment that caused his death after nearly 2 years of grievous illness. We're convinced that it robbed him of at least 20 or 25 years to enjoy his material success in life for his father was a vigorous man who was still turning in a good day of work in his middle eighties.

It wasn't many weeks ago in a talk we had with him that he said this: "You know a fellow starts out in life, hoping to make enough money so he feels he's independent and can do the things he's always wanted to do. But it can be like climbing up a long hill. You struggle to make the top and when you get there and look around, you find there really isn't anything there."

People indebted to him for favors and wise counsel were legion and his host of friends included people in high and low places. A helping hand to a friend down in his luck was always extended without the asking. A promise of help was not just a lipservice but a forerunner that might be both costly and time consuming. When he gave you his word it was final and unconditional.

It was his refusal back in the early thirty's to withdraw a promise to support Attorney General John Bennett for Governor in a Democratic State primary that inspired opposition that a long time later blocked his appointment as chairman of the State liquor authority and also as chairman of the Democratic State Committee.

We never really understood why—but it was the job of member of the Liquor Authority in Western New York that he enjoys most and he gave it his full energies and talents.

Maybe it was because it was an assignment in which others had taken the easy way and merely attended board meetings. Or it could have been because he recognized it as one that took a firm hand to keep orderly conditions in the trade. He believed that people did not want letter of the law enforcement—but enforcement with heart and understanding that would keep sound process of administration and cause a minimum of distress.

The neighborhood tavern keeper with a family of five or six kids, who had violated the alcoholic beverage control law, always had more sympathetic treatment from the commissioner than did the man of power who had a variety of influential people urging easy treatment of his transgressions. And eyen after 15 years in this State service, he continued until his last days of life to have frequent calls for advice and opinion in matters of liquor law enforcement.

A lover of sports, Joe poured his money and his talents into bringing professional baseball to Batavia. When he thought it was too much a one-man show and that it might advance the sport if he stepped out, he turned his stock over without compensation and continued a loyal fan and supporter with never a suggestion that he be reimbursed for the funds he had advanced.

His fine sense of humor is illustrated in a story that we recalled today. It was while he was on the liquor authority and was sitting in a group that included the late Watts L. Richmond, a Batavia native who had been a volunteer coach when Joe was a high school football player. Another member of the group drew Mr. Richmond into a discussion of liquor law enforcement. It was soon after repeal and Mr. Richmond described conditions in Buffalo as terrible, saying that among other things that there were saloons next to most churches, the law was being flaunted, and that a bunch of New York Irishmen were running the law enforcement with a loose hand.

About this time he seemed to sense something wrong and he turned to Commissioner Ryan and asked: "Joe, what are you doing these days." And with a smile Joe replied: "Watts, I'm still a butcher."

The meat business in which he made his first success after coming back from war service was always close to his heart. He continued it along with his other enterprises and during the past year when he seldom left the house, he was in constant touch and by telephone did all of the daily ordering of supplies.

People across the Nation are pouring messages of condolence to his sorrowing family and here in his own community there is a widespread consciousness that we have lost a truly great citizen.

John J. Pershing, General of the Armies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, on June 1 the President approved House

Joint Resolution 640 proclaiming September 13 as a day for all Americans to pay proper homage to General of the Armies John J. Pershing and to the men who served under him. On that day all departments and agencies of the Government are authorized to cooperate with any civic and patriotic organization which may be conducting ceremonies in commemoration of the birth of General Pershing. As in communities throughout the Nation, Alaskans will join in paying homage to this great American and to the many men who served so bravely during the First World War.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I call attention of my colleagues to an excellent article by James Warner Bellah paying tribute to this man who so symbolized America's World War I Army. I would like to quote the final few paragraphs of Mr. Bellah's article as it appeared in the August 1960 issue of the American Legion magazine:

A TRIBUTE TO JOHN J. PERSHING, GENERAL OF THE ARMIES OF THE UNITED STATES

American soldiers as a class do not readily come by a love for their generals. There is no record of any great soldier love for Washington. For a time the Army of the Potomac seems to have had a deep emotional enthusiasm for General McClellan—but for no one else who commanded. The Third Army did not love Patton; they respected him. Nobody loved Stilwell; they admired him for the odds he was up against. The exception is the love that the Army of Northern Virginia had for Lee.

Therefore, the rule must be that if the character of an American general officer commands respect, that is enough for him to function on. You can hate his guts; but if you will follow him, that is the mission. The converse is that most of us have to employ a compensatory gut-hating technique in the face of strong character at a crisis of history—for there stands the antithesis of our own weakness.

On a maneuver in the Philippines years before World War I, the final movement of the problem called for a bridge across a swollen river. An Engineer lieutenant reported to Brigadier General Pershing that because of high water it was impossible even to get the first rope across the river. Pershing's answer was: "I never ask the impossible of any officer or soldier of my command. When you get an order, you must find a way to execute it. Now come with me." The general then rode to the stream, fastened a rope to his saddle, and swam his mount with it to the other side.

You can't love such a man because he has made a fool out of you—forevermore in your heart. But you would have to respect him, because he proved himself right.

The Grant template is what they are after at West Point, not success in a popularity contest. That is why, at times, they are a hard breed for a non-West-Pointer to understand.

In September of 1919 Congress gave to Pershing a rank previously held only by George Washington. As General of the Armies of the United States he outranked all the generals and admirals of World War II. In 1921 he served as Chief of Staff and as such laid down the permanent framework of our modern Army. When age began to come upon him, he met it in the cool dignity that had always marked his intercourse even with his most personal friends. He wrote no carping, critical books. He did not sell his retired sword to commerce. He made no particular effort to inflict his aging mind upon the Nation as a senior citizen. There was a humanity and an earthiness to the man that caused a whisper now and then but always fell short of scandal.

Of all men of his time, he semed to have an unerring instinct for just exactly where he fitted into the scheme of things. He was, in essence, a dirt soldier who came up the hard way but loved his profession dearly enough to continue the pursuit of excellence in it—also the hard way—A dignified man by nature and by virtue of the period he was born into, he inherited the further dignity of Germanic stock. He never dramatized that dignity beyond its natural limitations—nor beyond the needs of the personification of the sovereign dignity of the United States, which he did so ably represent.

So that when his time came, on July 15, 1948, he folded his cloak about him and quietly departed, almost a stranger to the new war that had come upon his country and to the newer threats still that growl beyond the horizons but forever a part of the careful building to meet those threats—that will bring victory once more—when the time comes.

Let's Stop Selling America Short

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT B. CHIPERFIELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I wonder how many Members of this distinguished body are getting just a little sick and tired of those who are running down our great country.

Just the other day, I heard one of them say his "criticism is not borne out of disloyalty, but out of deep loyalty." To me, that sounds just a bit like the old quote about the licking in the woodshed—"this hurts me more than it does you." But when I was a boy I was always under the impression that I was the one who got hurt.

And today I think the country may be getting hurt worse than those who are trying to make capital by calling us a second-rate power.

Our national wealth is the greatest in the world. We have built more than 9 million new homes since World War II. Only a very few years ago the demand seemed insatiable.

Living standards are higher. Poverty and unemployment are close to a minimum. Our economy continues strong and steady, neither pushing upward into an inflationary spiral, nor slipping into recession. And above everything else, we are at peace.

We are spending 2½ times more for research and development than we did 7 years ago. Nearly 12 million more persons are covered by social security than when the Democrats lost the White House; and medical care of the aged is at long last getting the attention it deserves.

We are carrying a tremendous burden of defense and foreign aid in addition to the cost of domestic programs. Under President Eisenhower's administration and its leaders in Congress we managed to produce a $1.1 billion surplus last year.

We could probably have had a surplus of $4.2 billion this fiscal year, had the opposition paid any responsible attention to the recommendations of President Eisenhower.

But to become more specific about our relative standing, economically, with our principal competitor, Soviet Russia, I suggest we consider these figures recently compiled by the Library of Congress. They compare prices in terms of hours worked in Moscow and New York. They show how much better off American workers are than Russian workers.

Items	Hours worked, Moscow, Russia	Hours worked, New York, U.S.A.	Russians work times more
Suit clothes	275 hours	23 hours	11 times.
Lady's dress (rayon)	73½ hours	4 hours 36 minutes	16 times.
Cotton shirt	15 hours	56 minutes	16 times.
Shoes (man)	61 hours	7 hours	8¼ times.
Nylon hose	8 hours	37 minutes	13 times.
Beef (pound)	1 hour 22 minutes	21 minutes	4 times.
Butter (pound)	3 hours 4 minutes	20½ minutes	9 times.
Milk (quart)	31 minutes	7½ minutes	4 times.
Cigarettes (20)	27 minutes	7 minutes	4 times.

Now it will be said by some that Russia is at least ahead of us in the space race, even though at this moment we have 14 satellites in orbit as against 3 belonging to Russia. It is true that they can send a larger thrust into orbit, but our satellites have a notable advantage in the more subtle areas of instrumentation. We are better able to record, transmit and receive information about the universe.

We were the first to send a navigational satellite aloft. A satellite whose radio signals can provide "fixes" for ships in bad weather.

We were the first with a satellite whose successors will give this country early warning of missile launchings.

We were the first to recover a capsule from orbit in space.

The giant, 100-foot ballon, Echo I, is the largest object in space, and is the first communication satellite. It has already relayed recorded messages, "live" telephone calls and even radioed pictures.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration expects soon to fire an American astronaut into space in the nose cone of a rocket, and have a man put into orbit and returned to earth. The moon will be the target of an instrument package.

And the most outstanding aspect of these technological breakthroughs is that they came from a nation whose research and development was begun in

1953—less than 8 years ago—in a Republican administration.

We have the word of President Eisenhower that we have become the strongest military power on earth. We have, for example, operational Atlas missiles ready for launching and capable of hitting targets anywhere in the world.

We have 2,000 long-range strategic bombers, deployed at bases around the globe, each of which can deliver more destructive power than has been spent in all the wars in history.

We have 16 wings of tactical aircraft, each with nuclear capability deployed on strategically located advance bases around the world.

We have missiles with large warheads, difficult to detect through defense radar.

We have Matador and Mace operational tactical missiles, each packing more explosive power than was expended against all Axis military targets in Europe during World War II.

We have intermediate range ballistic missiles, such as the Thor, which is stationed in allied forces' hands in the United Kingdom.

We have cruisers and submarines equipped with the Regulus I, a surface-to-surface weapon.

We have aircraft carriers, several of which are deployed around the periphery of the Soviet Union, able to launch more aircraft than the entire Soviet heavy bomber force and capable of nuclear strikes into almost any area of the Communist bloc.

We have naval alert forces which include 9 antisubmarine carriers, 14 cruisers, 269 destroyers, 115 submarines, 81 minecraft, and more than 7,000 operational aircraft.

We have 14 Army divisions, 8 overseas and 6 in this country, all at the highest state of readiness in peacetime history.

We have three divisions of marines, always prepared to move quickly and effectively into trouble spots anywhere in the world.

In addition, we have as part of our defense program another very important factor often overlooked by its critics: The collective military strength of our friends and allies abroad, embracing, in effect, the armed forces of all free nations. Our allies provide the United States with some 250 strategically located bases, contribute to our collective defense more than 5 million men, more than 25,000 planes, half of which are jet powered, and some 2,200 combat vessels which help insure free world control of the seas.

All this adds up to a military force overwhelmingly superior to anything the Russians can put together.

Nowhere in this admittedly brief account do I find anything but justification for pride in our country. I say, let us stop selling America short.

In the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in the New York Times issue of January 29, 1960, Curtis Krock wrote an interesting article in relation to certain officials of the Defense Department engaging in campaign activities, which the present Republican administration should keep in mind in connection with the present election campaign.

What Mr. Krock said in relation to the Defense Department certainly has application also to the State Department:

IN THE NATION—OFFICIALS WHO SHOULD SKIP PARTISAN GATHERINGS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 28.—Senator HUMPHREY of Minnesota made a complaint today against the participation of high Defense Department officials in Republican political activities in this Presidential election year. He said this involvement was "unethical and beneath the dignity of the administration." He could have added that the appearance of such officials at party gatherings, including campaign fundraising dinners, is calculated to give a partisan color to the department responsible for military security.

Obviously the reaction to this in the Democratic Congress could further roil the atmosphere in which the administration's defense program is being examined by the legislative branch of the Government. This already has evoked much controversy over goals and the methods of attaining them. Since most of the critics are Democrats, among them citizens who clearly aspire to the Presidency, Republicans are hinting that partisan considerations are responsible for the violence of some of the criticism. But the Republicans would have small foundation for a hope that the people could be persuaded of this as a dominant motive if the Department of Defense seems to the public to be deep in Republican electoral politics. And the principal victim would be national security.

ITEMS OF COMPLAINT

Senator HUMPHREY cited, as grounds for his complaint, the drafting of the following as speakers at Republican fundraising "Dinners With Ike" last night: Deputy Secretary of Defense James H. Douglas, in Kansas; Army Secretary Brucker, in North Carolina; Assistant Secretary Short and Air Force Secretary Sharp in Texas; and Defense Secretary Gates in Oregon. (The latter's speech was read for him only because his plane was grounded by weather.) The list fully establishes the point made by the Senator.

The same situation arose in 1948. But in that year President Truman, at the insistance of Defense Secretary Forrestal, put a ban on the participation of officials of Forrestal's department in partisan political gatherings. This restriction followed an announcement by Senator Hatch, then chairman of the Democratic Speakers Bureau, that, except for Secretary of State Marshall and Under Secretary Lovett, all members of the President's Cabinet circle would take the stump for Mr. Truman in his campaign for election.

In this space at the time the following comment was made on Hatch's announcement: "This would mean that Forrestal is expected to be among the campaigners; that, though Marshall and Lovett were excused because of the 'nonpartisan' character of their work, this does not apply to the Secretary of Defense. * * * How any such difference coud be found between the department which conducts our foreign policy and the department which must supply the power on which that policy rests requires an answer that only partisan politicians could give." That applies equally today to Senator HUMPHREY's admonition.

FORRESTAL AND KENNEY INTERVENE

In 1948 W. John Kenney, as Under Secretary of the Navy, was in charge of the Navy's legislative relations, Congress had a Republican majority, and Kenney was carrying out Forrestal's instructions that Chairman Andrews and Gurney of the House and Senate Military Committees, respectively, should be kept fully informed on departmental activities. When they and other Republicans in Congress expressed resentment of Hatch's announcement, Kenney reported and endorsed this feeling to Forrestal, who endorsed it to President Truman, and the Democratic campaign committees which were the source of the plan were told by the President to find their campaign speakers elsewhere. In the campaign of 1952, when Kenney was deputy director of the Mutual Security Administration, the same question arose, and the President took the same position.

This wise and proper policy calls for reassertion by President Eisenhower to the Republican National Committee and the other party groups which apply the pressure to Defense Department officials to make speeches at partisan gatherings, including campaign fundraising dinners. These officials would be very happy if this pressure were removed from them, as it long has been from the Department of State. The President could do that with a word, and end the reluctant, improper and dangerous participation of the Defense Department in partisan politics.

Connally Amendment—HUAC and FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of Congress and the American people two timely and vitally important news items appearing in the August 27, 1960, issue of the Tablet:

K. OF C. MEMBERS OPPOSE CONNALLY PROVISION REPEAL—UNITED STATES MUST NEVER ALLOW U.N. COURT TO DECIDE WHAT ARE DOMESTIC ISSUES—78TH CONVENTION HELD—DELEGATES BAR FOREIGN AID, BIRTH CONTROL, SUPPORT HUAC AND THE FBI

ATLANTA, GA.—Delegates to the 78th Supreme Council Convention of the Knights of

Columbus adopted a resolution here opposing the repeal of the Connally amendment which said that the World Court "shall have no jurisdiction over disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States 'as determined by the United States.'"

The resolution further stated that "we must never surrender the right and sovereignty of the United States of America to decide and determine its domestic and internal affairs and issues."

The Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus "opposed the giving of the World Court any right, power, or jurisdiction to decide what are the domestic and what are the international issues and disputes of the United States of America, and favors the retention of the Connally amendment."

The resolution read:

"Whereas, a World Court was established by the United Nations in 1945, said Court to be composed of 15 judges, not more than 1 from each participating nation, which World Court is designed to be superior to the domestic courts of each nation that participates in the Court, and

"Whereas, the resolution of Congress, committing and binding the United States to participate in the World Court and to accept its jurisdiction, was amended by a resolution sponsored by Senate Tom Connally of Texas to provide that such Court shall have no jurisdiction over disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States 'as determined by the United States'; and"

PRAISE HOUSE COMMITTEE

"Whereas there has been introduced in Congress, Senate Resolution 94, which has for its purpose the repeal of the Connally amendment, and whereas we must never surrender the right and sovereignty of the United States of America to decide and determine its domestic and internal affairs and issues.

"Resolved, The Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus, in annual meeting assembled opposes the giving of the World Court any right, power or jurisdiction to decide what are the domestic and what are the international issues and disputes of the United States of America, and favors the retention of the Connally amendment.

The supreme council opposed the use of U.S. tax funds to provide birth preventive information as part of the foreign aid program. Other resolutions adopted follow:

Endorsement of the "aims and efforts" of the House Un-American Activities Committee. It said the Communists have tried to destroy the committee by using American college youth, an apparent reference to the disorder caused by collegians at a May committee hearing in San Francisco.

Support and praise for the "aims, achievements and activities" of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its director, J. Edgar Hoover. It said the FBI has been criticized "by innuendo and smear attacks by a small minority during the past year."

Condemnation of the Red Chinese for jailing of American missionary Bishop James E. Walsh, M.M., and an appeal to President Eisenhower to use "every possible means" to secure his release.

A call for respect and prayers for the late Cardinal Alojzije Stepinac, archbishop of Zagreb, Yugoslavia. The council said the cardinal is a martyr who should be remembered as an inspiration by all anti-Communists.

Support for a bill (H.R. 1374) before Congress to strengthen the power of the Post Office Department in dealing with distributors of obscene literature. The bill proposes several technical steps to streamline Post Office antismut efforts.

An appeal to K. of C. councils to give consideration to the American Society of Ephesus. The society, with Lima, Ohio, headquarters, hopes to restore the basilica containing the tomb of St. John, the apostle and evangelist, and the Marian Basilica, where in A.D. 431 Mary was proclaimed the Mother of God. Both are in Ephesus, Turkey.

Unqualified endorsement of the Catholic advertising program conducted by the supreme council. The program was hailed as one of the greatest apostolic endeavors of all times.

NAMED DIRECTORS

Delegates to the convention elected 8 members to the 21-member board of directors. Reelected for 3-year terms were: Luke E. Hart of St. Louis, supreme knight; Francis Fautex of Montreal; Clarence J. Malone of Topeka, Kans.; Charles J. Morgan of Chicago; Wilfred T. Connelly of Detroit; Henry J. Kondrat of Cleveland Heights, Ohio, and Emmet Burke of Yonkers, N.Y. Dr. John H. Griffin, of Hughesville, Md., was elected for a 1-year term to fill the vacancy of Charles B. Humeleine of Baltimore, who resigned.

CWV HITS RETURN OF MOVIE REDS—25TH CONVENTION BACKS "MARK AMERICAN" AND CONNALLY MEASURES

CHICAGO.—Some 4,000 delegates to the 25th national convention of the Catholic War Veterans last week enthusiastically accepted a committee report charging that Communist sympathizers are associated with 15 films soon to be released by Hollywood.

Reiterating their stand against employment of persons with pro-Communist backgrounds in this media as well as in television and radio, the CWV approved a recommendation by Americanism Chairman Joseph Anderson that members seek the cooperation of the public in a campaign to withhold patronage from these films.

Among the productions cited, were "Exodus," produced by Otto Preminger, and "Spartacus," by Kirk Douglas, both scripted by Dalton Trumbo, and "Inherit the Wind," produced by Stanley Kramer and written by Nedrick Young, alias Nathan E. Douglas. Young and Trumbo have been identified as Communists.

COMMEND "CONSPIRACY"

The veterans also approved a resolution commending Paramount Pictures and England's J. Arthur Rank studios for the picture "Conspiracy of Hearts," describing it as "a human interest story of courage in the face of evil, violence, and hate."

CWV delegates reaffirmed the organization's opposition to the admission of Communist China to the United Nations and its recognition by the United States, asserting it is increasingly evident that special interest groups are exerting pressures to accomplish these ends.

They again called for implementation of the Mark American resolution by which Congress has authorized that all foreign aid goods be suitably marked "Made in the U.S.A." When failure of the proper Government agencies to do this was criticized by the idea's originator, John J. Shaughnessy, of Brooklyn, Mr. Shaughnessy was relieved of his civil service post. The resolution asked an investigation into the firing as well as failure of authorities to follow the expressed wishes of the Congress.

The convention also urged retention of the Connally amendment, repeal of which has been called for by both political parties. The controversial amendment allows the United States to determine if international controversies to which it is a party are domestic matters and thus outside the jurisdiction of the United Nations' World Court.

PRAYER FOR U–2 PILOT

Rev. Rufus J. Wicelinski, O.F.M. Conv., of Ellicott City, Md., C.W.V. chaplain, led the delegates in prayer for the welfare of U–2 pilot, Francis G. Powers. A resolution was passed asking the proper authorities to "do everything possible to honorably secure the release" of the civilian airman who was convicted of spying by the Reds and given a 10-year sentence.

Among the 50 resolutions considered, affirmative action was taken on a request that President Eisenhower "lodge an official protest with Chinese Communists" against the unjust imprisonment of Maryknoll Bishop James E. Walsh and demand his immediate release; commendation of the President for the dignity, courage, and restraint with which he faced the "abusive verbal attack" of Khrushchev at the abortive summit conference; recommendation that Congress retain the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Also, inaugurating a letterwriting campaign to the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Hungarian U.N. delegates, and Khrushchev protesting the jailing of children who aided the 1956 uprising until they are 18 at which time they will be executed; urging this country to use all appropriate means for the liberation of Red-enslaved nations and that we see to it that at all summit and other international sessions "appropriate recognition be given to the Supreme Being in all deliberations"; pledging support to programs which oppose shopping on Sundays; recommending the United States adopt "a strong policy" regarding Cuba and firmly oppose any attempt to take over our Guantanamo installations.

Memorial Tribute to Oscar Hammerstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, Oscar Hammerstein II is dead, at the height of his creative powers. The uncrowned poet laureate of the musical stage, his unique talent delighted many generations of theater goers with the grace and unabashed sentiment of his lyrics. His departure from the human stage at the age of 65 halts forever the collaboration with Richard Rodgers, which began with "Oklahoma!," continued through "Carousel," "Allegro," "South Pacific," "The King and I," "Me and Juliet," "Pipe Dream," "Flower Drum Song," to the current Broadway success, "The Sound of Music."

The magic touch of Oscar Hammerstein II did not come without effort. Born into a theatrical family, he schooled himself in the theater from an early age. One of his earliest mentors was the dean of American lyricists, Otto A. Harbach. Hammerstein was accustomed to write and rewrite laboriously in pencil until at last his inspiration took the form best suited to its content. He used to say that the requisites for good lyric writing, in addition to a knowledge of musical form and the mechanics of song, are fourfold; something to say; a deep-down desire to say it; a sense of rhythm, and a feeling for poetry.

Oscar Hammerstein II had more than talent—he had character. For many lean years in the thirties success, after brushing him with her wings, seemed to

have deserted him forever but he stubbornly continued to work in the musical theater. Lured by his deep poetic ability and his perseverance in his chosen profession, success finally and gloriously returned to him.

Oscar Hammerstein II was not only uniquely talented; he was also endowed with a desire to serve his fellow man and especially his fellow workers in the musical world. For almost 20 years—from 1939 to 1960—he served as a member of the board of directors of the American Society of Composers, Authors, and Publishers—ASCAP. He was one of the chief guides of the destiny of this unique institution which has done so much for composers and writers of musical works and, with leaders such as Hammerstein, has become not only a respected but essential component of the entertainment world.

Oscar's stature was great. His heart was great. His reputation was great. The memory of this great American will remain forever in the hearts of all of us who love the theater and who were privileged to know this unique gentleman.

Goethe died calling for light. Oscar Hammerstein ever sought light and knowledge and truth. He learned much from living. He learned the divine order of things, that you cannot violate the laws of nature with impunity. He knew the laws of compensation. He recognized the dignity of the individual and refused to judge success by the mere acquisition of wealth. His judgment of man's worth was unselfish devotion to the welfare of one's fellows.

Queen Elizabeth died saying, "I have lived." Oscar Hammerstein lived in every true sense. He lived fully but unfortunately for too short a span. He rounded out his life with many activities aside from those of lyrics, music and the theater. There were few good causes that failed to attract his active attention, whether they concerned atomic bombs or welfare agencies, Actor's Equity, ASCAP or juvenile delinquency. He was alert to and made himself conversant with the perplexing problems of our era.

Charles Darwin's last words were, "I am not afraid to die." I am sure Oscar Hammerstein was not afraid of death, just as he was unafraid of life. He had a heart for every fate. He has now taken his last voyage—a great leap in the dark. He knew that "life is but preparation for death." He realized there can be no reason why life should be perpetuated in any one person. Immortality lies in handing down life to one's children and their children, like one who gives the torch of life to another and he to one more, and so on down the corridor of time. He must have agreed with Lord Byron, who said:

Death, so called, is a thing that makes men weep,
And yet a third of life is passed in sleep.

John Keats said, "I feel the flowers growing over me." Yes, Oscar Hammerstein I am certain, would want flowers to grow upon his grave—flowers of delicate hues and fragrance, as symbols of a gentle, benign creature. God placed his finger upon him and he sleeps.

I should like to append to my remarks a tribute paid to Oscar Hammerstein II by the New York Times in its editorial columns of August 24, 1960, headed, "Oscar Hammerstein 2d":

Although Oscar Hammerstein 2d had a genius for the musical theater, he had something finer than that. He had character. His death yesterday shatters the remarkable collaboration of Richard Rodgers, composer of the music, and Mr. Hammerstein, composer of the lyrics and most of the books of their plays. Now we must accept the doleful fact that there will be no successors to "Oklahoma," "Carousel," "The King and I," and "South Pacific."

The big four—written within the span of 8 years—have become part of our cultural heritage.

But the theater has also lost a man of character who stood for all that is decent in life. His point of view was implicit in everything he wrote. The concern for racial respect in "South Pacific," the sympathy and respect for a difficult though aspiring monarch in "The King and I," the indomitable faith that runs through "Carousel" were not clever bits of showmanship. They represented Mr. Hammerstein's faith in human beings and their destiny.

Outside the theater, as well as inside, he quietly accepted the responsibilities of a man of conscience. If his work represents something more than surface pleasure, it is because he brought the whole force of his character to it. Like Billy in "Carousel," he was always prepared to be "judged by the highest judge of all."

Since he was at heart a serious man, his lyrics were rarely clever. Instead of turning facetious phrases he made a studious attempt to write idiomatically in the popular tradition of the musical theater, for he was a dedicated craftsman. But the style that is apparently so artless has brought glimpses of glory into our lives. "There's a bright, golden haze on the meadow," sings Curley in "Oklahoma," and gritty streets of a slatternly city look fresher. "June Is Bustin' Out All Over," sing Carrie and Nettie in "Carousel," and the harshness of our winter vanishes. "Getting To Know You," sings Anna in "The King and I," and the world becomes a friendlier place.

In memorable songs there is a quality of transmutation that turns the common materials of life into something that seems ideal. Since Mr. Hammerstein was a craftsman it must have been a gratifying experience to have written the lyrics of so many songs that have become musical literature—all the way from "Show Boat" to "Sound of Music." To us it is gratifying that he also had the character to use his genius with faith and scruple.

I include also an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of August 24, 1960, entitled "Oscar Hammerstein and His Songs":

OSCAR HAMMERSTEIN AND HIS SONGS

The role of the librettist traditionally is a minor, even a minimal one. When one thinks of "Aida," "Carmen," "Don Giovanni," one remembers Verdi, Bizet, and Mozart, not Ghislanzoni, Meilhac, and da Ponte.

But this was not true of Oscar Hammerstein II any more than it was true of W. S. Gilbert. The great musical shows of our time such as "Oklahoma," South Pacific," "The King and I," and "Carousel" were all by Rodgers and Hammerstein, and few conjunctions have been as significant in theatrical history.

Mr. Hammerstein's achievement was all the more remarkable in that, in his partnership with Richard Rodgers, he stepped into a role that had been filled with flair and distinction by another man, Lorenz Hart.

To this collaboration Mr. Hammerstein brought new qualities of literary distinction and emotional impact. He wrote not only good lyrics but good plays. He respected and put to good use the richness of the American language.

Even aside from the collaboration that began in 1943 with "Oklahoma," Oscar Hammerstein was assured of his share of immortality. It could not be otherwise with the man who wrote the words of such songs as "Ol' Man River," "When I Grow Too Old To Dream," "The Last Time I Saw Paris"—words which caught a mood, a moment; words which stirred profound emotions.

Others made his country's laws; Oscar Hammerstein made its songs. And in them he lives beyond death.

Good Debt Management

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Baltimore Sun, August 29, 1960, which I think effectively answers the wild charges of robbery made by a few spokesmen of the Democratic Party in their discussions of the refunding plans of the Treasury Department:

PLAN FOR THE DEBT

Representative REUSS and several colleagues have criticized Treasury plans for advance refunding of World War II bonds paying 2.5 percent interest and falling due between 1967 and 1972. The refunding would be at rates nearer the present market. According to Representative Johnson of Colorado, "this is robbery in broad daylight." The Government would have to pay higher interest, that is, than on the bonds which it wants to call in.

But in any refunding, the Treasury has to meet prevailing market rates. There is no guarantee that they will go as low as 2.5 in any near future—that the present 2.5 bonds can be refinanced at the same low rate. The reason is that the rate was held down when the bonds were issued by artificial wartime pressures. Yet interest rates have been declining. While the Treasury doubts they will go as low as 2.5 percent, it knows they can well begin to rise again. In other words, on just the interest-rate ground cited by the critics, the present seems to the Treasury a propitious time to make the advance refunding offer.

Certainly the debt managers think they would be buying something of value for the higher rate. One main advantage would be an extension in the average maturities of the national debt. This is a vital consideration when the debt is as large as it is in this country. With the Government incomparably the biggest borrower there is, every time it goes to the money market it competes heavily with State, city, and private borrowers. Yet State and city borrowing is vital and it is on the private borrowers that the country depends for economic growth.

Naturally the Treasury wants to minimize the frequency of these competitive forays into the money market. One way to do this for the immediate future is to get as much debt as possible into the longest term secu-

rities. The Treasury is thinking in terms of 20, 30 and 40 years for the new advance refunding bonds. Considerations like these make a solid counter to the points raised by Mr. REUSS and his friends.

Extolling Simple Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AVERY
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, much has been said and written in recent years about the disappearance of the small rural community from the national scene. There is obviously considerable evidence throughout the Middle West that the small town or community does not occupy the same place economically nor socially that it did even 25 years ago. This is not a pleasant observation for me because I spent my childhood on a farm at the edge of a small town in northeast Kansas. Nevertheless, with our modern communications, transportation, and facilities for large-scale farming, there no longer remains the economic factors necessary to sustain these midwestern communities. In view of this changing picture, it is refreshing to note that Richland, Kans., has undertaken a project that may not reverse the trend away from small towns, but it does certainly remind everyone of the many virtues existing in the way of life in a rural community. This project in Richland has largely been under the direction of Andy Gray, businessman in the Richland community and highlighted by a homecoming observation at the annual Richland Fair from August 14 to 17.

This project in Richland, Kans., has attracted much attention not only in our State of Kansas but in surrounding States as well. So many persons have spent their early lives in small towns that this project must have reminded them of the many pleasant memories of their childhood and reminded them also that the environment in a small town had a very wholesome and stabilizing impact on them which carried on through their entire life.

The theme of this project was well spelled out by Mr. Gray in this simple sentence, "In contrast to chamber of commerce type activities, we intend to extol simple living." I am personally familiar with Richland, Kans., and know many persons who live in the community. There is a population of only about 200, but nevertheless it exemplifies rural living in the United States of America. Congratulations to this typical Kansas town for its effort to remind us of some of our most important resources.

Mr. Speaker, under previous consent, I include two editorials dealing with this project in Richland, Kans.:

[From the Topeka Sunday Capital-Journal, June 26, 1960]

EXTOLLING SIMPLE LIVING

The village of Richland 19 miles southeast of Topeka will stage the Richland Homecoming Fair August 14–17 and believes the theme of the 4-day event is extraordinary.

"In contrast to chamber of commerce-type activities," says the Richland fair president, Andrew J. Gray, "we intend to extol simple living. We hope to attract crowds and interest by being ourselves. There will be no brags about exploding population (ours is 200); not a word about tallest buildings or expanding industry.

"Our story is that for a few days people can visit Richland and sample, enjoy and refresh themselves in a hometown atmosphere. In boosting Richland, we hope to put into focus the fact that there is something nice about rural living. Richland typifies it."

The Richland fair, a nonprofit community activity, will have carnival, food and livestock judging, 4–H contests and other events which usually are part of fair activities. But Richland's stress on the satisfactions of smalltown life, while commonplace enough, is at the same time extraordinary in promoting a fair.

[From the Parsons (Kans.) Sun]

EDITOR WRITES MOVINGLY ABOUT SMALL TOWNS

I am a compact cluster of people and their modest homes, set down along the banks of some placid stream, or in some secluded vale—or perhaps in the sheltering shadows of high hills.

I make no pretense at earthly greatness. No roaring facilities of mankind intrude upon my premises; no glittering spires or minarets or towers dominate my lowly skyline.

Yet I represent a happiness and a repose such as is rarely found in these latter days of worldly turmoil and striving.

Sturdy hands formed my outlines in the long, long ago when the world was young—and when an empire was being wrested from the virgin wilderness. I am the product of the truehearted—those faithful, valiant ones, who came and stayed, who planted their banners on the rolling prairies and established a secure homeland for their kind.

I am not given to vainglory, nor to the conceit of thanking any gods that I am not as others are. Yet I hold a deep and glowing pride in the land whence I came, and in the warm family life which it has fostered and sustained.

I am profoundly grateful that the blood of the gallant pioneers, with their "far, eternal look," runs in my veins. I take satisfaction in the knowledge that the lessons they taught of frugality, of the innate blessings of honest work and adherence to the basic virtues have not entirely departed from me.

I rejoice that the dwellers within my narrow boundaries find delight in the lovely landscape about them, contentment in simple forms of toil and recreation, and strength in the ties of true neighborly relationships.

For my part, I endeavor to bestow upon them a perspective of peace, free from bedlam and confusion, far removed from the clang and clamor of worldly marts and the buzzing hives of industry. Here, I accord them calm and tranquillity, inviting them to work and play at moderate pace, to mingle harmoniously with kindred spirits, to ponder and reflect, and to find sufficient time and room for their souls to grow.

Wayfarers will not behold my name emblazoned in dazzling lights—yet there are those scattered in far places who remember me tenderly—sometimes with tear or sigh. The mapmakers mark me with a single dot upon their charts—yet to some who wander in the desolation of human jungles I bear the magic and mystic symbol of home.

I number my children only by the score, and those who sojourn in the crowded canyons of massed centers hold me in slight esteem. I bear no grudge, for I am favored with such bounties as the good earth, the radiant sky, the free and vagrant winds, and a sympathetic kinship with all Nature—which comfort me. Each day as it passes brings new vigor—new appreciation for the wonders of plain, wholesome life.

I occupy only a tiny spot in the firmament, yet my being must be marked for usefulness in the master plan, else there would not be so many of me.

I am a haven and a habitation, and my environment has also invested me with a personality through which I strive to exalt the concord of brotherhood. From me flows a force which, I am convinced, exerts a mellowing influence upon the driving lustiness of our Nation, and contributes the savor of tolerance and restraint to the distilled essence of its character.

I am the American small town—the final freehold of American liberties, and the sleepless guardian of America's unrivaled and surpassingly precious way of life.

An Outstanding Farmer Writes About the Farm Problem and Its Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. FOLEY
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1952 the total number of farms in the United States was 5,400,000. By the second quarter of 1960 this number has been reduced to 4,500,000, a loss of 900,000 farms. The net income per farm including net change in inventories in 1952 was $3,010. For the second quarter of 1960 this net income for farms is $2,640.

In 1952 prices received by farmers on all farm products was 288 percent of the 1910 to 1914 index. By July 15, 1960, the percentage had dropped to 238 percent of the same index. In 1952 prices paid by farmers on all items including interest, taxes and wage rates was 287 percent of the index. By July 15, 1960, these prices had increased to 298 percent of the 1910–14 index. Thus the prices received lowered 50 percentage points while during the same period farm prices paid increased 11 percentage points.

In talking with farmers from Maryland's Sixth District at the Montgomery County Fair at Gaithersburg during the week of August 22, 1960, various suggestions for solving the farm problem were discussed.

Mr. W. Lawson King, of Gaithersburg, is a leading dairy farmer in Maryland and the justly proud owner of the all-American champion Holstein bull for 1958 and 1959. His views on the farm problem are contained in a letter to me which I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

IRVINGTON FARM,
Gaithersburg, Md., August 29, 1960.

Congressman JOHN FOLEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FOLEY: Agriculture, which is the farmer and where he finds himself after many years of management by the Agriculture Department and foolish advice, and accepted by the Congress and Senate of the United States attempting to control production by acres, at the same time spending

millions of dollars through the colleges teaching the farmer how to produce more per acre. It has proven that the present system will not work and it seems to me that this should have been realized many years ago. The present cost of storing surplus is now running about $1,200,000 a day. This seems to me enough signal to change the entire system of control of production. My suggestion is that we either go one of two ways and I will attempt to explain my ideas in the one or two ways that I have in mind.

First, that we have full control on the basis of bushels or pounds by setting up a base on the past 5 years production of each and every farm in this great country of ours, which means full control which many of us are not strong for, but when we find ourselves in a position of spending the amount of money that is being spent to carry the cost of a program that has failed to work we have to take some rigid stand. We hear some folks say that full control would be socialist, but what could be more socialist than hoarding of grain when there are millions of people in the world starving? I do not know too much about the Bible, but I think and know that it does mention the hoarding of grain as being wrong and I would certainly think it would be wrong when there are millions of people who are undernourished and starving. If we could have a complete audit in the method and cost of storing this grain and the few that make millions, I think it would open the eyes of the Congress and Senate to take a rigid stand on this important matter.

Now, my second idea is this—to take all controls off, get rid of many of the people who are participating in the method of control that we have in effect today and let the farmers control their own production based on supply and demand and at the same time that you do this get rid of the farmers' home administration and any and all direct government lending agencies to agriculture and allow the farmer to operate his farm as he did many years ago based on supply and demand. As you know, this method will reach and hurt many people—poor farmers and those agencies that are directly working into the program that has cost all of the millions and billions of dollars.

The cost of running the Agriculture Department has been a very expensive one and more expensive in the last number of years and the years ahead to run a program that has gradually, speedily, grown worse in the cost of its functions. We spend these dollars, all to find out how many pounds of sugar and beans we eat in this country, and after we get all these records that are so costly to produce, we then do very little or nothing about it. Agriculture is a very important part of our economy. Government is a very important part of our life, but it was never intended that government support the people. It is the intent and right that the people support their Government and the cost of running the Department of Agriculture under the present program is growing more of Government supporting the farmer instead of the farmer supporting the Government.

I hope that this Congress will take the time to pass the necessary legislation to correct this contagious disease that there seems to be no cure for; I refer to the present program of agriculture. I read and from the figures of the Department of Agriculture that the farmers' net worth is very great. What has caused this? Inflation in land values caused by the purchase of land by investors and wealthy people of the world. What has this inflation in the land values meant to farmers? It has meant that they could borrow more money on the inflated values which means that the farmers today owe more money than they ever owed in dollars than at any other time in this great country of ours. The cost of operating the farms has increased and is still increasing, and the income to the farmer per unit is continuing to decline and under the present method it will continue to get worse because the farmer is fighting for more units at a lower price to realize enough income to keep him in his daily operation.

I suggest to the candidates for President that they not rely upon college professors and corporation presidents to assist in writing a bill for agriculture, that they go to the farmers who have given time and study of their situation and get the ideas from these farmers which will assist them in coming up with a workable agriculture program. Doctors do not go to lawyers when they have an ill patient; lawyers do not go to doctors to assist them in practicing law. Would you expect the president of General Foods to give ideas to assist the farmers? Check the list of 18 chosen by the President to advise him on agriculture, and the reports from them to the President, and find who was making the motions and see if they were farmers. In my opinion, this is one of the most serious responsibilities of the Senate and Congress today.

I hope that I have been of some help in suggesting to you, Mr. Congressman, to assist you in making up your mind.

Respectfully yours,

W. LAWSON KING.

Fellowship of Christian Athletes Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. SMITH

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest baseball pitchers in recent times was David "Boo" Ferriss of the Boston Red Sox. Boo Ferriss is still best known to us in Mississippi as the great schoolboy pitcher at Shaw, in spite of his later exploits in leading the Boston Red Sox to the American League pennant in 1946.

Today Boo is making a great record as athletic director at Delta State College in Cleveland, Miss. He recently outlined in a guest column in the Cleveland Bolivar Commercial the story of the Fifth Annual Fellowship of Christian Athletes Conference.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mr. Ferriss' comments on this significant movement:

(By Boo Ferriss, athletic director of Delta State College)

Pinch hitting was always one of my toughest jobs in baseball, and I find filling in for our able editor and good friend, Clif Langford, is even tougher. I am sure you join with me in wishing Clif a most successful journey, and we will be anxiously looking forward to his reports of this study mission abroad. We are proud of Clif for being chosen for this assignment, and I appreciate his asking me to pinch-hit for him.

I have just returned from Estes Park, Colo., where I was privileged to serve on the staff of the fifth annual fellowship of Christian Athletes Conference which attracted 600 high school and college athletes from every part of the country.

With the majestic snowcapped mountains of the Rockies serving as a background, the 5-day conference was one of "inspiration and perspiration" during which religion was linked vigorously and harmoniously with athletics. The youngsters rubbed shoulders with outstanding men from the world of sports and listened attentively as they told of their athletic experiences and Christ's influence on their lives. In talks and workouts the stars and coaches polished the youngsters' athletic skills, and then, in small Bible huddles or mass meetings, the stars talked on the importance of religion.

Among those on the staff of the nondenominational fellowship were: Frank Broyles, Arkansas grid coach; Bob Pettit, St. Louis Hawks pro cage star; basketball coaches Dick Harp of Kansas and Ben Carnevale of Navy; Don Lash, former Indiana U. track great; Donn Moomaw, twice UCLA All-American lineman; Bebe Lee, Kansas State athletic director; and Marvin Franklin, SMU end coach.

A large number of college athletes were in attendance, many of whom will be making headlines in the forthcoming football season. Gus Kinchen, one of the famed Chinese Bandits of LSU and student body president, told of kicking a tremendous seven yard kick after which Ole Miss went on to score at the Sugar Bowl. Encouraged by Coach Dietzel to cheer up, things could be worse, Gus cheered up, had a kick blocked and Ole Miss scored again. Kinchen told, too, what Christment to him and the LSU football team.

One of the most impressive sights was seeing these young athletes with a pair of football, basketball, or baseball shoes in one hand and a Bible in the other. A very unforgettable sight, also, was the discipline of silence following breakfast each morning when the youngsters would go alone to all parts of the conference grounds and for 30 minutes sit in quiet meditation and prayer. And you can imagine the thrill of hearing 600 male voices singing "Rise Up, O Men of God" and "Battle Hymn of the Republic."

A fine looking California high school pitcher told me the conference was the greatest thing that ever happened to him and his life now had new meaning. I am sure there were many more boys who came to realize that as Christian athletes they could have much influence in their towns, schools, and communities.

Because of the increased enrollment at the Estes Park Conference the past 4 years, a similar conference was held at Lake Geneva, Wis., August 7–12, and eight athletes from our area attended; from Cleveland, Lee Lewis, Merrill Boyd, Billy Smith-Vaniz, Wylie Hilburn, Jimmy Harden, and Bill Hunter; from Shaw, Donald Vineyard and Dump Warren.

On the Lake Geneva staff were such well known sport figures as Paul Dietzel, LSU coach; Bob Feller, former major league pitching great; Otto Graham, former pro football great; Pete Elliott, Illinois University football coach; Frank McGuire, basketball coach at North Carolina; Don Faurot, Missouri University athletic director; and Bill Easton, Kansas University track coach.

You may be interested in knowing that in 1954 a young college basketball coach, Don McClanen, of East Oklahoma A and M, was the originator of the Fellowship of Christian Athletes. "It occurred to me," McClanen once said, "That nearly everybody was capitalizing on the well-known social phenomenon of hero worship. I knew that if guys like Otto Graham, Bob Feller, and Alvin Dark told kids to eat a certain kind of cereal, the kids ate that kind of cereal. I wondered why, if sports stars could endorse breakfast foods, cigarettes, razor blades, or sportswear, they couldn't endorse Christianity."

With an undying faith and determination Don McClanen has seen his crusade become a powerful and influential fellowship. Though much of the credit for its success is his, he is quick to remind anyone that "the credit belongs to the Lord. I am merely trying to do His will."

George Sokolsky on Vincent Hallinan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON H. SCHERER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. SCHERER. Mr. Speaker, one of the lawyers representing identified Communists before the House Committee on Un-American Activities at its hearings in San Francisco was Vincent Hallinan. Mr. Hallinan engaged in a number of contemptuous outbursts against the committee during the riots which took place in connection with those hearings. In view of his record, with which the committee is familiar, it was no surprise that this gentleman was selected by the Communists as an observer at the recent Powers trial in Moscow.

George Sokolsky, in his usual effective way, clearly points up the issue in his recent column entitled, "Invitation to Hallinan":

INVITATION TO HALLINAN
(By George E. Sokolsky)

For reasons of their own, Soviet Russia invited Vincent William Hallinan, a San Francisco lawyer, to attend the trial of Francis G. Powers, the U-2 pilot. Hallinan attended as an observer. He was not asked by the Government of the United States to be an observer. For that purpose an Embassy is maintained in Moscow. Why then did the Soviet Legal Society ask this particular person?

Hallinan is not the president of the American Bar Association. He is not the dean of a distinguished law school. He is not a judge or even a particularly prominent jurist. So why was he asked?

Well, he is an American Marxist. He once said that he developed from an intellectual rebel to a Marxist-Leninist. By any definition, a man who so describes himself could be called a Communist by his own admission whether he belongs to the Communist Party or not. One of his clients was Harry Bridges whom he defended in 1949; another was Marion Bachrach, indicted under the Smith Act, in 1956. In 1952, he ran for President under the label of the Independent Progressive Party. If you do not know of this party, it is way out left. He has been on the board of directors of the Civil Rights Congress and in 1951 was vice president of the National Lawyers Guild.

So far as the Attorney General's list is concerned, he has supported the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, the California Labor School, the Northern California Committee for the Protection of Foreign Born, and the Committee to Secure Justice in the Rosenberg case.

So the Russians regard him as a suitable American observer. Out of the thousands of American lawyers, they pick this one to return to this country to say that everything they, the Russians, have done is perfect. Actually, they have had experience with Hallinan. He toured Europe in 1959 and issued a statement from Moscow to the effect that he had visited a Russian jail and that the Russian prison system is far superior to that of the United States.

In this, Hallinan is not altogether without intimate knowledge. In 1952, he served 6 months in McNeil Island Federal Penitentiary for contempt of court which arose out of the Bridges trial. In 1954–55, he served 18 months for income tax evasion as a result of which he was suspended from practice for 3 years. He resumed legal practice in March 1960.

This then is the needle in the haystack that Soviet Russia found to invite to Moscow as the American observer in the Powers case. If there was to be an American observer, custom and decency require that such an invitation be extended to the Government of the United States. Then the Government could, if it wished to send a lawyer, request the Department of Justice to select a learned jurist, a man of distinction, to attend the trial. The likelihood is that somebody from the embassy would have attended officially. But Soviet Russia picked this lawyer who had once been suspended from practice, who had twice been imprisoned, to represent the United States.

Now presumably Vincent William Hallinan will return to the United States to engage in propagandistic speeches on behalf of Soviet jurisprudence. He will undoubtedly pose as an expert on Soviet law and American espionage and will condemn the Pentagon and the CIA. And there will undoubtedly be women's clubs that will pay a fee to listen to intimate talks on this subject. It is amazing how many so-called Americans have suddenly become experts on Soviet Russia and how many of them travel about the country praising the ways of life of the bitterest foe we have had in our history.

U.S. Senator Spessard Holland, Florida, Wins Great Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the city of Long Beach, Calif., recently held a civic testimonial in honor of Florida's Senator, SPESSARD HOLLAND. Does it strike you as unusual that the people of California honor the distinguished U.S. Senator from Florida?

Not at all, they have good cause, as do the people of Florida and all America.

Mr. Speaker, I could not have this Congress close without again calling to the attention of my colleagues a significant and important contribution by Florida's distinguished and able senior Senator, the Honorable SPESSARD HOLLAND. His participation and leadership in a momentous task has culminated in the recent ruling of the Supreme Court of the United States applying the Submerged Lands Act to the State of Florida. This ruling confirms Florida's claim to all property rights to a distance of 3 marine leagues in the Gulf of Mexico, off the mainland of Florida.

Not only has Senator HOLLAND had to carry on his many duties in the U.S. Senate, but since 1951, he has had a primary responsibility in the tidelands dispute, which affects many of our States. His most recent effort was joining in the argument before the U.S. Supreme Court. The case was so brilliantly and convincingly presented that it resulted in a 6 to 1 decision. In this matter, Senator HOLLAND has gone far beyond his duty as a U.S. Senator. He has fought for and supported, in and out of the Senate, a cause born of deep conviction—the cause of States' rights. In these days of claims of centralized government, it is especially noteworthy that in a case of this magnitude, the U.S. Supreme Court has recognized the proprietory authority of the State of Florida over these marine lands. The Court's decision not only settled oil and gas rights, but the citizens' rights in construction, extension of lands, conservation, use of sand and gravel, and other still unknown and potential rights in the use of the sea.

The affirmation of these rights are important in themselves. There is, however, greater pride for all of us in recognizing and realizing that this long, persistent effort on the part of Florida's great Senator took courage, determination, ability, and qualities of leadership which can only be claimed by few Americans. U.S. Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, senior Senator from Florida, has carved a rightful place in American history with this most recent success in a long and distinguished public career.

After this session, Senator HOLLAND will return to Florida for this year's presidential campaign. Nothing less than a hero's welcome should be awaiting him.

Decision for the Democrats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEVEN B. DEROUNIAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. DEROUNIAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that there be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial that appeared in the Washington Evening Star on August 27, 1960. The editorial discusses a clumsy situation created by overanxious members of the Democratic Party. This has been apparent to the American people and it is also clear that now the Democratic Party is faced with a decision to be made because they cannot have it both ways:

CAN'T HAVE IT BOTH WAYS

Efforts of some Democrats to make political capital out of President Eisenhower's press conference comments on Vice President NIXON's advisory role in the administration are confusing, to say the least. The net effect has been to put those indulging in such disingenuousness in the rather absurd position of arguing against their own arguments.

In the first place, we do not recall that the Vice President ever has claimed that he shared in the decisionmaking responsibilities of the Chief Executive. On the contrary, Mr. NIXON has made it plain in the past—and has reaffirmed it in a television interview following the President's press conference—that his role in the Cabinet and National Security Council meetings has been solely of a consultative and advisory nature. However, the Vice President's attendance at these meetings certainly has provided him with an invaluable background of knowledge and experience that should be of great benefit to him if he were to become President of the United States.

In the second place, the glee with which some Democratic spokesmen have greeted Mr. Eisenhower's assertion that he alone makes administrative decisions is hard to understand, in view of Democratic attempts to saddle Candidate NIXON with some responsibility for the Eisenhower administration's farm policies, defense "shortcomings" and other alleged Republican failures. Their real target ought to be President Eisenhower himself—but apparently the present strategy is to go easy on Mr. Eisenhower. Too many people still like Ike.

But if the Democrats want to blame Mr. NIXON for what they regard as basic faults of the Republican administration, then they can ill afford at the same time to belittle the role of the Vice President in the councils of state held under the Eisenhower regime. Contrariwise, if the Democratic pitch is to be that Mr. NIXON has been in no position to gain either valuable knowledge or experience in the Government, any charge that he is even partly responsibile for so-called Republican bungling in domestic or international fields will have an exceedingly hollow ring. The Democrats just can't have it both ways.

Example of Unnecessary Secrecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on August 21, 1960, an article by Allen M. Smythe, a financial writer, that illustrated the problem the press faces in getting information from the executive branch. Mr. Smythe's story dealt with an attempt to present full coverage of the cost of jet aircraft engines.

The significance of Mr. Smythe's story is that after he was initially refused the simple information of how much the Government paid for jet engines, he appealed to the House Government Information Subcommittee to assist him. As soon as the subcommitee made inquiry, the Department of the Navy reversed itself and released the information. It now appears, however, that only part of the information was released and so, apparently, we must go through the procedure again. Because of the significance of the subject matter of Mr. Smythe's story, as well as the information problem involved, I believe that the Members of the House would be interested in having his story available:

AIRBORNE ALERT COSTS ASTOUND CONGRESSMEN

(By Allen M. Smythe)

With international tensions becoming more irritating and Soviet diplomatic activitives more "truculent," congressional attention is being directed once more toward this Nation's airborne alert plans. These are for a continuous alert of our B–52 heavy bombers, a partial alert for the same, and the "standby" alert which is now being prepared.

Credulous members of House fiscal groups learned that a partial airborne alert for 10 wings of eight sorties might cost the taxpayers $800 million a year. Their curiosity led them to examine detailed costs. As a result, they have coined such phrases as "bejeweled powerplants" and "diamond-studded jets."

Continuous flying of heavy bombers does not wear out the airframe. The need is for spare engines, extra engine parts and an occasional landing gear.

Representative GERALD FORD, Republican, of Michigan, member of the powerful House Appropriations Committee, recently complained that "some of those little rods that are jet engine parts cost the taxpayer more than a new automobile engine."

Through some archaic regulation the Air Force must buy their J–57 jet engines used in the eight-engined B–52 bombers through Navy procurement channels. These Navy officers have consistently refused to release any prices on these engines because of the "proprietary rights" of the engine builder.

Under prodding from the Moss Government Information Committee, Under Secretary Fred A. Bantz, reversed the former Navy policy and wrote the Moss group that "prices paid by the Government for Pratt & Whitney engines" would be released.

However, only a small partial release has been made. The Air Force has given out all prices on the General Electric J–79 jet engine.

The J–57 jet engine made by Pratt & Whitney has been the workhorse for military aircraft for 10 years. It is now considered obsolete. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been spent on its development, improvement, and modification. The Navy refuses to give exact figures but some officials estimate that the Navy has spent $6 billion on this engine. Others say this amount is one-third too small.

The Navy has an inventory of 2,000 J–57's. The Air Force has 15,000. The last production order for Navy use had a unit price of $195,000. Some production orders have cost over $300,000. The Air Force reimbursed the Navy $226,000 for each of the engines used for the F model of their B–52 bomber. The engines used on the latest H model cost $192,000 each.

Spare parts for these engines add at least 30 percent to these costs. For arctic or desert use this may be raised to 110 percent.

A commercial version of this engine that is slightly heavier and much more reliable and which is mounted in the Douglas DC–8 jet airliner costs $154,000. This cost includes the modifications. Commercial airliners must have engines that can stand continuous use, while military aircraft engines stress lightness, fast climbing, and high ceilings.

The new, lighter, and more powerful General Electric J–79 jet engine is scheduled to propel most new military aircraft. Only 1,400 have been built and the production cost is around $275,000 each. Two Navy versions cost $310,000 and $340,000. Air Force officials believe this cost will be reduced drastically if and when production reaches the 4,000 mark.

Use of these powerplants in commercial airliners is being encouraged so that overall production costs can be reduced. A commercial version of the J–79 is used in the Convair medium-range 880 airliner at a cost of $164,500 each. The long-range Convair 600 mounts a turbo-fan model with an increase of $35,000 in price.

Hon. Paul Brown

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK E. SMITH
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. SMITH of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, one of the sad occasions of this session of the Congress is the realization that PAUL BROWN of Georgia, will not be with us in the coming year. He is going on to a well-earned retirement, but we in the Congress who have benefited from his leadership and advice will sorely miss him.

PAUL BROWN's career is in the best tradition of a southern statesman. He has stoutly defended the way of life of his people, and at the same time has lent his full contribution to progress for all the people of our country. PAUL BROWN is always a gentleman, fully understanding of the viewpoints of others, while stanch in his own convictions. I know that the people of Georgia, whom he has served so well, share the love and affection for him felt by all the Members of the House of Representatives.

Our American Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Harry H. Schlacht which appeared Friday, August 26, 1960, in the East Side News, a publication with wide circulation in the 19th Congressional District of New York:

OUR AMERICAN HERITAGE

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Wherein lies the greatness of America? Because it is the home of liberty. Because it is the last refuge of free men under God. Because it is the place where we are privileged to utter the three precious words: "I Am Free."

The sturdy quality of our early American leadership was born of prayers and fellowship with God.

We can tread the earth upright and measure with the power of our brain and the sinew of our strength with our fellowman. We have a government which we help to make and an opportunity which we help to create. We are neither serf nor slave. We are free Americans.

Our future lies with those who will tear assunder the shackles of slavery and reassert their faith in man's dignity. Proud of the power of our country, we can be prouder still of our unflinching defense of the rights of man.

Our light of liberty took fire in the resurgent blessings of the teachings of the Sermon on the Mount. Our light of liberty has been kept burning through the blood baths of the years.

The anvil upon which our liberty was fashioned was a hard anvil. Its ring, when struck, was a ring of justice. Mighty hands and sinews of a superior strength struck against its hard surface before our liberty took shape and man became free.

The altar of man's liberty is the mountain of his hope. The altar stone of man's liberty has been sanctified by America's deathless dead.

It was here in America that man rose to the full height of his freedom. It was here in America that the dignity of God put about man the rich garment of the sonhood of God.

So long as truth prevails over falsehood, the foundation of our nation will be secure. The strength of America rests on the proposition that its people shall know that truth shall make them free.

Today there are traitors in our midst, who would sell their American birthright for a mess of Communistic sabotage.

There vile creatures are supporting a poisonous communistic philosophy which seeks the complete destruction of our moral, spiritual, economic and governmental ideologies.

Communism is born of deceit, avarice and lust. It is seeking complete domination over the lives, the thoughts, the hearts and prayers of the citizens of every nation on earth.

It would take the glory of his God from the Jew. It would take the Cross from the Christian. Once religion is destroyed, Communism is ready for its coup de grace.

The common man will find himself expendable in a labor camp or on a battlefield, or wherever the ruthless communistic leaders may wish to bring about his liquidation.

We will guard our precious American heritage. We will defend our precious American democracy. We will retain our precious system of free enterprise and man's right to work and live beneath the sun as a free individual.

Liberty will supplant slavery. Justice will supplant injustice. Democracy will uproot tyranny. Let us keep the ideals of our blessed forefathers alive and our democracy will always flourish.

Washington's Newspapers Deserve Praise in Handling Racial Listings in Real Estate Advertisements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that this month Washington's three daily newspapers—the Post and Times Herald, the Star, and the News—have abandoned the use of racial designations in real estate advertising.

Almost a year ago, on September 11, 1959, I introduced H.R. 9209, which would have prohibited newspapers in the District of Columbia from using racial designations in listing houses for sale or lease. In introducing the bill, I said—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 19, 1959, page 17603:

Some people may cry that this is an attempt to withhold information. It is nothing of the sort. It is an attempt to curb deceptive advertising. An examination of houses designated as "colored" in these ads will show that very often they are in neighborhoods still predominantly white. The ads falsely suggest to homeseekers who do not know the city that the houses are in a Negro neighborhood. Such designations act as a traffic signal, diverting white homebuyers to one section of the city and colored homebuyers to another. As a result, they are an obstacle to any attempt to stabilize these changing neighborhoods as integrated neighborhoods. Worse than that, the designations are used by some unscrupulous real estate dealers to "break" blocks, stir panic selling, and perpetuate and extend segregated neighborhoods. Deceptive advertising and racial zoning is not the proper business of newspapers.

I regret to say that an example of a Federal area that continues this harmful practice is our Nation's Capital. The three major newspapers of the District of Columbia continue to list real estate by race, and show no disposition to examine the social and economic consequences of the practice. They have been listing houses by race for years and, though it is evident that the practice is a powerful force in creating racial ghettoes, the papers seem bent upon keeping things the way they are. This is the result, I believe, of inertia, not of any careful consideration of what their advertising practices do. Because the welfare of this city and other Federal districts is entrusted to Congress, I believe we must take action in this matter.

The need for action to achieve the national goal of equal opportunity in housing was emphasized in the report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, which we received this week. My bill will materially aid this objective. I hope it will be promptly enacted."

A recent statement by the American Veterans Committee, through J. Arnold Feldman, its executive director, commended the three Washington papers for their forward-looking step. Mr. Feldman's statement reads in part as follows:

These racial designations in real estate ads have been an insidious influence in fostering racial segregation, racial ghettos, and racial tensions. Their elimination will greatly benefit the growth, welfare and stability of Washington's neighborhoods. The Washington newspapers have, by this change in policy, come into step with the newspapers in many other cities which no longer use such racial labels. Among these cities are Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, Pittsburgh, Sacramento, Indianapolis, San Francisco, and others. Two States (Oregon and Colorado) recently enacted statutes prohibiting racial designations in real estate ads.

It is our understanding that the newspapers will permit reference to race in ads for rental of apartments and furnished rooms; but we further understand that such references will not be placed at the top of the ad, that the ads will not be grouped by race, and that racial references will not be compulsory, but will be included only upon the specific request of the advertiser.

The new policy represents a great step forward in eliminating a substantial stimulus to racial discrimination.

The three Washington daily newspapers deserve praise for their forward-looking action.

Hon. Edward H. Rees

SPEECH

OF

HON. JOHN YOUNG

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I have learned of the impending retirement of my distinguished colleague and friend, EDWARD H. REES.

I had the honor of serving with the gentleman from Kansas, Congressman REES, as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. EDWARD REES made a lasting impression on me as a man completely devoted to the trust the good people of Kansas placed in him, a man of integrity and the highest character. He shall be greatly missed as my colleague and friend. I want to take this opportunity to wish him the greatest of good fortune and good health in the years to come.

Money and the Platforms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT H. BOSCH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BOSCH. Mr. Speaker, much study and thought is now being given to the platforms of the Republican and Democratic Parties. Under leave to extend by remarks, I include an article by Dr. Charles A. Tonsor, Queens County, N.Y., which appeared in the August 25, 1960, edition of the Ridgewood Times. Dr. Tonsor's article points out the necessity for a sound dollar and the failure of the Democratic Platform to meet this necessity. I commend this very lucid explanation of the situation to my colleagues:

MONEY AND THE PLATFORMS

(By Dr. Charles A. Tonsor)

The Democratic platform reads: "As a first step in speeding economic growth, a Democratic President will put an end to the present tight-money policy." The pertinent question is, how?

Interest rates are determined not by the President but by an independent Federal Reserve System, a bankers' bank created under the Presidency of Woodrow Wilson and spearheaded by Carter Glass, Senator from Virginia. The President has no control over this system nor has Congress; the latter only to abolish or amend the act creating it.

The Federal Reserve System was created to stabilize our monetary system. Prior to its creation we had "money" panics every so often because money was plentiful in some places and scarce in others, or because overspeculation had used up money in ways that hindered rather than helped the economy.

The Federal Reserve System was designed to smooth out these peaks and depressions and thus keep our economy on even keel; and it has been doing just that.

How does it do that? By making money tight when too much is demanded for speculation and easy when not enough is demanded to make things go. At once it is apparent that the business situation and not the President or the Governors of the Federal Reserve System are responsible for tight or easy money.

When the demand for money exceeds the visible supply, it forces the System to increase money rates, i.e. interest, to decrease the demand. When the supply exceeds the demand, it decreases interest rates to stimulate demand.

In addition to the interest rate, the System seeks to increase or decrease the supply of money through the sale or purchase of bills or trade acceptances in the open market. Bankers loan money on bills. When they have loaned all they can and need more money, they take these bills to the Federal Reserve System and discount them, i.e. re-

ceive money for them at the prevailing rediscount (interest) rate.

When the System enters the open market, its purchase of bills decreases the supply, hence supports the price level. When it sells, it increases the supply, hence again supports the level. How is a President to interfere with this?

Business conditions and not the action of the System determine what is to be done.

The Republican platform in this writer's opinion, is more in line with economic commonsense. It guarantees the use of the full powers of the Government to prevent the scourges of inflation and depression and the maintenance of a stable dollar as an indispensable means of progress. Inflation is entirely under the control of the administration.

If it takes no heed to balancing the budget it will bring on inflation. We are witnessing that in Cuba now; the inflation must ultimately result in runaway inflation if the printing press is called upon to produce the difference between income and outgo, just as is now happening in Cuba with its $300 billion of printing press money at the moment.

The Democrats have not mentioned the sound dollar, but unless they keep the dollar sound, they could bring on a bigger depression than that of 1929. What is a sound dollar? One that is based on gold, a medium of exchange that has universal acceptance.

The currencies of the world that are strong are based on gold * * * gold which is deposited at Fort Knox because the country's currency is tied to ours, because ours at the time was the soundest in the world.

From many points of view, what either Democrats or Republicans will do about the dollar depends on what the world situation forces them to do. With the bulk of the free world's money reserves held here in the United States in U.S. dollars, we can no more afford to abandon the soundness of our currency than we can afford to abandon the efficiency of our military defenses.

Gold has been leaving the country causing some to keep a sharp eye on the situation. The reason may be that other nations have recovered from the shock of World War II and are playing a more constructive role in the world economy.

If, however, the outflow is a result of loss of confidence in the dollar by foreign governments and central banks, we are headed for trouble that the Democratic platform may intensify. That this may be true to some extent is shown by the fact that the flight from the dollar, or foreigners cashing in short-term dollar investments in the United States to get back gold, occurred when our budgetary deficit was largest. The Republican platform seems to meet this situation by its control of inflation.

In any event, no matter what the rhetoric of the platforms, we must have sound money or else.

American Athletes at the Olympics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I think we should stop for a moment to reflect on the marvelous achievements of our American athletes at the Olympic games in Rome. Daily reports of the excellent performances of these young men and women pay tribute to them for the years of arduous training and effort they have put in to achieve the very highest level in athletic prowess.

But amidst these marvelous feats of athletic accomplishments the greatest tribute we can pay to these youngsters is to focus attention on them as representatives of American youth. It was with a great sense of warmth and pride that I read the accounts of the tremendous welcome that was given to our standard bearers when the team entered the Olympic Stadium. The accounts clearly dispel some of the reports we sometimes hear about the regard in which Americans are held abroad. The tumult of 100,000 unrestrained cheers of persons from all nations when the bearers of the Stars and Stripes entered the stadium justifies our confidence and support of these outstanding young Americans. They represent the finest in American traditions and more so they are among our best missionaries for good will. I salute them and I ask my colleagues to join with me in wishing them well.

A New and Great Opportunity for Our Country and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL K. INOUYE
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. Speaker, it is quite evident that this Congress and our Nation as a whole has become acutely aware of world tensions and the pressing need to alleviate and, preferably, to eliminate these tensions through bold and perhaps new approaches. As has often been said, there is a need to reach, directly, the people of the rest of the world rather than merely concerning ourselves principally with government. This idea is encompassed in the establishment, recently, of the Center for Cultural and Technical Interchange Between East and West in Hawaii.

I have this date introduced in this House a bill to complement the intent and purpose of the East-West Center; namely, that of bringing better understanding between our country and those countries on the Pacific basin. My bill would help in this respect by stressing the development of trade and interchange of the products of the Pacific cultures to the primary objectives of sound economics and world peace through the establishment of a trade center in Hawaii. Its effect and operations are better explained by Mr. Lorrin P. Thurston, publisher of the Honolulu Advertiser, in his talk to the Social Science Association of Hawaii on June 6, 1960, entitled "A New and Great Opportunity for Our Country and Hawaii."

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I respectfully commend Mr. Thurston's speech to the attention of my colleagues:

A NEW AND GREAT OPPORTUNITY FOR OUR COUNTRY AND FOR HAWAII

(Presented before the Social Science Association of Hawaii, June 6, 1960, by Lorrin P. Thurston, publisher, Honolulu Advertiser)

I will attempt to draw for you tonight a word picture of what I believe is a new and great opportunity for our country to make real friends throughout the Pacific and for Hawaii to enjoy greatly increased prestige, business, and travel as a byproduct.

My chain of thought was started some 10 years ago when the amazing success which has attended the building of International House in New Orleans, first came to my attention.

Because of Frank D. Roosevelt's desire to build our South American good-neighbor policy, forward-looking businessmen in the city of New Orleans decided that with enthusiasm, cooperation, and with some of their own hard-earned cash—they might accomplish quite a bit of value to their city and themselves by increasing the tonnage of freight flowing through their port, both incoming and outgoing.

And so what they chose to call International House was founded at a cost of about $3 million.

It was decided that the services which International House could render should be in three divisions—and that they should be developed simultaneously.

First, they took over an entire office building, wherein all of the consulates and their official staffs were quartered and business offices for transient importers and exporters were provided. They made available bi- or multi-lingual secretaries to any who needed them. They provided private dining and meeting rooms—featuring excellent food—plus a large dining and meeting hall, suitable for official dinners. There were made available limited hotel facilities for foreign businessmen and everything provided for their comfort, on a cost basis.

An International House staff was organized to help visiting businessmen contact American distributors, set up meetings with potential buyers, help South American businessmen with their displays in the Merchandise Mart, and generally acted as if they were on the personal payroll of these visiting or interested merchants.

Second, they established a 10-story Merchandise Mart. With growing official interest, an enthusiastic staff was recruited, which next visited the businessmen of the Caribbean and all South American countries, urging upon them the maintenance of continuous displays of their products in the ideal surroundings provided and to use the staff of International House to build up their American business in every possible way.

Finally, they enlisted the cooperation of the U.S. Government and their own Louisiana State government, who turned over to International House a small island in the Mississippi River, easily guarded and with good warehouses for use as a bonded and free port area, where foreign merchandise could be stored, pending sale—or completed and stored, until sold—when normal customs duties would be paid; or where goods could be returned without customs duty to port of origin—if they proved unsalable in the American market.

With these three departments of physical plant completed the staff then really went to work. Their list of exhibitors grew steadily. More and more merchants had the free services of International House brought to their attention. Suspicions were undermined—sales were accomplished and business really started to flow through the port of New Orleans.

I visited International House in 1951, curious to know what made it work, and I found out in a hurry. Enthusiasm and the ideal of helpful service.

International House had as its principal objective helping foreign businessmen to expand their sales within the United States and at the same time they helped exporters of the United States to find sales outlets, banking facilities, personnel, etc. with which to man their offices in these same foreign countries, overcoming the language barriers, the redtape of customs barriers, the delays of consular visas, etc.

It was indeed a two-way street. Ocean shipping tonnage jumped by leaps and bounds—until in the space of a few short years, New Orleans has risen from 17th to 2d—second only to New York as a port of entry to the United States.

International House is now going through its second major expansion and Mr. George Chaplin, present editor of the Advertiser—who was one of its directors for 8 years and is here tonight as one of my guests—told me that the raising of $9 million for their new plant was accomplished last year with much less difficulty than their first plant. International House had truly benefited those who used it.

And so this idea—not new—but tried, tested, and proven came to me—why shouldn't the U.S. Government—in continuous quest for ways of winning friends and influencing people in the entire Pacific area—become the sponsor of a Pacific International House capitalizing on every proven function of its New Orleans counterpart, but enlarging materially the scope of the services to be rendered?

Here in our front yard, we have an unused, priceless asset, Sand Island—with an area of nearly 700 acres, with no permanent buildings of any kind which would have to be demolished, with deepwater shipping facilities, easily policed and guarded, with its own sand beach, situated about halfway between the International Airport and Waikiki, easily accessable to the business offices of Hawaii, and to U.S. and State Government offices, and to thousands of American tourists. A visit to this merchandise mart could be made a must.

Why not go a step farther than International House in New Orleans and set up Sand Island by U.S. Government and State proclamation and deed as extra-territorial land—a gift of the Federal and the State Government to the countries and businessmen of the Pacific, to be owned and administered by them, just as the United Nations Building and land area is in New York?

Set up a complete duplicate of the New Orleans type of service, but go much further by having the permanent merchandise displays as complete as possible from every country—giving all of the space that each industry of every country involved felt was of practical value—a gift of our Government—with the sole purpose of helping the businessmen of the Pacific—to help themselves and increase their business.

Why not invite the architects of each country to design the buildings to house their own country's displays—work out the vast floor space necessary and tie in their plans and suggestions with our own Nations architects—to work out a truly unique and permanent trade and cultural center?

Why not centralize all of the consular offices and our own Government passport offices on one convenient floor in the new office building, and then undertake another step that no one has undertaken before?

In the vast area, dedicated to the service of the businessmen of the Pacific, set up an East-West cultural and educational center, even as that which is now being backed actively in the present session of Congress.

Establish schools where foreign students to the United States could have an indoctrination training course for a year, learning American customs, dress, manners, language, slang.

In Hawaii's atmosphere of tolerance and understanding, with many representatives of their country's industries constantly available for friendly council and advice, I believe wonders could be accomplished.

Then let these students go on to the American colleges of their choice, better equipped, in every way, to capitalize on their great opportunity.

And side by side with them, have indoctrination courses setup in reverse, teaching the language, customs, history, and backgrounds of the countries of the Pacific under the finest teachers available, where representatives of our Government, or of the businesses of America, who wish to work in the countries of the Pacific could secure their own indoctrination and training so that they would not have to go out as untrained "ugly Americans."

Provide for these east- and west-bound students, the finest library that each country, involved, could contribute. Have it the center of knowledge of the entire Pacific area, with new worthwhile books being constantly added, until its library should become world famous.

And for the businessmen of the countries of the Pacific who would come here to supervise the sales of their products and learn how to design products with greater sales value, and for the buyers from America and the rest of the eastern world, build a 5- or 600-room hotel where they could be given every courtesy and service which would be helpful, where they could entertain buyers or their opposite members from America's businessmen.

And to further stimulate trade understanding and friendship, provide a really complete convention hall, to seat 5,000 people, air conditioned and with the finest staff of bilingual translators and headphones available, so that speeches in Chinese, Japanese or any language, could be brought to all listeners—translated instantaneously into the language they know best.

A convention department should be established to stimulate conventions at the center, each month of the year, giving businessmen from the East the opportunity of meeting with businessmen or students, scholars, scientists, doctors, geophysicists, bankers, manufacturers or what have you from the West, to hold their meetings under the most ideal circumstances an intelligent sincere management could provide.

Another staff project should be to see that ever-changing new merchandise was made available for display and sale—sale, not in the trade center, but through established business houses in Honolulu.

These displays and conventions should be constantly publicized throughout the press and trade journals of America in paid and in free space, and such similar sources as would be most helpful in each Pacific country.

The operating staff should also have ample funds—again Government supplied—at least for 10 years or until a fair amount of time has passed to prove the value of the project, funds which would enable them to travel whenever and wherever was necessary to carry on the vast publicity activity which would bring Pacific International House and its services constantly to the attention of businessmen who could profit by using it.

There would also have to be homes and recreation facilities on the island for the permanent business staffs who would be assigned there for duty, in the offices and exhibits, and possibly even schools for their children.

And in the third area of service there should be a free port and bonded warehouse area where merchandise could be stored for filling orders; where unfinished goods could be completed and then released for sale with duty only then being applicable.

I cannot help but visualize the absolute electric effect in Japan, for example, if our Ambassador, at the request of the President, were to go before the Diet of Japan or its modern equivalent and extend this invitation to the leaders of every business in Japan to get together, organize and plan with their own leaders and architects just how much space they needed to adequately and with beauty and dignity, display the products they are making, all at the expense of the U.S. Government.

Every businessman would get into the act. He would want his industry to be well represented. If his business prospered he could not help but be grateful and friendly to a nation that for the first time in history would not try to tell him how to do the things he knows best, but help him to display, improve, and sell them.

The businessmen of the Pacific area with whom I have discussed this idea have been unanimous in their instantaneous approval. Their common reaction has been a "what can I do to help? It is a wonderful idea which would do a great deal of good."

And what would Hawaii get as a byproduct of this activity in all of its ramifications?

I believe Hawaii would become the very hub of business in the entire Pacific area. Thousands of buyers and sellers would meet here, halfway between the Orient and Washington—each saving in time and in travel expense.

For students and those in the cultural center it would give a background and environment of many of their own people, constantly coming and going, which would be most important to them. To our American businessmen it would give them an opportunity to get their representatives' own feet wet in the ways of the countries of the Pacific before they were turned loose and put on their own.

To the participants and representatives of businesses who would be manning the displays, the offices, and handling conventions, it would give an unparalleled opportunity to rub shoulders and work in friendship with people from other Pacific countries and build lasting friendships which could not help but aid the cause of peace, mutual trust, and understanding.

The merchandise mart would be of outstanding interest to every tourist visiting Hawaii. It could be made as much of a must as the trip through Pearl Harbor.

Some years ago I learned that in the dreams of our State road planning department it had been suggested that Ala Moana Boulevard should be diverted out by pier 1, thence under the harbor by tunnel to Sand Island, thence on to the International Airport, bypassing the entire downtown business area.

If our State capitol could be placed on the Kewalo side of the harbor entrance and Pacific International House, with all of its ramifications, built on Sand Island side, what a splendid front door the State of Hawaii would have.

And the cost? What would it be? I would say perhaps $90 million for the original plant, with $10 million a year for complete operating expenses, plus whatever additional cost would come as a byproduct of the Cultural Center's costs.

Too much, you will say? Well, bear in mind that we are spending $3,200 million today of your money and mine for foreign aid, arms, and propaganda. Would one-third of 1 percent of this vast sum the first year, for plant, and one twenty-seventh of 1 percent thereafter be too much? I do not think so.

And, finally, what has been done about this fantastic dream to help possibly bring it to reality?

During my last five visits to Washington, in the closing 2 years of the statehood campaign, I talked continuously about Pacific International House.

First, I tried it out on Secretary Seaton, of Interior. He asked that I write him a memo on the whole concept, which I did. His reaction was that it was novel and certainly a worthy field of endeavor on a national scale, which had never been tried; then on two occasions, I discussed its possibilities with Vice President NIXON, who got the picture immediately, because he is completely aware of the great success and contribution that International House in New Orleans has made to our business and friendly relations in the Caribbean and throughout South America.

And to Colonel Gray, permanent Secretary of the Cabinet, Senator Pat McCarran of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, who is most enthusiastic, and indirectly to the President who reportedly said it was certainly worthy of study; and by Seaton with Secretary Dulles, then Secretary Herter who liked it, but as in the case of the East-West Cultural Center, did nothing; and to Robert Close, president of General Dynamics Corp. at his request.

I have discussed it with Senators LONG and FONG and DANIEL INOUYE. LONG said he felt it epitomized the role which Hawaii could and should play in the Pacific area—that it should be done before Sand Island is lost for all time to routine business development.

And to Jack Burns, who now feels that he indeed is the father of the idea, and before a confidential group of 16 corporation presidents in New York, through the invitation of Sam Pryor, vice president of Pan American, who strongly backs the whole concept.

The idea has been expressed by one astute political observer, that a local committee should be gotten together, that the hat should be passed, that the Governor, legislature, chambers of commerce, etc., should be worked on. To me, however, it seems as if the idea, of real national importance, should be sufficiently worthwhile that the State Department or those in it, who have so much to say regarding our foreign policy, should seize upon the idea and boost it.

Well, that has not happened. I would hate to get the project into a pork barrel realm, where Los Angeles, San Francisco, Seattle, or others might immediately want to get their feet into the trough, and claim that theirs was the gateway to the Orient; that if that kind of money were to be spent they want it for their city.

Backers of the East-West Cultural Center have done splendid work. I believe that before the present session of Congress adjourns they may be successful in securing an appropriation of the necessary funds with which to go ahead.

While present plans call for the center being built on University of Hawaii lands even this could be restudied if the Sand Island project could be moved ahead.

The angle which I am perhaps too naive or inexperienced politically to understand, is "why shouldn't our State Department take a good look at this whole suggestion and back it wholeheartedly, if they believe in it?" Why should we, as citizens, have to do all the many things the proponents of the Cultural Center are having to do—to try and get Congress to act?

Why can't the State Department, with vast sums at their disposal, take the lead? Why the hesitation and lukewarm support, when they know the Russians have seized upon the idea of the Cultural Center and have already appropriated the money, and have a vast foreign students training program in operation while we are still fighting for action.

FONG, LONG, and INOUYE are heading the fight for the Cultural Center, but it should be the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate as a whole who should be taking the leadership, backed up by the State Department itself.

There is no chance of Pacific International House making any progress in the present session of Congress—but the idea will be just as worthwhile next year, as it is now. Perhaps even more so.

My greatest fear is that with the ever greater need for industrial land, Sand Island, which is the finest possible location for such an undertaking, will be lost to uses which, while important to our own economy, cannot compare with its use as the permanent site of Pacific International House.

Here is another angle which should be considered.

I know that even now airlines are planning direct flights to all parts of the Pacific, on a nonstop basis from principal mainland cities. The time is not too far ahead when thousands of transpacific travelers will be flying over us.

Already Gander in Newfoundland and Shannon in Ireland are being bypassed by transatlantic flights. They are precedents for what we can perhaps expect here in Hawaii.

Possibly we of Hawaii must assist in furnishing reasons why people should stop in Hawaii. Perhaps if we do not see ahead far enough, we are going to lose out in many ways as far as the development of the Pacific area is concerned and Hawaii may lose out on even its present ability to act as a catalytic agent for the creation of friendship and understanding between Americans and the peoples of the Pacific.

From 1945 until 1959 I devoted a large part of my time to the chamber of commerce, Hawaii Visitors Bureau, Pacific Area Travel Association, broadening our tourist travel to the neighbor islands, and the cause of statehood.

I haven't the time at this point, to drop all else and devote my energies to trying to put this idea over, but if any of the members of this venerable association have suggestions as to how and why Pacific International House can be brought about, I'm certainly willing to listen. I hope the plan has enough merit not to die unborn.

Hon. Edward H. Rees

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, it has been for me a prime personal pleasure and privilege to have had the acquaintanceship of the Honorable EDWARD REES of Kansas.

During the 9 years I have been in Congress, I have known ED REES to be generous and expert in his counsel on legislative matters, and with it all he was extremely kind and thoughtful.

He has been a truly devoted servant to his district, State, and Nation, just as he has been a key figure in the House of Representatives.

ED has been a distinguished member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and his record in this area is replete with efforts directed toward sound legislation designed to create efficient Government service and provide just rewards for Government employees.

By all standards ED REES has well earned the comforts of a less strenuous life, but his personal gain will prove a loss to the House of Representatives.

Mrs. McIntire joins with me in extending to ED and Mrs. Rees our warmest and best wishes for health and happiness in their many years that lie ahead.

Col. James Gaynor, U.S. Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago a fellow Hoosier was assigned to the Office of Legislative Liaison, Department of the Army, as Chief of the Legislative Division. He has done a superior job in this assignment and has earned the respect of all who have had association with him in this job. No man could have served the Army better in this assignment which has been extremely difficult at times; and his fair, kind, and efficient handling of those problems with which he was confronted has added to the prestige of the Army.

It is no accident that Col. James K. "Jim" Gaynor has done an outstanding job, for he has always performed in that manner. During two of the years that he attended Indiana University he was managing editor of the Star-Courier, where he was highly regarded by all who had contact with him. He holds B.S. and J.D. degrees from Indiana University and LL.M. and S.J.D. from George Washington University. He is accomplished in the world of sports and was an accredited umpire in following leagues: Arkansas State League, Nebraska State League, Western Association, North Carolina State League, Northern New York-Vermont League, Pennsylvania-Ontario-New York League, Three-I League, American Legion Junior National Finals at Omaha, Detroit, Denver, and Miami.

Colonel Gaynor has had a distinguished military career which included a tour as judge advocate of the Ryukyus Command in Okinawa.

Colonel Gaynor has written many outstanding legal articles, the latest of which is his book "The Army and the Congress," soon to be published, which is very informative and challenging.

We are happy that, although Colonel Gaynor is leaving his present assignment, he will still remain in Washington as a member of the board of review of the Office of the Judge Advocate General. Capitol Hill, especially those of us from Indiana, wish Colonel Gaynor the best.

Suicide, Like Blasphemy, Is Intrinsically Evil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, by now all of us have heard and read literally thousands of words concerning the ill-famed U–2 incident. From the actual flight through the collapse of the summit meeting in Paris and the cancellation of Mr. Eisenhower's invitation to visit Russia to the trial of Gary Powers, the whole incident has received a tremendous volume of news coverage. However, there is one aspect of the flight which, in my opinion, has not been accorded the degree of attention which I believe it merits. This is the idea that the U–2 pilot, Gary Powers, evidently had instructions and was equipped to destroy his life rather than be captured. This very concept involves basic moral issues which in the true order of things transcend considerations of national policy. This point has been very well covered in an editorial in the recent issue of the magazine America, under date of September 3, 1960. I would like to insert this editorial into the RECORD at this time and to invite all my colleagues to weigh very carefully the premises and questions it poses:

WHAT ABOUT SUICIDE?

The indictment in the U–2 spy case stated that "Powers was provided with a special pin with a lethal poison." It is to the credit of this man that he ignored the unwritten law of espionage agents and refused to make his exit "with a bare bodkin."

Although we have already expressed traditional Christian attitudes on suicide (America, June 18, p. 371), the issue is basic enough to warrant specific emphasis on a few points.

The radical malice of calculated self-destruction lies in the fact that it infringes the exclusive dominion of God and fractures one of the essential axes of human development. These lesions of right order put suicide in the category of actions which, like blasphemy and adultery, are intrinsically evil.

The peculiarity of intrinsically evil choices is that they are always and with qualification wrong and therefore proscribed. There is no such thing as a "moral feedback" whereby the splendor or apparently compelling necessity of motives can transform that which is crooked by essence into a beeline for heaven. No Christian witness, thrust into the Colosseum, could excuse apostasy and Caesar-worship by pleading: "It was such a big lion and such a teeny-weeny pinch of incense that I dropped on the altar." Judas' crime would have remained the betrayal of innocent blood, even if his paymasters had tempted him with the throne of David and a permanent niche in Israel's Hall of Fame.

On the other hand, there is what might be called a perilous "moral irradiation" in letting the end justify the means in the question of suicide. If suicide is right for any reason, such as safeguarding national secrets, the way is open for permitting it in order to preserve honor or escape the intolerable pain of terminal cancer. The original concession made to fine motives becomes an opening wedge for a general assault on all the sanctities of life. The transition is easy from permissible suicide to legalized euthanasia and all the horrors of a political eugenics program such as the one Hitler imposed in the last monstrous years of the Third Reich. How such trends can maximize themselves is clear from the analogy of contraception. Condemned by the churches generally within living memory, it was by turns tolerated, approved, and encouraged. Today some clerics are even prescribing it as the uniquely Christian duty vis-a-vis the population explosion.

It is plain, of course, that if suicide is wrong in itself, then the State may not condone, abet, or command it. Hobbes called the State a "mortal god," but this temporal deity cannot modify eternal canons; it may fancy itself to be a "great Leviathan," but all its portentous bulk cannot tip the scales in the moral universe.

Apart from essential morality, there is a dreadful thesis lurking in the claim that the State, for overriding reasons of policy, can order its agents to do themselves in. This is the thesis that inalienable rights may be sacrificed to national interests. Such a thesis strangely smacks of totalitarianism, whose basic position is that the individaul exists in order to serve the State. It is a denial of our own public philosophy of government.

More than that, it is a denial of the Christian truth that, in his personal being, man is not ordered to the utility of society. On the contrary, the community exists for man. This is a truth that Pope Pius XII often emphasized, as well as its corollary, viz., that every attempt by the State to dispose directly of the physical being of its members is wrong.

We preach morality and the public philosophy in season and out, lest the "descending curve of morality" touch the zero mark, never to rise again.

Medical Care for the Aged

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, although over the past 2 years voluminous evidence has been adduced to show the urgent need for Federal legislation to provide medical care for our older citizens, this Congress has taken only a faltering step forward. Although it has been shown that many senior citizens are pushed to the limit of their financial resources by medical bills, while others forego or delay treatment because of inability to pay, the Congress has failed, in my opinion, to meet its responsibility to our senior citizens.

Instead of passing the Forand bill, or a Forand-type bill, which afford the social security approach to this problem, the bill that was passed provides for Federal grants to States to enable the States to increase their expenditures for medical care to old-age recipients, and to enable them to institute programs of medical assistance for the aged. Where a Forand-type bill would have made unnecessary a means test and would have given medical assistance to our senior citizens as a matter of right, the bill that was passed would only afford assistance to those who can pass a means test or a test which will disclose the fact that the needy individual is unable to afford to pay for any medical care.

But this is only half of the problem in connection with this bill. It is necessary, before the law can become effective, that the States adopt legislation calling for a program of medical assistance to the aged before any call upon the Federal Government for contributions. Although it is true, if a State decides to participate, it may determine the amount, scope and duration of benefits and, within broad limits, the eligibility standards, I fear there will be too few States which will adopt the necessary legislative programs.

There is provision in the bill, if adopted by the States, and the State program accepts the same, that medical benefits cannot only be received by those needy individuals receiving old-age assistance, but those aged individuals who, although financially independent so far as their daily living requirements are concerned, cannot meet the medical bills which occur frequently. The new program would be designed to prevent aged persons from becoming indigent on account of medical expenses. The benefits under the bill may be made available almost immediately, if adopted by any State government.

The passage of this bill does not mean the end of the fight for medical care for our senior citizens. This is merely the beginning. I am certain that next year there will be reintroduced a bill which will contain the social security approach providing insurance against the cost of hospital, nursing home and surgical care for persons eligible for old-age and survivors insurance benefits. Such a bill will obviate the necessity for any means test and will permit all our citizens to support themselves in their old age by making small contributions during their working years.

At least the problem has been recognized. The conservative combination in the Congress had permitted only a slight step forward to be taken. I am certain that this step will be lengthened in the years to come.

Hon. Leo E. Allen

SPEECH
OF
HON. CLIFFORD G. McINTIRE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. McINTIRE. Mr. Speaker, may I add to the comments of my colleagues by expressing my appreciation to LEO ALLEN for the sound counsel and warm friendship that he has extended me in the 9 years that it has been my privilege to serve in the House of Representatives.

LEO ALLEN has rendered distinguished service to both his State and his Nation.

We shall miss his stalwart defense of sound principles of government.

I extend my very best wishes to LEO and Mrs. Allen, and I express the sincere wish that their years ahead will harbor a bounty of good health and a great harvest of happiness.

A Tribute to George Washington Carver

SPEECH
OF
HON. HERMAN TOLL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. TOLL. Mr. Speaker, as the unquestioned giant of this and all future generations, science has come to dominate the attention of the world. And America is justly proud to find so many of her sons dedicated to scientific pursuits.

Among our men of science, a few stand out in exceptional splendor, for service to a cause worthy only of the clearest intellect. Included in the group—as one of a select, special nucleus comprising the most ingenious of all—stands George Washington Carver, the "Wizard of Tuskegee," and the miracleman of agricultural chemistry.

Entering American society as a slave of the Civil War era, George Washington Carver rose quickly to academic recognition, and upon joining the staff at Tuskegee Institute, Ala., soon claimed the attention of the scientific world.

The work of Dr. Carver centered in the preservation of our soil and to this end he proposed the planting of peanuts as a substitute for cotton. Certain of the scientific principles involved, Carver was also a practical man, and therefore set out to improve the economic status of the peanut; a course which carried him not only into the field of economics, but medicine, as well.

When finally he concluded his experimentation, Dr. Carver had developed hundreds of new uses for the peanut, including an oil for the cure of paralysis. In consequence, the farmers of the Southern States found a wide market for peanuts, which soon became a major money crop in the southern economy.

Captivated by so astonishing a performance, the Royal Society of Arts of London admitted Dr. Carver to its councils in 1916, and the scientific community hailed him as one of their most distinguished leaders. Thereafter, Dr. Carver was showered with honors and hired as an expert in his field to advise in the operation of a branch of the U.S. Agriculture Department.

A pioneer in the professional sense and a hero in the personal sense, he has earned the appreciation he receives today from every corner of the globe. All America is proud to join in honoring this man of genius and conscience whose service to mankind shall never be forgotten.

Tool Steel Makers See Import Threat—Call Any Cut in Tariff Folly, Hit Labor Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, as each day passes, more and more industries in my district and no doubt in other districts of our great Nation, find themselves pushed to the wall by imports from low wage, low standard producers in foreign countries.

At first the importation of foreign goods was like a mild cold but it has now become a dangerous case of pneumonia with Congress sitting idly by refusing to administer the proper medicine.

The proper medicine in this case being a clamping down on further tariff reductions and certainly stopping any further increase in quotas on all imports that compete with American production and labor.

We have heard so much about the Russian threat of an economic war that maybe we ought to at least give them credit for protecting their own domestic market, their own industry and their own workers.

The Russians are not permitted to see any imported product at a price less than that charged for a Russian made product.

I am sure our American industries and our American workers are entitled to some consideration since many of the foreign production facilities have been built with their tax dollars.

I present for the RECORD the presentation by Jim Gill, chairman of the Board of Vanadium Alloys Steel Co., Latrobe, Pa., before the Tariff Commission:

[From American Metal Market, Aug. 25, 1960]

TOOL STEEL MAKERS SEE IMPORT THREAT—CALL ANY CUT IN TARIFF FOLLY, HIT LABOR COSTS

WASHINGTON.—Producers of tool steel in the United States warned the Tariff Commission today that rising tool steel imports are threatening to export jobs of American workers.

The hearings were in protest to possible tariff concessions by the United States at the coming General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade negotiations.

Speaking for the industry, James P. Gill advised the Commission that foreign producers, with their lower labor costs, are able to sell their steels in this country at prices American companies cannot meet.

Mr. Gill, who is chairman of the board of Vanadium Alloys Steel Co., Latrobe, Pa., reminded the Commission that the tool steel industry is of strategic importance from the standpoint of national security, and declared, "any further reduction in the tariff rates on tool steel would threaten serious injury to the domestic industry."

"While costs of items such as scrap and power are somewhat similar here and abroad," Mr. Gill acknowledged, "the real difference lies in labor costs. This factor is even more important to tool and fine steel producers because it takes a great deal more labor to make a ton of tool steel than a ton of average steel produced on a high tonnage basis."

Canada was listed as the only foreign country whose tool steel industry paid hourly wages even approaching that of the American industry.

The 1959 hourly wage figures for the world's foremost producers of tool steels, in terms of American dollars, according to the committee, compare as follows: United States, $3.14; Canada, $2.45; Sweden, $1.12; United Kingdom, 92 cents; Belgium, 82 cents; West Germany, 76 cents; France, 52 cents; Italy, 50 cents; and Japan, 50 cents.

American companies have little or no advantage over foreign competition in productivity, Mr. Gill said, because "I know from personal observation and experience that productivity in European tool steel mills does not differ greatly from productivity in our own plant in the United States.

Most Canadian and European mills also have fine, modern equipment and production methods, he added.

IMPORTS RISING

The spokesman pointed out that although tonnage steel imports so far in 1960 have declined from the 1959 rate, imports of tool steel have increased sharply over last year. This rise is significant because 1959 reflected a big increase over 1958 tool steel imports. Imports under two major classes of alloyed bars in 1959 amounted to 6.5 million pounds. This was more than double the 1958 import figure of 3 million pounds.

Last year's large increase was not due to the steel strike that took place during the last half of 1959, he remarked. Imports during the first 4 months of 1960 already amount to 4.6 million pounds, which is nearly double the annual rate in 1959. Furthermore, he added, most of the American tool steel industry was not struck, and U.S. producers had at all times ample stocks of tool steel in warehouses.

As a further indication of the trend toward increased tool steel imports, Mr. Gill cited statistics on alloy content which more positively indicates the types of steels imported. He compared the dutiable amounts of vanadium, tungsten, and molybdenum—all three of which are used chiefly in tool steel.

The 6.5 million pounds of alloyed bars imported in 1959 contained 25.1 thousand pounds of dutiable vanadium, 81 thousand pounds of tungsten, and 73.8 thousand pounds of molybdenum.

The comparable figures for 1958, in thousands of pounds, were 7 vanadium, 21.3 tungsten, and 17.6 molybdenum. Thus, the alloys chiefly used in tool steel increased nearly four times while imports of the steel under broader classification were little more than double.

In the first 4 months of 1960, the 4.6 million pounds of imported steel bars contained 20,000 pounds of dutiable vanadium, 65,000 of tungsten, and 54,700 of molybdenum.

The Nation's large tonnage mills, Mr. Gill said, have neither the equipment nor technical knowledge to make the tool steels and special steels needed for missiles and similar items.

Fifteen steel companies were represented in the statement.

The 15 include Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Bethlehem Steel Co., Bethlehem, Pa.; Braeburn Alloy Steel Corp., Braeburn, Pa.; the Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa.; Columbia Tool Steel Co., Chicago Heights, Ill.; Crucible Steel Co. of America, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Firth Sterling, Inc., Pittsburgh, Pa.; Ingersoll Steel Division, Borg-Warner Corp, New Castle, Ind.; Jessop

Steel Co., Washington, Pa.; Latrobe Steel Co., Latrobe, Pa.; Simonds Saw & Steel Co., Lockport, N.Y.; Steel & Tube Division, the Timken Roller Bearing Co., Canton, Ohio; Universal-Cyclops Steel Corp., Bridgeville, Pa.; Vanadium Alloys Steel Co., Latrobe, Pa.; Vulcan-Kidd Steel Division, H. K. Porter Co., Inc., Aliquippa, Pa.

Poison Labeling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOB WILSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I read with interest in the Oakland, Calif., Tribune, July 22, 1960, a thoughtful column entitled "Mother Helped Put Antipoison Label Law on Books." I also noted this United Press International report in many other leading newspapers, including the Terre Haute, Ind., Tribune, July 24; Albuquerque, N. Mex., Journal, July 25; Syracuse, N.Y., Herald-Journal, July 25; and Baton Rouge, La., Advocate, July 28. Mrs. Patricia McCormack, who dug up and reported this story, is a veteran reporter and feature writer for UPI, who specializes in national features entitled "Woman to Woman," and "Child Care Today." Through her efforts, my colleague, THOMAS B. CURTIS of St. Louis, Mo., is being given just recognition for the years of work and effort he has engaged in so that this law might be passed. As the father of three children including a teenager, I know firsthand how important the passage of this Poison Labeling Act is. Many people will be interested how for 4 years, the gentleman from Missouri, Congressman CURTIS, gathered the facts and obtained support from professional groups, fellow legislators and other citizens to get this act into such fine shape that it was passed overwhelmingly at this session of Congress and signed by President Eisenhower. This all started with a frantic telephone call to TOM CURTIS from a St. Louis mother whose child had swallowed a bottle of nail polish remover which contained poison in it. TOM CURTIS pays the closest attention to phone calls and letters coming to him, and this act is the result of this. I am also bringing to your attention a letter from the mother of the child involved, from the July 18, 1960, issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, as well as a news report from that newspaper of July 22 telling how the pen used by President Eisenhower was given to the youngster involved. A July 24 report from the St. Louis Globe Democrat is also of value. Mothers and fathers of youngsters throughout our country join me in expressing appreciation for the passage of this act and the great contribution my friend and colleague TOM CURTIS made in bringing this to the attention of the Congress and getting action on this serious problem.

[From the Oakland (Calif.) Tribune, July 27, 1960]

MOTHER HELPED PUT ANTIPOISON LABEL LAW ON BOOKS

(By Patrick McCormack)

NEW YORK, July 27.—We parents owe a vote of thanks to a Missouri mother who called her Congressman as well as her doctor when her toddling son guzzled fingernail polish remover.

When she found her son, Martin, drinking the polish remover, Mrs. Floris Mills, of Webster Groves, immediately called her doctor to find the antidote for the poison.

The doctor asked Mrs. Mills what the polish remover contained. But the bottle's label did not list the chemical contents. The doctor needed to know the contents to prescribe a specific antidote.

By good fortune, the general antidote the doctor prescribed saved the child's life. It doesn't always work for all poisons.

Mrs. Mills was upset. She asked herself why the label didn't contain a listing of chemical ingredients in the fluid. She thought that Federal laws covered such situations, that potential killers in the home had to be labeled.

At once, she called her Congressman, THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, Missouri, asking him to do something to protect children who innocently drink household poisons.

CURTIS thought Federal laws covered such situations, too. But when he checked with the Food and Drug Administration he was told that many household products which have dangerous ingredients were not bound by existing Federal labeling laws.

Further investigation revealed great interest in the problem of death and inury resulting from the accidental ingestion of hundreds of new, useful, but dangerous household products on the market.

The Food and Drug Administration was anxious to bring these products to the same standards of safety as many already covered by Federal law.

Doctors were particularly aware of the problem. In many locations, local medical groups established poison control centers in which records were kept on the harmful ingredients in thousands of products and to which individual doctors might refer inquiries concerning them.

These were a help, but frequently not help enough in an emergency, CURTIS learned.

The Congressman also contacted representatives of the industries making many of the products with potentially lethal ingredients. They shared the desire to prevent needless deaths.

The Congressman drafted a bill calling for the enactment of legislation to close the gaps in the labeling laws.

"Sometimes you find that legislation, like good wine, must be aged," CURTIS said. His bill, introduced in 1957, wasn't acted upon the first time around.

The father of five, he shared the anxiety Mrs. Mills felt over existing gaps in the law. He continued to work for passage of the bill.

The campaign started by Mrs. Mills received a big boost when Dr. Robert Grayson, president of the American Association of Poison Control Centers, endorsed the proposed legislation.

The endorsement came in 1960—three years after Mrs. Mills started her Congressman on the campaign to save lives.

Grayson, in a letter to CURTIS, reported that the Poison Control Centers Association, through its executive committee, favors passage of a uniform hazardous substances act.

"The need for such legislation is self-evident to those of us who are closely connected with this particular problem and we as a group would like to do all we can to promote its passage in the current session of Congress," Dr. Grayson said.

The American Medical Association's committee on toxicology also threw its support behind the measure. Dr. Bernard E. Conley, secretary of the committee, told CURTIS:

"We believe that legislation of this type is not only a valuable and effective means of reducing cases of accidental poisoning, but that by requiring identification of toxic ingredients it will aid the physician in making a prompt diagnosis and initiating treatment.

The bill—H.R. 7352—was signed into law this month by President Eisenhower. It gives the Federal Government authority to regulate the labeling of all hazardouus substances for nonmanufacturing purposes.

It covers the labeling of any hazardous substances in fingernail polish remover and other helpful liquids, creams, powders and lotions in the Nation's homes.

On the record, it's CURTIS' bill.

The Congressman likes to call the new law "Mrs. Mills' bill."

[From the Terre Haute (Ind.) Tribune, July 24, 1960]

LABELING LAW OMISSION FIXED BY CONGRESS

(By Patricia McCormack)

NEW YORK, July 23.—We parents owe a vote of thanks to a Missouri mother who called her Congresman as well as her doctor when her toddling son guzzled fingernail polish remover.

When she found her son, Martin, drinking the polish remover, Mrs. Floris Mills, of Webster Groves, immediately called her doctor to find the antidote for the poison.

The doctor asked Mrs. Mills what the polish remover contained. But the bottle's label did not list the chemical contents. The doctor needed to know the contents to prescribe a specific antidote.

By good fortune, the general antidote the doctor prescribed saved the child's life. It doesn't always work for all poisons.

Mrs. Mills was upset. She asked herself why the label didn't contain a listing of chemical ingredients in the fluid. She thought that Federal laws covered such situations, that potential killers in the home had to be labeled.

At once, she called her Congressman, THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Missouri, asking him to do something to protect children who innocently drink household poisons.

CURTIS thought Federal laws covered such situations, too. But when he checked with the Food and Drug Administration he was told that many household products which have dangerous ingredients were not bound by existing Federal labeling laws.

Further investigation revealed great interest in the problem of death and injury resulting from the accidental ingestion of hundreds of new, useful, but dangerous household products on the market.

The Food and Drug Administration was anxious to bring these products to the same standards of safety as many already covered by Federal law.

Doctors were particularly aware of the problem. In many locations, local medical groups established poison control centers in which records were kept on the harmful ingredients in thousands of products and to which individual doctors might refer inquiries concerning them.

These were a help, but frequently not help enough in an emergency, CURTIS learned.

The Congressman also contacted representatives of the industries making many of the products with potentially lethal ingredients. They shared the desire to prevent needless deaths.

The Congressman drafted a bill calling for the enactment of legislation to close the gaps in the labeling laws. But the bill, in-

troduced in 1957, wasn't acted upon the first time around.

The father of five, he shared the anxiety Mrs. Mills felt over existing gaps in the law. He continued to work for passage of the bill which finally was signed into law 11 days ago by President Eisenhower. It gives the Federal Government authority to regulate the labeling of all hazardous substances for nonmanufacturing purposes.

It covers the labeling of any hazardous substances in fingernail polish remover and other helpful liquids, creams, powders, and lotions in the Nation's homes.

On the record, it's CURTIS' bill.

The Congressman likes to call the new law "Mrs. Mills' bill."

[From St. Louis Post-Dispatch, July 22, 1960]

GIVEN PEN USED BY EISENHOWER IN SIGNING BILL

Mrs. C. H. Mills, 437 Woodlawn Avenue, Webster Groves, was given the pen yesterday which was used by President Eisenhower to sign into law the new Hazardous Substances Labeling Act. The presentation was made by Representative THOMAS B. CURTIS, Republican, of Webster Groves.

In 1956 Mrs. Mills called Representative CURTIS and urged him to introduce legislation to require the labeling of household products containing substances which are poisonous if taken internally.

Her son had swallowed the contents of a bottle of cuticle remover and information was not available for the proper antidote because there were no contents listed on the label. The new law provides that a clear warning must be printed on the labels of containers of hazardous substances. The statute also provides that first-aid instructions concerning dangerous ingredients be placed on labels.

Signing the bill by President Eisenhower culminated a long campaign by the American Medical Association for a law requiring labeling of all chemical products containing hazardous ingredients used in the home. Representative CURTIS was one of the leaders in the campaign for the new law after its need was brought to his attention by Mrs. Mills.

[From St. Louis Post-Dispatch, July 18, 1960]

EFFECTIVE IN CONGRESS

As the mother who called Congressman CURTIS in 1956 after my son drank cuticle remover and I was not able to find out what to do about it, I want to thank him and all others for the work and devotion which they have put into the passing of the Federal hazardous substance bill.

However, I feel I must do more than simply give him my thanks. Mr. CURTIS should be recognized for the type of consideration he gave me. He listened to me, and then went to work on the problem immediately, in spite of having to run in the 1956 election.

I received all the available literature on labeling of household chemicals and was kept in touch with the progress of the bill through 4 years and another election.

As much as I enjoy the satisfaction of knowing I said the right thing to the right person at the right time, it is even more important that in Mr. CURTIS we have a Congressman who does take the time and patience to listen, even to a mere housewife.

Mrs. C. H. MILLS.

Representative Ken Hechler Answers an Attack on His Record in Congress

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN HECHLER

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A6352, August 24, was printed a letter I received from Clyde B. Pinson, one of my constituents. The following is the text of my response to Mr. Pinson, which was in his hands 24 hours prior to publication; he gave his letter to the press and it was published long before I received the letter in the mail:

AUGUST 25, 1960.

Mr. CLYDE B. PINSON,
Huntington, W. Va.

DEAR MR. PINSON: I was glad to receive your good letter of August 22. I love nothing better than a good, clean campaign on the issues, which will help the voters to make an intelligent choice on November 8.

Your letter furnishes a wonderful springboard for me to discuss some of the basic issues, and I welcome the opportunity.

Reelection really doesn't obsess me, as you say. You know, there are lots of very exciting things I enjoy doing. I love to write, I love to teach, I love to work with young people, and I love any occupation which enables me to help my fellow human beings and bring out their best qualities. I love serving in Congress because it give me an opportunity to help people, to help our State, our Nation, and the whole free world. It is a challenging job, and I love challenges—which is why I accept yours with such relish.

Your letter expresses a concern about my inacitivity and failure to "do something." I am glad, however, that my activities are sufficiently important to attract your attention and impel you to write me. As I stated, when your letter appeared in the press, long before I had a chance to receive it, I doubt whether you want a serious answer, or you would not have given it to the press beforehand in the way you did. Nevertheless, I am going to furnish a serious answer in the hope that it will illuminate the issues involved in this campaign.

The Democratic Party has a majority in the House and Senate, which enabled the Congress to pass an area redevelopment bill which would have helped many of our communities with chronic unemployment. West Virginia's one Republican representative, the Honorable ARCH A. MOORE, JR., voted for that bill, yet your Republican President vetoed it and thus helped choke off a program to do something for West Virginia. I voted for that bill, and stood up on the floor of the House of Representatives and invited President Eisenhower to visit West Virginia and see how the area redevelopment bill would have helped our State. The President didn't accept that invitation, although he has had plenty of time to visit India, Turkey, and many other foreign lands. In 1958, President Eisenhower, Vice President NIXON and many members of the Republican Cabinet came to West Virginia to make campaign speeches because our State had two Senators up for election, but despite our pleas they haven't been back to help us or even to inspect West Virginia. I'll be willing to bet you that they'll be back just before the election in 1960 to make some more campaign speeches, but when the chips were down and the President had a good bill in front of him to sign, he vetoed it.

I also fought and voted for a bill which Congress passed to control water pollution of our streams in West Virginia and all over the Nation. Cleaning up our streams and preserving our God-given natural resources was such a worthwhile program—particularly for our Ohio Valley area—that I was astonished when the President opposed this bill and torpedoed it with another veto. This measure would have "done something" for West Virginia, for all American communities and for lovers of the great outdoors everywhere. The spirit of a great Republican President, Theodore Roosevelt, must have wept at this shoddy spectacle.

I must also point out that I voted for bills to create a Coal Research and Development Commission and to preserve the markets for our small tobacco farmers. Yet the President vetoed both these bills in 1959 and stalled action on them for 1 full year, until Congress returned them in revised form to him in 1960.

Your letter said that I had done nothing to "feed our hungry children." President Eisenhower denied in his press conference on April 27, 1960, that there were any hungry children. In response to a question by Mrs. May Craig of the Portland Press-Herald, he answered: "Well, Mrs. Craig, you say they haven't been helped. I thought they had." Nonetheless, I believe that there are needy children in West Virginia, and these are the things I have done to help them:

I introduced a bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a balanced diet for needy persons from funds already at hand. The Department of Agriculture under Ezra Taft Benson fought this bill and deterred its passage.

I wrote, phoned and pleaded with the Department of Agriculture to add a few more staple items to the diet being provided needy persons. I was rebuffed at every turn.

I supported a food stamp plan to reduce our huge crop surpluses by helping to feed the needy. Secretary Benson has refused to use this law a Democratic Congress put on the books to do something for the needy.

I obtained a special order of $10,000 worth of vitamins for needy children in West Virginia from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare after the State health department advised that the poor diet these children were forced to eat had lowered their resistance to flu and other diseases last winter.

Now may I move to your charge that I consistently opposed defense expenditures, while urging better preparedness in the space and missile fields. My position on this is well known, and I am sure you are aware of it. I made it clear at the beginning of this session of Congress that because I believe education is our real first line of defense, I would not vote for any defense expenditures which placed emphasis on muscles and material, without regard for the brainpower and trained hands that could put these things to the best use in our struggle to stay strong and to resist Communist pressures until some form of aid to education had been passed. Although this principle was thoroughly publicized and my position was made crystal clear, I heard no objection from you.

Now as for the request that I "do something" during these last days of the post-convention session of Congress. I am sure

that you know—if you keep abreast of national affairs through news media—that this session was called for the sole purpose of handling some "must" legislation, including several appropriations bills. These are major bills affecting the entire Nation. A new bill coming up would require committee hearings and debates for which there simply is not sufficient time prior to the adjournment of this session. I am proud of my record of "doing something" for our district and State. Among the proudest of these accomplishments, I list:

Helped put through two appropriations totaling $19,750 for a survey to determine the feasibility of a dam and reservoir on Twelve Pole Creek in Wayne County. This project had been inactive for 28 years since its inception due to lack of funds.

Called conferences and repeatedly put pressure on Navy and General Services Administration officials to free the idle Sylvania Plant for sale to an industrial employer. This plant is now available for sale to private industry.

Helped to get money to complete planning for the vast Belleville lock and dam project on the Ohio River in Wood County.

Assisted area industries with efforts to get defense contracts and spoke out in the House on 18 occasions in favor of more defense contracts and facilities for West Virginia.

Made countless appearances before the Civil Aeronautics Board and its officials in support of better airline service for the State and in appearance before congressional committees urged more funds for the Tri-State Airport.

Worked to convince the Eisenhower administration of the need for mandatory controls on importation of residual fuel oil, which had cut into West Virginia coal markets. These controls were imposed in March, 1959, and tightened in 1960.

Urged the U.S. Tariff Commission on several occasions to restrict imports of glass, ceramics, steel and fabrics which were cutting production of West Virginia plants and throwing workers out of their jobs.

Introduced and worked to have enacted a bill to transfer a Federal lock and dam on the Big Sandy River to Fort Gay, West Virginia, to improve its water supply and open the way to industrial development.

Repeatedly wrote, called and conferred in person with industrialists interested in locating facilities in West Virginia.

But if I did nothing else in Congress, I am proudest of all of the opportunity and inspiration I have tried to afford young people in West Virginia by enabling them to come to the Capitol to work for periods of a week or longer in my office and learn about our democratic processes. More than 60 high school and college students—45 of them winners in the nonpartisan "Week in Washington" contest which I conduct for high school juniors—have come from West Virginia to work in my office, and the door is always open to these energetic, idealistic young volunteers.

I am enclosing a summary of 101 points which represent my aims and achievements. I also am enclosing a detailed summary of legislation which I have introduced, and a history of what has become of these bills, indicating the number which have become law.

I would be glad to send these two documents to any person you suggest, or to anyone who writes in to ask for them.

In your letter, you state: "I shall be happy to consult with you on the problems we face." That statement particularly interested me, because I am always glad to consult with constituents like yourself who have constructive ideas.

However, in all the time I have represented you in the Congress, you have never communicated with me about issues or problems.

A thorough check of my files reveals that you have never once written me a letter, telephoned me, visited my office in either Huntington or Washington, nor made one single suggestion to consult with me on the problems we face. Our only communication is a response to a telegram I sent you on the occasion of your primary victory.

Since you have been in Washington recently having your picture taken with President Eisenhower, Mr. NIXON and others, I can only assume that you considered none of the problems you mention of sufficient importance to call my office about them, nor to contact me in Huntington, although our offices there are not too far apart.

If you have problems, however, I want to assure you that I shall be happy to consult with you and to attempt to give you the same intensive degree of personal service which I am proud of giving every voter in my district who comes to me for assistance, regardless of political affiliation.

Do you have problems? Why not come by my office, and you may be sure my all-West Virginia staff will give you a cordial welcome and we can discuss action in the best interests of our State.

I will be happy to confer with you at any time or place, provided it does not interfere with a rollcall vote in the House of Representatives, for I am very proud of my voting attendance record (95 percent in 1959, 100 percent in 1960) which is the best mark of any West Virginia Congressman and far above the average of all Members of Congress.

As I told 23,000 Huntington citizens in a letter asking them to make my campaign one financed by contributions from the people, "I will conduct a clean and constructive campaign on my record, never either privately or publicy attacking my opponent, but setting forth the details of my performance and platform." I intend to abide by that pledge.

You seem to be disturbed by the fact that frequent stories appear in the newspapers concerning my activities. I believe very deeply that every person in public life must be an educator, bringing facts to the attention of the people so they can make firm judgments. I also believe that a very important part of a Congressman's job is to keep the people informed on what he is doing. That is why I have worked hard to inform the people about the background of issues confronting the Congress, what goes on behind the scenes of Congress, and what your Congressman is doing or planning to do. In public life, one cannot retire behind a cloak of false modesty, but one must continue to give the people the whole truth about matters which affect their interests. So far as "gimmicks" are concerned, I guess everybody has to get a good, hearty laugh every now and then, and I get just as much of a kick out of this as the next fellow.

I have had your letter printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with an invitation to my colleagues in Congress and constituents to comment on what they feel I have accomplished in my first term. After all, a fellow can't judge this with total objectivity himself, and I'd prefer to have others indicate what they think from their own viewpoint. From time to time, I'll send you copies of these letters.

We are living in very troubled times in the world. From Cuba to the Congo, the world is in ferment. If there is one thing we need in our own country it is a new moral leadership. We also need a rededication to basic ideals and principles, a redefinition of our national purpose, and a determination on the part of the people that we will lift our sights above the petty, backbiting, and selfish jealousies which sap our Nation's moral strength. We must be builders, and not wreckers. We must purify our hearts if we would strengthen our muscles.

Your servant in Congress,

KEN HECHLER.

Certified Bourbon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following address of the Honorable Harold W. Handley, Governor of Indiana, at Lawrenceburg, Ind., on August 8, 1960, at the Introduction Day Celebration for Certified Bourbon:

ADDRESS BY GOV. HAROLD W. HANDLEY, OF INDIANA, AT INTRODUCTORY DAY CEREMONIES FOR CERTIFIED BOURBON AT LAWRENCEBURG, IND., ON AUGUST 8, 1960

Toastmaster Bill, Mr. Rosenstiel, members of the executive family of Schenley's Distilleries, to all of our good friends—the employees who are here in the room who after all make it possible for the executives to cash their checks—and good Hoosier friends all, I want to welcome Mr. Rosenstiel and the executive group back to Indiana, because I remember some 5 years ago when I was down here, things were pretty rough. They weren't sure that they were going to be able to keep the plant open. We had a lot of wonderful people in this area that were concerned about their jobs. And because of the foresight, vision, the merchandising ability of Schenley's, we once again see this great plant in real productive operation.

And it certainly means a great deal to the economy of the State of Indiana, not only to this particular area but to the State as a whole. And it is with a great deal of pride that I come down here today to place the seal of approval, the certification, on this new Indiana bourbon.

I think it's with a little extra pride because some of us happen to know that the Federal Government frowned upon this particular performance. And you know, Mr. Rosenstiel, you're in the heart of the States rights country, and if the Federal Government said "No" but we felt that you had a product of merit, we'd say "Yes." And we're glad to do it today. [Applause.]

We're all pretty much concerned about the buildup of bureaucracy on the Potomac. It's getting to the point where the Federal Government makes an awful lot of the decisions for us. It's just like the judge who told this boy, "I'm going to give you a very fair trial but I have to set the execution for tomorrow."

I think there's a great deal of difference between positive action and negative action, and Schenley Distillers has shown some real positive action. I was talking to Mr. Lockwood about his experiences in the district attorney's office in New York, and was reminded of his political opposition in those days, Tammany Hall. There was this Tammany Hall leader who was called by one of his friends who said, "You know, my brother has just been arrested. I'm afraid they're going to send him to the penitentiary. What can you do to help me out?"

The leader said, "I'll take a look at it." He investigated and found out that the fellow was guilty as charged, so he took no action whatsoever.

About a week later this irate call came and the man said, "You're a fine friend of mine. Did you see the the morning papers? My brother's picture is in the Rogues' Gallery. That picture of him in the paper—and he's going to the penitentiary."

But this Tammany leader said, "Well, now, what are you getting so concerned about?

Did you see the low number I got for him?" [Laughter.]

So you see, there is a big difference between positive and negative action. And so on behalf of this Hoosier State, to all of the members of the Schenley family, we certainly want to thank you, to tell you how grateful we are that you have once again resumed increased production, and we hope that with this certification you will expand your facilities even more.

After all, the attitude of our administration here is one that I am very proud of, that we all are proud of, all Hoosiers. Because it is an attitude that clearly illustrates the slogan of our department of commerce that "Indiana wants industry, and wants industry to feel wanted."

There's an old saying that a man is known by the company he keeps, and the State of Indiana wants to be known by the company it keeps. I don't think any State has a better industrial climate, and perhaps that's why more than two industrial major plants are built in Indiana each week the year round. There must be a reason.

This is a day that will long be remembered by both the Indiana distilling industry and by consumers of the world's finest quality whisky: Indiana certified bourbon.

It is a historic occasion, because it opens a new horizon to the distilling industry of our State and marks a sweeping departure from traditional methods in the merchandising of Indiana-made bourbon.

Now, as you all know, the new merchandising method was made possible by the promulgation last year of a regulation by the Indiana Alcoholic Beverage Commission. This regulation, known as rule 40, was designed to place the prestige of the State behind the prestige of the product, and open new markets for Indiana certified bourbon, both at home and abroad. It's a regulation that gives Indiana distillers the privilege of marketing their straight bourbon whisky as a product certified by the State of Indiana.

This action by the alcoholic beverage commission in the State of Indiana is Indiana's answer to foreign competition. By tradition, consumers regard a bottled-in-bond stamp as a hallmark of quality, whether it is affixed to a bottle of bourbon, a bottle of Canadian whisky, or a bottle of Scotch. Unfortunately, our Federal bottled-in-bond stamp has a diminishing value today because it can be applied only to whiskies that are heavy bodied.

Distillers have therefore been at a great disadvantage in competing with imported whiskies because both the Canadian bottled-in-bond stamp and the British bottled-bonding stamp may be affixed to whiskies that are lightbodied. And this is what the public taste seems to be veering toward, as demonstrated by constant increases in sales of imported whiskies in this country.

So Indiana sees a certification stamp as a great opportunity for distillers—not only Schenley, but any distiller—because it gives recognition to this changing public taste pattern. The new Indiana stamp is a hallmark of quality, a hallmark that will enable Indiana bourbon to compete with Canadian and Scotch whiskies whose popular appeal lies in their light body and mild, smooth taste.

I heard a story about Babe Herman, the legendary outfielder who was with the Dodgers when they were from Brooklyn. In a restaurant he asked for a sardine sandwich and the waitress said, "Domestic or imported?" He said, "What's the difference?" She said "Fifty cents." He said, "Well, why the hell should I pay 50 cents for passage of a bunch of lousy sardines from across the sea?"

Well, here we have a bourbon, certified with Indiana's stamp, that's as good as or better than you can get from across the sea * * * and Mr. Rosenstiel told me it's cheaper and going to be still cheaper * * * and besides, the tax money on it goes to our own Federal Government.

We see this product proving a boon to one of the State's principal agricultural products, corn, good Hoosier Indiana corn. I'm told that Schenley Distillers uses over 4½ million bushels of corn each year in the manufacture of its many fine products. And as the national reputation for Indiana bourbon grows, so will the demand for our State's fine corn. And of course, if the distillers of Indiana are able to expand their shipments, this will mean more employment for Indiana labor.

I don't know whether you gentlemen from outside the State know this, but at the International Livestock Show in Chicago, Indiana has had more than 70 percent of the corn kings of America. Indiana corn is the best corn in the Nation. And it takes good corn to make good Bourbon, so the combination has brought Schenley's to us in expanded capacity. And because of that fact we, in turn, have brought certification to Schenley.

The history of Dearborn County contains something of historic value and of great interest, namely that the first commercial distillery in Indiana territory was built here in Lawrenceburg—right on this spot where the Schenley distillery stands today—back in 1809. That was 7 years before Indiana was admitted to statehood.

We know that commercial distilleries did not come into existence in those times until long after the advent of home distilleries. The farmer-distiller always blazed the trail for the commercial distiller. So, since Indiana was a great corn-producing area even in those early times, it is reasonable to believe that farmer-distillers were making Bourbon here at the time of the Revolutionary War.

Back in those days there were no drugstores, no wonder drugs, and Bourbon was more than a beverage for settlers living on the frontiers. It was the only "patent medicine" that was available. Settlers used it as an antiseptic, as a painkilling anesthetic, and as an all-purpose medicine. Bourbon was practically indispensable to life on the frontier.

Also, bourbon was used as a medium of exchange. Merchants accepted bourbon as a barter for manufactured goods, farm supplies and foodstuffs. In Indiana Territory a gallon of bourbon sold for the same price as a bushel of wheat, about 25 cents. And if a farmer didn't have the cash to buy it, he could take his corn to a local distillery and have it converted into bourbon on a percentage basis. Hoosiers, you know, have always been a very resourceful people.

And because Lawrenceburg is located on the Ohio River, the early Indiana distillers had access to all markets along the inland waterways from Cincinnati to New Orleans. They did a thriving business in Louisiana Territory, shipping bourbon by the barrel on flatboats down the Ohio and the Mississippi to New Orleans. Indeed, Indiana bouron was the favorite of French-speaking settlers in the Mississippi bayous long before Napoleon sold Louisiana to the United States.

There were seven distilleries operating in the Lawrenceburg area and many others scattered throughout the Territory in the early years of the 19th century. Now we don't know too much about the details, but we do know that enormous quantities of bourbon were produced each year. Later history records that the Gaff plant in Aurora took orders for 2,820 barrels of bourbon during a 7-day period in 1875. And its fine quality is attested by the fact that it sold at an average of $50 a barrel. The same historian quotes "a gentleman who for years was connected with the Internal Revenue office" as saying that Lawrenceburg distillers "made enough whiskey to float a navy or flood a city." Now it's a fact that between the Civil War, when the Federal excise tax was enacted, and 1880, a period of only 15 years, Lawrenceburg distillers paid $30 million in Federal excise taxes.

But Lawrenceburg was not the only bourbon production center in the State. Throughout the 19th century there was hardly a town in Indiana that didn't have its own distillery. In fact, Terre Haute during the last half of the century became one of the greatest production centers in the Nation. And as the century came to a close the distilling industry, with an output valued in excess of $22 million, was Indiana's fourth largest industry.

Just prior to World War I, the industry in Terre Haute alone was producing about 15 million gallons a year and contributing in Federal excise taxes about one-seventh of all funds required to operate the U.S. Government. That's a far cry from today.

World War I was the turning point in the history of distilling in Indiana, for it brought grain rationing and production controls—and, ultimately, national prohibition.

A great Indiana industry was destroyed overnight, and the fame of its chief product—straight bourbon whisky—faded quickly.

After repeal of the 18th amendment, the Indiana distilling industry was not wholly resurrected. Only in Lawrenceburg was the revival anywhere near complete.

A new generation of consumers had come of age, a generation that was more familiar with Scotch and Canadian whiskies than with our incomparable bourbon, because, after all, bourbon hadn't been available for some 13 years.

For the past 26 years, from the time of repeal on to this day, Indiana distillers have consistently been outadvertised, outpublicized, and outmerchandised by producers of straight bourbon in other States. Consequently, Indiana bourbon has never been able to regain its eminent position of pre-prohibition times.

That's why we here in Indiana had to take the bull by the horns and create an effective means for merchandising Indiana straight bourbon. We can do it, because, after all, Indiana has more limestone and more limestone water than any other State in the Union; Indiana is a major corn-producing State, and corn and limestone water are the principal ingredients of good bourbon whisky. No State produces better bourbon than Indiana and no State has so much to offer to bourbon distillers, for in addition to an abundance of corn and limestone water, Indiana has everything else needed for a large-scale bourbon production.

We have access to the sea through the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence Seaway. We have access to the Gulf of Mexico through the Ohio and the Mississippi Rivers. We have splendid statewide networks of highways and railroads. We are serviced by nine airlines. We have an adequate supply of skilled labor and we have low tax rates, and the State is on a pay-as-you-go basis, with a constitutional prohibition against the incurring of funded debt.

Indiana, gentlemen, is a good place to do business, a good place to live, and a mighty good place to work. It's a State in which every good distilling company should have a bourbon-producing plant.

At this time I want to commend Schenley Industries for its willingness to cooperate with the State of Indiana in its declared policy of making Indiana certified bourbon the toast of the world, which means a toast to Indiana as well.

Thank you very much, Mr. Rosenstiel.

What's Behind the Pledge?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in extending in my remarks today the award-winning speech given by Miss Carolyn Funk of Wheeling, W. Va. Miss Funk was first place winner in the West Virginia State 4–H public speaking contest held as part of the annual State 4–H roundup, where she presented her speech, "What's Behind the Pledge," given at Jackson's Mill on August 25.

During her junior year at Bethany High School, 1959, Miss Funk placed second in the district division of the annual American Legion oratorical contest and won 4 years' tuition at one of the State's colleges.

Last summer, under the auspices of the United Christian Missionary Society and as a representative of Bethany Memorial Church, she traveled throughout Mexico visiting the Mexican missions. Upon her return from this trip, she gave a full report of the visit from the pulpit of the Bethany Memorial Church.

During her senior year in high school, she was vice president of the class; as a junior, she was class president. She graduated as an honor student and was girls' State representative and delegate to the honorary West Virginia State leadership meeting in June 1959.

Traveling and meeting different races of people is not new to Miss Funk for in addition to visiting Mexico, she has lived in Hawaii for 5 years where she made many friends with people of all nationalities.

Miss Funk's speech follows:

WHAT'S BEHIND THE PLEDGE?

How often have you said: I pledge—
My head to clearer thinking;
My heart to greater loyalty;
My hands to larger service;
My health to better living;
For my club, my community, and my country?

Yes; you have given this pledge many times. Do you remember, when you were a brandnew 4–H member, how carefully you memorized the 4–H pledge? Do you remember that every time you gave this pledge you tried very hard to have each word in its correct place? This was long ago, and now all of us know the pledge well indeed. In fact, some of us know it so well that we can stand on our heads and say it backward. I have seen this done at camp, and that was some stunt. So we say we have learned this pledge well. We have memorized the words, but do we understand the meaning? Just what's behind the pledge? I see the word "citizenship." Let's look at each of the four H's and find citizenship.

I pledge my head to clearer thinking. Everyone of us must be a clear thinker if we are going to be a valuable American citizen. We must be able to evaluate that which we hear and read and see. Evaluation—you know the old childhood adage, "If I told you to go jump in a lake, would you do it? No." But evaluation is not always easy. You cannot with indifference say, "This is yes and this is no, or this is black and this is white." Evaluating, making wise choices, takes practice.

How does 4–H help to develop the head H? The 4–H member has the chance to vote at his club meetings. He is evaluating choices. The 4–H member has the chance to broaden his outlook as he meets many new and different types of people at meetings—county, State, and nationwide. Through the charting program the 4–H member thinks seriously of world problems. I pledge my head to clearer thinking—I evaluate.

I pledge my heart to greater loyalty. The true American citizen knows the ideal his country upholds. In America, we believe in democracy and in equal rights. "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." Thomas Jefferson said this for the benefit of the American people. It makes no difference if these citizens are red or white, brown or black or yellow. They are all entitled to equal rights. How often Jefferson's words are abused. If we are going to be loyal American citizens, we must stand for this ideal of equal rights, even when those around us fall short of the goal.

What does 4–H have to say about loyalty? I especially like 4–H because it stresses the ideal of loyalty to oneself. If I am going to be loyal to myself, I must do my project work honestly and to the best of my ability. If I am going to be loyal to myself, I must be willing to take an office in my club, to better myself for leadership. If I am going to be loyal to myself, I must be able to use encouragement and criticism constructively—to make the best better. I pledge my heart to greater loyalty—I stand for an ideal.

I pledge my hands to larger service. The useful American citizen not only dreams of high ideals, he actually does something about them. If we are going to keep all our many freedoms in America, there is need of many skillful hands. There is need of doctors, lawyers, ministers, teachers, farmers, factory workers, plumbers, politicians, nurses, businessmen, researchers, repairmen—just to name a few. But above all, there is need of the teacher who puts that spark of interest in her pupils; there is need of the researcher who wrestles with the problem until the solution is found; there is need of the politician who keeps his promises.

How does 4–H progress the development of the Hand H? The 4–H member increases the power of his hands as he does his project work and community project work. Through charting, the member ponders long his life vocation. He learns to help himself as he helps others. I pledge my hands to larger service—I am useful.

I pledge my health to better living. Without health a citizen just can't be very useful. One of our greatest Presidents knew the importance of good health. When he was a boy he was frail, but he went westward and strengthened his body until he became as strong as western cowboys. As he rode with the Rough Riders his sound mind and healthy body were indeed an asset to our country. Yes, Teddy Roosevelt knew the importance of good health.

Part of the 4–H principle is a sound mind and healthy body. Without these it is hard to think clearly or to have loyalty or to be of service. I pledge my health to better living—I take care of myself.

Just what's behind the pledge? I see the word "citizenship," spelled with four H's—"Head, Heart, Hands, and Health."

Further Reduction in Rates of Import Duties Harmful to Scissors and Shears Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. D. BAUMHART, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, the importation of foreign-made goods has seriously affected production in our country. One of the imported items which has been most harmful to my Congressional District is the importation of scisors and shears. I have always opposed this free importation of foreign-made goods which in effect tends to export good jobs and import competitive items. I trust that future sessions of the Congress will give consideration to this problem before it is too late for the industry mentioned here, as well as the many other industries which are affected in the same manner. Recently I received a "summary" of the situation from Mr. C. L. F. Wieber, president of the Clauss Cutlery Co. of Fremont, Ohio. Under unanimous consent I incorporate the following in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION PRESENTED TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION AND THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION BY THE SHEARS, SCISSORS, AND MANICURE IMPLEMENT MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

The Shears, Scissors, and Manicure Implement Manufacturers Association has filed a written brief and presented oral testimony to the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information opposing any reduction, during the GATT negotiations at Geneva, Switzerland, in the present rates of import duties on scissors and shears provided for in paragraphs 357 and 1531 of the Tariff Act of 1930, is amended.

Further reduction in the rates of import duties on scissors and shears are opposed for the following reasons:

1. The domestic scissors and shears industry is truly a small business as there are only two domestic firms which employ 250 or more production workers, and none with more than 500 production workers.

2. There are only 20 firms manufacturing scissors and shears in the United States. This is less than one-half of the number manufacturing scissors and shears before the import duty reductions made during 1950 and 1951.

3. Approximately one-half of the firms still manufacturing scissors and shears have less than 10 employees each.

4. The rates of duties on scissors and shears valued at more than 50 cents per dozen provided for in paragraph 357 of the Tariff Act of 1930 were reduced 50 percent during 1950 and 1951.

5. The rate of import duty on scissors and shears in fitted cases provided for in paragraph 1531 has been reduced 60 percent since the Tariff Act of 1930 were enacted.

6. Scissors and shears are an ideal import item because:

(a) They are light in weight,

(b) They are cheap to ship from abroad,

(c) They are not fragile,

(d) They will not deteriorate,
(e) They will not go out of style, and
(f) The foreign cost of production is substantially less than the domestic cost of production.

7. During 1951 the quantity and value of imports of scissors and shears valued at more than 50 cents per dozen were greater than during the entire 10 prewar years of 1931–40.

8. Imports of scissors and shears valued at more than 50 cents per dozen during 1959 had a foreign value of $3,059,673 which is more than 49 times the average annual value during the 10 prewar years.

9. The quantity of scissors and shears valued at more than 50 cents per dozen imported during 1959 was 8,204,568 pairs which is more than 50 times the average annual quantity imported during the 10 prewar years.

10. Imports of scissors and shears valued at more than 50 cents per dozen increased 21 percent from 1958 to 1959.

11. Imports of scissors and shears valued at more than 50 cents per dozen during the first 5 months of 1960 were 22 percent higher than during the first 5 months of 1959.

12. Foreign manufacturers, since the end of World War II, have cut their prices on scissors and shears so that the average value of an imported pair during 1959 was less than half of the value of a pair imported during 1946.

13. The major sources of imported scissors and shears are West Germany, Italy, and Japan. Hourly wages paid to employees in the scissors and shears industry in these countries are from one-tenth to one-third the hourly wages paid in the United States for similar work. In the United States, the labor cost of producing a pair of quality scissors or shears is about 75 percent of the total cost.

14. Domestic manufacturers are unable to sell scissors and shears in foreign markets due to low prices of scissors and shears produced in West Germany, Italy, and Japan.

15. Imports of scissors and shears valued at more than $1.75 per dozen during 1959 were equal to 95 percent of domestic manufacturers shipments of similar scissors and shears.

16. The value of shipments of domestically manufactured scissors and shears declined from $19,526,000 in 1948 to $11,058,000 in 1958, a decrease of over 40 percent.

17. Some domestic manufacturers are presently operating at a loss.

18. Many employees in the domestic scissors and shears industry are trained only for this type of work and have been unable to find new work in other industries.

19. Scissors and shears are essential items for use during national emergencies. Certain types are included on the "List of Items Essential for Survival" issued during February 1958 by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

20. The domestic scissors and shears industry has the employees, equipment, and know-how to produce surgical scissors and bandage scissors in case of a national emergency.

For the reasons summarized above domestic manufacturers of scissors and shears have requested that scissors and shears classified under paragraphs 357 and 1531 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, be removed from the list of products to be considered for possible U.S. concessions during the coming negotiations under the Trade Agreements Act of 1934, as amended and extended.

Each pair of scissors or shears imported means one less pair will be manufactured by U.S. workmen in U.S. plants, financed with private capital and paying taxes to the U.S. Government.

On the Other Foot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, August 25, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by John Herling as it appeared in the Washington Daily News of August 23, 1960:

ON THE OTHER FOOT
(By John Herling)

Must we believe that unethical practices are built into the American business system? The scandal in the Chrysler Corp. compels us to find an answer.

When Robert F. Kennedy, former chief counsel of the McClellan rackets investigation, looked into improper practices of the labor or management field, he came up with serious findings against a group of business "respectables."

His list of the so-called respectables included some of the country's blue-chip companies whose top officers, according to the committee investigators, had been hip deep in collusion with certain characters who had muscled their way into the trade union movement. In return for current and future favors, so-called trade union representaitves had "supplied" labor to employers either at cut-wage rates or other profitable considerations.

Loud and justified indignation was heard. The scorn and the legislation were, however, directed mainly at the trade union movement. Senator JOHN F. KENNEDY worked for a law to apply equally to malpractice in labor and in management. But, by and large, under Landrum-Griffin, companies and their managements came through with scarcely a legislative glove laid on them. Here and there, some provision in the Landrum-Griffin law called for certain types of "reporting and disclosure." But, as one of the administrators of the Landrum-Griffin law told me sardonically: "This is a 50-50 law, all right. Both labor and management are mentioned in it, in equal percentages—like the famous stew made up of half horse and half rabbit."

You will recall that the McClellan investigation went on full tilt despite the establishment of codes of ethical practices by the American Federation of Labor and the Congress of Industrial Organizations; despite the expulsion from the AFL–CIO of the Teamsters and other unions whose leadership was declared corrupt; and with the approval of key AFL–CIO leaders.

During and after the McClellan hearings, as Bob Kennedy shows, questions were raised about the ethical practices of management itself. The National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce—and its large corporate memberships—were both queried about the need for ethical practice codes. These questions were ducked. But now, with the Chrysler supplier scandals made public, the time for evasion has passed.

What do we find is alleged to have happened in the Chrysler Corp.? Its miracle man president, William C. Newberg, was fired for "conflict of interest." He is charged with profiting from personal interest in two firms supplying parts to the Chrysler Corp. He is not the only one. Jack W. Miner, director of marketing for the Plymouth-De Soto-Valiant Division, was tied in with an advertising company which did profitable business with Chrysler. Stockholders' suits have been brought. The Chrysler management has hired a big law firm, headed by former Republican presidential nominee Thomas E. Dewey, to "check on the adequacy of its continuing investigation"—an investigation being conducted by the corporation itself.

Will Chrysler's appointment of Tom Dewey satisfy the public? Remember the scorn which was deservedly heaped upon James R. Hoffa when he appointed former Senator George H. Bender, Republican, of Ohio, to report to him on malpractice inside the Teamsters Union?

Let us be candid. Only congressional committees have power to study the nature and extent of this and related conditions in the national business community. The Attorney General also has power to investigate. What's good for organized labor is good for organized business. Let's have a 50-50 deal.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago this autumn an organization was formed to represent the views of more than 2 million fine Americans of Ukrainian ancestry. It is a privilege for me today as it reaches that milestone in its history to salute that organization, the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, and its noted chairman, Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University and its Institute of Ethnic Studies, who has been the leader of the congress committee during more than half its lifetime.

The Ukrainian Congress Committee, under the direction of such leaders as Dr. Dobriansky, is dedicated to the security interest of the United States which it serves principally through information concerning the struggle for freedom of the captive nations behind the Iron Curtain and through concrete proposals in the propaganda aspects of the cold war. Through information provided by the congress committee we have been able to pierce the myth of Soviet unity which Communist Russian has foisted upon the free world. Dr. Dobriansky has pointed out that the non-Russian nations within the Soviet borders are peoples with enduring histories and that the Ukraine with its 42 million people is the largest of the non-Russian nations within the Soviet Union—which cannot by any stretch of the imagination be called a nation itself.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that the Ukrainian Congress Committee will continue to flourish so that it can proceed with its mission of informing all the American people about the conditions within the Soviet Union. I heartily congratulate it on its 20th aniversary and I commend it for the great work it has done during those years.

Know Your Congressman—Legislative Record, Duties, and Responsibilities of Congressman Gordon L. McDonough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, it is the desire of all Members of Congress to become intimately and personally acquainted with all of the people they represent and likewise for the people they represent to know their Congressman.

This is not always possible as much as the Congressman and the people he represents try to become personally acquainted.

However, through correspondence, the press, radio, TV, and other means of communication, all Congressmen try to inform their people what they are doing; the bills they sponsor, introduce, and promote; the committees they are assigned to; the major issues they have voted for; and their duties and responsibilities.

In order to properly inform the people of the 15th District, I am submitting the following summary of my legislative record, my duties and responsibilities, and some of the important legislation I have promoted:

MAJOR ISSUES CONGRESSMAN M'DONOUGH HAS SUPPORTED AND VOTED FOR

The McDonough record speaks for itself. But the record of achievement in legislation initiated by him is but a small part of the total record of accomplishment built by the consistent and vigorous efforts of the Congressman from the 15th District in behalf of his constituency.

He has supported legislation to establish a strong adequate national and civilian defense to meet any enemy attack.

He has urged legislation to outlaw the Communist Party in the United States and to combat communism both within the United States and abroad.

He stands firmly opposed to the admission of Red China to the United Nations.

He has consistently supported new and improved veterans' hospitals and necessary increases in pensions for service and nonservice-connected veterans and war widows and dependents.

He has supported lower downpayments on new homes and liberal loans for alternations and repairs of existing homes, and for slum clearance under housing legislation.

He has supported increased social security payments that would provide adequate pensions to our senior citizens, and legislation to provide health and medical aid for our needy senior citizens.

He believes in a sound fiscal policy which will hold inflation in check and at the same time promote stable economic growth in the United States and maintain a maximum level of employment.

He has supported civil rights legislation to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, or color in education, voting rights, and employment.

McDONOUGH believes in economy in Government through elimination of waste, extravagance, and duplication of services. He also believes in providing maximum service to our citizens for every dollar spent by Government.

He believes in tax reduction, if such reduction can be achieved while we at the same time maintain our national defense at the high level necessary and meet the technological challenge of the Soviet Union in the field of scientific achievement.

LEGISLATIVE RECORD OF CONGRESSMAN GORDON L. M'DONOUGH

The record of achievement attained during his term of service to the people of the 15th Congressional District is outstanding. It is a record of action rather than words—of accomplishment rather than promises. It is the result of his consistent efforts to act and work in the best interest of all the people in his district as well as for the Nation.

During the eight complete Congresses in which McDONOUGH has served, he has introduced the following major bills which have resulted in ultimate action and public law.

Now let's have a look at the McDonough record.

California ownership of tidelands: A bill to establish the title of the States to tidelands areas was introduced by McDONOUGH in the 79th Congress. His fight to establish California's ownership of tideland property which is so important to the citizens of our State culminated in enactment of Public Law 31, 83d Congress, which recognizes California's ownership of tideland property.

Los Angeles post office expansion: A bill for the expansion and remodeling of the terminal annex post office was introduced by McDONOUGH in the 80th Congress. The improvement and extension of facilities at terminal annex which included an additional floor on the building was necessary as this post office handles the bulk of ingoing and outgoing mail for the Los Angeles area, and the tremendous population increase in the Los Angeles area since World War II resulted in a corresponding increase in the mail load handled at terminal annex. The expansion and remodeling of terminal annex has been completed as a result of Public Law 233, 81st Congress, and efficient mail service in the Los Angeles area has been maintained.

Federal buildings for Los Angeles: Congressman McDONOUGH introduced a bill in the 80th Congress for the construction of a new customhouse and Federal office building to meet the increased need in the Los Angeles metropolitan area, and to afford greater service and convenience to the public. Congressional action providing approval of this building was completed July 1956, and construction on the new Los Angeles customhouse and Federal office building will soon be underway.

Los Angeles harbor improvements: Los Angeles Harbor is one of the largest harbors in the United States, and with constantly increasing commerce, facilities for the loading and unloading of vessels must be expanded with harbor channels extended and enlarged to provide more space for vessels and to assure adequate channels for larger vessels to make port at Los Angeles.

Congressman McDONOUGH introduced bills to improve the east basin of Los Angeles Harbor by dredging and enlarging, and to improve the west basin including the removal of a drawbridge, and these harbor improvements were authorized in Public Law 641, 84th Congress.

He also obtained reimbursement to the city of Los Angeles for funds which had been expended on the East Basin Harbor improvement for necessary immediate work prior to the congressional authorization.

Air pollution control—smog: Recognizing the serious threat of smog to the health and welfare of every citizen of Los Angeles, McDONOUGH introduced a bill in the 84th Congress to provide for research by the Federal Government into the causes of air pollution, its control and prevention.

The Federal program for research on air pollution now in progress under the direction of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare was inaugurated with enactment of Public Law 159, 84th Congress.

Marina Del Rey project: The McDonough bill introduced in the 83d Congress provided for authorization of the Marina Del Rey small craft harbor, a project urgently needed to supply a base for the U.S. Coast Guard Air-Sea Rescue Unit, and which also will provide additional small-craft facilities and a useful recreation area. Authorization for this project was included in Public Law 780, 83d Congress. Congressman McDONOUGH's vigorous efforts also obtained the following appropriations for the Marina Del Rey project: $25,000, Public Law 163, 84th Congress; $355,000, Public Law 641, 84th Congress.

Repeal of taxes: Congressman McDONOUGH introduced legislation in the 80th Congress to repeal the excise tax on theater admissions. Partial repeal of the admission excise tax was enacted under Public Law 324 of the 83d Congress and Public Law 1010, 84th Congress.

Veterans: In the 79th Congress, McDONOUGH introduced a bill to extend National Service Life Insurance for 5 additional years thereby assuring life-insurance benefits for all men in service which otherwise would have terminated. The extension of National Service Life Insurance was established under Public Law 118, 79th Congress.

McDONOUGH introduced a bill in the 83d Congress to extend the 3-year presumption of service connection to veterans in all types of tuberculosis. This bill was designed to bring relief to many veterans with types of tuberculosis other than pulmonary, which were contracted as a result of service. The 3-year presumption of service connection was extended to veterans in all types of tuberculosis under Public Law 241, 83d Congress.

McDONOUGH introduced legislation in the 85th Congress to increase pensions for widows of Spanish-American War veterans. The increase in pension was effective under Public Law 425, 85th Congress.

Armed services: The McDonough bill introduced in the 82d Congress fixed the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps to assure full efficiency of the corps, and also gave the Commandant of the Marine Corps a place on the Joint Chiefs of Staff. This was accomplished with the enactment of Public Law 416, 82d Congress.

Air Force Academy: A bill to establish an Air Force Academy to provide the highly specialized training necessary to provide competent and efficient officers for the United States Air Force necessary for the defense of our Nation was introduced by McDONOUGH in the 81st Congress. The U.S. Air Force Academy, now located in Colorado, was authorized with enactment of Public Law 325, 83d Congress.

Post Graduate Naval Academy in California: The McDonough bill to establish an additional Naval Academy in California and his fight to improve and extend facilities for the technical training of officers for the U.S. Navy resulted in establishment of the Post Graduate Naval School at Monterey, Calif., December 22, 1951.

U.S. flag: McDONOUGH introduced House Joint Resolution 167 in the 80th Congress to assure that the flag of the United States always shall receive proper respect and be placed in its proper position by providing that no foreign or supranational flag shall be displayed in a superior position or in place of the flag of the United States.

This protection of the flag of the United States was established with enactment of Public Law 107, 83d Congress.

Scientific research: In the 85th Congress, McDONOUGH introduced a bill to establish the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The National Aeronautics and

Space Administration was established with the enactment of Public Law 568, 85th Congress.

In the 80th Congress, McDONOUGH introduced a bill to provide a research program to develop economical methods to convert sea water to fresh. This program is of vital importance to southern California, as a practical economical method which will convert sea water to fresh for industrial, agricultural, and domestic use, will help solve the all important problem of continuous adequate water supply to meet continuing needs of an increasing population and industry. This bill also provided for establishment of demonstration plants, one of which is scheduled for construction in southern California with construction beginning early in 1961.

The research program now in progress by the Federal Government to convert sea water to fresh was initiated under Public Law 448, 82d Congress.

McDONOUGH also introduced a bill in the 80th Congress to provide for Federal research into the causes and treatment of multiple sclerosis. This program was initiated under Public Law 835, 84th Congress.

Statehood for Hawaii: McDONOUGH introduced legislation in the 80th Congress to grant statehood to Hawaii. Hawaii became the 50th State in the Union with the enactment of Public Law 3 of the 86th Congress.

Automobile exhaust control: McDONOUGH introduced a bill in the 86th Congress to provide for the necessary research by the Surgeon General to establish the amounts of exhaust gases discharged by motor vehicles and their effect on human health to provide the basis for necessary Federal control to eliminate harmful exhaust from motor vehicles. Research was authorized under Public Law 493 of the 86th Congress.

Recognition of the American schoolteacher: A bill introduced in the 82d Congress by McDONOUGH provided for the issue of a special postage stamp honoring our American schoolteachers who receive so little recognition for the service they render to our Nation. The special stamp honoring the American schoolteacher was issued July 1, 1957.

Equal rights: A bill introduced by McDONOUGH in the 82d Congress provided naturalized citizenship rights to all immigrants having the right to permanent residence in the United States, and provided quotas for Asian and Pacific peoples. The provisions of this bill were included in Public Law 414, 82d Congress.

IMPORTANT DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONGRESSMAN GORDON L. M'DONOUGH

Banking and Currency Committee

McDONOUGH is a ranking member of the powerful and important Banking and Currency Committee which has jurisdiction over the Federal Reserve Board, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Export-Import Bank, the International Bank for Reconstruction, the International Finance Corporation, and all legislation concerning the financing and rehabilitation of homes, and military housing.

Housing Subcommittee

He is also a ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Housing which has made a specific and detailed study of the need for all types of housing throughout the United States, which includes multiple housing, individual homes, slum clearance, and rehabilitation, and reconstruction of blighted areas in the cities throughout the Nation.

Committee on Science and Astronautics

He is a ranking member of the Committee on Science and Astronautics which has the duty and responsibility to pioneer the study of interplanetary travel and communication, and outer space exploration. The efforts of this committee have resulted in the successful advances in the exploration of outer space and the establishment of its practical uses as typified by Tiros I, Pioneer V, Echo I, and others.

Joint Senate and House Committee on Defense Production

He is also a member of the Joint Senate and House Defense Production Committee, which has the responsibility of making a continuous study of the programs authorized by the Defense Production Act and of reviewing the progress achieved in the execution and administration of these programs for the defense of our Nation.

Voting record and attendance

With the multiple duties and responsibilities required by the foregoing committee assignments and congressional responsibilities, Congressman McDONOUGH has one of the best records for being present and voting on important and vital issues debated and voted upon in the House of Representatives.

He is also a member of the Inter-Parliamentary Union by appointment of the Speaker and approval of the House.

He was a U.S. delegate to the 46th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, which was held in London in September 1957, and also a U.S. delegate to the 48th Conference of the Interparliamentary Union, which was held in Warsaw, Poland in September of 1959. Some 700 delegates from 46 countries attended the Conferences.

Resolution of the Commercial Law League of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following resolution which was adopted by the Commercial Law League of America at its annual convention, held in French Lick, Ind., July 17–20:

Whereas there are certain instrumentalities of the U.S. Government which are known as nonappropriated fund activities; and

Whereas these nonappropriated fund activities carry on their functions without benefit of congressional appropriations; and

Whereas these nonappropriated fund activities include such important Government commercial activities as the operation of military post exchanges and ship stores with annual gross sales in excess of $1,200 million; and

Whereas the nonappropriated fund activities are the only Government instrumentalities which are still cloaked with sovereign immunity from legal suit; and

Whereas it would be in the best interests of industry, commerce and labor that this cloak of sovereign immunity be removed from the nonappropriated fund activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Commercial Law League of America favor the passage of appropriate legislation to remove the sovereign immunity which shields the nonappropriated fund activities so that they might be sued in courts of law to the same extent as any other instrumentality of the U.S. Government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Commercial Law League of America instruct its duly authorized representatives to take appropriate steps to draft and to arrange for the introduction of proposed legislation to carry out the purpose of the above resolution, and to encourage its membership to actively support the same.

Report From Washington by Stuyvesant Wainwright

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STUYVESANT WAINWRIGHT
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, this is my eighth annual report from Washington to the citizens of Long Island's First District. It is my custom each year to submit this report so that a record of the year's congressional business is available. At this point I ask your permission, Mr. Speaker, to address myself directly to the men and women of Suffolk and Nassau Counties.

The simplest breakdown is to divide this report into two parts: First, a legislative report on this 86th Congress, properly labeled the "Wait and See" Congress; the second part will deal with personal service rendered in the district and to the individual.

I. LEGISLATIVE SECTION

In 1958 at the conclusion of the 85th Congress I wrote in this report that the 85th had been a good session. That also was a Democrat-controlled Congress; but in 1957 and 1958 the Democrats cooperated in the national interest. It was not a major election year. Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for the present 86th Congress. With presidential elections in the offing, the Congress—with a 2-to-1 Democrat majority—turned from statesmanship to gamemanship.

The Democratic leadership—the JOHNSON-RAYBURN team—failed to take action on issues which they were later to incorporate in their party platform. They rejected all major requests made by President Eisenhower in January. A few of these requests were: liberalization of the Immigration Laws, a Farm Bill designed to eliminate "give-away," much needed additional Federal judgeships, new conservation proposals, a sound minimum wage, health insurance for the aged, a housing bill, school construction aid, a depressed area assistance bill, and proper financing of the interstate highway program. With legislation floundering, Congress recessed on July 2 for the hoopla of party conventions. Needed bills gave way to balloon flying, histrionics, and portly cheer leaders reviving the "old college spirit." After 10 days of hearts and flowers, 6 weeks of recess and NIXON and KENNEDY both nominated on the first ballot, Congress reassembled.

The Senate returned on August 8 and proceeded to accuse President Eisenhower of being "silly" to expect twenty-one measures to be passed in 4 weeks. Yet the President had been urging 18 of these measures for 2 years. The Sen-

ate then turned to discussing which presidential nominee had been absent from the Senate on more occasions. A crescendo came when 3 hours of oratory was delivered at the celebration of a Senator's 50th birthday. All this momentous drama played to a sell-out audience in the galleries. Occasionally a young spectator would lean on the rail under the approving eye of a parent, displaying a "Vote for ———" banner until an usher would smilingly reprove this offender to senatorial dignity.

The House convened on August 15 and in an entire week worked the grand total of 1 hour and 12 minutes. The Democratic leader did not even bother to show up in Washington. The reason the House loafed through the week of August 15 is the fact that KENNEDY and JOHNSON in the Senate could not unify their party—66 Democrats, 34 Republicans—behind the Democratic Party platform.

The reason the Senate twiddled its thumbs in political quandary lay in ineffectual leadership. During the final 2 weeks of the rump session, Congress could only manage compromise measures on care for the aged and minimum wage. Of the 21 needed bills advocated by the President, 4 were enacted—2 of these being the ratification of the Antarctica Treaty and the appropriation of funds for Latin American aid. Of the five "must" issues in the Democratic program, none was successful. The Kennedy bills on minimum wage and care for the aged were defeated by his own party.

The lesson here is that wishful thinking does not enact legislation. An old Democrat, Columnist Walter Lippmann, summed it up a few days ago as follows:

> It is plain enough that the Democrats would be better off if there had been no August session of Congress. Senator JOHNSON and Speaker RAYBURN, who engineered it, made a miscalculation. They supposed that the session would help JOHNSON to win the presidential nomination and then to shine in August as the great legislative operator. In fact, with President Eisenhower in the White House, the odds were overwhelmingly against any Democratic success. For while the Democratic majority can say "No" to the President, and they did, a Republican President can say "No" to a Democratic majority, and he did. In our congressional system positive political achievement in a very short session against the will of the President is impossible.

That the Democratic leaders failed, even with their immense majority, can mean only one thing. The Democratic majority refused to buy the Kennedy legislative proposals. Senator KENNEDY already feels that this congressional rejection of his program may cause his defeat in November.

II. PERSONAL SERVICE RENDERED TO THE DISTRICT AND TO THE INDIVIDUAL

Due to the incredible population growth of the first district—the 1960 census shows a count of approximately 900,000 persons—this personal service phase of congressional work has increased almost beyond the physical ability of my small staff and myself. It is virtually impossible for me to spend as much time on each case as I would like. However, you may be sure that I examine each individual problem to make certain that proper action is taken. I am especially proud of my professional, nonpolitical staff who have worked long, extra hours to serve you.

Of this year's several hundred military cases, over 94 percent have been successfully resolved. A great many people think this type of work is easy for a Congressman. It just is not so. For example, the Congressman can never himself authorize a compassionate reassignment or a transfer. The decision is up to the military service. All the Representative can do is to make sure all the facts are reviewed. Unfortunately, it is often true that the armed services get bogged down in the tremendous volume of peacetime administration. Request forms might lie weeks in a sergeant's "in" box. A Congressman stimulates the machinery, cuts the redtape.

The annual review of our files reveals over 100 veterans cases completed, 267 passports and citizenship cases expedited and 136 visa cases handled and processed. This is over three times the number received by the average legislator. The visa problems we receive are extremely complicated. One individual case, successful this year, was actually initiated early in 1955. It concerned a young man of Polish descent, born in this country. He was taken to Poland as a child by his parents and thus acquired dual citizenship. Having remained in Poland by necessity during the war, his chance to come to the United States finally arrived in 1955. Naturally, this was within his right as an American citizen. The problem arose when the Polish, Communist-controlled government, ignoring his American birth, claimed him as a national. After 5 years of negotiation with the State Department, our Embassy in Warsaw, the Immigration Service, and relatives in the United States, I am happy to report that the man and his family have arrived safely in this country. Incidentally the file of correspondence in this case is over 4 inches thick. It is also most gratifying to have been of assistance in having several foreign-born orphans admitted for adoption by couples in Suffolk and Nassau—five from Korea, two from Italy, two from Germany, and one each from Greece and Norway. Miss Alison Anderson of my staff has done unselfish service on all these cases.

Another service to this office is to fulfill requests for everything from a 400-foot Navy destroyer, the U.S.S. *Myles S. Fox*, for Port Jefferson's Fourth of July celebration, to simply a copy of a House resolution. Perhaps the bulkiest item in this category was the many flags that were flown at my request over the Capitol this Fourth of July. As a matter of interest, these flags will some day be collectors' items in that they were certified by the Architect of the Capitol as having been flown on the first day our 50-star flag became official. Since it is rather unlikely that there will be any additional States admitted to the Union for many years, or possibly ever, this event is historic. All flags so flown are paid for by the constituent.

As in past years, we have filled our entire quota to each of the service academies, including six at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point. Perhaps the most important aspect of the service function is to keep you, the citizen, informed. This report is but one method. Each week while Congress is in session I submit to our weekly newspapers a column for publication. I also broadcast a weekly radio program over a number of local stations. Both of these efforts are designed to give you a better insight into the workings of our Government. This is based on my fundamental belief that a Representative is responsible to the people. What he does or fails to do in Washington is in the last analysis your concern. Perhaps the high point of this year's radio programs was the interview with Capt. Edward Beach, a distinguished friend and skipper of the Navy's atomic-powered submarine, *Triton*, immediately after the return from his epic, globe-encircling voyage.

Another important area of service is to provide you with proper postal facilities. In this instance it is necessary to repeat the fact that Suffolk and Nassau Counties are colossal "growth regions." I would estimate that an average of four letters a day leave my office on some postal matter. This year we have been especially fortunate in acquiring a record of 15 new post offices—Babylon, Center Moriches, East Hampton, East Islip, East Patchogue, East Setauket, Massapequa, Montauk, Shelter Island, Greenport, Shirley, East Quogue, Farmingdale, Farmingville, and Shoreham. In addition, Amityville now has "foot delivery"; Cutchogue, Farmingdale, and Greenport all have new R.F.D. routes; Port Jefferson will have outgoing mail on Sunday; Sag Harbor has delivery service to North Haven; and Westhampton Beach has had city delivery approved. Each one of these items represents many man-hours in Washington, especially on the part of Mr. Ralph A. Patterson of my staff.

As in past years there have been several million dollars in Federal Housing Administration loans and Defense Department contracts awarded to Long Island. This fact in itself is a mark of economic growth and national prosperity. The Army Corps of Engineers reports over $5 million in construction in Suffolk alone. While on the subject of the engineers, I might mention that their work at Fire Island Inlet has not been satisfactory. Guided by the New York Park Commission, they failed to provide the type of inlet channel to give maximum safety. Several tragedies have occurred. All that they did was to put sand on the park commission beach. All my attempts to keep this from happening were to no avail. At the present time I have asked for a complete review of the project. This along with my beach erosion program must be constantly watched or else the State park commission will force deviation.

My personal economic prediction for Long Island, highly accurate over the past 8 years, is extremely optimistic for the next 6 months. Despite every effort

of partisan Democratic politics to claim that we are in the midst of a depression, the proof contained in facts and figures continues to provide evidence of a healthy, expanding economy.

Finally, through our efforts the Federal Aviation Agency has agreed to locate a new $41 million air route traffic control center near MacArthur Airport in Islip, as well as to relocate a facility at Montauk.

As you know, I hold regular office hours in Huntington and Wainscott on alternate weekends to hear your problems and suggestions. In Washington I welcome your mail. An effective democracy must involve, by its very nature, the interest and opinions of all its member citizens. It is a pleasure and an honor to serve you in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to address my annual report to the people of the First District of New York.

Life Line Program Has Grassroots Support

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the patriotic and religious educational movement known as Life Line is having a tremendous impact on the thinking of Americans about important national issues.

Under Life Line's auspices, a daily radio program, originating in Washington, is broadcast over more than 100 stations throughout the country. Also, there is published a triweekly newspaper, Life Lines, containing up-to-the-minute discussions of matters that are of vital interest to all Americans who are concerned about preserving freedom in the world.

An example of the influence of the Life Line movement is shown in a letter recently received by the organization from a constituent of mine, Mr. Curtis Bozarth of Lampasas, Tex. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert this letter in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LAMPASAS, TEX., *August 25, 1960.*

LIFE LINE,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a U.S. history teacher in Lampasas Junior High School and am very interested in the program called "Life Line." I have been working on a program in my classes which we call Freedom Foundation. We attempt to give the American way of life or our American heritage much greater stress than before. We started this program in 1951 and have had great success. As I listen to "Life Line" over WFAA, Dallas, Tex., I can see we are interested in the same thing, namely preserving our American way of life against government social problems.

In our school, from the 1st grade through grade 12, we carry on this program. We do a very simple thing and we think it is very successful. We stress eight basic principles which cover the American way of life; namely:

1. Freedom of the individual.
2. Importance of the individual.
3. Trust in God as each individual understand Him; freedom of religion.
4. Dignity of work.
5. The profit motive.
6. Free competition.
7. Government as a protector, not a provider.
8. Private ownership of property.

As you can see, we are trying to accomplish the same thing you are. We believe it can be done in the classroom. I am interested in securing information I can use in my class work or club programs. "Life Line" has so many good ideas that I am wondering of you could send me copies of talks or ony other information. I assure you that it will be used to good advantage.

Thanking you in advance for your trouble on my behalf, I am,

Respectfully yours,

CURTIS BOZARTH.

Jets and Whirlybirds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 24, 1960

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have asked leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of this editorial so that attention will be called to the fact that the Federal Aviation Agency is currently planning the inauguration of airline service at the new $100 million Dulles International Airport on July 1, 1961. It is claimed that this airport will be a showpiece since it has been designed in the most modern manner for the exclusive purpose of serving the Capital of our country. Dulles International Airport is located some 30 miles west of Washington. Even under the most optimum conditions, surface transportation can be expected to consume a very substantial amount of time. I am advised that new, 155 miles per hour, 25-passenger helicopters will be operating in the New York area next spring. With similar machines operating in the District, the distance between Dulles International and downtown Washington could be covered in under 10 minutes. It seems that this matter deserves the urgent attention of both the Civil Aeronautics Board and the Federal Aviation Agency.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington Sunday Star, July 10, 1960]

JETS AND WHIRLYBIRDS

The Federal Aviation Agency wisely is seeking bids for a variety of transit facilities to link the Dulles International Airport to Washington and the National Airport, for the 30-mile distance to the city is sure to pose severe headaches when the new jet airport opens next summer. Along with ground transportation, however, we think the Civil Aeronautics Board would be well advised to consider the possibilities of regularly scheduled helicopter passenger service, of the sort already functioning at air terminals in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles.

Such scheduled service as exists in these cities requires a special certification from the CAB, and thus far the agency has been reluctant to extend it. The main reason is that the New York-Chicago-Los Angeles helicopter operations all have required substantial Government subsidies, which have been granted on the theory that such service is a promising venture still in the developmental stages. This CAB attitude, of course, is understandable, for there are limits to how far such subsidy programs can and should go.

The need for subsidies, however, are expected to lessen progressively as new improved helicopter aircraft are developed. Already, one of the several firms which have applied for scheduled flight certification here has on order a fleet of 25-passenger turbine engine helicopters, which will constitute a step toward more economical operation. Other improvements are sure to follow.

There is no doubt that ground transit carriers, no matter what the future of the whirlybirds, will handle most of the airport-to-airport and airport-to-city traffic, for the passenger load will be enormous and certainly ground travel will be cheaper. As a supplement, however, officials are becoming more and more convinced that the Dulles operation also will provide a strong public requirement for an effective helicopter program. Its possibilities, at the very least, should be considered, and discussions to this end between officials of the FAA and the CAB should be initiated before any more time elapses.

Jewish Home for Convalescents To Honor Harry D. Cohen, Its President, on the Occasion of Its 45th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT ZELENKO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. ZELENKO. Mr. Speaker, on December 11, 1960, at the Hotel Biltmore, in New York City, the Jewish Home for Convalescents will honor its president, Harry D. Cohen. It is important that the history and efforts of this institution be made a part of this RECORD, for it is indeed a classic example of an American community effort.

In reciting the story of the Jewish Home for Convalescents, located at Grand View on the Hudson, and in bringing it to the attention of a larger public than the community in New York City which it serves, I do so because its story is a reflection of life as we know it in America—where everyday people are concerned about the welfare of a neighbor on a true humanitarian level. It is a story of good will, opportunity and achievement, and in its dissemination projects a plan which can benefit other communities. To paraphrase an early neighbor, bestseller author, Harry Golden, "Only in America" could this story be told.

It was back in 1915 in New York City that everyday people struggling to support their families, felt the existing need to succor the needy who had become ill and although discharged from the hospital, had no place to recuperate. This

socially creative urge expressed itself in the affiliation of some 15 small fraternal societies of the East Side which began a search for a suitable location for a rest home. They planned that on the basis of an annual $50 membership by enough affiliated organizations they could create the fund with which to initiate the enterprise. Neighborhood doctors Phillip Bereano and Julius Weiss, merchants Samuel Goldstein and Emanuel Bauman, restaurateur Solomon Hechter, and lawyer Morris D. Reiss were of the committee that brought back the report that the opportunity had been found. It presented itself when a roadhouse on the Hudson River, some distance from the city, had been foreclosed.

It would only need a deposit of $500 to sign the contract. The bank was impressed with the project and made the terms easy.

It had to be a labor of love—how else to explain the fact that East Side ladies like Jennie Leibowitz, Rose Markowitz, Betty Zucker, and Rose Cohen would go up to the building on the river to clean rooms, wash floors and sew linens. How else to explain how Eddie Stein and Max Orenstein would solicit the merchants of the East Side for their overstocked weekend perishable foods and cart them up so that needy sick people could be nourished and restored to health. The efforts of this pioneer group soon became the talk of the organizational life of the community and Roumanian, Hungarian, and Russian organizations joined them. In time there were some 110 affiliations. Labor and industrial groups joined in too, for here was a group of people that was really being helpful to working people. The Masons, Odd Fellows, and Pythians and their ladies' affiliates added their support.

Soon the bank's mortgage was lifted and there was now room for expansion. Solaria were built, modern plumbing introduced and an elevator installed. The department of social welfare under whose legal supervision the enterprise functioned looked upon the program with great approval—it rated it A–1 for plant and administration. The home had reached a point of development where it was referred to as "Grand View the Gem on the Hudson." What earned it that name was the scenic beauty of the Hudson River at that point. The patients were resting in chaises and lounging chairs on the large veranda overlooking the river, with sun, mountain air, and river breezes blending in a well balanced portion of a health restorative. Plentiful food, adequate rest, and medical supervision assured speedy recovery.

The patients represented a true cross section of the New York community, for this was intended to be a true nonsectarian philanthropic enterprise. They came from the city's municipal and private hospitals, from the social service agencies, and were recommended by the fraternal organizations and private physicians. They included people with backgrounds of 23 different nations, and of all creeds and colors. The project of the city people appealed to the neighbors of the surrounding villages and the nonsectarian character invited the interest of appellate division Justice Arthur Tompkins, Grand View Mayor James Bloor, and the Drs. Kline and Drs. Rooney, fathers and sons.

In its time the home attracted, in New York City, Dr. Julius Weiss, Leather Merchants Samuel Goldstein and Isaac Lippman, Counselor Morris D. Reiss, and Construction Contractor Maurice Schwartz to become presidents of the organization. Samuel Koenig, the textile executive, made gifts of substantial improvements. Dr. O. L. Friedman, the noted expert on geriatrics, headed the medical board.

Harry D. Cohen, who has been the president during the past 10 years, was an immigrant who had been brought up in a home which had encouraged philanthropic interest. Together with his brothers he found his way into the company of the pioneers in 1915. He prospered as a dress manufacturer and Miami hotel owner. During all this time he has given this philanthropic interest the same devotion he has shown to his own business activities.

Recognition has come to the Jewish Home for Convalescents in its selection as one of the agencies of the Greater New York Fund to receive an allocation from its annual fund raising campaign.

An example of the home's progressive outlook is the seminar which is conducted annually when the social workers of the hospitals are taken for a day's outing to the institution where coupled with a recreation program, a period is devoted to the exchange of ideas of how the service can be put to a more efficient use by the public, and speakers from the department of hospitals and the department of social service are heard.

The home with its 100-bed capacity presently accepts guests for a period of 2 to 4 weeks and under the new program a stay will be of longer duration. It is most gratifying that during its existence the home has brought important help to over 50,000 families in restoring people to health and enabling them to take again their positions as active members of the community.

During the past several years, with the discovery and use of new drugs and procedures, a new hospital approach to immediate patient ambulation reduced the need of convalescence of hospital patients in the home as the institution had been practicing it for many years.

Always progressive in outlook, the governing board studied the problem and learned how urgent was now the need for care for the aged sick. There was now an overwhelming demand for nursing care. It consulted with the department of social welfare and decided to request charter authority to extend its functions to include nursing care aid to supplement its dwindling convalescent care program.

The State's architects studied the building and plans were formulated to convert one wing of the building from a ward into a series of private rooms. They would experiment with the idea of a concentrated health and care program to serve the community's needs in one center instead of in separate institutions. The idea would encourage an ambulatory existence for all as part of the same health and restoration and maintenance program.

A new day was dawning. The opportunity to serve people would now be greater than ever and it would be measured by the readiness of the organization to adapt itself to the needs of the changing times, changes dictated by science, medical outlook, and community viewpoint. Since the care of the aged was a greater responsibility than the care of the fully ambulatory convalescent patient, the safety measures prescribed by law would be extensive and the home must be prepared to implement them.

And so now in its 45th year of existence, the institution is launching its programs to create these new facilities and is bringing itself to the attention of foundations, labor, industry, fraternal societies, and the legal and accounting professions to grant encouragement and material aid to a project which may serve as a pilot for implementation by other communities throughout the land, illustrating how a people's project, although unendowed, renders superb service.

U.S. Workers Entitled to Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see an increasing number of Americans becoming articulate in their demands for sensible and constructive thinking in our trade and aid programs.

Certainly it is not unbecoming to an American to demand equal rights under the law of supply and demand for American workers as well as American enterprise.

If any Member of Congress kids himself or his constituents with the argument that "if we do not do the Russians will," he is only doing the bidding of those amongst us in both our country and abroad whose whole interest in foreign trade and aid is the dollar he makes for himself.

While on the subject of Russia maybe our promoters of foreign trade and aid ought to know that the Russians have a trade policy that shows how they take care of home industries and protect their own markets.

The Russian Government forbids any article imported into Russia to be sold for less than the same article—or equal—manufactured in Russia.

We as Americans should remember one simple truth, "We are as strong internationally as we are at home—no stronger and no weaker."

I am happy to present for the RECORD the presentation by Thomas Carpenter, district 50, research assistant, before the U.S. Tariff Commission.

[From United Mine Workers Journal, Aug. 15, 1960]

U.S. WORKERS ENTITLED TO PROTECTION—THOMAS CARPENTER, DISTRICT 50 RESEARCH ASSISTANT, OBJECTS TO FURTHER TARIFF CUTS ON LOW-WAGE IMPORTS

A notice of intention to negotiate pursuant to the Trade Agreements Act of 1934 as amended and extended, including a list of dutiable items to be considered, was published in May 1960. Under schedule I entitled "Chemicals, Oils, and Paints," paragraph 1 through paragraph 95 of the Tariff Act of 1930, there appears a list of chemical, oil, and paint products, numbering some 425 items, imported into the United States and proposed for consideration in trade agreement negotiations. Generally speaking, these items are either directly or indirectly competitive imports of practically every major industrial chemical employer in the United States.

District 50, United Mine Workers of America, represents, for purposes of collective bargaining, a large number of workers who contribute to the production of either the source material or the end product of practically all of the items listed in the above announcement.

Taking into account the broad scope of the chemical industry in the United States, we find that a substantial number of the chemicals listed above are used by other industries in the production of durable goods: that is, building materials, electrical equipment, furniture and fixtures, hardware, lumber products, machinery, metal products, motor vehicles and equipment, and transportation equipment; and nondurable goods; that is, beverages, food products, leather and leather products, packaging, paper and paper products, petroleum and coal products, rubber products and textiles.

District 50, United Mine Workers of America, represents, for purposes of collective bargaining, a considerable number of workers employed in the manufacture of those products itemized in both the durable and nondurable goods lists mentioned above.

Therefore, in behalf of the members of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, who may be affected by the proposed negotiations, it is the desire of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, to object to further decreases in tariffs on the May, 1960, list.

Free enterprise in the United States has prospered and grown through competition. Competition has caused American industry to engage in exhaustive and costly research to make more products cheaper and better. We have today, resulting from an intranational competitive chemical industry, a most superior complex machine contributing its fair share to the success of the United States of America in peace and war. The members of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, employed in this industry have likewise made substantial contribution to the success of this industry and the maintenance of an American standard of living.

Now this industry and the people who work to make it successful turn to the U.S. Government for the least that can be asked; i.e., an opportunity to continue to serve the United States. The American worker is entitled to necessary protection from the competitive imports of products produced by the chemical industry in other nations where wages, working conditions, and living standards are greatly inferior to our own.

For example, the workers in the six nations comprising the European Economic Community receive average hourly earnings that are between 21 and 22 percent of the average hourly earnings received by the chemical worker in the United States. It must be noted that the chemical producer in the United States is required by law to pay minimum straight-time hourly wages of nearly double the average hourly earnings of the foreign chemical producer manufacturing these competitive imports.

American industry can continually improve its output per man hour, but productivity alone cannot make up the differential between the domestic industry wages and the wages paid to their foreign counterpart.

Blocs of nations such as the European Economic Community can within that geographic area remove trade barriers because this relatively small area (approximately one-sixth of the size of the United States) has within its confines similar living and economic conditions. The problem of differentials is of no significance in this community of nations. However, comparing the wages of this economic bloc with those of the United States, we have the following:

Comparison of average hourly earnings of nonsalaried workers in the chemical industry[1] in the European Economic Community (Common Market) countries with comparable workers in the United States for comparable periods

Country	Average hourly domestic rate	Earnings U.S. dollars	Percent of U.S. rate	Year
United States		$2.31	100.00	1958
Belgium:[2]				
Males	32.08 francs	.645	27.92	1958
Females	18.59 francs	.373	16.15	1958
Germany (Federal Republic):				
Males	2.51 marks	.599	25.93	1958
Females	1.64 marks	.391	16.93	1958
Italy	234 liras	.374	16.19	1958
Luxembourg	32.47 francs	.651	28.18	[3]1957
Netherlands	1.82 gilders	.482	20.87	1958
France	2.50 francs	.505	21.86	1958

[1] International Standard Industrial Classification 3[1] (chemical and chemical products).

[2] Hourly rate estimated on daily average earnings of 240.6 francs for male and 139.4 francs for female and an average work day of 7.5 hours. Combined average hourly earnings (excluding United States) equals $0.503. Percent of combined average to U.S. average equals 21.77 percent.

[3] Latest figures available.

Sources: Yearbook of Labor Statistics, 1959, International Labor Office, and U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Based on the above data, we find such vast differences in the wage structure that it would seem completely unrealistic to presume that any real competition could exist between the domestic and foreign industries, based on labor costs portrayed in this table.

The vast and dynamic machine of the industrial United States requires all of its components in working order. The interdependence of various large and important segments of industry on the chemical industry was outlined above and discussed in a statement by the president of the Manufacturing Chemists Association before the House Committee on Ways and Means, Subcommittee on Foreign Trade Policy, in 1957, and is well known to interested persons and need not be restated here.

While it is true that some American chemical manufacturers have acquired chemical plant facilities in foreign countries and enjoy cheap foreign labor, that in itself would be no justification for the further reduction in tariffs in order to unfairly enhance their competitive position against the workers in the chemical industry in the United States.

It appears that our Congress is also concerned about the unilateral trade program. On January 26, 1960, Congressman BAILEY [Representative CLEVELAND M. BAILEY (Democrat, West Virginia)] submitted to the House of Representatives House Concurrent Resolution 512, and Senator KERR [Senator ROBERT S. KERR (Democrat, Oklahoma)] for himself and Senators THURMOND, CURTIS, DWORSHAK, ALLOTT, and JOHNSTON (South Carolina), submitted to the U.S. Senate, Senate Concurrent Resolution 104. These documents express the sense of Congress that the United States should not grant further tariff reductions in the forthcoming negotiations since:

"Profound changes in the international competitive standing of the U.S. producers have occurred since the passage of the Trade Agreements Extension Act of 1958;

"Whereas, imports have increased sharply while exports have declined."

Both of these resolutions are in appropriate committees of the respective Houses of Congress and we feel certain that they capably express a growing concern of Americans everywhere.

On March 30, 1954, President Dwight D. Eisenhower sent a message to Congress, on foreign economic policy, containing the following passage:

"I have approved the Commission's recommendations that the United States withhold reductions in tariffs on products made by workers receiving wages which are substandard in the exporting country. This policy shall be placed in effect. I have also approved the Commission's recommendations concerning raising of labor standards through consultative procedures and cooperation in international conferences such as those sponsored by the International Labor Organization."

The essence of the first sentence of the President's message, quoted above, is also stated on page viii of the Notice of U.S. Intention to Negotiate.

This announced policy should bear some weight in these negotiations where the wages paid in the exporting nations are substandard to those of the United States. The United States of America has adopted a very formal policy as to what is substandard. This is outlined in the Fair Labor Standards Act. This act proclaims that all persons, employed by employers engaged in interstate commerce, shall be paid not less than $1 per hour. If we are to compete in international commerce, the United States must require that any foreign producer, desiring to sell his products in the American market, pay his workers the minimum required to be paid under domestic policy. The alternative, then, is to impose necessary restrictions on competitive imports, produced under substandard wages and working conditions, as will more fully protect the American worker in his employment opportunities as a citizen and as a taxpayer.

WE SHOULD NOT UNDERSELL OURSELVES

The policies of the United States are not to be taken lightly by Americans themselves nor should they be undersold to our foreign counterparts.

The history of the United States is resplendent with bold and virtuous actions. In this matter, an action to raise the standard of living of foreign workmen to that of American workmen is preferable to lowering the American standard to that of our foreign competition.

In reemphasizing the position of District 50, United Mine Workers of America, in this matter, it is noted that under the Fair Labor Standards Act we have, by law, established certain restrictions upon the employment of child labor by domestic employers. Oppressive child labor is defined as the employment of minors (1) under 18 in occupations found to be particularly hazardous, (2) under 16 in any other occupation, and (3) under 14 in limited work outside school hours in nonmanufacturing and nonmining occupations.

Further, under the Fair Labor Standards Act, there is established a national policy that all persons, employed by employers engaged in interstate commerce, shall be paid not less than $1 per hour. Consideration is now being given by Congress of increasing the minimum under the Fair Labor Stand-

ards Act from $1 per hour to $1.25 per hour by step rates over a period of 3 years.

In connection with this subject matter, it might be well for both the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information, during their investigation of this matter, to consider the imposition of additional import restrictions on goods produced by foreign manufacturers which pay wage rates to their employees and impose restrictions on their workers that are below the minimum standards required by law to be maintained with respect to domestic manufacturers within the United States of America.

We respectfully submit that we are opposed to any further reduction of tariff duties on competitive imports during the forthcoming negotiations.

At the Summit: Rubble and Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, August 26, 1960

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by Jay Lovestone as it appeared in the AFL–CIO Free Trade Union News of June 1960. Jay Lovestone is assistant director of the AFL–CIO department of international affairs:

AT THE SUMMIT: RUBBLE AND REALITY

(By Jay Lovestone)

Khrushchev worked hard to get the Paris summit. There he expected, as Hitler did at Munich, through massive intimidation, to have the heads of the democratic states make new concessions which would enable him to pursue more advantageously further political and territorial aggrandizement. Berlin, as the most exposed position of the democratic camp, was his immediate target. Sole possession of all Berlin would assure success for his next act of aggrandizement: another summit when he felt he would be strong enough to confront the democratic world with another ultimatum promoting his drive for Soviet domination of all Europe.

At the Paris summit, Khrushchev also hoped to have the Big Three agree to some arms reduction scheme without adequate control. Thereby, he sought to weaken Western capacity for effective military defense.

After Camp David, the Soviet dictator was optimistic. President Eisenhower used Khrushchev's own words when he referred to the "abnormal situation" in Berlin. He raised Khrushchev's spirits still higher when he said that the position of the Western troops in Berlin could not be guaranteed.

Christmas 1959 saw the free world in the grip of a great illusion about the Paris summit reducing international tension and assuring peace. Many were suffering from a great obsession that Khrushchev was endowed with a peaceful disposition and good will, which provided a unique opportunity for attaining just and harmonious relations between East and West. At the beginning of the new year, the free world was vacillating and fearful. And, to cap it all, the United States was approaching a presidential election campaign with its countless possibilities for confusion and partisan conflicts.

NOT FOR APPEASEMENT

But the American people were not for appeasement of Soviet expansionism. Intensely eager as they were for peace, they were not at all convinced that Khrushchev had broken with Stalinist cold war policy. At this time, labor, more than any other voluntary organization, reflected accurately the mood developing among the American people. In September 1959, the AFL–CIO convention, meeting in San Francisco, while Khrushchev was guest of the city, unanimously declared:

"Khrushchev has been more truculent and demanding in his aggression than Stalin. The present Kremlin course toward the problem of German reunification and Berlin is far tougher than the hardest Soviet proposals put forward under Stalin. In the current Berlin crisis, the Kremlin is seeking to push its territorial position considerably westward by absorbing first Berlin and then all Germany behind the Iron Curtain. No diplomatic niceties or jovial smiles can hide this ominous development."

The subsequent Adenauer and De Gaulle visits to the United States stimulated the maturing realistic American attitude toward the projected summit. State Department declarations began to reflect the growing sentiment among the people for negotiating the Berlin issue at the summit without being bound by costly concessions previously offered to Moscow by the Big Three Foreign Ministers at the Geneva Conference.

It soon dawned upon the Kremlin that the United States, with varying degrees of support from its allies, was not going to oblige Khrushchev. At this point, it is important to keep in mind certain dates significantly emphasized by the Kremlin. According to Khrushchev, an American U–2 plane had violated Soviet air space on April 9. During a reception at the Czechoslovak Embassy in Moscow, he said: "This reconnaissance plane * * * should have been shot down. But our military missed the chance, to say the least." Though fully aware of this incident, Pravda reaffirmed, on April 18, its faith in the strategy of peaceful coexistence.

But soon, there was to be a change of Soviet tune. On April 20, Under Secretary of State Dillon strongly assured the AFL–CIO Conference on World Affairs that the United States would not hand over Berlin to Moscow or accept any disarmament without effective control. The Dillon address was the turning point in Soviet calculations as to what it could expect at the Summit. On April 25, at Baku, Khrushchev replied to Dillon with a menacing declaration regarding Berlin. He said:

"Preservation of the present situation in West Berlin would signify the preservation of a breeding ground of provocations, a breeding ground that may give rise to all sorts of surprise developments and conflicts and may even cause a catastrophe."

This was the tipoff that the Kremlin saw practically no prospect for the summit settling the Berlin issue to its satisfaction. In addition, the Geneva disarmament negotiations showed strong Western unity in insisting on effective international control. By now, it was clear to the Kremlin that the summit was to meet in a new atmosphere and not in the clouds of Camp David.

WHY DID KHRUSHCHEV EXPLODE?

Unmindful of this important turn of affairs, many, who were prisoners of high hopes and grand illusions, were surprised and stunned by Khrushchev's torpedoing of the summit. Attempts to explain his destructive action have ranged from the serious to the superficial and the silly. These explanations generally rested on the false assumption that Khrushchev was forced into dynamiting the summit by heavy triple pressure: (1) by the Stalinists under Suslov's leadership; (2) by the military; and (3) by the Chinese Communists. One correspondent, William L. Ryan, cabled from Paris:

"The Soviet boss has been required to kick overboard all he has built with great care over the past 3 years. Apparently, in the Stalinist and Red Chinese view, his peace gestures went much too far and threatened communism as a constantly moving dynamic force." (May 18, 1960.)

But what edifice of peace did this Soviet dictator ever build? And when? In the Ukraine, where, as Stalin's right-hand man, he directed the murder of millions? In 1953, in East Germany, when he crushed the workers' revolt against life-sapping speedup and Soviet tyranny? When he threatened to rocket-bomb London and Paris during the Suez crisis? Through his Berlin ultimatum of November 1958? Through his support of Peiping in Tibet and Mao Tse-tung's seizure of more than 30,000 square miles of India's territory?

When Khrushchev ordered the merciless suppression of Hungary in October 1956, he knowingly risked western disillusionment with his peaceful coexistence campaign. He took the risk—and took Hungary. Despite his reprehensible savagery, he has been able to garner huge dividends—politically and morally speaking, for example, in the post-Hungary western culture exchanges with and so-called tourist pilgrimages to the U.S.S.R.

Time and again, Khrushchev admitted that it was Lenin who initated the so-called peaceful coexistence policy as part of the strategy for Communist world domination. Khrushchev's teacher and master, Stalin, pursued this strategy vigorously in the thirties. His peaceful coexistence flirtations with democracies were soon followed by the Stalin-Hitler marriage and the Soviet war against little Finland as an aggressor. These pages from the history of Soviet foreign policy help in understanding Khrushchev's good behavior before Paris and bad behavior at the summit.

In regard to Soviet foreign and domestic policy, Khrushchev's head and hand are no longer seriously questioned—let alone challenged—in the Kremlin hierarchy. The so-called anti-Party group of Malenkov-Molotov has been destroyed. Whether Molotov is a diplomatic goatherd in Outer Mongolia or Malenkov is a shepherd in some remote Soviet village, is of no political consequence. Marshal Zhukov and Bulganin are now political zeros. Just before the Paris summit, Khrushchev tightened his grip on the Party machinery through another substantial reorganization of the Party hierarchy. The illusions Khrushchev generated about himself in the free world and the prestige gained through the sputniks and the luniks have strengthened his authority throughout the Iron Curtain domain.

In comparison with his behavior at Paris, Khrushchev's speech in East Berlin, immediately after the summit debacle, was "restrained" and rather mild. It did not announce that Moscow was about to sign its oft-threatened separate peace with Pankow. It set no new ultimatum. This soft speech showed how wrong were those who maintained that Khrushchev had been forced by a Suslov-led hard-line opposition to be tough—3 days before—at Paris. In effect, that would mean that Khrushchev could, in one night, by telephone, defeat his so-called Stalinist opposition and again become good enough for the western democracies to put even greater trust in him and his coexistence campaign.

ROLE OF MILITARY FORCES

The argument that the military forced Khrushchev to torpedo the Paris summit, abandon his peaceful coexistence policy, and adopt a hard line is equally wrong. The theory that the military dictate Moscow foreign policy is not exactly new. Only a few years ago, we were told that the Soviet military were the great hope and force for the liberalization of Soviet policy at home

and abroad. Marshal Zhukov was then hailed as the great countervailing force to Khrushchev. This theory exploded when Khrushchev easily got rid of Zhukov in November 1957. Now we are asked to believe that the military are for an aggressive Soviet foreign policy, while Khrushchev is for an understanding with the West. Khrushchev, we are told, has to follow the "tough line" dictates of the army.

The theory is based on a misconception of the relationship between the Communist Party and the armed forces. The Soviet military are not the masters but the instruments and servants of the Communist Party. Any reversing of this relationship would mean the end of the one-party system in the Soviet Union. Such a change could not be brought about without a deep-going transformation, possibly a revolt or even a revolution.

Such a change could not be brought about without a deep-going revolution. Nothing of this sort has occurred in the Soviet Union before, during, or since the Paris fiasco. In fact, only a few days before the summit conference, Khrushchev purged the opponents of his foreign policy among the high command. Most prominent among the purged were Marshal Konev, commander of the Warsaw Pact armed forces and known for his intransigency in international affairs; Marshal Sokolovsky, former Chief of Staff, and Marshal Rokossovsky. The latter two were once closely associated with Zhukov. Malinovsky has always been loyal to Khrushchev, to whom he owes his present office.

Last January, as a step toward modernizing and increasing its striking power, the Red Army was reported to have been reduced by about 1,200,000 men, including 250,000 officers. This reduction decreased the prestige and power of the Army in relation to the Communist Party. Moreover, the ability of the U-2 unarmed reconnaissance planes to penetrate the Soviet defense system has certainly not enhanced its status.

Khrushchev has always met the slightest dissatisfaction in the armed forces with intensified ideological activities and increased party control especially of the officer corps. Toward this end, an increased number of periodicals have been published since the beginning of the year to propagate the Communist Party viewpoint in the Army. Several days before the Paris blowup, there was held a conference of secretaries of the party organizations in the Army. It was devoted, among other objectives, to the strengthening of party surveillance of the armed forces. In this connection, it is appropriate to cite Sovietskaya Aviatsiya:

"The role of party political work has grown; it has strengthened its influence on decisions about concrete tasks for raising military preparedness * * * This has found expression in the growth of the party ranks. Last year, 22 percent more soldiers, sergeants, and officers were accepted into the ranks of the CPSU than in 1958 * * * In all military units, full-fledged party organizations and party groups have been created." (May 12, 1960.)

Some have argued that Malinovsky accompanied Khrushchev to Paris, upon orders from his opponents, in order to supervise the Soviet dictator. This is not so. Since disarmament was to be considered at the summit, it was only natural for the Soviet Defense Minister to be there. Furthermore Malinovsky's presence was to symbolize Khrushchev's readiness to apply military intimidation. Marshall Malinovsky was taken along by Khrushchev as his wild dog and not as his watchdog. His role in Paris was also to foster the illusion that Khrushchev now heads a constitutional government, since he, like Eisenhower, was accompanied by his Minister of Defense and Foreign Minister.

THE CHINESE FAIRY TALE

Nor is there any foundation in fact for the widely held notion that the Chinese Communists forced Khrushchev to adopt their hard line and to blow up the Paris summit. Had Peiping been able to bring about such a reversal of Moscow's international course, the entire relationship between the U.S.S.R. and Communist China would have been basically changed. Then, Peiping would not be Moscow's junior partner—as it is today. Then, Communist China would now be the master of the Soviet Union. So complete a change of power relationship could flow only from a complete reversal of respective power positions. That would signify that there had occurred a profound weakening of the economic, military and diplomatic strength of the U.S.S.R. and a corresponding strengthening of the Chinese positions. This has not happened.

Of course, there are differences between Moscow and Peiping in regard to international and other matters. But these differences are in approach, in respect to propaganda forms, and not over principles. Between Moscow and Peiping, there is absolute unity over the ultimate goal of Communist world domination. For a number of reasons, Chinese Communist tactics are more rigid and inflexible, more intransigent and aggressive, than Moscow's. Mao Tse-tung's China is in an earlier stage of revolutionary development than Khrushchev's Russia. During the comparable stage—30 years ago—Moscow's international propaganda line also was harsher and harder against the democracies than it is today. In those days it was Moscow which pursued an ultra-left course.

Peiping also has its gripes and resentments over not getting more technical and military assistance from Moscow. Mao Tse-tung is bitter at the West for not recognizing Communist China as a big power, for excluding it from the summit and the U.N. Peiping wants more help from Moscow for overcoming this inferior world position and chafes at the Kremlin's inability to deliver. But what is decisive in regard to these resentments and differences is that Moscow continues to call the tune and has the last word. Thus, Mao's trusted adviser on foreign affairs, Yu Chao-li, echoed Khrushchev in Peiping's authoritative organ, Red Flag, by saying that "some ruling forces in the United States and in other Western countries have been forced to accept a certain moderation and to abandon, partially, the state of tension," because "the east wind dominates over the west wind." He further stressed:

"My country's Government and people, together with all Socialist countries, are decided to coexist peacefully with non-Socialist states. We welcome the relaxation of international tension. We hold firmly to the policy of general disarmament, the prohibition of testing and using atomic weapons, and we desire that between the two blocs nonaggression pacts should be concluded. My country's Government has always supported the efforts of the Soviet Government and of Comrade Khrushchev with regard to the opening of an East-West summit conference and other peace propositions." (Jan. 1, 1960.)

Six months later, during the 11th session of the General Council of the WFTU, meeting at Peiping, Liu Ning-I, president of the so-called All-China Federation of Trade Unions continued Mao's support of Khrushchev by saying:

"In order to avert the danger of war and safeguard world peace, we favor the holding of talks between the Socialist and imperialist countries and, through such talks, the settling of international disputes, the reaching of agreement on general disarmament and prohibition of nuclear weapons; and even the concluding of pacts of mutual nonaggression." (June 7, 1960.)

Liu wound up his remarks with all-out support "for the persistent and unflagging efforts the Soviet Union had made in this respect and the Soviet Government's new proposal of June 2 on universal and complete disarmament."

The aforementioned triple pressure theory rests on a dangerously false axiom. Its explanations of Khrushchev's outburst at Paris reflect and call for continued trust in his aims and policies as peaceful and liberal, if not yet fully democratic. Based on this axiom, Western relations with the Kremlin would lead to paralyzing complacency and accepting Soviet promises and pledges without enforcing guarantees.

The U-2 incident and whatever mistakes were made in handling it did not cause or lead Khrushchev to torpedo the summit. He merely seized upon this incident as the excuse for carrying out his previous plan to smash the summit. Before coming to Paris, Khrushchev had already realized that he could not get, at this summit, either Berlin or uncontrolled arms reduction. To participate in a summit without attaining his objectives would be a defeat for him. Such a defeat would hurt his position in world communism and slow down his drive for world domination.

And, at this time, Khrushchev did not dare to carry out any threat which might lead to war against the NATO powers. The very ill-fated U-2 incident, which he exploited, helped debunk his bragging about Soviet military invincibility. By now, America knew too much about the actual military strength and weaknesses of the Soviet military machine. Also, the Soviet people had been quite shaken by the fact that an unarmed American glider-type reconnaissance plane could, with impunity, penetrate their much-vaunted military establishment for more than 4 years. Khrushchev's insults against President Eisenhower were calculated to reassure the Soviet people that he is strong and not afraid to abuse even the United States.

Toward further overcoming the Soviet people's developing skepticism about his boasts of invincible military power, Khrushchev demanded an apology by President Eisenhower as a prerequisite for going on with the summit. He knew he could not get such an apology, because it would humiliate America in the eyes of the whole world. It would seriously undermine the faith of all NATO members in United States prowess and reliability for firm action at a critical moment.

There were costly mistakes in American and other Western democracies' policies which led to the nightmarish situation at Paris. Yet, the aftermath of the summit fiasco is not all bad. Had the democratic powers appeased Soviet expanionism, it would have whetted Khrushchev's appetite for further aggrandizement and aggravated the danger of a new world war.

WHAT IS AHEAD?

Khrushchev's truculent behavior in dynamiting the summit has served to disillusion many people who now see more clearly his role in promoting Soviet world domination under cover of hypocritical smiles and demagogical pretensions to peace. What he did at Paris has had a salutary effect on the German Social Democratic Party and important sections of the British labor movement which were, with all good intentions, drifting dangerously into suicidal pacificism.

The post-Paris world situation will become increasingly grave. Moscow will bring to bear all sorts of new pressures. The latest Soviet "disarmament" proposals are not an improvement of Khrushchev's past proposals. They only prove that the Kremlin will resort to all sorts of tricks for the purpose of undermining western capacity to resist Com-

munist aggression. The coming months will see Moscow intensifying the cold war to desperate levels.

Only the joint strength—military, economic, and political—of the western democracies has to date saved the free world from Soviet conquest and Communist domination. This power and unity of NATO must be greatly strengthened in order to discourage and deter Soviet aggression and preserve world peace and human freedom.

Paris has exposed the folly of relying on "Summitry." Our government and allies should utilize the regular and normal channels of diplomacy for negotiating with the Soviet Union agreements to preserve world peace. Even in these negotiations, the western statesmen should keep in mind that the traditional rules of civilized diplomacy do not apply in dealing with totalitarian dictators who are not bound by any rules—except those which they set for binding others and keeping them bound. Moreover, unless the democracies have superior strength, their negotiations with dictators will prove disastrous.

In all such negotiations, it is imperative for the democracies to make their own proposals for eliminating the sources of world strife. Without such initiative, the free world diplomats will tend to be negotiating on the dictators' basis and from weakened positions.

It is a human and moral necessity for every democracy to seek ways towards lasting peace. But we are not striving for peace alone. We are not striving merely to survive. We are striving for peace and freedom, for advancing human dignity and well-being—regardless of race, color, or creed.

The free world must recognize the urgency of all liberty-loving peoples uniting their capacities and resources for overcoming poverty and hunger, dictatorship, all forms of colonialism, and the threats to peace, freedom, and social progress. Such recognition demands energetic efforts to make the democratic world economically, politically, morally, and militarily superior to communism or any totalitarian despotism.

Whether this great goal can be achieved so that all mankind can enjoy peace and freedom, depends in great measure on the readiness and ability of free world labor to do more than its share in working and fighting for human well-being, dignity, liberty, and peace.

Hon. Edward H. Rees

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I cannot allow this occasion to pass without associating myself with those who have made remarks in respect to the high type of public service rendered by our distinguished colleague from Kansas, the Honorable EDWARD H. REES. I served during the 83d Congress as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee during the time that Mr. REES was chairman of that committee. He presided with dexterity and skill, and with fairness and impartiality. He enjoys the respect and confidence not only of the members of that committee, but of the Members of the House of Representatives in general. I soon came to recognize his true manly worth and his nobility of character. He certainly deserves to rank as he does among the great men who have served in the House of Representatives. He is a solid and substantial man. He possesses sterling qualities of character and he will be greatly missed when he leaves this body.

I wish him every happiness and contentment in his retirement and hope that he may be spared many more years of his useful and happy life. His friendship means much to me and I shall always remember our associations in the House of Representatives.

Hon. Paul Brown

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. PAUL KITCHIN
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, it has been a privilege to know and serve with my colleague, the Honorable PAUL BROWN, and as a result of this association I have a profound feeling of respect, admiration, and friendship for this truly great American.

PAUL BROWN has represented the people of the 10th District of Georgia well and conscientiously for over a quarter of a century, and I daresay there are few men in this body today who have a finer attendance record than has our beloved colleague. He has dedicated his life to the principles of sound constitutional government and the problems and welfare of his people have received his constant attention. He has made an outstanding contribution to the strength of our Nation and he is highly regarded by Members on both sides of the aisle.

It was with regret that I learned of his decision to retire and return to Georgia, but as he leaves the Congress I salute him for a job well done and sincerely trust that he and his fine wife will enjoy many years of good health and happiness.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C., at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in Statuary Hall, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

How To Win a War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN M. BENTLEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include the following article entitled "How To Win a War" which appeared in the August 1960 issue of the Freeman. The author, Ed Lipscomb, is director of public relations and sales promotion of the National Cotton Council of America. This is indeed a most thoughtful appraisal of the situation our country is facing today and I recommend it to the attention of all Members:

HOW TO WIN A WAR
(By Ed Lipscomb)

If all the words which have been written and spoken about the cold war with Russia could be placed end to end, they probably would match the length of an average satellite's orbit.

Every newspaper you read, every newscast you hear, gives the cold war day-to-day attention. Authors write books about it; politicians issue statements about it; and men on public platforms bring it into every presentation.

The reason is simple. Here is an international conflict which everyone agrees will determine the nature of civilization and the conditions of human life for generations to come. From the standpoint of the United States, we must either win this war or witness the death of our Nation.

I wish I could tell you how we are doing with it. Intelligent appraisal, however, is extremely difficult. Consider the matter of Russia's actual strength. I know, of course, that the Communists have been making imposing claims, but I also know that with Communists it is a matter of fundamental principle to lie. They have emphasized in their party literature since the days of Karl Marx that truth is anything which promotes the cause of communism. Evasion or denial of unwanted facts and the invention of plausible replacements for them are considered to be proof of patriotism rather than of perfidy.

I know that the Soviets have launched some satellites, and that strategically their progress here has been impressive; but I also have read that their moon shot was so arranged that no reputable tracking station could confirm or deny they even tried one; and I find that a responsible professional says their moon photographs are entirely a hoax. I know that their missiles are a fearful menace, and am confident they fired a big one into the Pacific, but again their claims of power and accuracy must be accepted or rejected on Communist word alone.

Surely they have large jets, since such a plane brought Khrushchev here; yet I understand that no airline in the world has ordered one for its own use, which suggests that a major aviation official was correct when he said that these planes are too inefficient and uneconomical for serious consideration.

They beat their chests and boast that they are going to overtake us in industrial production, with all the military capability this suggests; but even their own figures show that despite claims of mechanization, it still takes one farmer to feed himself and one other man, whereas an American farmer feeds himself and 22.

HOW STRONG ARE WE?

It is almost as difficult to feel reasonably intelligent concerning our own military strength. Judged on the basis of speeches by Senators and Congressmen trying to make political capital out of the defense issue—or statements from military officials seeking larger appropriations and greater control—one would have to conclude that we are years behind in missiles, that our strategic air force is archaic, that our warships are sitting ducks, and that in general our position is dangerous and deplorable.

Yet I have heard the Chief of Naval Operations assure a group of officers that we are capable of destroying 70 percent of the total population of Russia within 24 hours; and I have heard another admiral say that he was criticized by a congressional committee for insisting that we already have all the submarines we could possibly use for the destruction of enemy shipping.

Adding to the difficulty of intelligent appraisal by folks like you and me is the soap opera atmosphere of overdramatization which has become standard procedure with most of our editorial fraternity. The newscaster must get controversy into his program, even to his tone of voice; and daily headlines must stir the emotions whether anything of importance has happened or not.

When I add up the speeches and statements, the reports in print and on the air, a limited amount of actual knowledge, and considerable thought and study, I still must admit my earlier statement that I simply cannot give you a very intelligent appraisal of our current status in this fateful conflict with communism that means national survival or servitude for us all.

ON THE HOMEFRONT

I can, however, tell you positively how we can win it—the only way we can win it—and it is not merely by appropriating more billions for defense, or even by insisting that we get as much defense as we already are paying for.

We can win it only by winning a second war—a decisive war—that is going on inside our own boundaries. It is a war between forces which would keep us powerful by maintaining the initiative, the independence, and the self-respect of our individual citizens, and forces which through exaltation of the godhood of the group would assure the economic cataclysm and accompanying ideological collapse on which our foreign enemy depends to leave us and our allies incapable of successful resistance.

Amazingly, we tend to underemphasize the relationship between the intercontinental cold war and the conflict within our own country. We have become so conscious of comparisons in military strength and international influence that we fail to follow the signs and significance of our victories and defeats on a far more important front. We tend to become so afraid of Moscow that we are not sufficiently afraid of Washington.

This is the war which every major Communist leader has predicted we would lose, and in losing it insure our national destruction. Marx, Lenin, Stalin—even Khrushchev as late as his visit last year—all have declared again and again that this would be the pattern of our disappearance as a world power.

I said I could not tell you much about how we are doing in the military race with Russia. I find no such problem in connection with the war here at home. We are losing it. Let me call your attention to just three areas of evidence.

WE MARCH TOWARD INSOLVENCY

First in our overall trend. All of us know that it is definitely and rapidly in the exact direction our Communist opponents have so often visited would bring our total defeat.

The trend, for example, is toward national insolvency. We take counterfeit comfort in the fact that we are staying with a so-called "temporary" debt limit of $295 billion—a limit that recently was raised three times in 1 year. There is irony, almost cynicism, however, in the fact that this is merely the acknowledged debt. Our real Federal debt—in the form of fixed obligations already definitely established—amounts to $750 billion.

Even if we accept the acknowledged figure, then add the debts of State and local governments, and finally private debts, we come out with a total equivalent to approximately twice the current market value of every single tangible asset in the United States—the land, the mines, factories, machinery, office buildings, residences, livestock—everything.

You would think that such a financial situation—plus the warning inherent in the loss of half the purchasing power of our money—plus the fact that foreign countries are now holding 17 billion liquid dollars, half of them subject to demand in gold—plus the fact that the Federal budget contains built-in increases exceeding $2 billion for the year ahead—would lead to some sort of serious concern for economy.

On the contrary, in the last session of Congress, there were 20 major bills introduced which alone would have added between $50 and $60 billion a year to the present total of Federal spending.

Our slide toward insolvency is being given further impetus by the flight of some of our industries to foreign lands, and the weakening of others by steep increases in imports from abroad.

You know the story—in sewing machines, in electronic equipment, in office machines. You know that half the barbed wire and half the plywood used by the entire American market now come from overseas. You know that imports of cotton textiles have increased 216 percent in 5 years, and that foreign steel is coming into Cleveland at $55 a ton less than the price of steel produced right there in the same city.

You would think that the leadership of American labor would be alarmed. Yet the recent bitter steel strike was settled on the basis of a wage increase which, if applied to all employed persons in the country, would raise the total cost of domestically produced goods and services more than $45 billion a year.

DECAY OF PERSONAL INCENTIVE

The trend also is toward destruction of incentive.

A man of exceptional competence and ability finds that the more hours he works the less he earns per hour of effort, until he reaches the point where he can keep less than one-tenth of each additional dollar.

The investor in corporate equities finds that half his profits are absorbed before he sees them and that a further major portion must be surrendered after that.

The factory worker finds that if he exceeds the approved rate of production, he is disciplined by his union or frowned upon by his fellows, and that his progress depends on the passage of time rather than on his energy, his intelligence, or the merit of his performance.

The man who works intermittently qualifies for public compensation between jobs. If his earnings are small enough, he qualifies for admission into a communal housing unit. If he stops work at 65, regardless of health and ability, he qualifies for social security payments.

From the mental anesthesia of the television screen to the use of ever-greater leisure for the modern equivalents of stick-whittling and cracker-barrel-sitting, we see around us a glorification of mediocrity and deification of the unproductive which reflect loss of intellectual ambition, decline of crusading spirit, and decay of personal incentive.

POLITICAL PATERNALISM

The trend also is toward perpetual programs of private life by public plan.

Again and again we have seen the whole sorry story of political paternalism paraded before us—the design for the nursemaid State—the plan for government by fairy godmother—the promise of heaven-on-earth through ballots cast on Capitol Hill. We are familiar with the philosophy that the answer to every difficulty is more legislation or larger figures in appropriations bills—that all we need to do is turn over our problems, our paychecks, and our independence to political agents, and everything we should have will be provided.

Under such a philosophy, we have seen Federal outlays for civilian programs increase 83 percent in 6 years of a so-called conservative administration; and we already have reached the point where 40 million people—who with their families account for roughly half our total population—now receive checks from the National Treasury.

A VESTED INTEREST IN CONFLICT

The trend, then—the trend toward national insolvency, toward destruction of personal incentive, toward accomplished but unadmitted socialization and regimentation—this is a major reason for serious, even desperate, concern over our homefront war for survival.

A second reason is one we do not hear much about. It is the extent of our vested interest in a high level of international tension, and in the waste and extravagance that accompany it. The connection between our posture of prosperity and a continuation of Russian sword-rattling is so obvious that I have wondered at times why the coyotes of the Kremlin do not seriously array themselves in sheep's clothing, agree to drastic disarmament, abandonment of any form of aggression, and establishment of an international atmosphere of peace and serenity. Certainly I can think of no quicker or surer way in which they could throw us into the financial tizzy and tailspin they so greatly desire.

Think about these vested interests for a moment. The most powerful, perhaps, is the interest of our bureaucracy—the hundreds of thousands of officials and clerks required to give away billions of dollars, prepare multitudinous programs, and operate all manner of redtape in the much maligned name of defense. In a wholly relaxed atmosphere, what would happen to military aid for our allies, the bulging State Department, the Office of Civil Defense, and the most extensive peacetime fighting establishment we have ever sought to maintain? Half the Federal budget, more than half our Federal employees, and arguments for everything from subsidized bomb shelters to subsidized training for scientists would no longer be justified.

Think of industry—the contracts for airplanes, missile parts, guns, and equipment—the contracts for military construction, housing units, and a multibillion-dollar highway system promoted in the name of defense mobility—the contracts for building ships and submarines, and even for sirens in every city.

Think of labor—the political demands of the unemployed—the quick absorption or bankruptcy of public compensation funds—wage scales no longer buttressed by high-priced military buying.

If the economic impact of peace did not bring promptly the full financial cataclysm Mr. Khrushchev predicts, he would need only to wait a little longer while we adopted emergency boondoggling measures, arranged for displaced civil servants and industrial casualties to be put on public or subsidized payrolls, and brought our national budget back near its present level. Here would be the moment in history for him and his friends to throw off their sheep's attire and revert to wolfhood, so that we in turn would undertake to pile another major defense program on top of our newly achieved socialistic utopia, with an outcome he could readily depend upon.

The point here, however, is not to speculate on possibilities, but to express the conviction that the tremendous vested interest of influential and important American groups in the maintenance of international tension—and the part which that interest plays in giving our economy a hue of rosiness—is a second reason for concern on the domestic front.

MATCHING OUR WORDS WITH DEEDS

A third and tremendously significant reason why I say we are losing the home war is that practically nobody is fighting wholly, sincerely, and unreservedly on the side of the forces that would keep us strong. Our defense is dependent largely on men and groups who either fight on one side one day and the other the next, or who fight with one hand while accepting bribes from the opposition with the other. Since such divided loyalty invites defeat, I want to explain exactly what I mean.

If you will ask around, you will find that practically everybody is opposed to national insolvency, to destruction of incentive, and to political domination of private and economic life. You will find that he is opposed to preemptive statism, and to the fiscal irresponsibility that can bring it upon us. At least he will say he is, and the chances are he really is—except the part that applies to his own community or puts a few temporary extra dollars into his personal pocket.

I can cite you illustration after illustration, and you can add more from your own experience, of the howls that go up when a man faces the specific application, to his own pocketbook, of the very principles of national strength to which he claims allegiance.

Try to close a military installation because of the economies which can be made by consolidating it with one in another area—try to cut a subsidy of any kind—try to eliminate the expense of Federal involvement in real estate mortgages, or pork-barrel projects, or loans at less than cost—try even to merge two offices in the same city if the merger reduces payrolls—and you will hear screams from sources that range from corporation heads and bank presidents to the lowliest tenants of public apartments, depending entirely on who is personally touched.

I would like to make a statement here which I want you to correct, if I am wrong. I do not know of a single businessmen's organization, of any kind, which customarily passes resolutions on public policies, whose record will not reveal support for programs or projects which are part of our trend toward defeat.

Here, then, are three reasons for solid conviction that as of this moment we are losing, and losing at a fearsome pace, the second war—the domestic war—on which the outcome of the cold war depends: (1) the trend toward exactly the conditions which our mortal enemies have predicted would bring our defeat; (2) the vested interest of large and influential groups in the perpetuation of international tension; (3) the absence of sincere, honest, wholehearted support for the simple principles and practical policies that would keep us strong.

THE WAR INSIDE EACH OF US

The most vital question which confronts us, however, is not that of losses already sustained in this second war, or even the question of our current status, but the all-decisive question, "Can we win it?"

If we can, and if we do—if we are truly victorious here—we will defeat foreign Communists and international gangsters on any front they choose, bt it military, economic, diplomatic, ideological, or what you please. We will confound the hopes and contradict the prophecies of our enemies, and earn the respect and admiration of our friends.

How, then, can we win this second war? We can win it, and win it only, if you and I and others like us can win still another war—a third war. It is the war which each one of us must fight inside himself.

We may not have thought about it much—we may balk at even admitting it—but inside each of us, way down where we really live, there is going on a personal miniature of the domestic war I have just described. It is a war to determine which side we are really on—not which side we say we are on, but the side we really support.

Here is a war where it is impossible for you or me to be spectators or bystanders. It is impossible even to be neutral, for we ourselves are the battleground. Our decisions, and ours only, will determine the outcome.

Arrayed on one front in this personal war is a tremendous force of animal inclinations and natural desires—the appeal of immediate benefits, business advantages, or personal profits from political programs. Here also is the power of inertia. Here is reluctance to get involved. Here is temptation to kid ourselves into believing that just one man doesn't make any difference—or that because we don't get a direct dole or handout every month we are not a part of the problem—or even that we and our fellow Americans are somehow immune to the age-old and unchangeable law of cause and effect.

On the other side are our conscience, our judgment, and our knowledge that throughout all history no nation has ever survived which continued much further than we already have come down the road we are traveling.

Neither I nor any other man can tell you how you are coming along with your own personal war. I can, however, tell you how you can win it, and in winning it achieve personal invincibility which no amount of legislation can bring, and no amount of persecution by either fellow citizens or outsiders can overthrow.

PRACTICE WHAT WE BELIEVE

First, you can practice what you profess to believe. You can apply in private and business life the principles you publicly

espouse. Three out of every four average Americans, when asked about the principles they support, will give the answers which you and I know to be right. Among businessmen, the figure is more likely to be 4 out of 4.

Hence, I say that the first battle you and I must win is to practice what we profess to believe. To do otherwise means not only to lose our personal war, but through our hypocricy to influence others to lose theirs also. Just as the temperance lecturer who gets drunk is a greater liability to his cause than is the admitted barfly, so the businessman who preaches free enterprise while he participates in programs of political intervention is a greater liability than the admitted Socialist.

You can join the WCTU, vote for prohibition, circulate resolutions to close liquor stores, and wear a tall black hat and swallow-tailed coat complete with cane, but your neighbor still will not think you believe in temperance if he sees you staggering around your yard or patio at cocktail time. You cannot convince him that you are opposed to statism if you support resolutions calling for Federal funds for local projects, or make him think you believe in individual freedom and independence if you expect Washington to underwrite, directly or indirectly, your personal or business risks.

Unless you and I are willing to fight and win this very first battle, all three of the wars I have mentioned are already lost as far as we personally are concerned.

WE CAN HELP THOSE AROUND US

The second thing you can do is to initiate, in your own particular area of influence and konwledge—be it large or small—a conscious effort to help those about you to win their personal wars also.

You and I may not be able to do a thing about the personal wars of people in distant places. We may not be able to help everyone in our own State, or even our hometown. But there is not one of us who cannot be effective, both by example and by precept, among the people we see and talk to every day.

How much good will you be able to do individually? I do not know, but I know that neither you nor I nor any other man on earth can do anything except individually. I further know that we cannot wash out our responsibility with a signature on a bank check, when our brains and talents and personalities are more important than our money. And I know still further that if you will work among those about you with the aggressive, intelligent, result-getting leadership which is you at your best—if you will work with the same crusading spirit, the fire and the zeal, the loyalty and drive which you know to be typical of a dedicated Communist—you will be amazed at what you can do, and you will be amazed at how overwhelming will be your own inner victory.

How many of us will have to win our personal wars—in order to win the bigger war on the national front, and in turn the cold war itself?

The answer to that depends on the completeness of our personal victories and the amount of enthusiasm with which that conquest inspires us. Not many are needed if we are sufficiently on fire. Karl Marx, one man, was a misanthropic ne'er-do-well. Saint Paul was a puny epileptic or otherwise physically handicapped man. Hitler was a psychopathic paperhanger in Austria. Certainly no reader of these words would consider himself inferior to any of them—or to any of the twelve whom Christ himself assembled—before these became dedicated men. Perhaps we cannot match them in dedication, but the degree to which we succeed will determine the number who are needed.

PERSONAL VICTORIES NEEDED

Here, then, is our war—a war that is going to decide the nature of civilization, and the conditions of human life for generations to come. I have broken it into three parts, but for you and me it is not in reality three wars. It is one war. The outcome of it is wholly dependent on whether or not you and others like us are victorious on the battlefront that lies inside ourselves.

I won't win, no matter how the domestic front and the international front come out, if I don't win my personal war and contribute my utmost to similar victories for those around me. And I cannot be beaten, no matter how other fronts come out, if I know that I have applied to my daily life the principles in which I believe, and have given my utter best to those within my reach.

For my own part, I can give you my answer. I am going to win my war, and I am going to try so hard to help others to win theirs that I am going to know, down inside, that if everyone who reads this did the same, along with others across this land who feel and profess exactly what we do, there is no question as to the outcome of both our domestic and our cold war campaigns.

May I urge that you join me in the prayer and determination that we, each through his own victory and the effort which that victory inspires, may achieve the invincibility of soul which makes personal defeat impossible—that together we shall make a vital and conceivably decisive contribution to our cause and to our country—and that with others of like purpose and spirit we may demonstrate to all the world that an individual man must be respected when he earns the right to respect himself.

This is the war we are in. This is the way to win it.

Second Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, last Saturday night, at Hopkinsville, Ky., one of the outstanding Democrats of our Nation, the Honorable Buford Ellington, Governor of my State of Tennessee, delivered a fighting speech on behalf of our party.

Governor Ellington is a real leader, able, courageous, and well qualified to speak for our cause. His remarks at Hopkinsville were in character with his convictions and leadership. I ask unanimous consent that Governor Ellington's speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

(Remarks of Gov. Buford Ellington, of Tennessee, in behalf of nominees of the Democratic Party, general election of 1960, Hopkinsville, Ky., August 27, 1960)

Four years ago the sister border States of Kentucky and Tennessee wandered away from the Democratic fold and voted a Republican national ticket. That won't happen in 1960.

This is the year of Democratic return to national power by one of those lop-sided majorities we knew so well in the days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

This is the year that the Democrats will devastate the Republicans in the manner Harry Truman did at the whistlestops of 1948.

KENNEDY TO THE WHITE HOUSE

This is the year that Kentucky and Tennessee are going to join most of the other States of America in sending to the White House the able and distinguished JOHN F. KENNEDY, of Massachusetts.

This is the year that those famous "J-J boys"—Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, and Keene Johnson, of Kentucky—will join Jack Kennedy, in Washington, Lyndon as the next Vice President of the United States, and Keene as the next U.S. Senator from Kentucky.

This is the year that the First Congressional District of Kentucky sends back to Washington your distinguished Democratic nominee from Murray, FRANK ALBERT STUBBLEFIELD.

This is the year that Tennessee sends back to the Senate that distinguished Democratic son of hers, ESTES KEFAUVER.

Yes—this is the year of great victories for the Democratic nominees on the national, State and local levels—and it's the year that Kentucky State Democratic Chairman Smith Broadbent is going to have the pleasure of watching Republican National Chairman THRUSTON MORTON look up next November and wonder what happened.

TIME TO GO TO GETTYSBURG

Early one morning next January, JACK KENNEDY and LYNDON JOHNSON, by direction of the American people, are going to walk up Pennsylvania Avenue to the White House, knock on the door, and say: "Ike. Ike. Get up. It's time to go to Gettysburg."

WHERE WE ARE HEADED

Destiny has placed the great ticket of KENNEDY and JOHNSON before the American people—a ticket that will show a looking-on world who we are and where we are headed.

Those new frontiers Mr. KENNEDY is talking about are not fictional phrases to die at the end of a campaign. They are realities of our national life. They are elements of survival. They are necessities for the maintenance of the dignity and destiny of America as the foremost Nation of the world.

I LIKE KENNEDY

I like JACK KENNEDY. He heads our ticket, doesn't he? He won on the first ballot, didn't he? He drew a strong man like LYNDON JOHNSON immediately to his side, didn't he?

I like KENNEDY's fighting ability, his organizing ability, and his winning ability.

I went to the Los Angeles convention openly and heartily for LYNDON JOHNSON, just as my friend Earle Clements did.

But along with Johnson, with Truman, with Stevenson, with Symington, with Eleanor Roosevelt, with Earle Clements, and with other good Democrats, I accept the convention's one-ballot decision and I am just as openly and heartily for JACK KENNEDY as I was for LYNDON.

TOUCHIEST ISSUE OF THE CAMPAIGN

Especially do I like the calm, appealing, and forthright manner in which JACK KENNEDY is meeting the most unwarranted, yet the touchiest issue of the campaign, the religious faith issue.

America already has enough physical dangers upon its hands from elsewhere, without now getting into a religious hatred fight at home. I was taught religious freedom from childhood all through life. I was reared in a community where some of my closest friends were Catholic. I roomed with a Catholic boy in school. I did not hesitate when I assumed the duties of Governor of Tennessee to appoint Catholics in my cabinet.

There is simply no place in America for religious hatred among its people.

CLASSIC IN AMERICAN HEROISM

I am a Protestant, JACK KENNEDY is a Catholic; but it was that Catholic boy, whose ship was split in two, who was flung with surviving comrades in the Pacific on a war night, who helped save them, who went through an experience that is going to become a classic in American history of heroism—it was this young Catholic boy who was willing to lay down his life for freedom, and by such action help to make it possible for you and for me to be alive and to be here tonight. How do you hate a man like that?

DIVIDE, DELUDE, AND DAMAGE

Great agencies elsewhere in the world, who have attempted in this strange new space age to terrorize America, now sit back to watch this 1960 election in America, hoping that the fires of hatred will break out among us, and do what outside enemies could not do—and that is to divide, delude, and damage our people. Religious freedom is a major heritage of ours. It is not on the market. It must not be swapped for a vote of hate. A thin minority may attempt it—but I have the abiding faith in America that its freedom-loving and religion-respecting citizens will by overwhelming majorities go to the polls next November and vote for JACK KENNEDY or DICK NIXON solely on the basis of belief in their qualifications, and not on the basis of religious hatred.

I have that confidence in America. I have that confidence in my Southland. I have the that confidence in Kentucky, and I have it in Tennessee.

SECOND DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE

This is a rich moment for the Democratic Party to offer to the people of America in this campaign year a "second declaration of independence"—independence from fear, independence from hatred, independence from hesitancy, and independence from humiliation.

The dignity and the destiny of America are involved in this year's presidential decision.

What sort of policy, what sort of peace, is it that finds the President of the United States in rapid succession frozen out at the summit, blocked out at Tokyo, and shouted out by Castro?

FOREIGN POLICY CRAZY QUILT

Republican foreign policy for the past 7 years and 8 months has given us only a political crazy quilt, patched at all corners, and coming loose at the seams. We don't like it.

Republican achievements or efforts on the foreign fronts have left us with uneasiness and humiliation. We don't like it.

Republican domestic programs and policies have been decided too frequently to the better interest of highly placed and privileged people. We don't like it.

We have had 7 years and 8 months of Republican coolness and delay toward the welfare of our older people. We don't like it.

We have had 7 years and 8 months of secrecy and highhandedness in National Government. We don't like it.

ANTAGONISM TO TVA

We have had 7 years and 8 months of outright antagonism toward TVA. We don't like it.

We had the Dixon-Yates scandal. We don't like it.

We had the Goldfine scandal. We don't like it.

We had Sherman Adams. We had Talbott.

VICUNA COATS AND BORROWED RUGS

We had vicuna coats and borrowed rugs. We had private business solicitation on Cabinet stationery. We don't like that either.

And we have had 7 long years and 8 long months of Ezra Benson and the farm problem.

Now at this point watch Candidate NIXON enter the scene from another direction.

For 7 years and up until the Republican national convention this year he defended Mr. Benson.

Hardly had the nomination of the Republican Party come his way before Mr. NIXON decided that Mr. Benson would have to go.

Well, we Democrats haven't been too happy with Ezra from the beginning, but you've got to say one thing for him: He will stand up and fight.

He expected, of course, the Democratic attack.

"YOU, TOO, RICHARD?"

But now to receive a mortal political wound from NIXON must have made him understand what Caesar meant when he turned to Brutus and said: "You, too."

Ezra Benson has become a symbol of Republican political expediency. When it served their purpose to exploit him, they did so. When it was expedient to do away with him, down came the hatchet. And you may believe me, it was wielded by an expert.

FARM PROGRAM OF BOLDNESS

Having repudiated Mr. Benson and thereby his policies, the Nixonites are now searching for a farm program good for presentation during a campaign year.

But the Des Moines farm rally last weekend turned out to be perhaps the most enthusiastic preelection Democratic ovation in Midwest farm history. JACK KENNEDY and LYNDON JOHNSON got specific. They made bold pledges. They outlined practical measures.

It was their first public appearance together of the national campaign and it brought real hope to the surplus-burdened and parity-hurt farm people of America.

Declining farm incomes, said Mr. KENNEDY, and the Republican disinterest in farmers, are the major domestic issues of the current campaign.

POSITIVE ACTION NEXT JANUARY

Citing the Democratic Party platform, Nominee KENNEDY promised positive action beginning next January to raise farm income to full parity and to protect the family-type farm as a way of life.

The Democratic Party, he said, would not go back on its commitments.

It will present a program of positive action beginning in Congress next January. Included in that program will be a system of sterner farm production and marketing controls, if necessary, to gain better incomes. The program also involves a positive policy of management of farm supplies that would emphasize better diets for the low income at home, and more food for the undernourished abroad.

POLITICAL DUST STORMS

The Democratic record of keeping promises is one of the reasons that the KENNEDY and JOHNSON appearance at Des Moines was a vote-producing turn in this campaign.

It is evident that the farmers of America are now quite weary of the political dust storms blown on them these past 7 years and several months by the Republicans.

And there seems to be no great shouting from the Midwest for 4 years of Mr. NIXON, the man who defended the Benson policies, then abandoned them, and now wanders around without a convincing farm program.

BLACKBOARD OF HIS CAREER

Mr. NIXON, when standing before the vast blackboard of his political career, has many erasures he should like to make in 1960. Undoubtedly first of all, he'd recall the loose words that implied red and pinkish tendencies in general to the Democratic Party.

Today all the American people have all they can do to combat communism, and no one party can lay proper claim that it and it alone is the party of patriotism.

Nor can any one political party lay proper claim that it and it alone is the party of peace.

Yet that is exactly what the Republican propagandists will attempt again this year, and we might as well get ready for it.

NOW IT'S "POOR RICHARD"

We also might as well get ready for a propaganda picture of the Republican Party as one now suddenly stricken with poverty.

They have already pictured poor RICHARD as a boy suffering from malnutrition of cash on which to make the campaign.

That's the political joke of the year.

The Republicans have always managed to run an expensive campaign and to raise dollars when the Democrats were struggling for dimes and quarters. All you have to do for proof of that is to examine the official record of expenditures for the campaigns of 1952 and 1956.

FAST EYE ON MR. NIXON

We've got to keep a fast eye on this Mr. NIXON. He's the summer replacement on television instead of a rerun of Ike; and the makeup men have already gone to work on him, politically and for the screen.

Yet it is a matter of impartial observation that something between Mr. NIXON and the American people has always failed to click.

His image has never been a steady one.

We had the old NIXON and the new NIXON and what we will get this year is yet to become clear.

But it is clear that we have a real tough fight on our hands and we should dispose of it before we look around and attempt to count the house.

ONE-CENT ELECTRICITY

It isn't hard for any of us to appreciate what TVA means. We only have to reflect that of every item in our basic cost of living, electricity is about the only one that has not been pushed up by inflation. As a matter of fact, in this TVA country electricity steadily has become cheaper and more abundant.

"One-cent electricity" was a dream in our land for many years. The other day, TVA announced that for the first time, the average cost of the power we use so freely in our homes and businesses throughout the Tennessee Valley has dropped below 1 cent a kilowatt-hour.

DEMOCRATS MADE IT POSSIBLE

How's that for something the Democratic Party made possible, over the greatest sort of hate and opposition, more than a quarter of a century ago?

TVA'S NATURAL ENEMY

Throughout all the years of TVA history, the Republicans have been, despite occasional lip service to TVA, its most natural enemy.

All the visits of Eisenhower or NIXON to Kentucky or Tennessee can't undo the damage—and when and if Mr. NIXON visits us in this campaign, simple political honesty would require that he admit that insofar as TVA is concerned, it has no friend in him.

IN TRIBUTE TO ALBEN BARKLEY

Looking around this area, thinking of its wondrous development, realizing that the most of these things were made possible under Democratic vision, fulfillment, and direction, how could the good people of Kentucky do anything but vote a Democratic ticket this year, undoing that departure from Democratic ranks 4 years ago?

In simple gratitude and justice, you can't do anything else.

You've got to do it in honor of the memory and the greatness of a famous Kentuckian and American who also helped to make all this possible, the beloved Veep, Alben W. Barkley.

INDICTED FOR FAILURES

In this Democratic victory atmosphere tonight, we have thus far indicted the Republican Party for failures in the foreign field, fumblings and favors on the domestic front, disregard of many critical items of the welfare of our people, petty scandals and some not so petty, a general air of hesitancy and confusion, all of which have led to an uneasiness and a feeling of second-place status among the American people.

But in fairness at least one good thing may at last be said about what's happening under the current Republican national administration.

SPACE-AGE JACKPOT

In recent weeks we have hit the jackpot in space-age developments. All America rejoices. Security and survival are not partisan affairs.

Heretofore the Republican space-age policy was about as up to date as Benjamin Franklin flying his kite with a house key attached.

Now we are back in the race and maybe in the lead.

Yet one by one we have seen nation after nation resist or impede the efforts of America to form a great band of freedom-loving people around the world.

PLAYING SECOND FIDDLE

We were reduced, for a time at least, to playing second fiddle in the orchestra of the world.

Let's examine the casualty list over the past seven and a half years of the nations that have preferred cold wars with America rather than warm friendship.

The record is a ghastly one.

While the United States was not an active participant, this country was represented at a Geneva Conference between France, Russia, Communist China and Great Britain in the summer of 1954. We made no protest when this conference divided Vietnam at the 17th parallel, after which time the territory north of the parallel went Communist. The situation in Laos remains obscure and troublesome, and we still are in doubt as to the results of a revolution there 2 or 3 weeks ago.

MARINES IN LEBANON

We landed Marines in Lebanon in 1958 for the announced purpose of protecting American lives and property. In fact they were landed to try to keep order and keep Lebanon from going the same Red route as Iraq. Lebanon had been on the verge of a civil war for several months. When the Iraq revolution occurred in July of 1958, the situation in Lebanon became more acute. We were pulled off the hook by U.N. action, but the Lebanese people have never since been as close to the United States.

CRISIS IN SUEZ

We offered the Egyptians help on Aswan Dam, a project of vital importance to them. Our offer of help, for some reason, was withdrawn in an abrupt and rude fashion. This was followed within a week by Egyptian President Gamal Abdul Nasser's seizure of the Suez Canal, which was followed by the Anglo-French landings in Egypt, placing the greatest strain on the United States-British-French alliance which had been known for 150 years.

WE CLOSED OUR EYES

There are many situations in Africa only slightly more orderly than the situation in the Congo, but which have not received such widespread attention. We were not prepared for the rush of developments all over the continent. We closed our eyes to long-term trends in Africa. We were caught short, with no ready policy or trained personnel.

Iraq has moved from the position of a firm and stanch ally to a neutralist position at the best—a hostile position at the worst, following a bloody revolution in July 1958.

THE NIXON RIOTS

Vice President RICHARD NIXON's visit to Lima, Peru, and Caracas, Venezuela, in May of 1958 provoked rioting and anti-U.S. demonstrations. There is a generally increasing anti-U.S. feeling in Latin America today.

DIMINISHING INFLUENCE

All over the world, Communist influence is increasing; U.S. influence is decreasing. This is demonstrated by the Japanese riots, the Cuban situation, African affairs, and Latin American animosity. There is an increased feeling throughout the world of neutralism toward the United States, if not downright anti-Americanism. The Soviets have been able to intervene at will throughout the world, while we have seemed powerless to counterattack, gain or even hold our own ground.

We have failed to demonstrate that we were ably prepared to cope with any single major world crisis which has happened within recent years.

That's the Republican record.

Oh, in this hour, for the greatness of a Cordell Hull.

Coming out of that "lost face" status is the most imperative demand of the American people today, and the solution lies in the election of the new frontier ticket of JACK KENNEDY and LYNDON JOHNSON.

A "ONE BY ONE" NATION

The Republican Party, massing its privileged strength, seems never to have been willing or able to achieve a sympathetic relationship with the individual.

But this is a "one by one" Nation—a Nation made up of the freest individuals on earth—and the Democratic Party recognizes the status of the individual ahead of any clique or faction or group.

But examine now the Republican attitude toward the individual.

One of the coldest expressions of political philosophy was made in the Senate when Republican Senator KEATING, of New York, arose and said:

"We Republicans think of a person first as a taxpayer."

Well, our answer there is: We Democrats think of a person first as a human being. We are concerned first about his welfare, rather than his dollar. We are concerned at all times with human betterment.

TIME TO CHANGE SYMBOLS

Do not ever förget this: Back in 1952, when the Republicans rode into national power behind a military hero, Big Business became the political byword, and the Homburg hat became the symbol.

Well, the Democrats feel that the little businessman and the farmer and the laborer are also entitled to be in the picture.

It's about time for a few old straw hats and battered felts to be worn again.

JACK KENNEDY would look good in either, and he'll look good in that President's chair.

Thank you and good voting next November.

Job of Vice President—Partygoer or Potential President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat under date of June 24, 1960, as follows:

JOB OF THE VICE PRESIDENT—PARTYGOER OR POTENTIAL PRESIDENT

Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, in a speech to the Senate yesterday, expressed the opinion that the Vice Presidency should go back to its former status of the pre-Eisenhower days in which the Vice President simply presided over the Senate and cast an occasional vote to break a tie.

The Senator specifically expressed disapproval of the Vice President sitting in on Cabinet meetings, being part of the administration team, and participating as an ambassador of international good will.

This is a unique and retrogressive point of view. The Vice Presidency, one of only two elective offices open to the vote of all the people, was sadly overlooked until President Eisenhower took office.. As a result, during the first 164 years of the Republic's history, some of our ablest and most potentially useful citizens vegetated in the job.

One Vice President resigned and another left town in disgust, and most of the rest until Mr. NIXON's time, devoted themselves to quips, ribbon cutting at ceremonial affairs, and going to parties which the President wanted to avoid.

Far more important, seven Vice Presidents succeeded to the Presidency. If there was one important similarity among all of them, it was their unpreparedness for the job—many of them not even being current on present plans, commitments and policies of the administration which they unexpectedly were called upon to head.

President Truman, for example, suddenly called to office at one of the most critical hours of the Nation's history, had been kept entirely in the dark by his predecessor and found himself at an appalling disadvantage in his early negotiations with other nations.

Vice President NIXON, on the other hand, because of the status given him by the President, has been by all odds the outstanding Vice President in our Nation's history.

In periods of the President's incapacity for reasons of health or absence from the country, he has been able to continue the administration of government on an even keel, which contrasts to the vacuums occasioned by the incapacity of former Presidents—notably that of President Wilson.

He has been well informed on all matters of policy. If he had been called upon to assume the Presidency, there would have been none of the period of uncertainty and "learning the job" which has featured all previous Vice Presidential successions.

On the international scene, Vice President NIXON has been a superb salesman of the United States wherever he has traveled—especially in South America and Russia where his dignity, quick intelligence, and ready graps of a momentarily shifting scene made legions of friends for America and the free world.

As a result of these experiences, Mr. NIXON is far beter qualified than any other for his party's nomination for the Presidency and, if elected, will make one of our greatest Presidents. In this fact, in all probability, lies Senator MANSFIELD's complaint.

It would be interesting to know how the presidential candidates of both parties feel on this matter and if they are willing to downgrade the Vice Presidency as Senator MANSFIELD suggests.

Our view is that the United States cannot afford the luxury of having the man who might at any moment have to take on the massive burdens of the Presidency trained only as a partygoer and ceremonialist. We need more—not fewer men—of topflight stature and availability in the second highest office of the land.

Emphasis on Penmanship and Spelling in School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, the annual convention of the International Association of Master Penmen and Teachers of Handwriting was held from August 13–20 in Bedford, Pa. Among other business accomplished at this meeting was the unanimous endorsement of a resolution which had previously been passed by the North Dakota State Legislature urging school authorities to give adequate emphasis to penmanship and spelling in North Dakota schools. This resolution was called to the attention of the convention by a prominent citizen of my State and a good friend and former colleague of mine in the State Senate of North Dakota, the Honorable Henry C. Frojen, of Oakes, N. Dak. Mr. Frojen, himself an expert penman, is a member of the association mentioned above.

I am proud of the fact that North Dakota has apparently taken the initiative in this most worthy project of bringing to the attention of the proper authorities the necessity for teaching our children the importance of good spelling and good penmanship at an early age.

Mr. President, believing that the action of the convention of the International Association of Master Penmen and Teachers of Handwriting is of national importance and of interest to members of the U.S. Senate, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a portion of a newspaper story which appeared in the Bedford Inquirer of Bedford, Pa., on August 19, 1960, together with a copy of the resolution adopted by the North Dakota State Legislature and endorsed by this international association.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENMANSHIP GROUP MEETING HERE BACKS NORTH DAKOTA ACTION

A resolution passed recently by the Senate and Legislature of North Dakota urging school authorities to give adequate emphasis to penmanship and spelling was unanimously endorsed Tuesday in a resolution approved by delegates attending the annual meeting of the International Association of Master Penmen and Teachers of Handwriting at the New Hoffman Hotel in Bedford.

Copies of the resolution will be sent to the National Association on Education, the largest educational organization in the country.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION E–1

EMPHASIS IN SCHOOLS ON PENMANSHIP AND SPELLING

Whereas communication by handwriting means is still the most prevalent method; and

Whereas the art of penmanship and the rudiments of spelling are no longer properly emphasized in our primary schools, high schools, nor in our teachers colleges; and

Whereas the art of writing legibly and accurately can only be learned and improved by reinstating and emphasizing teaching of penmanship and spelling by rote and by emphasizing its importance in society to students and teachers thereof; and

Whereas some of the most intelligent thoughts are often lost or uncommunicated because of illegible handwriting today; and

Whereas businessmen and others are observing increasing difficulty with the inability of their employees to spell properly: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the superintendent of public instruction, the board of public schools, the board of higher education, the presidents of the various teachers colleges, and the principals of each elementary and secondary public school in this State, are hereby directed to place greater emphasis on instruction of students in the art of penmanship and the rules of spelling, so that our future adults will not be handicapped by inadequacy in these essential fields; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall be sent by the secretary of state to the superintendent of public instruction, each member of the board of higher education, each member of the board of public school education. The superintendent of public instruction will mimeograph copies for the principals of schools and presidents of each teachers college.

Jets—Aid to Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, recent events in Latin America have focused new attention on the Caribbean, Central, and South America.

More and more Americans are becoming increasingly aware of their economic difficulties. We are also recognizing the tremendous economic interdependence which almost inextricably binds us.

A modern-day miracle is making its helpful contribution in solving at least a part of the problem of our southern friends.

The helper? Jet speed. The faster you can get from here to there, the more people are going to take the trip.

This proposition, proven by scientific studies, looms large today as a potent factor in bolstering the economies of numerous Latin American countries. For today is the jet age, and a 575-mile-an-hour jetliner gets people from here to there 40 percent faster than ever before.

Thus comes the obvious conclusion: Where the jets go, more people are going. The nearly 1 million U.S. visitors who traveled to the Caribbean, Central, and South America in 1959 spent almost $200 million in the area.

Even a 20-percent increase in this travel, which experts predict the jet airliners can easily generate, would mean an extra $40 million poured directly into the economic bloodstream of those countries this year.

Proof that reduced travel time brings increased travel is compiled in a survey made by Pan American World Airways, pioneer carrier which has been serving virtually all of Latin America for three decades.

As further proof, three Caribbean resorts whose air facilities enabled them to be among the first spots to welcome jet service last year recorded impressive travel gains.

In Puerto Rico, which Pan American has made the jet capital of Latin America with some 62 jet flights a week currently, travel figures practically shot off the chart under the impetus of the faster, more luxurious service. Puerto Rico's visitor count zoomed from about 270,000 in 1958 to a staggering 331,000 last year. Similarly, the number of visitors to Nassau rose from 178,000 to 264,000, and Jamaica shot up from 170,000 to 191,000.

Jet speeds combine with the changing work pattern of U.S. employees to provide even brighter prospects for Latin American vacation spots. "The paid vacation of from 2 to 4 weeks has become almost universal in the United States," the Pan American survey notes. "This circumstance would appear propitious for an increase in vacation travel to more distant points." This is especially significant in view of the fact that the survey found approximately 52 percent of the clipper travelers were vacation travelers.

And as a final bright note, the traveling public has obviously taken instantly and enthusiastically to jet travel everywhere on all airlines.

The Connally Reservation and the World Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a forceful editorial entitled "Facade for the Jungle," published in the Wall Street Journal of today, August 31, 1960.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FACADE FOR THE JUNGLE

This newspaper believes that the Connally reservation is a useful protection of the U.S. interests, since it permits this country to determine when an issue before the World Court is primarily an American domestic matter and hence beyond that Court's jurisdiction.

But whether one likes or dislikes the reservation, it seems to us President Eisenhower, in addressing the American Bar Association, made a curiously unconvincing case for abolishing it.

We seek, the President argued, peace with justice, which is another way of saying a world of law. "Look at what peace means. And how are we ever going to travel that road unless we are ready to make some concessions?"

The idea that the United States is somehow deficient in making concessions in international affairs won't stand much scrutiny. At vast expense we have tried to rehabilitate and defend much of the world.

The United Nations itself, for what it is worth, could not function without its primary financial and other support from the United States. As for Connally-type reservations, other nations have put strictures on the terms of their adherence to the World Court, but no one seems to demand concessions from them.

More importantly, abandoning the Connally reservation could not possibly bring a just peace or a world rule of law one whit closer. The stipulation is valuable from the point of U.S. interests; its removal would be of zero value from the point of view of advancing peace.

The issues of peace and war, we may be very sure, lie far deeper than anything like this. The world's peace is threatened by the militant Communist conspiracy which never hestitates to violate any treaty or precept of international conduct when it suits its purposes. We can and must resist communism, but we can have scant hope of converting the Communists any time soon.

Because of these realities in the world situation, the United Nations has never been able to live up to the reason for its existence. Declaring unity among the nations could not bring actual unity when one powerful nation seeks only the tragic unity of Communist dictatorship.

That is even more specifically true of the World Court, which it was hoped would be the U.N.'s judicial arm. We have just had a glaring example of Soviet "justice" in the Powers trial; obviously there is no common denominator between the Soviets' legal philosophy and our own.

At one point in his speech Mr. Eisenhower himself indirectly emphasized this difficulty. He noted the debt the writers of our Constitution owed to the legal tutelage and traditions of Britain; indeed, the Constitution as we know it could not have been written "except for this great heritage."

So it would be possible to have an international court including the United States, Britain and other countries with a common understanding of the nature of man and law. But how can anyone talk seriously of a functioning World Court that could embrace such nations along with Cuba, the Congo, and the Kremlin?

The trouble with all this, it seems to us, is that people sometimes let their desire for real peace lead them into wishful thinking. Thanks to Communist imperialism, the "world rule of law" that we have today is the law of the jungle. It may be pleasant to think that this can be changed simply by establishing forms and institutions. But without the substance of a common legal understanding, the forms must be empty.

In fact, worse than empty. For to the extent that the United States involves itself in a World Court that is but a facade for the law of the jungle, it puts itself at the mercy of the jungle. That is why we think it necessary to keep the Connally reservation. And why we think it a peculiar sort of folly to encourage the delusion that an international fiction can alter the world's stark actualities.

Veterinary Positions—U.S. Department of Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED, 97TH ANNUAL MEETING, AMERICAN VETERINARY MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

VETERINARY POSITIONS—U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Whereas the recruitment, classification and retention of doctors of veterinary medicine in the Department of Agriculture presents a serious problem; and

Whereas this problem has received the attention and study of the American Veterinary Medical Association for a number of years; and

Whereas recommendations made to the Department of Agriculture has not solved the problem; and

Whereas this Association is quite concerned about the effect the shortage of veterinarians has on programs in the Agricultural Research Service particularly in connection with disease prevention and control, inspection and quarantine, and research; and

Whereas this Association believes a review and reclassification of veterinary positions in the Department is indicated: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Veterinary Medical Association, in convention assembled, requests the U.S. Civil Service Commission to conduct a complete occupational study and survey of veterinary positions in the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other agencies in the Federal Government; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, the chairman of the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the chairman of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and to other apropriate officials as deemed desirable.

Foreign Policy Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on August 19, 1960, at the request of the Foreign Policy Association, I placed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by the organization in response to certain charges against it. I have now received a communication from Mr. Edgar C. Bundy, general chairman of the Church League of America, which takes exception to a portion of the Foreign Policy Association's memorandum. I am glad to ask unanimous consent that their telegram be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

I may say that I have not had an opportunity to check the accuracy of the memorandum prepared by the Foreign Policy Association or earlier material put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which the Foreign Policy Association's memorandum was designed to rebut. My purpose in inserting this material is to make available to the public the two sides to this controversy.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHEATON, ILL.,
August 26, 1960.

Hon. J. W. FULBRIGHT,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In your extension of remarks, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for Friday August 19, 1960, you insert statement of Foreign Policy Association in which utterly false statements appear concerning my alleged associations with anti-Semites and with two men in particular Al Zoll and Harry A. Jung. FPA then states, "So far as we know, these statements in the pamphlets have not been challenged." I have never been associated with anti-Semites in any manner, shape or form in my entire life nor with Messrs. Zoll or Jung. I have deplored anti-Semitism publicly and in writing. I have been the target of extreme abuse by the anti-Semites because I would have no truck with them. Not only have the statements in National Council of Churches pamphlet quoted by Foreign Policy Association been challenged by me as soon as they appeared in print but I have on file letters from National Council of Churches officials and other who have distributed this vicious propaganda that they are not using it anymore and have regretted its use. One church editor was forced to retract and apologize for passing this falsehood on when notified of impending lawsuit for libel and slander. I respectfully request that my reply to the Foreign Policy Association insertion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD be incorporated in the RECORD before this present Congress adjourns.

EDGAR C. BUNDY,
General Chairman, Church League of America.

"The Role of the Organized Profession in Achieving the Goals of Education"—An Address by Robert H. Wyatt, Executive Secretary, Indiana State Teachers Association, August 8, 1960

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BRADEMAS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, few men have done more for public education in the State of Indiana than Robert H. Wyatt, the able and dedicated executive secretary of the Indiana State Teachers Association. Mr. Wyatt has served in that position for 22 years and every Hoosier has reason to be grateful to him for his continuing effort to improve the educational system of our State.

Earlier this month, Mr. Wyatt delivered an address to some 600 leaders of education in Indiana—school superintendents, principals, college presidents and college professors, presidents of local education associations and committee chairmen—on "The Role of the Organized Profession in Achieving the Goals of Education."

ELEVENTH INDIANA LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE

Mr. Wyatt's address, delivered at French Lick, Ind., on August 8, 1960, to the 11th Indiana Leadership Conference, is one of the finest discussions of the need for our investment in education and improving our educational system that I have ever seen. As the only Indiana member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I am particularly proud that Indiana can offer to the Nation such thoughtful leadership toward meeting the challenges confront-

ing American education as Mr. Wyatt's address represents.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert the text of Mr. Wyatt's address at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE ROLE OF THE ORGANIZED PROFESSION IN ACHIEVING THE GOALS OF EDUCATION

(By Robert H. Wyatt, executive secretary, Indiana State Teachers Association)

A DESIGN FOR THE DECADE

No real solution to the problems of education can be had without first identifying our objectives and viewing them in context with all the other social and economic problems with which they are so inextricably entwined. Obviously, we cannot as a professional organization involve ourselves directly in all of the problems that face the people of this country. Just as certainly, however, we cannot grasp our own problems, nor the solutions; nor can we interpret them to the public which must ultimately make decisions unless we do treat them in the perspective of education's place in the total social and economic structure.

WILL LAISSEZ FAIRE EDUCATION DO THE JOB?

There are many among us who really and truly believe that an educated citizenry is good for the economy. This thesis was powerfully expounded in the well-known book of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, entitled "Education: An Investment in People." But there are many of this group of citizens, however, who believe that a sort of laissez faire policy in education will do the job; and that if we starve the educational facilities of a community severely enough, somehow or other the illiterate victims of the starved community's program will rise up and produce a school system from local effort. If we had unlimited time both as a nation and as individuals, such a program would not be so serious; but we do not have that kind of time. We do not have it in relation to our faster growing neighbors and opponents overseas. But what is more important we do not have it in relation to the fulfillment of the responsibilities and imperatives that are so explosively emerging in the social conscience of hundreds of millions of previously suppressed people in this country and throughout the world.

GROWTH OR DECAY

On the other hand, fortunately, there is a growing number of our people who hold to the opposite philosophy that the whole Nation will advance or stagnate together; and that if substantial numbers of our people are denied education or, because of ignorance or poverty or other reason, cannot free themselves from disease or malnutrition or ignorance or slums or crime, then most certainly these undeveloped human resources cannot and will not produce the economy that must undergird a high standard of living and national strength. Any sound philosophy of national growth must be based upon this thesis: That it is the social and intellectual development of our people that ultimately produces the foundation of economic growth necessary to achieve our ideals as a nation.

In the past month, we have been witnesses to the two national conventions of our political parties. It is interesting that one of the major issues discussed at both of these conventions is the issue of speed of economic growth. This was particularly sharp in the Republican convention between Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, who believes that our rate of growth must be doubled in the immediate future and Senator BARRY GOLDWATER, of Arizona, who seems to believe that we should let this subject alone.

The Democratic platform sets as an economic growth objective "an average rate of 5 percent annually." The Republican platform asserts that much has already been accomplished in the matter of annual growth, but believes that "we can and must do better."

There is thus a substantial agreement on goals. There is also a substantial measure of agreement that growth must be primarily a matter of expanding the American system of free enterprise. The Democrats say that "free, competitive enterprise is the most creative and productive form of economic order that the world has seen." The Republicans "accord high priority to vigorous economic growth and recognize that its mainspring lies in the private sector of the economy." On the issues of how to reach their common objective, the parties are at variance on such matters as high interest rates, credit policies, monetary programs, tax reform, and the role of the Federal Government in stimulating a rapid development of our human resources. I shall not invade the differences between the parties, nor comment upon their performances in the past. That I shall leave to you and your own judgment.

PROGRESS MOVES IN CYCLES

Those of us in the teaching profession have a natural interest, however, in history, and are inclined to be sensitive to the larger movements and trends of history, and to integrate into our projections and our planning the lessons of the past. It is sometimes dangerous to attempt to interpret the great swings of history, or to determine our immediate location in those large cycles of human experience. It is a relatively simple and basic fact, however, that these movements follow the line of mass psychological changes.

WE SPENT LAVISHLY IN THE TWENTIES

The enormous public spending requirements of World War I were followed in the twenties by an equally great effort on the national level to cut back public expenditures, reduce taxes, reduce public debt, and restrict the growth of our economy as far as public participation was concerned. At the same time, the great economic growth that attended the war spilled over into the twenties for a period of some 10 years and stimulated the greatest buying of consumer goods, private speculation, and wastefulness that our Nation had ever seen.

This period is noted for very few significant social advances so far as solving our massive problems of disease, housing, hospitalization, natural resources, education, problems of the aged, unemployment and disability practices, and a host of other social problems involving the welfare and the savings and investments of little people.

WE MADE SOCIAL PROGRESS IN THE THIRTIES

It is scarcely necessary to recount the events of the thirties and the sharp revulsion of public opinion that produced our all-time greatest decade of social advances in the fields that had been so obviously neglected in the twenties.

It is scarcely necessary to recount the events of the forties, with their second great outpouring of money and energy for World War II and succeeding conflicts. It is likewise unnecessary to recount the explosion of emotionalism that found its expression in witch hunts, attacks upon intellectualism and foresight of any kind, and the vigilante operations that had their forerunners in the Klan of the twenties, and previous war-generated manifestations of overemotionalism.

But, in the late forties and early fifties, we had the good fortune of having a somewhat larger segment of our population with an awakening insight into economic history, and a sufficient social consciousness to realize that a nation grows strong and remains healthy only if attention is paid to massive, widespread economic growth of all the people, and to the massive, widespread development of human resources through the enlargement of the welfare of human beings of all ages, and all abilities, and all stations in life.

OUR ECONOMIC GROWTH RATE DECLINES

As a result of this new and enlarged understanding of the imperative role of government in a modern free nation, we passed through a period, specifically 1947–53, in which we experienced an economic growth of some 4.6 percent annually, and a very considerable concern for the problems of all kinds of people. Since that time, the forces which came to the fore in the twenties have gained preeminence in our national life, and by one means and another, have brought about a slowdown of economic growth and attention to social problems. As the decade of the fifties ended, we were moving at an economic growth rate of some 2.6 percent and the control group in our Government had crossed off or vetoed a significant number of measures for the development of our human resources through better housing, better education, and healthier communities. At the same time our neighbors in Western Europe were experiencing a growth rate of something over 4 percent annually, and our major rival for world leadership, Russia, and our newfound friend, Japan, were experiencing an annual growth rate of 6 percent.

PRIVATE COMSUMPTION VERSUS PUBLIC PROGRESS

At this point, I should like to look more closely at this disturbing trend in the history of the 1950's. Since 1953, our gross national product—which is the sum total of goods and services produced and purchased—has increased in terms of 1959 dollars from $417 to $479 billion, a net gain of $62 billion. In 1953, this product consisted of 61 percent personal consumption of goods, 24 percent Government purchases of goods and services, and 15 percent private investment. In this 6-year period, the $62 billion of net gain in production was allocated as follows: 92 percent for private consumption rather than 61 percent, 15 percent to private investment as compared to the same figure in 1953, and an actual loss of 7 percent in Government purchases of goods and services.

Now, not all private consumption is either good or bad. Not all government purchases of goods and services are either good or bad. But two striking facts are plain to be seen by either a layman or an economist:

BILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF PRIVATE CONSUMPTION FOR LUXURIES

1. Billions of dollars of private consumption for alcohol, tobacco, and an enormous list of trivial gadgets and luxuries are either useless or actually destructive as far as increasing the economic growth and productive power of our Nation. A disheartening bit of evidence in this respect emerged from a survey of corporation-employed scientists by the Opinion Research Corp. in which 78 percent testified that management was misusing their talent in ways which to them seemed unproductive except in management's push for profits. Another bit of sobering testimony appears in a recent release by the Committee for Economic Development which reports the conclusions of six visiting Soviet economists who questioned the ability of any economy to stand up against the enormous losses from: (a) the economic waste in frequent model and style changes; (b) the $11 billion spent for advertising; and (c) the influence of the banking industry on Government monetary and credit policy.

BILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF UNMET NEEDS

2. That there are billions of dollars of unmet, crying needs in those areas in which

only Government can function, such as the education of our raw human resources, the treatment of our disease-laden swamps and rivers and streams, the clearance of our disease- and crime-breeding slums, the building of parks and hospitals and recreation facilities for millions of our children and adults, and a host of other needs which are totally beyond the capacity of the individual to meet. There is only one force in this Nation that can function in some areas of redirecting and rechanneling our gross national product and that force is the Government.

THE CHALLENGE OF THE SIXTIES IS GROWTH

As we enter the sixties, therefore, it seems to me that we are poised somewhat ominously at a point not too unlike the last years of the twenties as far as national policy and direction are concerned. We have on the one hand a powerful and predominant group who think in terms of remaining forever on the present plateau of economic activity and public expenditure; while on the other hand there are those who grasp the fact that healthy economic growth evolves from the development of human resources whether through public expenditures or private action. This concept, so vital and so imperative for our national health and our military preservation must become a basic part of the thinking of America and its leaders in the 1960's, or the growth of this Nation will be stagnated into mediocrity.

PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING IS RISING

In spite of the fact, however, that there is a large reactionary force opposing Government action to stimulate economic and social growth, there are, at this juncture, the most hopeful signs of widespread, popular understanding of this concept that we have ever seen in our Nation's history. In the last several years there have been numerous pronouncements of groups of businessmen, scholars, and professionals that have identified these twin objectives of national economic growth and national development of human resources as being integral parts of the same thing. Some examples of this rising mass of evidence of public understanding are these:

1. Edwin J. Dale, Jr., in the New York Times, February 7, 1960: "A new 'great debate' is raging. * * * The debate has been inspired by a single idea: that the basic trouble with American society is that we devote too much of our resources to increasing an already affluent level of private consumption, and too little to public services of all kinds."

2. Walter Lippmann, on February 9, 1960 (New Republic, Mar. 7, 1960): "The central issue of the world struggle is whether the Soviet system or a liberal system can best deal with the problems that beset mankind. In that struggle we shall surely lose if we tell the world that, though we have the richest economy in all history, our liberal system is such that we cannot afford a sure defense and adequate provision for the civil needs of our people."

3. The Rockefeller Bros. Fund report, "The Pursuit of Excellence," in 1958, concluded: "All of the problems of the schools lead us back sooner or later to one basic problem—financing. It is a problem with which we cannot afford to cope half-heartedly.

"It will not be enough to meet the problem grudgingly or with a little more money. The Nation's need for good education is immediate; and good education is expensive. That is a fact that the American people have never been quite prepared to face.

"Perhaps the greatest problem facing American education is the widely held view that all we require are a few more teachers, a few more buildings, a little more money. Such an approach will be disastrous. We are moving into the most demanding era in our history. An educational system grudgingly and tardily patched to meet the needs of the moment will be perpetually out of date. We must build for the future in education as daringly and aggressively as we have built other aspects of our national life in the past."

4. The Committee for Economic Development, an organization of several hundred industrial leaders and scholars ,in a pronouncement January 1960, entitled, "We Can Have Better Schools," calls for a substantial increase in public expenditures for schools, including Federal assistance to education, and closes with the statement: "The expenditure required will contribute more to the welfare of the country than many existing Federal expenditures, some of which could well be cut. But if the program implies higher taxes, they will be justified by the anticipated benefits. The committee is now reviewing the problem of Federal taxation and expects in a subsequent statement to present suggestions for financing essential Federal expenditure, including those recommended here for education."

5. The Conference on Economic Progress (December 1959), a nonprofit, nonpolitical organization, devoted to research, drawn from business, labor, and agriculture, in a document entitled, "The Federal Budget and the 'General Welfare'" had this to say: "For a number of years, the Federal budget has shown a marked trend toward dangerously inadequate outlays for domestic programs, essential not only to individual well-being, but also to the overall health and growth of the American economy.

"Even from the limited viewpoint of the national security, many experts and informed laymen are now agreed upon this: A deficiency in weaponry is compounded by deficiencies in education, health services, and basic research. As a nation, we are piling up supplies of the trinkets that we enjoy, but slighting the basic services which everybody needs. Taking a broader viewpoint of the world challenge confronting us, we cannot afford a further neglect of insistent human needs, on the spurious ground that we 'cannot afford' to do better while still in an arms race. To survive the all-pervasive race that we are really in, we must demonstrate mature awareness of the need for progress on many fronts, and dedicate ourselves to this well-balanced program.

"All who point this out recognize fully that this many-sided progress requires vigorous and sustained efforts by individuals, private organizations, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. But they further recognize that the Federal Government must take the lead, and largely through the Federal budget. The Federal budget determines our national priorities; it is the most important tool for identifying and helping to accomplish our greatest purposes as a nation. If the Federal budget falls down on its tasks, others cannot rise fully to theirs."

6. The Committee for the White House Conference on Education: "Ignorance is a far greater handicap to an individual than it was a generation ago, and an uneducated populace is a greater handicap to a nation. This trend is obviously going to continue and quicken.

"An important reason for the growing importance of education is the plain fact that the schools have become the chief instrument for keeping this Nation the fabled land of opportunity it started out to be."

7. A report entitled, "Human Resources: The Wealth of a Nation," published in 1958, as a result of a program organized and originated by President Dwight Eisenhower while at Columbia University, to discover the reason for such widespread failure on army tests in World War II, found that the "squandering of our human-resource capital" had grown out of the failure of our society to invest adequately in the development of its people, particularly its young people during their formative years.

8. And even the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, in its widely read book entitled, "Education—An Investment in People," in 1955 states: "People who have a good education produce more goods, earn more money, buy and consume more goods, read more magazines and newspapers, are more active in civic and national affairs, enjoy a higher standard of living—and, in general, contribute more to the economy—than those who are not so well educated."

9. The penetrating statement of Marion B. Folsom, a former director of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in 1958 on leaving the cabinet as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare: "In the main, we as a people seem inclined to concentrate our energies on the production of things, rather than on the development of human capacities and resources. * * * The outpouring of consumer goods is one of the landmarks of our society. Certainly there is nothing wrong with this, particularly so long as the multiplication of material goods ultimately serves the best interests of men. But we do not invest nearly enough time and thought and money in the intellectual and moral, social, and physical development of the man who makes all these material things possible. We retard the progress of our society by a pinchpenny attitude toward investments in health and education, in fundamental research."

10. Of course, no comment on this important subject would be complete without a reference to the greatest contribution of the decade to thinking on this subject by Dr. Kenneth Galbraith of Harvard University in his book, "The Affluent Society."

I do not propose to go forth on a crusade to persuade our people to quit smoking or drinking or doing a whole host of other foolish things that are either illegal, immoral, or fattening. But I do say that we can line up these two sets of values alongside each other and throw into bold relief the absurdity of the statement that we cannot afford to process our own raw material.

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Conference on Economic Progress, referred to above, estimates that the part played by the Federal budget in our economy has declined from 18.7 percent of our total production in 1954 to 16.2 percent in 1960, and that if sufficient participation by the Federal Government had been carried on in those years to produce a national economic growth of 4 to 5 percent annually, there would have resulted a total increase in gross national product of $199 billion. This increased production at present tax rates would have produced, according to the report, an additional $65 billion of public tax revenue. It is fascinating to note what the conference report reveals could have been done with this additional $65 billion of public tax revenue, all of which would have been derived from that unproduced national production. Here it is:

1. Twenty percent of those revenues would have built 140,000 classrooms (3,500 for Indiana), the President's estimate of our shortage, and would have paid teachers $1,000 more each year.

2. Ten percent of this tax revenue would have built 360,000 hospital beds (9,000 for Indiana).

3. Three percent of this tax revenue could have replaced 1.4 million slum homes with good homes (35,000 for Indiana).

4. Twenty percent of it—$13 billion—could have met the Soviet arms and space challenge.

5. Eight percent of this would have made our social security payments more nearly adequate.

6. Ten percent of it would have increased economic assistance overseas by 50 percent.

7. Twenty-nine percent could have wiped out the total Federal deficit for 1959.

These data reveal in a dramatic way the answer to the question: Where shall we get the money to educate and develop our human resources? The answer: These resources when developed will produce the economy to pay for them, and there is no other way.

THE STATUS OF EDUCATION IN INDIANA IN 1960

Let us examine what has occurred in Indiana in the recent past and what must occur in the immediate future.

First, as to the salary of instructional personnel:

In the last two decades, teachers' salaries in Indiana have risen 300 percent while the income of all of our people has risen 447 percent. In the decade of the forties, Indiana teachers' salaries rose 135 percent compared to only 91 percent for the teachers of the Nation as a whole. In the decade of the fifties, teachers' salaries in Indiana rose 70 percent as against 85 percent for all teachers in the Nation. Other school expenditures followed a similar pattern. It is necessary to conclude from these facts that Indiana in the forties outpaced the Nation, but failed to do so in the fifties.

When we observe that State participation in local schools in the fifties declined from 40 percent of expenditures to 30 percent, it is easy to identify the fact that the State simply did not hold up its share of the cost and that the State legislatures in 1953, 1955, and 1957 refused to enact legislation to undergrid the teacher salary structure. There is one bright spot in 1959–60, however, when we note that Indiana's average salary rose to 10th place in the Nation and that the increase in this 1 year, 1959–60, was the largest increase of any of the top 10 States of the Nation. This result is traceable to the enactment of the 1959 minimum salary schedule of $3,600 to $5,600, and might have been better if the original proposal of $4,000 to $6,000, which was passed twice by the house of representatives, had been agreed to by the senate and the Governor.

Let us examine the status of Indiana teachers further:

1. In 1958, the median family income in the United States stood at $397 above the median salary of Indiana classroom teachers.

2. The average personal income per employed member of the labor force stood at $495 above the average salary of classroom teachers.

3. The average beginning salary for beginning teachers as indicated by 315 local salary schedules in Indiana last summer was $4,156; while the average for engineering graduates stood at $5,868; accounting graduates at $5,196; sales graduates at $5,064; general business graduates at $4,932; and other graduate fields at $5,412.

4. Studies reported in the "1960 Salary and Economic Trends Handbook," published by the Research Service of the Indiana State Teachers Association, reveal that college graduates generally experience an increase in the first 10 years of employment of 100 percent in salary. No salary schedule in Indiana provides more than a 50-percent increase, while most of the remainder provide increases far below that point.

SUBSTANTIAL PROGRESS IN SALARY SCHEDULING

Through the work of the local, State, and National salary committees and workshops, we have made substantial progress in the last few years in developing sound principles of salary scheduling. The objective of beginning salaries for teachers comparable with those of the other professions to be doubled after 10 years of service and a master's degree is an objective that has become widely recognized by all who believe in education. The objective of working conditions comparable to those in other professional and business fields with reference to hours of work, workload, sick and emergency leave, and the like are making slow but sure progress into the thinking of school boards and administrators.

A further look at Indiana's ranking in the Nation reveals the following:

1. Indiana stands 42d in the Nation in per capita expenditures for all purposes.

2. Indiana stands 39th in the Nation in total State and local taxation as a percentage of personal income.

3. Indiana stands 34th in the percentage of school revenue provided by the State.

4. Indiana stands 27th in the Nation in expenditures per pupil in public schools.

5. Indiana stands 28th in the Nation in public school expenditures as a percentage of personal income.

6. Indiana stands 19th in the Nation in per capita personal income.

All of this means that Indiana is not putting forth the effort to provide public schools, either in terms of dollars or in terms of a percentage of her personal income, that is being put forth by most of the other States.

WHY DID EDUCATION FALTER IN THE FIFTIES?

To summarize, we stand 19th in ability and 28th in the percentage of our income that we spend for schools. This situation is the result of a grouping of causes.

One of them is that in the decade of the fifties Indiana has subordinated the development of many of her human resources to an overpowering drive for a tax program that would please business, particularly interstate business, and attract industry to Indiana. This has resulted in a tax program which still places on the antiquated property tax 70 percent of the cost of schools and 100 percent of the cost of many other local services. This antiquated property tax is accompanied by the only so-called gross income tax in the Nation. This tax fails completely to reach the receipts of interstate commerce and falls with highly inequitable incidence upon various individuals and groups without relationship, in many cases, as to whether profits or losses are being taxed. The gross income tax is the darling of Indiana largely because it produces money and does not have the opposition of large corporate and interstate business.

Indiana is not making any attempt to devise a tax system geared to ability to pay. She is making no attempt to reach interstate receipts. She is making practically no attempt to tax certain substantial mineral and oil production by severance taxes as exist in other States. In addition to this, the administration of the property tax is excessively bad.

We shall not find a reasonable solution to this tax dilemma until we courageously attack the problem on both the State and National levels and take into account that the States and the local communities are, in fact, powerless to reach certain sources of revenue which exist within their own borders and that they, in fact, will not be reached until a reform program of taxation and distribution on a national level is achieved.

WHAT ABOUT SCHOOL FINANCE IN 1961–63?

As to the State tax picture for the next biennium, however, we should recognize the following significant factors as a part of our planning. We have just come through two major developments in school financing. One of them is the 50-percent increase in taxes in 1957 on the State level and the other is the adoption of a new finance program in 1959. The 1957 increase in taxes produced some $80 million of additional funds for a State that was already far undertaxed and underfinanced. As a result, the institutions of the State—higher education, mental health, penal, correctional, and all of the other services calling upon the State general fund—have come into the picture rapidly and have absorbed the increase. That gives us a situation in 1960 where a recent increase in taxes on the State level of nearly 50 percent has already been absorbed for the various State purposes, and little additional revenue will be forthcoming from the present tax structure.

The second factor in the picture is the new school finance program adopted in 1959. One of its basic effects was that it changed the direction of the flow of State funds, granting larger funds to the poorer areas and making lesser grants to the wealthy ones. This means that some of the poorer areas profited from this system as much as a thousand dollars per classroom unit last year. As a result, it was necessary to appropriate $86 million for the first year of the biennium and $103 million for the second year—a total of $189 million for salaries in the biennium. If we are to stand still on our present $103-million level the next biennium, as you can see, would require $206 million rather than $189 million. That alone is an increase of $17 million for teachers' salaries without considering the additional factors of increased enrollment which will demand $10 million more, increased transportation which will require $3 million more, and increased maintenance and operation costs which will require $2 million more. That amounts to $32 million plus whatever else may be required for the increasing of teachers' salaries at the rate of three million each year for each $100 of increase in teachers' salaries.

As a result of these facts, it becomes clear that a mere standstill increase in State funds for the next biennium would be an addition of $32 million more; and that if teachers' salaries are to be increased as they would need to be to attract teachers and if State participation in the financing of schools is to even stand still in percentage, then the legislature of 1961 must take a courageous and long range stand on the basic problem of State responsibility for developing the human resources of our State.

THE FINANCING OF SCHOOLS IN A TAX FIGHT

And before we leave the question of school finance, we should get clear in our thinking the whole problem of local, State, and National taxation for schools. The developments of the last half century have produced an economy in this country which may be characterized by the words bigness and speed. Our industrial corporations have become enormous institutions, with hundreds of plants, warehouses, loading facilities, trucks, ships, airplanes, and other property located in many communities and States. The speed with which the raw materials and output of these plants move across township, county, and State lines poses a problem for taxing units that is so complex that it defies the ability of local and State governmental units to determine equitably their share of the profits of each such corporation. This means that the ancient tax system of the 19th century in which a local community levied and collected taxes for schools, highways, and other public services has become as obsolete as the horse and buggy which characterized that era.

These new economic facts also mean that the owners and controllers of the new giant corporations in many cases live in distant States or communities and have little knowledge or personal interest in the affairs of a given local community. These facts mean also that the taxing unit that can discover and tax an equitable share of these new giants must be a taxing unit that covers a territory large enough to encompass a substantial share of the trade and commercial activities of the taxpayer corporation.

WHAT IS THE ROLE OF CONGRESS?

These economic facts highlight the reason why the managers of our great, new corporations are temptd to continue advocating that taxes for schools should be levied on a local basis, where obviously only the small and the slow taxpayers can be easily found and taxed. It has long been clear to honest students of the subject that the State and the Congress are the only taxing agencies in this Nation that can cope with the new tax problem of 20th century America. It is similarly obvious that even the State cannot reach certain huge sources of wealth and income and provide for equitable taxation, and that only Congress can reach these sources, primarily those derived from interstate commerce, and thus finally achieve equity.

Every major public service other than education has faced collapse when depending upon local community taxation, and each has sought and received financial strength from the tax powers of the Federal Government, be it highways, airports, flood control, harbors, welfare, soil conservation, or many others.

Education is a vital concern of the whole Nation. We cannot live without it. In fact, it has become the very heart of our military defense system. The race against catastrophe will be lost unless we face up as a Nation to the fact that we must find the money and the way to develop the economic resources that reside in our children whether they, or their parents, or even their State want these human resources salvaged and developed.

THE CURRICULUM AS A POLITICAL ISSUE

During the past 10 years, there have been several waves of discussion of the curriculum in the public schools and the colleges. Much of this discussion has arisen from the sincere concern of many people for the proper education of their children. Some of it has arisen from the age-old practice of belittling scholarship and appealing to prejudice against any change that would disturb the status quo or the fond but inaccurate recollections of our childhood. A little of it obviously is pure political chicanery; but whatever the source or the cause, it is the responsibility of the teaching profession to sift the criticisms and suggestions for possible good, and to go an additional mile with those who seek to use the public schools as a sounding board for political attention.

We must not, on this or any other occasion, lose our faith in education itself. If we really believe that education not only ennobles but also has value as a preparation for living and working, then we cannot escape the conclusion that the technical education of a lawyer or doctor or plumber or teacher will produce a superior workman. Whether we are trying to produce any of these—an engineer, a teacher, a superintendent, or a State superintendent, we would betray our faith in education if we should suddenly pretend that for these important tasks no special kind of education or experience is required.

ARE WE SOLVING CHILD PROBLEM?

The work of the public school will never reach the level of quality that sincere critics inside and outside the schools know is demanded in the 20th century until the body of practitioners in the field are permitted by their employers to strike out boldly and without fear in those fields where they believe change should be made. Great educational changes are now in progress throughout this country. These changes are coming about by the age-old process of profiting from errors and learning from careful research and experimentation. A recent survey of urban school systems by the National Education Association, published in May, 1960, reveals the following:

1. Seventy-seven percent of the urban school systems were providing special learning experiences for gifted pupils in the junior and senior high schools.

2. More than 25 percent of the systems were providing for televised instruction.

3. In 12 percent, foreign languages were being taught in the elementary grades by special teachers and in others by regular teachers on a limited basis.

4. In nearly all systems expanded and accelerated reading programs were underway using a variety of methods to attain the obvious variety of reading objectives which are familiar to anyone who has made a study of the subject.

I might say, incidentally, that the study did not reveal any systems that are offering courses in tattooing, bowling, horseback riding, or fly casting, and I might add as a personal observation, there is probably too little attention being paid in schools to the evaluation of political propaganda and the great new world of Madison Avenue techniques and to simple consumer education.

Seriously and basically, the teaching profession must undertake to carry the responsibility of leadership in the direction that research points the way. It must undertake greater responsibility on both State and National levels in improving and refining the recruitment, screening, education, orientation, and policing of the profession and its own membership. I especially direct your attention to the new programs in this area now being launched by the TEPS Commission of NEA.

No highly technical or scholarly program can be developed or properly administered in the rough and tumble of active politics. Our State has not stooped to such a program in the past, and we must continue to stand in a firm and dignified manner for this policy in education.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I have tried to touch upon several of our problems and to raise certain questions and implications that have evolved in the past few years in the thinking of our officers, our staff, and our many committee members. I recognize that there is, and should be, great latitude in decisionmaking and in experimentation in the solution of our problems. I know that your hours of discussion in this conference will probe more deeply and produce scores of ideas and proposals that are so much needed for the decisions of the months ahead.

A 10-POINT PROPOSAL FOR THE SIXTIES

For the purposes of summary, however, and as a possible catalytic agent for some of your discussion, I should like to make a 10-point proposal for the decade of the sixties immediately ahead of us. It is not a program to keep up with someone else. It is not a program to patch up and fill the holes in our walls. It is a program that I believe firmly may be a practical design for the decade if we are to live up to what we profess, or in fact, if we are to live at all:

1. Our program must be based upon a philosophy that encompasses our entire national life, necessities, and aspirations.

2. It must be based upon a comprehension that the problem of educating our youth is an integral part of the whole problem of finding, releasing, and developing our human resources, whether these resources are chained or restricted by ignorance or poverty or disease or youth or old age.

WE MUST CONSTRUCT THE CLASSROOMS WE NEED

3. We should set out in the 5-year period immediately ahead of us to construct the classrooms in the United States that are obviously needed: 90,000 in 1960–61, rising to 118,000 in 1964–65; costing $3 billion the first year and $5 billion the fifth year; paid for at the ratio of 1 to 3 of Federal and State-local funds.

In the past several years, we have been engaged in a ridiculous numbers game as to the needs of education. The latest report from the U.S. Office of Education estimates a backlog shortage of classrooms because of obsolescence and exploding enrollments of 140,000 rooms. This figure reveals a campaign on the part of someone to deprecate the need as it was revealed by the most comprehensive study of education ever made in the 1950–55 school facilities survey, financed by a congressional appropriation and conducted by the U.S. Office of Education.

This survey revealed that in 1952 there was a shortage of 312,000 classrooms. In this 7-year period we have abandoned 150,000 classrooms and acquired a need for 258,000 for new enrollments. It appears that we have built 430,000 classrooms, leaving a conservative estimate as of 1960 of a shortage of 284,000 classrooms. Without being technical about the mobility of our population, the changing residences of our pupils, the more than adequate construction in certain areas, and the total inability of other areas to construct, it is obvious that we are making practically no headway in meeting the shortage of classrooms in this country. But at the same time, we have piled up a State-local debt for what we have built of 211 percent over that of 1948, as against a Federal debt rise of 10 percent in dollars and an actual decline in terms of percentage of gross national product of 33 percent.

SEVEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY THOUSAND TEACHERS REQUIRED IN THE 5 YEARS AHEAD

4. We should set out with determination to find the three-quarters million additional teachers that will be required in the 5 years ahead. To do this, we must recognize that the average annual teacher's salary today stands at only 61 percent of the median income of the 17 other professions, which was $7,600 in 1958.

We must recognize that if we are to compete successfully for these personnel for our public schools, the average annual teacher's salary over this 5-year period must rise a minimum of $500 annually, reaching the $7,500 figure by 1964–65. The total cost of this program will be $8 billion the first year and $13 billion the fifth year, paid for likewise at 1-to-3 ratio of Federal and State-local funds.

The attack upon this crucial problem is in fact a four-way attack. Here are the facts:

(a) We shall need 350,000 teachers for the 10 million children now under the instruction of teachers without a college degree.

(b) We shall need 300,000 teachers for the 8 million new children that will enter our schools.

(c) We shall need 200,000 teachers if we are to pull down the pupil-teacher ratio to a figure that will produce a class size in harmony with the demands of good instruction.

(d) We shall need an additional 150,000 to replace those who die, retire, or leave us for other pursuits.

WE MUST REORGANIZE ANTIQUATED SCHOOL GOVERNMENT

5. We must push on courageously to reorganize the antiquated school government in our country into school corporations with a minimum of 1,000 to 1,500 pupils. In this objective we are making headway. In the 10 years just past, the number of school corporations in the United States has declined from 103,000 to 45,000. Here in Indiana, our new reorganization law is achieving real preliminary results. At this very moment, however, the forces of reaction in this reorganization program are organizing and appealing to the prejudices and the petty vested interests of a lot of people. A number of candidates for office have called for the repeal of the act. This is serious, and we must immediately regroup and redouble our efforts to achive what this law promises to be—the greatest advance in effi-

cient, economical school government in the history of our State.

6. We must continue the fight for qualified teachers in the classrooms. Here, too, we have made substantial progress in the last 5 years, particularly in Indiana. Our problem now is not so much to persuade our public of the need for highly qualified teaching personnel. Our problem now and in the sixties may well be the problem of defining and determining for ourselves what constitutes real quality in instruction and how it can be achieved. Real progress is being made through widespread experimentation over the country in new ways of teaching, in sounder grade placement of subject matter itself, and in the redirection of thinking from segmented bodies of knowwledge to the real objective of education concerned with the development of competent, functioning human beings.

It seems at the moment that headway is being made toward integrating the efforts of the warring factions in the teaching profession on some of these subjects. There are hopeful signs also of a significent increase in the willingness of a larger segment of the public to rely upon the judgment of competent members of the profession for leadership and direction of the schools and the curriculum. These are hopeful signs, but they did not come about easily; and they will not be sustained without a vigorous and intelligent effort on the part of everyone.

THE FANTASTIC NEEDS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

7. We must incorporate into our thinking the fantastic needs of higher education. In only a decade or so, college enrollments in this country will double; and still there will be left behind a sizable number of our upper 25 percent who will be unable to go to college. The private colleges have little hope of taking their share of the mounting increase in college enrollment. As a result, the public colleges and universities must be restudied immediately with a view to making college facilities available on a practical and economical basis near the homes of millions of young people that America needs to educate.

We must approach this problem on the State level as to organization of public colleges and universities and financing them. We must likewise approach the problem on the national level if these institutions are to survive and if some quarter million intellectually able students each year are to be salvaged for the economic and social growth that we must have for survival.

8. We must embrace and advocate a realistic tax policy on the local, State, and National levels that recognizes that all three levels of government have a definite and compelling interest and concern as to whether our population is intelligent or illiterate. This involves a recognition by the National Government that the tax powers that are inherent only in Congress must be applied to the great new sources of wealth and income that have grown out of the reach of States and local communities.

9. The ninth objective is an objective of how rather than what. When it is considered that only half of the teaching profession in America is affiliated with its national professional organization and that a sizable percentage in many States is not affiliated with State or local associations, it is not difficult to see the enormous handicap with which the teaching profession is attacking its problems. The solution of these problems requires the energies and support of every teacher in this land; and we should make a resolution that the 700,000 members of NEA shall be a million in 1964 and all of them in 1970. I, for one, am ashamed of Indiana's record in the national professional organization as to membership, and my pride at the local level is only pride in progress, for we still have 10,000 of our teachers not enrolled in local associations. I am very serious about this ninth objective, not as an objective in itself, but as the only means by which we can hope to achieve professional status in the decade ahead.

THE TEACHING PROFESSION MUST MATURE IN CIVIC AND POLITICAL LIFE

10. The members of the teaching profession must mature in the civic and political life of our country. The image of a teacher who has no philosophy or no position about the great matters of public interest, including the education of children, is certainly not an image that can inspire and lead youth toa mature intellectual growth. At the same time, the teaching profession must continue to grow to a position where public confidence in its leadership in education becomes firm and effective.

Our friends in the State and National chambers of commerce have recently announced a large-scale series of clinics throughout the State and Nation to inform their members on the issues and the recommended solutions. We likewise must live up to our responsibilities in political life if we expect public faith in our leadership to emerge and remain strong.

What I have said about the schools and the teaching profession is what I believe deeply must materialize if the schools are to meet their responsibility and the teachers are to justify the confidence of our people. I know that there are many practical problems and sometimes unpleasant tasks to be performed if we are to bring our thinking and our experience to bear; but I also believe so very strongly that all of your work in professional organizations, in your local communities, in your elections, and in your discussions with the public will fail to materialize into positive and dynamic results unless these activities are geared to a central philosophy as to the role of the profession and the schools.

AMERICA MUST DEVELOP OUR HUMAN RESOURCES

America simply cannot stand up, either in comparative strength in the world or as an example of the best way of life in the eyes of emerging millions in underdeveloped countries of the world, unless the moral and intellectual forces of this country rise to the surface and evolve a national policy for the research and development of our vast human resources.

To say that we cannot afford such a program is to say that we do not have faith in an investment in people. It is equivalent to saying that we do not believe that the free enterprise system can integrate all the brains and abilities of our people and set them in motion toward a better way of life.

Ukrainian Congress Committee of America—A Tribute on Its 20th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this year we commemorate the 20th anniversary of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America. It is fitting that we salute the leaders of this organization from the floor of Congress, for their service to Ukrainians and to the United States has been very valuable.

One of the great problems facing new Americans is the difficulty of adjusting to a completely new national environment. The Ukrainian Congress Committee has played an important role in helping our new Ukrainian citizens adjust to their new country. It has served as something of a bridge between the old country and the new, the old way of life and the new. In so doing, it has kept alive some of the finest traditions of the Ukrainian people which have found their place solidly in our American civilization. However, the greatest contribution of this organization has been to keep alive in Americans their dedication to freedom everywhere by their insistence upon freedom for the Ukraine.

Ukrainians everywhere, America salutes you.

Twentieth Anniversary of Ukrainian Congress Committee of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, there are some 2½ million Americans of Ukrainian ancestry in this country. This fall the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America is marking the 20th anniversary of its founding.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a letter I have written on this occasion to Prof. Lev E. Dobriansky, who, for more than a decade, has led the Ukrainian Congress Committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 31, 1960.

Prof. LEV E. DOBRIANSKY,
Chairman, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Inc., Georgetown University, Washington, D.C.

DEAR PROFESSOR DOBRIANSKY: On the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the founding of the Ukrainian Congress Committee of America this fall, I want to express to you the sorrow and anguish I feel, in common with the members of your committee, at the continuing plight of the Ukraine under Russian Communist domination. The committee which you have led for more than a decade has helped to insure that all Americans remember our stake in the aspirations of other peoples for freedom and respect for the dignity of man.

It may be that the Iron Curtain is now more perforated than it was in the era of Joseph Stalin and that the repressive policy of the Soviet Union toward its national minorities is somewhat lessened. But the fact remains that the Soviet Union is a ruthless totalitarian state which has not changed its nature or policies in any essential respect.

As one who joined in sponsoring the Senate resolution last year to establish Captive Nations Week, I would like to note again your tireless efforts and devoted service on behalf of its successful establishment and annual observance. Freedom-loving Americans, whatever their national backgrounds, are indebted to you and to all those who

serve with you in the cause of human freedom.

Sincerely,

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
U.S. Senator.

The Status of Public and Private Debts, 1952 to 1959

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, August 30, 1960

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, sometime ago I requested the Library of Congress to prepare for me a statement showing the status of public and private debts by years 1952–59.

I wanted to know the status for the Federal Government, the State governments, and the local governments—county, city, township, school district, special district, and also private debts by corporations, individuals, farm, and nonfarm.

I have recently received a statement from the Library of Congress which, under leave to extend my remarks, I am placing in the RECORD. This statement—all figures in millions—shows that the Federal debt has increased from $259,105 in 1952 to $284,706 in 1959 or about 10 percent. Actually, the public debt as of the present time is about $289,000.

The State governments' debt has increased from $6,874 to $17,102 or about 149 percent.

The local governments' indebtedness rose from $23,226 to $45,235 or about 95 percent.

The total public debt, therefore, has increased from $289,205 to $347,043 or about 20 percent.

In the meantime the total private debt has increased from $337,100 to $601,700 or about 78 percent and is broken down as follows:

Corporation, $201,600 to $335,800 or about 67 percent.

Farm, $15,200 to $23,700 or about 56 percent.

Nonfarm, $120,400 to $242,100 or about 101 percent.

The grand total of public and private indebtedness has increased from $626,305 to $948,743 or about 51 percent during this 8-year period.

I have noted also from a speech which Budget Director Stans made to the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce on June 20, 1960, that:

> Now the $290 billion of public debt, plus over $350 billion of future obligations for past services, plus nearly $100 billion of c.o.d.'s adds to the almost unbelievable total of nearly $750 billion.

Mr. Stans also states that:

> We should realize that when you look only at the budget for one fiscal year at a time, you see merely the visible part of the iceberg; the dangerous part is below the surface.

I am making this information available to the public at this time in order that they may have a more complete look at the fiscal picture than is revealed in a statement that the budget for a particular fiscal year shows a surplus of $1.1 billion or some relatively small amount.

The statement from the Library of Congress follows:

Gross public and private debt, 1952–59

[In millions]

	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
Public debt: [2]								
Federal Government	$259,105	$266,071	$271,260	$274,374	$272,751	$270,527	$276,343	$284,706
State governments:								
Alabama	51	73	73	69	88	112	134	151
Alaska	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	0	0	3
Arizona	3	3	3	4	6	11	13	13
Arkansas	131	125	123	118	113	109	110	105
California	522	600	795	860	943	1,159	1,455	1,712
Colorado	19	17	21	23	35	49	58	67
Connecticut	238	265	386	361	478	567	797	873
Delaware	93	110	125	128	139	147	184	206
Florida	71	72	78	86	164	212	214	261
Georgia	21	70	193	233	236	264	297	308
Hawaii	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	65	100	124	172
Idaho	1	1	1	2	5	6	6	7
Illinois	381	359	332	306	699	646	687	667
Indiana	18	24	317	321	321	339	355	407
Iowa	33	31	29	29	29	30	31	56
Kansas	6	5	5	173	176	177	197	202
Kentucky	10	10	19	69	70	75	146	148
Louisiana	215	212	216	229	318	321	332	363
Maine	27	64	118	117	119	119	117	123
Maryland	205	234	267	462	493	520	545	559
Massachusetts	402	423	496	824	934	1,024	1,163	1,332
Michigan	351	358	455	518	532	628	624	729
Minnesota	121	114	96	84	84	81	133	178
Mississippi	76	81	76	91	86	89	124	153
Missouri	26	19	15	11	8	30	83	87
Montana	45	46	45	43	46	42	44	46
Nebraska	1	3	3	3	8	9	10	10
Nevada	1	1	1	1	3	3	3	3
New Hampshire	26	31	42	42	56	62	79	86
New Jersey	325	432	678	857	884	896	873	874
New Mexico	30	28	28	28	48	47	51	51
New York	909	964	1,176	1,535	1,939	1,974	2,075	2,434
North Carolina	275	264	299	297	282	281	290	273
North Dakota	35	31	26	22	19	14	20	15
Ohio	165	479	473	497	591	708	852	898
Oklahoma	127	129	124	194	207	205	202	201
Oregon	117	135	184	178	172	182	219	283
Pennsylvania	895	953	1,178	1,203	1,245	1,202	1,214	1,279
Rhode Island	52	55	58	65	65	76	107	102
South Carolina	125	142	170	208	218	231	268	268
South Dakota	21	14	9	(3)	(3)	(3)	5	5
Tennessee	100	111	122	116	110	114	118	119
Texas	81	93	110	139	213	221	286	316
Utah	1	2	3	5	4	4	6	10
Vermont	5	4	5	8	7	16	27	38
Virginia	37	35	33	112	180	180	188	187
Washington	226	245	293	233	232	272	348	394
West Virginia	246	256	289	281	275	268	284	295
Wisconsin	5	5	5	5	6	7	15	39
Wyoming	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Total, State governments	6,874	7,824	9,600	11,198	12,955	13,838	15,518	17,102

Footnotes at end of table.

Gross public and private debt, 1952-59—Continued

[In millions]

	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959
Public debt—Con.								
Local governments:								
County	$2,018	$2,454	$2,710	$3,140	$3,528	$3,665	$4,256	(1)
City	12,659	13,558	14,587	15,973	16,937	18,833	20,355	(1)
Township	619	656	801	860	974	1,089	1,014	(1)
School district	3,806	4,712	5,923	7,259	8,586	9,229	10,085	(1)
Special district	4,125	4,577	5,310	5,837	6,246	6,179	6,946	(1)
Total, local governments	23,226	25,957	29,331	33,069	36,271	38,995	42,656	45,235
Total, public debt	289,205	296,852	310,191	318,641	321,977	323,360	334,517	347,043
Private debt:								
Corporations	201,600	211,500	216,300	251,000	274,900	293,400	305,000	335,800
Individuals and unincorporated enterprises:								
Farm	15,200	16,800	17,600	18,800	19,500	20,300	23,300	23,700
Nonfarm	120,400	133,400	147,800	171,600	188,100	201,200	217,100	242,100
Total, individuals and unincorporated enterprises	135,500	150,100	165,400	190,400	207,700	221,500	240,400	265,800
Total, private debt	337,100	361,600	381,700	441,300	482,600	514,900	545,300	601,700
Total, public and private debt	626,305	658,452	691,891	759,941	804,577	838,260	879,817	$948,743

NOTE.—Debt of the Federal, State, and local governments are for the end of the governmental fiscal year. For the Federal Government; most school districts, and all except 4 of the States the fiscal year ends on June 30. With respect to other governments a considerable proportion end their fiscal years on Dec. 31. Private debt is for the end of each calendar year.

[1] Not reported for these years.
[2] Less than $500,000.
[3] Breakdown is not yet available. Total figure given is for June 30, 1959.

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "Compendium of State Government Finances," annual issues for the years 1952 through 1957; "Summary of State Government Finances in 1959," series G-SF-59-No. 1, Apr. 3, 1960, p. 17; "Summary of Governmental Finances," issues for 1954, 1957, and 1958. Office of Business Economics, Survey of Current Business, May issues for 1957, 1959, and 1960. U.S. Treasury Department, Annual Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the State of the Finances, fiscal year 1959, p. 447.

Maureen McBreen, Legislative Reference Service, Economics Division, June 21, 1960.

Plight of the Shears and Scissors Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PRESCOTT BUSH
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a summary of information presented to the Tariff Commission and others regarding the plight of the shears and scissors industry.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION PRESENTED TO THE U.S. TARIFF COMMISSION AND THE COMMITTEE FOR RECIPROCITY INFORMATION BY THE SHEARS, SCISSORS & MANICURE IMPLEMENT MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION

The Shears, Scissors & Manicure Implement Manufacturers Association has filed a written brief and presented oral testimony to the Tariff Commission and the Committee for Reciprocity Information opposing any reduction, during the GATT negotiations at Geneva, Switzerland, in the present rates of import duties on scissors and shears provided for in paragraphs 357 and 1531 of the Tariff Act of 1930 as amended.

Further reduction in the rates of import duties on scissors and shears are opposed for the following reasons:

1. The domestic scissors and shears industry is truly a small business as there are only two domestic firms which employ 250 or more production workers, and none with more than 500 production workers.

2. There are only 20 firms manufacturing scissors and shears in the United States. This is less than one-half of the number manufacturing scissors and shears before the import duty reductions made during 1950 and 1951.

3. Approximately one-half of the firms still manufacturing scissors and shears have less than 10 employees each.

4. The rates of duties on scissors and shears valued at more than 50 cents per dozen provided for in paragraph 357 of the Tariff Act of 1930 were reduced 50 percent during 1950 and 1951.

5. The rate of import duty on scissors and shears in fitted cases provided for in paragraph 1531 has been reduced 60 percent since the Tariff Act of 1930 was enacted.

6. Scissors and shears are an ideal import item because (a) they are light in weight; (b) they are cheap to ship from abroad; (c) they are not fragile; (d) they will not deteriorate; (e) they will not go out of style; and (f) the foreign cost of production is substantially less than the domestic cost of production.

7. During 1951 the quantity and value of imports of scissors and shears valued at more than 50 cents per dozen were greater than during the entire 10 prewar years of 1931-40.

8. Imports of scissors and shears valued at more than 50 cents per dozen during 1959 had a foreign value of $3,059,673 which is more than 49 times the average annual value during the 10 prewar years.

9. The quantity of scissors and shears valued at more than 50 cents per dozen imported during 1959 was 8,204,568 pairs which is more than 50 times the average annual quantity imported during the 10 prewar years.

10. Imports of scissors and shears valued at more than 50 cents per dozen increased 21 percent from 1958 to 1959.

11. Imports of scissors and shears valued at more than 50 cents per dozen during the first 5 months of 1960 were 22 percent higher than during the first 5 months of 1959.

12. Foreign manufacturers, since the end of World War II, have cut their prices on scissors and shears so that the average value of an imported pair during 1959 was less than half of the value of a pair imported during 1946.

13. The major sources of imported scissors and shears are West Germany, Italy, and Japan. Hourly wages paid to employees in the scissors and shears industry in these countries are from one-tenth to one-third the hourly wages paid in the United States for similar work. In the United States, the labor cost of producing a pair of quality scissors or shears is about 75 percent of the total cost.

14. Domestic manufacturers are unable to sell scissors and shears in foreign markets due to low prices of scissors and shears produced in West Germany, Italy, and Japan.

15. Imports of scissors and shears valued at more than $1.75 per dozen during 1959 were equal to 95 percent of domestic manufacturers' shipments of similar scissors and shears.

16. The value of shipments of domestically manufactured scissors and shears declined from $19,526,000 in 1948 to $11,058,000 in 1958, a decrease of over 40 percent.

17. Some domestic manufacturers are presently operating at a loss.

18. Many employees in the domestic scissors and shears industry are trained only for this type of work and have been unable to find new work in other industries.

19. Scissors and shears are essential items for use during national emergencies. Certain types are included on the "List of Items Essential for Survival" issued during February 1958 by the Office of Defense Mobilization.

20. The domestic scissors and shears industry has the employees, equipment, and know-how to produce surgical scissors and bandage scissors in case of a national emergency.

For the reasons summarized above domestic manufacturers of scissors and shears have requested that scissors and shears classified under paragraphs 357 and 1531 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, be removed from the list of products to be considered for possible U.S. concessions during the coming negotiations under the Trade Agreement Act of 1934, as amended and extended.

Each pair of scissors or shears imported means one less pair will be manufactured by U.S. workmen in U.S. plants, financed with private capital and paying taxes to the U.S. Government.

Questions Answered by New York Port Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. BECKER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, during debate on August 23, 1960, I posed two specific questions on the floor of the House in reference to the actions of the New York Port Authority. I have received a letter from the executive director of the port authority commenting on the questions I asked.

In the interest of fairness, I am inserting this letter in the RECORD:

THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY,
New York, N.Y., August 25, 1960.

Hon. FRANK J. BECKER,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I appreciate your inquiry regarding a statement made by Congressman CELLER with reference to port authority insurance brokerage practices in the debate on August 23, 1960, on the proposed citation for contempt of Congress of our chairman, secretary, and myself.

Congressman CELLER said:

"We have been denied access to the port authority's books and records, but are gathering a great deal of material from indirect sources though with the greatest difficulty. There are allegations of grave error in the awarding of contracts. There are allegations that one concern has a monopoly on the insurance brokerage business of the port authority. There are allegations that one concern has a virtual monopoly on handling airtrip insurance at various of the airports operated by the port authority." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 16074.)

I simply cannot understand how Congressman CELLER could have believed that there was any difficulty in obtaining information regarding "allegations that one concern has a monopoly on the insurance brokerage business of the port authority."

In the first place, I testified as long ago as May 14, 1952, that we have one insurance broker in response to questioning by Congressman CELLER in his first inquiry into the port authority in congressional hearings on House Joint Resolution 375. The record shows that the following colloquy took place, the chairman referred to being Congressman CELLER:

"The CHAIRMAN. In your insurance do you ask for bids?

"Mr. TOBIN. No, there are no bids that I know of in the insurance field. We have one insurance broker that has been the insurance brokering agent for the port authority for 20 years.

"The CHAIRMAN. In other words, he has all the insurance for the port authority?

"Mr. TOBIN. He handles the entire program.

"The CHAIRMAN. Is he an employee——

"Mr. TOBIN. No.

"Mr. KEATING. He is not a commissioner, is he?

"Mr. TOBIN. He is not a commissioner, no, sir."

In the second place, on June 29, 1960, on the return of the subpena in question, I offered to testify orally and answer any question which the committee members might wish to ask concerning the work of the port authority. This offer to testify was completely ignored.

Finally, the fact that the port authority uses one insurance broker appears clearly in the official minutes of the port authority which were furnished in response to the subcommittee's subpena but which were not examined by the committee or its staff before we were held in default for failing to produce all of the file materials which were subpenaed.

The insistence upon the production of file materials which the Governors of New York and New Jersey had ordered withheld cannot, therefore, be justified in this case, nor in any other case, by a need to verify allegations made to the committee or its chairman.

Furthermore, I cannot accept the inference that there is something censurable in the practice of employing one broker. As you know from your work in the insurance business, there cannot be any bidding on brokerage commissions on insurance. The commissions are paid by the insurance companies, not by the insureds. The amounts are completely outside the control of the insureds. The premium charged a public agency cannot be lowered as a result of competition between brokers for servicing the insurance.

In the case of the port authority, the insurance broker's services are far from routine. He must stand ready to provide integrated service in those areas in which the port authority self-insures as well as those in which the port authority purchases insurance. The broker must be staffed and prepared to engage in a far more costly servicing function than is customarily the case. Such staff services must include fire insurance inspection and engineering, rate analysis and valuation of property, safety engineering and related loss prevention activities. Also required is a thorough knowledge of all possible sources of domestic insurance and, when these are saturated with port authority coverage, a further knowledge of British and continental sources for additional insurance to complete the necessary coverage.

Continuity through a single broker is obviously the best way of making sure that these services will be available to the port authority.

There is an analogy which should be within the personal experience of Congressman CELLER and other Members of Congress who are attorneys. A responsible business or governmental organization will not ask for bids between possible attorney to provide legal counseling. Moreover, the use of a single attorney or firm of attorneys on a continuing basis is considered sound practice in order to achieve the continuity of association with the problems of the client which would be sacrificed by an attempt to place this service in the same category as, for example, construction contracts on which bids may be received and compared.

It remains to comment upon the reference to allegations that one concern has a virtual monopoly on handling air-trip insurance at various of the port authority airports. In the first place, this simply is not so. There is competition in the writing of air-trip insurance at all port authority airports. In the second place, as I would have told the committee if they had accepted my offer to answer any questions they might wish to ask on June 29, the port authority expressly rejected the offer of a particular group to double the port authority's percentage rental charge for this concession if it could receive a monopoly. I might note that exclusive concessions in this field are quite common in American airports throughout the country.

I appreciate this opportunity to set the record straight.

Very truly yours,

AUSTIN J. TOBIN,
Executive Director.

Nineteen Sixties—Testing Period for Freemen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, in a world in which peace is threatened by tortuous, deceptive tactics of alternating handshaking and missile bristling of the Communists; new nations are emerging with a volcanic spirit, aimed at independence and self-determination; the national interests of nations on both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains sometimes conflict; in the face of these factors, we, as a nation and individuals, need a stable and fundamental outlook and philosophy.

Recently, the La Crosse Tribune published a timely editorial entitled "Time To Summon Courage, Face It; It's a Testing Period for Freemen."

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the La Crosse Sunday Tribune, Aug. 28, 1960]

TIME TO SUMMON COURAGE, FACE IT; IT'S A TESTING PERIOD FOR FREEMEN

Since the close of World War II it has been the great hope of the world's peoples that a true and lasting peace be found. After a decade and a half, however, this prospect seems further from fulfillment than ever.

This fact unquestionably is a source of deep disappointment, disillusionment, and frustration to many, many millions.

It leads some inevitably to feel that there must be something wrong with our approach to the Russian and Chinese Communists, that if we can just find the right formula we can wash away all difficulties and have the peace we all yearn for.

Yet there is a mountain of evidence to indicate that the only kind of peace the Communists would accept is one which would compel our surrender to their tyrannies.

A very reasonable argument can therefore be made that the present real alternative to war is not a blissful peace but exactly the kind of tension-filled, crises-ridden existence we endure today.

This is an outlook few of us care to contemplate. Nevertheless, our survival as free men depends on our ability to continue to bear, perhaps indefinitely, the tensions and crises of this age.

A recent writer talked of maturity in an individual as a condition demonstrated most forcefully by his ability to bear tensions in his life. It might well be said that America's maturity as a country should be gaged in the same way.

Resistance to this notion cannot be expected to yield easily. Oddly, a good many of our intellectuals, who ought above all to understand today's painful alternatives, are among those most readily persuaded that some magic peace formula lies just around the corner.

Intellectuals often are wedded to the idea of the perfectibility of man. They abhor the prevailing international disorder. But they, like all of us, may be slowly driven to accept the fact that mankind, always falli-

ble, is today in one of its most imperfect moods.

Facing this uncomfortable reality, we do not have to grin but we do have to bear it. This is one of the great testing times in all history for freemen.

Summary of One-Check-Payroll Services

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, August 22, 1960

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of my colleagues to a recent bulletin issued by the American Bankers Association, entitled "Summary of One-Check-Payroll Services." The question of one-check-payroll system has been considered from time to time by various agencies of the Federal Government, but up to this point, it has only been applied in limited fields. However, without prejudicing the issue, I am impressed by the conclusion given in this summary that "one-check-payroll services appear destined to be a major step toward serving individuals and businesses more fully." With this in mind, I would suggest that it might be well for the next Congress to examine this question more fully, since the pace of growth of National Government payrolls matches that of private business. The complete text of the bulletin is as follows:

SUMMARY OF ONE-CHECK-PAYROLL SERVICES

WHAT ARE "ONE-CHECK-PAYROLL SERVICES?"

One-check-payroll services are convenient arrangements whereby pay is automatically credited to respective employees' bank accounts on or before the normal payday by mutual consent of employees, employer, and banker.

The employer may send one check to the bank accompanied by a list of employees who are eligible or who may choose the plan. The bank credits respective accounts, and employees are fully informed on all details of the transaction, including gross pay, deductions, and net pay. One-check-payroll services are flexible. Several variations of these basic ideas have been used.

WHAT ARE THEIR ADVANTAGES?

For employees, one-check-payroll services:

1. Provide convenience for depositing pay without filling in a deposit slip or leaving their place of employment.

2. Provide assurance of a safe, accurate, and timely deposit of pay.

For employers, one-check-payroll services:

1. Reduce normal payroll processing costs.

2. Save time typically used to distribute or mail individual payments.

3. Reduce or eliminate payroll deduction expenses.

4. Facilitate excellent employee relations, because they are desirable services for employees.

5. Reduce or avoid risks associated with conventional payroll procedures.

For banks, one-check-payroll services:

1. Are an efficient way to credit pay to employee checking accounts.

2. Are an effective way to obtain business—to serve more people with checking accounts and other services which may result therefrom.

3. Are compatible with automation in check handling and bookkeeping.

One-check-payroll services can be an excellent supplement to on-the-job services. Both enable employees to obtain convenient services at a low cost, enable employers to operate efficiently, and enable banks to serve more people better and at a reasonable profit.

WHAT ARE THEIR PITFALLS?

As with on-the-job services, there are pitfalls:

1. Some employees still desire direct cash payment. Their initial response to one-check-payroll services may be one of apprehension. Widespread acceptance may require education on the advantages of this service. Such is the nature of progress. Some banks and employers have started with salaried employees.

2. The most significant advantages may be long run. Patience is required. Progress may not be immediately conspicuous. Collateral benefits may not be easily measured.

3. Establishing one-check-payroll services requires sales initiative.

ARE THEY WORTHWHILE?

Although variations of one-check-payroll services have been used for some time, their value to banks, employers, and employees takes on greater significance as competition intensifies, automation advances, and employees' pay levels rise. One-check-payroll services appear destined to be a major step toward serving individuals and businesses more fully.

Resolutions by Merchant Marine Committee, Department of New York American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the American Legion and many of its departments have always been among the foremost champions of the American merchant marine. Resolutions to this effect, adopted at Buffalo, N.Y., on August 25, by the Merchant Marine Committee, Department of New York, American Legion, reflect a thorough awareness of the value of American shipping to our country's commerce and defense, as well as of the problems facing this most strategic maritime industry.

With the hope that Senators will give deserved attention to the matters involved, I ask unanimous consent that the merchant marine resolutions of the Department of New York, American Legion, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MERCHANT MARINE COMMITTEE, DEPARTMENT OF NEW YORK, AMERICAN LEGION—MERCHANT MARINE RESOLUTION

Whereas the majority of our war-built merchant vessels now are low-speed, inefficient, and overage, which impairs the required capacity to promptly meet the military sea lifts for mass troop and material transportation to wherever they may be needed througout the world; and

Whereas there is urgent need for an orderly merchant ship replacement program to correct this seapower deficiency: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to:

1. Implement as fully as possible the sound national maritime policy established in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

2. Assure the appropriation of adequate funds to enable the Government to meet its obligations and proceed in an accelerated vessel replacement program.

3. Effectively administer the 50–50 law, requiring that a minimum of 50 percent of cargoes financed by the U.S. Government be transported in American-flag ships to the extent they are available.

4. Encourage the Department of Defense, exporters, importers, and tourists to use the dependable and reliable services of American-flag ships, in the interest of a dynamic and expanding U.S. foreign commerce and for national defense.

5. Insure immediately available for national defense, strong intercoastal and coastwise steamship services; and expand and improve the port and alternate route facilities for use in case of attack.

6. Increase the efforts of the Government to work with other nations toward eliminating discriminatory practice harmful to U.S.-flag shipping.

7. Commend the American maritime industry and the U.S. Maritime Administration for their research programs on ship design, ship propulsion, and for more efficient cargo handling, so that the most up-to date information will be available to various segments of the American merchant fleet to insure its leadership among the world's maritime nations.

8. Provide adequate shipbuilding and ship repair mobilization bases for wartime requirements along all sea coasts, and that Government and military officials allocate and distribute peacetime new ship construction and repairs equitably among the Atlantic, Gulf, Great Lakes, and Pacific facilities in the interest of national security.

9. Continue to encourage and support the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy and the Maritime Colleges in Maine, Massachusetts, California, and New York.

10. Continue a program of direct action for a strong American merchant marine.

11. Implement a broad and extensive information and education campaign by the American Legion on behalf of a strong American merchant marine for our national security.

12. Provide that the chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee and the director of the National Security Committee of the American Legion be, and they hereby are, directed to continue to seek and obtain from all possible sources such information and assistance as will insure the effectiveness of the mandates of this convention concerning the American merchant marine, and further that the chairman and director be, and they hereby are, authorized to participate in all public hearings affecting the said program; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Legion instruct the National Headquarters of the American Legion to continue to prepare and to carry out an extensive information and education program about the American merchant marine as the "fourth arm" of national security.

EDWARD C. HOLDEN, Jr.,
Chairman, Department Merchant Marine Committee.
BUFFALO, N.Y., *August 25, 1960.*

Six Outstanding Conservatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the New York

Times magazine an article entitled "A Conservative Sets Out His Credo" by BARRY M. GOLDWATER. In this article he names six outstanding conservatives and sets forth his reasons for listing them. I desire to include this portion of the article from the New York Times magazine of July 31, 1960, which lists the six outstanding conservatives named by Senator GOLDWATER with his reasons:

SIX OUTSTANDING CONSERVATIVES NAMED BY GOLDWATER, WITH HIS REASONS

Roosevelt: This man displayed his conservative bent by recognizing the lessons of history which showed that the proper use of power could preserve peace in the world.

Hoover: This conservative President showed to the world the intense interest of the conservative in the problems of his fellow men. His whole life has been a dedication to the solution of these problems.

BYRD: Senator BYRD, being a true conservative, recognizes the obvious lessons of history which tell us that no individual, business, or government can forever spend money that is not at hand.

WILLIAMS: I could include Senator WILLIAMS for the same reasons I have discussed in Senator BYRD's case, but, in addition, Senator WILLIAMS recognizes that history has taught us that dishonesty in government creates contempt for the government. And he has devoted a great part of his career to ferreting out dishonesty where it exists.

Kirk: Professor Kirk's writings are probably the clearest ever done on the conservative philosophy and I list him because a reading of his works will give a person an immediate understanding of what conservatism means.

ALGER: I have selected Congressman ALGER because he typifies a new and young group of conservative politicians who know that we must study the past if we are to make progress in the future. That is the one point on which all conservatives agree. That is why none of them wants to try the mistakes of yesterday in the solving of the problems of tomorrow.

Drugs for Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, the activities of numerous Americans, from every area of our country, are helping to bring new hope to countless millions of people in scores of developing nations. If we could know of these activities by our own neighbors, and the difference they are making in the lives of other people, our country's overall efforts in this field would acquire a new and personal meaning to us.

The Foreign Policy Committee of the League of Women Voters of Englewood, N.J., has endeavored to do just this in a series of 15 weekly illustrated articles published this year by the Bergen Evening Record. The foreign policy chairman, Mrs. Florence Thomases, conceived the idea of a series of articles highlighting the oversea experiences of people from Bergen County who have served in international development work. At my request, the International Cooperation Administration supplied a list of such persons from the Bergen County area, which was one of the sources used by the committee in developing its material. Mrs. Adele H. Stern, public relations chairman, wrote the articles.

This series, entitled "Bergen International," seems to me to be a signal accomplishment in awakening the interest of Americans in how their neighbors and their communities are helping in the effort to raise living standards and to improve health and education all over the world. The stories show, for example, how Bergen County people have helped university education in India; have helped Icelanders use their native volcanic ash in building lower cost housing; have helped schools and teacher training in Chile; have helped solve nutritional problems in the Philippines; how pills from an Englewood plant stopped the tubercular coughing of a little girl in Korea. They link such activities to the larger programs by American private agencies and foundations, the mutual security program and the work of United Nations agencies.

I ask unanimous consent, to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD one of the articles from this series. I believe it illustrates well how our country's work in this field can be brought close to home to any American community.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BERGEN INTERNATIONAL—DRUGS FOR KOREA

(By Adele H. Stern)

A small child has been coughing. Nobody takes notice. Her once bright, black eyes are dulled, and she listlessly leans her frail body against a tree in front of her parents' crude home. Another spasm shakes her outrageously. Still nobody pays any particular attention. For this is a child in postwar Korea, and she is only one victim of uncounted sufferers of the disease of tuberculosis.

Then one day something happens. A man from the World Health Organization comes to the town. The gossips say that he is distributing pills which will help the coughing. And for those who are not infected, there will be vaccinations to prevent them from becoming ill. The child is given a pill and another and another, and one day the coughing lessens and stops. And the child can run again and play.

What is this pill that gives hope to tuberculosis victims in Korea, and where does it come from?

A drug company in New Jersey called Panray Corp. manufactured the pills. They had been requisitioned through the U.S. International Co-operation Administration and shipped from the Panray plant in Englewood. The pills may be either Parasal (aminosalicilic acid) or Isoniazid (isonicotinic acid hydrazide) whch, with streptomycin, make up the three durgs which are commonly used to treat tuberculosis. Since the outbreak of hostilities in 1950, with the accompanying disruption of population, lack of proper food, and lowering of health standards, tuberculosis has been on the increase in Korea.

And it is only since 1953 that the program for controlling it has been stepped up. Panray has increased its shipments of the drugs enormously from the 25,000 to 50,000 bottles which were sent at a time in 1956 to as many as 300,000 bottles in a single shipment in 1959. So critical was the need at one point that 20 percent of one shipment of the drug, which normally travels overland to the central assembly base at Sharpe, Calif., and then on vessels to Korea, was airlifted to Sharpe by the Flying Tigers and then flown to Seoul by the Army Transportation Corps.

And so the next 10 years should see a sharp reduction in the disease in Korea. While tuberculosis is not curable, it may be arrested, and the aim is to rehabilitate patients so that they may function again as healthy people.

The next 10 years should bring, as well, many other hopeful things for our little coughing girl, Yung Ok. The war-beaten earth of her homeland is being reclaimed and irrigated with the help of U.S. technicians who also are teaching farmers the better use of pesticides and fertilizer. Already the rice yield, the staple crop in this densely populated land of 22½ million, has increased substantially. Existing cotton mills, which were damaged during hostilities, have been rehabilitated with ICA assistance. And more than 1 million bales of U.S. surplus cotton has been disposed of to aid the all but destroyed textile industry.

Splendid Americans, such as Philadelphia lawyer Graham French, have given sums of money to build towns in which refugees can live and work and rehabilitate themselves. Such a town is New Chorwon, where, through French's gift of no more than $10,000, some 500 people can make a living from crops of potatoes, wheat, cabbage, and barley. In the raw, Korean winter, these people, former refugees from the north, make straw rope with the use of a rope machine, another gift from French.

ICA has initiated technical assistance for do-it-yourself housing. After learning how to use indigenous materials which permit the reduction of imported building materials by 60 percent, unemployed laborers working with zest have built in Korea some urban housing which is impressive. Moreover, the Koreans have learned how to solve their own housing problems, so that now the United States can step out of the picture in this area of endeavor.

At the Hae Myung Orphanage outside Seoul, seven American soldiers assisted in the building of two wooden washing machines, which the orphans now use to help support the orphanage. From a news story about a build-it-yourself washing machine developed by the ICA the seven GIs figured out the blueprints, added some innovations of their own, came up with a better machine, and cut the cost to $4.

The fishing industry took a new lease on life with the use of mechanical equipment provided by the ICA. Where previously it had been necessary for 7 boats to be operated by 80 men, with the new power gear it was found that 26 men operating 2 boats—1 boat to catch the fish and 1 boat to carry the catch back to shore—could land twice the precious catch in half the time. Crew members replaced by the mechanical equipment have gone to work ashore to salt, pickle, dry, freeze, market, and distribute the increased fish harvest to areas where seafood has never been consumed before, and orders have been placed for 16 more power blocks to mechanize further the Korean fishing fleets.

Little Yung Ok, returned to health, will eat better food; live in a better house, and will be clothed more warmly. With these advantages and the while pills from Englewood, N.J., her children and grandchildren can have the opportunity to grow strong and comfortable.

The Republic of Korea, devastated by the fighting of 1950–53, has made remarkable progress in rehabilitating its economy. The majority of the war damage has been repaired and agricultural and industrial development has progressed well beyond the pre-1950 stage.

The U.S. mutual security program has been the principal source of assistance. From 1954 to 1959 obligations for direct U.S. economic aid to Korea totaled billions of dollars.

The fiscal year of 1959 witnessed continued close United States-Korean cooperation in handling new and changing problems. Nevertheless, while its administrative and technical proficiency is improving steadily, Korea is not yet adequately prepared to meet the needs of an efficient, modern state.

But, Yung Ok, there is progress and there is hope.

An Alarming Paradox

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the June 1960 issue of Marine Engineering Log, capitioned "An Alarming Paradox" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. It traces the disastrous decline in carriage by American shipping of our country's foreign trade, from a high of 67.6 percent in 1946, to a threadbare 10.6 percentage for 1959. There is little consolation in the figures cited, but I hope that they may at least be a warning to the Congress and the administration that continued neglect of this most strategic maritime industry will have catastrophic consequences, both to our commerce and to the national defense.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN ALARMING PARADOX

While it may come as a shock to many distressed individuals and entire segments of our maritime industry, the year 1959 will be recorded as the greatest year of world trade. The total value of goods moved in global trade last year exceeded the whopping $100 billion tallied in 1957.

This fact was made known recently by Secretary of Commerce Frederick H. Mueller. While his statement provided no idea as to the margin by which the 1957 total was exceeded, it is presumed that his preliminary figures are not compiled on any haphazard "guesstimates."

UNITED STATES IS LEADING TRADE NATION

At the same time we learned that the U.S. total trade (imports plus exports) accounted for $31.5 billion of this huge $100-billion-plus trade melon. Our imports rose to a new—and somewhat alarming—high of $15.2 billion. Our exports amounted to a disappointing $16.3 billion—providing the narrowest trade surplus we've had since 1950.

(In 1957, our biggest trade year, our total trade amounted to $32.5 billion. In that year we imported $12.9 billion while exporting the unparalleled amount of $19.4 billion. Thus, in 1957, we had a trade surplus of $6.5 billion as against last year's $1.1 billion. Happily, our exports for the first quarter of 1960 have been at an annual rate of $18.4 billion while imports have been running at a rate of $15.7 billion.)

Obviously, Secretary Mueller's pronouncement that 1959 was the greatest trade year ever known provides little comfort to many who earn their livelihood in the U.S. maritime industries. And the fact that the United States again accounted for the dominant share of the world's trade must be particularly ironic to the bankrupt tramp operator, the distressed directors of many of our berth lines, and the worried executives of our shipbuilding and repair yards.

Now, the U.S. maritime industry has no corner on rough times. Every maritime nation in the world has felt to some degree the so-called shipping recession of the past few years. But American steamship lines and shipyards with their attendant high operating and construction costs are less able to ride out an economic blow.

There are many factors that adversely affect the American shipping company and shipyards. And high costs are a formidable disadvantage. Yet the paramount factor is the lack of support shown by American industry for U.S.-flag shipping.

A SORRY RECORD

In 1946, excluding waterborne trade with Canada, American ships carried 67.6 percent of this Nation's waterborne trade. In 1948, 54.8 percent was carried. In 1950 the percentage was 44.6; 1952, 35.8; and 1954, 27.8.

By 1956 only 20.4 percent was shipped American. In 1957 it declined to 17.6 and then dropped to 12.8 percent in 1958. And the final tally for 1959 shows that only 10.6 percent of our foreign waterborne commerce was hauled by our ships. This is a sad record for the world's most dominant trading nation. Mr. K's boast that he was going to bury us in a war of trade doesn't seem so boastful now. After all, if things get any worse for our shipping, if our shipping sinks any lower, we won't have the principal tool with which to wage a war of trade.

Pakistan Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Washington will be the poorer next month when Pakistani Major General M. Hayaud Din, head of his country's military mission to the United States for the past 5 years, returns to Pakistan. As a military "ambassador" to the United States, Gen. Hayaud Din has won many friends for Pakistan. I, for one, knew little of his people and their newly created nation when I first met him almost 5 years ago. Today, though still far from expert on Pakistan, I have learned much about this country on the other side of the world, most of which has impressed me greatly. For example:

Pakistan, with 80 million citizens, is the seventh most populated country in the world.

Pakistan soldiers, the Moslems of Great Britain's Indian Empire, fought with the soldiers of the United States in both World Wars of this century and are presently allies with us in the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization and the Central Treaty Organization.

The Communist Party is outlawed in Pakistan, and the Pakistani Government has been openly pro-free world since its creation in 1947.

Pakistan appears to be opposed to the "something for nothing" policy adhered to by many governments in the world today in dealing with its citizens. Private enterprise is encouraged to its fullest.

In lunching with Gen. Hayaud Din on Friday, I was given an interesting briefing on the current situation in Pakistan. President Mohammed Ayub Khan is committed to forming a democratic form of government which is suitable for the background of his people. His ideas show a sincere concern for his people and are spelled out simply, but with singular comments, in the July issue of Foreign Affairs. In mentioning the bloodless revolution of 1958 which saw him take over the reins of the Pakistan Government, he says:

When circumstances such as our revolution concentrate power in the hands of one person, it is his bounden duty to pass that power on to a more broadly based system without avoidable delay. Individuals are fallible; but institutions stay. That is why I am in such a hurry to insure the induction of a suitable constitutional system without any loss of time.

For the benefit of those persons not familiar with the situation in Pakistan, in many respects our stanchest ally in the Mideast and southeast Asia, I ask unanimous consent that President Ayub Khan's article, entitled "Pakistan Perspective," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAKISTAN PERSPECTIVE

(By Mohammed Ayub Khan)

I am not sure if the peculiar strains which confronted Pakistan immediately on its emergence as a free state are adequately understood.

The first strain was ideological. It is a common fallacy to believe that the concept of Pakistan was formed in a poet's dream. The poet, Dr. Muhammad Iqbal, was no idle dreamer. Nor can countries like Pakistan (364,737 square miles; population 80 million) spring from the nebulous realm of poetry alone. Iqbal was in fact a philosopher of traditional as well as modern thought who had made a careful study of human affairs, both East and West, and focused the light of his inquiry on the causes of economic and cultural subjugation to which the Muslims of India had been systematically subjected since their first abortive struggle for independence in 1857. It was in his presidential address to the annual session of All-India Muslim League in 1930 that he spelt out the broad outlines of a plan under which the Muslims of India were led to aspire to an independent state in which they would be free to follow their own way of life.

The All-India Muslim League based its charter on this idea and, under the leadership of Qaid-i-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah, launched a struggle which culminated in the establishment of Pakistan in August 1947.

Iqbal's thesis that in their free state the Muslims were to practice their own way of life posed an ideological problem which was not easy to handle. On one hand, there were many outside Pakistan who charged us with planning to establish an abdurate theocracy in the medieval sense of the term. On the other, most of us within Pakistan itself were not quite clear how to go about welding our spiritual ideals into the business of statecraft. The result was a great deal of loose groping which infected our politics and our intellect alike.

Pakistan was thus involved in the paradox of almost losing its ideology in the very act

of trying to fulfill it. This distraction was totally unwarranted, for Iqbal, one of the main creators of our ideology, had taken pains to define it in very clear terms: "In Islam the spiritual and the temporal are not two distinct domains and the nature of an act, however secular in its import, is determined by the attitude of mind with which the agent does it. It is the invisible mental background of the act which ultimately determines its character. An act is temporal or profane if it is done in a spirit of detachment from the infinite complexity of life behind it. It is spiritual if it is inspired by that complexity. In Islam it is the same reality which appears as church looked at from one point of view and state from another."

According to this concept, the state owes a singular and specific duty to its people. "The essence of Tauhid (unity of God) as a working idea is equality, solidity and freedom," according to Iqbal. "The state from the Islamic standpoint is an endeavor to transform these ideals into space-time forces, as aspiration to realize them in a definite human organization."

It is this sort of human organization which Pakistan aspires to become and one of my endeavors is to clear at least a part of the way by liberating the basic concept of our ideology from the dust of vagueness and ambiguities it has accumulated over the years.

The second strain which befell Pakistan immediately on its emergence was economic. Besides more than 9 million refugees who poured over the border in a state of appalling terror and distress, food fell desperately short owing to hundreds of thousands of acres of land going out of use every year on this account. Moreover, successive gova menace which still continues unabated. As much as 10 million acres of good fertile land have already fallen out of cultivation on this account. Moreover, successive governments were unable to control the situation adequately, and large-scale, organized smuggling, currency rackets, black-marketing and increasingly plastic standards of honesty and efficiency brought the affairs of the country to the verge of total ruin.

The third strain—which is a continuous one—is geographical. Divided into two wings (West Pakistan: 310,236 square miles, population 38,779,000; East Pakistan: 54,501 square miles, population 42,063,000), there are over 1,000 miles of India in-between without any assured means of land communications. Air travel is heavily subsidized but still too expensive for most people. The sea link involves a journey of about 7 days. There is diversity of languages, scripts and social customs. By the very nature of things, these factors are centrifugal and call for a new and bold experiment with political and administrative science to weave unity out of diversity. The situation is often difficult but not baffling, for a common ideology provides a positive base for cohesion. The firmness of this base is strong or weak accordingly as that ideology is understood and practiced rightly or wrongly.

Finally, there is the emotional factor. Until the advent of Pakistan, none of was in fact a Pakistani, for the simple reason that there was no territorial entity bearing that name. Actually, the boundaries of Pakistan were still being drawn and redrawn secretly in the Viceregal Lodge at New Delhi when independence was proclaimed. Never had the destiny of so many millions depended so helplessly on the arbitrary strokes of one man's pencil. It was because Mr. Radcliffe happened to make a small dent on the wrong side of the line that over 4 million inhabitants of Jammu and Kashmir have been locked in a life-and-death struggle for self-determination for 13 long and dreadful years.

So, prior to 1947, our nationalism was based more on an idea than on any territorial definition. Till then, ideologically we were Muslims; territorially we happened to be Indians; and parochially we were a conglomeration of at least 11 smaller, provincial loyalties. But when suddenly Pakistan emerged as a reality, we who had got together from every nook and corner of the vast subcontinent of India were faced with the task of transforming all our tradifional, territorial, and parochial loyalties into one great loyalty for the new state of Pakistan. This process of metamorphism was naturally attended by difficult psychological and emotional strains which we have borne in full measure—and are still bearing.

Under normal circumstances, it would have required most extraordinary efforts by the best of governments to cope with the problems which have been confronting us. But unfortunately neither have our circumstances been normal, nor did we have good strong governments; and they did not make even ordinary efforts to resolve the problems in front of them.

* * * * *

It is now the fashion to blame the politicians outright for this mess. Yes, they were guilty of many misdeeds of omission and commission; but there is one fundamental point in which, I have a feeling, they were rather sinned against than sinning. That is, they were given a system of government totally unsuited to the temper and climate of the country.

The British parliamentary system which we inherited and later adopted in the constitution of 1956 is largely an unwritten law and takes for granted too many prerequisites which do not really exist in a country like Pakistan. Our rate of literacy is appallingly low. Our means of communication are poor, even primitive. The rural population which constitutes over 80 percent of the total is hardly touched by the world outside the villages.

Just before independence, when Mr. Jinnah was anxious to put more and more of his party men in the Central and Provincial Assemblies of India to carry on the struggle for the idea of Pakistan, he issued an appeal: "Vote for a Muslim Leaguer even if it be a lamppost." People complied cheerfully; some even literally. When independence came, the gentlemen thus elected found themselves in a position of vantage to assume power in the new State of Pakistan, and the political system in their hands enabled them to keep delaying the making of a constitution for about 8 years. The outgoing Parliament of Pakistan had 80 seats, each member presuming to represent about a million of his countrymen for almost an indefinite period. Even under the Constitution of 1956, a member of the Provincial Assembly was required to be elected by more than 100,000 voters. Now this is the type of electoral college which just cannot work in Pakistan—or for that matter in any country where conditions like those of Pakistan obtain, as they do in many newly independent countries of Asia and Africa. An average villager with little or no education has no means of gaining any personal knowledge about a candidate who is mixed up in a population of 100,000 or more, spread over a large area without any advanced means of communication and contact. Votes cast under these circumstances cannot but be vague, wanton, and responsive to fear, coercion, temptation, and other modes of misguidance. This is exactly what had been happening in Pakistan. Whenever elections were held, they could be easily manipulated to return candidates with power to influence, money to bribe and nuisance value to coerce. Conditions such as these reduce the practice of democracy to a farce.

But this does not dismay us. Nor should it be taken to imply that we can do—or wish to do—without democracy. The revolution of October 7, 1958, was not aimed against the institution of democracy as such. No, it was only against the manner in which its institutions were being worked. There are two main reasons why we in Pakistan cannot but adhere to a democratic pattern of life and government. In the first place, as Muslims, we are brought up on two basic ingredients of democracy, namely, equality and fraternity. Anything to the contrary would be the negation of our spiritual faith and practice. And, secondly, we have to fight a long and arduous battle for progress and development in which every man, woman, and child of Pakistan must participate to the fullest possible extent. Democracy provides the only healthy and dignified way for arousing the willing cooperation of people and harnessing it to a sustained national endeavor.

We must, therefore, have democracy. The question then is: What type of democracy? The answer need not be sought in the theories and practices of other people alone. On the contrary, it must be found from within the book of Pakistan itself.

To my mind, there are four prerequisites for the success of any democratic system in a country like Pakistan:

1. It should be simple to understand, easy to work and cheap to sustain.

2. It should put to the voter only such questions as he can answer in the light of his own personal knowledge and understanding without external prompting.

3. It should insure the effective participation of all citizens in the affairs of the country up to the level of their mental horizon and intellectual caliber.

4. It should be able to produce reasonably strong and stable governments.

The scheme of "basic democracies" which has been launched in Pakistan is designed to meet most of these fundamental prerequisites. Under this scheme, the two wings of the country have each been divided into 40,000 constituencies with an average population of about 1,000. Every constituency elects one representative by universal franchise. In such a small and well-defined field of choice, voters of the meanest intelligence cannot go far wrong in putting their finger on the right type of candidate.

Ten such constituencies form a union council in the rural areas, and this elects its own chairman from among the elected members. Provision has also been made for nominated members to insure, where necessary, the representation of special interests, like women, minorities, etc. In towns and larger municipalities organization follows a similar pattern.

The elected chairmen of union councils and town committees represent their areas on the next tier of administration; namely, the Thana Council, which covers the entire area under the jurisdiction of a police station. From this stage, this system of associating the chosen representatives of the people with local administration travels upward covering all intermediary tiers, like tehsils, districts, and divisions, up to the provincial level. This is designed to insure a full sense of cooperation between the official and elected agencies at all stages of public administration.

The first elections to basic democracies were held last December and I feel the results were quite heartening. The average percentage of votes cast was 67 percent by men and 42 percent by women. Those elected included 14 percent university graduates, 78 percent literate and 8 percent illiterate members. They came from the real hard core of the country, the majority of them being middle-class and lower middle-class agriculturists, lawyers, medical practitioners, businessmen, retired government servants, workers, and artisans.

One great lesson which these elections brought out was that, for the first time in Pakistan, it seemed possible for an average citizen to seek election purely on his or her personal merit without the help of any financial, social or political backing. Also for the first time, the elected candidate finds himself in a position to participate effectively and directly in the affairs of the country as they exist immediately around him.

The Union Councils and Town Committees have been given a wide charter of duties and responsibilities ranging from local self-government to national reconstruction and development. Besides this, I am looking to this gigantic instrument of mass representation to achieve three other pressing objectives. First, to help throw up a fresh supply of local and national leaders. Second, to serve as a two-way traffic post between the government and the basic core of the people and to bridge the gulf which under the best of systems is bound to exist between them in countries where education is limited, distances are large and modern facilities for reaching the masses are not universal. And, third, I would personally like this body of 80,000 elected representatives to serve as the electoral college for the Parliament and, possibly, for the President. This is only my personal view, for I do not wish to prejudge the recommendations of the Constitution Commission which is at the moment seized of this and other allied problems.

The Constitution Commission of Pakistan, consisting of eminent judges, lawyers and other interests, was set up in February this year and has been entrusted with the following terms of reference:

"To examine the progressive failure of parliamentary government in Pakistan leading to the abrogation of the Constitution of 1956 and to determine the causes and the nature of the failure;

"To consider how best the said or like causes may be identified and their recurrence prevented;

"And, having further taken account of the genius of the people, the general standard of education and of political judgment in the country, the present state of a sense of nationhood, the prime need for sustained development, and the effect of the constitutional and administrative changes brought into being in recent months, to submit constitutional proposals in the form of a report advising how best the following ends may be secured: A democracy adaptable to changing circumstances and based on the Islamic principles of justice, equality and tolerance; the consolidation of national unity; and a firm and stable system of government."

* * * * *

While the Constitution is still in the making, there is time to complete the reforms already in hand or give a start to those which are still under contemplation. The meaning of all this activity is to prepare the ground for the growth of a happy and healthy life which, after all, is the end product of all human endeavor.

An archaic type of feudalism which existed in Pakistan—particularly West Pakistan—had vested the entire political, economic, and social might of the country in a limited group of families. It was impossible to make any advance in any direction without first breaking this monopoly of power. Therefore, land reform was one of the first measures to be taken by the new regime. This was a major operation but it was performed peacefully and scientifically and was attended by no manner of tyranny or injustice. This is a far-reaching socioeconomic change and its full impact will be felt only with the passage of time.

Other fields in which reforms have been undertaken include education, public health, fiscal systems, law courts, civil administration, and the rehabilitation of refugees. The object is to get us to the starting point of development, whence we may be better able to grapple with some of the most pressing and immediate of our problems. These are: fighting the grave menace to the land of salinity and waterlogging; curbing the excessive rate of growth of population; and launching the next 5-year plan for national development, estimated to cost over 19 billion rupees (about $4 billion). According to experts, these figures are not astronomical but only reasonable.

The next 15 to 20 years are going to be most crucial for Pakistan. Either we "make the grade" in this period or we do not. If we fail to make the grade, we are bound to be submerged under the tidal wave of communism which is consantly lashing its fury all around us. Since we do not seek this fate we must move forward, and do so quickly. It is here that our eyes turn toward our friends and allies. They have already given us magnanimous aid, for which we are most grateful. But there are reasons of history which entitle us to claim still more.

During the last 200 years or so the area which is now Pakistan was subjected to foreign rule. This stunted our growth immeasurably and all this long period of time was lost to us for preparing ourselves to move with the modern scientific times. We have now to catch up with the fast-moving world—and this will require extraordinary endeavor as well as expenditure.

It was during the period of imperial rule that the British industrial development started and gained momentum with resources which to a large extent were taken from the colonial areas. The British industrial development in a way gave a fillip to the American industrial development. It is common knowledge that up to the Second World War, Britain had enormous investments in both the Americas. Most of the progress in the Commonwealth countries and Dominions was also stimulated by the British industrial development. So far as the area now forming Pakistan is concerned, its manpower was generally employed to man the British armies to maintain and protect the empire. For this reason, this part of the Indian subcontinent was purposely kept industrially backward so that the populace would not be diverted into other channels of employment.

Moreover, in the context of present-day world politics Pakistan has openly and unequivocally cast its lot with the West, and unlike several other countries around us, we have shut ourselves off almost completely from the possibility of any major assistance from the Communist bloc. We do not believe in hunting with the hound and running with the hare. We wish to follow, and are following, a clear and unambiguous path.

All these factors lead to one conclusion: that the English-speaking world ought to feel a special responsibility to assist Pakistan in attaining a reasonable posture of advancement. It is not just a claim. It is in fact the dictate of history.

Potsdam Papers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, there has just been printed in the Washington Star a most interesting series of articles relating to the events of the Potsdam Conference, and most particularly to the decision of President Truman to drop the atomic bomb on Japan. It now seems clear, in spite of the rather cloudy reference in Mr. Truman's memoirs, that there had been a Japanese offer to surrender before the bomb was dropped. It also appears that Mr. Truman trusted Josef Stalin enough to rely on Stalin's judgment in this matter, and to let Stalin ignore a clear and definite Japanese peace initiative.

Mr. President, it is no surprise to learn what many of us knew all the time—that Stalin cared a good deal less for peace than he did for Soviet expansion. But it is a surprise to learn that a perfectly legitimate Japanese peace offer, transmitted through regular diplomatic channels, was thrust aside in such a cavalier manner. That was not a policy of brinksmanship; it was a policy of going over the brink. The long-term cost of that policy in the life and health of the Japanese people has been a great one. The price of that policy in Japanese-American relations is one that we are still paying today.

Mr. President, if there is one thing that these articles from State Department records reveal, it is that judgment is a cardinal factor in conducting foreign affairs. And judgment comes only from experience. It is interesting to observe that, with few exceptions, the trained, professional Foreign Service officers were more often right in assessing Stalin's aims than were the political appointees attached to the White House or in the State Department.

Mr. President, I have found these articles very revealing. They tell the story of an unfortunate era in this country's foreign policy, an era which many of us would like to forget. But I think we would be foolish, indeed, if we did not try to learn from the errors of the past. If we remember how badly President Roosevelt and President Truman were fooled by "Uncle Joe Stalin," then we shall be far less likely to be taken in by such tactics in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that some of these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the first article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Aug. 21–22, 1960]

TRUMAN BACKED STALIN'S STALLING ON JAPAN PEACE, NOTES INDICATE—THE POTSDAM PAPERS

(By Fletcher Knebel and Charles W. Bailey)

Josef Stalin, the late Soviet dictator, with the approval of former President Harry S. Truman, intentionally stalled off a Japanese attempt to end World War II 3 weeks before the dropping of the first atomic bomb on Hiroshima.

Details of the decision by Stalin and Mr. Truman to brush off Japanese surrender efforts are revealed for the first time in the still-confidential unpublished Potsdam Papers.

The papers give no clue to the precise reason for the decision but there are indications that the desire for an unconditional surrender by the Japanese was the main sticking point.

The writers gained access to the two volumes—totaling more than 2,000 pages—of

Potsdam documents, meticulously prepared by State Department historians and slated for publication after the November elections.

The massive papers deal with the American-British-Russian terminal meeting, held in Potsdam in July 1945, where the allies in the war against Hitler sought to divide the plunder of war and to pave the road to a peace conference—a conference that was never held.

For the Americans, headed by a new President, Harry S. Truman, these were days of disillusionment over Russian aims and methods.

For the British, led at first by the doughty Winston Churchill, they were days of bitter vindication of their belief that Russia sought nothing less than the rule of all Europe.

For the Russians, led by the cynical and ruthless Stalin, they were days of gimlet-eyed bargaining to protect their hold on the newly communized lands behind what Mr. Churchill was already calling the "iron fence."

While a number of American and British memoirs have told part of the story of Potsdam, the conference papers shed new light on the momentous issues that still remain unresolved on this 15th anniversary of Japan's surrender.

New and penetrating light is shed especially on one controversial question—that of Japan's abortive efforts to surrender before America dropped the single bomb that killed 80,000 Japanese at Hiroshima in an instant.

Until now, it has been assumed that the Soviets acted independently and without seeking the advice of the United States when they put off the Japanese attempt to get them to act as mediators in arranging a surrender. President Truman's own memoirs give this impression.

But the unpublished papers reveal that on July 18, 1945, in Stalin's lakeside villa at Babelsberg, Germany, Truman joined the Russian dictator in making a key decision in the surrender story.

It was only the second time the two had met—their first encounter was the day before—and they were alone except for their Foreign Ministers (James F. Byrnes for the United States, V. M. Molotov for Russia), and their interpreters.

Charles E. (Chip) Bohlen, then a political adviser and Mr. Truman's personal interpreter, kept the only record of the talk—a series of fragmentary notes jotted down as guides for translation. On March 28 of this year, Mr. Bohlen, now Special Assistant on Soviet Affairs to Secretary of State Christian Herter, himself wrote an amplification of the notes for State Department historians.

He said the opening remarks involved a comment by President Truman on the views from Stalin's villa overlooking the lake. Mr. Bohlen then took up the surrender story:

"Stalin said that the Soviet Union had received a communication from the Japanese, and he handed to the President a copy of a note from Sato (Naotake Sato, Japanese Ambassador to Moscow) * * * with a message from the Emperor. Secretary Byrnes then referred to something which Harry Hopkins had told him following Mr. Hopkins' return from Moscow in June 1945.

"Stalin inquired of the President whether it was worthwhile to answer this communication. The President replied that he had no respect for the good faith of the Japanese. Stalin pointed out that the Soviet Union was not at war with Japan and that it might be desirable to lull the Japanese to sleep, and possibly a general and unspecific answer might be returned, pointing out that the exact character of the proposed (Prince Fuminaro) Konoye mission was not clear. Alternatives would be that they might ignore it completely and not answer, or send back a definite refusal.

"The President said that he thought the first course of action would be satisfactory. Molotov pointed out that it would be completely factual, since it was not entirely clear what the Konoye mission would have to offer.

"Secretary Byrnes observed it was possible that this Japanese move had been inspired by fear of what the Soviets intended to do. Molotov said that he was sure the Japanese could guess and Stalin remarked that they had observed Soviet forces and tanks, etc., moving in the Far East. There seems to have been a discussion here of previous Japanese peace feelers not only to the U.S.S.R. but also to the Allied powers, and the President mentioned that the United States had had some indication via Sweden."

TRUMAN ACCOUNT COMPARED

Mr. Bohlen's account in the Potsdam papers differs sharply from the impression left by Mr. Truman in his memoirs published in 1955. In "Year of Decisions," Mr. Truman has only this to say of his second meeting with Stalin on July 18:

"Later I went to Marshal Stalin's quarters to return his call and by 4 o'clock in the afternoon I arrived at Cecilienhof Palace for the second meeting of the conference."

Later in his chronicle of Potsdam, Mr. Truman alluded to the discussion of the 18th, but without indicating, as the Bohlen notes do that Stalin sought Mr. Truman's views and that Mr. Truman shared in the decision to stall the Japanese overture. Mr. Truman's comment in his book follows:

"Stalin had told me, shortly after our arrival in Potsdam, that the Japanese had asked the Kremlin if it would be possible for Prince Konoye to come to Moscow. The Russians, so Stalin had informed me, had replied that they could not answer such a request until they knew what he wanted to talk about."

The night of July 18, Stalin's first suggestion, as approved by Mr. Truman, apparently was phoned or wired to Moscow, for Solomon A. Lozovsky, acting Commissar for Foreign Affairs, called in Japanese Ambassador Sato and handed him a note which did little more than stall off the idea of a peace mission to Moscow. It read in part:

"By order of the Government of the U.S.S.R., I have the honor to call your attention to the fact that the imperial views stated in the message of the Emperor of Japan are general in form and contain no concrete proposal. The mission of Prince Konoye, special envoy, is also not clear to the Government of the U.S.S.R."

The Soviet-American agreement of July 18 to brush aside the official peace feeler from Emperor Hirohito of Japan had this background, as revealed in the Potsdam papers:

First, U.S. officials already were aware of Japanese efforts to end the war by mediation. On July 6, as Mr. Truman was leaving for Potsdam, the U.S. Minister in Sweden cabled the State Department that Prince Carl Bernadotte, nephew of King Gustav, had been told by the Japanese military attaché in Sweden that Japan had lost the war and wanted to enter surrender negotiations through the King of Sweden. Also, U.S. officials knew of Japanese peace feelers through Switzerland.

STALIN PROMISE RELATED

In addition to these overtures, the United States had broken the Japanese code and certain of the messages passing between Tokyo and the Japanese embassy in Moscow on surrender offerings there were known to top United States officials.

Second, Russia had long promised to enter the Japanese war sometime in August. At Yalta earlier in the year, Stalin had promised to move against Japan about 3 months after the defeat of Germany. On May 28 in Moscow, he told Harry Hopkins, special emissary, Ambassador Averell Harriman and Mr. Bohlen that Russia would be ready to enter the Pacific war August 8. Later, at Potsdam, Stalin again indicated his armies would move on that date.

Third, President Truman knew that the United States possessed the new atomic bomb, a weapon of devastating power that would knock Japan out of the war. When Mr. Truman conferred with Stalin on the 18th, he already had seen a dramatic message telling of the success of the first atomic test at Alamagordo, N. Mex., on July 16. Gen. Leslie R. Groves, chief of the Manhattan Project, had said the weapon would be ready for use in the Pacific about August 1.

Fourth, "unconditional surrender" of the Japanese was U.S. Government policy, first proclaimed at the Cairo Conference in 1943. It had also become Stalin's policy. On May 28 at the Kremlin, according to the Potsdam papers, he told Harry Hopkins, Mr. Harriman and Mr. Bohlen that he favored unconditional surrender and "therefore felt it would be wiser to do away with the institution of the emperor," according to Mr. Bohlen's notes.

EMPEROR A FACTOR

Both Secretary Byrnes and former Secretary of State Cordell Hull opposed efforts of Under Secretary of State Joseph C. Grew and Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson to modify "unconditional surrender" to the extent of letting the Japanese keep their Emperor.

Both Assistant Secretaries of State, Archibald MacLeish and Dean Acheson (later Mr. Truman's Secretary of State) backed up Secretary Byrnes in opposition to Mr. Grew and Mr. Stimson. On July 6, 1945, Mr. MacLeish wrote a top secret memo to Mr. Byrnes which said in part:

"What has made Japan dangerous in the past and will make her dangerous in the future if we permit it, is, in large part, the Japanese cult of emperor worship which gives the ruling groups in Japan—the Gumbatsu—the current coalition of militarists, industrialists, large landowners, and officeholders—their control over the Japanese people.

"As Mr. Acheson pointed out in the staff committee, the institution of the throne is an anachronistic, feudal institution, perfectly adapted to the manipulation and use of anachronistic, feudal-minded groups within the country."

In a meeting in Mr. Grew's office on July 7, the Under Secretary renewed his arguments for letting the Japanese keep the Emperor and Mr. MacLeish again argued against him, as he did Mr. Acheson.

"Mr. Acheson," according to the notes of James H. Lewis, foreign affairs specialist, said "he could not understand why, if the Emperor had no importance in Japanese warmaking capacity, the military element in Japan should be so insistent on retaining the Emperor."

HIROHITO HAD SWITCHES

At that very moment, however, Emperor Hirohito had thrown his prestige against the military clique and was advocating an early suit for peace.

On July 12, 1945, in one of the many peace messages zipping between Foreign Minister Togo in Tokyo and Ambassador Sato in Moscow, Mr. Togo represented Emperor Hirohito thus:

"His majesty the emperor is greatly concerned over the daily increasing calamities and sacrifices faced by the citizens of the various belligerent countries in this present war and it is his majesty's heart's desire to see the swift termination of the war."

The Potsdam papers reveal the swift chronology of doom after the July 18 meeting of Stalin and Mr. Truman.

On July 21, Foreign Minister Togo sent Ambassador Sato the goals of the Konoye mission which Stalin had demanded:

"The mission of the special envoy Konoye is to ask the Government of the U.S.S.R. for its assistance in terminating the war and to explain our concrete intentions concerning the matter in accordance with the wishes of the emperor."

On July 24, Mr. Stimson made a last unsuccessful effort with Mr. Truman to have the projected ultimatum to Japan indicate a continuance of the dynasty. The same day President Truman informed Stalin of the existence of the atomic bomb.

On July 25 Mr. Stimson and President Truman approved orders written in Washington to drop the first atomic bomb on Japan "after about August 3, 1945." That same day Foreign Minister Togo ordered Ambassador Sato to see Mr. Molotov personally on plans for surrender. This was stressed as "urgent," although 4 days before Togo had reiterated to Sato that "we can not accept unconditional surrender."

JAPAN REJECTS SURRENDER

On July 26 the United States, Britain, and China demanded that Japan surrender without conditions or face "prompt and utter destruction."

On July 27, Ambassador Sato wired Foreign Minister Togo that he must promptly come out with "a concrete proposal" to end the war.

On July 28, Japan rejected the unconditional surrender ultimatum and Minister Togo prodded Ambassador Sato again to see Foreign Minister Molotov in the suit for a peace that would be less than unconditional surrender.

Also on July 28, Stalin informed Mr. Truman of the July 21 message of Togo in which he said the purpose of the Konoye mission was to ask Russia to assist in terminating the war. Stalin said he would reply "No," and Mr. Truman, without comment, thanked him for the information.

On July 29 Foreign Minister Molotov called at Mr. Truman's quarters and asked that the Allies in the Asian war address a "formal request" to the Soviets to enter the war against Japan. According to Mr. Bohlen's notes, Mr. Molotov said that "this could be based on the refusal of the Japanese to accept the recent ultimation to surrender and made on the basis of shortening the war and saving lives." Mr. Truman said he would consider the proposal.

On July 30 Ambassador Sato called again at the Moscow Foreign Office, but was told only that it would be several days before Stalin and Mr. Molotov returned from Berlin.

On August 6 the first atomic bomb in warfare demolished the city of Hiroshima.

On August 8 Ambassador Sato called on Mr. Molotov and was handed a Russian declaration of war against Japan.

On August 9 the second atomic bomb exploded over Nagasaki.

Japan offered to surrender on August 10, provided she could retain the Emperor. On August 11 the United States accepted, provided the Emperor was made subject to the authority of the Allied commander. On August 14 Japan surrendered on those terms.

It was unconditional surrender—as modified by several conditions.

NOTE OUTLINES DETAILS

State Department historians prefer to leave the evaluation of the whole surrender episode to others. An editor's note opening the section of the Potsdam papers dealing with the surrender overtures has this to say (deletions refer to documents and other sources):

"It has not been possible to establish the precise extent to which the U.S. delegation at the Berlin conference was aware of the contents of the papers of Japanese origin printed in this section and in volume II • • • the contents of certain of these papers were known to U.S. officials in Washington, however, as early as July 13 • • • and information on Japanese peace maneuvers was received by Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson at Babelsberg on July 16.

"It also has been determined that a series of messages of Japanese origin on this subject was received by the U.S. delegation during the course of the Berlin conference and that these messages were circulated at Babelsberg to some members of the President's party.

"Furthermore, in a conference on January 24, 1956, between Truman and members of his staff and Department of State historians, Truman supplied the information that he was familiar with the contents of the first Japanese peace feeler—before Stalin mention it to him at Babelsberg—and that he was familiar with the contents of the second Japanese peace feeler—before Stalin brought it to the attention of Truman and Attlee at the 10th plenary meeting of the Berlin conference on July 28."

Highways and Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, on August 23 I introduced a bill to encourage greater coordination of Federal highway programs with other Federal programs and local planning efforts. As I explained at that time, the bill would:

First. Attempt to establish a new policy establishing the principle that highway systems in urban areas should assist in the development of more orderly and well-balanced communities in which to live and work.

Second. Establish additional standards to guide the Secretary of Commerce in approving highway programs and plans, and directing him to require greatest possible coordination of Federal programs that affect urban areas.

Third. Authorize the establishment of regional planning commissions to submit highway programs and project recommendations for each standard metropolitan area in the Nation.

Fourth. Change procedure for public hearings and finance operation of the Commissions by increasing research and planning funds available to the States from 1½ percent to 2 percent.

Mr. President, the bill attempts to deal with the problems that arise often when important highways must cross highly populated areas. At the time of introduction I emphasized that I would welcome any suggestions on the bill because I believe that a thorough discussion of the impact of the Federal highway program on our urban communities is badly needed.

I am happy, therefore, to offer for the RECORD two editorials dealing with the proposed legislation. I believe that the editorials discuss the need for the bill and suggest the particular problems faced in New Jersey. Both appeared on August 29, one in the Bergen Evening Record, Hackensack, N.J., and the other in the Passaic Herald News, Passaic, N.J.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorials printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bergen (N.J.) Evening Record, Aug. 29, 1960]

A WAY TO DISSOLVE THE FIRST ROAD JAM

Senator WILLIAMS, Democrat, New Jersey, uneasy about the turmoil caused by the East-West Freeway planning in Essex County, has offered a suggestion to cope with the disruption caused by the construction of big highways. It deserves the thought and comment Mr. WILLIAMS asks of us.

The Senator has introduced a bill that would, among its provisions, encourage the formation of regional planning commissions. They would be a sort of clearinghouse and sounding board for opinion on such matters as highways. As evidence of the need for some such discussion, Mr. WILLIAMS said this to fellow Senate Members:

"So far there has been little progress in the development of cooperative planning for metropolitan areas as a whole. For example, one community may wish a road to run from point A to point B in its area but the adjacent community may desire a quiet residential neighborhood at the spot where it joins point B. More than likely, any road through the two communities will respect the desires of neither."

This is only too true if the road is being built with Federal funds—and what main road isn't these days? Mr. WILLIAMS said he was surprised to learn from the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads that local needs are not given consideration equal to that accorded interstate commerce's demands.

How many times have we in Bergen County seen Mr. WILLIAMS' example at its most parochial? Just mention a proposed road alinement, and right away every municipality involved hollers, "Not here"— before there is anything but a tentative tracing on a map.

Mr. WILLIAMS suggests that some of this pain be prevented by the establishment of regional planning commissions in each standard metropolitan area. (Metropolitan areas are defined by the Census Bureau, sometimes arbitrarily and unrealistically. Bergen, for instance, is listed under Paterson-Passaic-Clifton. Mr. WILLIAMS says he uses these definitions only because they're handy; the Governor or the legislature of any State could work out the method best suited to specific needs.) The planning commissions would listen, weigh, and recommend. They would have no powers of enforcement, but they might be heard where until now there has been very little sympathetic attention.

Mr. WILLIAMS says he expects no action on the legislation this year. He is sending the proposal to all official planning bodies in New Jersey. He wants their reactions. They should volunteer it not in the belief that this is one more ticket to supergovernment but that it is, as Mr. WILLIAMS described it, a plan designed to help overcome inherent difficulties faced by State highway departments and individual communities when they have to deal with the inevitable big roads.

[From the Passaic (N.J.) Herald News, Aug. 29, 1960]

ESSEX FREEWAY BATTLE CONTINUES

The demand in Essex County for depression rather than elevation of the East-West freeway has led U.S. Senator WILLIAMS to introduce a bill requiring that "community values and community living" be given the same consideration as the needs of interstate commerce in the Federal interstate highway construction program.

Senator WILLIAMS says he is introducing the bill because he feels "thorough discussion of the impact of the Federal highway program on our urban communities is badly needed". The bill is a tentative approach to the problem, Mr. WILLIAMS indicates by his statement that if discussion shows the need for changes, he will make them in time for reintroduction of the bill in January.

In Essex, the criticism has been made that the planed elevation of a 7-mile stretch would cause blight in the densely populated adjacent areas. Federal highway authorities have refused to approve depression because it would add $13 million to the cost. The affected communities have been told that they can have a depressed highway by putting up the extra money. They have dismissed the suggestion as out of the question.

Unquestionably, the Essex objectors are on sound ground in opposing an elevated highway. The experience with elevated structures in New York and other cities has proved that they are undesirable. The idea of subjecting Federal highway projects to the scrutiny of planners, as the Williams bill proposes, is also sound.

The distressing feature of the Essex clamor is the refusal to consider an alternative, namely, the construction of a toll highway. A depressed toll highway could be built speedily. The users would pay for it. Essex, however, prefers to use its political power to try to get someone else to foot the bill, either the Federal Government or the rest of the State.

Weaver's Annual Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHIL WEAVER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 29, 1960

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker, every year I have made an effort to keep my friends and neighbors in the First Congressional District completely informed as to the activities of the Congress. I have from time to time made special reports which have been universally greeted with favor.

Once again this year I am making such a report to my constituents which, under leave to extend my remarks, I now place in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON, August 31, 1960.—The 86th Congress is now history—so, let's look at the record:

Defense: We are the most powerful nation on earth and we'll remain that way. We have built a well-balanced, flexible and retaliatory force to keep the peace.

Economy: We wound up the fiscal year with a $1 billion surplus. Prospects are bright for an even better surplus next year.

Socialist trends: Although still strong among the "big spend" boys, much of the socialistic legislation was blocked.

Farm problem: The big failure of the 86th Congress. The leadership refused to work for a sound solution to the problem.

DEFENSE POSTURE

As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense I have concentrated for 2 years on the effort to build a balanced, flexible defense program geared to keeping the peace.

Bombers: Still the backbone of our retaliatory force. We have a fleet of heavy bombers capable of delivering a devastating nuclear blow anywhere in the Communist empire—ready around the clock.

Missiles: Already squadrons of Atlas ICBM's are operational; Titan soon to be in the operational category; Minuteman, highly mobile and therefore less vulnerable from attack, is well ahead of schedule; Polaris has passed its tests and the first missiles will be on station with the fleet this fall. We'll have close to 50 of these missiles at sea by spring. Intermediate missiles backing up our "at home" force we have shorter range missiles stationed abroad, near Communist borders, capable of dealing severe blows to selected targets.

Intelligence: Always a risky business, our intelligence agents have been able to paint a truer picture of Soviet capabilities. We are ahead of the Soviets in military matters. They have some interesting gadgets and have made some spectacular propaganda splashes. But responsible leaders of both parties agree we are stronger. Democrat GEORGE MAHON of Texas, chairman of the Committee on Defense Appropriations has this to say: "We have a greater overall striking ability than the Soviet Union. This Nation is stronger than any nation in the world today."

BUDGET ECONOMY

The big-spend boys were in the saddle as the 86th Congress got underway, but a determined effort by the Republican minority backed up by the potent Presidential veto helped to hold the line against bigger government, more inflation. However, the pressure is still there.

Supporters of big-spend and giveaway programs such as subsidies for airports, schools, socialized medicine, area redevelopment, and urban renewal are still fighting.

If we want the Federal Government to be all-powerful, all-supporting, they have the proposals. If all the spend-ourselves-rich bills had been passed, it has been estimated our annual budget would be in excess of $125 billion and you would foot the bill.

LABOR REFORM

In one area, the cleanup of some underworld elements in labor, the 86th Congress made real progress. Enactment of the Landrum-Griffin bill will go down in history as a great step forward.

The bill was enacted after years of investigation, months of hearings that developed a sordid story of corruption, vice, and undue political pressure by some in the labor movement. Enacted into law last year, the cleanup drive has already begun.

But the Hoffa-Carey crowd is still a potent force. Many will recall that AFL–CIO Vice President James Carey wrote an open, threatening letter to everyone who supported sound labor-management reform legislation. I was the recipient of one of those letters. I am proud to have been among those who stood up to be counted in favor of good legislation to protect the rank and file of labor.

SOCIALIST TREND

There is a saying that in Washington they have more solutions than the country has problems. Every local problem becomes a national crisis and they turn to Uncle Sam for a solution—always a costly one and always involving more government, a bigger bureaucracy.

The billion-dollar emergency housing proposal is an example; private builders are keeping abreast of the housing needs; never in history have so many owned their homes, and yet, there are those in the House and Senate who want the Government to expand in this field, and to finance directly home buying and homebuilding.

This would mean Government control and absolute standardization. Every home in America would look exactly alike. We would become one gigantic collective housing development.

NEGLECT OF FARMERS

The Democrats have a 2-to-1 margin in both the House and the Senate and control all of the committees of the Congress, and yet they were unable to come up with a reasonable, fair, and just solution to the farm problem.

Several proposals were made including the old Brannan plan in new clothing. Only one major farm bill, a modified wheat program, came out of the House Agriculture Committee and northern Democrats teamed up to kill it. The Senate passed a wheat bill which would have cut both acreage allotments and support prices.

There are several reasons why sound farm legislation cannot be written under the prevailing circumstances.

Sectionalism: In the Senate, the four ranking Democratic members of the Agriculture Committee are from the Deep South; are interested in sugar, peanuts, tung nuts, cotton, and tobacco. Peanuts are one of the support crops and are involved in setting parity payments and, in a literal sense, the price support level depends on the size of baseball crowds. In the House, the top nine Democrats on the committee come from the South. The chairman is a tobacco farmer. Therefore it is difficult to generate enthusiastic support for wheat or grain crops.

Partisanship: Unfortunately our farm citizens have been the victims of political maneuvering of the most cynical kind.

There are those in Congress who obviously prefer a political issue to a solution. Proposal after proposal went down the drain or into pigeonholes. Senate Majority Leader LYNDON B. JOHNSON, when listing "must" legislation after reconvening of Congress, pointedly ignored the farm problem. The Democratic presidential nominee has a solid Benson voting record. Every sound program has been watered down until nothing workable remains.

I personally have introduced or supported a number of major and workable proposals; the wheat marketing bill, industrial use of surpluses proposal, payment in kind, the Weaver farm plan.

Any one of these proposals would help ease the farm situation. As always I stand ready to cooperate with anyone in Congress who advances constructive proposals along these lines.

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

This Congress has seen major advances for two vitally important resource development and protection projects. Construction has begun on Red Willow Dam. Construction funds for Salt-Wahoo have been included this year. I was happy to head up the presentation to the House Appropriations Committee on both projects in 1959 and 1960.

Mr. Speaker, I was this year highly honored by the Civic Affairs Associates, Inc., by receiving a certificate of merit. This group represents a conservative point of view and believes in freedom of Americans, both in the economic and political sense.

That certificate is signed by Mr. Alex Akerman, Jr., vice president-secretary, and Mr. Biehl P. Clarke, president, and it reads as follows:

Certificate of merit for service in behalf of economic and political freedom. The Honorable PHIL WEAVER, Congressman from Nebraska, has demonstrated by his voting record that he is an advocate of economy in government, limited government, free enterprise, economic growth with stability, and equality under the law. On key rollcall votes during the 86th Congress, as selected by the Free Citizen's Voting Record,

Congressman WEAVER scored in the top 20 percent of the House of Representatives in his support of these principles of sound and forward-looking government. In recognition thereof, the board of directors of the Civic Affairs Associates, Inc. awards this certificate of merit.

By the Board of Directors, August 19, 1960.

ALEX AKERMAN, Jr.,
Vice President-Secretary.
BIEHL P. CLARKE,
President,
Civic Affairs Associates, Inc.

How To Reach Latin America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in a letter to the editor of the New York Times this morning, Mr. Loring M. Hewen, of New York City, recommends that the United States conduct broadcasts to Central America and the Caribbean to let the people there know more about our country and to give them an opportunity to learn the truth about us. The writer offered a novel proposal, to set up a broadcasting station on the U.S.-owned Swan Islands off the coast of Honduras and to transmit Spanish-language programs to Central America and the Caribbean. The idea is excellent. As Mr. Hewen points out, the Voice of America's South American broadcasts are limited to 1 hour a day and are transmitted by shortwave stations. This is a drawback since the shortwave broadcasts reach only that fraction of the population owning shortwave receivers. I have long advocated use of radio to tell the true story of America, not only to Central America and the Caribbean but to all of Latin America. There is no doubting the fact that we are in trouble there because of a lack of understanding, among other things, which might be vastly improved through use of regular, longwave radio broadcasts. During the past 2 years, the Honorable JOSEPH M. MONTOYA and myself have conducted weekly radio broadcasts in Spanish for use on the Voice of America's Latin American programs and while this was something it was obvious that much, much more must be done. It was obvious further that much, much more could be done. There is no question in my mind but that the benefits derived from whatever it might cost would constitute profitable returns for the investment. Under permission previously granted, I include Mr. Hewen's letter for the information of all Members of the Congress:

CENTRAL AMERICA'S AMITY—RADIO BROADCASTS URGED BEAMED TO "COMMON MAN" OF AREA

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Whatever day this letter is read the chances are that the front page of the New York Times on that morning will have carried a story about some anti-American activity somewhere in the Caribbean or central America.

The almost daily reports leave no doubt that the recruiting campaign of international communism is gathering strength. Nor can there be a doubt that the prestige and popularity of the United States are falling. I have some personal knowledge of it.

Many years ago I started making annual trips to central America. A visiting American was a welcomed and important guest then, in most towns and all of the rural communities. Today I no longer detect this universal feeling of friendship; I sense instead a resentment directed at any "Norte Americano" by many central Americans.

Why this change of heart? I do not have all the answers, but some are obvious: that small percentage of American tourists who vex with their air of superiority and their flouting of local customs; the unrebutted libels heaped against the United States by radical politicians of the Castro ilk; the widespread conviction, rightly or wrongly held, that Latin America has been discriminated against in our foreign aid programs.

DISSEMINATING TRUTH

A false picture of America and Americans? I think so. But I also realize that a central American could hardly think any differently. We are not doing enough to tell him the truth.

We are not communicating directly to the common man. We are not reaching him with facts about the many fine things being done in his country by the U.S. Government and private organizations like the Rockefeller fund. He does not regularly read newspapers, so he does not know much about what is going on in the world. He does not own a shortwave radio, so he cannot hear the truth as the Voice of America tells it in its 1 hour of Spanish broadcasting every day.

We have almost ignored addressing this common man. We have left him to feed his large family from his small cornfield. We have taken no notice of him as he works on a company plantation or builds a road by the profuse sweat of his brow. In fact, we scarcely know this man even exists until the day when, shod in sandals cut from old auto tires and armed with machete and shotgun, he and hundreds like him swarm into the capital city to unseat a government.

But there is a way we can reach this man. It can be done effectively. It can be done now.

Almost every little grocery, bar, and restaurant in Central America has a radio going full blast most of the time. Even the poorest homes often manage to afford a small radio to tune in the local stations. Moreover, 100 miles off the coast of Honduras lie Swan Islands, an almost unknown possession of the United States. Here, near the center of the east coast of Central America, we could establish a powerful transmitter receivable on the ordinary small radio.

PROGRAM MATERIAL

With this transmitter Spanish-speaking Americans could bring the truth to our friends, potential friends, and even our disenchanted friends in southern Mexico, El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, Guatemala, and parts of Cuba and Panama.

The choice of program material I leave to the experts—our own famed Voice of America, for example. I daresay, though, that a balanced diet could be established of popular music, factual news, and features of popular appeal in that area (talks on child care, advice on sanitation, reporting of improvements in farming methods, religious programs, perhaps lessons in basic English).

All are things that would interest these near neighbors of ours and let them know that we are their friends, that we do have their interests at heart, and that Americans of all nationalities will live better in the long run if we resolve to stick together.

"Papa" Duclos, now chief of staff of the French Communist Party, recently addressed an enthusiastic crowd in Havana. They cheered when he promised that the Castro chant "Cuba si, Yankee no" would soon spread to become "Latin America si, Yankee no." Let us try as hard as we can to keep his words from proving to be a prophecy. One step we can take now. Swan Islands are there. Money for the necessary radio equipment could be found. The people of Central America will listen. Can we afford not to act now?

LORING M. HEWEN.

NEW YORK, *August 29, 1960.*

Special Town Meeting Urges Action on New Post Office for Goshen, Conn.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK KOWALSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, August 31, 1960

Mr. KOWALSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department admits the need for new post office facilities in the town of Goshen, Conn.

However, the people of Goshen are understandably disturbed by the delay of the Post Office Department in proceeding with a new post office.

A special town meeting was held recently, at which the following resolution was adopted:

FRANK KOWALSKI,
Congressman at Large, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE SIR: At a special town meeting held in Goshen, Conn. on August 9, 1960, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the U.S. Post Office Department has determined that the present post office facilities for the town of Goshen are inadequate; and

"Whereas said Post Office Department has investigated several possibilities for the construction of new post office facilities in the town of Goshen: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this meeting go on record as urging the Post Office Department to proceed as soon as possible with the necessary steps to provide new post office facilities; and it is further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to U.S. Senators THOMAS DODD and PRESCOTT BUSH, and to U.S. Congressman FRANK KOWALSKI and JOHN S. MONAGAN."

Very truly yours,

VIOLET W. VAILL,
Goshen Town Clerk.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).